



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—Monday, February 26, 2018

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Gracious God, lover of our souls, inspire our Senators to acknowledge Your greatness and to depend on Your wisdom and power. May they find their strength and usefulness in their total dependence on You.

Lord, deliver them from those who hate the upright and surround them with the shield of Your Divine favor. Give them the wisdom to find common ground in order to accomplish the best for our Nation and world. Remind them that righteousness elevates a nation but sin destroys. Prepare their hearts and minds for all the challenges they will face in the days to come.

And Lord, today we thank You for the legacy of our Nation's first President, George Washington.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January

24, 1901, as amended by the order of January 29, 2018, the Senator from Michigan, Mr. PETERS, will now read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. PETERS, at the rostrum, read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you at the same time to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country—and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise and as an instructive example in our annals that, under circumstances in which the passions agitated in every direction were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of success

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

has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger natural to that solicitude, urge me on an occasion like the present to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think

and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts—of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South in the same intercourse, benefitting by the agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation.

Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value! they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—northern and southern—Atlantic and western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the

jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head. They have seen in the negotiation by the executive—and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate—of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a Constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate Union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character with the real design to direct,

control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction; to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests. However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments as of other human institutions, that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country, that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypotheses and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypotheses and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable; liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is indeed little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations.

Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and the duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, fomented occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true—and in governments of a monarchical cast patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country

should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the

general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all; religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its

animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak towards a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be

impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements (I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy)—I repeat it therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed—in order to give to trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them—conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another—that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character—that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could ob-

tain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take—and was bound in duty and interest to take—a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.
UNITED STATES, 19th September 1796.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in the wake of the horrific shootings at Stoneman Douglas High School, the deadliest school shooting since Sandy Hook, there has been a broad national conversation about the epidemic of gun violence in this country. It is being led by a group of brave high school students, the friends and classmates of the fallen, whom I will be sitting down with tomorrow. Their passion and eloquence have been a moral course for change.

Thank God for these students. They are urging us now to have a debate in Congress about something very straightforward: What can we do to stop very dangerous guns from getting into the hands of very dangerous people? How can we keep Americans safe at our movie theaters, at night clubs, at concerts and churches, and above all, at our schools?

We need to get something real and significant accomplished. The problem of gun violence in this country is too immediate for another delay, too severe for half measures.

President Trump has been talking about comprehensive background checks. We are glad to hear that. We are glad that folks are finally starting to talk about the real issues of gun safety again. Democrats believe that, at the very least, in the wake of Parkland, we should strive for comprehensive background checks—closing the loopholes that allow anyone, regardless of a violent history or a history of mental illness, to walk into a gun show or go on the internet and purchase a gun. More than 90 percent of Americans and the vast majority of gun owners support comprehensive background checks. What are we waiting for?

There seems to be a discussion about a more limited proposal, the Fix NICS bill, sponsored by Senators CORNYN and MURPHY, which improves the existing background check system in a few ways. I support the bill and I am a co-sponsor, but the Fix NICS bill is not what President Trump has been talking about this afternoon and at other times when he says “comprehensive background checks.” Fix NICS was written to address one specific issue that was brought to light after the horrific shooting in a church in Sutherland Springs, TX. It is a proposal to ad-

dress that specific problem, but it leaves unaddressed a host of crucial gun safety issues, including, and especially, the loopholes in our background check system. If we only pass Fix NICS, we will be right back here after the next shooting in nearly the same place. If all Congress does in response to the Parkland shooting is to pass Fix NICS, we will not be doing our job. We must do much more than that.

This week, the Democratic caucus will discuss what policies we believe will most effectively curb the uniquely American epidemic of gun violence. We will propose them and work with our Republican colleagues to perfect and, hopefully, enact them. I sincerely believe we can make progress even on an issue as fraught as this one, but it will require our Republican friends to break free from the iron grip of the NRA.

Our Republican friends face a simple choice: Do something real on guns or please the NRA. Doing both is impossible.

The NRA's No. 1 goal is to make sure nothing meaningful on gun safety ever happens. When there are national issues, when there are horrible shootings, they make a feint as if they might try to do something, but then they pull right back because they want nothing to be done.

As an example, after the shooting in Las Vegas, Senators tried to do something here in the Senate about bump stocks, the modification that allowed the perpetrator to automatically fire his arsenal of assault weapons. The NRA and many Republicans said that they would be willing to work on it, but then what? The NRA pushed the weakest possible measure—a simple review of the issue by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, which had already said that they couldn't do anything about the bill. And then what happened? Nothing.

Now the NRA has pushed the House Republicans to attach the Fix NICS bill—the Cornyn-Murphy bill, a very modest improvement focused on one issue that happened in Texas, but it was not relevant to what happened here in Parkland. They tried to attach that to the NRA's No. 1 legislative priority, concealed carry reciprocity, a bill that undermines our existing gun laws, defeating the entire purpose of the legislation.

Even when it comes to the most modest improvements to gun safety laws, the NRA always finds a way to stand in the way of progress. If we are going to get something significant done to keep our schools and our kids safe from gun violence, for the first time in a very long time, President Trump and congressional Republicans will have to buck the NRA.

It is our hope that Republican leaders will work with us in a bipartisan way to pass legislation that makes a real difference—not half measures, not

baby steps, and certainly not attaching good legislation to legislation that would make the overall problem even worse.

We hope Republicans will work with us to pass serious changes to our gun laws, whether the NRA supports them or not. That is the only way we will make progress on an issue that has frustrated Congress and the vast majority of the American people for far too long.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on another matter, last week the Republican-led FCC formally published a rule reversing net neutrality—the legal infrastructure that kept the internet free and open to all Americans. The FCC's rule will give the ISP—the internet service providers—the authority to restrict customers' access to their favorite websites by forcing consumers to buy internet packages, such as cable, and pay more for premium access.

In this new universe, big companies that can pay to play could get faster internet service while startups and everyday Americans are stuck in the slow lane. It will mean the end of the free and open internet as we know it. The way the internet has driven innovation and entrepreneurship and the way it has provided unprecedented opportunities for Americans to learn and connect with one another could all change, with a profit-making organization at the toll booth deciding who pays what.

We have an opportunity to save the internet by undoing the FCC's ruling through the Congressional Review Act. All 49 Democrats have already signed on to the bill, and one Republican, SUSAN COLLINS, has joined us. We now need only one more vote, one more Republican, to reverse the FCC's ruling here in the Senate.

When we force a vote on this bill, for the first time, Republicans in Congress will have the opportunity to right the administration's wrong and show the American people whose side they are on—the average consumer or once again side with big corporate interests. Are they on the side of big internet service providers and corporations, or are they on the side of consumers, entrepreneurs, startups, and small business owners?

Tomorrow there will be a net neutrality day of action here on the Hill that I hope will focus the Senate's attention on the issue. We have 60 legislative days to pass the CRA, and I urge every single one of my Republican colleagues to join us and help save the internet.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

TRIBUTE TO MARIAN BENTON TASCO

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate Black History Month and to pay tribute to a Pennsylvanian who has dedicated her life to public service.

Today, we honor former Philadelphia councilwoman Marian Benton Tasco, whose 50-year career in public service has improved the lives of countless people in our State. Throughout her career, Marian Tasco consistently fought for the people of her community. From her first days as a typist working in the city of Philadelphia to the end of her seventh term serving on the city council, Marian Tasco's life has been dedicated to helping people. Today we celebrate Marian's commitment to public service.

Born during the days of segregation in Greensboro, NC, Marian Tasco was joyfully raised through the love and care of her mother, Mazie Benton; her great-grandmother, Susie Short; and her grandparents, Alice and Thomas Benton. At an early age, Marian expressed an interest in community service through volunteer activities with the Brownies and Girl Scouts of America. Even as a child, Marian Tasco was inspired to help others.

It was at this point in her life that Marian imagined that she would go on to become an educator. With that goal in mind, she began her education at Bennett College, a historically Black liberal arts college for women, which is located in Greensboro. Marian worked during the summers to pay for her tuition. After 2 years, Marian had to leave Bennett when she could no longer afford to pay the cost of tuition. Later in life, Marian would return to Bennett College as a member of the board of trustees and actively work to support the growth of the college.

After leaving Bennett, Marian Tasco moved to Philadelphia to be with her family and to continue her education at Temple University. Again working to pay her way through school, she attended classes at night until her graduation.

While she maintained a strong interest in serving others, she decided that, rather than education, politics and

government would be her venue for service. In 1959, Marian began her work for the city of Philadelphia as a clerk typist I in the Philadelphia Police Department's Pawn Brokers Division. As a result of her diligent work, not long thereafter, she was promoted to clerk typist II. In this new role, she was reassigned to the registrar's office of the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

Like many others who have served the public, Marian Tasco's story in politics began on the frontlines of the community—the community she would later go on to serve.

Under the leadership of a distinguished lawyer, Charles Bowser, Marian served as a task force coordinator for the Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition. This is an organization that she continues to serve today as a board member. One of Marian's greatest accomplishments was the creation of a youth-focused summer work program that still exists today. Her experience at the Urban Affairs Coalition affirmed her interest in public affairs and community outreach and helped increase her understanding of the needs of the African-American community in Philadelphia.

As her career progressed and new opportunities emerged, Marian Tasco remained committed to the path of service. Following her work as an assistant to the former secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, C. Delores Tucker, Marian brought her passion for service to the office of the late U.S. Congressman William H. Gray III. He also, of course, served as House majority whip and chairman of the Budget Committee. She worked as both campaign manager and director of constituent services for Congressman Gray.

Serving with Secretary Tucker and Congressman Gray made Marian Tasco worthy of recognition, but Marian wanted to do more. She decided that with her years of experience in community activism and public service, she would seek elected office. It was at the urging of Marian's mentor, former Representative, City Councilman, and Secretary of Public Welfare John White, Jr., that she made the decision to seek elected office.

In 1983, Marian became the first African American elected Philadelphia city commissioner. Instantly, she helped develop voter education and registration programs in the city and worked to grow civic education focusing on Philadelphia's young people.

In 1988, Marian began her first term on the Philadelphia City Council as a representative for the ninth district of the city. For over 27 years, she served in a number of communities, including East Oak Lane, West Oak Lane, Mount Airy, Olney, Logan, Lawncrest, and Oxford Circle. She would go on to be re-elected seven times and pioneer initiatives to improve the quality of life for Philadelphians young and old.

Throughout her tenure in office, Councilwoman Tasco's role continued to grow in responsibility and scope. She eventually rose to serve as Philadelphia City Council's majority leader, as well as majority whip.

Marian Tasco has served as ward leader for the 50th Ward of Philadelphia for the last three decades. She was also unanimously elected by the Pennsylvania Democratic State Committee to represent Pennsylvania on the Democratic National Committee. In this DNC role, Councilwoman Tasco's reach grew beyond Philadelphia into the national political arena.

She helped institute meaningful change in Philadelphia and literally across the Nation. Among other issues, she worked to fight predatory lending, and her work in that area positively impacted the lives of many Philadelphians. Her commitment to "protect Americans from unscrupulous dealings of financial institutions" spanned both Broad Street and Wall Street and helped inspire some of President Barack Obama's work. Her advocacy on this issue dates back to the early 1990s, when she worked with community organizations to alert Philadelphia residents about the potential harm of money offered by loan sharks. In 2004, she briefed then-State Senator Obama on the issue during his campaign for the U.S. Senate. In commemoration of her efforts, President Obama invited Councilwoman Tasco to join him for the signing of the historic Dodd-Frank legislation.

Marian Tasco's accomplishments in public office made Philadelphia a better place to live and work, and the people of Pennsylvania's largest city remembered. Her retirement celebrations had over 1,200 attendees, including elected officials, labor leaders, community leaders, clergy, and, of course, constituents—the people she served. Councilwoman Tasco is a beloved figure throughout the city of Philadelphia and beyond. She is beloved by her peers and those she represented as a councilwoman.

Marian's work in public service was a shining example for others to follow. Philadelphia mayor and former city council member Jim Kenney and former mayor and councilman Michael Nutter have both cited the councilwoman as a mentor. In fact, Mayor Kenney even noted that Councilwoman Tasco "raised him" from the age of 32, when he was a new council member.

She also has a proven legacy of recognizing and developing young talent on her own team. Two current members of the Philadelphia City Council, Derrick Green and Cherelle Parker, and the late Judge Brenda Frazier-Clemons all served as members of her staff.

Councilwoman Marian Tasco's lifetime of service has been the subject of

commendation. She has received a notable list of awards and honors, including an honorary doctorate of laws degree from Lincoln University. Her years of work to improve the city of Philadelphia resulted in a lifetime appointment to the Board of Directors of City Trusts, the Philadelphia Cultural Fund, and the Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority Board, just to name a few. For her advocacy on behalf of behavioral health programs and work to push local healthcare reforms, the former Lindley Court senior living apartments were renamed in her honor.

Marian Tasco has spent the better part of her life working to improve her community, and she has inspired the next generation of public servants. As we celebrate this Black History Month, we honor those who have made a real commitment to serve others. Marian Tasco has always honored that commitment.

On behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the city of Philadelphia, and all those whose lives have been impacted and inspired by her work, it is my privilege on this day to pay tribute to Marian Tasco, a former member and leader of the City Council of Philadelphia and a devoted public servant who worked her way from clerk typist I to citywide leader with national impact.

Well done, Marian. Your adopted city and our Commonwealth are proud of your noble work.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SCHOOL VIOLENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today marks nearly 2 weeks since the murder of 17 students and staff in Parkland, FL. May today also mark the moment that we resolved to do something about school violence. May it mark the moment that left and right determined to lay aside their differences and work together to prevent future tragedies.

To keep our children safe from harm, there is no panacea, no one legislative solution, and it disheartens me when I hear talk about what can't be done. It is time to focus on what can be done.

Fortunately, solutions on the State level—including in my home State of Utah—can help show us the way forward. Working in the realm of the possible, Utah State legislators have come together to forge bipartisan solutions to stop school violence. When I was in Salt Lake last week, I learned firsthand about the Safe Utah smartphone app. The Safe Utah crisis text and tip line is a statewide service that provides

real-time crisis intervention to use through texting and a confidential tip program. Licensed clinicians from the University Neuropsychiatric Institute at the University of Utah Health respond to all incoming chats, texts, and calls 24/7 by providing supporting or crisis counseling, suicide prevention, and referral services.

The Safe Utah Program—developed with funding from the Utah State Legislature in collaboration with the University Neuropsychiatric Institute, the Utah State Office of Education, the Utah Office of the Attorney General, and the Utah Anti-Bullying Coalition—is a testament to what can be done when mental health, education, and law enforcement agencies work together to prevent student violence.

Not only is the app innovative, it works. Since the app was unveiled in 2016, 86 planned school attacks have been stopped. Think about that, 86 school attacks stopped in a relatively small State. That number translates to dozens of lives saved and hundreds of heartbreaks spared. For thousands of families across the State, this simple app made a world of difference. Imagine the potential if these kinds of technologies were available to students across the country. We could quickly get help for those who need it and, in the process, save countless lives.

That is why, later this week, I will introduce the Students, Teachers, and Officers Preventing School Violence Act, or the STOP School Violence Act. My bill makes Department of Justice grants available to States to fund programs designed to reduce school violence.

To that end, the STOP School Violence Act will fund four initiatives. First, it will provide grant funding for evidence-based training to prevent student violence against others and self, including training for local law enforcement officers, school personnel, and students. This is not just active shooter training but training designed to give students and teachers the knowledge to recognize and properly respond to warning signals or signals to stop school violence before it occurs.

Second, the bill will fund evidence-based technology and equipment to improve security and prevent school violence. This includes the development and operation of anonymous reporting systems like the Safe Utah app, as well as improvements to school security infrastructure to deter and respond to threats of school violence, and, when prevention efforts fall short—as they unfortunately will in some cases—locks on classroom doors, reinforced entryways, and other commonsense security infrastructure improvements will help.

Third, the bill will provide funding for the development and operation of evidence-based school threat assessment and crisis intervention teams,

which may include evidence-based training for school officials in responding to mental health crises. Again, school personnel need the tools to assess and respond to threats before they materialize, including those threats that originate from individuals struggling with mental health issues.

Finally, the bill will provide funding for continued coordination with local law enforcement. Law enforcement alone cannot prevent school violence—just as no amount of prevention training, security infrastructure improvements, or mental health resources would be able to singularly prevent tragedies like that in Parkland, but law enforcement, and in particular those officers who already staff schools, have an important role to play in any comprehensive solution to prevent school violence.

Now, some of you may point out something my bill will not address, and that is guns. On this issue, many reforms have been proposed over the last 12 days—some old and some new. I believe we can find common ground here, too, such as that outlined in the bipartisan Fix NICS Act, which ensures that our background check system is operating as designed.

A background check is only as good as the records in the database. The FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System is currently incomplete because many Federal agencies and States have not provided all records that establish someone as prohibited from owning a firearm under current law, especially those related to mental health adjudications and involuntary commitment orders.

The bipartisan Fix NICS Act will ensure more of those records make it into the database by holding Federal agencies accountable for uploading relevant records and incentivizing States to upload all relevant information. Including these missing records will help ensure more accurate and complete background checks, thereby keeping dangerous weapons out of the hands of felons, fugitives, drug addicts, persons with serious mental illness, and other prohibited persons.

I will be the first to admit there is no single, perfect solution—not the STOP School Violence Act and not the Fix NICS Act, but both of these bills can help save lives. Remember the 86 planned school attacks since the Safe Utah app was unveiled and remember the 26 lives that might have been spared if the domestic violence offense of the shooter in Sutherland Springs, TX, had been properly entered into the FBI background check database.

Now is not the time for argument but for action. Rather than letting the perfect be the enemy of the good, I implore my friends on both sides of the aisle to come together for the safety of our children. Rather than resorting to

recycled talking points, I ask my colleagues to heed Minority Leader SCHUMER's call to "pass real legislation that makes a difference." Rather than retreating to our partisan foxholes, I call on Republicans and Democrats alike to surrender their rhetorical weapons. For the good of the Nation, and the good of our children, all of us must look beyond the horizon of our political differences to find common ground.

Is this legislation enough to solve the problem of school violence? No. Quite frankly, it is not enough, but it is a start, and it is a start upon which we can all agree. We will not solve the problem of school violence overnight, but with incremental efforts—such as the legislation I have proposed—we can make a lasting difference and even save thousands of lives.

So let's not delay any further. We owe it to our children, and to all of those affected by gun violence, to take decisive action in those areas where we do agree. This is important stuff. We can't just throw in the sponge and act like we have this problem solved when we still have work to do. So I hope we will take heed to what I have just suggested—I think it can be very helpful to us—and we follow the suggestions I have made here today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PARKLAND, FLORIDA, SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I bring a report to the Senate from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL, a suburb of Ft. Lauderdale. The teachers and staff of the school returned to work today, which is less than 2 weeks after a former student walked on to the campus with an AR-15 and opened fire on all three floors of a classroom building.

I have spent time the past couple of weeks in Parkland, visiting with some of the families. Those of us who are parents can only imagine the grief and anger that they are feeling, just like the grief and anger after every one of these massacres. I have also spent time meeting with some of the courageous students who have turned this tragedy into a call for action. As I have suggested to them, their hope gives me hope. Their determination gives me all the more determination. These students have told us over and over that they don't plan to stop until Congress and the State legislators around the country start enacting commonsense gun reform. They have said that they are not going to stop, and neither am I.

What happened at that high school shouldn't happen anywhere in this

country. It shouldn't have happened in Columbine. It shouldn't have happened in Newtown. It shouldn't have happened in Orlando. It shouldn't have happened at the Ft. Lauderdale airport or Parkland. It shouldn't happen, period. Now it is up to us to make sure that it never happens again.

This Senator grew up on a ranch. I have always had guns. I have hunted all my life. I still hunt with my son. An AR-15 or a SIG Sauer MCX, the gun that was used at the Pulse nightclub, is not for hunting; they are for killing. Yet, despite these horrific events, these devastating tragedies are occurring throughout our country over and over, and Congress refuses to act. Why is it that we can't enact the most commonsense measures to protect the people we represent?

We need a comprehensive background check on the purchase of a weapon, a commonsense background check that would not only include if there is a criminal record or if someone has been adjudicated mentally incompetent but all the other myriad reasons, all the other things surrounding mental health. Was the shooter on the terrorist watch list? Had Omar Mateen, the shooter, been on the terrorist watch list, he would have been caught. He was the shooter in Orlando. We need to get assault rifles off the streets.

Protecting our fellow citizens should be a top priority. If making it more difficult for someone to walk into a store and purchase a weapon of war will do that, why can't we get that done? Why? I will tell you why. Because there are folks who are more concerned about an A-plus rating from the NRA than they are about providing those commonsense solutions to the problems.

I want to read something that appeared in a national magazine, reprinted in the paper that is published in Broward County, where the shooting occurred. It is from a radiologist who is in the trauma center at Broward Health, which is a hospital chain organization in the area of Broward County. Her name is Dr. Heather Sher. She was working the day of the school shooting, and she went to work in the trauma center on some of the victims. She has treated countless gunshot wounds in trauma centers throughout her career, but this one was the second time that she had treated someone shot by an assault rifle like the AR-15. Here is what Dr. Sher had to say:

Routine handgun injuries leave entry and exit wounds and linear tracks through the victim's body that are roughly the size of the bullet. If the bullet [from a handgun] does not directly hit something crucial like the heart or the aorta . . . chances are, we can save the victim. The bullets fired by an AR-15 are different.

She continues:

With an AR-15, the shooter does not have to be particularly accurate. The victim does not have to be unlucky. If a victim takes a direct hit to the liver from an AR-15, the

damage is far graver than that of a handgun bullet injury. Handgun injuries to the liver are generally survivable unless the bullet hits the main blood supply to the liver. An AR-15 bullet to the middle of the liver would cause so much bleeding and tissue loss that the patient would likely never make it to a trauma center to receive our care.

She continues:

As a doctor, I feel I have a duty to inform the public of what I have learned as I have observed these wounds and cared for these patients. It's clear to me that AR-15 or other high-velocity weapons, especially when outfitted with a high-capacity magazine, have no place in a civilian's gun cabinet. . . . Banning the AR-15 should not be a partisan issue.

The senseless shootings are not going to stop until we change ourselves as a culture. I believe, with these students who have been so strong in their statements, so determined to make a change, that time might be now. It didn't happen after Sandy Hook Elementary. Nothing happened. It didn't happen after the myriad of others. It didn't happen just 2 years ago after the Orlando nightclub shooting. Again, it did not happen after the Ft. Lauderdale airport shooting.

Is it different now? It certainly is time for us to come together and enact commonsense gun measures to keep our communities safe. It is time for us to come together—not as Republicans or Democrats but as human beings—and to say that this time it is going to be different.

You hear so many different things. You hear about mental health, and that is certainly a part of it. You hear about school protection, and that is certainly a part of it. You hear about the miscues not only in the FBI, and that is certainly a part of it, but the miscues in the Florida Department of Children and Families a year prior that had noted that this shooter—all of those things ought to be a part of the solution. If you get right down to it, we ought to come together, not as Republicans or Democrats but as human beings, and say that if we want to solve the problem, the solution is commonsense background checks in order to purchase a weapon and getting assault rifles off the streets.

Let's do this. Let's use this tragedy as the catalyst to enact real change in our society—changes that are going to have a real impact. Let's make what happened at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School a significant moment in this country's history, not because it was one of the largest mass shootings but because it was the last.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask that before the remarks that I plan to make now are made and memorialized by the reporter, I be able to say to my friend from Florida, on behalf of the people of Georgia, who

stopped me in the halls and corridors, at the grocery stores, the churches—everywhere we went—what happened in Florida was an attack everywhere in America, not just in Florida. The tragedy of school shootings has magnified itself, so much so that every one of us feels it more than anybody realizes.

I want to share with you the prayers, the hopes, and concern of the people of Georgia. It is a pleasure to work together with you and the other Members of the Senate so that we can find common ground as we move forward to address this situation. Having just been home, and being with the citizens I represent, I can say that the first and foremost item on the minds of every citizen of Georgia is the tragedy that took place in Florida. Our hearts and prayers go out to you and all the families and all those who survived the terrible tragedy.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Georgia: Hallelujah that you have expressed that heartfelt concern and that your constituents in the State of Georgia have been very emotionally touched by this whole incident, this terrible incident that we have gone through again in this country. I am grateful for the comments of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I rise today with a great sense of pride and honor to commend to my fellow Senators Elizabeth “Lisa” Branch, who has been nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit of the United States of America by President Trump.

There are significant reasons why I am so excited to do this. I am going to save the most significant for last. One of the things I am so proud of in our constitutional responsibility of advice and consent for the appointments of the administration is that, every time, we appoint someone who is the right person at the right time and the right place, and Lisa is certainly that for the court of appeals and for the bench of the United States of America and the Eleventh Circuit.

Lisa was a partner in the commercial litigation practice of Smith, Gambrell & Russell, a limited liability partnership in Atlanta, where she began her legal career in 1996. She moved on to work in the George W. Bush administration from 2004 to 2008 as the Counselor to the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the U.S. Office of Management and Budget and, for 1 year, as the Associate General Counsel for Rules and Legislation at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. She served for 2 years as a law clerk to Judge J. Owen Forrester of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. She received her BA degree from Davidson College in North Carolina—an outstanding institution—and her law de-

gree from Emory University, which is one of the most renowned law schools in the United States of America.

She is a great lady and a great lawyer. She was named to the Court of Appeals in Georgia by Gov. Nathan Deal, the current Governor of the State, and will serve us in the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals with honor and privilege in the United States of America.

Most importantly, on a personal note, as I make these remarks, I am sure my father, Ed Isakson, and his best friend, Harold Russell, who is the Russell of Smith, Gambrell & Russell, are looking down from Heaven on this occasion today and recognizing it for the following reason:

When Lisa went with Smith, Gambrell & Russell, she went to work with a firm that represented my father and his company—a firm that represented me. She is not unknown to me as a person, as a lawyer, as a litigator. She is a great individual in our State and has provided a great service to our State. She will be a great judge for the United States of America. She also worked with Harold Russell, who was my dad’s best friend, and Harold represented my father for years in business.

I know today, in Heaven, they are looking down during this special occasion of an outstanding Georgia jurist who is renowned in our State and is about to be confirmed by the U.S. Senate to be on the Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate Elizabeth “Lisa” Branch to be confirmed, and I urge their favorable votes to see to it that takes place.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I yield back all time on our side and ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion be voted on.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Tim Scott, Todd Young, Richard C. Shelby, John Boozman, Roger F.

Wicker, Marco Rubio, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, Jerry Moran, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, David Perdue, John Cornyn, John Thune.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 37 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Baldwin	Fischer	Murphy
Barrasso	Flake	Nelson
Bennet	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hassan	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cardin	Heitkamp	Rubio
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Casey	Inhofe	Schatz
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Smith
Cornyn	King	Tester
Cotton	Klobuchar	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Leahy	Toomey
Daines	Lee	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Manchin	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NAYS—22

Blumenthal	Heinrich	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Markey	Stabenow
Cantwell	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—6

Corker	Jones	Rounds
Heller	McCain	Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 72, the nays are 22.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from North Dakota.

CONGRATULATING THE U.S. WOMEN'S HOCKEY TEAM

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the U.S. women's hockey team for their outstanding victories in the 2018 Winter Olympics. All told, the team won four games, including two 5-to-0 wins over Finland and Russia, and finished as champions after a 3-to-2 victory over Team Canada. Their achievement stands as a powerful example of hard work, perseverance, and collaboration.

North Dakota is proud to be represented among the talented members of this team by two athletes, the Lamoureux twins, Jocelyne and Monique. These sisters are natives of Grand Forks, ND, and alumni of the University of North Dakota, where they played three seasons of NCAA women's hockey.

This was their third trip to the Olympics with Team USA, having won silver medals in 2010 and 2014 and, of course, now the gold in 2018. They have a tremendous collegiate record and a tremendous Olympic record now, as well. Across their Olympic careers, they have scored 13 goals and provided 17 assists, for a total of 30 points. They displayed tremendous skill, tremendous work ethic, and a tremendous team spirit as leaders of a great women's Olympic hockey team.

Jocelyne holds an Olympic record now, as well, having scored two goals in less than 6 seconds in the match against Finland. However, it was in the final game where the Lamoureux twins really shined. It was a close game throughout. While Team USA started out with the lead, Team Canada came back in the second period with a 2-to-1 lead. Remember, Canada had won gold in the last two Olympics. It was Monique who brought the game to a tie in the final period, and then Jocelyne scored the game-winning goal in the shootout. How great is that? It was unbelievable and exciting. It was such a great representation of sportsmanship for our Nation, coming back after twice seeing Canada take the gold, ending up with silver, and now coming back and winning the gold. This ended Canada's four-time gold-winning streak in women's hockey. Obviously, it was a joyous occasion—certainly for my State of North Dakota but also for our whole country. It is uplifting and positive—all the things you want the Olympics to be.

As they arrive home from South Korea, we congratulate Team USA for their historic victory and thank them for representing our Nation with their incredible dedication, tireless effort, and tremendous sportsmanship.

I yielded floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

HONORING OFFICERS ERIC JOERING AND ANTHONY MORELLI

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this month, Ohio laid to rest two remark-

able public servants, Westerville Police Officers Eric Joering and Anthony Morelli. Together, these men dedicated decades of their lives to the police force, giving the ultimate sacrifice to keep their fellow Ohioans safe.

Officer Joering and Officer Morelli were doing their jobs, responding to a desperate 9-1-1 call when they were tragically shot and killed earlier this month. In the days since their passing, we have heard stories of their incredible service to their community, their fellow officers, and their families.

Both men were married with children. Officer Joering was 39 and had three young daughters. His pastor, Reverend Hammond, spoke to the local news about Officer Joering's dedication to his family. He said that Officer Joering would do anything for his daughters. He let them style his hair. He let them paint his nails. Reverend Hammond quipped: "I heard he drew the line at makeup."

Officer Morelli was a 30-year veteran of the Westerville police force. Westerville is a Columbus suburb. He had two children. His daughter is getting married this summer. His colleagues remembered his infectious smile and his passion for life. Westerville Police Chaplain James Meacham said Officer Morelli "went to heaven and partied."

These two heroes were laid to rest 10 days ago with services at St. Paul Catholic Church in Westerville, drawing thousands of Ohioans and fellow officers to pay their respects. Thousands of people waited in line in the cold and rain to enter the church. Officers from around the country came to honor these men, as they so often do. The church parking lot filled with patrol cars from Illinois, Texas, West Virginia, Michigan, and so many other States. They had to use a TV at a gym next door as an overflow room to accommodate everyone. After the services, a long procession of police vehicles wound its way through Westerville. Ohioans lined the streets, waving American flags and wearing blue ribbons pinned to their raincoats.

The tribute to these officers won't end with that memorial service. In times of tragedy, Ohioans always rise to the occasion. A donation page for the families set up by the local Fraternal Order of Police has raised more than half a million dollars. The city of Westerville will honor Officers Morelli and Joering with a permanent memorial in First Responders Park. The Westerville City Council voted unanimously to retire Officer Joering's K-9 partner, Officer Sam, and send him home with Officer Joering's family. They were there last week to take Sam home. One of Joering's daughters wore Sam's badge around her neck. Otterbein University, the local 4-year, private, distinguished university very nearby, will offer full-tuition scholarships to each of the three Joering girls.

While none of these gestures can ever repay them or their loved ones for their service and sacrifice, today we honor these heroes' memories and lift up the entire Westerville community and all those who knew them.

The best way for the public to honor these public servants is by supporting all Ohio officers and working to give law enforcement the resources they need to do their jobs. From the bipartisan legislation we passed last year to speed up claims processing for the families of fallen officers, to getting local police officers the resources they need to protect themselves as they fight the opioid epidemic, we must do all we can to support these women and men who sacrifice so much.

Let's honor the memory of Officer Joering and Officer Morelli by recommitting ourselves to protecting and supporting their fellow officers and the families who sacrifice alongside them.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

Mr. President, this month, the toy company Hasbro announced that it is introducing a new version of the board game Monopoly. In this version—imagine this—players get rewarded, not punished, for cheating. It is Wall Street 2018.

It might be fun to be the banker in this new, rigged version of Monopoly when you are playing with game pieces and pretend money, but it is not so fun when you are a Wells Fargo employee. It is not so fun if you have been victimized by Equifax. It is not so fun if you are one of the millions of people who have had to go through the process to get restitution from their banks. Families get ripped off by shady payday lenders and by big banks. Families lose real money, not Monopoly money.

When you think about getting away with cheating and even rewarding cheaters, pretty soon, you might not have to use much imagination at all. There have always been shady corporations trying to get away with ripping off consumers. The difference is that now they have an ally in charge of the watchdog that is supposed to be policing them. It is called the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—a bureau that has done yeomen's work to protect consumers, to get restitution for consumers when they have been cheated by Wall Street, when they have been cheated by a payday lender, and when they have been cheated by some shady financial service operator.

In his short time heading the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Mick Mulvaney has done the opposite of what we used to see and the opposite of what we should expect of the person whose job it is to look out for consumers. It is called the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, not the "let's protect Wall Street in one more way" bureau.

This month, NPR reported that in a new memo, Mulvaney laid out a "revised mission and vision of the consumer bureau." What is that vision? That vision is to dismantle it and stop all the work it does to hold banks accountable. These are NPR's words: He is "making radical changes to deter the agency from aggressively pursuing its mission"—a mission designed to protect hard-working people from banks and payday lenders who look to cheat them.

In his memo, Mulvaney actually said that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau should be "acting with humility and moderation." He is saying that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau should be acting with humility and moderation, but does he ever admonish Wall Street to act with humility and moderation? It would be laughable because of the way Wall Street so often acts. We shouldn't want moderation when it comes to going after big banks and corporations who are cheating consumers. We should want aggressive actions.

Those two words, "humility" and "moderation," are not the first two that come to mind when you think of the administration. To the surprise of many, the White House now looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives. When you talk about humility and moderation with regard to this administration, when translated in this context, it seems as though they mean to go easy on the fraudsters who are ripping off the American people.

This is the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This isn't a Wall Street regulator who is captured by Wall Street, where you see people from Citibank and other big Wall Street entities—the \$1 trillion, \$2 trillion, \$2 trillion-plus banks—going in and out of the revolving door, working for the regulators, and working for the banks.

This is the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Its job was created 8 or 9 years ago to fight just as hard for American families as Wall Street lobbyists fight for their big banks. Believe me, these lobbyists don't exactly act with humility and moderation. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau can't afford to.

Since it was created, this consumer bureau has returned \$12 billion—that is \$12,000 million—to 29 million Americans who were cheated by banks and who were cheated by payday lenders, and moderating that now is literally taking money out of the pockets of working families. Because the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has been so effective, the administration has now put the fox in charge of the chicken coop—the chicken house.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which helped 29 million Americans return \$12 billion because the banks were cheating them, is now run by Mick Mulvaney, who clearly doesn't

even think the Bureau should exist. Nothing in this memo that he wrote should surprise anyone who has watched Mr. Mulvaney over the past few months or, frankly, his career. Although he has been running the CFPB on a part-time basis, he is supposed to be overseeing the Federal budget, so I am a little curious that the full-time Budget Director—my friend from my State of Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, used to run that, so he knows it is a full-time job. The administration scooped up Mr. Mulvaney and said: Well, you keep doing that, but you are going to run the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Mr. Mulvaney had no real interest, apparently, in running the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, but he has managed to do a lot on behalf of Wall Street cheaters. His first action was to freeze payments from the Civil Penalty Fund to families who were scammed by big banks and other financial institutions. Think about that. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has levied these actions against people who cheated consumers. Mulvaney walks in the door on the first day, assembles a staff, and says: Freeze those payments. We are not going to pay them. These were actions taken by people who were looking out for consumers. They were actions they took to penalize these banks and to get restitution from these financial institutions that had cheated the public. So on his first week on the job, on his first day, he took back the hard-earned money of Americans who had been ripped off. He followed that by delaying a rule that protects consumers from predatory payday lenders, dismissing a lawsuit against those shady loan sharks.

Senator JACK REED was out in Ohio the other day. Senator REED and I sit on the Banking Committee. He is a West Point graduate. He is the senior Democrat on the Armed Services Committee. He talked about what happens at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base right outside of Dayton, where the payday lenders prey on these men and women who are young and perhaps not as experienced as some in having the financial sophistication to deal with some of these loan sharks, and he knows that payday lenders and others prey on these generally low-paid and underpaid men and women who have sacrificed for their country. Sometimes they initiate foreclosures on the homes of people who are overseas serving our country. But the new Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau doesn't seem all that interested in any of this.

After delaying the rule that protects consumers from predatory payday lenders, after dismissing a lawsuit against these shady loan sharks—we are talking about lenders who have been accused of deceiving customers,

sometimes with payday lenders charging 9 percent interest and trying to collect debts people don't even owe. Those people should be protected. You don't protect Wall Street; you protect people who have been defrauded by Wall Street.

It is not that complicated, but apparently at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, it is now. Most payday lenders are getting an even better return on their campaign donations than they are on their predatory loans.

Mulvaney has put on ice another case that has been pending against Wells Fargo, this time for wrongly charging borrowers fees when they took out a mortgage.

At his day job running another Federal agency, Mulvaney proposed a budget earlier this month that would defund the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau entirely for a year—defund it—basically saying: We are spending no more money on this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Philosophically, he just doesn't like the idea of somebody standing up for customers, standing up for consumers, standing up against Wall Street, standing up against the payday lenders, and standing up against the loan sharks that he seems to be in alliance with.

We shouldn't be surprised by any of this. Mr. Mulvaney, the person heading the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau now, is a man who doesn't even think the Bureau should exist. He said some time ago that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is "a sick, sad joke." He sponsored legislation to repeal it.

How do you explain to 29 million Americans who have gotten \$12 billion in restitution because they were cheated that this is a sad, sick joke and it shouldn't exist? It is no joke to the servicemembers who rely on the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to fight for them against bank abuse. It is no joke to the 3½ million—3½ million—victims of Wells Fargo's fake account scam or the 145 million Americans, with 5 million in my State alone—145 million Americans, that is pretty much half the adult population in our country—who had their data breached by Equifax. The Equifax executives had little contrition and didn't apologize much, and they are skating free. What is Mick Mulvaney doing to help roughly half of the adult population in this country who were the victims of the Equifax breach to make sure it doesn't happen again? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was investigating this massive breach, but Mulvaney ordered them to close the investigation. This is malpractice or worse. We are talking about a data breach that exposed birthdays, Social Security numbers, and addresses. People's identities could be stolen and their credit scores ruined. Did Mr.

Mulvaney care? Apparently not. He was on the side of Equifax when he wasn't on the side of Wall Street, when he wasn't on the side of payday lenders, when he wasn't on the side of scam artists—and maybe he is on the side of all of them. But apparently he thinks it is more important to protect the corporations that let it happen than it is to protect the American people he is supposed to serve. I guess we shouldn't be surprised.

Once again, Mick Mulvaney and this administration are making it clear whose side they are on. Over and over, they side with Wall Street. They side with the largest corporations. They side with companies that shut down production in Gallopolis, Mansfield, and Zanesville and move their companies overseas. They side with them instead of with hard-working Americans who are struggling. We see it at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with Mulvaney's determination to protect corporate special interests. We see it with other bank watchdogs who are putting Americans at risk of another financial crisis just to help Wall Street pad their pockets.

Mr. President, as you know, America's financial system has had a really, really, really good couple of years, even though we bailed them out. Ten years ago, this Congress bailed out these huge banks—\$1 trillion, \$2 trillion banks. We bailed them out.

Congress passed a tax bill in which 81 percent of the benefits go to the richest 1 percent of people in this country. It is believed that the financial services industry did better under that tax bill than anyone else in the country—any other industry. Now we see Mick Mulvaney and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau doing even more for the banks by representing them instead of representing workers and consumers.

As I said, it is increasingly clear whose side the administration is on. We have seen it with the rollback of rules that protect Americans from the fine print in contracts, the fine print that few of us read and even fewer of us could understand. When we sign up for a credit card, when we sign up for a car loan, when we get a job and we sign a contract with our employer, these fine print, forced administration clauses—you know what they did? They denied customers and employees who were cheated their day in court. So when you sign up for a credit card and you sign a bank document and then you want to sue because they did something to you that you thought was against the law, you are out of luck. You have lost your right because you signed that document.

We see it right here in the Senate with bills to dismantle Wall Street reform, to make it easier for big banks to take big risks that could wreck the economy all over again.

At the 10-year anniversary of the biggest financial crisis since the Great Depression, there is already a collective amnesia that has settled over this town. The Republican leaders in Congress, people down the hall in the office of the majority leader, Senator McCONNELL—over and over, they side with Wall Street instead of with workers.

Ten years ago we saw what Wall Street and the financial services industry, particularly Wall Street, did to our country. My wife and I live in Cleveland, OH. Our ZIP Code is 44105. Our ZIP Code 10 or 11 years ago had more foreclosures in the first half of that year than any other ZIP Code in the United States of America. I still see the blight because of the Wall Street abuse in the loss of retirement savings, the lost jobs, the closed factories, and the foreclosed homes. I see all of that in my neighborhood. I see all of that throughout my State. We all see it in all 50 States. Yet there is this collective amnesia in this body, as if none of that ever happened to this country. This administration and Republican leaders, again and again and again, side with Wall Street over workers, side with Wall Street over customers.

The lessons of a decade ago are clear. You don't grow the middle class by letting big banks take massive risks or by letting shady lenders prey on hard-working Americans. That is why we passed Wall Street reform, and that is why we created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—to hold big banks and other bad actors accountable when they cheat, to deter them from bad and risky behavior in the first place.

We need a new permanent Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau who will protect the consumers instead of handing big corporations a “get out of jail free” card. A cheater's version of Monopoly might sound like fun on game night, but we have already seen what it looks like in real life. Powerful special interests on Wall Street win big every single time, and everybody else loses.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

TAX REFORM

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the impact that tax reform is having in my home State of Arkansas.

Despite what you may have heard from those who opposed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, including House Minority Leader PELOSI's infamous description of the tax plan's benefits as “crumbs” and the passage of the plan as “the end of the world, Armageddon,” the economy is responding incredibly well to the changes we made to the Tax Code.

I have long believed our economy has struggled under the weight of an outdated, inefficient, and ineffective tax system. Now, businesses are beginning to do the math and are realizing that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will mean more savings. As a result, many have announced they are passing some of these savings on to their employees or will now be seeking to grow and expand operations.

As of today, more than 350 companies have announced pay raises, bonuses and/or 401(k) increases, benefiting over 4 million Americans. According to a recent National Federation of Independent Business survey, 32 percent of small businesses believe now is a good time to expand—the highest level ever recorded by this survey.

This is happening across the country and in Arkansas. Here are just a few examples of the companies headquartered in Arkansas, with a sizable presence in the State, that are passing along savings to their employees through wage increases, bonuses, and other benefits, are giving to charity, and/or making investments to grow their businesses and better serve customers:

BancorpSouth Bank is giving pay increases and/or one-time bonuses to nearly all noncommissioned employees. The investment of over \$10 million in 2018 will benefit 96 percent of the company's noncommissioned workforce. Pay increases were effective as of January 1, 2018.

Home Bancshares, Inc., of Conway, AR, is distributing a one-time bonus of \$500 to more than 850 full-time, tenured employees. Home Bancshares' chairman, John Allison, said “investing in these individuals is an important step to help support them, their families and the communities in which we operate.”

People's Bank of Magnolia, AR, provided a \$500 bonus to employees and contributed \$50,000 to its charitable endowment.

Little Rock, Arkansas-based Bank of the Ozarks is giving up to \$1,200 annual bonuses. Approximately 2,300 employees will be eligible under the plan.

Walmart, whose headquarters is located in Bentonville, AR, is a significant economic force not only in our State but nationwide, is increasing starting hourly wage rates in the United States to \$11 an hour, expanding maternity and parental leave benefits, and providing one-time cash bonuses of up to \$1,000. It also has created a new

benefit to assist associates with adoption expenses.

Regions Bank is increasing its minimum wage to \$15, contributing \$40 million to the company's charitable foundation, and increasing the company's capital expenditures budget by approximately \$100 million, or 50 percent over the 2017 level.

Springdale, AR, is home to Tyson Foods' headquarters. The company recently announced that it is giving bonuses to more than 100,000 employees whose compensation does not include an annual bonus. Eligible full-time team members will receive a bonus of \$1,000, and eligible part-time team members will receive \$500.

In addition, Tyson will use savings resulting from tax reform to improve training and education opportunities for employees, including teaching English as a second language and general education development classes, and it will also be accelerating capital projects.

FedEx, whose freight headquarters is located in Arkansas and which employs over 3,500 Arkansans, is investing more than \$3.2 billion in growing its business, including raising wages and investing \$1.5 billion in pension plans.

Finally, UPS is investing \$12 billion to expand the company's Smart Logistics Network, and it also made a \$5 billion tax-qualified contribution to the company's three UPS-sponsored U.S. pension plans. This represents about \$13,000 per participant. The company has more than 2,200 active employees in Arkansas in addition to around 390 retirees who reside in the State.

The numbers speak for themselves. Clearly, when Washington helps to create an environment that makes businesses more globally competitive, it benefits Arkansas, and it benefits the entire country.

The law is already helping hard-working Arkansans keep more of their money in their own pockets. By nearly doubling the standard deduction, lowering rates, eliminating loopholes, and creating a climate that incentivizes business to boost wages and give employees bonuses as a result of the reduction in the corporate tax rate, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is providing much needed tax relief to Arkansans.

Additionally, our Governor, Asa Hutchinson, has instructed the Arkansas Public Service Commission to examine how the new lower tax rates will benefit utility providers in Arkansas. He is encouraging the commission to instruct utilities to pass savings down to ratepayers, which could mean possible lower utility rates for those in the Natural State.

That is not all. Arkansas-based companies like ArcBest and Murphy USA are already reaping the benefits of the new tax system with higher revenues and incomes.

This is only the beginning. I believe we will continue to see positive trends

and reactions to the tax law that will help grow our economy and spur even more investment in Arkansas and across the country.

One provision included in the law that I believe can have an enormous impact on average Arkansans is a new incentive for employers to offer paid family leave benefits to their employees. Now employers can offer 12 weeks of paid family leave in exchange for a tax credit.

My friend and colleague from Nebraska Senator FISCHER fought to get this idea included in the bill. Thanks to her vision and perseverance, families in Arkansas and across the country who most need access to this type of benefit will now have that chance. This is just one more example of tax reform delivering results that will help the middle class.

I want to reiterate how well tax reform is working for my State. We are seeing growth, higher wages, and other positive benefits. Employees are getting bigger paychecks and businesses are investing in their workforces and expanding their operations. Those are not "crumbs." It is "not Armageddon." It isn't an attack on working Americans. It is opportunity, it is upward mobility, and it is what Americans deserve. I am proud to have cast my vote for tax reform.

Learning about how it is helping our economy and benefiting American families just confirms what we predicted would happen if we made American businesses more competitive and let average individuals and families keep more of what they earn.

Moving forward, I am committed to ensuring that the changes we made to the Tax Code help increase economic activity and spur growth, address our national debt, and create jobs. I am confident it will have lasting, positive effects on our economy.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

KENTUCKY FLOODING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the last week, heavy rains and strong winds caused widespread destruction across Kentucky. Sustained rainfall has led to devastating flooding in many communities, especially along the Ohio River.

The high waters have closed dozens of roads, and some areas are reporting dangerous mudslides. The extent of this flooding hasn't been seen in my State since the 1997 flood.

In addition, the National Weather Service has confirmed that three tornadoes touched down in western Kentucky. The entire Commonwealth is under a state of emergency because of the damage caused by this severe weather.

I was saddened to hear reports this morning that these destructive storms have claimed the lives of three Kentuckians. Many are still struggling to stay safe.

As they always do, Kentucky's emergency personnel responded quickly and professionally to the storms and the aftermath. Rescuing many individuals from their homes or their cars, these dedicated men and women continue to do everything they can to protect Kentuckians in need. They have our sincere gratitude.

Although the sky has cleared, there is more rain in the forecast for this week.

My staff in the State and I will continue to monitor this situation as it develops throughout Kentucky.

HONORING COMMANDER PAUL BAUER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise with a heavy heart to pay tribute to Chicago Police Commander Paul Bauer, who gave his life to protect the city he loved. We use the word "hero" far too often, but in this case, that word is fitting. Commander Paul Bauer is a true American hero, and his loss is a tragedy.

On February 13, Commander Bauer was at an "active shooter" training session in downtown Chicago, but he didn't hesitate to help out his fellow officers when they were pursuing a fleeing suspect. Commander Bauer was shot several times by the suspect and died from his wounds. Commander Bauer's story is a reminder to us all that our heroes serving in blue risk their lives every day, and even routine calls can turn into tragedy in an instant.

A 31-year veteran of the Chicago Police Department and the commander of the 18th Police District in the Near North Side, Paul Bauer was a pillar of that community. Last year, he was commended by the city council for a charity holiday party he helped host for underprivileged kids. Police Superintendent Eddie Johnson said it best: "This department didn't just lose an exemplary police officer. The City lost a piece of itself."

Last week, when the charges were announced against the alleged shooter, an impromptu memorial developed outside the Thompson Center. People brought flowers, left crosses, and displayed signs reading, "RIP CDR

Bauer." One woman on her lunch break even left a plush stuffed dog that she hoped would make it in to the arms of Paul's teenage daughter. It was a tremendous show of love, respect, and gratitude.

A few years ago, I gave a commencement address and asked the students to think about what they wanted people to say about their lives. I asked them, "What will you be remembered for? What service did you render to your community? Your nation? Your world?" The great thing about living in America is we can choose the answers to those questions. Commander Bauer will be remembered for his service to his community. He gave what Lincoln called, "the last full measure of devotion" and did so for the people and city he loved and served, but he will be remembered for so much more. A friend described Paul as "every bit the good guy he's being made out to be," but also added: "You can't capture his goodness." What a beautiful legacy.

For all Paul Bauer's professional accomplishments, the highlights of his life were his family. Paul met his wife, Erin, met at a fundraiser for a Chicago police officer who was also killed in the line of duty. The Friday following Paul's death, February 16, would have been the couple's 16th anniversary. Together, Paul and Erin raised a bright and wonderful 13-year-old daughter Grace. Paul's family will carry on his legacy of love and his devotion to service and community.

Commander Bauer was the quintessential officer, a role model in his department and his bravery inspires the rest of us, especially his friends and family. After his memorial service Commander Bauer's wife, Erin, sent a touching message to all who paid tribute to her husband. She wrote: "One man almost stole my faith in humanity, but the City of Chicago and the rest of the nation restored it, and I want to thank you for that."

We are all humbled by her strength, and our thoughts and prayers are with Erin, Grace and all who loved and knew Paul. Commander Paul Bauer was one of our best.

REMEMBERING MAURICE DUANE GEIGER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on February 18, 2018, New Hampshire lost one of its finest lawyers and humanitarians, Maurice Duane Geiger. He was 83 years old.

Some might ask why, as a Senator from Vermont, I would call the Senate's attention to a resident of our neighbor to the east. In fact, Maury Geiger not only had close ties to Vermont where, in 1982, he cofounded the Rural Justice Center in Montpelier, he was in every respect a global citizen. Over his long career, he worked to improve access to justice in Haiti, Ban-

gladesh, Rwanda, and several other countries.

I met Maury Geiger years ago and will never forget going with him, my wife, Marcelle, and my staff member Tim Rieser to visit the national penitentiary in Port au Prince, Haiti. A more squalid example of a corrections facility would be hard to imagine. It was overflowing with thousands of impoverished men of all ages, sweltering in the heat and humidity, crammed into cement rooms with nothing to sleep on but the floor, with little food and vulnerable to AIDS, tuberculosis, and other dangerous diseases, and the vast majority had never been formally charged with any crime. Some had languished there for 2 or more years, far longer than any sentence they would have received if tried and convicted. Almost none had lawyers.

After first laying eyes on that unforgettable scene of inhumane neglect, Maury returned to Haiti year after year, determined to do whatever he could to help improve the lives and protect the rights of those caught up in Haiti's corrupt, dysfunctional justice system. It was that same passion for justice that took him to the courts and jails of rural America and to distant places like Addis Ababa and Tbilisi.

As his obituary describes, Maury was born into poverty, and that experience, and his mother's guidance, shaped his character. He served as a naval aviator and then at the Department of Justice. He was as patriotic and as fierce a defender of the Constitution and Bill of Rights as anyone I have known. He became one of our country's first experts in court administration, and he worked throughout his life to teach others about the fundamentals of a modern justice system.

Maury loved his work, and he cared passionately about fairness. He devoted his life to fighting for justice at every opportunity. Knowing what it means to be poor, Maury did not hold himself above anyone. He was not the least bit impressed by wealth or titles. He loathed the self-importance of so many government officials and the abuse of power, especially when it was at the expense of those without power, which is so common in places like Haiti where inequality is glaring and the rule of law barely exists. He was known for his irreverence, just as he was for his wonderful, dry sense of humor.

Over the years, I have met countless accomplished people, many of them of the highest integrity. Maury Geiger could match any of them. He was as ethical, selfless, compassionate, and determined a champion of the less fortunate as anyone I have known.

My thoughts are with Nancy, his wife of 58 years, and their four sons, Robert, Kevin, Tom, and Steven. I know they are all proud of the principled example Maury set for all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that the February 20 obituary of Maurice Duane

Geiger in the Conway Daily Sun be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Conway Daily Sun, February 20, 2018]

Maurice Duane Geiger, 83, died Feb. 18, 2018, following a long struggle with Parkinsonism, at his home in Center Conway, surrounded by family at his bedside. He dedicated his life to justice.

He was born on Aug. 20, 1934, south of White Cloud, Mich., and east of Newaygo, in an isolated log cabin with no running water except the creek out back. He lived the first years of his life in the cabin with his five siblings, spending much of his time with the animals and plants of the surrounding woods. The cabin, which his father had helped build, burned to the ground when Maurice was 6.

His father was Lawrence Geiger, and his mother was born L. Marguerite Welch. His parents separated while Maurice was a child. His mother, whose grit and wisdom served as a support and guide for Maurice, was a schoolteacher. She ended up with a different post nearly every year, and Maurice said he had moved about 15 times before he graduated from Clinton High School in 1952.

He then attended Michigan State University, while he worked 40 hours a week at an Oldsmobile plant to support his family. He received his bachelor's degree from Michigan State in 1956 with a major in police administration.

After college, he joined the Navy and graduated from flight school at the Naval Air station in Pensacola, Fla. He was an aviator on active duty in the Navy from 1956-1957. Following his active service, he moved to Washington, D.C., serving in the reserves for several more years, finally leaving as lieutenant commander. In D.C., he first worked as a corrections officer in the Bureau of Prisons and then as a computer programmer for the Navy. During this time, he met his future wife, Nancy Crocker, in a boarding house in the nation's capital where they both rented rooms. They married on May 27, 1960. They had four sons, each born two years apart starting in 1962.

While working days, Maurice took night classes at Georgetown University Law Center and he received his law degree in 1963. He went to work for the U.S. Department of Justice in 1965, becoming the director of the department's Management Information Office the next year.

He left the Department of Justice in 1969, following the election of Richard Nixon, saying that the department was becoming too politicized and no longer interested in justice. He was recruited by former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark to develop management systems capability at the Federal Judicial Center, which serves as staff to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1972, he and his family moved to Birch Hill in North Conway. From 1972 to 1976, he was a staff attorney and adjudication specialist for the New England region for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, he worked with Ernest Friesen, dean of the California Western University School of Law, studying and working to improve court systems throughout the country by helping them to reduce backlogs and delays.

In 1982, he co-founded the Rural Justice Center with Kathryn Fahnestock. They worked together to reform judicial systems

in rural areas and small towns throughout the United States. Starting in 1995, the Rural Justice Center concentrated on international programs. Maurice made scores of trips to Haiti, spent 15 months in Bangladesh, and also worked in Rwanda, Ethiopia, the Republic of Georgia, Armenia, and other countries. He was awarded the New Hampshire Bar Association's 2008 Daniel Webster International Lawyer of the Year Award. In 2016, he was honored by Haiti's Supreme Council of Judicial Power for his two decades of service working to improve the country's judicial system.

The United States Agency for International Development issued him a certificate of appreciation "in recognition of Maurice Geiger's tireless advocacy for judicial and prison reforms in Haiti, which have benefited thousands of Haitians. His unflinching and selfless quest for justice, taken often at great personal sacrifice to his own health and finances, have made him a hero to the Haitian people and to all who have crossed his path."

Over the years, he appeared on "CBS News," "60 Minutes" and in front-page articles in *The New York Times* concerning Haiti and judicial reform issues.

He was a member of both the Virginia and New Hampshire bar associations.

"Looking back over the last 50 years," Maurice told the New Hampshire Bar Association's Bar News in 2013, "I find that I take the most satisfaction from helping to bring relief to the . . . poor souls trapped in the godforsaken prisons and jails wherever they exist."

He later estimated that his work had helped free several thousand Haitians who should have no longer been in prison. Many of them had languished in prison awaiting trial for longer than they would have been sentenced to serve if they had been found guilty. Maurice spent considerable time with children at an orphanage in Haiti and brought loads of supplies to them during his many trips to the island. He said: "My most memorable experience was living through the devastating earthquake that hit Port-au-Prince, Haiti, in 2010."

Despite his travels, Maurice immersed himself in the civic life of the Mount Washington Valley.

He was a delegate to the New Hampshire Constitutional Convention in 1974. Beginning in 1976, he practiced law in Carroll County, primarily taking pro bono and court-appointed cases.

He served as president of the Eastern Slopes Little League in 1977. He was elected to three terms on the Conway School Board, serving nine years from 1975 to 1984. He was elected Carroll County Attorney, and served as the county's prosecutor from 1992 to 1994.

Maurice loved playing sports with his sons and with other young people in the area. On weekends, he could often be found playing touch football on the green in North Conway in summer and fall, or boot hockey by Third Bridge on West Side Road in winter. He also spent many hours playing basketball and tennis. He served as an umpire at Little League games and later as a line judge for the Volvo International tennis tournament in North Conway. He was an occasional poet, and several of his poems were published in Mount Washington Valley newspapers.

U.S. Sen. Patrick Leahy of Vermont, where the Rural Justice Center was based, honored Geiger by entering a tribute into the Congressional Record. Leahy said, "The example he has set of selflessness, of caring, commitment to human rights and equal ac-

cess to justice, and of an unwavering belief in the basic dignity of all people regardless of their station in life, is one that every law student, every lawyer, every prosecutor, every judge, and every prison warden should strive to emulate."

He is survived by one sister, Marguerite I. Kellogg, of Lansing, Mich.; his wife, Nancy C. Geiger, of Center Conway, N.H.; their four sons, Robert S. Geiger, of Silver Spring, Md., his wife, Catherine Buckler, and their daughter, Sophia Buckler Geiger; Kevin W. Geiger of Pomfret, Vt., his wife, Corinne Smith, their son, Brendan Geiger, and their daughter, Rosalie Geiger; Thomas S. Geiger of Seattle, Wash., his wife Aiko Schaefer, their son, Isaiah Schaefer-Geiger, and their daughter, Naomi Schaefer-Geiger; and Steven T. Geiger of Washington, D.C., and his spouse, Raul Serpas; sister-in-law, Linda Saunders and brother-in-law, Albert Saunders of Plymouth, Mass.; brother-in-law, James Lopez of West Olive, Mich.; and numerous nieces, nephews and cousins.

A memorial service will be planned for a later date. Arrangements are being handled by Furber & White Funeral Home in North Conway. The family would like to extend a special thank you for the care and comfort provided the Visiting Nurse Home Care & Hospice of Carroll County. Donations in Maurice's memory can be made to Health through Walls, a non-profit whose mission is to assist low-income countries in implementing sustainable improvements in the health care services of their prisons.

The donations can be made online at healththroughwalls.org or by mail to Health through Walls, 12555 Biscayne Blvd., No. 955, North Miami, FL 33181.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-78, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Gov-

ernment of Kuwait for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$259 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREGORY M. KAUSNER

(For Charles W. Hooper,

Lieutenant General, USA, Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-78

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Kuwait.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$0 million.

Other \$259 million.

Total \$259 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE: Four (4) King Air 350ER ISR aircraft with enhanced PT6A-67A engines and one (1) engine spare; four (4) AN/AAQ-35 WESCAM MX-15HDI Electro-Optical & Infrared Imaging Sensor Turret; four (4) Selex Seaspray 7500E Active Electronically Scanned Array Radars (AESA); AN/AAR-47 Missile Warning Systems (MWS); AN/ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser Systems; secure communications, cryptographic, and precision navigation equipment; Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Systems; aircraft modification and integration for ISR mission systems; facility design and construction; ground data processing systems and support equipment; spares and repair parts; support and test equipment; simulators, training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. Additionally, one of the four aircraft will be further modified to accommodate VIP/senior leadership personnel for transport and Med Evac capability or command and control, and other related elements of logistical support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (KU-D-SAB).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 21, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Kuwait—Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance King Air 350ER

The Government of Kuwait has requested a possible sale of four (4) King Air 350ER Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) aircraft with enhanced PT6A-67A engines and one (1) engine spare; four (4) AN/AAQ-35 WESCAM MX-15HDI Electro-Optical & Infrared Imaging Sensor Turret; four (4) Selex Seaspray 7500E Active Electronically Scanned Array Radars (AESA); AN/AAR-47 Missile Warning Systems (MWS); AN/ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser Systems; secure communications, cryptographic, and precision navigation equipment; Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Systems; aircraft modification and integration for ISR mission systems; facility design and construction;

ground data processing systems and support equipment; spares and repair parts; support and test equipment; simulators, training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. Additionally, one of the four aircraft will be further modified to accommodate VIP/senior leadership personnel for transport and Med Evac capability or command and control, and other related elements of logistical support. The estimated total case value is \$259 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country. Kuwait plays a large role in U.S. efforts to advance stability in the Middle East, providing basing, access, and transit for U.S. forces in the region.

The proposed sale will enable Kuwait to gather its own airborne ISR data. This capability will improve Kuwait's situational awareness, armed forces posture, and armed forces capability to respond to threats. Enhancing Kuwait's Command, Control, Communications, Computers, & Intelligence (C4I) capability will result in the potential for greater burden sharing. The proposed sale of items and services will establish Kuwait's first dedicated airborne ISR fleet. The King Air 350ER ISR is part of the Kuwaiti Air Force's rapid expansion and modernization efforts, and is a priority for Kuwait and the United States. Kuwait will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Sierra Nevada Corporation, Hagerstown, MD. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the long term assignment of any additional U.S. Government representatives to Kuwait. There will be U.S. contractor field representatives relocating to Kuwait in order provide day-to-day maintenance and logistics support.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-78

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. King Air 350ER is an Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) aircraft, a specifically modified B350ER, capable of operating in austere environments while providing real-time ISR. It is equipped with an integrated electro-optical and infrared (EO/IR) which gives it a day/night ISR capability. Additionally, the aircraft will have a signal intercept system capable of searching, direction finding (geo-locating), collection, and on-board analysis of simple signals of interest in the very high frequency (VHF) and ultra-high frequency (UHF) broadcast bands. It will also have synthetic aperture radar (SAR) to provide spot and strip ground mapping along with ground moving target indicator (GMTI) modes. It will also have on-board workstations that will control the intercept system and EO/IR system. The system will provide voice and data communication with personnel on the ground to share

collected data. Aircraft hardware and software are UNCLASSIFIED; technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

2. Small Tactical Terminal (STT) KOR-24A is a two-channel radio for Link 16 networks and tactical wideband UHF or legacy VHF/UHF systems. The Link 16 command, control, communications, and intelligence (C3I) system incorporating high-capacity, jam-resistant, digital communication links for exchange of near real-time tactical information, including both data and voice, among air, ground, and sea elements. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Technical data and documentation to be provided is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. AN/AAQ-35 WESCAM MX-15H Di Electro-Optical & Infrared Imaging Sensor Turret is a gyro-stabilized, multi-spectral, multi-field of view EO/IR system. The system provides color daylight TV and nighttime IR video with a laser range finder and laser pointer through use of an externally mounted turret sensor unit and internally mounted sensor control. Video imagery is displayed in the aircraft real time and may be recorded for subsequent ground analysis. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

4. Selex Seaspray 7500E is a multi-mode radar combines a state-of-the-art Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) with Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) processor. It provides strip and spotlight SAR imaging and ground moving target indicator (GMTI) capability for all-weather and wide range surveillance. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Technical data and documentation to be provided is UNCLASSIFIED.

5. AAR-47 Missile Warning Systems is a small, lightweight, passive, electro-optic, threat warning device used to detect surface-to-air missiles and automatically provide countermeasures, as well as audio and visual-sector warning messages to the aircrew. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Software is SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

6. ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser Systems (CMDS) provides an integrated threat-adaptive, computer controlled capability for dispensing chaff, flares, and active radio frequency expendables. The AN/ALE 47 uses threat data received over the aircraft interfaces to assess the threat situation and determine a response. Expendable routines tailored to the immediate aircraft and threat environment may be dispensed using one of four operational modes. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Software is SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

7. AN/APX-119 Identification Friend or Foe combined transponder interrogator system is UNCLASSIFIED unless Mode IV or V operational evaluator parameters, which are SECRET, are loaded into the equipment.

8. This sale will involve the release of sensitive and or classified cryptographic elements for secure communications radios, cryptographic equipment, and precision navigation equipment. The hardware is UNCLASSIFIED, except where systems are loaded with cryptographic software, which is classified up to SECRET.

9. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of specific hardware, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

10. A determination has been made that Kuwait can provide substantially the same

degree of protection for sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sustainment program is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

11. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Kuwait.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-56, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Kuwait for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$100 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-56

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Kuwait.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$2.6 million.

Other \$97.4 million.

Total \$100.0 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Kuwait has requested the possible sale of fifteen (15) 13.6 meter Fast Patrol Boats.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): Thirty-six (36) .50 Caliber Machine Guns (thirty (30) installed, two (2) per boat and six (6) spares).

Non-MDE: This request includes fifteen (15) 13.6 meter Fast Patrol Boats outfitted with support equipment, and personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (KU-P-SBK).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 20, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of Kuwait—Fast Patrol Boats

The Government of Kuwait has requested to purchase fifteen (15) fast patrol boats outfitted with thirty-six (36) .50 caliber machine guns (thirty (30) installed, two (2) per boat and six (6) spares). This request also includes support equipment, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated total case value is \$100 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign and national security of the United

States by improving the security of a friendly country. Kuwait plays a key role in U.S. efforts to advance stability in the Middle East, providing basing, access, and transit of U.S. forces in the region.

Kuwait intends to use the boats for patrol, interdiction, and maritime protection. These boats will help Kuwait develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability. Kuwait will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Kvichak (a Vigor Company), Kent, Washington. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require multiple trips by U.S. Government and contractor representatives to participate in program and technical reviews plus training and maintenance support in country, on a temporary basis, for a period of twenty-four (24) months. It will also require three (3) contractor representatives to reside in country for a period of two (2) years to support this program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-56

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology

1. The following components and technical documentation for the program are classified as listed below:

a. The Browning M2 .50 caliber machine gun is an automatic, recoil operated, air-cooled machine gun which has been modified for shipboard use. Its classification level is UNCLASSIFIED.

b. The Fast Patrol Boat is a 13.6 meter (45-foot) utility boat used by the United States Coast Guard as a Response Boat Medium (RB-M). The boats are built by Kvichak Marine Industries of Kent, Washington and Marinette Marine Corporation of Marinette, Wisconsin. While primarily designed as a Search and Rescue (SAR) asset the RB-M is also used to perform Recreational Boating Safety (RBS), Marine Environmental Protection (MEP), Enforcement of Laws and Treaties (ELT), Ports, Waterways, and Coastal Security (PWCS) and Defense Operations (DO), including those traditional missions associated with Border Protection. The RB-M is powered by two MTU Detroit Diesel turbocharged Series 60 engines (825 hp) and two Rolls-Royce FF-Series waterjets with a top speed of 42.5 knots and a range of 250nm. The RB-Ms classification level is UNCLASSIFIED.

2. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the Kuwait.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-66, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the Netherlands for defense articles

and services estimated to cost \$1.191 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-66

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of the Netherlands.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$829 million.

Other \$362 million.

Total \$1.191 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of the Netherlands has requested the possible sale of items and services to support the upgrade/remanufacturing of twenty-eight (28) AH-64D Block II Apache Attack Helicopters to the AH-64E configuration.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Fifty-one (51) T700-GE-701D Engines (42 remanufactured engines to be installed and 9 spares).

Seventeen (17) AN/APG-78 Fire Control Radars and Subcomponents.

Twenty-eight (28) AN/ASQ-170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sights (MTADS)/AN/AAR-11 Modernized Pilot Night Vision Sensors (PNVS).

Twenty-eight (28) AN/APR-48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometers (MRFI). Seventy (70) Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Navigation Systems (EGI) plus Multi-Mode Receiver (56 installed, 14 spares).

Non-MDE: Non-MDE items and services to support the upgrade/remanufacturing of the existing AH-64D Block II Apache Attack Helicopters to AH-64E configuration, training devices, helmets, simulators, generators, transportation, wheeled vehicles and organization equipment, spare and repair parts, support equipment, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (NE-B-WJW).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: NE-B-VXC, NE-B-WDP, NE-B-WES, NE-B-WBW, NE-B-WHD, NE-B-WGC.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 20, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Netherlands—AH-64E Remanufactured Apache Attack Helicopters

The Government of the Netherlands has requested the possible sale of items and services to support the upgrade/remanufacturing of twenty-eight (28) AH-64D Block II Apache Attack Helicopters to the AH-64E configuration to include upgrading fifty-one (51) remaining T700-GE-701C Engines to T700-GE-701D (42 engines to be installed, 9 spares), seventeen (17) AN/APG-78 Fire Control Radar (FCR) and subcomponents, twenty-eight (28)

AN/ASQ-170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sights (MTADS)/AN/AAR-11 Modernized Pilot Night Vision Sensors (PNVS), twenty-eight (28) AN/APR-48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometers (MRFI), and seventy (70) Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Navigation Systems (EGI) plus Multi-Mode Receiver. Non-MDE items and services to support the upgrade/remanufacturing of the existing AH-64D Block II Apache Attack Helicopters to AH-64E configuration, training devices, helmets, simulators, generators, transportation, wheeled vehicles and organization equipment, spare and repair parts, support equipment, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value is \$1.191 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO ally which has been, and continues to be, an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to U.S. national interests to assist the Netherlands to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale of the AH-64E remanufacture will improve the Netherlands' capability to meet current and future threats of enemy. The Netherlands will use the enhanced capability to strengthen its homeland defense and deter regional threats, and provide direct support to coalition and security cooperation efforts. The Netherlands will have no difficulty absorbing this aircraft upgrade into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractors are Boeing Company, St. Louis, MO and Lockheed Martin, Bethesda, MD. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to the Netherlands.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-66

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AH-64E Apache Attack Helicopter weapon system contains communications and target identification equipment, navigation equipment, aircraft survivability equipment, displays, and sensors. The airframe itself does not contain sensitive technology; however, the pertinent equipment listed below will either be installed on the aircraft or included in the sale:

a. The AN/APG-78 Fire Control Radar (FCR) is an active, low-probability of intercept, millimeter-wave radar, combined with a passive AN/APR-48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometer (M-RFI) mounted on top of the helicopter mast. The FCR Ground Targeting Mode detects, locates, classifies and prioritizes stationary or moving armored vehicles, tanks and mobile air defense systems as well as hovering helicopters, helicopters, and fixed wing aircraft

in normal flight. The M-RFI detects threat radar emissions and determines the type of radar and mode of operation. The FCR data and M-RFI data are fused for maximum synergism. If desired, the radar data can be used to refer targets to the regular electro-optical Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight (MTADS), permitting additional visual/infrared imagery and control of weapons, including the semi-active laser version of the HELLFIRE II missile. Critical system information is stored in the FCR in the form of mission executable code, target detection, classification algorithms and coded threat parameters. This information is provided in a form that cannot be extracted by the foreign user via anti-tamper provisions built into the system. The content of these items is classified SECRET. The M-RFI is a passive radar detection and direction finding system, which utilizes a detachable User Data Module (UDM) on the RFI processor, which contains the Radio Frequency threat library. The UDM, which is a hardware assemblage, is classified CONFIDENTIAL when programmed with threat parameters, threat priorities and/or techniques derived from U.S. intelligence information.

b. The AN/ASQ-170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight/AN/AAQ-11 Pilot Night Vision Sensor (MTADS/PNVS) provides day, night, and limited adverse weather target information, as well as night navigation capabilities. The PNVS provides thermal imaging that permits map-of-the-earth flight to, from, and within the battle area, while TADS provides the co-pilot gunner with search, detection, recognition, and designation by means of Direct View Optics (DVO), EI² television, and Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) sighting systems that may be used singularly or in combinations. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Technical manuals for authorized maintenance levels are UNCLASSIFIED.

c. The AN/APR-48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometer (M-RFI) is an updated version of the passive radar detection and direction finding system. It utilizes a detachable UDM on the M-RFI processor, which contains the Radar Frequency (RF) threat library. The UDM, which is a hardware assemblage item, is classified CONFIDENTIAL when programmed with threat parameters, threat priorities and/or techniques derived from U.S. intelligence information. Hardware becomes CLASSIFIED when populated with threat parametric data.

d. KIV-77 A common IFF Applique Crypto Computer that provides information assurance for the IFF interrogators and transponders using Modes 4 and 5. The hardware is classified UNCLASSIFIED. This item is CCI and SENSITIVE. Releasable technical manuals for operation and maintenance are classified FOUO.

e. The Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Navigation System plus Multi-Mode Receiver (EGI+MMR) EGI GEM V 3.3 W/SAASM PN: 3424 9950-R004-XXX Software Security Core PN: CP34211974-003 (CP34211903-002), GCORE 3 ver 3 SAASM with MMR. The aircraft has two EGIs which use internal accelerometers, rate gyro measurements, and external sensor measurements to estimate the aircraft state, provides aircraft flight and position data to aircraft systems. The EGI is a velocity-aided, strap down, ring laser gyro based inertial unit. The EGI unit houses a 12-channel (GEM 5) GPS receiver. The receiver is capable of operating in either non-encrypted (C/A code) or encrypted (P/Y code). The Group User Variable (GUV) is the normal encryption key used when operating

in the P/Y code mode. The GUV key is loaded into the EGI using an ANACD-10 or equivalent device. When keyed, the GPS receiver will automatically use anti-spoof/jam capabilities when they are in use. The EGI will retain the key through power on/off/on cycles. Because of safeguards built into the EGI, it is not considered classified when keyed. Integrated within the EGI is an Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) with processing functions for performing the inertial navigation computations, GPS card, receiver management, and Kalman filter estimates to support all aircraft and weapon systems position and navigation computations. Each EGI also houses a Multi-Mode Receiver (MMR). The MMR is incorporated to provide for reception of ground based NAVJID signals for instrument aided flight. Provides IMC/IFR integration and certification of improved Embedded Global Positioning System and Inertial (EGI) unit with attached MMR, with specific cockpit instrumentation that allows Apaches to operate within the worldwide IFR route structure. Also includes integration of the Common Army Aviation Map (CAAM), Area Navigation (RNAV), Digital Aeronautical Flight Information File (DAFIF) and Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) compliance.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of specific hardware, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the Netherlands can provide substantially the same degree of protection for sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sustainment program is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the Netherlands.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 18-01, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Sweden for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$3.2 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREGORY M. KAUSNER
(For Charles W. Hooper,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director).
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18-01

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Sweden.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$2.3 billion.
Other \$.9 billion.
Total \$3.2 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consider-

ation for Purchase: Four (4) Patriot Configuration-3+ Modernized Fire Units consisting of:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Four (4) AN/MPQ-65 Radar Sets.
Four (4) AN/MSQ-132 Engagement Control Stations.
Nine (9) Antenna Mast Groups.
Twelve (12) M903 Launching Stations.
One hundred (100) Patriot MIM-104E Guidance Enhanced Missile Tactical Ballistic Missile (GEM-T) Missiles.

Two hundred (200) Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) Missile Segment Enhancement (MSE) Missiles.

Four (4) Electrical Power Plants (EPP) III.

Non-MDE includes: Also included with this request are communications equipment, tools and test equipment, range and test programs, support equipment to include associated vehicles, prime movers, generators, publications and technical documentation, training equipment, spare and repair parts, personnel training, Technical Assistance Field Team (TAFT), U.S. Government and contractor technical, engineering, and logistics support services, Systems Integration and Checkout (SICO), field office support, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 20, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Sweden—Patriot Configuration-3+ Modernized Fire Units

The Government of Sweden has requested to buy four (4) Patriot Configuration-3+ Modernized Fire Units consisting of: four (4) AN/MPQ-65 radar sets, four (4) AN/MSQ-132 engagement control stations, nine (9) antenna mast groups, twelve (12) M903 launching stations, one hundred (100) Patriot MIM-104E Guidance Enhanced Missile-TBM (GEM-T) missiles, two hundred (200) Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) Missile Segment Enhancement (MSE) missiles, and four (4) Electrical Power Plants (EPP) III. Also included with this request are communications equipment, tools and test equipment, range and test programs, support equipment to include associated vehicles, prime movers, generators, publications and technical documentation, training equipment, spare and repair parts, personnel training, Technical Assistance Field Team (TAFT), U.S. Government and contractor technical, engineering, and logistics support services, Systems Integration and Checkout (SICO), field office support, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$3.2 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a strategic partner which has been, and continues to be, an important force for political stability and economic progress within the Baltic Sea region and across Europe.

The proposed sale of the Patriot missile system will improve Sweden's missile defense capability. Sweden will use the Patriot system to defend its territorial integrity and promote regional stability. The proposed sale will increase the defensive capabilities

of the Swedish military and support interoperability with U.S. and NATO forces. Sweden will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors will be Raytheon Corporation in Andover, Massachusetts, and Lockheed-Martin in Dallas, Texas. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require approximately 24 U.S. Government and 32 contractor representatives to travel to Sweden for an extended period for equipment de-processing/fielding, system check-out, training, and technical and logistics support.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18-01

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Patriot Air Defense System contains classified CONFIDENTIAL hardware components, SECRET tactical software and CRITICAL/SENSITIVE technology. Patriot ground support equipment and Patriot missile hardware contain CONFIDENTIAL components and the associated launcher hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. The items requested represent significant technological advances for Sweden Patriot. The Patriot Air Defense System continues to hold a significant technology lead over other surface-to-air missile systems in the world.

2. The Patriot sensitive/critical technology is primarily in the area of design and production know-how and primarily inherent in the design, development and/or manufacturing data related to certain components. The list of components is classified CONFIDENTIAL.

3. Information on system performance capabilities, effectiveness, survivability, missile seeker capabilities, select software/software documentation and test data are classified up to and including SECRET.

4. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

5. A determination has been made that Sweden can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

6. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Sweden.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-75, concerning the Navy's proposed Let-

ter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Finland for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$70 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-75

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Finland.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$60 million.

Other \$10 million.

Total \$70 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): Four (4) Mk 41 Baseline VII Strike-Length Vertical Launching Systems.

Non-MDE: Also included are spares, handling equipment, test equipment, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, training, technical, and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (FI-P-LBN).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 20, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Finland—Mk 41 Vertical Launching Systems

The Government of Finland has requested a possible sale of four (4) Mk 41 Baseline VII Strike-Length Vertical Launching Systems. Also included are spares, handling equipment, test equipment, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, training, technical, and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical support. The estimated total case value is \$70 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a partner nation that has been, and continues to be, an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

Finland intends to use the vertical launching systems on four new construction corvettes that will make up the Finnish Navy's Squadron 2020. The vertical launching systems will enable Finland to acquire missiles that will significantly enhance the Finnish Navy's area defense capabilities over critical air-and-sea-lines of trade and communication. The proposed sale of the Mk 41 will increase the Finnish Navy's maritime partnership, interoperability, and regional security capability. Finland has not purchased the Mk 41 previously, but will have no difficulty incorporating this capability into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin Corporation, Bethesda, MD. The pur-

chaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require up to 12 U.S. Government personnel and up to five contractor representatives to travel to Finland providing support over a period of ten years.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-75

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Mk 41 Vertical Launching System (VLS) is a fixed, vertical, multi-missile launching system with the capability to store and launch multiple missile variants depending on the warfighting mission, including the Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile (ESSM) and Standard Missile 2 (SM-2). This proposed sale would provide tactical VLS capability for the ESSM. Mk 41 VLS is a modular below-deck configuration with each module consisting of 8 missile cells with an associated gas management and deluge system. The highest classification of the hardware in the proposed sale is UNCLASSIFIED. The highest classification of the technical documentation in the proposed sale is UNCLASSIFIED. The highest classification of the software to be exported is CONFIDENTIAL.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of specific hardware, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that Finland can provide substantially the same degree of protection for sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sustainment program is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Finland.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO WILMA AND WELLINGTON WEBB

● Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wish to celebrate the diamond jubilee birthdays of the Honorable Wilma and Wellington Webb.

Wilma and Wellington Webb embody the best of Colorado. Through a long and distinguished career, they have made history, improved our communities, and set an example of leadership for our State.

Wilma Webb's life is defined by service to others. Her career began as a community organizer registering voters, assisting impoverished families, and fighting for equality in education. In 1980, she joined the Colorado House of Representatives, where she was re-elected for six terms and served a total of 13 years. During her tenure, Wilma

sponsored many substantive bills and became the first African American to serve on the powerful joint budget committee, which writes Colorado's multibillion dollar annual budget. After 4 years of tireless advocacy, she pushed through legislation to recognize Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday in Denver through events like the annual "Marade." President Clinton later appointed her to serve as the regional administrator for the U.S. Department of Labor.

Her husband, Wellington Webb, likewise displays an example of public service. Mayor Webb has served in the Colorado House of Representatives, the Carter administration, and Colorado's Department of Regulatory Agencies. In a historic election in 1991, he became the first African-American mayor of Denver. Over two terms, Mayor Webb dedicated himself to improving Denver's parks and open spaces, strengthening public safety, championing inclusive economic development, and expanding access to high-quality education for our children. Like his wife, Mayor Webb's leadership has left an indelible mark. We see it throughout our city, from the Denver International Airport to the expanded Denver Art Museum, the Blair-Caldwell African-American Research Library, and the many buildings that bear his name.

As individuals, Wilma and Wellington Webb are exceptional examples of public service. Together, they have formed an extraordinarily powerful force that has left Denver and Colorado more prosperous, inclusive, and just. On this day of celebration, I join Coloradans across our State in sharing my deep gratitude and admiration for the legacy they created and the years of contributions that lie ahead.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF READING TERMINAL MARKET

● Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and honor Reading Terminal Market as it celebrates the 125th anniversary of its founding in Pennsylvania.

Reading Terminal Market officially opened on February 22, 1893, under the Reading Railroad Company and is one of the Nation's oldest farmers' markets. The market was a result of the city's consolidation of public markets in the early 19th century due to the mass number of merchants and health hazards that became associated with merchant stalls.

Reading Terminal Market opened with approximately 78,000 square feet, including 800 spaces for merchants to sell their goods. The market was prosperous during the Great Depression and World War II due to local farmers coming to the city because of high demand and fair prices. Individuals living in the suburbs could have their groceries delivered for free through the use of

the train station. Employees at the Reading Terminal would load carts of groceries onto trains and deliver them to each station as the customer requested. Much of Reading Terminal Market's customer base and services relied on the Reading Railroad Company.

When the railroad company failed, the market suffered and experienced financial hardship from the 1960s to the early 1990s. A \$30 million investment in infrastructure resuscitated the market, and it has thrived as an economic hub ever since.

Today, Reading Terminal Market, housed in a National Historic Landmark building, is home to 80 merchants of all different cultural backgrounds with products ranging from fresh, locally sourced produce, meats, handmade wares, and clothing, to a broad range of ethnic food and global goods. With an estimated 100,000 people experiencing the market on a weekly basis, Reading Terminal Market is one of the most prosperous, public markets in both the Commonwealth and in the Nation.

I commend Reading Terminal Market, its employees, and its merchants on the 125th anniversary of its founding. As the market has reached global recognition, I am honored it calls Pennsylvania home. Rich in both diversity and tradition, let it serve as a symbol of culture, history, opportunity, and inspiration for us all.●

TRIBUTE TO DONALD GUIMOND

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to honor and recognize Donald Guimond who is resigning as the town manager for the town of Fort Kent, ME. Don is a remarkable public servant, mentor, and individual who has truly led by example. His inclusive leadership style has cultivated a community that is now the envy of many communities throughout the State of Maine. Located in Aroostook County—the Crown of Maine—Fort Kent is known for being the northern boundary of Route One, for the generosity of its citizens, and for the ability to make seemingly insurmountable projects happen.

During his 24-year tenure as town manager, Don was at the heart of all of the significant projects that have maintained and continue to shape the town. Staying true to his philosophy that "taxpayers of our community [stay] at the forefront decisions," he has included the voices of community members in his decisions. In the same vein, he was present for every project, regardless of its scope.

Don has provided invaluable advice and leadership to development groups, the Greater Fort Kent Chamber of Commerce and many other boards and organizations. He has also participated in numerous international events from

outdoor, volunteer-driven events like World Cup Biathlons and the Can Am Crown sled dog races, to cultural events like the 2014 World Acadian Congress. During the flood of 2008, Don was everywhere, making sure that townfolks were taken care of, using his skills to assist government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and others to make sure that people's needs were being met. His efforts during that tumultuous time were praised by local and State leaders.

Don has mentored many leaders within Aroostook County, imparting to them his understanding of how a municipality functions best. If we could all channel our inner Don Guimond, governing would be a little easier. I join the State of Maine, his family, colleagues, and employees in thanking Don for his outstanding service and the instrumental impact he has made on Fort Kent and Aroostook County. In showing the way to make a community and a region better by action, he has made many contributions to the State of Maine, and I am certain he will find a way to continue to do that.●

TRIBUTE TO MCKENZIE BOBBITT

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize McKenzie Bobbitt, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

McKenzie is a graduate of Texas A&M University—Commerce, in Commerce, TX, having earned a degree in business administration. She is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to McKenzie for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on February 23, 2018, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY) had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1725. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit certain reports relating to medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary.

H.R. 3122. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include on the internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs a warning regarding dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices targeting individuals who are eligible for increased pension on the basis of need for regular aid and attendance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4533. An act to designate the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Lexington VA Health Care System" and to make certain other designations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 620. An act to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, and for other purposes.

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

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution authorizing Reverend Billy Graham to lie in honor in the Rotunda of the Capitol.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 30442(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform: Mr. WOMACK of Arkansas, Mr. SESSIONS of Texas, Mr. WOODALL of Georgia, and Mr. ARRINGTON of Texas.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 30422(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans: Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN of Florida, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 30442(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), the Minority Leader appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform: Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California, and Mr. KILMER of Washington.

The message also announced that that pursuant to section 30422(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), the Minority Leader appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NORCROSS of New Jersey, and Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 931(c) of the Com-

prehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-198), the Minority Leader appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Creating Options for Veterans' Expedited Recovery (COVER) Commission: Dr. Michael J. Potoczniak of El Cerrito, California, and Dr. Shira Maguen of San Francisco, California.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1281. A bill to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-209).

S. 1884. A bill to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-210).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1791. A bill to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-211).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 2451. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to consider State analysis and sharing of prescription drug monitoring program data in determining prescription drug monitoring program grants to States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 2452. A bill to provide for the improvement of the capacity of the Navy to conduct surface warfare operations and activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

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

S. 428

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordi-

nated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 818

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with disabilities to save additional amounts in their ABLE accounts above the current annual maximum contribution if they work and earn income.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 834, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, *supra*.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 982

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to require mandatory reporting of incidents of child abuse or neglect, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator

from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1130

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1130, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a sustainable future for rural healthcare.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others, and law enforcement, with new tools to prevent gun violence.

S. 1539

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1539, a bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence.

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, *supra*.

S. 1685

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1685, a bill to require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to establish procedures for considering certain credit scores in making a determination whether to purchase a residential mortgage, and for other purposes.

S. 1850

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1850, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to prevent the militarization of Federal, State, and local law enforcement by Federal excess property transfers and grant programs.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1917, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1945, a bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, *supra*.

S. 1989

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1989, a bill to enhance transparency and accountability for online political advertisements by requiring those who purchase and publish such ads to disclose information about the advertisements to the public, and for other purposes.

S. 2060

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2060, a bill to promote democracy and human rights in Burma, and for other purposes.

S. 2095

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2095, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS *Indianapolis*, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2227

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2227, a bill to reauthorize the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Program.

S. 2250

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2250, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 2255

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2255, a bill to reauthorize title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve and encourage innovation in international education, and for other purposes.

S. 2301

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2301, a bill to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits.

S. 2304

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2304, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect veterans from predatory lending, and for other purposes.

S. 2317

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2317, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for additional flexibility with respect to medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, and for other purposes.

S. 2341

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2341, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes.

S. 2353

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2353, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes.

S. 2361

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2361, a bill to amend the

Federal Home Loan Bank Act to allow a captive insurance company that was a member of a Federal Home Loan Bank before January 19, 2016, to continue or restore the membership of the captive insurance company in the Federal Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes.

S. 2384

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2384, a bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to make funding available to 1890 institutions without fiscal year limitation.

S. 2387

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2387, a bill to provide better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and their caregivers while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure.

S. 2398

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2398, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide that activities relating to the training and readiness of the reserve components of the Armed Forces during a lapse in appropriations shall constitute voluntary services that may be accepted by the United States.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2432

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2432, a bill to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

S. RES. 355

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 355, a resolution improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Washington

(Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2018, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

S. RES. 386

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 386, a resolution urging the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to fulfill its agreement to hold credible elections, comply with constitutional limits on presidential terms, and fulfill its constitutional mandate for a democratic transition of power by taking concrete and measurable steps towards holding elections not later than December 2018 as outlined in the existing election calendar, and allowing for freedom of expression and association.

S. RES. 402

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 402, a resolution calling upon the President to exercise relevant mandatory sanctions authorities under the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act in response to the Government of the Russian Federation's continued aggression in Ukraine and illegal occupation of Crimea and assault on democratic institutions around the world, including through cyber attacks.

S. RES. 409

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 409, a resolution honoring the dedication and courage of the Buffalo Soldiers.

S. RES. 413

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 413, a resolution celebrating Black History Month.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2044. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 390, to provide emergency relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2044. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 390, to provide emergency relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(6) Millions of Syrian refugees and internally displaced persons will face enormous difficulties returning to their homes in Syria unless President Bashar al-Assad is no longer in power.

On page 13, line 4, strike "(6)" and insert "(7)".

On page 13, line 11, strike "(7)" and insert "(8)".

On page 14, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(2) denounces the roles Iran and Russia have played in perpetuating the conflict in Syria, and their involvement in the commission of crimes against humanity;

On page 14, line 8, strike "(2)" and insert "(3)".

On page 14, line 10, strike "(3)" and insert "(4)".

On page 14, line 16, strike "(4)" and insert "(5)".

On page 14, lines 20 and 21, strike "and" and all that follows through "(5)", and insert the following:

(6) affirms—

(A) Secretary of State Rex Tillerson's statement on October 26, 2017, that "the United States wants a whole and unified Syria with no role for Bashar al-Assad in the government"; and

(B) former Secretary of State John Kerry's January 23, 2014 statement on Al Arabiya, that "this should be about all of the people in Syria and the future of Syria. And Assad right now is the one person who stands in the way of peace and the future of Syria"; and

(7)

On page 36, line 2, strike "8" and insert "12".

On page 36, after line 25, add the following:

(I) One member appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(J) One member appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(K) One member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(L) One member appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

On page 37, lines 6 through 8, strike "and the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives" and insert "the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives".

On page 37, lines 15 through 17, strike "and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of

Representatives" and insert "the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the Senate, and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives".

On page 39, lines 12 through 14, strike "and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives" and insert "the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives".

On page 40, lines 19 and 20, strike "and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives" and insert "the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives".

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 103, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM TO LIE IN HONOR IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 107, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) authorizing Reverend Billy Graham to lie in honor in the Rotunda of the Capitol.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2018

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, February 27; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Branch nomination; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Branch nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 27, 2018, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 26, 2018

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 26, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN NEWHOUSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HONORING JOE QUATTRONE

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the hardest working men on Capitol Hill, Joe Quattrone.

Joe's 84th birthday was Saturday, February 10. He has been cutting hair in the House for 47 years. Joe embodies the principles of hard work, dedication, and humility. He has cut the hair of the most powerful people in Washington, including: President Gerald Ford; President George Bush, Sr.; Vice President Al Gore; and almost every single Speaker of the House. He has cut hair in hospital rooms, before inaugurations, and even for foreign Presidents and ambassadors.

Joe grew up in Reggio Calabria, Italy, and came to the United States in 1952. He served as an Italian translator with the American Air Force during the Korean war. Along with an honorable discharge, Joe received his American citizenship upon leaving the Army. In 1960, Joe came to D.C. and

held a number of jobs before cutting hair in the House. He even worked construction on the Rayburn House Office Building.

Emigrating from Italy, Joe is so proud of his American citizenship. Growing up in Italy, Joe was first introduced to America when American troops flew over his town during World War II. He said they would get so close to the town that he even made eye contact with the pilots flying those planes. When American troops came through his city, Joe remembers waving a small American flag, along with his family, welcoming them to his hometown.

After serving with the Air Force, in 1955 he joined the Metropolitan D.C. Police Force, where he was active for 25 years. When you speak to Joe, you see the pride and joy he takes in his job and his country reflected in his attitude. It is because of Joe and the hard-working staff in the Capitol buildings of the Congress that Congress is able to perform its duties every day.

Today I honor Joe and the lifetime of service he has given to the Capitol and to the United States of America.

VOCA FUNDING—LOCK THE BOX

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of 1984, Congress came up with a unique idea: with Congress' support, President Ronald Reagan signed into law the Victims of Crime Act, otherwise known as VOCA.

This law established the Crime Victims Fund, with the sole purpose of supporting crime victims throughout the United States. But instead of using taxpayer money for the fund, Congress came up with a novel idea: Why not force the criminals, the traffickers, the abusers, the scourges on society, to pay for the restitution to their victims? They inflicted pain and suffering on innocent people, so they should be the ones, literally, to pay for their crimes.

Because of the new law, convicted felons in Federal court who are assessed fines and fees pay into the Crime Victims Fund. The money in the fund is used for a wide range of victims' services:

It pays for domestic violence shelters where spouses can recover from their abusers;

It funds rape crisis coalition centers;

It funds children's assessment centers like the one in my hometown of Houston;

It sends money to victim advocates throughout the United States who go to court with victims of crime;

It gives victims restitution and pays for critical medical and mental health programs.

It is a really good idea, Mr. Speaker.

Over the years, because our Federal judges have continued to fine and assess greater and greater penalties to the criminals, the VOCA fund currently holds—get this, Mr. Speaker—\$12 billion. And let me make it clear: This is not taxpayer money; it is money that criminals have paid into the system. Criminals are paying the rent on the courthouse, paying for the system that they have created.

So what is the problem? Here is the problem, Mr. Speaker: The fund, every year, is robbed by the bureaucrats to offset other Federal projects that are completely unrelated to crime victims. For example, about \$800,000 is spent out of the fund, which has \$12 billion in money, and over the years, it continues to have more and more money because less of it is being spent. In my opinion, these bureaucrats are literally stealing money from the Victims Fund and throwing it into the abyss of the Federal Treasury. That money does not belong to the Federal Government; it belongs to crime victims.

Victims do not have, Mr. Speaker, high-dollar lobbyists up here in Washington, D.C., advocating on their behalf. They expect us, Members of Congress, to be their lobbyists, to be their voice. As a former prosecutor and a former judge in Texas, I take that duty very seriously.

It is the first responsibility of government to actually protect the people. We must stop the robber bureaucrats from stealing money out of the Crime Victims Fund and make sure that victims have access to the resources they need to become survivors.

To achieve this goal, my friend, Representative JIM COSTA from California, my cochair in the Victims' Rights Caucus, and I have introduced the Crime Victims Fund Preservation Act. The bill is very simple. It creates a lockbox to make sure that the money in the fund cannot be used for anything other than victims' programs under the Victims of Crime Act.

The Crime Victims Fund becomes an especially attractive target for offsets at this time when our government faces any sort of a deficit. That is why Congress must safeguard the fund to make sure the money is protected.

The bill uses the money paid by criminals to help rescue and restore

victims and ensure that it is safe from the sticky, pilfering hands of bureaucrats—and does so forever. So let the victims of crime keep the money and not send it to other programs in the Federal departments throughout the Nation.

And that is just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF NBA ALL-STAR JOE JOHNSON

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud the work of NBA all-star and Arkansas native Joe Johnson of the Sacramento Kings with a local youth basketball program, the Arkansas H.A.W.K.S.

The Arkansas H.A.W.K.S., an acronym meaning Hard At Work Kids, is a member of the Amateur Athletic Union organization dedicated to the development of athletic ability in American youth. Under the leadership of Coach Bill Ingram, the team's goal extends beyond the court and into the communities of central Arkansas, building a dynasty of basketball players who seek to make a lasting impact on their neighborhoods, city, State, and our country.

Before he was a seven-time NBA all-star, Joe Johnson was a student at the historic Little Rock Central High School and a star player on the Arkansas H.A.W.K.S roster. In this partnership, the teams and players connected with the H.A.W.K.S will be given unique opportunities, including, mentorship, player development, and academic assistance.

I would like to extend a hearty debt of gratitude and congratulations to Joe Johnson and the Arkansas H.A.W.K.S program for their selfless and worthwhile investment in central Arkansas youth.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ALBERT YARNELL

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the legacy of one of Arkansas' great innovators and leaders, my friend Albert Yarnell of Searcy, Arkansas, who passed away earlier this year at the age of 94.

Albert worked for over 75 years with his family to make Yarnell's Ice Cream one of the most successful regional ice cream companies in the United States. Yarnell's Ice Cream created many unique flavors, such as the Razorbacks' ice cream, Woo Pig Chewy; and my personal favorite, peppermint.

Yarnell was an icon of Arkansas business and anchor of the Searcy and White County business community for decades. He is a past president of the Searcy Chamber of Commerce and served as mayor of Searcy. He was inducted into the Arkansas Business Hall of Fame in 2007 and is a member of the Arkansas Dairy Products Hall of Fame.

He was a role model and friend to many across our State.

I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to his many dear friends, family, and loved ones.

RECOGNIZING NORTH LITTLE ROCK MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHER DAWN McLAIN

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize North Little Rock Middle School teacher Dawn McLain. Dawn, a sixth grade science and math teacher, recently was named a 2017–2018 recipient of the national Milken Educator Award, one of only 44 across our country. This prestigious honor is given to teachers with exceptional educational talent who impact students both in and out of the classroom.

Dawn has not only increased her students' test scores, but she has engaged her students through robotics, design modeling, and rocketry. She is a strong proponent of project-based learning, technology integration, and data deployment. Dawn is also focused on helping her students build life skills that will help them succeed into adulthood and works to build strong relationships with both parents and her students.

Teachers like Dawn prove that education is one of the best investments America can make. I am proud to represent her and all the teachers of central Arkansas who are making a difference in the lives of our kids.

RECOGNIZING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER 2 JOHN HEFFERNAN

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize one of Arkansas' finest, Chief Warrant Officer 2 John Heffernan, who passed away late last month at the age of 77. His leadership and dedication to our State and Nation as a soldier, a veteran, and a volunteer is an example to all Arkansans and all Americans.

Heffernan enlisted in the Army in 1962, and after more than 27 years of military service, John retired from the Arkansas Army National Guard. For the next 23 years, John provided his services at Camp Robinson and the Little Rock Air Force Base. He was one of many of the strongest advocates in central Arkansas for all matters related to our military veterans and their families.

For the better part of half a century, John was a selfless servant to others, giving more of himself than he had to give. He had a passion for volunteering, rivaled only by his passion of service to his country.

I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to his family and their loved ones.

HONORING JROTC CADET PETER WANG

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, the shooting in Parkland, Florida, on 14

February represented a catastrophic failure of local authorities as well as the FBI. The students needed a hero that day, and while the sheriff's department failed the students, I think it is important to recognize and commemorate the fact that a 15-year-old JROTC cadet named Peter Wang answered the call.

In the face of a deranged gunman descending on his school, Cadet Wang helped his fellow students flee to safety, exposing himself to fire in the process. He could have simply saved himself, but like a true hero, Peter Wang chose to protect the lives of others. Going above and beyond the call of duty, he sacrificed his life on that fateful day.

Scripture teaches that there is no greater love than that a man should lay down his life for his friends, and his fellow students will be indebted to Peter Wang for his actions on that day.

Now, Peter Wang had a desire to attend West Point, and his actions on 14 February more than lived up to the U.S. Military Academy's motto of duty, honor, and country. His posthumous admittance to West Point represented a rare but well-deserved honor.

In Peter Wang, the country lost someone who no doubt would have enriched the Army's officer corps and provided honorable service in uniform. Yet it is also true that, with the lives he saved that day, he accomplished more on his final day on this Earth than most of us who serve in the military accomplish over the course of an entire career.

□ 1215

You can train for moments like those faced by Peter Wang, but you don't know if you can pass the test until you are actually put to the test. Peter Wang passed his test with flying colors. His steadfast devotion to duty reflected great credit upon himself and was in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Army.

Rest in peace, soldier. Job well done.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF GRANT COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT BATTALION CHIEF DAN DISHON

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Grant County Fire District Battalion Chief Dan Dishon from Moses Lake, Washington. Dan passed away on January 8, 2018.

Dan was a husband, a father, a friend, and a highly respected fire service member. His love of firefighting and his dedication to his community were evident in his 15 years of volunteer

service at both the Grant County Fire District 13 as well as District 5, where he eventually secured his dream job of shift captain.

Local firefighters, members of his team, and the community will remember him for his leadership, humility, and commitment to keeping the citizens of Grant County safe. My prayers and sincere condolences go out to his family and his friends and all those affected by his passing during this difficult time.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in thanking Dan Dishon for his inspirational life of service to Washington State in the Fourth District.

ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF GLOBAL HUNGER

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of global hunger. Tonight, this very evening, 800 million people across the world will go to bed hungry. Throughout 2017, this very past year, this number has only grown, making this the first year in a decade that global hunger has increased.

This increase arises from violent conflicts and natural disasters that have worsened the situation for many living in extreme poverty. These crises demonstrate the need for lifesaving United States humanitarian relief around the world.

For 63 years, our Nation's signature food donation program, Food for Peace, has fed more than 3 billion hungry people. This program has benefitted people facing some of the worst humanitarian disasters of the century, averting famine, and providing medical care for those who need it most.

Today, USAID remains committed to providing for people in dire situations with emergency help. In countries like Yemen and Nigeria, where more than 70 percent of the population is facing severe starvation, USAID continues to step in to prevent famine and fight disease.

The USAID mission is to provide emergency food assistance, is vital to many countries around the world, and is a key pillar of President Trump's National Security Strategy. Its purpose is to end the need for its own existence by responding to the disasters and helping our partners achieve self-reliance.

A world without hunger is in America's very best interest. Hunger breeds instability and conflict. These programs represent a small investment to prevent future conflicts.

I am proud that wheat is the most used commodity in U.S. hunger programs. Kansas is known as the breadbasket of the world and is the Nation's leading wheat producer. But today,

while our growers have full grain elevators in my State, we still have four ongoing declared famines around the world. There is no reason that we cannot connect the starving with our ample supplies of food.

I look forward to working with the House Agriculture Committee as we reauthorize the Food for Peace and other critical antihunger programs in the 2018 farm bill so that USAID and the United States Department of Agriculture can continue to help provide for the hungry and strengthen our national security across the world.

Need for Broadband Deployment in Rural Communities

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to emphasize the need for broadband development in rural communities. More and more, we see a transition from "brick and mortar" to "click and mortar" establishments, with the world quickly moving from paper to digital.

In rural America, the digital divide is becoming increasingly present. From limited connection speeds to locations entirely without service, these communities are lacking the same basic abilities as their urban counterparts. I am encouraged to see so many conversations happening in and around the Hill related to removing the barriers to connecting Americans, but there is still a lot of work to be done.

I applaud the efforts of President Trump, Chairman Pai, and Agriculture Secretary Perdue in making rural broadband deployment a national priority as we head into 2018. I hope that my colleagues here in Congress will remember that all Americans deserve reasonable and comparable service, no matter where in the country they live.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Vincent DeRosa, St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, who are the hope of sinners and the joy of the holy, grant this House a spirit of compunction for failures, perseverance for growth, and humility in success.

For the good of our country, we ask You to enflame the Members of this Chamber with wisdom, hope, courage, and all the other virtues necessary to secure prosperity throughout our land and equal justice under the law.

Above all, help us to be a people of loving encounter with each other and with our neighbors around the world, that establishing an ever more perfect society on Earth, we may one day know the joys of paradise with You.

We ask this in Your most holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. MCCOLLUM led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

RECOGNIZING WAKULLA COUNTY TEACHER KATRINA RODDENBERRY

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding teacher from Wakulla County, Florida's Second Congressional District.

Katrina Roddenberry, a science teacher at Wakulla Middle School, was selected by the Space Foundation as one of 31 educators worldwide who were honored for her work promoting science and space curricula at Wakulla Middle School. Along with this honor, Ms. Roddenberry and her colleague, Melissa Martin, were selected to work with NASA as part of their Microgravity University for Educators 2018 Challenge.

This once-in-a-lifetime opportunity will give these teachers and four of their students the chance to work directly with the experts at NASA. It is clear that they are inspiring a love of science and space in their students. These teachers are forming not just strong minds but also strong characters and big hearts in young men and women with a sense of community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Ms. Roddenberry and thanking her for instilling a love of science and space in our next generation.

HIGHLIGHTING THE WORK OF THE CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA DIG- ITAL LEARNING FOUNDATION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was at the Central Pennsylvania Digital Learning Foundation in Duncansville to speak about my work on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The Central Pennsylvania Digital Learning Foundation Charter School offers a customizable cyber education for students throughout Pennsylvania. Its learning experience connects, engages, and empowers every student to be successful in reaching their academic and personal goals for today and tomorrow.

This school was developed from the ground up by the area superintendents in collaboration with Intermediate Unit 8. The IU8 was created to furnish a broad range of educational services to the 35 public schools, 5 area vocational-technical schools, 2 charter schools, and approximately 81 non public schools in west central and southwestern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, we must understand that there are numerous educational environments, and many students thrive in a cyber school-style setup. The IU8 is doing tremendous work to ensure that students who choose a cyber school education are receiving the same quality education as their peers who attend brick-and-mortar schools. I am proud of the work they are doing.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy grieving for the 17 innocents murdered in Parkland. We are praying for their families and friends.

I cannot begin to fathom the sorrow of parents who must bury a child. From the time our children are born, we instinctively understand it is our responsibility to protect them; but, increasingly, as a nation, we are failing our children and allowing them to be gunned down in schools, at concerts, and in houses of worship.

Still, in this darkest of time, I see reason to hope. I am inspired by the eloquence of the survivors and the young people across the country who are speaking out for positive action.

We all know there are commonsense actions that would curb gun violence in our communities and save lives: universal background checks; banning military-style assault weapons, high-capacity magazines, and bump stocks;

and funding mental healthcare, to name but a few.

These measures have the overwhelming support of the American people. All that is missing is the political will from Congress. Hopefully, this moment will be different.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the voices of our young people. Let's have the debate and vote on real actions to reduce gun violence in our schools, our neighborhoods, and our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

RECOGNIZING THE EXTRAOR- DINARY WORK OF SALLY HAR- RISON

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary work of Sally Harrison.

Sally is the president and CEO of the Mesa Chamber of Commerce. She has worked in this role since 2013. Mesa's business environment is thriving with her at the helm.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Sally led the meeting at Arizona State University Polytechnic campus with Congressman JIM BRIDENSTINE and the Mesa Industry and Defense Council. Under her leadership, this unique council continues to highlight the tremendous technological and manufacturing capabilities we have in my district. There have been positive reports of the discussion she facilitated, and I am confident that she will continue to create these opportunities for my constituents.

These conversations between local officials, Federal office holders, and business leaders are paramount to ensuring that our constituents receive the best possible representation. Sally understands this and is working every day to facilitate enduring success in Mesa and our region.

I thank her for her service to our great city.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we have been out of session for a week, and much has happened in America. Of

course, the most dreadful thing is Parkland, Florida, and the Douglas High School. I shed quite a few tears thinking about those students and looking at the teachers who lost their lives.

The system failed. The FBI failed to follow up. Apparently, the sheriff's department failed to follow up. Mr. Speaker, our President failed because he failed to see the problem that we have in this country is not giving teachers guns, but giving teachers more respect and giving them more aid to be able to teach. He failed to see that the problem is not just in schools, where it is so important and there have been shootings and killings, but there are killings in Texas churches and in Las Vegas concerts, and by people over 21 years of age.

Banning bump stocks, which was the response to Las Vegas, is right and good and needs to be done by law to be done legally. Banning assault weapons being purchased by under 21-year-olds is good, but we need to ban assault weapons for everybody, for the 58 victims in Las Vegas as well as the victims in that church in Texas—and high-capacity magazines. We need to let the CDC study. We need to act.

God save America and the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:45 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1647

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

ASHLYNNE MIKE AMBER ALERT IN INDIAN COUNTRY ACT

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 772) to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 772

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ashlynne Mike AMBER Alert in Indian Country Act”.

SEC. 2. AMBER ALERT GRANTS FOR INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 304 of the PROTECT Act (34 U.S.C. 20504) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Attorney General shall carry out a program to provide grants to States and Indian tribes for—

“(1) the development or enhancement of programs and activities for the support of AMBER Alert communications plans; and

“(2) the integration of tribal AMBER Alert systems into State AMBER Alert systems.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) the integration of State or regional AMBER Alert communication plans with an Indian tribe; and”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “The Federal” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) WAIVER OF FEDERAL SHARE.—If the Attorney General determines that an Indian tribe does not have sufficient funds available to comply with the Federal share requirement under paragraph (1) for the cost of activities funded by a grant for the purpose described in subsection (b)(4), the Attorney General may increase the Federal share of the costs for such activities to the extent the Attorney General determines necessary.”;

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “for grants under” and inserting “and standards to improve accountability and transparency for grants awarded under”;

(5) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g);

(6) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) DEFINITION OF INDIAN TRIBE.—In this section, the term ‘Indian tribe’ means a federally recognized Indian tribe or a Native village, Regional Corporation, or Village Corporation (as those terms are defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)).”; and

(7) in subsection (g)(1), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “2004” each place it appears and inserting “2019”; and

(B) by striking “subsection (b)(3)” and inserting “paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b)”.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit a report evaluating the readiness, education, and training needs, technological challenges, and specific obstacles encountered by Indian tribes in the integration of State or regional AMBER Alert communication plans to—

(1) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 772, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a sponsor of the AMBER Alert in Indian Country Act, in memory of the life of Ashlynne Mike.

I want to thank the House leadership and Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this bill before the House for consideration.

Eleven-year-old Ashlynne lived in the Navajo Nation, the largest Indian reservation in the United States, located in four States: Arizona, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. Her favorite color was yellow, and she enjoyed playing music for her friends and family. She was a kindhearted young girl who had enormous potential.

After school on Monday, May 2, 2016, while Ashlynne and her 9-year-old brother Ian waited and played near the local bus stop, a stranger approached and lured them into his vehicle by offering them a ride home.

He abducted the children and took them to a remote part of the reservation, where he abused Ashlynne, slaughtered her, and left her brother to fend for himself in the desert. Ashlynne died alone.

Ashlynne had been abducted around 4 p.m. Her father filed a missing person report at 6:53 p.m., within 3 hours. Unfortunately, authorities did not send an AMBER Alert until 2:30 a.m. on Tuesday, almost 10 hours after Ashlynne went missing.

According to law enforcement records, Tom Begay, Jr., Ashlynne's perpetrator, admitted that Ashlynne was alive when he left her stranded in the desert.

Mr. Speaker, had Indian Country been included as partners in the AMBER Alert plans, law enforcement might have rescued Ashlynne in time. She might still be alive and with us today.

When a child is abducted, action in those first hours is crucial to their safe return. The AMBER Alert program has proven effective at instantly providing information to the public to assist in the effort.

According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, of the AMBER Alerts issued in 2016, 94 percent of the recovered children were found within the first 72 hours, including 47 percent who were found within the first 3 hours.

Between 1997 and February 2017, the AMBER Alert program has been credited with the safe recovery of 868 children. AMBER Alerts save lives.

Today, we have the opportunity to ensure all children may benefit from the AMBER Alert program if necessary, no matter where they reside.

This bill will reauthorize the Department of Justice grant program that assists State and local governments in developing and implementing AMBER Alert communications plans. It will explicitly require the Department of Justice to perform a needs assessment of AMBER Alert capabilities on Indian reservations.

It will also, for the first time, require funds be used to integrate Tribal AMBER Alert systems with those of neighboring jurisdictions to ensure that AMBER Alerts reach as many people as swiftly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank House leadership and Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this bill forward and acknowledging the importance of filling a gap in our AMBER Alert system that might have prevented the death of Ashlynne.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. If enacted, this bill will help to build a truly national and cohesive network of AMBER Alert.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 772, the AMBER Alert in Indian Country Act. I strongly favor this important legislation because it will provide Indian Tribes with the ability to respond quickly to child abductions, thereby increasing the chances that we can avert catastrophe.

Through the grant program reauthorized by S. 772, Tribal law enforcement agencies would develop the capacity to immediately initiate their own AMBER Alerts and allow Tribal alert systems to be integrated with the more advanced AMBER Alert communications plans of State and regional law enforcement.

The AMBER Alert program is a powerful tool that engages geographically targeted networks of law enforcement, broadcast and transparency agencies, digital signage companies, internet service providers, and the wireless industry to issue urgent notifications in the most serious cases of child abduction. Such alerts can instantly galvanize an entire community in the search for an abducted and endangered child.

From its inception through January of 2018, the AMBER Alert program has

directly led to the rescue of more than 900 children. Presently, the AMBER Alert program is used in all 50 States, here in the District of Columbia, in Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

AMBER Alert systems have evolved to utilize all available technology in notifying the public of a child abduction. Native American Tribal communities, however, are unable to take full advantage of this lifesaving program. Currently, Tribal law enforcement must rely on State or regional law enforcement agencies off-reservation to issue the complete AMBER Alert on their behalf. This is unfortunate, and indeed it is notable because the rate of child abduction is reportedly down across the country with the sole exception of Indian Country.

As we all know, time is of the essence when a child is abducted or goes missing. AMBER Alert plans provide comprehensive, rapid-response system, which is critical to success in such cases. Statistics show that roughly 74 percent of abducted children who are murdered are killed within the first 3 hours of their abduction.

The time spent to coordinate with State or regional law enforcement before issuing an AMBER Alert can be lengthy and can have a dire consequence.

In 2003, the PROTECT Act established a grant program to be administered by the attorney general for the States, with the goals of strengthening AMBER Alert communications plans nationwide and developing a seamless network through the Nation, which dramatically increases the likelihood that abducted children will be recovered swiftly and safely.

S. 772 would reauthorize \$10 million for the program and would make Indian Tribal communities eligible to receive grant funds for the very first time. With this funding, Tribes will be able to develop and implement AMBER Alert communications plans of their own, and also integrate their AMBER Alert systems into and with State and regional communications plans.

Awarded funds may also be used for education, training, and law enforcement tools and equipment related to the AMBER Alert plans.

If enacted, this legislation will help build a truly national and cohesive network of AMBER Alert systems. Tribal law enforcement will have the ability to directly issue AMBER Alerts without having to rely on outside law enforcement, while outside agencies will be available to fill in any gaps when necessary through the improved coordination.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to join us in supporting this crucial piece of bipartisan legislation.

S. 772 was introduced in response to a fatal abduction that occurred on the

Navajo Nation in New Mexico. Eleven-year-old Ashlynnne Mike was kidnapped after school, along with her brother. Her brother escaped, and, alas, she did not.

That case focused attention on gaps in communication and coordination between Tribal and off-reservation law enforcement.

In the past, the Navajo Tribe has relied on New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah to activate AMBER Alerts. Before an alert issued, Tribal officers have been required to meet a list of requirements to establish a case. If the criteria are met, the officers may only then begin the process of requesting States to issue the AMBER Alert.

Based on several accounts of this case, the AMBER Alert was issued 10 or more hours after Ashlynnne was abducted.

Her abductor confessed to brutalizing her and leaving her alive to fend for herself in the desert. It was too late for Ashlynnne when she was found dead a day later.

Children are precious to us, and they deserve our protection wherever they may live, either on reservations or off reservations.

Mr. Speaker, because we should do everything that we can to ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to efforts to recover missing or abducted children, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from across the aisle. This bill is truly a bipartisan effort, worked on by Members of both parties. It is because of its importance.

The particular case that both of us have cited today does focus the attention on the massive hole where there are more than 500 Indian Tribes that do not have access to the AMBER Alert system. It is the only part of this Nation and its territories that is not covered by the AMBER Alert system. This will solve that problem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees and as founder and co-chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus I rise in strong support of S. 772, "AMBER Alert in Indian Country Act of 2017."

This bill ensures that Native American tribes would be eligible for Justice Department grants to establish AMBER Alert systems, authorizing a \$10 million grant program.

The bill would allow grants to cover costs associated with integrating tribal AMBER Alert systems into state and regional plans to ensure broader distribution of alerts involving Indian children.

This legislation provides crucial infrastructure to keep children and adults safe in all of

America, whether they live on a reservation or not.

The Justice Department will be able to waive their 50 percent funds matching cap if any Native American Tribe is not able to fully fund their nonfederal share of the project.

Law enforcement agencies use the AMBER Alert system through radio, television, phones, email, and road alerts to alert the public of child abductions.

This system is responsible for the successful return of over 800 missing children.

The lack of coordination between tribal and state authorities, and the resulting delays in broadcasting an AMBER Alert, were blamed for the 2016 death of Ashlynnne Mike, an 11-year-old Navajo girl.

More than 7,500 Native American children are listed as missing in the United States. This legislation will reduce that number.

This legislation facilitates coordination between tribal and state authorities, resulting in faster unification of families of abducted children.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will make a difference and deserves the overwhelming support of this body.

The sheer volume of abduction of love ones is enough to support this legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in protecting our children and those suffering from abuse by supporting S. 772.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the United States Congress for taking the right step forward in helping combat the high numbers of children abduction and crime rates in Indian Country.

As a former 911 operator, I know that the AMBER Alert program has led to the rescue of countless lives across the United States—but until now, access to this critical tool has been limited for our tribal communities.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill will give tribes across the United States the ability to respond quickly to child abductions and help ensure the public safety of their citizens. These precious young lives are no less valuable than any others and they deserve to be protected.

Last November, I introduced Savanna's Act as a result of the disturbing increase in murdered and missing Native American women and girls. My bill is named in honor of Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind, a 22-year-old pregnant member of the Spirit Lake Tribe who was tragically murdered.

While I am hopeful that the institution of an AMBER alert program will help bring some much needed relief to this issue, we must do more to address the gap of information sharing between tribal, local, and federal law enforcement agencies. My bill aims to do just that.

Let's keep the momentum going and finally bring full justice to our Native American neighbors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 772, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

STOP, OBSERVE, ASK, AND RESPOND TO HEALTH AND WELLNESS ACT OF 2018

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 767) to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 767

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Act of 2018” or the “SOAR to Health and Wellness Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**—The term “human trafficking” has the meaning given the term “severe forms of trafficking in persons” as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SEC. 3. PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program to be known as the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training Program or the SOAR to Health and Wellness Training Program (in this Act referred to as the “Program”) to provide training to health care providers and other related providers, at all levels, on human trafficking in accordance with the purpose described in subsection (c).

(b) **GRANTS.**—The Secretary may carry out the Program through the award of grants to health care sites and health care professional organizations that represent diversity in—

- (1) geography;
- (2) the demographics of the population served;
- (3) the predominant types of human trafficking cases; and
- (4) health care provider profiles.

(c) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Program shall be to train health care providers and other related providers to enable such providers to—

- (1) identify potential human trafficking victims;
- (2) implement proper protocols and procedures for working with law enforcement to report, and facilitate communication with, such victims, in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, local, and tribal requirements, including legal confidentiality requirements for patients and health care providers;
- (3) implement proper protocols and procedures for referring such victims to appropriate health care, social, or victims service agencies or organizations;
- (4) provide such victims care that is—
 - (A) coordinated;
 - (B) victim centered;
 - (C) culturally relevant;
 - (D) comprehensive;

- (E) evidence-based;
- (F) gender responsive;
- (G) age-appropriate, with a focus on care for youth; and
- (H) trauma-informed; and

(5) consider the potential for integrating the training described in paragraphs (1) through (4) with training programs, in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, child abuse, child neglect, child maltreatment, and child sexual exploitation.

(d) FUNCTIONS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The functions of the Program shall include the functions of the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training program that was operating on the day before the date of enactment of this Act and the authorized initiatives described in paragraph (2).

(2) **AUTHORIZED INITIATIVES.**—The authorized initiatives of the Program shall include—

(A) engaging stakeholders, including victims of human trafficking and any Federal, State, local, or tribal partners, to develop a flexible training module—

(i) for achieving the purpose described in subsection (c); and

(ii) that adapts to changing needs, settings, health care providers, and other related providers;

(B) providing technical assistance for health education programs and health care professional organizations to implement health care protocols, or develop continuing education training materials, that assist in achieving the purpose described in subsection (c);

(C) facilitating the dissemination of best practices and recommendations as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(D) developing a reliable methodology for collecting data, and reporting such data, on the number of human trafficking victims identified and served in health care settings or other related provider settings.

SEC. 4. DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DATA COLLECTION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—During each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the Secretary shall collect data on each of the following:

(A) The total number of grantees operating under the Program.

(B) The total number of health care providers and other related providers trained through the Program.

(2) **INITIAL REPORT.**—In addition to the data required to be collected under paragraph (1), for purposes of the initial report to be submitted under subsection (b), the Secretary shall collect data on the total number of facilities and health care professional organizations that were operating under, and the total number of health care providers and other related providers trained through, the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training program that was operating before the establishment under section 3(a) of the Program.

(b) **REPORTING.**—Not later than 90 days after the first day of each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on the data collected under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022.

SEC. 6. CUT-GO COMPLIANCE.

Subsection (f) of section 319D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-4) is

amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2017, and \$118,300,000 for fiscal year 2018”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 767, the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Act of 2018, introduced by our colleague, Representative STEVE COHEN from Tennessee.

This bill will help in the fight against human trafficking. Worldwide, nearly 21 million people are victims of human trafficking, forced labor, or exploitation. This bipartisan initiative expands and further codifies the Department of Health and Human Services’ Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond program, which enhances the healthcare system’s response to human trafficking by requiring the program to provide grants to healthcare sites, to work with stakeholders to develop flexible training modules, and to provide technical assistance to health education programs. This legislation will teach health professionals to identify and to respond to victims of human trafficking.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 767, the SOAR to Health and Wellness Act of 2018. This bill expands the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond—or SOAR—training program, which provides healthcare professionals with training on how to identify and appropriately treat victims of human trafficking.

Nearly 21 million people worldwide are victims of human trafficking, forced labor, or sexual exploitation. At some point, many of these unidentified victims will come into contact with healthcare professionals during their captivity. A doctor’s visit or emergency department trip can offer a critical point of intervention for victims and a brief chance when a victim may be able to detach from traffickers.

This bill will provide the necessary resources for the healthcare professionals to spot victims and provide

trauma-informed, culturally appropriate care once identified. Helping healthcare professionals better recognize the signs of trafficking and improve their ability to intervene can truly be the difference between life and death.

I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in support of the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Act, which is the acronym SOAR.

In April of 2016, I worked with the Department of Homeland Security to host a Human Trafficking Awareness Training program in Memphis at the University of Tennessee. We gathered State and local law enforcement, first responders, healthcare workers, faith-based groups, and educators to discuss the importance of and strategies to combat human trafficking. This event solidified my stance and activated me to go forward with the legislation to address the human trafficking that is occurring in the United States.

Shortly after, I was proud to introduce this bipartisan bill along with my colleagues: Congressman KINZINGER from Illinois, Congressman CÁRDENAS from California, and Congresswoman WAGNER from Missouri in the House, as well as Senators HEITKAMP and SUSAN COLLINS in the Senate.

Human trafficking is the second fastest-growing crime in Tennessee, and it is amazing that every 2 minutes someone in the United States is entered into human trafficking. Every 2 minutes. In 2016, 8,042 cases were reported to the National Human Trafficking Hotline, with 110 of those occurring in Tennessee. Those are just the cases that were reported. Human trafficking remains a hidden crime, and victims rarely seek help because of cultural barriers or due to fear of their traffickers, law enforcement, or of being deported, because many are imported into our country to engage in sex crimes.

In April 2016, I joined with the Department of Homeland Security in hosting our conference in Memphis, and from there came our legislation. The SOAR Act directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a program to provide training to healthcare providers at all levels on human trafficking.

Trafficking victims often end up in healthcare settings, and because traffickers want to maximize profits, victims will not have health insurance and will not often follow up on treatment. And pimps and johns will beat up the women, and they will end up in a public healthcare facility because they don't have insurance.

Mr. Speaker, 57 percent of trafficking victims report physical injuries, and nearly all report having faced either sexual abuse or physical violence. These injuries caused a reported 63 percent of trafficking victims to go to the emergency room when they are being exploited. Many victims also end up with sexually transmitted infections, including HIV, and are at high risk of pregnancy. As a result, nearly 88 percent of trafficked victims are seen by a healthcare provider at some point and, more likely than not, it is in an emergency room. So these are the people we seek out most to train and see the signs of trafficking to be able to report it to law enforcement and help these ladies out of the situation they are in.

Despite this, out of more than 5,600 hospitals in the country, only a handful have a plan for treating patients who are victims of trafficking, and over 95 percent of emergency room personnel are not trained to identify trafficking victims. As a result, it is estimated that only 1 percent of human trafficking victims are identified when they seek emergency care.

We must encourage healthcare professionals to be alert to possible instances of human trafficking when victims appear in clinics or doctors' offices for needed care, and we must provide them the additional training and resources to accomplish this goal.

I am proud to work on the SOAR to Health and Wellness Act and I urge my colleagues to help pass it today. I thank my cosponsors and the Republican leadership for scheduling this bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know how important trafficking is for the Chair in his history, and I think the Speaker of the House has an interest in this bill, too.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a valuable member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and, in fact, the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 767, the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Act. I am a proud colead of this important bill with Mr. COHEN from Tennessee, and I thank him for his work.

Mr. Speaker, when someone says "human trafficking," oftentimes we view it as a problem far away from our shores that affects people who are not us. It is hard to imagine that this modern-day slavery is happening over here, hurting the people within our community every day. In my home State of Illinois, we have the fifth highest number of trafficking cases in this country; and the city of Rockford, in my district, is ranked second behind Chicago in human trafficking cases.

The most important thing we can do to combat this heinous crime is to raise awareness. That is what the SOAR to Health and Wellness Act is designed to do. This important legislation would expand on a pilot program with the Department of Health and Human Services by supporting the training of healthcare workers to identify victims and best care for them through established protocols and procedures.

Many times, when trafficking victims come to emergency rooms, healthcare professionals may not always spot the signs that their patient was a victim of human trafficking. Education is critical in combating human trafficking, and our awareness could, in fact, save a life.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 767. I believe it can have an impact towards identifying cases of human trafficking and helping the most vulnerable and at-risk individuals of this evil crime.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this is a worthwhile bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 767, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY INJURY SURGICAL SYSTEMS INTEGRATED OPERATIONALLY NATIONWIDE TO ACHIEVE ZERO PREVENTABLE DEATHS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to support such centers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 880

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Military Injury Surgical Systems Integrated Operationally Nationwide to Achieve ZERO Preventable Deaths Act" or the "MISSION ZERO Act".

SEC. 2. MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRAUMA READINESS GRANT PROGRAM.

Title XII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART I—MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRAUMA READINESS GRANT PROGRAM

"SEC. 1291. MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRAUMA READINESS GRANT PROGRAM.

"(a) **MILITARY TRAUMA TEAM PLACEMENT PROGRAM.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall award grants to not more than 20 eligible high-acuity trauma centers to enable military trauma teams to provide, on a full-time basis, trauma care and related acute care at such trauma centers.

"(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—In the case of a grant awarded under paragraph (1) to an eligible high-acuity trauma center, such grant—

"(A) shall be for a period of at least 3 years and not more than 5 years (and may be renewed at the end of such period); and

"(B) shall be in an amount that does not exceed \$1,000,000 per year.

"(3) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AFTER PERFORMANCE PERIOD.**—Notwithstanding section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, funds available to the Secretary for obligation for a grant under this subsection shall remain available for expenditure for 100 days after the last day of the performance period of such grant.

"(b) **MILITARY TRAUMA CARE PROVIDER PLACEMENT PROGRAM.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall award grants to eligible trauma centers to enable military trauma care providers to provide trauma care and related acute care at such trauma centers.

"(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—In the case of a grant awarded under paragraph (1) to an eligible trauma center, such grant—

"(A) shall be for a period of at least 1 year and not more than 3 years (and may be renewed at the end of such period); and

"(B) shall be in an amount that does not exceed, in a year—

"(i) \$100,000 for each military trauma care provider that is a physician at such eligible trauma center; and

"(ii) \$50,000 for each other military trauma care provider at such eligible trauma center.

"(c) **GRANT REQUIREMENTS.**—

"(1) **DEPLOYMENT.**—As a condition of receipt of a grant under this section, a grant recipient shall agree to allow military trauma care providers providing care pursuant to such grant to be deployed by the Secretary of Defense for military operations, for training, or for response to a mass casualty incident.

"(2) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Grants awarded under this section to an eligible trauma center may be used to train and incorporate military trauma care providers into such trauma center, including expenditures for malpractice insurance, office space, information technology, specialty education and supervision, trauma programs, research, and State license fees for such military trauma care providers.

"(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the extent to which State licensing requirements for health care professionals are preempted by other Federal law from applying to military trauma care providers.

"(e) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

"(1) **REPORT TO THE SECRETARY AND THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.**—Each eligible trauma center or eligible high-acuity trauma center awarded a grant under subsection (a) or (b) for a year shall submit to the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense a report for such year that includes information on—

"(A) the number and types of trauma cases managed by military trauma teams or mili-

tary trauma care providers pursuant to such grant during such year;

"(B) the financial impact of such grant on the trauma center;

"(C) the educational impact on resident trainees in centers where military trauma teams are assigned;

"(D) any research conducted during such year supported by such grant; and

"(E) any other information required by the Secretaries for the purpose of evaluating the effect of such grant.

"(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not less than once every 2 years, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to Congress that includes information on the effect of placing military trauma care providers in trauma centers awarded grants under this section on—

"(A) maintaining readiness of military trauma care providers for battlefield injuries;

"(B) providing health care to civilian trauma patients in both urban and rural settings;

"(C) the capability to respond to surges in trauma cases, including as a result of a large scale event; and

"(D) the financial State of the trauma centers.

"(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this part:

"(1) **ELIGIBLE TRAUMA CENTER.**—The term 'eligible trauma center' means a Level I, II, or III trauma center that satisfies each of the following:

"(A) Such trauma center has an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to enable military trauma care providers to provide trauma care and related acute care at such trauma center.

"(B) Such trauma center utilizes a risk-adjusted benchmarking system to measure performance and outcomes, such as the Trauma Quality Improvement Program of the American College of Surgeons.

"(C) Such trauma center demonstrates a need for integrated military trauma care providers to maintain or improve the trauma clinical capability of such trauma center.

"(2) **ELIGIBLE HIGH-ACUITY TRAUMA CENTER.**—The term 'eligible high-acuity trauma center' means a Level I trauma center that satisfies each of the following:

"(A) Such trauma center has an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to enable military trauma teams to provide trauma care and related acute care at such trauma center.

"(B) At least 20 percent of patients of such trauma center in the most recent 3-month period for which data is available are treated for a major trauma at such trauma center.

"(C) Such trauma center utilizes a risk-adjusted benchmarking system to measure performance and outcomes, such as the Trauma Quality Improvement Program of the American College of Surgeons.

"(D) Such trauma center is an academic training center—

"(i) affiliated with a medical school;

"(ii) that maintains residency programs and fellowships in critical trauma specialties and subspecialties, and provides education and supervision of military trauma team members according to those specialties and subspecialties; and

"(iii) that undertakes research in the prevention and treatment of traumatic injury.

"(E) Such trauma center serves as a disaster response leader for its community, such as by participating in a partnership for State and regional hospital preparedness established under section 319C-2.

"(3) **MAJOR TRAUMA.**—The term 'major trauma' means an injury that is greater than or equal to 15 on the injury severity score.

"(4) **MILITARY TRAUMA TEAM.**—The term 'military trauma team' means a complete military trauma team consisting of military trauma care providers.

"(5) **MILITARY TRAUMA CARE PROVIDER.**—The term 'military trauma care provider' means a member of the Armed Forces who furnishes emergency, critical care, and other trauma acute care, including a physician, military surgeon, physician assistant, nurse, respiratory therapist, flight paramedic, combat medic, or enlisted medical technician.

"(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

"(1) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2018, of which—

"(A) \$4,500,000 shall be for carrying out subsection (a); and

"(B) \$2,500,000 shall be for carrying out subsection (b);

"(2) \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 2019, of which—

"(A) \$8,000,000 shall be for carrying out subsection (a); and

"(B) \$4,000,000 shall be for carrying out subsection (b); and

"(3) \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2022, of which—

"(A) \$10,000,000 shall be for carrying out subsection (a); and

"(B) \$5,000,000 shall be for carrying out subsection (b)."

SEC. 3. CUT-GO COMPLIANCE.

Subsection (f) of section 319D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-4) is amended by striking "through 2018" and inserting "through 2017, and \$75,300,000 for fiscal year 2018".

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the **RECORD** on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago I was an intern and resident at Parkland Hospital in Dallas. Any intern or resident will tell you the month of July is significant in the life of an intern or resident. You were last week's medical student, and you are this week's intern managing the emergency room; or you were last year's intern, and you are this week's house officer managing perhaps a busy practice, perhaps a busy emergency room. As such, every intern and resident remembers the end of that first week of their internship or residency. It is just something that you do. You got through the first week of what was a very trying time. So I remember

well July 7 of my internship, July 7 of my residency.

Mr. Speaker, in 2016, July 7 also took on additional significance in Dallas, Texas. Five police officers were killed and 9 more were injured during a shooting in downtown Dallas. In the immediate aftermath of the attack, area hospitals sprang into action and activated their disaster plans. I am proud to say that the staff at Parkland Hospital, the staff at Baylor University Hospital, and other medical professionals provided excellent emergency care to the victims of the attack.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we have people who are able to respond when called. Now, additionally, I have long believed that the American military is the arsenal of democracy and that it is critical for upholding freedom in the world. Each member of the United States Armed Forces has an important role in a collective team effort. This is especially true in a combat zone, where trauma surgeons are some of the most crucial members of the Armed Forces. These medical professionals are trained to save the lives of soldiers who sustain traumatic injuries on the battlefield, and they are some of the best in the business.

However, as wars wind down and our soldiers come home, the experience that military trauma surgeons have gained overseas may be diminished or lost unless these surgeons continue to train and to prepare for their next possible deployment. To let this expertise and skill drift away would be a significant loss to trauma patients, both at home and abroad. Trauma, Mr. Speaker, is not limited to the battlefields and active conflicts. Unfortunately, no community is immune from the threat of traumatic injury, and community doctors must be prepared to give life-saving care to trauma victims.

However, there is a way that we can ensure trained combat surgeons' skills are utilized to help American patients here in the homeland who need it. The MISSION ZERO Act seeks to connect American patients with battle-tested trauma care through the craft of military trauma care providers. The bill provides grants to allow military trauma care providers and teams to offer care in our Nation's leading trauma centers and systems.

Here is the bottom line: the MISSION ZERO Act is a win for both civilian patients and military trauma doctors.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that this bipartisan legislation has finally come to the floor. Along with my fellow Texan, Mr. GENE GREEN, I introduced this bill in 2016 following that particularly traumatic incident that struck so close to home.

Texas is not unique in its need for this expertise. Over the last few months alone, our Nation has witnessed a need for trauma care hospitals across the country. One such incident

was the Amtrak derailment near Dupont, Washington, on December 18, 2017. That incident resulted in 3 passenger fatalities and 70 injuries over a busy freeway.

As we have seen, having access to experienced trauma care can become the difference between life and death for a critically injured patient. There is no doubt that integrating military physicians into the trauma and disaster system is beneficial not only for American patients, but also for American soldiers.

I am encouraged by the bipartisan effort to support both our servicemen and our Nation's trauma system, and I thank the cosponsors from both sides of the aisle for their support of this important legislation.

Quite simply, the MISSION ZERO Act is common sense, and I urge Members to join me in supporting this life-saving legislation.

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

□ 1715

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 880, the Military Injury Surgical Systems Integrated Operationally Nationwide to Achieve ZERO Preventable Deaths Act, or MISSION ZERO Act.

I am proud to have worked closely with Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health Chairman BURGESS and my colleagues from Florida and North Carolina, Representative CASTOR and Representative HUDSON, on this legislation.

The MISSION ZERO Act will help us move towards a trauma system that achieves the goal of zero preventable traumatic deaths.

Whether in response to a gruesome sports injury, a car accident on the highway, or, unfortunately, a tragic event like the recent school shooting in Parkland, Florida, Americans of all ages and backgrounds depend on our trauma care system to respond with skilled experts to provide the services necessary to save lives and prevent disability.

The MISSION ZERO Act will help us ensure access to quality trauma care based on the best available evidence by establishing a grant program to assist civilian trauma centers to partner with military trauma professionals. This partnership will benefit our civilian trauma centers by increasing the availability of trauma professionals to serve in trauma centers across the United States.

This partnership will benefit our military trauma system by allowing trauma professionals to maintain their trauma care capabilities during times of peace and help ensure they are prepared to meet the needs of our heroes on the battlefield.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and help ensure that Americans in need of trauma services, whether civilian or in the Armed Forces, receive the highest quality of care possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the cosponsor of the bill, and I thank the cosponsors of this bill for serving on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the MISSION ZERO Act, H.R. 880, and I would like to thank Chairman BURGESS, Ranking Member GENE GREEN from Texas, and Mr. HUDSON from North Carolina for sponsoring this legislation with me.

The MISSION ZERO Act will assist the Department of Defense in assigning trauma surgeons to our civilian trauma centers. It will help fill the gap that we currently have in care recently examined by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

The MISSION ZERO Act will establish grant initiatives for eligible trauma systems to incorporate full military trauma teams or individual military trauma providers into our hospitals—the ones that have busy emergency rooms.

This mutually beneficial partnership will allow civilian doctors and nurses and care providers the chance to learn more about military best practices and will give our military trauma care providers the opportunity to utilize their cutting-edge expertise without leaving the military.

I have seen this initiative in action already back home in Tampa at Tampa General Hospital, located just a few miles down the road from MacDill Air Force Base, which is home to U.S. Central Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and the 6th Air Mobility Wing, which is also home to the 6th Air Medical Group.

Since about 2011, they have had an ongoing partnership to do just what this bill provides: create a lot of energy and shared expertise in the civilian trauma center at Tampa General Hospital and bring in the military specialists so they can continue to hone their caregiving and craft. They use nurses, surgeons, and all sorts of specialists.

The initiative allows military and civilian medical teams to work in the most intense trauma environments—that is, our level one trauma center—and take very good care of folks all across central Florida. These partnerships are vital for continued training for our community and our military.

I think Dr. BURGESS and Mr. GENE GREEN from Texas are doing a great service by replicating this in other trauma centers across the United States.

The MISSION ZERO Act is endorsed by the American Congress of Neurological Surgeons, American College of

Emergency Physicians, American College of Surgeons, and the Trauma Care Association of America.

Again, I thank Dr. BURGESS, Ranking Member GENE GREEN from Texas, Mr. HUDSON, and all my Energy and Commerce colleagues, and I urge everyone here in the House to support this important bill.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 880, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGENITAL HEART FUTURES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1222) to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1222

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM.

Section 399V–2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g–13) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 399V–2. NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, AND AWARENESS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) enhance and expand research and surveillance infrastructure to study and track the epidemiology of congenital heart disease (in this section referred to as ‘CHD’); and

“(2) award grants to eligible entities to undertake the activities described in this section.

“(b) NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall plan, develop, implement, and submit one or more reports to the Congress on a study to improve understanding of the epidemiology of CHD across the lifespan, from birth to adulthood, with particular interest in the following:

“(A) Health care utilization of those affected by CHD.

“(B) Demographic factors associated with CHD, such as age, race, ethnicity, gender, and family history of individuals who are diagnosed with the disease.

“(C) Outcome measures, such that analysis of the outcome measures will allow derivation of

evidence-based best practices and guidelines for CHD patients.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATIONS.—The study under this subsection may—

“(A) gather data on the health outcomes of a diverse population of those affected by CHD;

“(B) consider health disparities among those affected by CHD, which may include the consideration of prenatal exposures; and

“(C) incorporate behavioral, emotional, and educational outcomes of those affected by CHD.

“(3) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Data generated from the study under this subsection shall be made available—

“(A) for purposes of CHD research, subject to appropriate protections of personal privacy, including protections required by paragraph (4); and

“(B) to the public, subject to paragraph (4) and with appropriate exceptions for protection of personal privacy.

“(4) PATIENT PRIVACY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the study under this subsection is carried out in a manner that complies with the requirements applicable to a covered entity under the regulations promulgated pursuant to section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.

“(c) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a)(2), an entity shall—

“(1) be a public or private nonprofit entity with specialized experience in CHD; and

“(2) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022.”.

SEC. 3. CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE RESEARCH.

Section 425 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285b–8) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 425. CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Institute may expand, intensify, and coordinate research and related activities of the Institute with respect to congenital heart disease, which may include congenital heart disease research with respect to—

“(1) causation of congenital heart disease, including genetic causes;

“(2) long-term outcomes in individuals with congenital heart disease, including infants, children, teenagers, adults, and elderly individuals;

“(3) diagnosis, treatment, and prevention;

“(4) studies using longitudinal data and retrospective analysis to identify effective treatments and outcomes for individuals with congenital heart disease; and

“(5) identifying barriers to lifelong care for individuals with congenital heart disease.

“(b) COORDINATION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—The Director of the Institute may coordinate research efforts related to congenital heart disease among multiple research institutions and may develop research networks.

“(c) MINORITY AND MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.—In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Director of the Institute shall consider the application of such research and other activities to minority and medically underserved communities.

“(d) REPORT FROM NIH.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017, the Director of NIH, acting through the Director of the Institute, shall provide a report to Congress—

“(1) outlining the ongoing research efforts of the National Institutes of Health regarding congenital heart disease; and

“(2) identifying—

“(A) future plans for research regarding congenital heart disease; and

“(B) the areas of greatest need for such research.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1222, the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act, introduced by my Energy and Commerce colleague, Representative GUS BILIRAKIS from Florida.

This important initiative will enhance current Federal efforts addressing congenital heart disease, which is the most common birth defect and leading cause of mortality in infants. This bipartisan legislation enhances research and surveillance at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, awards grants to further study congenital heart disease, and directs the National Institutes of Health to report on their current research efforts in this space.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1222, the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act, led by Congressman BILIRAKIS and Congressman SCHIFF from California.

This legislation reauthorizes the Congenital Heart Futures Act, which was enacted in 2010, as part of the Affordable Care Act.

The Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act builds on the success of current efforts by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to improve and expand research, monitoring, and public outreach and educational programs relating to congenital heart disease.

This bill requires the National Institutes of Health to issue a report outlining current and future research plans with respect to congenital heart disease.

Each year, more than 40,000 babies are born in the United States with a congenital heart defect. One million

children and 1.4 million adults are currently living with congenital heart disorders. Individuals living with a congenital heart disease often require specialized care and remain at risk of disability or premature death throughout their life.

More research and surveillance is needed to improve our knowledge of why congenital heart defects develop and how they can be effectively treated. This legislation will help expand our understanding of congenital heart disease across the lifespan and has the potential to improve the lives of the millions of children and adults living with congenital heart disease in America.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the principal author of this bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1222, the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act, which will reauthorize and ensure continued investment in surveillance research to assess the lifelong needs of individuals with congenital heart defects, or CHDs.

These surveillance efforts will help improve our understanding of CHD across the lifespan, from birth to adulthood. This research will help us learn more about demographic factors such as age, race, gender, or ethnicity.

In addition, the legislation emphasizes the need for continued biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health on the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of CHD.

NIH will further research into the causes of congenital heart defects, including genetic causes, and study long-term outcomes in individuals with CHD of all ages. Also, NIH may study data to identify effective treatments and outcomes and identify barriers to lifelong care for individuals with congenital heart defects.

CHD is the most common birth defect and the leading cause of birth defect-related infant mortality. For the Down syndrome community, about half of the children born with Down syndrome have CHD. It is a true public health issue and, as late-night show host Jimmy Kimmel noted, it does not discriminate by race, gender, or socioeconomic status.

The road ahead may be scary and uncertain for any parent with a newborn who has CHD, but this bill helps give hope to those coping with the diagnosis. Nearly 1 in 100 babies are born with CHD, and more than 5 percent will not live to see their first birthday, unfortunately. We have to change that.

Even for those who receive successful intervention, it is not a cure. We have to change that.

Children and adults born with CHD require ongoing, costly, specialized

cardiac care and face a lifelong risk of permanent disability and premature death. We must change that.

As a result, healthcare utilization among the CHD population is significantly higher than the general population. It is estimated that, compared to their peers, the medical costs for individuals with congenital heart defects are 10 to 20 times greater.

Hospitalization costs for pediatric patients alone total more than \$5.6 billion each year, which is 15 percent of all hospitalization costs for patients 20 years of age and younger.

Despite its prevalence and significance, there are still gaps in research and standards of care for CHD patients. But for the sake of the estimated 40,000 babies, Mr. Speaker, who will be born in the next year with CHD, there is more work to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I began this journey almost 10 years ago, when then-Congressman Zack Space and I first introduced the Congenital Heart Futures Act. Last Congress, Congressman SCHIFF and I reintroduced the reauthorization of the original bill. During that time, I met a lot of patients with congenital heart defects along the way, and I have been touched by their stories.

There are people like Trey and Nicole Flynn, a young Floridian couple who lost their son, Holden, while waiting for a heart transplant. He was only 2 years old.

This bill supports the essential research necessary to make sure another family doesn't have to leave the hospital without their child in their arms.

There is also Lucas Iguina, a young man born with a complex congenital heart disease that essentially left him with half a heart.

□ 1730

Despite having three open-heart surgeries, Mr. Speaker, and countless doctor visits and medical procedures, Lucas has hopes and dreams like every other child. This bill ensures that the medical research will keep pace with his generation as they grow to be adults.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Jackson Radandt, born with half a heart, has hypoplastic left heart syndrome, which means the left side of his heart was underdeveloped. He depended on lifesaving research to help his failing heart survive until his heart transplant at age 11. He is a teenager now and will live his life with a heightened sensitivity for his new heart.

Nicholas Basken was born with complex heart disease and wasn't getting blood to the lower half of his body, requiring heart surgery when he was just 2 days old. He is now at the top of his

class, and this bill will ensure that his future remains bright as he navigates this chronic illness throughout his adulthood.

Abigail Adams is a young Florida advocate, whom I will meet again tomorrow, with Down syndrome. Roughly half of the babies born with Down syndrome, Mr. Speaker, have a congenital heart defect. Abigail continues to advocate for individuals with Down syndrome.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. My friend, David Peluso, was born with pulmonary stenosis, a condition where the pulmonary valve will not open properly. He had surgery, again, emergency open-heart surgery, at 2 days old, another corrective surgery at age 10, and many hospital visits and procedures in the meantime.

Today, again, we are giving these children hope. Today, he is a husband and a father to two kids, trying to live a normal life with atrial flutter that requires additional surgeries. This bill will continue the surveillance program so we can collect data on children and adults with congenital heart problems.

I can go on and on, Mr. Speaker. Thank you so very much, and let's pass this great bill for our children and give them hope.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers.

I want to thank, also, the cosponsors of the bill, both Congressman SCHIFF and a member of our committee, Congressman BILIRAKIS, for introducing this reauthorization bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act. This legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a colleague and good friend, to address a very serious issue.

Congenital heart disease is the leading cause of infant mortality and is the most common birth defect found in young children. These children grow up facing a wealth of health issues that will have a tremendous impact on them for the rest of their lives. They often require specialized care, including cardiac care, and are subjected to a lifetime of risk for disability or premature death.

This legislation enhances research and surveillance at the CDC to ensure that our medical community and the research to support their efforts are the best available for treatment. It

also establishes grants to further study congenital heart disease so that we can better combat this disease and the harm it causes in so many people's lives.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible disease that leaves people never knowing when it could strike. Like other diseases, we need to better understand how it develops and impacts people so that we have a better chance of fighting it and saving lives.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for getting this legislation passed through the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I support its passage.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1222, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SICKLE CELL DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, PREVENTION, AND TREATMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2410) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2410

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act of 2017”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Sickle cell disease research.
- Sec. 3. Sickle cell disease surveillance.
- Sec. 4. Sickle cell disease prevention and treatment.
- Sec. 5. Collaboration with community-based entities.

SEC. 2. SICKLE CELL DISEASE RESEARCH.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 399V-6 (42 U.S.C. 280g-17) the following:

“SEC. 399V-7. NATIONAL SICKLE CELL DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, PREVENTION, AND TREATMENT PROGRAM.

“(a) RESEARCH.—The Secretary may conduct or support research to expand the understanding of the cause of, and to find a cure for, sickle cell disease.”

SEC. 3. SICKLE CELL DISEASE SURVEILLANCE.

Section 399V-7 of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) SURVEILLANCE.—

“(1) GRANTS.—The Secretary may, for each fiscal year for which appropriations are available to carry out this subsection, make grants to not more than 20 States—

“(A) to conduct surveillance and maintain data on the prevalence and distribution of sickle cell disease and its associated health outcomes, complications, and treatments;

“(B) to conduct public health initiatives with respect to sickle cell disease, including—

“(i) increasing efforts to improve access to, and receipt of, high-quality sickle cell disease-related health care, including the use of treatments approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of this Act;

“(ii) working with partners to improve health outcomes of people with sickle cell disease over the lifespan by promoting guidelines for sickle cell disease screening, prevention, and treatment, including management of sickle cell disease complications;

“(iii) providing support to community-based organizations and State and local health departments in conducting sickle cell disease education and training activities for patients, communities, and health care providers; and

“(iv) supporting and training State health departments and regional laboratories in comprehensive testing to identify specific forms of sickle cell disease in people of all ages; and

“(C) to identify and evaluate promising strategies for prevention and treatment of sickle cell disease complications, including through—

“(i) improving estimates of the national incidence and prevalence of sickle cell disease, including estimates about the specific types of sickle cell disease;

“(ii) identifying health disparities related to sickle cell disease;

“(iii) assessing the utilization of therapies and strategies to prevent complications related to sickle cell disease; and

“(iv) evaluating the impact of genetic, environmental, behavioral, and other risk factors that may affect sickle cell disease health outcomes.

“(2) POPULATION INCLUDED.—The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, award grants under this subsection to States across the United States so as to include data on the majority of the United States population with sickle cell disease.

“(3) APPLICATION.—To seek a grant under this subsection, a State shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities.

“(B) The term ‘State’ includes the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the

Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau.”

SEC. 4. SICKLE CELL DISEASE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 712(c) of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-357; 42 U.S.C. 300b-1 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “Sickle Cell Disease” each place it appears and inserting “sickle cell disease”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “grants to up to 40 eligible entities for each fiscal year in which the program is conducted under this section for the purpose of developing and establishing systemic mechanisms to improve the prevention and treatment of Sickle Cell Disease” and inserting “grants to up to 25 eligible entities for each fiscal year in which the program is conducted under this section for the purpose of developing and establishing systemic mechanisms to improve the prevention and treatment of sickle cell disease in populations with a high density of sickle cell disease patients”;

(3) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by striking clause (ii) (relating to priority); and

(B) by striking “GRANT AWARD REQUIREMENTS” and all that follows through “The Administrator shall” and inserting “GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—The Administrator shall”;

(4) in paragraph (2), by adding the following new subparagraph at the end:

“(E) To expand, coordinate, and implement transition services for adolescents with sickle cell disease making the transition to adult health care.”; and

(5) in paragraph (6), by striking “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$4,455,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

(b) TECHNICAL CHANGES.—Subsection (c) of section 712 of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-357; 42 U.S.C. 300b-1 note), as amended by subsection (a), is—

(1) transferred to the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.); and

(2) inserted at the end of section 399V-7 of such Act, as added and amended by sections 2 and 3 of this Act.

SEC. 5. COLLABORATION WITH COMMUNITY-BASED ENTITIES.

Section 399V-7 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 4, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) COLLABORATION WITH COMMUNITY-BASED ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant or other assistance under subsection (b) or (c), an entity must have in effect a collaborative agreement with a community-based organization with 5 or more years of experience in providing services to sickle cell disease patients.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2410, the Sick Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act of 2017, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS). This reauthorizes the sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program.

Sickle cell disease causes blockages of small vessels leading to various health complications. By improving research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment, along with enhancing collaboration with community-based entities focussing on sickle cell disease, this important legislation will help improve outcomes in patients suffering from this inherited blood disorder, which currently affects 1 in 500 African-American births.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2410, the Sick Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) and Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee Chairman BURGESS.

Sickle cell disease is a group of inherited red blood cell disorders where red blood cells become hard and sticky and have a C shape. When these sickle cells travel through the blood vessels, they can get stuck and clog the blood flow. When this occurs, it often causes extreme pain and other serious health problems, including infections, lung-related complications, and stroke.

100,000 Americans are living with sickle cell disease today. These individuals need comprehensive treatment throughout their lives in order to manage their symptoms and prevent their disease from worsening, which requires a robust network of providers available to treat sickle cell patients at every stage of life.

H.R. 2410 would reauthorize the Sick Cell Disease Treatment Demonstration Program, allowing the Department of Health and Human Services to invest critical resources in research, surveillance, and public health initiatives for sickle cell disease. These investments will help bolster the sickle cell workforce and improve treatments for sickle cell patients of all ages.

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

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me just, first of all, commend Representative BURGESS, chairman of the subcommittee, and Mr. GREEN, as well as Representative BUTTERFIELD and all of the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for their leadership in bringing this bill to this point at this moment.

As we just heard, sickle cell disease is an inherited blood disorder characterized by affected red blood cells that mutate into the shape of a crescent or sickle, and, as such, these cells are unable to pass through small blood vessels. It is a recessive genetic condition that occurs when a child inherits two sickle cell genes or traits from each parent.

The consequences and complications of this disease are extreme. The Sick Cell Disease Association of America, with whom we have worked for many years, has studied and reported that common complications with this disease include early childhood death from infection; stroke in young children and adults; lung problems similar to pneumonia; chronic damage to organs, including the kidney, leading to kidney failure, and to the lungs, causing pulmonary hypertension; and severe painful episodes.

In fact, pain episodes are a hallmark of sickle cell disease. They are unpredictable in many ways, both the timing of when they occur—how severe they will be—and how long they will last. For those with the disease, these devastating pain episodes can start as early as 6 months of age and can span a lifetime, impacting school attendance and participation in the workforce. In fact, these pain crises contribute significantly to the 200,000 emergency room visits collectively made by sufferers of sickle cell disease each year in our country. A typical crisis will result in a hospital stay of 7 to 10 days.

Mr. Speaker, we have made a tremendous amount of progress in the treatment, research, and effective ways of dealing with this disease. I note that more than 20 years ago I worked with the project at the University of Illinois running a sickle cell education project, and I have seen much of that progress that we have talked about, but we still have a long way to go. There is still tremendous need for research. There is need for additional treatment modalities.

So, again, I thank all of those who have demonstrated support for this important legislation. I urge its passage.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), our colleague on the committee whom I call "Judge," just

like I do you, because you are both former district judges.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2410, the Sick Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act.

I want to commend my friends Representative DANNY DAVIS and Representative Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS for their tireless work in this space. Both of these men have a lifetime of service in the delivery of healthcare, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS). I thank both of them for their incredible work.

I have been a lifetime advocate, Mr. Speaker, for addressing sickle cell disease, and I am proud to cosponsor this bill. I have done so in previous Congresses.

Sickle cell disease is the most common genetic blood disorder. It affects approximately 100,000 individuals, primarily African Americans, throughout the country.

Sickle cell disease awareness is significant to me for many reasons. One, because this disorder affects many of my constituents in North Carolina. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, because I had a dear cousin, whose name was Rubie Butterfield Mizell, who, in 1972, passed away from this disease in Opa-locka, Florida.

People with sickle cell disease have red blood cells with abnormal types of hemoglobin, often causing anemia, jaundice, and the formation of gallstones.

What is truly frightening is that sickle cell disease does not have a cure. The most widely used treatment for sickle cell disease was modern medicine 20 years ago that can reduce the number of episodes but does not eliminate them or their severity.

The health challenges facing people with sickle cell disease are enormous. The disease is widespread. The consequences can be dire, and that is why the Congressional Black Caucus and the Health Brain Trust of the Congressional Black Caucus have made these a priority in our agenda over the years under the leadership of the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

□ 1745

People with sickle cell disease have a much shorter life expectancy, with median ages of death for males of only 33 years and for females of only 36 years. These patients are also more likely to have additional health complications, including stroke, blood clots, loss of vision, and lung and kidney failure.

There are approximately 4,400 people with sickle cell disease in North Carolina. I am sure that, Mr. Speaker, in the State of Texas, it may be even more. My hope is that someday there will be none.

That is why we must reauthorize the Sickle Cell Disease Treatment Demonstration Program to enable the Secretary of HHS to support research to increase our understanding of the disease, and create a grant program to study the prevalence of sickle cell and identify ways to prevent and treat sickle cell disease effectively.

Sixty-five percent of individuals with this disease in North Carolina have at least one emergency room visit per year. That is no way to live. I am sure Dr. BURGESS, when he practiced medicine in his home State, saw many, many patients who were similarly situated.

We should do all that we can to help improve patients' lives, advance treatment, and find a cure. I am grateful for the opportunity to move this bill through the House, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

I thank Dr. BURGESS, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. GREEN for their work. All of these gentlemen have done a great job in this space.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn at the legislative hearing that we had on this bill—and it has been now several months ago—that there had not been a new FDA-approved treatment for sickle cell in 40 year's time. Now, my understanding is that may have changed recently, but that is way too long. We do need to improve research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment, and really take care of those patients who are suffering with this disease.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I thank Mr. DAVIS for bringing it to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support to H.R. 2410, the "Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act of 2017."

I support this bipartisan legislation because it will improve the way states study and monitor sickle cell disease.

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act to require the Department of Health and Human Services to make grants to states to:

Collect data on the prevalence and distribution of sickle cell disease;

Conduct sickle cell disease public health initiatives to improve access to care and health outcomes; and

Identify and evaluate strategies for prevention and treatment of sickle cell disease complications.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that:

Sickle cell disease affects 90,000 to 100,000; Americans;

Sickle cell disease occurs among about 1 out of every 500 Black or African-American births;

Sickle cell disease occurs among about 1 out of every 36,000 Hispanic-American births;

Sickle Cell Trait occurs among about 1 in 12 Blacks or African Americans.

If one parent has sickle cell 4 anemia and the other has sickle cell trait, there is a 50 percent chance (or 1 out of 2) of having a baby with either sickle cell disease or sickle cell trait with each pregnancy.

It is critical that infants with Sickle Cell are identified early.

Sickle cell-related deaths among African-American children younger than 4 years of age fell by 42 percent from 1999 through 2002.

This drop coincided with the introduction in 2000 of a vaccine that protects against invasive pneumococcal disease.

Many racial health disparities stem from lack of access to quality healthcare and proper health awareness.

Certain medical illnesses are known to be more prevalent in certain demographic groups, including type II diabetes, lupus, sickle cell anemia, and Triple Negative Breast Cancer for which African Americans are more than twice as likely to be diagnosed on average.

As a Member of Congress, I have been a staunch advocate for my constituents to find a cure for sickle cell disease.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation will prepare states to combat sickle cell disease in the 21st century, while helping provide access to healthcare for Americans.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of H.R. 2410.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2410.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACTION FOR DENTAL HEALTH ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2422) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2422

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Action for Dental Health Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. VOLUNTEER DENTAL PROJECTS AND ACTION FOR DENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM.

Section 317M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b-14) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) ACTION FOR DENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Administrator of the Health Resources and Service Administration, may award grants to or enter into contracts with eligible entities to collaborate with State, county, or local public officials and other stakeholders to develop and implement initiatives to accomplish any of the following goals:

"(A) To improve oral health education and dental disease prevention, including through community-wide prevention programs, through the use of dental sealants and fluoride varnish, and by increasing oral health literacy.

"(B) To reduce geographic barriers, language barriers, cultural barriers, and other similar barriers to the provision of dental services.

"(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible entity' means an entity that is—

"(A) a State or local dental association;

"(B) a State oral health program;

"(C) a dental education, dental hygiene, or postdoctoral dental education program accredited by the Commission on Dental Accreditation; or

"(D) a community-based organization that—

"(i) partners with an academic institution;

"(ii) is exempt from tax under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

"(iii) partners with public and private stakeholders to facilitate the provision of dental services for underserved populations."; and

(3) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking "such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005" and inserting "\$18,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022".

SEC. 3. GRANTS FOR INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS.

Section 340G of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking "and" at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) the establishment of dental homes for children and adults, including for the aged, blind, and disabled populations;

"(E) the establishment of initiatives to reduce the use of emergency departments by individuals who seek dental services more appropriately delivered in a dental primary care setting; and

"(F) the provision of dental care to nursing home residents;"; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking "\$25,000,000 for the 5-fiscal year period beginning with fiscal year 2008" and inserting "\$13,903,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2422, the Action for Dental Health Act of 2017, introduced by Representative ROBIN KELLY.

The bill reauthorizes the oral health promotion and disease prevention programs at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and permits the CDC to award grants or enter into contracts with stakeholders to develop projects to improve oral health education and dental disease prevention. This bill also reauthorizes HRSA's Grants to States to Support Oral Health Workforce Activities and permits States to establish dental homes, mobile or portable dental clinics, initiatives to reduce the use of emergency departments by patients seeking dental services, and initiatives to provide dental care to nursing home residents.

Good oral health is an important component of good overall health, and this bill takes important steps to help improve the dental care in underserved communities.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2422, the Action for Dental Health Act, sponsored by my colleague, Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY from Illinois.

For millions of Americans, affordable dental care is hard to find and desperately needed. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, nearly half of all individuals in our country over the age of 30 suffer from some form of gum disease. One in four children under the age of 5 already have cavities.

The lack of basic oral health services in some communities today leads many Americans to delay treatment to the point the pain is so severe that they rush to the emergency room, where they receive expensive treatment for common dental issues.

Dental care is necessary for more than cosmetic reasons. Good oral health is vital to a person's overall health. Bad oral health can be a sign of larger health issues.

Increasing access to affordable dental care would lower the number of emergency department visits for preventable oral health conditions and reduce the risk of chronic disease.

The Action for Dental Health Act will make grants available through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Health Resources and Services Administration, for programs to improve oral health for underserved populations.

This legislation will make it possible for groups, such as State health departments and nonprofit dental societies, to receive funding for critical oral health services. These services may include providing dental services to nursing home residents, operating a mobile dental clinic, or implementing an emergency room program so patients can receive dental care in the dentist's chair instead of the ER.

I thank the bill's sponsors for their bipartisan work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Action for Dental Health Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as February's National Children's Dental Health Month draws to a close, I thank Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member PALLONE for their leadership in making sure that this bill came to the floor today.

It has been a tremendous honor to work with my colleague, Mr. SIMPSON from Idaho, in moving this legislation that I am intensely passionate about—the Action for Dental Health Act.

I want to acknowledge that, while Members of this Chamber may not always see eye-to-eye on matters of health policy, I am proud that my colleagues were able to work together in a constructive, compassionate, and considerate way to address the critical public health matter of improving oral health in America.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans deserve a healthy smile; but, sadly, each year, tens of millions of Americans forego needed oral healthcare due to poverty, fear, language or cultural barriers, or the simple fact that there isn't a dentist in the area in which they live.

We know that regular visits to a dentist can do more than keep your smile attractive. They can tell a whole lot about your overall health, including whether or not you may be developing a disease like diabetes, or if you are at risk for a stroke.

Fifty million Americans live in places with limited access to dental care, and economically vulnerable adults are almost twice as likely to have had no dental care in the previous year than Americans in middle- and upper-income brackets.

Dental problems are a leading problem of school absences for kids and missed work for parents. Oral health has a direct relationship with school performance. Kids who reported having recent tooth pain were four times more likely to have a low grade point average—below the median GPA of 2.8—when compared to children without oral pain, according to a study by the Ostrow School of Dentistry at the University of Southern California.

My bill improves oral health for Americans by breaking down barriers to care. It allows organizations to qualify for oral health grants to support activities that improve oral health education and dental disease prevention.

This includes developing and expanding outreach programs that will facilitate establishing dental homes for children and adults, including the elderly, blind, and disabled.

The Action for Dental Health Act has received the endorsement of the American Dental Association, the National Dental Association, the American Dental Education Association, and a bipartisan coalition of our congressional colleagues.

On a final note, I would like to thank the staff of the Energy and Commerce Committee; Mia Keays on my staff; Jamie McNeil with Congressman SIMPSON; and also Dr. Cheryl Watson-Lowry, who came to testify on behalf of the bill, in working together to help shepherd the bill before us today.

I am a true believer in the power of order and bipartisanship in making a difference in the lives of the families we represent. The process of working with you all in advancing this bill has truly strengthened my belief in that power.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I urge passage.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2422, the Action for Dental Health Act of 2017.

The ADH Act will allow states to receive grants that will establish innovative dental programs on behalf of the Health Resources and Services Administration.

Passing H.R. 2422 will establish of dental homes for children and adults, reduce use of emergency departments for dental services, and reduce geographic, language and cultural barriers in the dental care system.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great need to improve oral health education and prevent dental diseases in low-income and underserved communities.

The health of many Americans is dependent upon the resources we provide.

African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans and Alaska Natives generally have the poorest oral health of any racial and ethnic groups in the United States.

African Americans, non-Hispanics, and Mexican Americans aged 35 to 44 years experience untreated tooth decay nearly twice as much as white, non-Hispanics.

Poor oral health is strongly correlated with other chronic health conditions like cardiovascular diseases, lung disease, strokes, diabetes and can also contribute to problems with employment which furthers poverty.

The Surgeon General estimates that children with oral disease miss over 51 million hours of school each year, and that adults with oral disease miss approximately 164 million hours of work each year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2422 to show their support and compassion for the people we serve and to ensure that individuals predisposed to contracting any sort of dental diseases receive the proper prevention and care they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules

and pass the bill, H.R. 2422, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAUMA-INFORMED CARE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 443) recognizing the importance and effectiveness of trauma-informed care, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 443

Whereas traumatic experiences affect millions of people in the United States and can affect a person's mental, emotional, physical, spiritual, economic, and social well-being;

Whereas adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) can be traumatizing and, if not recognized, can affect health across the lifespan and, in some cases, result in a shortened life span;

Whereas ACEs are recognized as a proxy for toxic stress, which can affect brain development and can cause a lifetime of physical, mental, and social challenges;

Whereas ACEs and trauma are determinants of public health problems in the United States such as obesity, addiction, and serious mental illness;

Whereas trauma-informed care is an approach that can bring greater understanding and more effective ways to support and serve children, adults, families, and communities affected by trauma;

Whereas trauma-informed care is not a therapy or an intervention, but a principle-based, culture-change process aimed at recognizing strengths and resiliency as well as helping people who have experienced trauma to overcome those issues in order to lead healthy and positive lives;

Whereas adopting trauma-informed approaches in workplaces, communities, and government programs can aid in preventing mental, emotional, physical, and/or social issues for people impacted by toxic stress and/or trauma;

Whereas trauma-informed care has been promoted and established in communities across the United States, including the following different uses of trauma-informed care being utilized by various types of entities:

(1) The State of Wisconsin established Fostering Futures, a statewide initiative partnering the State with Tribes, State agencies, county governments, and nonprofit organizations to make Wisconsin the first trauma-informed State. The goal of Fostering Futures is to reduce toxic stress and improve lifelong health and well-being for all Wisconsinites.

(2) The Menominee Tribe in Wisconsin improved educational and public health out-

comes by increasing understanding of historical trauma and childhood adversity and by developing culturally relevant, trauma-informed practices.

(3) In Chicago, Illinois, schools of medicine provide critical trauma-informed care, including the University of Illinois at Chicago Comprehensive Assessment and Response Training System, which improves the quality of psychiatric services provided to youth in foster care, and the University of Chicago Recovery & Empowerment After Community Trauma Initiative, which helps residents who are coping with community violence.

(4) In Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, service providers, academics, and local artists use art to engage their community to educate and involve citizens in trauma-informed care activities.

(5) In San Francisco, California, the city's public health department aligned its workforce to create a trauma-informed system.

(6) In Kansas City, Missouri, schools worked to become trauma-informed by encouraging teachers and children to create their own self-care plans to manage stress. They have implemented broad community-wide, trauma-informed culture change.

(7) In Tarpon Springs, Florida, the city crafted a community effort to gather city officials, professionals, and residents to coordinate multiple trauma-informed activities, including a community education day.

(8) In Worcester, Massachusetts, community members worked with the Massachusetts State Department of Mental Health to create a venue with peer-to-peer support to better engage individuals dealing with trauma or extreme emotional distress.

(9) In Walla Walla, Washington, the city and community members launched the Children's Resilience Initiative to mobilize neighborhoods and Washington State agencies to tackle ACEs.

(10) The State of Oregon passed the first law to promote trauma-informed approaches to decrease rates of school absenteeism and understanding and promoting best practices to leverage community resources to support youth.

(11) The State of Massachusetts passed a law to promote whole-school efforts to implement trauma-informed care approaches to support the social, emotional, and academic well-being of all students, including both preventive and intensive services and supports depending on students' needs.

(12) The State of Washington implemented the ACEs Public-Private Initiative, a collaboration among private, public, and community organizations to research and inform policies to prevent childhood trauma and reduce its negative emotional, social, and health effects;

Whereas the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration provides substantial resources to better engage individuals and communities across the United States to implement trauma-informed care; and

Whereas numerous Federal agencies have integrated trauma-informed approaches into their programs and grants and could benefit from closer collaboration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the importance, effectiveness, and need for trauma-informed care among existing programs and agencies at the Federal level; and

(2) encourages the use and practice of trauma-informed care within the Federal Government, its agencies, and the United States Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of Representative MIKE GALLAGHER's H. Res. 443, which recognizes the importance and effectiveness of trauma-informed care.

According to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, trauma results from an event or a series of events that cause intense physical and psychological stress reactions. The individual's functioning and emotional, physical, social, and spiritual health can be severely affected. It is important that health providers understand the nature and impact of trauma when caring for their patients.

H. Res. 443 highlights the work of States in trauma-informed care and encourages the Federal Government to build on the States' momentum by identifying opportunities to embed this approach to care within current Federal health operations.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 443, Recognizing the Importance and Effectiveness of Trauma-Informed Care, sponsored by Congressman GALLAGHER from Wisconsin and Congressman DAVIS from Illinois.

This resolution recognizes the important role that trauma plays in health and life situations and the importance of deploying trauma-informed protocols to respond to traumatic experiences.

Research shows that traumatic experiences are associated with behavioral health and chronic physical health conditions, such as substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and heart disease.

Traumatic experiences, such as physical or sexual abuse, neglect, bullying, community-based violence, and natural disasters give rise to these negative health consequences.

Because of the harmful consequences of trauma, it is important for our health system to deploy trauma-informed protocols.

The resolution recognizes the importance of Federal agencies deploying trauma-informed care to ensure that local care providers are appropriately engaging individuals with histories of trauma, and implementing strategies to intervene on the negative consequences of traumatic experiences.

I urge my colleagues to join me and support this resolution.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER), the principal author of this resolution.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for children, for vulnerable populations, and caregivers in my home State of Wisconsin and across this country.

□ 1800

H. Res. 443 recognizes the importance of trauma-informed care to individual wellness, the efficacy of care, and improved quality of life for those who have experienced trauma. Passage of this resolution demonstrates that this body believes in the power that trauma-informed care can have in helping children, families, and adults overcome trauma and lead healthy lives.

From veterans reintegrating into society to survivors of childhood abuse, individuals from across the population can benefit from the simple but effective principles of trauma-informed care. By recognizing and sensitively addressing the impacts of traumatic experiences, we can build stronger and more resilient communities.

We all want to address major public health issues like addiction, mental health issues, and obesity, and this resolution moves the ball forward by raising awareness and building momentum behind evidence-based best practices and solutions.

Rigorous study and academic review have shown benefits for organizations, communities, and governments that implement trauma-informed care.

I am proud to announce that my home State of Wisconsin, under the leadership of our first lady, Tonette Walker, is on track to becoming the first fully trauma-informed State in the Nation. In Illinois, home to our colleague and the colead of this resolution, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, experts have come together to make this material more accessible to policymakers and the public.

Exciting innovation in mental healthcare is happening across this country, and this resolution recognizes that hard work.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I express my sincere thanks to my colleague, Congressman DAVIS, for his commitment to this resolution. I also thank Tonette Walker, first lady of Wisconsin, for her dedication and service and leadership in this important cause.

Mr. Speaker, additionally, I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the committee for their hard work on this issue as well.

H. Res. 443 is an important step in breaking down the stigma surrounding mental healthcare and building more inclusive communities, more resilient communities, more strong communities that take care of each other. I encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend Dr. BURGESS for his leadership, and Representative GENE GREEN. They have both demonstrated, I think, the kind of leadership that we are often seeking, searching for, and looking for.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to work with Representative GALLAGHER of Wisconsin in development of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the first lady of Wisconsin for the leadership that she has provided. Of course, the first lady is the wife of the Governor. I must admit that I was a bit amazed when we were contacted by the first lady of Wisconsin to talk about this kind of legislation and to talk about the importance of it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 443, which recognizes the importance and effectiveness of trauma-informed care and proposes to implement this care at the Federal level.

Traumatic experiences affect millions of people across the country, including the city of Chicago. It is integral to the development of any person who has experienced trauma to get physical and emotional support after experiencing an extremely stressful life event.

This is especially important to our Nation's children, as adverse childhood experiences can affect the health of a child for the rest of his or her life. If a child does not receive care for trauma, it could even shorten his or her lifespan, and this stress facilitates negative brain development.

Trauma-informed care addresses the survivor's specific needs in relation to his or her personal trauma and recovery. It promotes a collaborative environment between the survivor and close friends and family, and it addresses the symptoms of trauma that require treatment. This helps the survivor work through his or her recovery in a positive way with the support of close allies.

Though many States have adopted trauma-informed care programs, it is essential to implement trauma-informed care at the Federal level and make sure that people anywhere in the country get the treatment and support

they need, not just those in certain States.

It has also been my pleasure to work closely with Senator DURBIN, the senior Senator from the State of Illinois, and hundreds of groups that have formed a coalition to help promote and develop an understanding of just how much trauma care is needed.

Very seldom do I talk about it or mention it, but I had a grandson who was murdered a year or so ago, and there were other children in the home. It was a home invasion. So I can tell people firsthand that the kind of attention and care that individuals get after they have had a traumatic experience makes a tremendous amount of difference in their recovery.

I also note that I was trained as a psychologist, and so I have interacted in many instances with individuals who had experienced stress. So this is an excellent piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative GALLAGHER again for his leadership. It has been my pleasure to work with him. I look forward to the passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is an important resolution. I urge its passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 443, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1222, by the yeas and nays; and
H.R. 2422, by the yeas and nays.

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

CONGENITAL HEART FUTURES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1222) to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 7, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—394

Abraham	Carson (IN)	DesJarlais
Adams	Carter (GA)	Deutch
Aderholt	Cartwright	Diaz-Balart
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Dingell
Allen	Castro (TX)	Donovan
Amodei	Chabot	Doyle, Michael
Arrington	Cheney	F.
Babin	Chu, Judy	Duncan (SC)
Bacon	Clark (MA)	Duncan (TN)
Banks (IN)	Clarke (NY)	Dunn
Barr	Clay	Ellison
Barragán	Clyburn	Emmer
Barton	Coffman	Eshoo
Bass	Cohen	Español
Beatty	Cole	Estes (KS)
Bera	Collins (GA)	Esty (CT)
Bergman	Collins (NY)	Evans
Beyer	Comer	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Comstock	Faso
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Ferguson
Bishop (MI)	Connolly	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Cooper	Flóres
Blum	Correa	Fortenberry
Blumenauer	Costa	Foster
Blunt Rochester	Costello (PA)	Foxx
Bonamici	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Bost	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Fudge
F.	Crowley	Gabbard
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Gaetz
Brat	Culberson	Gallagher
Bridenstine	Curbelo (FL)	Gállego
Brooks (IN)	Curtis	Garamendi
Brown (MD)	Davidson	Garrett
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Gianforte
Buchanan	Davis, Danny	Gibbs
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Gohmert
Bucshon	DeFazio	Gomez
Budd	DeGette	Gonzalez (TX)
Burgess	Delaney	Goodlatte
Bustos	DeLauro	Gosar
Butterfield	DelBene	Gottheimer
Byrne	Demings	Gowdy
Calvert	Denham	Granger
Capuano	Dent	Graves (GA)
Carbajal	DeSantis	Graves (LA)
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Green, Al

Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham, M.	Ruiz
Griffith	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger
Grijalva	Lynch	Russell
Grothman	MacArthur	Rutherford
Guthrie	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)
Gutiérrez	Marchant	Sánchez
Hanabusa	Marino	Sarbanes
Handel	Marshall	Scalise
Harper	Mast	Schakowsky
Harris	Matsui	Schiff
Hartzler	McCarthy	Schrader
Hastings	McCaul	Schweikert
Heck	McClintock	Scott (VA)
Hensarling	McCollum	Scott, Austin
Herrera Beutler	McEachin	Scott, David
Hice, Jody B.	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Higgins (LA)	McKinley	Serrano
Higgins (NY)	McMorris	Sessions
Hill	Rodgers	Sewell (AL)
Himes	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Holding	McSally	Sherman
Hollingsworth	Meadows	Shimkus
Hoyer	Meehan	Simpson
Hudson	Meeks	Sinema
Huffman	Meng	Sires
Hultgren	Messer	Slaughter
Hunter	Mitchell	Smith (MO)
Hurd	Moolenaar	Smith (NE)
Issa	Moore	Smith (NJ)
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Smith (TX)
Jayapal	Mullin	Smucker
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Soto
Jenkins (KS)	Nadler	Stefanik
Jenkins (WV)	Napolitano	Stewart
Johnson (GA)	Newhouse	Stivers
Johnson (LA)	Norcross	Suozzi
Johnson (OH)	Norman	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Nunes	Takano
Johnson, Sam	O'Halleran	Taylor
Jordan	O'Rourke	Tenney
Joyce (OH)	Olson	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Palazzo	Thompson (MS)
Katko	Pallone	Thompson (PA)
Keating	Palmer	Thornberry
Kelly (IL)	Panetta	Tipton
Kelly (MS)	Pascarell	Titus
Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Tonko
Khanna	Pelosi	Torres
Kihuen	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Kildee	Perry	Turner
Kilmer	Peters	Upton
Kind	Peterson	Valadao
King (IA)	Pingree	Veasey
King (NY)	Pittenger	Vela
Kinzinger	Pocan	Velázquez
Knight	Poe (TX)	Visclosky
Krishnamoorthi	Poliquin	Wagner
Kuster (NH)	Polis	Walberg
Kustoff (TN)	Posey	Walden
Labrador	Price (NC)	Walker
LaHood	Quigley	Walorski
LaMalfa	Raskin	Walters, Mimi
Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Walz
Lance	Reed	Wasserman
Langevin	Reichert	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Renacci	Waters, Maxine
Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Latta	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Lawrence	Richmond	Webster (FL)
Lawson (FL)	Roby	Welch
Lee	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup
Levin	Rogers (AL)	Westerman
Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)	Williams
Lewis (MN)	Rohrabacher	Wilson (FL)
Lieu, Ted	Rokita	Wilson (SC)
Lipinski	Rooney, Thomas	Wittman
LoBiondo	J.	Womack
Loebach	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall
Lofgren	Rosen	Yarmuth
Loudermilk	Roskam	Yoder
Love	Ross	Yoho
Lowenthal	Rothfus	Young (AK)
Lowe	Rouzer	Young (IA)
Lucas	Roybal-Allard	Zeldin
Luetkemeyer	Royce (CA)	

NAYS—7

Amash	Jones	Sanford
Biggs	Massie	
Brooks (AL)	Mooney (WV)	

NOT VOTING—29

Barletta	Brady (PA)	Cicilline
Black	Carter (TX)	Cleaver

Cramer	Long	Pearce
Cummings	Maloney,	Rooney, Francis
Doggett	Russell	Rush
Duffy	McGovern	Shuster
Engel	Neal	Smith (WA)
Graves (MO)	Noem	Speier
Huizenga	Nolan	Trott
Kennedy	Payne	Vargas

□ 1855

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THOSE KILLED AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of 17 members of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School community in Parkland, Florida, and do so in the presence of some of their classmates:

Alyssa, Chris, Meadow, Scott, Luke, Helena, Martin, Cara, Alex, Nicholas, Gina, Carmen, Aaron, Joaquin, Peter, Jaime, and Alaina.

On February 14, 2018, they were killed in yet another senseless act of gun violence.

As we bow in silence, I ask that we remember those we lost, I ask that we lift up the families who are grieving, and I ask that we offer prayers of healing for those who were injured and prayers of peace for the 3,300 survivors.

I ask that our quiet contemplation stir courage within the Members of this body—the courage to take action to ensure the freedom of our students, the freedom to learn without fear, and to take action to secure the freedom of all Americans to live in communities without gun violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members and guests in the gallery, please rise for a moment of silence.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUES- TION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Calling on the House of Representatives to immediately consider gun violence prevention legislation.

Whereas, gun violence affects every community in our Nation;

Whereas, 30 people are killed every day by someone using a gun;

Whereas, more than 2,200 people have been killed this year by someone using a gun;

Whereas, there have been at least 34 mass shootings this year;

Whereas, while mass shootings often receive media attention, gun violence is present every day in every community;

Whereas, since the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School, the House of Representatives has held 43 moments of silence to honor the memory of people killed by someone using guns;

Whereas, most gun owners are responsible and law-abiding;

Whereas, the Supreme Court, in its District of Columbia v. Heller decision, recognized the right to keep and to bear arms;

Whereas, the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act was enacted on November 30, 1993;

Whereas, background checks have been successful and every day stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun;

Whereas, over 2,000,000 gun sales were blocked since enactment of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act;

Whereas, 90 percent of all background checks are done instantly;

Whereas, the States that require background checks, 47 percent fewer women are murdered by intimate partners;

Whereas, in States that require background checks, there are 47 percent firearm suicides;

Whereas, in States that require background checks, 53 percent fewer law enforcement officers are killed by someone using a gun;

Whereas, 97 percent of Americans polled support background checks for all gun sales;

Whereas, in many States, no background check is required to buy a gun online or at a gun show; and

Whereas, the President has said, "Whether we are Republican or Democrats must now focus on strengthening Background Checks!"

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives should immediately consider H.R. 4240, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2017, and H.R. 3464, the Background Check Completion Act of 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from California will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not, at this point, determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time

designated for the consideration of the resolution.

ACTION FOR DENTAL HEALTH ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2422) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 13, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—387

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot

Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Curtis
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison

Emmer
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gotthelmer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth

Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
J.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley
McCollum
McEachin

Amash
Biggs
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Davidson

McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panteta
Pascarella
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise

Farenthold
Gaezt
Garrett
Gohmert
Jones

Doggett
Duffy
Engel
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Huizenga

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozy
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Massie
McClintock
Sanford

NAYS—13

NOT VOTING—30

Payne
Pearce
Rooney, Francis

Rush
Shuster
Smith (WA)

Speier
Trott
Vargas

□ 1913

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4296, OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4607, COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-582) on the resolution (H. Res. 747) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4296) to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4607) to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1865, ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-583) on the resolution (H. Res. 748) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1915

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING ROSE ANN SHANNON IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I rise to recognize a woman dedicated to journalistic integrity, who made history as Omaha's first female TV news director. Rose Ann Shannon recently retired after 45 years in TV news and was a mentor to many local and national reporters.

When Rose Ann started her career at KMTV in 1973, she was one of only three women in Omaha TV news. After KMTV, Rose Ann worked as a communications director for Omaha's mayor, then returned to TV news at KETV. She was then promoted to news director, the first female TV news director in Omaha. KETV's general manager said Rose Ann exemplified "integrity-first journalism at its core."

Rose Ann is a trailblazer who shattered a glass ceiling. She served as a mentor to men and women in the industry, ensuring reporters connected to the public through "integrity-first reporting and truth."

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, no one should experience what the students of Parkland, Florida, did last week. My heart breaks for that community, for the lives of the lost, for those who were injured, and for the families that were affected. No family should ever have to bury a child because of gun violence in school.

Mr. Speaker, we need sensible gun violence prevention legislation to finally begin to address these tragedies, but I want to say I cannot support the President's frightening proposal to put more guns in our Nation's schools, in our Nation's classrooms.

I wholeheartedly agree that we must make our schools safer places for students to learn, but arming teachers will do just the opposite. I know firsthand that accidents can happen even when guns are in the hands of highly trained firearms experts.

I speak from this wheelchair today because, when I was 16, a stray bullet hit my spine and left me paralyzed. This was at the hands of two weapons experts on the police SWAT team. My accident occurred as a police cadet in the police department among trained experts. Just imagine what could happen in a school filled with children

with people who are handling firearms who are not as well trained.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to keep our students safe. More guns around them is not the answer.

RECOGNIZING GRACE HERSCHELMAN

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Rare Disease Day, I am proud to recognize Grace Herschelman, a 6-year-old from Hillsboro, Illinois, who continues to be an inspiration for thousands.

When Grace was 3 years old, she was diagnosed with infantile neuroaxonal dystrophy, a neurodegenerative disease that results in a loss of muscle strength, movement, and the ability to speak. At the time of her diagnosis, there were only 10 documented cases of INAD in the Nation, and most children with this disease do not make it to their 10th birthday.

Throughout her diagnosis and therapy treatment, Grace and her family have been a source of inspiration throughout Illinois. They have increased awareness for a rare and terminal disease and have raised more than \$175,000 for research, with donors coming from all 50 States.

Grace and her family's story is just one example of why I support increased funding for the National Institutes of Health and legislation like the 21st Century Cures Act. Thousands of Americans are afflicted with rare diseases like those that afflict Grace, and we, as a nation, must work together to ensure better treatment, cures, and hope that is prioritized and possible for these patients and their families.

EXPANSION OF CHICAGO O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago and Chicago's airline carriers are finalizing their negotiations for an \$8.5 billion expansion of Chicago O'Hare International Airport. This will provide it with a state-of-the-art global terminal. This plan will bring more tourism, more economic activity, and more jobs to the Chicago area, while making it more necessary than ever to complete the Elgin O'Hare Western Access Project.

This project has won support from every faction: Chicago and the suburbs, Republicans and Democrats, business and labor, and even Cubs and Sox fans. It is clear why. Western Access would create nearly 20,000 jobs: 7,400 in direct construction and more than 3,000 in engineering; another 6,000 indirect jobs

would be created for equipment suppliers and contractors.

Once the project is completed, our region would realize 65,000 permanent jobs: 44,000 in Cook County, and nearly half that many in DuPage.

With the O'Hare of the future in development, it is time we complete Western Access and allow our region to reap the rewards.

CONGRATULATING FAIRVIEW SOUTHDALE HOSPITAL

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Fairview Southdale Hospital in Edina for recently receiving the 2018 Distinguished Hospital Award for Clinical Excellence from Healthgrades.

Fairview Southdale was also named one of the country's top 100 best hospitals for cardiac care, coronary intervention, and pulmonary care. Distinguished hospitals are determined and measured by whether they achieve outstanding outcomes in at least 21 of 23 common conditions and procedures.

Patients who are treated in these hospitals, on average, face a lower risk of death than if they were treated in hospitals without this designation. These hospitals also achieve better clinical results than 95 percent of hospitals across the country.

Mr. Speaker, the doctors, the nurses, the staffs at Fairview do incredible work, and I know they deserve this recognition, and we also know their patients are in good hands.

RECOGNIZING MONSIGNOR WILLIAM LINDER

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, there are few Americans who dedicate their lives completely to rebuilding an inner-city community.

Imagine a person who seeks no personal recognition but is imbued with deep faith and a future they help guide. Imagine their drive arising from their mission to serve others.

One of these rare souls is Monsignor William Linder of Newark, New Jersey, the founder of the New Community Corporation, which celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. Monsignor Linder's adult life is a powerful and pioneering example of a modern wise man who planted a church in the public square to transform America.

As a young priest in the 1960s, he was assigned to Newark's Central Ward amidst riots and racial tension. This was a divisive and uncertain time, yet he took it upon himself to walk hand

in hand with the people of Newark who desperately needed someone to believe in them and inspire a better way forward.

Linder listened to the people, and together they organized for affordable housing, civil rights, and a better way of life for all. His determination and boundless faith helped New Community achieve major revitalization.

Without question, New Community provides a reliable blueprint for rebuilding America's most neglected spaces. America is blessed, indeed, humbled, and filled with gratitude for Linder's life of service.

Thank you, Monsignor Linder. You are a good and faithful servant and living example of the commitment real progress requires.

DENICE MIRACLE—AMERICAN AIR- LINES EMPLOYEE TO THE RES- CUE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, New York City lights, modeling, and starring in music videos sounds like a script from a movie. So when two young girls met a man they knew as "Drey" on Instagram, they thought they had their ticket to the spotlight. Little did they know they were about to be victims of human sex trafficking.

The 15- and 17-year-old girls headed to the airport, ready to check into their American Airlines flight. Denice Miracle, however, was working the American Airlines ticket counter when the girls approached. She noticed that the teenagers looked nervous. They had too many bags, no adult was with them, and they had one-way, first-class tickets.

Denise's training kicked in, recognizing the red flags of human trafficking. She immediately alerted law enforcement, and they came to the rescue. Thankfully, this story ends with both girls returning home safely. They were not trafficked into the scourge of human slavery, in large part, because of Denice, who saw something and said something.

We thank people like Denise Miracle for their work, for their personal involvement in rescuing these two girls from evil.

And that is just the way it is.

CONGRESS MUST CONTINUE TO WORK TO PROTECT DREAMERS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Supreme Court rejected the Trump administration's appeal to leapfrog the judicial system in an attempt to end DACA. Today's decision is a victory for Dreamers and the en-

tire Nation. But our work in Congress must continue until we pass the Dream Act to protect Dreamers once and for all.

This decision tells us what we have already known all along, that ending DACA would be detrimental to our community and for our economy. With the loss of revenue, if we end DACA, it means that critical public programs like Social Security and Medicaid will take a big hit. We know that the Dreamers will bring in \$460 billion in economic output over a decade.

Dreamers are our sisters, our brothers, our cousins. They are owners of grocery stores, taxi drivers, members of our Armed Forces. We cannot afford to sit idly by. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring a clean Dream Act to the floor.

CONGRATULATING REMEDIOS DIAZ OLIVER

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Remedios Diaz Oliver, a prominent member of our south Florida community, on her retirement from All American Containers.

Remedios is a powerhouse. Along with her husband, Fausto, she established All American Containers, a multimillion-dollar business, a bottling company in Miami that serves corporations worldwide. Her son, Fausto, Jr.; her daughter, Rosie; and her grandchildren, Jackie and Fausto III, also work in the family business.

Like me, Remedios was forced to flee the Castro regime in communist Cuba, and she has been an unstoppable commitment of force for the island's freedom.

Remedios has been a trusted adviser to Presidents, to Senators, and to Members of Congress on the issue of her native homeland. And her advocacy in charitable events is second to none.

Remedios has been a leader in the American Cancer Society, raising funds and awareness to assist those stricken with this terrible disease.

While Remedios may be retiring from All American Containers, she is not retiring from our community, and I look forward to her next endeavor.

I love you so much, my friend. Te quiero mucho, amiga mia. Thank you. Felicidades to Remedios.

□ 1930

GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, although many in my constituency are still recovering from Hurricane Harvey—and I wear a "Houston Strong"

pin—we are working on getting housing rebuilt and seniors back in their homes, I can tell you that, throughout my district, as I was there this past week, they spoke in quiet tones about Douglas, the high school, and the tragedy in Florida.

And none of them seemed to agree—and, in particular, young men, who I will talk about in the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order on guns. None of them seemed to agree to arming teachers. All of them had ideas about gun violence and handguns, as well as weapons of war. And I believe the young people should be listened to, and we should not leave until we do constructive, sensible gun safety legislation, and it should be done now.

I ask the American people to rise up and speak in tones of nonpartisanship, bipartisanship, to save and secure our children and our teachers.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR SANDRA STOQUERT

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major Sandra Stoquert of Camden, New York, an outstanding member of our community. Major Stoquert recently took command of the 109th Aircraft Maintenance Squadron at the New York Air National Guard's 109th Airlift Wing, based out of Stratton Air National Guard Base in Scotia, New York.

Major Stoquert joined the New York Air National Guard in 1996, after serving in both the Army and the Navy Reserves. In 2004, she was commissioned as an officer and since then has served in Iraq at Balad Air Base and was deployed to New Orleans in 2005, to assist in the response to Hurricane Katrina.

Since returning to upstate New York, Major Stoquert has remained active in the community. In 2013, she was named the public affairs officer for the 174th Attack Wing based out of Syracuse, New York. She served as a school counselor at Adirondack Central School District in Boonville, New York, as well as on the board for the Central New York Veteran's Outreach Center in Utica.

I would like to take this time to thank Major Stoquert for her years of service to our country and community. She is an inspiration to all and a wonderful community leader.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CLEAN DRINKING WATER

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, America loses 7 billion gallons of clean drinking

water every single day through broken pipes and leaking pipes. Flowing through those pipes, water, yes, but also dollars, tax dollars, to purify the water and treat it. Eighty-six percent of our households depend on public drinking water, and these systems are failing. I have seen my share of corroded pipes and broken pumps over the years. I have seen communities and businesses suffer from a water main break, which happens 700 times a day across America.

Last week, I visited systems in Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Rensselaer, East Greenbush, and Castleton-on-Hudson in my district. I visited that legendary baby food maker, Beech-Nut, in Montgomery County, New York, which requires 275,000 gallons of water per day.

The message is clear: we must invest in our public water systems to protect our public health and to support our local businesses. We have a bipartisan bill, H.R. 3387, that has passed through committee and now awaits a vote by the full House. It would deliver critical funding to State and local governments to get this big job started.

Whether you are a Republican, Democrat, or Independent, every life and every job depends on access to safe drinking water. This is the kind of infrastructure plan we need. Let's get this job done.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STACEE ETCHEBER

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Stacey Etcheber. She attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

I would like to read a poem written for Stacey by a friend:

I am strong, and I am blessed because the strength of the animal beneath me multiplies my own strength, so I am able to stand and support my family and friends.

I am joyful, and I am blessed because the gentle wind that rushes by my face as I rid with abandon spreads my smile and my joy far and wide.

I am loyal, and I am blessed because the loyalty of a horse transcends words, embraces my soul, and flows out to encompass everything in my world.

I am filled with love, and I am blessed because the trusting love between human and horse is a love that radiates from my heart and settles protectively on those who join me in my journey.

I am a cowgirl, and the blessings of partnering with a horse are reflected in the strength, the joy, the loyalty, and the love that I am able to share with everyone whose path crosses mine.

I am blessed to be a cowgirl.

RECOGNIZING THE LEGACY OF GWEN YORK

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the legacy of Gwen York, who dedicated her life to advancing the goals of the Transport Workers Union and the Texas AFL-CIO.

Gwen was born December 27, 1956. Soon after her birthday, she located to Garland, which is just outside of Dallas, where she would spend much of her life. She graduated from South Garland High School and attended the University of Texas at Austin and later went on to join Southwest Airlines in 1980. It was a job that she loved dearly and put everything into.

She later returned to school and graduated from the National Labor College in 2006. And for the past 10 years, Gwen continued her passion for making sure that people could have a good life, particularly those at the Transport Workers Union. She was loyal and dedicated. She was everybody's advocate and friend.

I checked my last text to Gwen, and it was trying to get her to advocate for me and give me some advice on something. She was just that type of person. She was always very busy with her work, but she always made time to mentor people, especially a lot of the young women who were also part of the labor movement.

Gwen left us far too soon, and it was very tragic in how she did, but I want all of her friends and family out there to know just what a big impact that she made on this world and for the State of Texas and for workers everywhere.

She is survived by her husband, Mark York; her daughter, Alyson Reed; and her sister, Wanda Goode.

URGING THE RELEASE OF IMPRISONED JOURNALISTS IN BURMA

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the immediate release of two Reuters journalists, Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, who have been imprisoned in Burma for their fearless reporting on the atrocities being perpetrated against the Rohingya.

The ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya shocked the conscience of the world in part because of the important public testimony gathered by these two journalists. In December, these journalists were invited to meet with the police, they were handed documents by officers they had never met before, and then they were immediately arrested under an obscure colonial-era law. The arrest of these journalists and the Burmese Government's refusal to grant

them bail is highly irregular. It seems obvious that the only purpose of their continued detention is to chill the independent media in Burma.

Mr. Speaker, a free press is essential to a democratic society. I join the State Department and governments around the world urging Burma to release these journalists immediately and to allow them to reunite with their families and to return to their important work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the immediate release of two Reuters journalists—Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo—who have been imprisoned around the world for fearless reporting on the atrocities being perpetrated against the Rohingya.

The ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya has shocked the conscience of the world, in part because of the important public testimony gathered by these two journalists.

In December, Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo were invited to meet with police officers in Yangon, were handed documents by two police officers they had never met before, and then were immediately arrested for allegedly breaching Burma's Official Secrets Act, a little-used colonial era law on government secrecy.

The arrest of these journalists and the Burmese government's refusal to grant them bail is highly irregular. It seems obvious that the only purpose of their continued detention is to chill the independent media in Burma.

I visited Burma and Bangladesh as part of a Congressional delegation in November, and it was clear to me that the urgent humanitarian crisis in the region needs more attention from the media and the public—not less.

Despite their ongoing detention, the two journalists agreed to Reuters publication this month of their special report detailing the role of the military and Rakhine Buddhists in these atrocities. I salute these journalists for their willingness to bravely support the truth despite the personal risks to them.

Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo are both ethnic Buddhists who grew up in Sittwe, the capital of Rakhine state. Their work on the ethnic cleansing and humanitarian crisis has won a joint honorable mention from the Society of Publishers in Asia. Additionally, Wa Lone has written an acclaimed children's book and co-founded a charity that promotes tolerance between different ethnic groups.

Government officials, including Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and United Nations Ambassador Nikki Haley have called for the journalists' release. Top United Nations officials, as well as the leaders of many nations—including Canada and the United Kingdom—have also urged their release.

Mr. Speaker, a free press is essential to a democratic society. I join the State Department and governments around the world urging Burma to release Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo immediately and allow them to reunite with their families and resume their vital work.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

EVANS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to anchor the CBC Special Order. I would like to thank CBC Chairman CEDRIC RICHMOND for his leadership in this effort. Chairman RICHMOND has been leading this effort and raising the question about when the President said what do we have to lose. The chairman indicated that we have a lot to lose.

So for the next 60 minutes, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus and the millions of constituents we represent. Tonight's Special Order is about gun violence. I thank my colleagues for joining me here today to speak about the national epidemic of gun violence, an important topic to us all.

The Black community is at a critical time because we have a lot to lose because too many of our neighbors, unfortunately, have been subject to gun violence at a consistent rate, a crime which often goes unpunished because of unreliable witnesses.

On February 14, this Nation once again witnessed a horrific tragedy that took place at a high school in Florida. Seventeen lives were taken at the hands of a gunman with way too much firepower. The horror and tragedy that shook the Florida high school should be an unimaginable event in our country. Yet, tragically, our Nation has lost too many loved ones at the hands of gun violence, to the point where we often see the same reaction: hand wringing, blaming going around, but nothing being done to stop the violence.

The city of Philadelphia knows all too well the lives we have lost at the hands of gun violence. In 2017, we saw the city experience its largest homicide epidemic since 2012. There were over 370 homicides in Philadelphia, according to the data from the Philadelphia Police Department.

And with the continuing scourge of gun violence in Philadelphia, last year I hand-delivered a letter to Pennsylvania Attorney General Josh Shapiro outlining our Commonwealth's need to use all resources possible to advocate for commonsense gun reform. Since I handed that letter to the Commonwealth's attorney general, we have had more heartbreaks in America, including the unspeakable tragedy at a

church, a place of worship and refuge, in Texas, and the mass shooting in Las Vegas.

Mr. Speaker, there is a gentleman who is our leader from our Caucus who will speak to this issue. He knows an awful lot about it. I have watched him in the short period of time I have been here: the Honorable JAMES CLYBURN from the Sixth District.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative EVANS for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly represent the Sixth Congressional District of South Carolina in this august body. This past week, I spent a significant amount of time throughout the district meeting with faith leaders as well as other community-based organizations. And one of the things I kept hearing came from people who are particularly interested in whether or not this Congress will do anything to respond to this horrific problem that we have with guns.

Of all the things that I find myself talking about, the one thing that bothers me most is the fact that we seem to be no longer safe in our most sacred institutions.

I often quote Alexis de Tocqueville, who came to this country way back in the early 1800s seeking what he called the magic of this great country. He said that he went throughout the country looking at our institutions—educational institutions, legislative bodies—trying to find the magic of this great country. Alexis de Tocqueville said that he could not find it in any of these places. He said that it was not until he went into our churches and synagogues that he found the real magic of this great country. He said that he came to the conclusion that, in spite of all of the difficulties and challenges we had as a country, that America was great because Americans are good.

And he went on to surmise that, if Americans ever cease to be good, America will cease to be great. It is kind of interesting that he came to that conclusion by visiting our places of worship. And tonight I want to remind the American people that that sacred institution has been violated time and time again.

And on this question of gun violence, we remember the Emanuel 9: nine soulful Bible study pupils in the basement of their church, once again reestablishing the goodness of Americans. They had that goodness violated by a young man with a gun who sat among them for a full hour before opening fire, killing nine of them.

Now, when we think about that incident and we ask ourselves how could such a thing happen, one of the things that we do know is that this young man was able to purchase a weapon, although under the law he was not eligible to make the purchase; but because of a loophole that we have in the law,

a loophole that I have taken to call the "Charleston Loophole," which says simply that, if the background check is not completed within 3 days, the purchase can proceed to conclusion.

Now, the fact of the matter is, this gun was purchased in West Columbia. I don't know whether or not this young man had enough sophistication about the law to give the wrong information about his address, but what we do know is that the wrong address was keyed in; and because it was keyed in, there was difficulty trying to get the information that was needed.

□ 1945

By the time they found out the problem, the 3 days had expired, and the young man went back to get the gun, and, within days, traveled all the way from Columbia, South Carolina, down to Charleston.

He picked this church because, he said, it was historic. He wanted to go into a historic Black church.

Well, this month, the Nation has set aside time to honor the contributions of Black Americans. I can think of no way for us to better highlight what this month is all about than to, once and for all, close this Charleston loophole, to demonstrate to those nine African-American worshippers, who were going about the business of helping to make this country great, going about the business of demonstrating the goodness of Americans, to have their lives snuffed out; I can think of no better way for us to honor their lives than for us to close this loophole.

Tomorrow, I am going to come before this body with a discharge petition, because the legislation to close this loophole was filed in this body last July. It has been hanging around now for 8 months. I am going to ask all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to sign this discharge petition before the end of this Black History Month so that we can say to those souls: Rest in peace.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question.

If the gentleman could just talk a little more about that magic he talked about and how do we get there. Does the gentleman have any sense of how we get there?

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question.

I am sort of a history buff, and so I have spent a little time trying to find out what this country is all about. I also recall a great writer, George Santayana, once writing that if we fail to learn the lessons of our history, we are bound to repeat them.

I believe that history should be instructive, and I think that that is what de Tocqueville was talking about in his writings. He really came to this country, from France, to study our penal system on that particular occasion, but he was enamored with this country because of its people.

Now, the interesting thing about this, remember, the early 1800s when he came here, slavery was the law of the land, and he wrote about how contradictory that was to what he found in people's hearts, the goodness that he found in people.

So irrespective of what the challenges may be of the various institutions that we may have, the various legal issues that may come before us, the various legislative accomplishments we might make, irrespective of all that, there is a certain goodness in Americans that ought to be on demonstration at all times.

I really feel that it will demonstrate that goodness if we can say to these nine souls that, just as Alexis de Tocqueville found in our places of worship, what the basic goodness about America is all about, that is what they were in pursuit of as they sat in the basement of their church, Emanuel AME, on Calhoun Street, Charleston, South Carolina, they were there perpetuating that goodness, and it was violated.

I believe that this body can take a long step toward demonstrating how important that is by saying, in their memory, we are going to close this loophole so that their nine souls can rest in peace.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, you just heard the gentleman from South Carolina, in my view, lay out a very clear vision of what it should be like from an aspirational standpoint.

Speaking of the leader of the Congressional Black Caucus leading the conscience of this body, the gentleman from the great State of Louisiana, he knows a little bit about that—from my understanding, there is legislation that he has—and that is Chairman CEDRIC RICHMOND from the Second District of Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for, once again, leading the Congressional Black Caucus's Special Order hour, where we get to address the American people and talk directly to the American people about what it is that is going on in Congress, what we would like to do.

Tonight is a very somber but important Special Order hour. We are talking about protecting American lives. It would not be Black History Month without a quote from Dr. Martin Luther King, a Morehouse graduate. He says: "At some point, silence becomes betrayal."

I want us to just think about that: silence becomes betrayal. When it comes to our communities being inundated with guns, this Congress has been far too silent. In fact, what we do is just take moments of silence, one after an-

other, whether it is Virginia Tech, moment of silence; Sandy Hook, moment of silence; Pulse nightclub, moment of silence; First Baptist Church, moment of silence; Las Vegas, moment of silence; Mother Emanuel, moment of silence.

So far in 2018, we have already seen 8,200 incidents of gun violence in America, including 34 mass shootings. These acts of violence have taken more than 2,200 lives. That is 2,200 families affected by gun violence.

I would just say that it is time for Congress to do something, at least have the debate, but we ought not become coconspirators with the crimes that are being committed across this country.

I know that many people will say: Hey, you all are in Congress, you all deal in theory. We deal in reality. Banning assault weapons wouldn't have kept this kid from being able to buy an AR-15.

Well, let me just tell you, that is not true.

An AR-15 from the store ranges about \$500 and \$600. A kid could probably get \$500 or \$600, but during the days of the assault weapons ban, those guns, the street value became three times as much. So that means that \$600 gun that he bought would have been \$1,800. The question is whether he would have had access to get to that \$1,800, whether good common sense would have prevailed before he got to \$1,800, whether somebody would have caught on to his plan while he tried to get \$1,800.

At some point, we can't not do anything because we say it wouldn't have made a difference.

The one thing I will say is it is amazing to see these young people rise up and speak out with one voice that they want something done.

It is a sad day in America when our seniors can't go to church without fear of gun violence, when families can't go to the movies because of fear of gun violence, and when children can't go to school because of fear of gun violence.

We as a Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, have an obligation to this country to make sure that we protect people who are vulnerable. I don't think it is too much to ask for both sides to come together and ignore the will of the National Rifle Association, but to listen to the people in our country who are demanding that we do something.

When we start talking about background checks, assault rifles, high-capacity cartridges that go in these guns which allow people to shoot large amounts of people in a very short order of time, those guns—let's just be clear, and I want Congressman EVANS to understand what we are talking about: nobody is talking about ending the Second Amendment. The right to bear arms is as fundamental and as protected as anything else in this country.

However, when we start talking about AR-15s and these assault weapons and these automatic things, we are talking about weapons of mass destruction.

We went to Afghanistan looking for weapons of mass destruction, when they are right here in this country. We don't have to go to Iraq, we don't have to go to Afghanistan. If you are looking for weapons of mass destruction, they are sold in our sporting goods shops all across this country, and they are being used to slaughter American citizens.

So I would just ask, in closing, that at some point, silence is betrayal. As for me, because of my conviction, because of my conscience, and because I don't lack any courage, I will not be silent.

I would just urge this body that we can't be silent anymore as weapons of mass destruction destroy our communities.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman leaves, being that this is the 50th anniversary of Dr. King's assassination, I would ask the gentleman, to the point that he raises about the moments of silence, if we look back and look where we are today, are we any closer to addressing these moments of silence, because I hear frustration in his voice?

Mr. RICHMOND. I am frustrated. I come from a funeral home family, and I know what it is like when people have to bury loved ones, and I know the natural order of things, because I have had to bury my father and my stepfather and my grandparents, who were—my grandfather specifically, who stepped in for my father when he died, but that is the natural order of things. Although my dad died when he was 32, it was of natural causes.

Parents shouldn't be burying children. Children shouldn't be victims and shot in school. So the frustration comes because I know the pain associated.

So when we start talking about the 2,200 people who were killed, that is 2,200 families that had to get up and hear the preacher say: Oh, pain may endure through the night, but joy cometh in the morning.

Well, joy is not going to come in the morning if the same thing keeps happening and Congress will not do anything about it, because that means those lives were lost in vain, and that is just as big a sin, in my estimation. I just think that we have to do something about it.

It is one thing when the cameras are there and the family has the support at the funeral of all these people, the Congressperson comes, family comes, and says, "Oh, we are going to be with you, and we are going to support you and pray for you during this time," but at the end of the day, that mother and father goes back to that house, and that kid's room is empty.

There are no words of comfort that we can give to that family when they walk by that room every night and it is empty because we let somebody with mental issues get their hands on an AR-15 and slaughter a bunch of kids in school. So if it sounds like I am upset, then you are right, because those parents shouldn't have to pass an empty room.

Every empty room that happens, my fear is that we are complicit by omission of letting it happen over and over again, and I don't want that on my conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 2000

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for laying out that eloquent statement.

Next is someone who is from the great State of Illinois, who, since I have been here, has been relentless on this issue, particularly from an inner-city standpoint, an urban standpoint. I have watched her over and over again constantly stand up and make comments, and I wonder if she thinks anybody is listening, but I am going to give her that opportunity to say a few things here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Second District of Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, Mr. EVANS, for yielding and for his leadership. I associate myself with the words of my colleagues who have already spoken.

Mr. Speaker, I never tire in my call to end senseless gun violence. But I am emboldened this evening by the grassroots movement we have seen from the brave and bright students that survived the shooting at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, which took the lives of 17 of their classmates and teachers. These brave students remind me of the determined young people I have come to know in the Chicago area who have been calling for change.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my Republican colleagues: Do you remember the terror you felt this past summer on the baseball diamond when you were senselessly attacked with a rifle? Do you remember the terror you felt as grown men?

Now imagine being a teenager, without the protection of trained Capitol Police officers at your side, being senselessly attacked with an AR-15.

Imagine being raised in a world where fear of being shot at school, on your block, or in a park was a daily reality.

Countless daily shootings that do not make the news certainly don't spur you to act. Losing 20 elementary school students didn't spur you to act. A colleague suffering a severe brain in-

jury didn't spur you to act. You, yourselves, being the targets hasn't even spurred you to act.

In the aftermath of Parkland, our children have made one thing abundantly clear: If you do not act to end this senseless violence, America will replace you with bold leaders who will.

The solutions are simple: mandatory background checks on all gun sales, including purchases online and at gun shows, and tightening the background check system; closing the loopholes; removing weapons of war from our streets; implementing gun violence protective orders; allowing scientists to study this issue for what it is, a public health crisis; and investing in programs that provide young people with hope so they put down guns and pick up pens, pencils, books and job skills; when appropriate, access to mental health. You cut the budget to mental health, yet you blame mental health as the reason these things are happening.

None of these proposals are new. In my first term in Congress, I issued the Kelly Report, studying this issue, with each of these recommendations. I will gladly provide every Member of this House a copy.

The solutions and the choice are clear.

Will you stand up to the NRA? Will you even read my report?

Our children are demanding it.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask just one question to the gentlewoman from Illinois, who has been speaking to this issue a lot.

Does the gentlewoman have any sense of optimism of people hearing her in any way? Does she see any signs?

I mean, she just ticked off some information. What are her thoughts about change around here?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't be in this job if I wasn't an optimist, believe me. I think people hear me. It is whether they are willing to act.

There are bipartisan bills ready to go; bipartisan bills. Some bills are sponsored by Republicans, some by Democrats. They have a lot of cosponsors, but the leadership has to hear; the leadership has to want to do something. Actually, the leadership on both sides has been very, very silent, unfortunately. But I am hoping that the pressure will continue to be put on by everybody across this United States.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I have someone who I have had the utmost respect for. He smiles. I told him he could get elected in Pennsylvania. He is from the great State of Mississippi. I don't want to shock the people of Mississippi. He is not leaving Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Second Congressional District of Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for yielding. I won't be

coming and running, though; but, nonetheless, I appreciate the kind words.

I am going to talk in a little different direction than from most of the previous speakers.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I am a country boy. I live in the country. Hunting is a rite of passage for most people who live in the country.

For the record, this past Friday, I hunted rabbit with three ministers, two deputy sheriffs, a county commissioner, and just a bunch of everyday people. But I don't need an assault weapon to hunt rabbit with.

So this notion that somehow an infringement on my Second Amendment right to bear arms is associated with a killing weapon, a weapon that was designed for war, a weapon that is designed to reap carnage in whatever environment that it is in—for those of us who hunt deer, who hunt ducks, who hunt pheasants, we look at this whole discussion and ask: Who are these people who want 30-, 40-, 50-shot clips in a gun? What are they hunting?

Those of us who are outdoorsmen, those of us who love the environment, we are not supportive of this notion that these kind of guns are made for outdoors. They are not. So it is a false premise, Mr. Speaker, that somehow my rights are being abridged.

Now, as important with this is this notion that somehow we are not safe unless I own a gun like this. Well, the people that I hunt with, they have absolutely no problem applying for whatever license they are required to have to own their guns. They don't have a problem with waiting so that they can clear up whatever question it is from the standpoint of owning a gun.

They really don't have a problem with saying gun shows should be outlawed because those are places where people sell guns, and sometimes there is a question about the legality of the guns they are selling.

Background checks. You know, if I have to have a background check for financing of anything. Then why shouldn't I have a background check to own a weapon?

A bump stock. Now, until what had occurred in Las Vegas, most of us had never heard of a bump stock. I mean, it was just some kind of exotic thing you put on a gun to make it an automatic weapon. But, again, all those things, to those of us who hunt, that is not who we are.

I marvel at some of my colleagues who probably couldn't hit anything with a gun, but they want to stand up and defend people who buy assault weapons. I challenge them to come, get up at 4:30, 5 in the morning, and let's go to the woods and let's do what real hunters do. Let's not just get on TV and brag about my Second Amendment rights, and then put on a \$500 suit and go on downtown and don't go to the woods.

What we saw in Florida, it was absolutely tragic. Errors occurred. We need to fix it. But I dare to say—and I absolutely hope I am wrong—when the comments subside, I doubt that we will have any legislation brought forward to address this assault weapon problem we have in this country. I doubt that we will have any legislation brought forward to look at the loopholes associated with purchasing guns. I doubt that we will have the age limit raised on individuals purchasing guns. The will is not here. I wish my colleagues could man up, or woman up, and do the right thing.

I am training my grandson, who is 12 years old, the right way to own a gun, to handle a gun, to do the things that are correct. He will have to go through gun safety classes before he gets his license. But more importantly is he understands that this weapon is either for sport or protection. But, you know, I don't need an AR-15. I have deer rifles. I have shotguns. That is what sportsmen use.

So all this killing that is going on is bad, and I really wish we would take the emotions out and say, let's just get rid of these high-powered weapons that are killing machines.

I could go on and on, but I won't. But I can just say that it is a problem, and I don't think the will is here in this body to address it. Every time a tragedy occurs, we take a moment of silence and we do nothing.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman, since I have never seen this thing called an AR-15, can he describe what this gun looks like?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. This AR-15?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Well, it is a weapon designed to kill. It is a weapon designed for war.

My friends who are in law enforcement, I want them to have weapons like that to defend themselves here; but we have made these guns street-legal, so there is the potential that our friends in law enforcement are going to run up on people who have guns as powerful, if not more powerful than they are.

That gun is not made for hunting. It is not made for anything other than to kill. I want my soldiers who are fighting wars to have weapons like that.

But, again, for us to try to stretch the margin, that that is a Second Amendment right to bear arms, it is not any arm. Again, it is a killing machine. And if anybody has ever had an opportunity to fire one, which I have, it is not accurate at all; but it will spray a lot of bullets out and will do some killing, like we just saw in Florida and a lot of other places.

It is not who we are as a nation. We are a better people than that. But adults are going to have to do the right

thing. Otherwise, the young people of this country will do it for us.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thought the gentleman gave a really clear sense of what the challenge is and what we face today.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, coming behind the gentleman from Mississippi, we have someone who knows a little bit about weaponry. She herself has a background. She was the police chief in Orlando. And since she and I are in the same class, I have learned a lot from her.

□ 2015

And coming behind the gentleman from Mississippi, who laid some things out here, is someone who has run a police department, and she couldn't be a better person for us to have come. I yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), from the 10th District.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an all-too-familiar topic, and that is gun violence in America, mass shootings in the United States of America.

A few days ago, I purchased a card of sympathy for the family of a young man who died way too soon. The card that I finally chose read: "I hardly know what to say."

When I think about yet another mass shooting in a country where, through ingenuity and determination, we have solved some of the world's toughest problems and challenges but yet we have chosen to do nothing about mass shootings, I hardly know what to say.

Mr. Speaker, you know last week a man used a semiautomatic rifle to brutally murder 17 children and educators in Parkland, Florida. Unlike past shootings, we have not just moved on. This is because of the survivors—not our generation doing something, but the children. It is because of them.

You see, this generation believes that they can change the world. I mean, isn't that exactly what we as parents taught them, that they can change the world? They believe in what President Obama called the audacity of hope. Not our generation, but the generation of our children and grandchildren.

And they have stood up to declare what should be obvious to all of us: that every American should have the right to go to school, to go to church, to go to a mall, to go to a movie theater or a nightclub without being brutally murdered by someone with a gun, no less an assault rifle, which greatly diminishes their chances of survival.

Sure, high school is tough for some children, but the worst our children

should have to fear is whether they can make a friend in a new school or whether they will make the track team or whether the boy or girl they like will notice them in the hallway or in class.

150,000 American children have experienced a school shooting. That is not something a great society tolerates. That is something we change.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the strength, the courage, and the passion of these young people in Florida. Not our generation, but the teenagers. And I am also proud of previous survivors and activists who laid the groundwork for the movement that is growing across America.

Survivors of the Pulse nightclub shooting have joined Parkland survivors to work for change. That shooting, which took place in my congressional district, was the second worst mass shooting in U.S. history, after Las Vegas.

That is not the only mass shooting to torment Florida. In 2017, a man shot and killed five people at the Ft. Lauderdale airport. In 2013, a man shot and killed six people at an apartment complex in Miami-Dade County. In 1990, a man shot and killed nine people in Jacksonville. According to the Gun Violence Archive, there have been at least 113 mass shootings, defined as four or more persons injured or killed, in Florida since 2013.

Instead of simply waiting and responding to mass shootings, we should work to prevent them. We should work to prevent them. We should work to prevent them.

As Orlando, Florida's, former chief of police, my goal was to not merely save lives of those who experienced violence, but we tried to stop the violence from occurring in the first place. When we know better, we are supposed to do better.

Some proposals may need more debate, some less, but let us have that debate.

As a former law enforcement officer, our job was to enforce the laws and to protect the innocent. As a Member of Congress, our job is to create laws that protect the innocent. Well, Congress is failing at that job.

The best gift, Mr. Speaker, we can give to our teachers and our students and to every American is to pass legislation that keeps deadly guns out of the hands of bad people. Thoughts and prayers are good. God will order our steps, but we have to move our feet.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague from Florida a question, since she talked about her law enforcement background. And she is correct, Congress is to make laws.

This Presidential administration talks about being law and order. Is he really law and order and on the side of the police if this is happening and running amok? I mean, if you were police

chief and you had that responsibility of protecting people—and we in Congress, as was stated by the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the moments of silence. If you were on the front line again, you were out there, and you still know a lot of the people who are part of the police departments, how do you think the police departments feel when they are outgunned and the challenges that they have? Can you talk a little bit about that?

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of my biggest fears as a 27-year law enforcement officer was that my officers, the officers who worked for me, the officers who swore that they would protect and serve, would find themselves in an active shooter situation where they would be outgunned.

As I indicated earlier, the AR-15 and other weapons like it, if you are shot with one, your chances of survival are greatly diminished. As my colleague from Mississippi indicated earlier, the weapon is designed to create mass devastation. It was designed for the battlefield.

And you are right; on the battlefield, we want our soldiers to take the enemy down as quickly as possible. But those weapons were not designed for our streets, for our neighborhoods where our children play, for our schools. If we are a great society, if we want to be the great Nation that we always talk about, then let's do what is within our power as one of the most powerful bodies in the world.

My 5-year-old granddaughter's kindergarten class had a moment of silence. I believe, as Members of Congress, we can do better than that.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I have someone who, when I came here, I said I have to meet her. She is a very dynamic person. She is the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the 13th Congressional District of California, and I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman EVANS for his tremendous leadership and his friendship, and I thank him for hosting this very important Special Order hour. His leadership in our caucus to fight the epidemic of gun violence in America is bold, it is visionary, and I thank him for calling us together tonight.

Mr. Speaker, let me also just acknowledge my sister and colleague Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY, who spoke earlier. Congresswoman KELLY chairs our Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, and she continues to demand that gun violence be treated as the public health crisis that it is.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to say enough is enough. The epidemic of gun violence in America must be brought to an end.

Two weeks ago, the world stood in shock as yet another gunman mas-

sacred innocent students and teachers in an American school. The 19-year-old killer legally purchased an AR-15 assault rifle and killed 17 students at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

My heart goes out to the victims, their classmates, families, and the entire Parkland community. We must take action so that this never happens again. Newtown, Aurora, Charleston, Orlando, Las Vegas, and now Parkland, this is not normal in a civilized society.

The United States of America is the only developed nation that experiences mass shootings with this level of frequency. This doesn't happen anywhere else in the world. Of course, we know it is because the National Rifle Association can't buy their votes in other countries, and the children's lives come first.

Speaker RYAN and the Republicans in Congress have been bought by the National Rifle Association, making it easier for mass shootings to occur.

Let me just say that mass shootings in public schools, unfortunately, are just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to gun violence in America. Our communities, especially our urban communities, are war zones.

On an average day, 93 innocent lives in America are cut short due to gun violence. This year alone, there have been over 8,200 incidents of gun violence in America, including 24 mass shootings. These senseless acts of violence have taken more than 2,200 lives already.

I represent the 13th Congressional District of California in the bay area, which includes the city of Oakland, which has been brutalized by gun violence. Since 2014, 312 of my constituents have had their lives cut short by gun violence. Our community feels their loss every single day. Here are just a few of their names and tragic stories.

Davon Ellis: Davon was a star football player and an excellent student at Oakland Tech High School. He was shot and killed while walking home from school. My nephew was walking with him when he was gunned down.

Travon Godfrey: Travon was killed in 2016 while sitting in a car with his friends in front of his home. Every time I think about Travon, my heart breaks. Travon came to a town meeting that I held on gun violence in January of 2016.

He was worried about coming to that town meeting, and he shared the toll that gun violence had taken on his life and that of his friends' lives, yet he was determined to make a difference and finish school and go on to college. Less than a year later, on November 28 in 2016, Travon and his lifelong friend, Deante Miller, were shot and killed in broad daylight.

Anibal Andres Ramirez: Anibal was Oakland's youngest gun victim in 2017.

He was only 13 years old and was shot outside of a community center.

Francisca Martinez Ramirez: She was one of Oakland's first homicide victims in 2018, killed by her husband during a domestic dispute.

Sadly, these heartbreaking stories are all too familiar in communities across the country. More than 30,000 Americans lose their lives to gun violence each year. Shootings now kill as many Americans as car accidents.

Last year, there were 77 gun violence homicides in my home city of Oakland.

□ 2030

Already this year there have been 12. This is only February, Mr. Speaker. How much bloodshed will we see this year?

We need action and we need it now. We need to pass, of course, the bipartisan King-Thompson legislation that strengthens background checks and keeps guns out of the wrong hands. And, yes, we need to reinstitute a ban on assault weapons to get these weapons of war out of our communities. We need to close the gun show loophole once and for all.

Passing our assistant leader Congressman CLYBURN's legislation to close the 3-day loophole to require background checks to be completed before you can buy a gun, that legislation is long overdue. That is common sense.

At some point we have to stand up and say enough is enough and stand up to this NRA. Ninety-seven percent of Americans support some kind of gun violence prevention legislation.

So that is why I am standing here tonight with my colleagues from the CBC demanding that the Speaker take action and bring commonsense gun legislation to the floor for a vote.

Give us a vote, Speaker RYAN, give us a vote.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I think showing those pictures, if anything, should get our point across. I hope that those pictures will send a message to all of us.

Closing out tonight—and I think all our colleagues really just summed up this gun violence issue—is someone who, again, I have known well and admired, the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE from the 18th District of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for his leadership. I am delighted to join the Congressional Black Caucus this evening under the leadership of Chairman RICHMOND.

As my colleagues have said, we have been, sadly, a leader on commonsense gun safety legislation, sadly, because many of our districts, although we represent the huge numbers of diverse Americans—our districts represent Anglos, African Americans, Hispanics,

and Asians, and all economic backgrounds, all wealth backgrounds, all backgrounds dealing with religion—we are able to speak because many of our districts have the reality of gun violence.

So I want to speak, Mr. Speaker, to a particular point that I have heard from the stander-uppers of the NRA, particularly the president and CEO when he spoke to the conservative organization just this past week. I was certainly shocked to hear accusations about Democrats are socialists, even to the extent of calling out Members' names, which I think patently rejects the comity and collegiality of recognizing democracy accepts two distinct parties and some other parties and respects differences of opinion.

But let me be very clear on the record. No one Member of this body, nor the distinguished gentleman, can eliminate the Second Amendment. No group of 20 Members of Congress, no Republicans of Congress and no Democrats of Congress, can eliminate the Second Amendment.

The Second Amendment is a constitutional amendment, and there is a decided practice of a percentage of Members of Congress and the percentage of Members of 50 States. With that in mind, let us clear the air. But if we want to know the truth, what is being fought is gun safety legislation, not gun eradication.

In my State, you cannot rent a car if you are not 21. The Federal law says that you cannot buy a gun if you are not 21. I will be introducing legislation to raise the age of 21. I already have legislation, a 7-day waiting period banning bump stocks, and, of course, dealing with automatic weapons. I know we are introducing one now.

There are a multitude of introductions of bills and a multitude of decisions being made by the Florida delegation which we should listen to. I hope they will come forward in a bipartisan way.

But let me talk about the children and parents. I was on the air today talking—or hearing that parents are hovering and scared of sending their children to school, and the children are scared. This last week I went into my schools where children were not only talking about not arming teachers, but the gunfire in their neighborhoods by handguns, or those who were in schools dealing with children who had steered in the wrong direction. Those children were talking about you got to pack. Gun culture doesn't realize what we are turning our children into that they have got to pack.

So from Las Vegas to Orlando, to Virginia, to Sandy Hook, to San Bernardino, to now Douglas High School, the question is: When are we going to act?

An average of 1,297 children die annually from a gun-related injury. A ma-

jority of Americans now support gun policy proposals, such as barring people with mental illness from buying guns. But let me make it very clear. I don't label people who suffer from mental health issues. What I say is: Let us provide the resources for those individuals and clearly between mistakes of reporting what this young man had indicated, to mistakes on the local and Federal level, to mistakes on his mental health situation. We all can stand in blame. But they are adults.

What the response has been from our good friends who are the gun advocates, so they say, has been to close their eyes, close their ears, and not sit down at the table of reconciliation. The gun manufacturers cannot continue to dominate the discussion of sensible gun legislation, from Gabby Giffords to the tragedies that I have listed, to children who are saying: I hover in my room, my bedroom, listening to gunfire in my neighborhood because the proliferation of guns is so extensive.

So guns are being trafficked illegally because of the gun culture. There are many elements that will go into this. The Congressional Black Caucus has been at the forefront of changing that gun culture, as Congresswoman KELLY has preached about, because of what happened in Chicago. I join her because what happens in our neighborhood is that our children are cowering over gun violence, period.

No, arming our teachers is not the answer. Securing our school is; banning those weapons of war is; extending the timeframe is; lifting the age is; and getting the background checks to close the loopholes is.

So I am asking this floor and this leadership, as we are doing good legislation on human trafficking, of which I will participate in tomorrow, that we put on the floor legislation of gun safety.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership tonight.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are no words in the English language to fully capture the pain and suffering that a parent will endure in the face of losing a child. Imagine then the immense pain that the families of the 17 Americans who were murdered during a mass shooting at the Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida must be experiencing at this moment. Even worse, imagine how they must feel as our nation remains crippled by inaction in the wake of the senseless gun violence that continues to tear apart countless families and communities throughout our country. That is our reality today as Congress fails to act, once again, on commonsense legislation to reduce gun violence.

We cannot allow the violence that we have witnessed at the Stoneman Douglas High School to become our new norm. More importantly, we cannot allow our inaction in the face of such tragic violence to also define what we

can and cannot accept as a society. We are all too familiar with gun violence in the United States. There have already been over 8,200 incidents of gun violence in 2018 alone. This violence has claimed the lives of 2,200 individuals, upending the lives of countless friends and families who are impacted by these deaths. I am here to join my colleagues and countless Americans across our nation by declaring in one voice, "Enough is enough."

Our children deserve the right to an education without a cloud of fear in their hearts and the sound of gunshots ringing in their ears. The people of the United States deserve representation that works in the face of senseless violence to deliver real solutions that work for millions of Americans. We need solutions that include stronger background checks, while also providing the resources for states to contribute complete and timely records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). We need solutions that reduce the proliferation of assault weapons on our streets, including high-capacity magazines, flash suppressors, and other accessories that enhance the lethality of firearms. More importantly, we need everyone to come to the table in a meaningful way that is not driven by fear or emotion so that we can deliver on the promises that we made when we took the oath of office.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling for action. I am calling for action that is already long overdue, and I call for others to find the compassion in their hearts to also get this done. I call for the courage to make the difficult choices that we finally need to make. Our failure to act now is a failure of our leaders to do what is right, notwithstanding political affiliation or preference. I am calling for action and I am calling for action now. Enough is enough.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to find the courage to take action and eradicate gun violence in America.

While our children and families demand a vote on commonsense legislation to keep our communities safe, my Republican colleagues continue to turn their backs.

Since the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary, the House has observed 42 moments of silence—tonight makes 43—to honor victims of gun violence, but no meaningful action has been taken to strengthen our gun laws. After every mass shooting we offer our thoughts and prayers to the victims, their families, and first responders. Our thoughts and prayers are not enough. A moment of silence is not enough.

In the past decade, more than one million Americans have been shot. Every day, on average at least 35 Americans are killed with a gun and nearly 33,000 die each year from gun-related violence.

In my home state of Ohio, someone is killed with a gun every eight hours. This is unacceptable. There are no moments of silence on the House Floor for these victims, and Congress is doing nothing to protect the next victim.

The White House and the National Rifle Association claim mental illness is to blame for this latest tragedy at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, and that arming teachers will keep our children safe. Republicans cannot claim that mental illness is

to blame, when they simultaneously cut funding for mental health treatment, undermine American's health insurance, and strip schools of resources needed to employ guidance counselors, social workers and/or more teachers to reduce class sizes and give students more individual attention.

The NRA claims any sensible action to strengthen our gun laws is an attack on the 2nd Amendment and the rights of gun owners. Nothing could be further from the truth. Democrats and Republicans must work together on meaningful reform to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, domestic abusers, and individuals in crisis.

Recent polls show that 97 percent of gun owners approve of background checks for all gun purchases, including those made at gun shows and through private sales. According to the Pew Research Center, 33 percent of gun owners oppose the NRA's prescription to make schools safer by arming teachers.

As I've said before, all citizens have a right to basic safety and life itself. Our families should not fear the possible massacre of their children in school or on playgrounds. Everyone should be able to go to a concert or place of worship and not confront a shooter armed with high capacity ammunition magazines and a weapon of mass destruction. It is up to all of us to protect our communities, schools, workplaces, and places of worship from senseless gun violence.

I have been encouraged by the courageous young people speaking out and taking action to effect change. I hope my Republican colleagues are listening.

Every day Congress fails to strengthen our gun laws, we are complicit in the violence that takes place in our nation. We can and must do more to end gun violence.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the issue of gun violence in America.

This Valentine's Day, February 14, 2018, marked the thirtieth mass shooting in our country this year, when a mentally unstable 19-year-old opened fire on Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida with an AR-15 military style weapon, killing 17 individuals and injuring 15 others.

We extend our deepest sympathies to all those affected by this tragedy and recognize the skill and heroism of the law enforcement officers and first responders who came to the aid of others.

We commend the efforts of those who are working to care for the injured and investigate this horrific incident.

We extend our heartfelt condolences and prayers to the families of the fallen, and to all those affected in the community of Parkland, Florida and in the United States.

The horrifying events in Parkland mark the 378th mass shooting in the U.S. since 2017, and the 30th this year, according to Gun Violence Archive.

Mass shootings are a near daily occurrence in America, but what happened in Las Vegas on October 1, 2017 stands out: It was the deadliest such incident in U.S. history, with more than 58 killed and 515 injured.

A mass shooting is defined by Gun Violence Archive as any incident in which four or more are shot and/or killed in a single event, at the same general time and location not including the shooter.

Recent U.S. mass shootings include:
Las Vegas, 2017: 58 killed; 515 wounded
Orlando, 2016: 50 killed
Virginia Tech, 2007: 32 killed
Sandy Hook, 2012: 27 killed
San Ysidro, 1984: 21 killed
San Bernadino, 2015: 14 killed
Edmond, 1986: 14 killed
Fort Hood, 2009: 13 killed
Columbine, 1999: 13 killed
Charleston, 2015: 9 killed

There were more than 11,600 deaths linked to gun violence in 2017, which is roughly equivalent to nearly four 9/11 attacks in terms of the total number killed on September 11, 2001.

Comparatively, more than 15 thousand were killed by gun violence in 2016, and there were 383 mass shootings.

It is horrifying to admit that gun violence now seems to be a staple of American life.

The United States ranks No. 1 in the world in terms of firearms per capita—with 88.8 guns per 100 people—and it has the highest homicide-by-firearm rate in the developed world.

The problem is so endemic that gun violence is now the third leading cause of death for children in the U.S.

An average of 1,297 children die annually from gun-related injuries.

Guns are linked to roughly 33 thousand deaths in the U.S. per year; about two-thirds of them are suicides.

According to Pew Research Center, a majority of Americans (across partisan lines) support gun policy proposals such as barring people with mental illnesses from buying guns; prohibiting gun purchases by people on federal no-fly or watch lists; and background checks for private gun sales and sales at gun shows.

America has six times as many firearm homicides as Canada, and nearly 16 times as many as Germany.

United Nations data shows that America far and away leads other developed countries when it comes to gun-related homicides.

America has 4.4 percent of the world's population, but almost half of the civilian-owned guns around the world.

In December 2012, a gunman walked into Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, and killed 20 children, six adults, and himself.

Since then, there have been at least 1,518 mass shootings, with at least 1,715 people killed and 6,089 wounded.

The fairly broad definition of "mass shooting" includes not only shootings in which four or more people were murdered, but shootings in which four or more people were shot at all (excluding the shooter).

Even under this broad definition, mass shootings make up a tiny portion of America's firearm deaths, which totaled more than 33,000 in 2014.

On average, there is more than one mass shooting for each day in America.

Whenever a mass shooting occurs, supporters of gun rights often argue that it is inappropriate to bring up political debates about gun control in the aftermath of a tragedy.

For example, former Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal, a strong supporter of gun rights,

criticized former President Barack Obama for “trying to score cheap political points” when Obama mentioned gun control after a mass shooting in Charleston, South Carolina.

But if this argument is followed to its logical end, then it will never be the right time to discuss mass shootings.

Under the broader definition of mass shootings, America has nearly one mass shooting a day.

So if Congress is forced to wait for a time when there is not a mass shooting to talk gun control, Congress could find itself waiting for a very long time.

The time for responding to mass shootings with thoughts and prayers has long since passed.

The time for responding with effective legislation is now.

I have called upon this Administration to secure the passage of H.R. 4268, the “Gun Safety Not Sorry Act,” legislation I have introduced that would impose a 7-day waiting, or “cooling off,” period prior to the purchase or transfer of ownership of a semiautomatic firearm, silencers, armor piercing ammunition, or large capacity ammunition magazines.

According to Newsweek, the “Gun Safety Not Sorry Act” is the No. 1 legislative proposal that Congress can and should pass right now.

The majority must cut its close ties to the powerful gun lobby to facilitate useful gun control legislation necessary immediately.

The “Gun Safety Not Sorry Act” will not abridge the Second Amendment, it will not take away gun rights, and it does not impose greater restrictions on gun ownership—it will not stop all mass shootings but it will certainly help.

In the wake of the horrific Valentine’s Day mass shooting in Parkland, Florida, the emboldened survivors of the high school shooting are calling for immediate gun reform.

States with tighter gun control laws have fewer gun-related deaths.

I will soon introduce legislation to keep our children safe from mass shootings: the “No More Atrocities with Guns Act” (No MAGA Act) raises the minimum age from 18 to 21 for a person to purchase or possess semi-automatic assault weapons.

Teenagers, whose brains are not yet fully developed should not yet be entrusted with a weapon that is designed to inflict maximum damage in minimum time.

Americans cannot understand how it is legally possible for a 19-year-old mentally unstable person to purchase such a highly lethal weapon such as the AR-15 assault rifle and then use that weapon to slaughter 17 high school students.

Although Americans say they want to protect the right to bear arms, they are very much supportive of many gun policy proposals—including some fairly contentious ideas, such as more background checks on private and gun show sales and banning semi-automatic and assault-style weapons.

Mass shootings occur more frequently in states that do not require background checks for all gun sales.

Analyses of mass shootings in the United States between 2009 and 2015 document that the majority of mass shootings occur in venues where the carrying of a firearm is not restricted.

In states that require background checks for all handgun sales, including guns offered in unlicensed sales online and at gun shows, there are 52 percent fewer mass shootings.

Congress must take action to prevent other incidents such as the recent act of terror and hatred in Parkland, Florida that resulted in the tragic loss of 17 innocent lives.

There have been 32 moments of silence observed on the House Floor related to Gun Violence since 2012.

The time for moments of silence has long since passed.

The American people are demanding moments of action.

I pledge to continue to work to reduce gun violence and prevent mass shootings.

THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material germane to the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am here with Mrs. WALTERS from California, who is the co-chair of the Tax Truth Squad. This has been an exciting first 14 months for me serving Michigan’s 10th Congressional District. I had the privilege of representing the freshman class in House leadership.

Tax cuts and tax reform are important to me, as I grew up the oldest of seven kids in a family in which dad built trucks in a line and my mom worked full time more often than not to support our family. I saw firsthand the difficulties experienced to make ends meet and support that family. That is why I am committed to ensuring policies that create jobs, economic growth, and wages in the pockets of people who go to work every day and get a paycheck.

Until last December, it seemed to be only a dream that we could achieve meaningful tax cuts and reform. It had been more than 30 years since that had been updated. Since that time, layers of rules and new additions to the Tax Code had grown that into a beast of 74,000 pages. You would have to be a wizard to know what was in it.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act addressed these problems and put more money in the pockets of hardworking Americans so they can make decisions about how to use their own money.

Up until now we have talked about the possibilities and the dream of tax cuts and reform. Now we can talk

about the realities of what tax reform is bringing to America.

Representative WALTERS and I have organized a series of floor speeches that begin tonight a little later than originally planned. Each legislative week we have designated one or more States’ delegations that will join us and talk about tax reform, tax cuts, and the impact it is having on their constituents and their districts.

Texas is kicking off that initiative tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS), who is the co-chair of the Tax Truth Squad.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and for his efforts to share the stories of Americans who are seeing the positive impacts of tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to set the record straight on the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. From day one, misinformation about the benefits of this historic tax reform plan have circulated. The truth is that Americans across the country are receiving bonuses, pay increases, and other benefits that are helping them support their families and save for their futures.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan and I started the Truth Tellers Initiative on Tax Reform to highlight the many ways this bill helps the American people.

Since December, we have witnessed the positive impacts of tax reform. Small businesses are expanding, jobs are being created, retirement and benefit packages are increasing in value, and the American people are keeping more of their hard-earned paychecks.

Over the coming months, Representatives from each State will have the opportunity to share how tax reform has helped their constituents.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, as we go through the evening, I will try to highlight some important components of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

I think one of the most important components is the larger standard deduction. We have doubled the standard deduction from \$12,000 to \$24,000 for married couples. We created a simpler filing process. What we created was, in essence, a filing process where 90 percent of Americans can file their taxes on a form about this size, significantly better than the current Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), who is a good friend, a colleague, and the gentleman who led us through the whole battle to achieve this epic change. Congressman KEVIN BRADY is the author of the legislation and a true champion for American taxpayers. He is the Representative of the Eighth District of Texas and the chairperson of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MITCHELL and Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS for arranging this Special Order to highlight the benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I am excited to be joined by our Texas colleagues.

Texas is a big winner, like many States, because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. They estimate it will create 81,000 new, good-paying jobs in our State alone. But that is not just our State. You see huge job gains in California, New York, throughout the Southern States, throughout our Midwest area, and throughout our manufacturing regions.

This historic tax reform is making a real difference for our families and our workers. We all know about tax relief for our small businesses, the first ever 20 percent small business deduction in history. The bill will be a write-off on day one in new investment in plants, equipment, software, and technology.

People know that we made our companies more competitive so they can compete and win all around the world, especially here at home.

I get excited about what we did for families, lowering the tax rates at every level. So whether you made \$20,000 or \$520,000, you keep more of what you earn. We doubled the standard deduction so few people have to itemize. We doubled the child credit and quadrupled how many Americans can actually use it. For the first time, all middle class Americans are going to get help raising children. We are doing away with the AMT except for households up to \$1 million. What that means next year is, instead of 5 million Americans getting caught up with that double tax, it is about 200,000, a fraction of what it is today.

What I really love are the stories. I was in Home Depot the other day, on Sunday. Apparently, we are redoing our bathroom. So my wife was looking at samples, and a woman came up and introduced herself. Her name is Pam. She is a small-business person. She redoes furniture, repaints, and all that, but she works at Home Depot to make ends meet. She introduced herself and said:

Thank you. I get \$184 more every paycheck. Maybe that couple thousand dollars doesn't mean much in Washington, but for my family, it really means a lot. Thank you for that.

Donald from Willis, Texas, saw the benefits of this law in his pay stub. He said:

My Federal tax deducted from my paycheck went from 12 to 9 percent. Yes, I am very happy.

Mr. Speaker, because of tax reform, Texans are excited for a strong and growing economy.

Larry from Spring, Texas, said:

As a 78-year-old retiree working part time, even a small difference in take-home pay is welcome. I am delighted to see the spur to

overall economic activity that should benefit all, locally and nationally.

□ 2045

Every day, I hear stories like this: people receiving raises and bigger benefits at work. And we did, simply, the Code. As Congressman MITCHELL pointed out, under the new Tax Code, next year, nearly 90 percent of Americans will be able to file their taxes using a simple postcard-style system. That is fairness. That is growth. That is increasing jobs and paychecks.

I want to thank my colleagues from Texas joining us here tonight for their critical role in passing this historic Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Without this support, it wouldn't have happened.

I also thank Congressman MITCHELL and Congresswoman WALTERS for arranging this Special Order and continuing, as they did during the debates, informing people of the tax reform plan. I thank them for playing such a leadership role.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BRADY for his leadership on this issue. He talked a little bit of the impact it has had on his district in Texas. Here, we have a sign. Since the tax reform bill passed, more than 400 companies have given a pay raise, a bonus, increased 401(k) contributions, or, in the case of utilities, lowered their rates.

At least 4 million Americans are receiving special tax reform bonuses. The direct bonus announcements already, to date, exceed \$3 billion. There are companies like JetBlue, KeyBank, and DTE Energy in my district back home, Alaska Airlines. We could go through the list. Four hundred companies have already announced major changes and major investments. These have a major impact throughout the country and on our constituents.

Next, we are going to hear from another colleague and a good friend. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Representative from the 25th District of Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who has consistently been a voice of businessowners throughout his district and America through his work on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to talk about how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is benefiting Texas, especially folks in the 25th Congressional District that I represent.

There are approximately 28 million people lucky enough to call themselves Texans. Of that, I have the great honor of representing hundreds of thousands of hardworking Americans who wake up and go to work every day, just like you and me.

For 5 years, I have traveled up and down the 25th District of Texas, most recently, just last week, where I visited many local businesses along the way. I have witnessed firsthand the hardships that families and small businesses face

day in and day out due to an intrusive Federal Government and overreaching administration.

I pledged to these people that I would bring my commonsense business perspective to Washington in order to jump-start this economy, and I am proud to say that I upheld that promise.

When I visited these folks last week, there was something different about them. For the first time in a long time, I had businessowners and their employees telling me about the positive impacts coming from our Nation's Tax Code. They were telling me they noticed more money in their most recent paychecks. One man even told me he plans to use his extra money to put into his 401(k) so that he can save even more for his retirement.

This means parents can now plan for their future and start putting away money for their kids' college funds. It means companies are adding to their workforce and that those individuals can keep more money in their pockets.

Ultimately, these hardworking Texans are seeing more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks. I am proud to be their voice in Washington, and I will continue fighting on their behalf.

In God we trust.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues on the floor, as we worked toward passing this epic reform, talked about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act as being Armageddon, as being the end of the world. Let's talk a little about that.

On CNBC on February 20, they had a survey: Q1 Small Business Confidence Index saw an increase of 5 points. Forty-six percent of those surveyed say tax policy changes will have a positive effect on their business, up from 38 percent in the fourth quarter. The number of those same tax policy changes that have a negative impact fell sharply to 23 percent. Only one in three respondents expect to receive a tax cut. The independent Tax Policy Center estimates that four out of five Americans will actually see a tax cut at the end of the year.

Not quite the Armageddon some of our colleagues predicted.

We are now going to hear from another colleague. Representing Texas' 22nd District and a vocal advocate for a simpler and fairer Tax Code, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, my friend from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), and his cohost, Mrs. WALTERS of California, for this first Special Order of the Tax Reform Truth Squad.

We are thrilled that Texans have the first chance to speak on such an important issue. Texans love to brag about Texas, and that is what we will do tonight. That is what I will do.

I want to brag about two stories from home and two faces from home. The

first face is Justin Mannino. He runs the Houston Shoe Hospital in my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas. It is right there at the corner of Williams Trace and State Highway 6. For 10 years, I have taken my boots to be shined at that store.

I have talked to Justin about what the Tax Code and the cuts will do for his business. He said:

It is simple. More money in my pocket means I will pay off all my credit cards and all our debt.

But most importantly, Justin met his bride in Mexico. They were married there. With all this new money he has because of our tax cuts, he plans to take his two kids to the same church where they were married to baptize them in the Lord, Jesus Christ. That is priceless. That has happened because of these tax cuts.

A second story and face that comes to mind is a dear friend, Andres Novoa. He is the owner of a Fort Bend County icon, La Cocina Mexican Restaurant, right there off of Highway 357.

He told me that the biggest benefit to his business is that he can pay his employees more—more money in their pockets. He can expand his business. He can get new equipment. He said the last 4 years of high taxes and the exploding regulations have caused a small retraction in his business. He is now in full expansion mode. He is giving his employees more pay and has plans right now to buy more equipment.

And there is more.

Andres is the heart and soul of an annual fundraiser for seniors' Meals on Wheels in Fort Bend County. Every Cinco de Mayo, when Mexico celebrates their independence from France, he has a fundraiser at La Cocina. Last year, he raised over \$60,000. With more money in his pocket, he thinks he can have a bigger party and maybe raise \$100,000, or maybe purchase a new van to deliver food.

This is a picture of Andres. He is smiling because he was talking with us about those amazing tax cuts. He is just one more picture.

I invite America to check out Justin's and Andres' story at my website, my Facebook page, or on Twitter. Hear their voices. See them speak. Learn what they have learned.

I will close with a request from Justin and Andres. They want me to say thank you to President Donald Trump and thank you to every Member of Congress who voted for this bill.

This bill is not about crumbs. This bill is about real money in real people's pockets. I invite everyone to come down to Houston, Texas, in Sugar Land, and get your boots shined at Houston Shoe Hospital. If you have some time, add another belt buckle, because you will get filled up at Andres' restaurant, La Cocina.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us.

We were talking about some of the improvements in people's lives that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has created. Over the weekend, I received a message from one of my constituents, Mark. I know him. He and his wife work hard. They don't make a lot of money.

But I got a nice note saying: Thank you so much. They met with their accountant about this year's taxes and projected next year. He said they will have another \$2,700 a year in their pocket that they will have to make decisions about fixing their house or maybe taking a little vacation up north.

These are the things the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a good friend of mine who has been an instrumental Member in bringing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to the House floor. His work on behalf of the 32nd District of Texas and all Americans has certainly been recognized. He is also chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I join to talk and to thank the leadership of the Republican Party, who made a firm decision during the last elections that our party needed to stand for not only making America great again, but every single American who needed an opportunity to join in that endeavor.

Tonight, I stand in this beautiful time that we discuss the tax bill that Republicans passed last year and talk about the effects of it and how much it has helped in America.

I think a story needs to be told about what the goal of the tax bill was. Why did Republicans work so hard to move these ideas forward?

The bottom line to it is Americans watched as the Democratic Party and President Obama not only had their control of the country, but economically, as the policies of the Democratic Party became more apparent to people, Americans and the world watched as America dwindled in economic activity and economic growth.

This took place because of the policies that the President, President Obama at the time, brought forth and Congress passed: trillion-dollar spending plans, trillion-dollar increases in the budget, and talk of raising taxes another trillion dollars.

What happened is, for some 8 years, there was GDP growth of about 1.2 percent. Mr. Speaker, that means, very plainly, that it would take about 70 years to double the size of our economy, which means that communities and States and companies and individuals lag behind as they would watch other cities and other countries and other people around the globe not only have economic activity, but opportunities that came to their doorsteps. IPOs, or initial public offerings, and all the acronyms that go with economic

growth and development went overseas; they went other places.

So Republicans began this discussion with the American people going into 2010 that said: We need to be careful about government spending, but, on the same side, what we need to do is to grow our economy. That is exactly the discussion that took place during the last Presidential election.

So as soon as the election was over, Republicans began the process of not only making America great again, but doing it by empowering every single State and every single American to be a part of this growth. Essentially, there was a look at some \$12 trillion worth of economic tax components.

KEVIN BRADY, who is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, from Houston, Texas—actually, Spring, Texas—was in charge, as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, of looking at how we were going to move our economy forward. I call that pop.

How we were going to take economic activity and, instead of perhaps helping an individual or a company or necessarily one particular part of the economy, we wanted where it would go and add pop or generationally develop more economic activity than just for a singular entity.

□ 2100

And KEVIN BRADY, as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, looked at some \$5.6 trillion out of this \$12 trillion and said: We need to take that and make that the engine of the economy.

So a decision was made to move that directly to the free enterprise system. Mr. Speaker, it is the free enterprise system that stands as the greatest activity for freedom in the world, an activity that not only brings opportunity and investment and entrepreneurship, but more than that, wealth. It has brought wealth to the United States of America, a free enterprise system that is there to produce for anyone that chooses to be participatory in that environment—an opportunity to begin by investing your own money, by hard work where you show up at work, and having customers or consumers that go and generate economic activity, and that is what America has been, and that is what we were slowing down.

The engine of that economy was slowed down because our predecessors, not only in the Presidency but also our friends who are Democrats, believed that they would engage the free enterprise system in such a way that did not allow it to grow, did not allow it to expand, and did not allow itself to build.

So what KEVIN BRADY did, as chairman of the Ways and Means, was propose a tax bill that would take \$5.6 trillion worth of tax components and move it directly to the free enterprise system. By moving it to the free enterprise system, we reduced taxes. We reduced taxes from the 37 percent range for corporate down to 21 percent.

What does that do? Well, that takes America, an American business as seen by the world, from 24th in the world to number one. So instead of us being what might be on a list of 24th place of easy-to-do business, that was generating not only goods and services, but was the ease of doing business with, that people wanted to be a part of, that has taken us to first in the world.

That means that America will begin building back not only jobs and job creation, but it will build back with the intellectual capacity to build the newest, finest ideas and products that the world needs for tomorrow because America will be a place that is not only easy to do business but is less priced, and because we can be less priced, we can become the products of choice all around the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say: This is working. This is working to take America not only where they are in first place, but it means Americans and American companies can be in the same position.

As a Member of Congress from Dallas, Texas, I have an opportunity to see firsthand not only how this impacts people and companies but how it impacts the workers. And it wasn't but 2 weeks ago when I was at what was called the National Write Your Congressman, which is headquartered in Dallas, Texas. Randy Ford is their President; and Randy gave me good news. He said that of the small businesses that they had talked to, that they believed that 74 percent of small-business owners expected revenues to be higher in 2018, and even higher the next year, which meant that they felt positive about not only economic growth but, more importantly, their companies.

I also visited Texas Moving Company, which is a family owned business of some 40 years old that is in Richardson, Texas, and they told me, point-blank, that as a result of us making sure that we would reduce the cost of doing business by reducing taxes, that they had increased their driver's pay by over \$2,400.

That means that it does come directly to the employees that are able to have not only more take-home pay, but they are able to know that they can fall into more easily knowing that they may take a part-time job to a full-time job, a full-time job to a career, and a career as an opportunity to make sure that they better the lives of not only their family but their children also in their community.

And this is why Texas Moving Company made a decision then, as they saw this money that they would have; they made a determination that they would increase their employees by \$2,400, but they also increased their health insurance reimbursement to where they now pay \$3,484 a year to help their employees to pay more of their healthcare

costs because they can do that on a pretax basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is all these things that the Republican majority has done. When others said it would simply be crumbs or unimportant, we said we are going to focus on making America great again; and when you do that, you will find that you not only make America great, but you make Americans and their families greater also.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we, as Texans, stand up not only as proud Members of the Congress, but also as proud Americans who say: We want to make sure that everybody, no matter where they live in the United States, that they would be a part of making their city, their State, their company, and their family even stronger.

I appreciate Mr. MITCHELL allowing me to be here tonight. It is my hope that the discussion that we have with the American people and the Chair, Mr. Speaker, that you will recognize that if we are going to do this, it will mean that we are going to have to understand it is not up to government to make this work; it is up to the American people. We are giving them the tools in this tax bill, and I think they will do the right thing for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me this evening.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SESSIONS joining me tonight. As I said, along the way, we are going to highlight some aspects of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Real quickly, I want to outline that up to \$24,000 of a married couple's income is taxed zero. There is no tax on that. We continue to allow families to write off State and local taxes, up to \$10,000. We help families with children in taking care of their loved ones by doubling the child tax credit and preserving the child and dependent tax credit, while also preserving the adoption tax credit, all critical things to families and helping support families through the Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, I next yield to the Congressman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee with decades of experience in job creation and providing opportunity for economic growth.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Today, I rise with my fellow Texas colleagues to share some examples of how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is helping hardworking Texans and their families.

Our bold progrowth tax reform bill was signed into law just 67 days ago. Since then, more than 4 million Americans have seen some combination of a wage boost, a bonus, or enhanced employee benefits. Businesses with footprints in the 17th Congressional District, the district that I am honored to represent, such as Apple, Best Buy, Cognizant, CVS, FedEx, Home Depot, Lowe's, Starbucks, U-Haul, UPS,

Walmart, Waste Management, and Visa have passed on some of the savings that they are getting from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act on to their employees.

Additionally, we know that there are plenty of other small and large businesses in Texas that are doing the same. Another great example of the benefits to central Texas families is Oncor Electric, which serves about 3.4 million homes and businesses in Texas, including seven counties in the 17th Congressional District. They have agreed to return all of the tax cut benefits to their customers in the form of lower energy bills.

Now that Federal tax withholding tables have been updated to reflect the lower tax rates, many Texans are taking home bigger paychecks. In the 17th Congressional District, a typical working class family of four will see a tax cut of \$1,885. This very welcome influx of cash helped central Texans have a chance to save and a chance to get ahead.

I am also proud to represent a district that includes a significant footprint of Texas' best research institutions, including Texas A&M University, Baylor University, and the University of Texas at Austin.

Our new progrowth tax system provides support for graduate students by continuing to exempt the value of reduced and free tuition from taxes. This is something that I fought hard to preserve so that we can continue to have the best and brightest students as they educate and pursue important research initiatives in the 21st century and in the State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is doing exactly what we set out to do, which is to help create more jobs, bigger paychecks, and fairer taxes for hardworking American families. I thank the gentleman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL); and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, for leading this great discussion tonight on the positive changes that have been brought about through the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I look forward to learning more about, and sharing, these important success stories with the citizens from my district.

As I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country during these difficult times, for the families of the victims in Florida, the recent Florida shootings, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us at home.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I continue with the discussion of the impact to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act by introducing a colleague on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee

and the defender of a strong rural economy, representing the 36th District of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman BRIAN BABIN.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PAUL MITCHELL for this opportunity to talk about our historic tax cut legislation and the great benefits that are flowing to small businesses and the tens of millions of Americans who work for them.

This is especially true in the great State of Texas and the nine counties that I represent from Houston to the Louisiana State line, which has more petrochemical refining facilities than any district in the entire United States, and their employees benefitting from lower taxes. But the gains and the headlines that we have seen say so much more than that. The gains extend far beyond just employees benefitting from lower taxes. I am also hearing from hundreds of individuals and families about how their tax bills are being cut and what they plan to do with their larger paychecks.

ExxonMobil has announced a \$50 billion investment in its U.S. operations and employees over the next 5 years. Walmart has already boosted hourly wages and provided employees with a bonus. Boeing, Incorporated, has announced \$300 million in employee-related investments and charitable giving.

Let's break this down even further to the stories that aren't making the headlines of major papers but which are improving lives and growing businesses all across southeast Texas.

Juan and Leigh both owned small businesses in Houston and were able to hire additional employees with the money that they are saving from their tax cuts. That is putting Americans to work immediately.

Amy in Polk County shared with me that she was able to purchase new equipment to run her business much more efficiently. Helen in Tyler County took her tax savings and plowed it back into her business to help it grow. Julie in Orange shared that she will save enough from the tax cuts to purchase a larger inventory for her business.

Small businesses are the backbone of our economy, and I am hearing story after story just like this about small businesses growing and hiring our friends and our neighbors. The individual tax rate cuts are making a huge difference for east Texans as over 90 percent of Americans are getting a tax cut.

Robert from Highlands wrote to tell me that he is using his tax savings to help his daughter get a college degree. Alan in Houston has decided to put his tax cut into savings for his retirement. Ms. Drake is now able to buy a new stove, while Justin from Harris County is paying down credit card debt.

Scott is using his savings to help him buy a brand new home. Mr. Woods told me that with his tax savings, he is spending it on his wife. He may be the smartest of us all.

The tax cuts are even helping in Hurricane Harvey recovery. Judy from Orange County shared with me how the tax cuts have enabled her to replace household items destroyed by Hurricane Harvey, and Jason from Baytown is able to now repair his home.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is making a real difference in the lives of our friends and our neighbors in southeast Texas and all across this Nation.

□ 2115

These decisions add up to tens of billions of dollars of investments in our economy, in small businesses, in education, and in the improvement of our lives.

Tens of millions of Americans are seeing lower payroll deductions resulting in bigger paychecks, more retirement savings, bigger family budgets, and relief at every level. This tax cut bill is benefiting families, job creators, and our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan, Mr. PAUL MITCHELL, for giving us this opportunity to speak about this wonderful historic tax package.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BABIN for joining us this evening.

Congressman BABIN talked about the impact on small businesses. Many businesses in his district are what are called pass-throughs—they are family businesses. For the first time ever, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act provides the ability for small businesses to deduct 20 percent of their income and tax it at a much lower rate—at 25 percent—to allow those businesses to grow.

It also allows those businesses to immediately write off the full cost of new equipment, rather than expense it or amortize it over 7 years, because money out of their pocket now means it is real money out that they can't wait for 7 years to get back to the Tax Code—significant differences allowing businesses in my district and throughout the country to invest in growth.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my colleague representing the 14th District of Texas, with extensive real-world experience in the private sector through his own small business.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MITCHELL for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, the Texas delegation comes before the American people to say that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is working. It is making a positive impact on our paychecks and our lives. This bill is making a big difference—not just crumbs—it is making a big difference.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan once said: “. . . whenever we lower the tax

rates, our Nation is better off.” President Reagan was on to something.

Mr. Speaker, in just over 2 months—listen to these astounding statistics—in just over 2 months, 350 companies have announced more than \$3 billion worth of bonuses. That benefits over 4 million Americans. The success of this bill spans from coast to coast and across all industries, both large and small, and across Democrat and Republican, I might add, Mr. Speaker.

During the week, I hear the success of this bill as companies make their various announcements. Then, on the weekends, when I am back home and out in the district, I have people coming up to me, telling me about the great things this bill is doing for them, their families, and their businesses.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is making a big difference. Everyone has a story to share. Paychecks are bigger. There are more opportunities. Student loans don't seem as daunting. A new car seems within reach. Sports equipment for their children is reasonable. That family vacation they have been saving for now is on the verge of reality.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of small businesses in the 14th District of Texas. I used to be one of them, as Mr. MITCHELL alluded to. Those small businesses support the community in more ways than one.

One, in particular, in my district has announced benefits from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and that is Hawkins Lease Service in Alvin, Texas. Jay and Adrienne Hawkins are great friends, great business people, and great patriots. Jay let me know the other day that they recently gave each of their employees a \$1,000 bonus. Let me repeat that: it is \$1,000. If I remember correctly, Jay said they have 120 employees. Now—do the math—that is \$120,000 put back into this economy, Mr. Speaker. That is far from crumbs. If you ask me, that will make a huge difference.

ExxonMobil announced they were expanding their Permian Basin project. This expansion alone will create thousands of jobs, strengthen the economy, and bolster energy security, and national security, I might add. The Permian Basin is a bit of a drive away from us on the coast, but the increased production will provide low-cost supply and feedstocks to their operations throughout the State, including ExxonMobil's plant in our very own district, in Beaumont, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that there was something my dad taught me: if it ain't broke, don't fix it. I will tell you what, he also taught me: if it is broke, you better fix it, and fix it we did.

My hat is off to KEVIN BRADY—what a great job he did—also, to Mr. MITCHELL and Mrs. WALTERS for heading up this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY for shepherding this bill

through. We couldn't have done this without him. I also thank Congressman MITCHELL and Congresswoman WALTERS for hosting this tax reform Special Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), from the 19th District of Texas, who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), for hosting us and giving us the opportunity from the great State of Texas to talk about all of the positive effects of this recent tax reform and tax relief for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have helped pass this historic tax relief for the American people and deliver on a promise that we would grow this economy, we would create jobs, and we would improve the overall quality of life for all Americans. I represent hard-working, God-fearing, freedom-loving people in rural west Texas. They produce the food, fuel, and fiber for this great country. They feed and clothe the American people, and they fuel this great American economy.

The burden of high taxes and regulations hurt all of our job creators, but they have a disproportionate negative impact on the little guys in rural America. Our small businesses, our community banks, our family farmers and ranchers are independent energy producers. I can say with great confidence—having been back to the district, having talked to numerous people from all over those 29 counties I represent in the broad swath of land in west Texas—this tax cut and reform package is proenergy, it is proagriculture, and it is prorural America.

Back in my district, we hosted some roundtables with small businesses and chambers of commerce. We had various events that I participated in. We even conducted surveys. According to our survey, over 80 percent of the people I represent say that this tax reform package has helped everybody.

At one of our roundtable events, we had a veteran-owned agribusinessman who said that he had had 600 new customers this January over last year. He said that the effects of that was that he converted some of his part-time workers to full-time workers and gave folks a raise.

At the Happy State Bank, the employees are happy, and there are happy days for that organization because they are saving \$5 million and plowing it back into their human capital. Six hundred out of 700 of Happy State Bank employees will receive an increase in their pay and benefits. Some will receive over a 50 percent pay increase.

Now, this is not crumbs to the folks whom I represent in west Texas. This is real cash in the pockets of real Ameri-

cans who work hard every day to make ends meet.

There has been a change in west Texas, and, for once, it is not the weather. There is a renewed optimism. You can hear it in their voices; you can see it in their faces.

Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a great American comeback, and the formula hasn't changed from the beginning of this great experiment. Limit the government and you will unleash the limitless potential of the American people.

God bless America, and go west Texas.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ARRINGTON referenced some of the changes in Texas in some of the important improvements in the business climate as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Southwest Airlines and American Airlines both chose to give bonuses to their employees of \$1,000 each shortly after passage of this bill and signed by President Trump.

A surprise we hadn't anticipated was lowering electricity bills. Both in north Texas and in my district back in Michigan, there were massive cuts in utility rates as a result of lowering taxes—not something that we thought about or bargained for at the time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and thank him for bringing his medical expertise to the tax reform discussion with his service on the Energy and Commerce Committee, from the 26th District of Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

1986 was the last time our Tax Code was refined. I had been practicing medicine for 5 years. Now, some 31 years later and after 15 years in Congress, the reformation of our Tax Code has made a profound difference in our country.

Mr. Speaker, it is not lost on me that the rhetoric prior to the vote on the conference report on the tax bill was pretty negative. The idea was to sow doubt in the minds of people who would be affected by the tax bill, to sow doubt in the minds of people who would otherwise be wanting to vote for tax relief for tax improvement.

And I will have to tell you something: after that vote—and Mr. MITCHELL referenced Southwest Airlines and American Airlines—I cannot remember having ever had the positive feedback for a vote that I have taken here in this Congress like there was for this tax vote.

In my own Walmart, the week after Christmas, people were coming up to me saying, "I work for American Airlines," or "I work for Southwest Airlines." I have a lot of families in the 26th District of Texas who work for American Airlines or Southwest Airlines, and they all got \$1,000 bonuses

because of the tax relief that we had provided. Again, I cannot ever remember having that much positive reinforcement on a bill that, quite honestly, the rhetoric going into it was pretty negative.

The benefits have been immediate, as indicated by the increases in salaries and bonuses paid to employees. And Southwest Airlines, in addition to the bonuses to their employees, donated \$5 million to charity, as well as made some capital improvements.

FedEx, which, of course, employs people all over the country, but has a big hub in the district that I represent, is going to spend \$133 million increasing hourly wages, as well as \$67 million on programs for salaried employees, and, get this, \$3 billion on their pension plan and capital improvements. That is a pretty big turnaround.

The good folks at Peterbilt trucks, located in the 26th District of Texas, received over \$170 million in tax benefits in the fourth quarter of 2017, as a direct result of this tax bill. Peterbilt also estimates that its 2018 effective global tax rate will be reduced by up to 8 percent and that the lower corporate tax rate and accelerated depreciation will, indeed, stimulate capital investment.

The increased prosperity of these and other companies will subsequently improve the financial situation of their employees. Coupled with a nearly doubled standard deduction, income for most individuals and families will, in fact, increase.

Chairman BRADY mentioned filing taxes on a postcard. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress, I really wanted us to enact a flat tax. I still do. But I will take the improvement that we have gotten, the gift of time, back to, what, 85 to 90 percent of tax filers who no longer are going to have to keep up with that shoebox full of receipts and spend quality time with their accountants every March and April as they prepare their Federal tax return. We are going to allow people to pay for necessities, without having to worry about other discretionary items and services, often provided by small businesses.

Local improvements in economic condition will not only benefit Main Street business owners, but I like to say it is going to benefit Elm Street business owners. That is the small business off of Main Street. It is going to allow people to spend money across State lines. Increased financial mobility will inject capital into the market and continue the growth of our economy.

□ 2130

Look, we are right on the verge of some pretty significant and profound economic changes that are going to be beneficial, I predict, to all Americans. This is an important time in this country, time for us to get to work and deliver for the American people.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining me this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to, at this point, wrap up this evening's version of the Tax Truth Squad.

Since the tax reform bill was passed and signed into law, let me state again that more than 400 companies have given a pay raise; bonuses; increased 401(k) contributions; or, in the case of utilities, lowered rates—lowered rates dramatically.

At least 4 million Americans are receiving special tax reform bonuses. Direct bonus announcements have already topped \$3 billion; \$3 billion into our economy, into people's pockets, decisions they can make about what they want to do with the money rather than turning it over to the government, rather than turning it over to the IRS, rather than having it spent on bureaucracy.

In my home district, we will talk about that more next week, but I want to reference that Fiat Chrysler is moving jobs here from Mexico, moving to Macomb County, investing \$1 billion—yes, you heard that right, investing \$1 billion—in expanding a plant and creating 2,500 new jobs in Michigan just in that one plant.

By the way, they also announced a bonus—a tax bonus separate from their bonus in their contract, which some people said: Oh, it was in their contract.

No, it wasn't. It was a bonus of \$2,000 per employee as a result of the tax bill.

These are major cuts that people overlook. Look at these companies, look at the list of them, and it grows every day.

Let me suggest real quickly: I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I know my district and I know my constituents, and \$1,000 is not crumbs.

I referenced earlier the note I got over the weekend from Mark in my district who says his projected taxes next year save him \$2,700 in his pocket.

Now, I know where you live, I know where I live, that is real money. Maybe for some of my colleagues, it doesn't matter as much, but that is why we passed this bill. That is why we worked so hard on this bill. That is why we support it. And that is the truth about taxes.

That is what we want the American people to understand: we are putting money back in their pockets, money back in the economy, rather than taking money and putting it in government and hoping they do something productive with it.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity this evening.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) until no later than 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for such great words of encouragement. I was hearing it all across east Texas as I was all over the district this past week. People are encouraged when it comes to the economy. People are feeling better about the economy. I am hearing it.

They are encouraged, but after yet another school shooting, another mass shooting, I am hearing more and more people who are asking: Why? Why is this?

Of course, some say, you know, the United States is the only place that mass shootings occur. Of course, that is just false. There are worse mass shootings in other parts of the world.

Some say if we get rid of all guns in the country, then we could end the senseless violence, but when you try to tell that to people who were in Rwanda during the period when 800,000 people or so were slaughtered with machetes for the most part, it goes beyond the question of the weapon.

We have seen airplanes used as bombs for the worst mass execution in our country's history. Of course, Pearl Harbor, bombs were used, bombs themselves. We know in Oklahoma City, apparently it was anhydrous ammonia, fertilizer. We have seen the Boston bombing utilizing pressure cookers.

So if the answer is to get rid of the weapons, we got to get rid of airplanes. We got to get rid of rental trucks. We got to get rid of fertilizer. Pressure cookers have got to go. Machetes have got to go. Once you start listing the things by which people with evil intent have killed others, you realize this is an endless list. There are people who have exacted violence on others all kinds of ways.

There is nothing more senseless and ignorant. And I don't mean that mean-spirited. I mean that everybody is ignorant of something; some are just ignorant of a lot more things. But the statement that, "I just want Congress to do something even if it is wrong," well, that is how you lose civilizations, by doing something even if it is wrong. But there are plenty of indications, things that we can do, things we can agree on.

It seems absolutely senseless that a school would know about a student who is repeatedly involved in violence, threats upon other students, threats upon other people, but actually not just threats, actual violence. We want to look into this to see if this is really a national phenomenon that some of our schools, to avoid having students continue to be arrested, that they actually try some mediation process so they avoid giving a 17-, 18-year-old student an arrest record, which once they have an assault that is confirmed in court, then certainly that would affect

their ability to get a gun at all of any kind.

So, actually, when you start analyzing all of the ways that the system broke down and didn't work, the things that should have protected those precious lives in Parkland, Florida, instead of saying, "Just do something even if it is wrong," how about if we do something that is right? How about if we do something that would actually prevent that kind of senseless violence from being exacted upon innocent people?

I mean, we got a sheriff that I don't know what kind of a department this guy is running. I know when there was a shooting involving a domestic case—and until terrorist activities and mass shootings started occurring, most often if there was violence at a courthouse, it was over a domestic affairs case.

I saw the video. I was already in Congress. I was no longer sitting on the bench in that courthouse, but I saw the video. And as soon as there were gunshots, those deputies—I knew them; I loved them—were running to the sound of the gun. They didn't hunker behind anything. They ran to the sound of the gun.

And that has been repeated around the country. Law officers hear a gun and they run to the sound of the gun. But, apparently, it appears from what we are reading, that the sheriff there had a department that is living in pre-Columbine days.

Just like before 9/11, it was thought that if your plane is hijacked, just don't create a problem; there will be negotiations when you land somewhere.

I still believe to this day there were American heroes on all four of those planes; and if the first three planes had known they were going to be used as a bomb to kill others, there were Americans that would have stepped up and stopped it just like those incredibly heroic Americans did who brought down the plane in Pennsylvania.

So I don't think it will ever happen again. There will always be people who love this country and love life so much that they would give theirs to save so many others. That is what Jesus said is the greatest love, and clearly the fourth flight had that.

But here is a story from the Florida Sun Sentinel. It is entitled "School shooter Nikolas Cruz: An unending saga of disturbed behavior and red flags," written by Brittany Wallman, Paula McMahon, Megan O'Matz, and Susannah Bryan. They document that he did things like—well, of course, we know apparently he didn't know his father. He knew his adopted father. Of course, his adopted father and mother had died. Apparently they had a wonderful home, swimming pool, lots of comforts; but he didn't have a moral

compass at all. Apparently he threatened his mother, threatened his brother, violence on his brother. At least threatened violence on his own mother.

We know from this article, at least, it says the adopted father, Mr. Cruz, didn't own any guns. But Nikolas was diagnosed as having a string of disorders: depression, attention deficit, hyperactivity disorder, emotional behavior disability, and autism. His mom told the sheriff's deputies he also had obsessive-compulsive disorder and anger issues. He had counselors in school and at home, according to DCF records. He took medications. We don't know what all medications he took. Maybe there was some relationship there.

We ought to be able to discern how many of these people have taken different types of drugs and which ones they were. We know there seems to be a correlation between people committing suicide and many of the medications that are prescribed to kids who feel troubled.

This article says that Nikolas was a mama's boy, yet he threatened his mother. His mother called the police to say he got physical with his brother and with her. It sounds like a physical assault on his mother.

My late mother was close to 5-foot. I was a lot bigger than she was in high school, but, whew, I knew not to even think about raising a hand.

When he was 14, his mother reported he had hit her with a plastic hose from a vacuum cleaner. A few months later, she told deputies he had thrown her against the wall because she took away his Xbox gaming system. A year later, she told deputies Nikolas had punched the wall after she took away his Xbox. Foul language, insults, disobedience, disruption.

Cruz's behavior was exactly what schoolteachers frowned upon. He went to a different school for a while which offered a program for emotionally and behaviorally disabled children, but, according to the article, Cruz could not control himself.

Now, it talked about in the article that he was 5-foot-7, 120 pounds. I know a lot about being bullied up through junior high, up through eighth grade, because I was very small. I didn't start growing of any size until high school. I may have been the smallest guy on our football team the first couple of years in high school. I know a lot about getting bullied. I know a lot about getting my nose bloodied. I never killed anybody.

□ 2145

I had parents that would make all four of us kids quite angry, but they taught us respect of authority. They disciplined us, and they made sure we were in Sunday school and church every week.

It looks like the school and the community and the sheriff's office all

helped Ms. Cruz and Nikolas—and I use "helped" loosely—avoid having a criminal record that would have prevented him from having a gun and would have prevented him from killing 17 people. At least, it would be a whole lot more difficult without a gun like he had.

But they all worked together, unknowingly. Of course, it was not intentionally. They thought they were helping him. And what they were doing, what was coming down the road, was a disaster of massive proportions.

We do need to do something that prevents this in the future. Some say, well, it is time to end the personal transfer loophole, so a father can't give a son a weapon.

Well, perhaps if Nikolas' father had taught him—I have got a friend from Florida I was visiting with this weekend, and he said the worst whipping that he ever got was when he pointed a gun, his grandfather's gun, at his brother. He never did that again.

I am not advocating violence on kids. I know the Bible says:

Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child, but the rod of correction will drive it far from him.

But as a judge, a felony judge, I have seen kids be abused beyond propriety that justified criminal penalty. But we could take some action, it would seem, that would prevent entities, whether it is the Air Force, whether it is the Broward school system, the Broward County Sheriff's Office, from preventing someone from avoiding appropriately having a criminal record that would prohibit them getting a gun. That way, we are talking about something that would prevent this same thing from happening.

When it comes to the personal transfer of weapons, as John Locke was saying the other day, in over 100 years, there has not been a mass shooting that involved a gun received in a personal transfer, whether it is from father to son, friend to friend.

Of course, if there is somebody at a gun show who is not having a background check and they are selling more than one weapon there, there is a good chance they are committing a crime. It is not a loophole at a gun show. Anybody that is there selling guns needs to have the background check done, and they do. And you can't get the gun until it has gone through a proper background check, and you get it from someone who ensures that everything is followed.

I had won a gun at an auction some—I have heard some people say, yeah, we have got to stop that, too, getting a gun at an auction. I had to go through the background check. I had to pick it up at a store. I felt sorry for the store.

But there are stores that sell guns that are constantly having to clear somebody who bought it online, because you cannot pick up that gun

until the background check is done, and you go to someone who has ensured the background check is done and then get the weapon. So that seems to be something we could do.

And then we were talking to some of our Freedom Caucus tonight, and unlike the no-fly list, where the Obama administration would not tell us how you got on it and would not give us any idea of how you appeal, how you get off—we would plead for some people who were law-abiding and shouldn't have been on there. Sometimes they get off; sometimes they don't.

But we, as Congress, House and Senate, need to pass a bill that sets up a due process where, if you are on the no-fly list, you can appeal and get off. We ought to make it where, if you had been guilty of assaults, whether in school or in the home, as Nikolas Cruz was, or whether it is in public, that ought to prevent you from getting a gun.

Of course, domestic situations, things often get so heated. I have seen terrible charges alleged against a father or mother during the course of a divorce, and that is something the State legislature could deal with. If it involves some Federal entity, it is something that we can deal with and say this is how you could appeal and get an unjust decision blocking a gun purchase.

But we also know that those people who say, hey, there have been 3 million or so people who shouldn't buy guns who have been blocked from buying guns, well, they don't know the rest of the story. The rest of the story is there aren't but just a few dozen people who get prosecuted out of 3 million.

Someone told me yesterday it was only a few dozen of the 3 million who are ever prosecuted for improperly filing for a gun. There may have been 3 million people denied, but it turns out there were mistakes because of the ways in which the names are checked.

Do you really want to get to the bottom line, Mr. Speaker?

John Adams was President in 1798. Some of these very issues kept coming up. The people who founded this country, they were better read than most students are today even after college. And even those who didn't believe the Bible, they quoted it.

In fact, in this very room and in the room right down the hall where the United States House of Representatives met for the majority of the 1800s, the Bible, during sessions, was the most quoted book in our history. In here, in that room, in the Senate down the hall, the Old Senate, the current Senate, the Bible is the most quoted book in our history, and there would seem to be good reason.

Within the Bible, itself, you find the words:

For the Word of God is living and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit. It

is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.

But John Adams was President after two terms under President George Washington, under our current Constitution. He knew precisely what the Constitution said. He knew how it had come about. He was Vice President, President of the Senate when the Bill of Rights was created. He was part of that process.

Yet John Adams explained, President John Adams explained, in 1798, the bottom line, that people in this country have got to understand, if we are going to address the kind of violence that has sparked around this country. John Adams explained it. His words were more than prescient. They are perpetually true as long as we are operating under this Constitution.

As he said, knowing, having read many times every word of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, having helped generate this Bill of Rights, he knew what they were. But he said:

Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.

You want to know where the answer is? If people are going to be safe in America, we have a choice. We either start anew, teaching morality, teaching that there is a right or wrong, that not everything is relative, and even if those who don't believe there is a God don't want to hear about it, it is okay to talk about God. You don't have to believe it.

Look at Jefferson's words. He made clear—of course, it always amazed me how he could put the biggest grievance in the original declaration against King George was ever allowing slavery. So on the one hand, he could see the problems created for America by ever allowing the inhumanity of man to man, but he talked about the best hope being the teaching of Jesus, that we should be teaching, the best hope for America.

But if we are going to be safe, we have got to teach morality, encourage religion, not force secular humanism, hedonism on America. It is okay to talk about it. It is okay to teach about it.

In fact, the studies I saw as a felony judge repeatedly indicated the best hope of cutting recidivism of criminals is if they go through an intensive Christian Bible study in prison. So afraid of talking about the Bible, so afraid of talking about Christianity.

There is no official religion in this country, but, as the Supreme Court said at the end of the 19th century, this is a Christian nation. Not everybody was Christian, of course, but it was founded on Judeo-Christian beliefs. It was founded on the Bible. And that is the reason Moses' full face is up there in the middle, because he was felt to be the best lawgiver in the history of the world. Obviously, the Supreme Court doesn't think so much anymore.

We have a choice: teach morality, encourage religion, or, in order to be safe, we have got to give up the Second Amendment. We have already given up parts of the Second Amendment in a part of it. We have given up part of our freedom of assembly. We have given up part of our freedom of speech. We have given up a big hunk of freedom of religion, because this Constitution was only meant to govern a moral and religious people. And unless we are willing to start teaching morality again, we have no hope of being safe under the current Constitution.

I pray to God, and prayers can work. God will hear from Heaven. I pray to God that people will wake up and we won't have to discharge different parts of our constitutional rights in order to remain safe.

I look at the interior of this Bible that belonged to my uncle. It is a New Testament. On the front, engraved in the middle "May the Lord be with you." He had it in World War II.

But inside, at the top, it says: "The White House, Washington. As Commander-in-Chief, I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible to all who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Throughout the centuries, men of many faiths and diverse origins have found in the Sacred Book words of wisdom, counsel, and inspiration. It is a fountain of strength and now, as always, an aid in attaining the highest aspirations of the human soul"—signed, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That is not a mistake that President Roosevelt made. It needs to be one we don't make either.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 27, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4099. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0360; FRL-9972-89-OAR] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4100. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flonicamid; Pesticide Tol-

erances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0498; FRL-9971-94] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4101. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0254; FRL-9971-95] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4102. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Calcium Salts of Phosphorous Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0578; FRL-9970-96] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4103. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry5Aa2.834-16; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0401; FRL-9972-62] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4104. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0398; FRL-9973-37-Region 3] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4105. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0107; FRL-9972-53-Region 1] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4106. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorfenapyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0333; FRL-9970-88] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4107. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — New York; Incorporation by Reference of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R02-RCRA-2018-0034; FRL-9974-06-Region 2] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4108. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Zoxamide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0681; FRL-9972-69] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4109. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rimsulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0516; FRL-9972-36] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4110. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyflufenamid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0649; FRL-9972-61] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4111. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0564; FRL-9973-56-Region 9] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4112. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0573; FRL-9973-55-Region 9] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4113. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule Trading Programs Replaced by Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Trading Programs [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0574; FRL-9974-12-Region 3] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4114. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approvals and Promulgations; California; South Coast Moderate Area Plan for the 2006 PM2.5 Standards; Correction of Deficiency [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0204; FRL-9974-11-Region 9] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4115. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; OR, Oakridge; PM2.5 Moderate Plan, Finding of Attainment and Clean Data Determination [EPA-R10-2017-0051; FRL-9974-16-Region 10] received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 805. A bill to authorize the conveyance of and remove the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands in the City of Tulare, California (Rept. 115-579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 835. A bill to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument (Rept. 115-580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4134. A bill to redesignate the White Clouds Wilderness in the Sawtooth and Challis National Forests in the State of Idaho as the Cecil D. Andrus-White Clouds Wilderness in honor of former Idaho Governor and Secretary of the Interior Cecil D. Andrus (Rept. 115-581). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 747. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4296) to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4607) to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-582). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 748. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-583). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5085. A bill to repeal the section of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 that requires the Federal Communications Commission to reallocate and auction the T-Band spectrum; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 5086. A bill to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I-Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS,

Mr. BERA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANG-GEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 5087. A bill to regulate the importation, manufacture, possession, sale or transfer of assault weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5088. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transfer of a semiautomatic assault weapon to a person under 21 years of age, and to prohibit the possession or ownership of a semiautomatic assault weapon by such a person, with exceptions for active duty military personnel and full-time law enforcement employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BARRAGAN (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 5089. A bill to improve threat information sharing, integrated operations, and law enforcement training for transportation security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BASS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5090. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a Federal firearms licensee from selling or delivering certain semiautomatic centerfire rifles to a person under 21 years of age, with exceptions for active duty military personnel and full-time law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 5091. A bill to require the head of each agency to submit a report with respect to nonessential employees after any lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5092. A bill to conduct or support further comprehensive research for the creation of a universal influenza vaccine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5093. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the effects of broadband deployment and adoption on the economy of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 5094. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to improve suspicious activity reporting to prevent acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5095. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to improve access of veterans to cancer treatment at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5096. A bill to establish a grant program to assist States to establish or expand universal prekindergarten in public schools and public charter schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 5097. A bill to amend title 38 and title 5, United States Code, to require the Sec-

retary of Veterans Affairs and other officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs to receive health care from the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 5098. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the notification to Congress of the hospitalization of combat-wounded members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. BASS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. TORRES):

H. Res. 749. A resolution calling upon the President to exercise relevant mandatory sanctions authorities under the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act in response to the Government of the Russian Federation's continued aggression in Ukraine and forcible and illegal annexation of Crimea and assault on democratic institutions around the world, including through cyber attacks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 750. A resolution expressing support for the designation of a "Prisoners of Conscience Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 751. A resolution calling on Congress to enact a new preclearance formula for the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and condemning voter suppression laws enacted by States and political subdivisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BARRAGAN:

H.R. 5089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section I of the U.S. Constitution
"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 5090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 3)

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 5091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 5093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 5097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 5098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 12–14

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 173: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 233: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 389: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 426: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 444: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 559: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 592: Mr. MACARTHUR and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 713: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 719: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 721: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 816: Mr. CRIST and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER.
H.R. 821: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 846: Mr. YOHO, Ms. LEE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 858: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 881: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 889: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 911: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 936: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 949: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 964: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 975: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 980: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1057: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 1078: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1079: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1111: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1160: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 1205: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1398: Ms. JAYAPAL and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1405: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1409: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1475: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1478: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1516: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 1542: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1562: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1599: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1612: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1617: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1636: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1661: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1676: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 1692: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1708: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1723: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1762: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1772: Mr. KILMER and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1832: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1861: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1880: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1881: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1902: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SOTO, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1905: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1906: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1928: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1953: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2004: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2024: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2149: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2215: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 2267: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. CULBERSON, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2299: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2309: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 2310: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 2319: Mr. FASO and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2379: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2392: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2409: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 2566: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2567: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2584: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2666: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2668: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2670: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 2687: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2851: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2871: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2953: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3013: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3030: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3124: Mr. WALZ and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3197: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3199: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3272: Ms. DELAULO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CORREA, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 3273: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BASS, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 3303: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 3304: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3307: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3314: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3464: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BASS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3586: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 3593: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3613: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3622: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 3623: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3642: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 3654: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. DELAULO.
H.R. 3694: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3712: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3790: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3810: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3889: Mr. FASO.
H.R. 3894: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 3964: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 3975: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3999: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 4025: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4052: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 4057: Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 4058: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 4082: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 4099: Mr. BARR and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 4122: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4186: Mr. COHEN and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4207: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4240: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 4265: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 4268: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4345: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4379: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4403: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 4429: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4444: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4473: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 4536: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 4549: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 4556: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4573: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4604: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4616: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4633: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 4655: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. FASO.
H.R. 4681: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4732: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MESSER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4747: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4760: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 4775: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TAKANO, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 4777: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4780: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4796: Mr. TROTT and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4811: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 4825: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4838: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 4839: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 4844: Mr. ROSS and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 4846: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4850: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 4851: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4881: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 4888: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 4903: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 4909: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ROSS, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. BACON, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4910: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 4912: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4916: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4917: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4925: Mr. FASO.
H.R. 4932: Mr. CRIST, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4949: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4953: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4962: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 4970: Mr. SOTO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 4995: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 4999: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5005: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 5009: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 5015: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. RUPERSBERGER.

H.R. 5031: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 5034: Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5045: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5056: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 5058: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 5072: Mr. PAULSEN and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. MESSER.

H.J. Res. 126: Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 22: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H. Res. 128: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H. Res. 134: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H. Res. 199: Mr. YOHO and Mr. NORCROSS.

H. Res. 313: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H. Res. 356: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 367: Ms. BASS.

H. Res. 401: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 632: Mr. BARR.

H. Res. 713: Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 715: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 720: Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H. Res. 740: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 741: Mr. SCHIFF.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Chairman GOODLATTE, or a designee, to H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS.
ELIZABETH "LIZ" MOORE TOMLIN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to rise today to recognize a dedicated public servant, engaging community leader, outstanding citizen, and friend of longstanding, Mrs. Elizabeth "Liz" Moore Tomlin. Liz was honored by the Nelson Chapel AME Church in Bainbridge, Georgia on February 24, 2018.

A native of Bainbridge, Georgia, Liz graduated from Hutto High School in 1969.

Liz was one of the first African-Americans to be hired as a cashier at Kwik Check and the first African-American in Decatur County to be employed by the Georgia Power Company, where she worked as a Customer Representative. Upon receiving employment with the Georgia Power Company, she pursued higher education.

She has been affiliated with several associations. She has served as President of the local chapter of the NAACP, County Chair of the Decatur County Democratic Party and Deputy Registrar, and a member of the Board of Elections of Decatur County.

As a foster parent, she has opened her home to hundreds of adolescents. She has also been an integral part of community programs such as "Kops N Kids", which helps to build relationships between law enforcement and local youth, and the HERO Foundation, which provides clothing, food, and housing for destitute families. For the past 30 years she has helped bring prominent speakers to Decatur County by personally sponsoring and organizing the Martin Luther King Day March and Parade.

Liz has received numerous honors and awards for her work in public service. These include: the Pilot Club Woman of the Year Award; the Unsung Hero Award presented by the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation; a Certificate of Achievement from Former Secretary of State Cathy Cox; and an Outstanding Service Award which I had the pleasure of presenting to her.

Liz Tomlin's faith has always instilled within her a desire to positively shape the community in which she lives. As an active member of Nelson Chapel A.M.E. Church, she regularly incorporates her faith into her commitment to public service by serving on the Steward Board, the Pastor's Aid Committee and as the Director of the Youth Development Program Department.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get, you make your life by what you give." We are so grateful that Liz has dedicated her time and talents to improve the quality of life for others. A woman

of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise are unparalleled. Bainbridge, Georgia shines a little brighter because of Liz Tomlin.

Liz has accomplished much throughout her life, but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of her seven children and the countless others who impacted her life over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my wife Vivian and me, along with the more than 730,000 constituents of the Second Congressional District, in extending our sincerest congratulations and appreciation to Mrs. Elizabeth "Liz" Moore Tomlin for her dedicated service to the people of Bainbridge, Georgia and Decatur County, Georgia.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF JAIME D.S. PAULINO

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Jaime D.S. Paulino. Jaime was a proud son of Guam and faithful public servant. He served as the commissioner of the village of Inarajan from 1981 to 1989. Jaime was born on December 8, 1935 and passed away on February 6, 2018 at the age of 82.

Jaime was the son of Jesus D. and Josefina S. Paulino. He was a member of Guam's greatest generation who survived the occupation of Guam during World War II. He went on to serve our country in the United States Navy.

Jaime graduated from George Washington High School in Guam in 1955, and from Navy Leadership School in 1964. Jaime served in the Vietnam War and later retired as Navy Chief in 1976. Additionally, Jaime served on several boards and commissions, and as a close advisor of my late husband, Governor Bordallo.

Jaime took an active role in different community organizations. He was a member of the Young Men's League of Guam, the Fleet Reserve Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Knights of Columbus. Jaime was a long time member of the Democratic Party of Guam. He served as vice chairman of the party from 2008 to 2012, and was a Super Delegate to the 2008 Democratic National Convention.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of Jaime D.S. Paulino and I join the people of Guam in celebrating his life. He was a dedicated public servant who worked to improve the quality of life in his village of Inarajan and the broader community during his time in office. My thoughts and prayers are with his family, loved ones and friends.

I extend my condolences to his children, Jaime Jr. and Rachel, Glenn and Eliza, Gerald, and Joel, and his grandchildren and great-grandchildren. He will be deeply missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RICHARD
KUNDE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Richard Kunde, who passed away on February 15, 2018 at the age of 75, after a lifetime of public service to his community.

Mr. Kunde was born on September 6, 1942 near his family's ranch in Glen Ellen, where they raised Hereford cattle and grew cabernet sauvignon grapes. Mr. Kunde attended the University of California, Davis (UC Davis) where he continued to study and work at improving grape vines by earning degrees in viticulture and horticulture. With enologists at UC Davis, Mr. Kunde worked on developing and cloning rootstock in order to produce superior grapes to be used throughout California and beyond. In 1982, Mr. Kunde purchased Sonoma Grapevines, where he continued to push Sonoma County to the top of the world in both vine growing and wine production. Always one to put the industry above his own personal gain, Mr. Kunde was one of the first nurserymen in his field to sell his cloned vines to other growers.

Mr. Kunde's legacy extends from a personal mission to serve the industry and product that he loved so dearly. As leaders in the wine industry, he and his late wife, Saralee, were unparalleled supporters of Future Farmers of America, 4-H, the Sonoma County Fair, and the Harvest Fair. Whether it was placing the highest bid at an auction, against himself, or becoming the single largest donor to the education and events building at the Sonoma County Fairgrounds, Mr. Kunde's generosity was unmatched. He received many honors over his illustrious career, including induction into the Sonoma County Farm Bureau's Hall of Fame and the Award of Distinction from the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences at UC Davis, both in 2008.

Mr. Kunde is survived by his son, Matthew Kunde and his daughter Catherine "Catie" Kunde, his granddaughter, and many nieces, nephews, and cousins. It is hard to speak about Mr. Kunde's personal or professional life without mentioning his constant companion in both, his late wife Saralee McClelland Kunde. Known as the shining star of their duo, Mrs. Kunde was intimately involved in all of Mr. Kunde's professional and philanthropic work.

Mr. Speaker, the depth of Mr. Kunde's service to his community has left a positive legacy

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

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

across Sonoma County and the entire grape growing industry, and he will be profoundly missed. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to him today and honor his memory.

IN RECOGNITION OF KEVIN SHAUGHNESSY, RECIPIENT OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS' PAUL "HOOK" O'MALLEY MAN OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kevin Shaughnessy, who will be honored as Man of the Year by the Ancient Order Hibernians Division 4, the Paul "Hook" O'Malley chapter, on Thursday, March 1. Kevin is a charter member of the AOH chapter named in memory of the late boxing trainer known for his charitable nature. The Man of the Year award is given to an individual who has worked to enrich the well-being of the community in the spirit of "Hook" O'Malley.

Kevin is the son of Jack and Rose Shaughnessy. He is a graduate of West Scranton High School, class of 1988. Kevin currently serves as the Lackawanna County Director of Building and Grounds. In addition to his government position, he has served two three-year terms as an executive board member of the IBEW Local 81 and is a past delegate to the Scranton Central Labor Union. Along with his leadership roles in organized labor, Kevin is a member of the John Mitchell Man of the Year Committee.

It is an honor to recognize Kevin as he receives the Man of the Year award from The Ancient Order of Hibernians. I am grateful for his efforts on behalf of the citizens of Lackawanna County and his colleagues within the labor community. I wish Kevin all the best as he continues to serve his neighbors with the generosity of "Hook" O'Malley.

HIS BOOK OF LOVE, IN MEMORY OF THE REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of a great American Hero, who touched and blessed so many lives. As an Ambassador of the Gospel he spread the word of our Lord and his Book of Love lifting people up. The Evangelist, The Reverend Billy Graham. I include in the RECORD this poem penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

HIS BOOK OF LOVE

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

His book of love
A gift from above
As was this
To so uplift

As God's kiss
To touch all hearts
As he did his part
To help us walk with God
With no facade
Was Billy thou art
To lighten our burdens
To help open the curtain
Which, separates us for certain
To feel the presence of Jesus Christ, for all those hurting
To give us hope and strength
Reminding us of the power of faith,
all in our short time with him spent
Armed with his gift from God ever forth he went
For the Reverend Billy Graham was such a man
Grabbing hearts,
as he took our hand
A messenger from God in his life span
With his Special Gift
Which was all this
To so uplift
His book of love
From above
A humble man from the South
A holy spirit who espoused
The word of God,
in his voice to all would shout
With him we felt the presence of Jesus Christ,
inside and out
To Save us bringing us to tears no doubt
No matter the denomination
Or the color of one's skin,
he fought against discrimination
And hatred's abomination my friend
As he walked with Dr. King
As the Angels up in Heaven they'd sing
We are all God's children in his equation
He did not just talk the talk
But, throughout his life he walked the walk
For in the sonnets of our lives
What have our moments comprised?
All in our time realized
And what have we left behind?
Who have we Saved or helped in our time?
Did we take or did we give?
Because, it's all about how we've lived
In our short lives
To turn the good from bad,
as Billy had
To spread the word
All in our actions and our deeds
Which all else supersedes
To give this world what she so needs
In that battle as old as time
Of GOOD versus EVIL which comes to mind
For in our darkest hours,
it's only our faith upon us which showers
To strength and courage and hope to find the power
To move forth all in that hour
While, The Reverend Graham's faith above
all so towered
And yet he was such a humble man all
throughout his hours
So, strengthened by his beliefs,
as onward this Christian Soldier battled to achieve
A lifetime to Save souls and bring relief
To walk with Jesus Christ, he'd speak
With his shot heard around the world,
to touch almost every woman and man, boy
and girl
As twelve Presidents counted on him so
With his council of love, hope, faith, and
peace to help them grow
As a Soldier in the Army of our Lord,
the path he strode
He was put on this earth to help us know
The greatest blessings are found in our
Lord's plans we sow

For almost 100 years on earth he walked here
Because, God knew we needed him far more
down here
For his was an open tent into everyone who
went
As we could fill the oceans up with the tears
he brought us to
A great Crusader who with such passion
God's word pursued
Answering his calling,
as you could almost hear the Lord saying, I
love you
As Billy asked us to take that walk of faith
so true
So, one day with our Lord we could live in
Heaven's hue
In Billy's presence,
with God we were always knew
The Holy Spirit
So, all in him imbued
As we could feel it coming through
Whether, on a TV screen or listening to a
radio,
we felt the presence of the Holy Spirit so
true
Giving us strength
Giving us hope
Giving us the faith to somehow cope
As with each new word Billy spoke
The Bible, the word of the Lord he invoked
And with it in hand and upon a pulpit he
would stand
As you could feel the fire and brimstone,
but even more the Lord reaching out his
hand
Telling us you're not alone
Touching every woman, child, and man
Showing us God's plan
Of resurrection and forgiveness and hope
As the love of Christ invoked
As thoughts to our Lord and Heaven awoke
To take that walk down the aisle,
as in that moment we began to smile
To be Saved,
all in his reassuring southern style
As his voice and presence conveyed,
such warmth and hope each day
So simple, so strong,
giving hope to all hearts who so longed
As he was an ambassador of the Lord,
so mighty and so strong
And yet so kind like a love song
In sermons out to hearts on Sunday's poured
The word of God to all restore
As all across the land in cars to work and
churches more
On radios in hearts he forged
Words of gold to souls as the tears began to
pour
I know, because I was one of those for sure
With his book of love the Angels him must
have him so adored
And tears of love flowing from our Lord
And Billy look at your beautiful family,
surely the sum of what love can be
Making our Lord up in Heaven happy even
more
All throughout the world Billy wherever you
spoke
In heart,
the love of Jesus Christ you awoke
We will miss you my son,
and all that you have done
On earth in that war which must be won
But, your voice and words and memory lives
on
Rise
Rise, now my son
Up to Heaven's gate as you have come
With our Lord's arms around you,
his chosen one
With tears in eyes perhaps these words he's
begun
"Billy, you never let me down my blessed
son"

A new Angel in Kingdom Come
 To serve in The Army of our Lord this one
 To watch over us day and night America's
 son
 As happily a family reunites up in Heaven's
 Sun
 And now we lay your body down to rest
 We pray our Lord your soul to bless
 As you Billy were one of our very best
 Who touched so many lives and blessed
 Lifting them up with the gift of love to help
 them crest
 And let us remember,
 this man and his embers,
 he left behind to warm us in his time in His
 Book of Love,
 as we go out in our life's quests
 Amen.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR.
 WILLIAM P. BLACK, SR.

HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. William Black, lovingly known to Louisianians as Buckskin Bill. He passed away on January 10, 2018, in the comfort of his home and surrounded by family. Mr. Black had an incredible life. He married Elma, his college sweetheart, and was the proud father of three children who survive his memory. Mr. Black was a patriot who honorably served in the U.S. Army during the Korean War, and he was a performer at heart. He traveled the country emceeing and performing to audiences of troops in order to boost morale. Mr. Black was probably best known for hosting Storyland and the Buckskin Bill Show, shows enjoyed in every household and loved by children across South Louisiana—including me. As a kid, I woke up early every Monday morning for Buckskin Bill's Monday Morning March. I remember thinking I was getting pretty good at it, too. His shows ran for 35 years, and Mr. Black was twice awarded "Best Children's Show in the United States" by the National Association of Broadcasters. Outside of his television accomplishments, his life was marked by a dedication to improving the lives of those around him, from assisting in the foundation of the Baton Rouge Zoo, to promoting the Louisiana School for the Deaf. Mr. Black was truly a man dedicated to his community and endearing children to civic engagement. I am proud to have enjoyed his shows growing up, and I know he will be marching on among the angels in heaven. Buckskin Bill will be fondly remembered by myself, his family, and all the lives he touched through his performances.

RECOGNIZING COACH LELAND
 ETZLER

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 78th birthday of coach

Leland Etzler of Monroeville, Indiana. From 1965 to 2004, Leland coached the Woodlan Warriors' Junior/Senior High School football, basketball, and track teams. He finished his football career with an overall record of 287–117–4.

Among his many distinguished achievements at Woodlan, Coach Etzler was named Conference Coach of the Year from 1971 to 1973 and in 1996. Additionally, he was named IFCA Coach of the Year in 1996, and the Ball State Alumni Coach of the Year in 1981. He also orchestrated three perfect seasons in 1965, 1968, 1970, and was a State Runner-up in 1981.

In recognition of his accomplishments, Coach Etzler received the National Football Foundation's Distinguished American Award in 2005, and he was inducted into the Indiana Football Hall of Fame in 2001.

I would like to wish a happy birthday to Coach Etzler.

IN RECOGNITION OF JEFF SEARS,
 MAN OF THE YEAR FOR THE AN-
 CIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS,
 DIVISION 2 OF LACKAWANNA
 COUNTY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeff Sears, who was named Man of the Year by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division 2 of Lackawanna County, "Monsignor Farrell Chapter." Jeff accepted the award during the chapter's annual banquet on Saturday, February 24. He is the current Vice President of the Monsignor Farrell Chapter and serves the branch as acting president for the late William Pryle.

Jeff is a graduate of Saint Rose High School in Carbondale, class of 1971. After graduation, Jeff went straight to work for RCA/Thomson Consumer Electronics, where he remained for 30 years. He went on to work for Auto Parts International after RCA/Thomson. He currently resides in Moosic, Pennsylvania with his wife, Mary Kay. They have been married for 46 years and have three children—Cathy, Kelly, and Jeff—and two grandchildren, Julian and Ella. Jeff enjoys golfing in his free time and is an avid New York Yankees fan and a Cincinnati Bengals fan.

Jeff has been a very active member of the community. In the Boy Scouts of America, he was an Assistant Scout Leader for Troop 8 and Cub Pack 307. While Jeff was with the Scouts, he attained the Wood Badge, the highest award given to adults. He is a past president of the Mitchell Hose Company in Carbondale. Jeff has served as the Carbondale Pioneer Days Parade Chairman for five years. He is also a life-long member of St. Rose Parrish Church and serves his community of faith as a Eucharistic minister.

It is an honor to recognize Jeff as he accepts the Man of the Year Award. I congratulate him for being honored by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and I wish him all the best as he continues to serve Lackawanna County.

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVER-
 SARY OF CHEYNEY UNIVER-
 SITY'S 1978 NCAA DIVISION II
 BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the momentous 40th anniversary of Cheyney University's 1978 NCAA Division II Basketball Championship win.

Founded in 1837, Cheyney University has been a true treasure in our Commonwealth for over 180 years. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is the proud home of the first Historically Black College (HBCU) in our nation; it is also the only HBCU in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE).

On March 18th, 2018 Cheyney University will celebrate the 40th anniversary of its notable NCAA Division II Basketball Championship win. The team made history in 1978 when they defeated the University of Wisconsin Green Bay's team with a score of 47–40 in Springfield, Missouri bringing home the University's first national championship victory.

Just as our victorious Super Bowl Champions, the Philadelphia Eagles, defied all the odds to prove that underdogs can and will be victorious so too did the No. 4 ranked Cheyney State College Wolves who defeated the No. 1 ranked Wisconsin Green Bay team in the 1978 NCAA Division II Basketball Championship game.

We extend congratulations to the entire 1978 Cheyney Wolves Team which included: John Butts, Duane Coleman, All-American Milt Colston, Tournament MVP Andrew Fields, Kenny Hinson, Jeffrey Hutcherson, Roger Leysath, Gerald Mills, Charles Murphy, Gilbert Saunders, Arthur Stone, and John Walter; under the leadership of Naismith Hall of Fame Coach John Chaney.

The 2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania is proud to celebrate and recognize Cheyney University on the 40th anniversary of their historic 1978 NCAA Division II championship win.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote No. 66 on H.R. 4771, the Small Bank Holding Company Relief Act of 2018, I mistakenly recorded my vote as YEA when I intended to vote NAY.

TRIBUTE TO MR. WILLIAM TATE
 ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. William Tate of

Meridianville, Alabama on the occasion of his 90th birthday, and join Mr. Tate's family and friends in congratulating him on this momentous milestone. I sincerely wish Mr. Tate continued good health and contentment.

As so many in our community know, Mr. Tate has led an extraordinary life full of accomplishment and service to others. Through his lifetime, he has shown exemplary dedication to his family, church, and farming community—all of which are undeniably stronger and more prosperous because of him. Mr. Tate transformed his small family farm into a thriving agritourism business visited by more than 60,000 every year, and all four of his sons have chosen careers in farming—a point of pride for Mr. Tate.

Mr. Speaker, parenthetically, my own children and grandchildren have all enjoyed family and school field trips to Tate Farms.

Mr. Tate's record of service to our community is exceptional. He has served in numerous civic and industry positions including on the Farm Service Agency Community Committee, Madison County Farmers Federation Board of Directors, Alabama Farmers Federation Cotton Committee, U.S. Department of Agriculture Cotton Board, Alabama Cotton Commission, and Madison County YMCA Board of Directors, just to name a few. As a member of Flint River Baptist Church, Mr. Tate has served as a Sunday School Teacher, Deacon, Trustee, and Deacon Emeritus, among others. Mr. Tate has set a fine example for others in our community to follow.

In closing, I would like to thank Mr. Tate for his contributions to our community, and wish him a very happy 90th birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF TOM MCCOY,
PH.D.

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Tom McCoy, Ph.D., Vice President of Research and Innovation, as he retires from his position at the University of North Texas.

Dr. McCoy joined UNT from his role as Vice President for Research, Creativity and Technology Transfer at Montana State University in July 2013 where he had previously helped MSU reach Carnegie Tier One research status. In assuming the role at UNT, Dr. McCoy was charged with similar expansion of the university's growth, breadth and impact in research toward the Tier One status here in Texas. Ultimately, UNT was announced as reaching the classification in February 2016.

Additionally, Dr. McCoy ably led UNT's path forward with the development of the 2017–2022 Strategic Plan for Research which was approved by the President and submitted to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. This was accomplished, along with continued efforts on organization and funding related to the four Institutes of Research Excellence; pursuit of partnerships involving the Army Research Lab and also Denton Municipal Electric; recruitment of targeted research

faculty; review of grant management processes; and review and allocation of research facilities and related processes.

I have personally appreciated Dr. McCoy's direct involvement and assistance with the Annual Energy Efficiency Summit held each July at UNT's Discovery Park and the educational opportunity it affords the Constituents of the 26th Congressional District and the showcase it provides of UNT's facilities and research efforts. I wish both he and his wife Shari much happiness in their retirement plans. I have been honored to represent them during their time as residents in Texas.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT J.
WASTE

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. Robert J. Waste on the occasion of his retirement as Director of UC Davis Health's Government and Community Relations Program. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Waste for his leadership and commitment to UC Davis Health, as well as for his dedication to the strength of the greater Sacramento region.

Since joining UC Davis Health (UCDH) eight years ago, Mr. Waste has been instrumental in building the Government and Community Relations Program into what it is today. His leadership has led to such revolutionary projects as the creation of the UCDH Infant Cord Blood Banking Program, the Burn Outcome Research Institute, and the UCDH Center for Behavioral Health Excellence—the multi-year Mental Health Collaborative that resulted in strengthening Sacramento County crisis mental health services.

In addition to his work in UC Davis Health's Government and Community Relations Program, Mr. Waste has also been an active member of the Sacramento community. Mr. Waste's experience includes service as chair and member of the City of Sacramento Planning Commission, membership on the Sacramento Heritage Board, and chair of the City of Sacramento Campaign Reform Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to Mr. Robert Waste, outgoing Director of UC Davis Health's Government and Community Relations Program, as his friends and colleagues celebrate his well-earned retirement. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring his tenacity and dedication on behalf of the Government and Community Relations Program, as well as his dedication to the Sacramento region.

RECOGNIZING THOMAS HOWARD

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate

Thomas Howard for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The son of Bob and Susan, Thomas is a sophomore at Bishop O'Connell High School in Arlington, VA. Thomas has been an active member of Cub Scout Pack 194 and Boy Scout Troop 648. He is an active leader on the local and national level, most notably serving as Patrol Leader at the National Jamboree. He currently serves as Junior Assistant Scout Master for his Troop.

For Thomas' Eagle Service Project, he led a team of scouts, friends, and adults to create thirty-seven, 2x3' environmental awareness poster puzzles for the Fairfax County Park Authority and invested over two-hundred and thirty-four service hours. With his dedication and leadership, every Park Authority building in the county now has access to these learning tools.

In addition to scouting, Thomas is an altar server at St. Thomas More Cathedral, a National SeaPerch competitor, and Mission Manager for Bishop O'Connell's ThinSat satellite program.

I am honored to recognize Thomas for his achievement and wish him all the best in his continuing education.

RECOGNIZING WORLD HEARING
DAY 2018

HON. DAVID B. MCKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Co-Chair of the Congressional Hearing Healthcare Caucus, I rise today to recognize World Hearing Day, which is held on March 3rd of each year to provide awareness focused on the importance of hearing preservation, hearing loss identification, and treatment. This day, founded by the World Health Organization, moves the needle as it relates to hearing healthcare in the United States.

Hearing plays a critical role in one's quality of life and personal safety. We rely on hearing to feel connected to the world around us. Over 37 million adults in America suffer from hearing loss, and we're seeing a growing number of children as well. Hearing loss has been tied to depression, economic hardship, and underlying medical conditions. Hearing aids are a proven method of rehabilitation for the majority of those who have lost their ability to hear. Yet just 30 percent of those who could be helped by hearing aids use them.

That's why I joined my colleague from California, Mr. THOMPSON, in introducing H. Res. 740, which expresses support for the designation of March 3rd as World Hearing Day, and recognizes the importance of hearing loss prevention and hearing healthcare access. I encourage my colleagues in the House to co-sponsor this resolution, and encourage all Americans to take appropriate steps to protect their hearing.

RECOGNIZING CHARMAINE KELLY

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of the accomplishments and the public service record of Palm Beach County's Chief Deputy Supervisor of Elections, Charmaine Kelly.

Ms. Kelly began her career with the Supervisor of Elections office as an election day worker, her earnings donated to a local charity in which she was active.

Noticing the talent and excitement of this young volunteer, the Supervisor of Elections office recruited her to work part-time, and then full-time, as an elections specialist. That was 35 years ago.

Ms. Kelly oversaw voting and voter registration in Palm Beach County, the third largest county in Florida and the 28th most populous in the nation. As the Chief Deputy Supervisor of Elections, she is the highest ranking non-elected public servant in the office. She has served under four elected Supervisors through nine Presidential elections, 17 congressional and state elections and countless municipal and local district elections.

Ms. Kelly has mentored a generation of young people in the importance of protecting the process of voter registration and voter participation. If any Supervisor or Supervisor of Elections employee has a question from around the state, Ms. Kelly is on their speed dial and will always help find the answer or solution.

Today I ask this body to recognize Ms. Kelly as she begins her well-deserved retirement.

Ms. Kelly represents the best of public servants and I, along with the citizens of Palm Beach County and the State of Florida, thank her for her service protecting our right to vote and assuring that our vote counts.

THURSTON SMITH RECEIVES DISTINGUISHED SERVICE-COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD FROM THE VVC FOUNDATION

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thurston "Smitty" Smith, who was awarded the Distinguished Service-Community Service Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 24, 2018.

Smitty was selected for this award because of his distinguished career as a public servant. As a former member of the Hesperia City Council, Smitty devoted countless hours of his time and expertise to economic and urban development of the city. He was instrumental in the completion of the Hesperia Civic Plaza Park, Rancho Underpass, and Rancho Bridge project. In addition to his work in Hesperia, Smitty serves on the Mojave Water Agency's Board of Directors, chairs the Victor Valley Bicycle Tour, and is active with several non-profit organizations.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate Thurston "Smitty" Smith for receiving the Distinguished Service-Community Service Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation. It is a well-deserved and long-overdue honor.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MS. KATE HITCHCOCK TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS AND CALIFORNIA'S 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN THE SPRING OF 2018

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional young woman who is spending the spring semester interning in my Washington, D.C. office. Ms. Kate Hitchcock came to our office as part of the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme (UCWIP), and has been a valuable contributor to our efforts on behalf of California's Eleventh Congressional District.

Since 2000, UCWIP has worked with congressional offices to foster strong ties and understanding between the United States and Australian governments by bringing the best and the brightest from top Australian universities to intern on Capitol Hill. I am proud to be involved in this wonderful program for the third year in a row.

Kate Hitchcock, a student from the University of Canberra, has quickly proved herself to be a highly valuable member of our team. She has drafted legislative requests, attended briefings, written constituent mail, and researched important issues, among many other duties. She consistently displays a deep desire to learn and treats everyone she encounters with respect. Her hard work and dedication is an asset to our office and the Eleventh Congressional District.

Kate has learned about the United States and the U.S. Congress, and our team has learned a great deal from Kate about her native country. She is a pleasure to have in the office and I offer her my thanks for a job well done. I wish her the best of luck in all of her future endeavors.

INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIVERSAL PREKINDERGARTEN AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION ACT OF 2018

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce a bill similar to one I have introduced in five previous Congresses, the Universal Prekindergarten and Early Childhood Education Act of 2018. This bill is particularly important today because recent reports indicate that Americans are limiting the number of children they have due to the cost of child care. My bill

begins the process of providing universal prekindergarten education in public and public charter schools in states that have or plan to phase in or are phasing in prekindergarten education for three- and four-year-old children. The District of Columbia has made considerable strides since I first introduced this bill, but today's bill is still needed to fill a hole in the "Every Student Succeeds Act," which addresses elementary and secondary education, but ignores the prekindergarten years, the most critical years for children's brain development. My bill also seeks a breakthrough in public education by providing the initial funding for states to encourage local school districts to add prekindergarten for children at three or four years of age, whereas kindergarten programs for five year olds are now routinely available in public schools. This bill would eliminate some of the major shortcomings of unevenly available "day care" and, importantly, would take advantage of the safe facilities required in public schools. Unless early education becomes a necessary part of a child's education, it almost surely will continue to be unavailable to the majority of families with children.

My bill provides federal funds to states, which must be matched by at least 20 percent with the state's own funds, to establish or expand universal, voluntary prekindergarten in public and public charter schools for three- and four-year-olds, regardless of income. The classes, which would be full-day and run throughout the entire school year, must be taught by teachers who possess equivalent or similar qualifications to those teaching other grades in the school. The funds would supplement, not supplant, other federal funds for early childhood education. The unique money-saving aspect of my bill is that it uses the existing public school infrastructure and trained teachers to make early childhood education available to all, saving billions of dollars in its implementation.

The success of Head Start and other prekindergarten programs, combined with new scientific evidence concerning the importance of brain development in early childhood, virtually mandate the expansion of early childhood education to all children today. Early learning programs have been available only to the affluent, who can afford them, and to low-income families in programs such as Head Start, which would be unaffected by my bill. My bill provides a practical way to universal, public preschool education for the majority of families. The goal of the bill is to afford the benefits of early childhood education to the majority of the American working poor, lower-middle-class and middle-class families, most of whom have been left out of this essential education for their children.

We cannot afford to continue to allow the most fertile years for childhood development to pass, only to wonder why a child cannot read. The bill responds both to the great needs of parents who seek early childhood education, as well as to today's brain science, which shows that a child's brain development begins much earlier than had been previously understood.

Considering the staggering cost of day care, the inaccessibility of early childhood education and the opportunity that early education offers

to improve a child's chances of success, schooling for three- and four-year-olds is overdue. The absence of viable options for working families demands our immediate attention.

My bill reflects what jurisdictions throughout the nation increasingly are trying to accomplish. The District of Columbia, for example, has achieved an extensive integration of early childhood education as part of a larger effort to improve D.C. public schools. A recent report highlighted the economic benefits of early childhood education, emphasizing its role in expanding job opportunities and decreasing the amount of money spent on programs to address teen pregnancy, crime and the like.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

FRED HUNTER RECEIVE PRESIDENT'S AWARD FROM THE VVC FOUNDATION

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fred Hunter, who received the President's Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 24, 2018.

Fred was selected for this prestigious award because of his selfless contributions to Victor Valley College and local community. As the Chief Executive Officer for the Desert Valley Hospital/Desert Valley Medical Group, Fred spearheaded a partnership with VVC to assist students in pursuing careers in the field of nursing. This partnership provided not only financial assistance to these students, but also three-year employment contracts with Desert Valley Hospital. If that wasn't enough, Fred personally mentors and tutors nursing students in the program to ensure their success.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate Fred Hunter for receiving the President's Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation. He is truly deserving of this honor and I thank him for his willingness to give back to his High Desert community.

RECOGNIZING GRACE HERSCHELMAN

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Rare Disease Day, I'm proud to recognize Grace Herschelman, a six-year-old from Hillsboro, Illinois who continues to be an inspiration for thousands across Illinois.

When Grace was three-years-old, she was diagnosed with Infantile Neuraxonal Dystrophy, a neurodegenerative disease that results in a loss of muscle strength, movement, and the ability to speak. At the time of her diagnosis, there were only 10 documented cases of INAD in the nation, and most children with this disease do not make it to their 10th birthday.

Throughout her diagnosis and regular therapy treatments, Grace and her family have been a source of inspiration throughout Illinois. They have increased awareness for this rare and terminal disease, and have raised more than \$175,000 for research, with donors coming from all 50 states.

Grace and her family's story is just one example of why I support increased funding for the National Institutes of Health and legislation like the 21st Century Cures Act. Thousands of Americans are afflicted with rare diseases like INAD, and we as a nation must work to ensure that better treatment, cures, and hope are prioritized and possible for these patients and their families.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GWEN YORK

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Gwen York who dedicated her life to advance the goals of Transportation Workers Union (TWA) and the Texas American Federation of Laborers and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). As Director of Transport Workers Union International Committee on Political Education, Gwen's contribution to the TWA and AFL-CIO are incalculable due to the combination of her unwavering dedication and prudent leadership. For these reasons and more, Gwen will be remembered as an integral part of the Transport Workers Union, a beloved member of the Texas AFL-CIO Executive Board, an outstanding organizer and a passionate voice for working families across the state.

Gwen York was born December 27, 1956, in Houston, Texas. Soon after her first birthday, her family relocated to Garland, Texas where she would spend much of her life. Gwen graduated from South Garland High School in 1974, and attended the University of Texas at Austin. In 1980, Gwen opted to become a flight attendant, an occupation she loved dearly. However, she never forgot the importance of education, when she decided to return to school and graduate from the National Labor College in 2006.

Gwen's passion, experience, and tenacity made her a unique and irreplaceable advocate for labor rights. Gwen's laser focus on the future of labor as well disrupting the status quo prompted her to undertake the task of mentoring the next generation of union activists. She dedicated her time to mentoring young women, who she believed would serve as a new stream of activists that would help renew the labor advocacy movement and push it into the 21st century and beyond.

Today, we recognize Gwen York for her leadership, dedication, and lifelong work with the Transport Workers Union and the Texas American Federation of Laborers and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

I honor the life of Gwen York, a cornerstone of the labor movement and an exemplar of women's leadership.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on February 13th and the first vote Series on February 14th because of an engagement in the Central Valley of CA.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 70—H.R. 4533; YEA on Roll Call No. 71—H.R. 4979; YEA on Roll Call No. 72—H. Res. 736 Previous Question; YEA on Roll Call No. 73—H. Res. 736; YEA on Roll Call No. 74—H.R. 3542; and YEA on Roll Call No. 75—H. Res. 129.

HONORING THE URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER MADISON ON THE ORGANIZATION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Urban League of Greater Madison as the organization celebrates its 50th Anniversary.

Since its founding on February 20, 1968, the Urban League of Greater Madison has championed the educational and professional advancement of the city's African-American population. In the earliest years of its operation, the organization excelled at developing programs to provide skills training and job placement, more than tripling the number of employees of color working for the City of Madison.

Over the last fifty years, the Urban League of Greater Madison has maintained exceptional programming, despite a number of challenges. Through the development of partnerships with community leaders and local businesses, the Urban League of Greater Madison has continued to enhance its operations and has expanded its outreach in minority and immigrant communities.

In recent years, the Urban League of Greater Madison has been at the forefront of fighting for equality in our community with its vision to make Greater Madison the "Best in the Midwest" for everyone to live, learn, and work by 2020. Last year, the organization launched a campaign to place 1,500 low-income job seekers into career pathway employment by 2020, continuing its long legacy of advocating for economic justice and opportunity.

Through its efforts to pursue education, employment, and empowerment, the Urban League of Greater Madison has remained committed to fighting for progress and our future. It is my honor to now recognize the Urban League of Greater Madison in celebration of its 50th Anniversary and I wish them many more years of success.

SID HULTQUIST SELECTED FOR
INDUCTION TO THE VICTOR VAL-
LEY COLLEGE ALUMNI HALL OF
FAME

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sid Hultquist, who was selected for induction to the Victor Valley College Alumni Hall of Fame. As an alumnus of VVC, Sid became a fixture in the Victor Valley and distinguished himself as a leader and public servant.

During his 38 years of fire service, Sid worked for nearly every firefighting agency in the High Desert. Under Sid's guidance as Fire Chief for the Apple Valley Fire Protection District, the agency was able to secure additional funding to hire new firefighters and reduce critical response times for town residents. Undoubtedly, the training he received at VVC was instrumental in helping Sid excel in many areas of his career.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate Sid Hultquist for his induction to the Victor Valley College Alumni Hall of Fame. I couldn't think of a better honor for someone who gave so much to his community.

REMEMBERING THE ANNIVER-
SARIES OF TWO TRAGEDIES IN
AZERBAIJAN

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as Co-Chairman of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, I would like to take time to recognize the anniversaries of two tragedies in the history of this great American ally.

On January 20th 1990, heavily-armed Soviet troops stormed the capital city of Baku in a final attempt to quell anti-communist uprising. The day is most commonly known as "Black January" due to the terrible human losses and subsequent military rule. 26,000 soldiers fired into crowds of civilians targeting women, children, hospitals, and ambulances. Fighting lasted for three days and resulted in 131 fatalities, over 600 injuries, 841 arrests where detainees were subject to torture, and to this day an unknown number are still missing. These horrific acts did not have their desired effect in the slightest on Azerbaijan who won independence less than two years later.

The second occurred on this day, February 26, twenty-six years ago in the city of Khojaly where several thousand ethnic Azerbaijani people were trapped in a blockade by Armenian troops seeking to lay claim to the Nagorno-Karabakh region. Citizens of the city were told that they may escape if they left immediately but regardless, hundreds of innocent citizens, including women, children, and the elderly, were brutally murdered or taken prisoner on that day. This was the largest

massacre as part of a conflict that is still ongoing.

As the first nation to lend its support to the United States following the attacks of September 11th, so too does Azerbaijan deserve our support and condolences for their losses. These were terrible crimes against humanity which we must never forget, and I urge my colleagues to commemorate them on this day.

IN HONOR OF MARK SCARANO,
FEDERAL CO-CHAIR OF THE
NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL
COMMISSION

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my good friend Mark Scarano as he steps down after nearly three years as Federal Co-Chair of the Northern Border Regional Commission (NBRC). Through his service on the Commission, Mark has continued his life's work as a community economic developer serving areas that are most in need of support. Mark got his start in this field in Millinocket, Maine, and later in Piscataquis County. We in New Hampshire were fortunate that he came next to Grafton County, where for eight years he led its Regional Development Corporation and significantly expanded workforce development and entrepreneurship programs.

In 2015, I was tremendously proud to support President Obama's nomination of Mark to co-chair the NBRC, and his unanimous confirmation by the Senate was a testament to his stellar reputation and achievements. He has proved more than worthy of that honor, as he has been a tireless leader, steward, and advocate of the Commission's important work during a period of tightening budgets and the emergence of new challenges, like the opioid epidemic, which are threatening our rural economy and its development.

Ten years after it was first authorized, the Northern Border Regional Commission continues to play a critical role in driving the economic growth and community development in some of New Hampshire's most economically distressed communities. It supports projects that create and sustain jobs, tackle workforce development, infrastructure, telecommunications, healthcare, culture, and much more. Mark has worked diligently during his tenure to streamline processes and procedures and maximize the impact of the Commission. Through his excellent leadership, Mark has been an invaluable resource to the Granite State and improved the lives of thousands who have relied on projects championed by the Commission.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's Second Congressional District, I thank Mark for his many years of dedicated service to the Granite State and the Northeast. His achievements will continue to benefit our state for years to come. I am honored to recognize and congratulate Mark, and wish him the very best of luck in the years ahead.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE
DENNISON MEMORIAL COMMU-
NITY CENTER

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 150th Anniversary of the Dennison Memorial Community Center.

The Dennison Memorial Community Center has been serving our area since 1868, when the New Bedford Ladies City Mission was officially incorporated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Their mission was to care for the less fortunate through free dental clinics, public baths, and social activities. Named after Rev. Tristan Dennison, the heart and soul of the organization, this center became a pillar of the community.

Today this center continues to serve the people of New Bedford, equipped with a recreational center, daycare, academic assistance and more. Dennison is made up of an incredible, multi-lingual staff working tirelessly to strengthen the city of New Bedford. Welcoming children and teens, age 6 to 16, there is no doubt the center will continue to have a major impact on the success of the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor the 150th anniversary of the Dennison Memorial Community Center for their dedication to bettering their community. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking them for their invaluable service and wishing them all the best in the many years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF REV-
EREND DR. BERTRAND MAURICE
BAILEY, SR.

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the life of a man of staunch faith, Reverend Dr. Bertrand Bailey, Sr. Reverend Bailey was born to the late Reverend Dr. Mauual Lee Bailey and Dr. Bertha Mae Bailey in McKinney, Texas. At the age of 16, Rev. Bailey answered the call to commit his life to preaching and serving his community through ministry. Pastor Bailey went on to not only receive a Bachelor of Arts degree with a double major in philosophy and religion from Bishop College; but also two honorary degrees from Short College and Jackson's Theological Seminary.

For over 30 years, Rev. Bailey served as pastor at St. Andrew Baptist Church in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Under his leadership and spiritual guidance, the congregation grew both in numbers and in Spirit. Rev. Bailey has served as a guest revivalist for citywide and local church revivals in Douglassville, Texas and across the nation. A published author, Rev. Bailey has released several books along with recorded music and preaching CD's. During his tenure, Rev. Bailey oversaw renovations to the

sanctuary and fellowship hall to better serve the needs of the congregation. This included increasing accessibility through building handicap bathrooms. Additionally, many ministries have grown from his leadership and passion for the Lord.

From the very beginning, he dedicated his 11 children to God, four of which went on to become ordained reverends themselves, including my pastor Dr. Bertrand M. Bailey, Jr. He is survived by his wife, of over 41 years, Mrs. Juandalyn J. Bailey and their children: Bertricia, Bertrand Jr., Bertrain, Bertheophilus, Bertshalyn, Bertjuanette, Bertholomew, BerTabitha, Bertrick, and BerThaddaeus, Bertrina (deceased) and his brother, Samuel L. Bailey; 17 grandchildren; a host of nieces and nephews. Although he has returned to his Heavenly Home, the works and seeds he planted on Earth continue to grow and prosper. And we are all better people having known him and stood in his light.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when moments of silence, and thoughts and prayers meant something. That time has long passed.

The Columbine High School massacre was nearly two decades ago. Sandy Hook was over five years ago. The Sutherland Springs and Las Vegas shootings were last year. Yet Congress did nothing to end gun violence in the United States.

How many lives must be sacrificed at the altar of the gun lobby before Congress says enough is enough?

Mass shootings have become all too common, and ordinary acts of violence are perpetrated on the streets every day. In fact, more Americans have died from guns in the United States since Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated than in all the wars this country has fought—starting with the American Revolution.

Each day in this country, ninety-six Americans are killed with guns. Seven of those people are children and teenagers. And Black men are thirteen times more likely than a white man to be shot and killed with a gun.

Gun safety is a civil rights issue. It is a human rights issue.

Congress needs to take immediate action on the dozens of reasonable gun-safety bills pending in this legislative body. We must ban semiautomatic assault weapons. We must stop the online sale of bulk ammunition. And we need to strengthen and mandate universal background checks.

But there's something else Congress can and must do. Congress must find creative ways to encourage people in the United States to voluntarily disarm. Research has shown that greater numbers of firearms result in higher numbers of firearm-related deaths.

Over the past two weeks, reports and viral videos have shown many law-abiding gun owners expressing buyers' remorse and de-

stroying their firearms. There is a movement underway in this country among gun owners to purge their firearms—particularly semiautomatic assault weapons—before they can be used to harm people.

That's why I introduced the Safer Neighborhoods Gun Buyback Act of 2017 (H.R. 3613) last year—to encourage people to voluntarily disarm. Gun buyback programs have proven their worth in communities across the United States. Law enforcement supports safe gun buyback programs. And research has shown that fewer guns means fewer gun deaths. By providing grants to fund gun buyback programs, Congress can incentivize Americans to do the right thing and safely dispose of their semiautomatic assault weapons.

There are dozens of gun safety bills active in this body that would make our streets, our schools, and our homes safer. It's time for us to declare never again. Congress cannot continue to do nothing. People are dying. We must do better by our children.

RECOGNIZING "BLACK JANUARY" AND THE KHOJALY MASSACRE

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate two tragic events in Azerbaijani history. 2018 marks the 28th anniversary of the "Black January" killings and the 26th anniversary of the Khojaly massacre.

On January 19, 1990, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet Presidium declared a state of emergency in response to the growing national independence movement in Azerbaijan, and Soviet troops moved into the Azerbaijani capital of Baku. They fired indiscriminately at peaceful demonstrators, and destroyed critical infrastructure, like medical facilities. When Soviet troops left the city on January 20, more than 130 people were dead, over 700 were injured, 841 were arrested, and five were missing. Human Rights Watch released a report on the incident, later named Black January, stated that, "indeed the violence used by the Soviet Army on the night of January 19–20 constitutes an exercise in collective punishment. The punishment inflicted on Baku by Soviet soldiers may have been intended as a warning to nationalists, not only in Azerbaijan, but in other Republics of the Soviet Union."

On February 26, 1992, Armenian troops descended on the town of Khojaly, located in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan. During their advance, Armenian armed forces massacred over 600 unarmed people, including 106 women and 83 children, and left less than 2,000 survivors. Hundreds more became disabled due to their horrific injuries. More than one hundred children lost a parent and 25 children lost both parents. At least 8 families were completely killed. The Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict remains unresolved.

In spite of these tragedies, Azerbaijan has emerged as an independent nation with a growing economy. It is also a strong ally of the United States; U.S.-Azerbaijani cooperation efforts include playing a leadership role in non-

proliferation issues; providing troops to serve shoulder-to-shoulder with U.S. forces in Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan; allowing transit of non-lethal equipment used by coalition forces through Azerbaijan to Afghanistan; construction of the Southern Gas Corridor from the Caspian Sea to Italy, thereby providing Europe with an alternative to Russian energy sources; and supplying 40 percent of Israel's oil. Azerbaijan also has a thriving Jewish community and is an ally of America's ally Israel.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the sacrifices of the Azerbaijani people in their steps toward a free market economy and democracy, and to work together to facilitate peace in the Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict.

HONORING THE YEARS OF SERVICE OF THE USS "IOWA" TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following proclamation to commend the USS *Iowa* for her seventy-five years of service to the United States of America; Saturday, February 24, will be her 75th anniversary:

Whereas the USS *Iowa* is a national treasure to the United States, having protected the country during both World War II, and the Korean War; and

Whereas the USS *Iowa* served our country over fifty years and designated as the "World's Greatest Naval Ship"; and

Whereas the USS *Iowa* has welcomed and escorted our nation's Commander in Chief on many occasions, no other battleship has been host to more U.S. Presidents than the *Iowa*; and

Whereas the USS *Iowa* has earned fourteen different ribbons and received numerous Command Excellence Awards over her fifty years of service; and

Whereas the USS *Iowa* continues to serve the United States as a living monument that highlights our nation's rich naval history; and

Whereas seventy-five years of continued service deserves the highest marks; and

Now, therefore, I commend the USS *Iowa* and all who served and continue to serve on this beautiful vessel, for seventy-five honorable years.

REMEMBERING THE KHOJALY TRAGEDY

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because Azerbaijan has been a reliable friend and valuable partner of the United States, and it is appropriate for Congress to commemorate the victims of the Khojaly tragedy as our Azerbaijani friends mark the 26th anniversary of the event.

We remember the 613 Azerbaijani men, women, and children killed in Khojaly on February 25 and 26, 1992. Continuing to mark the anniversary of such a tragedy is always difficult, but it is critical that we spend time honoring the precious lives lost.

The Government of Azerbaijan continues to partner with the United States in counter-terrorism efforts, and the country has made meaningful strides its short history as an independent nation to promote economic development regionally, including its efforts in constituting the "New Silk Road."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the town and people of Khojaly who died on those fateful days and in offering our deepest condolences to Azerbaijan on this tragic anniversary.

**CITY OF BURIEN'S 25TH
ANNIVERSARY**

HON. PRAMILA JAYAPAL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud today to join in the celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the City of Burien in Washington's seventh congressional district.

The story of Burien's incorporation begins with a desire for the people to have their voices heard. Nestled between the peaceful waters of the Puget Sound and the bustle of Sea-Tac Airport, Burien's residents felt underrepresented as impacted communities of the airport. Through determination and organizing, the residents were able to reclaim their own agency and set forth on a path to incorporation and representation. The City's vision commits to, "A vibrant and creative community, where the residents embrace diversity, celebrate arts and culture, promote vitality, and treasure the environment."

This vision has guided Burien long before its incorporation. Driven by family and immigrant owned businesses, Burien is ever expanding and innovating new opportunities for its people. Together, long time Burien residents, Americans and immigrants from places like Vietnam and Mexico form a tight-knit city that bustles with traditional foods, celebrations, and neighborly spirit. These communities have laid a foundation for Burien to thrive.

Burien's investment in a just and sustainable city for all has been critical in the fight against climate change and will continue to be critical as we transition to a future powered by renewable energy. Individuals such as Burien's first mayor Dr. Arun Jhaveri have been leading Burien in climate solutions like solar centering a commitment to clean air, clean water and healthy communities.

With over 50,000 residents and over 50 different languages spoken, Burien brings people together across difference to celebrate what we have in common, whether basking in the glow of giant illuminated flower sculptures at Dottie Harper Park for Arts-A-Glow, dancing in the streets for Pride Fest, or eating strawberry shortcake while checking out vintage cars at Strawberry Days.

Mr. Speaker, my hope for Burien is to continue growing with compassion, love and un-

derstanding. To harness the power of collective action and grow in ways that supports their vision for a brighter, more inclusive, and sustainable future. With the election of Jimmy Matta, Burien's first Latino mayor and this passionate City Council, will lead a vision of unity and strength for Burien's community. Together this community will tackle challenges with grace and courage ensuring that we leave the world a little better for our youth. A legacy that we can celebrate with pride.

I again offer congratulations to all in the City of Burien on their 25th anniversary and wish them the best for your next 25 years.

**FALLEN K-9 OFFICER RONY—
HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT**

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the radio blared, a criminal was on the loose.

K-9 Officer Rony and his fellow officers of the Houston Police Department (HPD) responded to the call, ready to take down a dastardly villain. The crook led the officers on a vehicle pursuit, throwing contraband from his car and intentionally ramming an HPD patrol car.

Suddenly, the criminal bailed out of the stolen vehicle, leaving K-9 Rony to pursue the criminal on foot, through a heavily wooded area. As he chased the suspect at full speed, one of K-9 Rony's legs became entangled on a fallen log.

Despite multiple breaks in his leg, K-9 Rony attempted to continue his pursuit. Always a fighter, he was simply in too much pain. His handler rushed him to an emergency animal hospital.

Prior to this accident, K-9 Rony had experienced the pain of arthritis in his other three legs from chasing outlaws. Losing a limb would have only put him in more suffering. His team made the heartbreaking decision. K-9 Rony would be put down.

K-9 Rony gave his life to the thin blue line, helping chase down and apprehend a vile criminal. He was a faithful servant of the Houston Police Department and the people of Houston. He served the department for seven years and had over 250 captures. Rony was known as one of the best K-9 officers the department had, and he will be dearly missed.

Mr. Speaker, we are eternally grateful for our police officers and their furry counterparts in their commitment to keeping our communities safe from criminals. K-9 officers like Rony are of the highest caliber, and we salute him for his service.

And that is just the way it is.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.

This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 27, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 28

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 2434, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs, S. 292, to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, S. 2278, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve health care in rural areas, and S. 1091, to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

SD-430

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 1520, to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and the nominations of Joseph Simons, of Virginia, Noah Joshua Phillips, of Maryland, Christine S. Wilson, of Virginia, and Rohit Chopra, of New York, each to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, and Jeffrey DeWit, of Arizona, to be Chief Financial Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-106

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Water and Power

To hold hearings to examine S. 1142, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects, S. 1556, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, S. 2074, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, S. 2166, to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery programs through fiscal year 2023, to require a report on the implementation of those programs, and H.R. 2786, to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the criteria and process to qualify as a qualifying conduit hydropower facility.

SD-366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider H.R. 2825, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the nomination of Michael K. Atkinson, of Maryland, to be Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SD-342

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of The American Legion.

SD-G50

3:30 p.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine seeking justice for and securing the legacy of Boris Nemtsov.

SD-138

MARCH 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lieutenant General Paul M. Nakasone, USA, to be general and Director, National Security Agency/Chief, Central Security Service/Commander, United States Cyber Command, Department of Defense, and Brent K. Park, of Tennessee, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration, and Anne Marie White, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary (Environmental Management), both of the Department of Energy.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Semi-annual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress.

SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine private sector and government chal-

lenges and opportunities to promote the cyber security and resiliency of our nation's critical energy infrastructure.

SD-366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the Administration's framework for rebuilding infrastructure in America.

SD-406

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert Frank Pence, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland, Department of State, and Judy Lynn Shelton, of Virginia, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine the role of Federal managers in hiring.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Joel M. Carson III, of New Mexico, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Colm F. Connolly, and Maryellen Noreika, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Delaware, William F. Jung, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Ryan T. Holte, of Ohio, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Jonathan F. Mitchell, of Washington, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, and Billy J. Williams, to be United States Attorney for the District of Oregon, Mark S. James, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Missouri, Daniel C. Mosteller, to be United States Marshal for the District of South Dakota, and

Jesse Seroyer, Jr., to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Alabama, all of the Department of Justice.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine implementation of positive train control.

SR-253

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing regarding certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

MARCH 6

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine worldwide threats; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SH-216

MARCH 7

2 p.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President.

SH-216

POSTPONEMENTS

FEBRUARY 28

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight

To hold hearings to examine S. 2421, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

SD-406

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of State and redesign plans.

SD-419

SENATE—Tuesday, February 27, 2018

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Rabbi Seth H. Frisch, senior rabbi of Historic Congregation Keshar Israel, from Philadelphia, PA.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Dearest God, we look to You today, You who remembers all that we have forgotten and You who is the eternal source of blessing.

We stand before You on the eve of the Biblical Festival of Purim, a joyous time in which we read from the ancient and sacred scroll of the Book of Esther. It is in the scroll we read at first of a certain darkness, a darkness which would come to envelope the entire nation over which Esther would soon reign as Queen.

It was Queen Esther who became frightened when the plan revealing a plot to erase the sacred remnants of her people, along with the fundamental teachings of her faith, came to light; and yet it was Esther, who, when confronted by the impending darkness, was able to bring the plot to an end, allowing her people to emerge from the shadow of darkness—of this horror—and live freely, without fear, celebrating life itself in the light of their newfound freedom.

And now, standing here today, before You, on the eve of this festival, we, too, ask that You remember us for life, instilling within us a greater love of freedom, seeking both peace and prosperity for all the inhabitants of this great Nation.

And yet, Dear Lord, we would be remiss if we were not to remember those who have sacrificed much, suffered, and paid dearly with their lives, allowing all of us—to this day—a life of freedom without fear, worshiping as we choose, and continuing to bask in that greater love which You shed and allow us to live within.

Teach us now and forever to celebrate our differences. Unify us to preserve and admire those differences among us—all of us—with respect and dignity for all the inhabitants of this Nation.

Lord, we ask You to bestow Your blessings today upon this assembly and upon the Nation which it serves. Bless all the inhabitants of this land with both prosperity and lasting joy, love, and freedom.

Yevarechecha
V'Yishmerecha.

May God bless you and keep you.
May God bless the United States of America, and may God bless us all.
Amen.

Adonai,

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2018.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

GUN SAFETY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, after Columbine, Sandy Hook, Charleston, Orlando, Las Vegas, and too many more to name, the Nation convulsed, and we talked about reforming our gun safety laws to prevent more names and places from being added to the list. Each time, we talked, but the Senate, the House—this government—did nothing.

Now, in the wake of the tragic shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School that took the lives of another 17 Americans, we must try again to pass meaningful changes to our laws to keep our children safe. That is our duty, and there are many things we could and should pursue.

Yesterday, I suggested that comprehensive background checks would be an excellent and necessary place to start. It doesn't make sense that we allow anyone, regardless of his criminal history—felons—or a history of mental illness, to walk into a gun show or to go online and buy a gun with no questions asked. There is no sense in that. When I wrote the Brady Law back in 1993, gun shows were not popular, and we didn't have internet sales to worry about at the time because there was no internet. These loopholes grew and grew and grew over time. Now, it is hard to know the exact number because we don't record the number of guns that are sold at gun shows or online, but about one-fifth of all gun sales happen without there being background checks.

It is likely that criminals and others who are up to no good have a higher percentage because they do not want to be detected and go through background checks. It is outrageous that so many guns are sold with there being no background checks whatsoever—whether you are a felon, one who is adjudicated mentally ill, or a spousal abuser. It is outrageous. We should close those loopholes and close them now. We should have comprehensive background checks, not just a little something here and a little something there. Comprehensive background checks are supported overwhelmingly by the American people.

Later this morning, just in about 15, 20 minutes, I will be meeting with several of the students—the brave, courageous students—from Stoneman Douglas High School. I want to hear what they have to say. These brave students, whether at the Florida statehouse or on national television, have spoken out with passion, with eloquence, with grace. I believe they are changing the way our country thinks about this

issue. I hope—I pray—they compel us to do something significant because we cannot settle for half measures, not after what happened in Florida, not after so many tragedies.

The fix NICS bill is an idea that has wide support in this Chamber, but it is tiny. It is a grant program that addresses one specific issue. Now, we have a whole host of issues to address, not just one. Fix NICS was aimed by the Senator from Texas at a particular tragedy in Texas by which a member of the Air Force had a record that would have disqualified him from getting a gun, but the Air Force failed to send the statement to NICS. It is a good thing to make sure that doesn't happen, but we should not be aiming our gun legislation simply at one past tragedy. We must look to the future and what will prevent future tragedies. Comprehensive background checks will; the Fix NICS bill will not.

So let's not set our sights too narrow and squander this moment. Let's try for significant, bipartisan legislation that will make a real difference in keeping our children safe. Even as our caucus discusses what legislation is best—and in our leadership meeting, we had an outstanding discussion this morning—I look forward to working with our Republican colleagues to see if we can get something real done.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. President, on another matter, today Senate Democrats will be introducing our legislation to reverse the FCC's repeal of net neutrality. It has the support of every single Democrat and one Senate Republican, Senator COLLINS from the State of Maine.

I say to all my Republican colleagues: This CRA is the best way to undo the terrible decision to repeal net neutrality. It is an important debate. At stake are two opposing visions of the future of the internet.

For its entire history, the internet has been free and open, accessible to all Americans. It has been a true public good, just as our highways have. Whether you are on Main Street or Wall Street, you have the same internet. Whether you are a consumer or big corporation, you have the same internet. Whether you are a teacher in a wealthy school or an underresourced school, you have the same internet. Equality of access has driven innovation and entrepreneurship and so much of what we value in the American spirit and the American economy. It is the American way.

Net neutrality rules were put in place to ensure that the internet remains that way—open and equal access to all, no matter who you are, how much money you have, how much power you have. But the repeal by the Republican-led FCC has opened us to an entirely new universe where internet service providers—the big boys—will have the authority to sell quality

internet to the highest bidder. That means they could restrict customers' access to their favorite websites by forcing them to buy internet packages or pay more for premium services.

Big companies could pay to get faster internet service, while startups and small businesses and average Americans are left in the slow lane.

Everything from Netflix, to Amazon Prime, to Spotify, streaming television, sports, and movies could be slower if you don't pay up.

Public schools that don't pay for premium service could be put at a significant disadvantage.

Startups that are looking to get their businesses off the ground but aren't large enough to negotiate faster internet delivery with ISPs might never take off. Our startups in New York are scared to death of the elimination of net neutrality, and they have created hundreds of thousands of jobs in my city and millions throughout the country.

The internet without net neutrality is a tale of two internets, where the best internet goes to the highest bidder and everyone else loses.

We have an opportunity to save the internet with our CRA, which would reinstitute net neutrality rules that keep the internet just the way it is now. Democrats believe that the future of the internet must be as free and open as in the past; that the startup founder living in her parents' basement should be able to compete with the world's largest corporations; that the young student in an underserved school district should be able to find all the information he needs online; that every American should be able to afford easily accessible internet. If we start grading the internet, it could dramatically hurt our economy and hurt equality in America—something we are all striving for.

Right now, unfortunately, only one Republican has signed up for the fair, open vision of an internet that we need and want to keep. All we need is one more. On this net neutrality day of action, I urge all Americans to contact their Senators and demand they sign up with us to save the internet.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. President, finally, a word on the Republican tax bill. When President Trump and congressional Republicans were trying to sell their tax bill, all we heard about was how it is going to be a boon to workers, stimulate investments in new factories, raise wages, and create jobs. It is a few months after the tax bill, and the promises have not been backed up by the evidence.

Now the evidence is flowing in that corporations are spending the lion's share of the benefits they reap on the tax bill not on workers but on goosing their own stock.

A headline from Monday's New York Times states "Trump's Tax Cuts in

Hand, Companies Spend More on Themselves Than on Wages." The article goes on to document how the Republican tax bill has unleashed a wave of share buybacks and stock repurchasing programs, things which help out rich executives and shareholders but don't accomplish much for everyday American workers. If you are a CEO of a company, you are judged by whether your stock is going up. The quickest hit on that is to buy back your shares, reduce the number. It doesn't help your workers, it doesn't help American productivity, but it helps your bottom line, Mr. CEO.

That is so wrong, that we passed a huge tax bill and put ourselves in deep debt so that much of the money can go to corporate executives—not improving the actual performance of their companies but just raising the value of their stock by buybacks. That is so wrong.

The article in the New York Times documents how the Republican tax bill has unleashed this wave of share buybacks and stock repurchasing programs, which, as I said, helps out rich executives and shareholders but doesn't accomplish much for everyday workers.

Rather than investing in new equipment and research, raising wages, providing better benefits, and raising productivity, which we are so short of here in America right now, corporate America is using the Trump tax cut to give itself a raise.

At Morgan Stanley—hardly a left-wing company—the analysts surveyed a bunch of companies, and the companies surveyed said that they would pass only 13 percent of the Trump tax cut savings on to workers, compared to the 43 percent that go to share buybacks. For manufacturers—we all care about manufacturing—it is even worse. They expect 9 percent to go to workers and 47 percent to go to share buybacks.

Republicans made a conscious decision to give corporations and the wealthiest Americans the lion's share of the tax cuts and promised it would trickle down to everybody else. Unfortunately, trickle-down never works. Corporate America is doing what is best for corporate America, and working America is getting left behind.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant Democratic leader.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, a few years ago, an author named Malcolm Gladwell wrote a book titled "The Tipping Point." He spelled out that in the course of history, when something occurs that changes people's thinking and actions, it is a precipitous moment where what has been done for so long stops, is reevaluated, and a different course is followed. The clear question we have in America today is whether we have reached a tipping point when it comes to gun violence.

It has only been 13 days since the tragedy in Parkland, FL. Look at what has happened since. Of course there is outrage, sadness, and mourning for the families who lost these wonderful students, teachers, and administrators, but beyond that, these high school students—17, 18 years old, some even younger—have become a national voice, a powerful voice on the issue of gun safety in schools.

I often wondered when this moment might occur or whether it would occur. There has been such a long litany and string of mass shootings and massacres. It is sad to say that there was a numbness setting in. When terrible things occurred in places like Las Vegas, Texas, and other States, you wondered, is that the event? Will the killing of those innocent children in Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut be the tipping point? Will America finally say “enough”? It appears that on this day, 13 days after the tragedy in Florida, we are near or at a tipping point when it comes to gun safety.

Some of it is very personal. Two weeks ago, after this occurred, my 6-year-old granddaughter said to her mother that she had been warned in her first grade classroom that if a shooter should turn up at school firing a gun, first, she should stay away from the windows, and second, she should lie down on the floor. I can’t tell you what a profound impact that had on me as a grandfather to think that my little first grader, this beautiful little girl, was worried about the moment when somebody would walk in her classroom and wantonly try to kill the students and teachers who are there.

I cannot believe that any sane person believes that the Second Amendment to the Constitution—the right to bear arms—envisioned that possibility. I am sure it didn’t. I am sure our Founding Fathers—and we can debate for the rest of the day what their words actually meant—never envisioned that an American citizen’s right to bear arms could somehow translate into violence against so many innocent people, as it has over and over again.

Last week, I was in Chicago. I was joined at a press conference by gun safety advocates at the Martin Luther King Jr. Community Center on the South Side. We stood together, victims of gun violence and I, at a press conference. With me were advocates from Hadiya’s Promise and the Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence, who have been working together for years to combat the scourge gun violence in Illinois. I also stood with Patrick Korellis, who was wounded on February 14 10 years ago at a mass school shooting at Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, IL.

A new voice came to join us, a graduate from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL, named

Francyn Brown. She graduated from Stoneman Douglas in 2009. She is currently a law student at the Chicago-Kent College of Law. She is one of dozens of Stoneman Douglas graduates in the Chicago area—which include, incidentally, the first baseman for the Chicago Cubs, Anthony Rizzo—and hundreds, if not thousands, nationwide who joined together in the aftermath of the February 14 mass shooting that killed 14 Stoneman Douglas students and 3 staff. These young men and women have come together to speak up and urge their lawmakers to do something about the Nation’s epidemic of gun violence. The message is starting to resonate.

When Francyn Brown was speaking last Wednesday, students at schools across the Chicagoland area were walking out of class in solidarity with Stoneman Douglas students. They are all calling for commonsense gun reform. These students don’t have time or patience for political games in Washington or Springfield. They have seen their friends, kids just like themselves, get shot in their classrooms and neighborhoods. They have had enough.

Francyn Brown said:

It’s not supposed to matter what side of the aisle a politician sits. We are supposed to all protect the future of our children.

I couldn’t agree more.

These students and young people across the country are changing the debate about gun violence. They are making it clear how absurd it is for lawmakers in this Chamber, across the rotunda, or in State capitals to do nothing when Americans get shot every day in their homes, their neighborhoods, their churches, nightclubs, concerts, and schools. They are fed up with politicians in Washington who ignore the overwhelming majority of Americans who want commonsense gun safety and listen instead to paranoid, bullying gun sales lobbyists.

Remember, the National Rifle Association and its allies oppose virtually anything that hurts gun sales. They fight against proposals that might reduce gun sales, and they try to roll back laws on the books that limit them. That is their agenda. But it is not America’s agenda. Corporate America is starting to walk away from the NRA. It is no longer a source of pride that they are doing business with the National Rifle Association—just the opposite. We are seeing company after company end relationships with the NRA because of its increasingly unhinged and hysterical rhetoric on the issue of gun safety. Corporate America—some of the biggest corporations in our Nation—realize that the NRA no longer speaks for responsible gun owners. When will Congress realize this?

We know we need to act to keep our children safe. There is no single reform that can stop every shooting, but we know there are gaps in our gun laws

that make it easy for criminals, abusers, troubled children, and mentally unstable people to get guns, even military assault weapons with bump stocks and high-capacity magazines.

We need to close these gaps, and that requires the Republicans who control Congress to stand up to the NRA and do something that the NRA might not like. For starters, my Republican colleagues could take up legislation that the leader of their party, President Trump, proposed last Thursday. Here is one of the President’s infamous tweets:

I will be strongly pushing Comprehensive Background Checks with an emphasis on Mental Health. Raise age to 21 and end sale of Bump Stocks! Congress is in a mood to finally do something on this issue—I hope!

And I hope as well.

There are proposals that Americans broadly support. Let’s do something. Of course, the NRA is opposed to most of these. We expected that. These proposals might have some negative impact on gun sales, but is the gun sales lobby now in charge of writing bills for the Senate and the House? Deferring to the NRA is the reason we have reached this moment in history.

Remember, the Senate has held one gun vote since President Trump came to office, and it was a vote to prevent mental health records from the Social Security Administration from going into the FBI’s gun background check system. That is the only vote since the Trump administration took office. It is the only thing we have done here—roll back a law on the books on mental health and background checks. That was a giveaway to the gun lobby, which claims to support enforcing the laws on the books but actually tries to roll back those laws if it means helping to lift their sales.

Let’s show the students at Stoneman Douglas and across the country that we hear them. I hope we show that reducing gun violence is a priority.

I call on my Republican colleagues to join the Democrats in a bipartisan effort to treat the issue of gun safety with the sense of urgency that the American people believe is necessary. If Republicans gave a fraction of the effort to gun safety that they have to other issues, we could get this done—and done quickly. There are plenty of reforms we could pass that are completely consistent with the Second Amendment and would save lives. Even President Trump, for the time being, has said that he supports them.

So let’s get started. Not on a giveaway to the gun lobby—let’s work on closing loopholes. Let’s have universal background checks. Over 90 percent of the American people believe we should keep guns out of the hands of convicted felons and mentally unstable people. I also believe that those who are subject to protective orders for domestic violence should be disqualified from buying a gun. I would say that those who

are on the terrorist watch list, whom we do not allow to fly on airplanes because of fear that they could do harm to others, shouldn't be allowed to buy guns in the United States. I want to add a provision that straw purchasers—the girlfriends with no criminal record who buy the weapons to give to the boyfriends with a long criminal record—ought to have the book thrown at them. Let's get to work.

I want to thank the victims and advocates who have worked for many years to help reduce the epidemic of gun violence. I want them to know we stand with them, and I hope we can all stand with them on a bipartisan basis.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

FIX NICS BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I heard the remarks of my colleague from Illinois, and I, too, hope that we can get past the rhetoric and the talking points of the past and actually do something meaningful when it comes to public safety and address the terrible tragedies like the one that occurred at Stoneman Douglas High School in Florida just 2 weeks ago. But we are not going to do it by trotting out our laundry lists of requests and saying that it has to be all of this or nothing because when you say here in Washington—and particularly in Congress—"I want everything on my list or I want nothing," one thing is for sure. You will end up with nothing, and that simply is an unacceptable outcome, particularly when it comes to the public safety crisis manifested here most recently at Stoneman Douglas High School in Florida.

We know that there were many, many failures; you might even call this a systemic failure when it comes to the children at Stoneman Douglas High School. First and foremost, why didn't Federal and local law enforcement follow up on threats and warnings? This young man, the shooter who took the lives of 17 people, telegraphed in very clear, unmistakable language what he intended to do, but the very people whom we trust and entrust with public safety at the Federal and State levels did not respond.

We know that the alleged shooter was expelled from school for disciplinary reasons. We know that deputies in Broward County received at least 18 calls warning them over the course of several years—18 calls. We know about the disturbing YouTube posts, where the shooter basically said what he intended to do and did, in fact, do later. We know that the FBI received many disturbing tips from citizens about the imminent danger posed by the shooter.

Another question is whether mental health officials could have done more. We know that this young man had a long history of violent outbursts. We are told that in 2016 he reportedly at-

tempted suicide by drinking gasoline. He had been accused of verbal slurs against racial and religious minorities.

We know that Florida has a State law, as some have advocated at the Federal level, that permits forced hospitalization of people in mental health crises, but it seems that in this particular case, mental health workers concluded that this individual was stable at the time they examined him. Why and how was that determination made, and why does that stand in such stark contrast to the picture that we have been able to draw as a result of all the information that we received since this terrible shooting? If law enforcement, public health workers, and school officials were communicating and coordinating effectively, would they have made the same decisions in this case? Could they have made a difference in the outcome? Well, I think we need the answers to those questions.

There are two other questions we need to answer as well. One is why and how did the shooter have access to firearms in the first place? Another is why didn't the school's armed resource officer intervene once the shooting began?

All of us are angry at the fact that this shooting happened, but that shouldn't tempt us into easy solutions that at the end of the day wouldn't make any difference in the outcome and wouldn't do any good. That is what we tend to get here in Congress when we have hard issues like this—easy solution talking points that lead to no effective action. We can't let that happen here. As one columnist put it last week, we can't fall victim to "the politics of false hope."

The most frequent refrain I hear in Washington after some tragedy like this occurs is "We need to do something." Well, we need to do something effective, something that would change the likely outcome. We may not be able to protect every citizen against terrible tragedies like this, but there are things we can do that will make things better and that will be effective in changing the outcome and, I believe, in saving lives.

Real solutions require us to look at why the FBI and local law enforcement failed to respond to multiple warnings. I asked one police officer about this, and he said: Well, in America we can't arrest somebody for precrimes. In other words, we can't arrest somebody for an offense that they haven't committed yet. It is perhaps a flaw that is exposed in our system when, unfortunately, we can't anticipate who might commit these terrible offenses and stop them before they commit the act. That is a feature of our law enforcement system, but this isn't just another job for law enforcement. There are a lot more people who could contribute to a solution here and prevent these incidents from happening beyond law enforce-

ment, who are, by our very Constitution, structured to investigate and prosecute crimes that have already occurred, not to stop them in the first place.

I think a fair question to ask is, What is the role of social media in preventing mass violence? When you have people basically telling us what they are getting ready to do and posting those on social media and nothing seems to happen as a consequence, it strikes me that something is terribly wrong there. What is the responsibility of these platforms? Well, we know that Congress has said, for example, that you have a responsibility to police your platform for things like child pornography. In other words, they can't be totally oblivious to the things that are being posted on these social media platforms. They have a responsibility to intervene in some cases, and maybe it ought to be in more cases.

What options currently exist to reporting disturbing content online? I believe in the YouTube video case, it was someone who actually saw it, was disturbed by it, and then reported it to the FBI. It was not even YouTube itself that identified it. Of course, they would be in the best position to identify it immediately. It was some third party who happened to see it, was disturbed by it, and contacted the FBI. Tragically, it was never followed up on. How often are these popular platforms reporting to police or Federal authorities when people actually threaten to commit acts of violence? If there are holes in the reporting protocol, we should close them.

That is why I think this is a systemic failure. When you look at mental health providers, when you look at law enforcement officials, when you look at the schools, when you look at the social media platforms, when you look at all of this together, I think it begins to give us some ideas about things we can do that may end up saving lives, and we should do them.

Members are discussing many ideas, which always happens after a tragedy like this, and I am open to a conversation with anyone who shares my desire to take effective action to prevent another one of these tragedies. There is one proposal that has already been introduced that has won bipartisan support and has brought together advocates from all sides. It is really a unique piece of legislation because there are not many times that I can think of where people who are strong Second Amendment advocates and people who believe there ought to be more controls imposed on guns can come together to find consensus, to find common ground, but we have on a bill called the Fix NICS Act, which I introduced to strengthen the background check system.

It may take a long time to answer all the questions raised by the tragedy in

Parkland, but one step we can take right now is to pass the Fix NICS bill. This bill has the unique quality of causing the junior Senator from Connecticut and me to cointroduce this bill. We couldn't be more ideologically different. He is a Democrat and I am a Republican, but we have come together on a bill that does enjoy broad bipartisan support and that, I believe, will save lives.

This bill was introduced in the wake of the shooting last fall in the small community near San Antonio called Sutherland Springs, TX. As we will recall, a deranged gunman with a criminal record and a history of violence and mental illness opened fire during a Sunday morning church service, killing 26 people and wounding 20 more. To add to the tragedy that had already occurred, this murderer's criminal conviction records were never uploaded to the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System. When he went to purchase firearms, he lied about his record, and there was nothing in the criminal background check system to show that he lied and thus deny him the opportunity to purchase weapons. This failure to enforce our background check law allowed this shooter to walk into a gun store, pass a background check, and illegally purchase a firearm.

This bipartisan legislation would tighten the National Instant Background Check System. It is supported by people all across the political spectrum. It is even cosponsored by the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, and is supported by Everytown for Gun Safety. It has brought together all sides in the gun debate—leaders on the Republican side and Democratic side alike.

Under current law, mentally ill individuals and persons convicted of violent crimes are prohibited by current law from purchasing or possessing firearms. This is to make sure that these laws are enforced and that criminal history information is uploaded into the NICS Federal database by State and Federal authorities.

For years, our colleagues across the aisle have said that they want reform that would help stem the tide of gun violence perpetrated by dangerous criminals. Well, this is their chance. This is our chance. It is our chance to show the Nation that we refuse to accept shootings in schools and churches as the new normal, and we can do that. We can start doing that by passing Fix NICS this week.

Senator SCHUMER, the minority leader, said yesterday that he wants to wait, even though he is a cosponsor of the Fix NICS bill. He is a cosponsor of the bill, but he says that he wants to wait. He wants to wait and debate other ideas he knows are controversial and can't pass. Of course, that is his right as a Senator, but as I said earlier,

if our attitude is "I want everything on my list or nothing," we are going to end up with nothing.

I, for one, am not willing to go home and look my constituents in the face and say that we had an opportunity to pass legislation, the Fix NICS bill, which will save lives in the future and will make sure that existing laws are enforced. I will not be able to go home and tell them, in good faith, that we have done everything we can in our power to help save lives. We can do that by passing bipartisan legislation that could pass today if it were put on the floor and voted on by a supermajority of the Senate.

I implore our Democratic colleagues to change course. Let's do the art of the possible. That is what politics is, the art of the possible. Let's do what we can immediately to pass Fix NICS and build from there. I am willing to work with them. The President is willing to work with them on things like bump stocks and the mental health failure, trying to make sure that our schools are safer and to make sure that social media platforms report threats of violence to law enforcement officials so they can be followed up on.

There are a lot of other things we can do, but the one thing we can do this week before we go home is to pass the Fix NICS bill and to send it to the House and have the President sign it into law. It will save lives.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote to confirm another fine candidate to serve on the Federal bench.

Yesterday afternoon, we voted to advance the nomination of Judge Elizabeth Branch for the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Judge Branch has sat on the Georgia Court of Appeals since 2012. This follows a fine career that spanned both private practice and public service.

Judge Branch has previously answered the call to serve at the Department of Homeland Security, where she worked as associate general counsel, and then at the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. Her record and qualifications are well known.

Our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee reported her nomination favorably by an overwhelming vote. Confirming this worthy nominee will be a further credit to the outstanding work of Chairman GRASSLEY and the members of the committee.

I encourage all my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm Elizabeth Branch today. Let's continue to fulfill our constitutional responsibility and confirm the President's outstanding judicial nominees.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 387.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Northey, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

The nomination was confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

REMEMBERING FREDERICK DOUGLASS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, 200 years ago this month, a man was born into slavery in a cabin not far from here in Maryland. The child knew his mother only briefly; they were cruelly separated when he was young. He knew his father only by the rumors. He didn't even know the exact day of his birth. Yes, even his birthday—for many of us, that foundational aspect of identity—was denied him by the cruel master of slavery.

This slave was whipped and beaten. His days were filled with toil. His

nights were filled with restless turning on a packed dirt floor. But that is not where the story ends—no, it is only the beginning of the incredible life of Frederick Douglass, the great abolitionist, orator, and one of the greatest Americans ever to live. As Douglass would later write in his memoirs, “You have seen how a man was made a slave. You shall see how a slave was made a man.”

For all its terrible might—its bloodhounds and its implements of torture—slavery was not built to withstand Frederick Douglass, just as it was not built to withstand the universal desire for freedom that lies within the heart of man.

Douglass knew that the first step to freedom was education, so he taught himself to read in secrecy because slaves were punished for learning to read. Around the time he was 12, he got hold of an old textbook called “The Columbian Orator.” Little did Douglass know that around that same time, the same textbook was being studied on the Illinois prairie by a young man named Abraham Lincoln. In that textbook, Douglass found speeches by George Washington and Benjamin Franklin—men who revolted against tyranny to claim their liberty. In that book, he also found a fictional dialogue between a slave and his master where the master brought forward “the whole argument in behalf of slavery . . . all of which was disposed of by the slave.” Douglass wrote: This exchange “gave tongue to interesting thoughts of [his] soul.” It kindled his burning conviction that slavery was wrong and he must escape it. From that moment on, Douglass was a grave threat to the very institution of slavery itself. He was free in his own mind.

Douglass’ journey “from the tomb of slavery, to the heaven of freedom” would go through many dramatic twists and turns before its conclusion. When a notorious slave breaker tried to beat him for disobeying orders, Douglass wrestled him into submission. He insisted on being treated as a man, and from that day forward, he was never whipped again.

Douglass’ first attempt at escape was a failure, thwarted at the last minute by a betrayal of confidence. He did not fail a second time. In 1838, traveling in disguise under an assumed identity, Douglass took a steamboat north to the blessedness of freedom. At this point in the story, you might expect Douglass to fade from history, to enjoy a modest and tranquil life with his wife and his children. But no—the former slave, who taught himself to read through the words of Cicero and Washington, went on to be history’s most eloquent witness against slavery. He denounced the bloody institution in 1,000 speeches and from the pages of his own abolitionist newspaper, *The North Star*, and he denounced slavery firmly from inside the American tradition.

Like many radical abolitionists, at times Frederick Douglass was profoundly ambivalent about his own country. Indeed, there was a time in his early adulthood when he affirmatively hated the United States, preferring disunion to union with slaveholders. But Frederick Douglass later came to a different conclusion about America. When he read the Nation’s founding documents, he did not find codified defenses of slavery; to the contrary, he found that the compromises the Founders had made to slavery were meant to undermine that institution over time, not to sustain it. What Douglass found in the Founders was quite different from what he had expected to find. He later said: Their message “is ‘We the people’; not we the white people, not even we the citizens, not we the privileged class, not we the high, not we the low, but we the people.”

Douglass was an activist, yes, a militant, yes, who led recruiting drives for Black soldiers during the Civil War. But for all of his righteous anger, he did not want to cast aside the principles of his country. Douglass knew that the most powerful antidote to injustice was found within the American tradition, with its insistence on natural rights for all men.

Douglass wrote:

From the first, I saw no chance of bettering the condition of the freedman until he should cease to be merely a freedman and should become a citizen. . . . The liberties of the American people [are] dependent upon the ballot-box, the jury-box, and the cartridge-box; that without these no class of people could live and flourish in this country.

Frederick Douglass has many lessons to teach us if we are willing to listen. I would like to highlight just one more, which I think is especially relevant to us today.

At the end of his famous autobiography, Frederick Douglass contrasted two societies: the slaveholder society he was born into and the northern society where he was reborn in freedom.

The slave society he described was built on force and fraud. Its religion had been perverted to serve earthly idols. Its families were torn apart at the auction block. Its workers toiled to no reward. This society had been poisoned by its rejection of the American creed, by its insistence that all men are not created equal. Indeed, it had become an authoritarian society that policed movement, association, even intimacy. And for what? To protect a hideous falsehood.

The free society Douglass described was different. Here, a man could hold an honest job, and he worked because his work was rewarded, not because he feared punishment. Here, a runaway slave could make a name for himself, rising to a position of esteem in his community through his service. Here, a family could put down roots and flourish.

Those are two very different societies, guided by very different beliefs. One is a weak community hiding behind a show of strength. The other is a strong and free community with absolutely nothing to hide.

Today we are blessedly free from the institution of slavery, but our communities have their own problems. The American family is in crisis. Our prisons are full, and our pews are empty. Heroin and opioids enslave millions. Many more are killed before they even get the chance to live.

Yes, we have our own battles to fight. In too many ways, we have fallen short of the high principles upon which our Nation was built. That ultimately is why the legacy of Frederick Douglass is so very important. He implored his generation to heal itself of its greatest disease. He calls upon us to do the same.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postclosure time on the Branch nomination expire at 4 p.m. today and the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate. Finally, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

RECESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:18 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Ohio.

HONORING OFFICERS ANTHONY MORELLI AND ERIC JOERING

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I would like to talk today about two brave Ohioans who were tragically killed while serving their community and all of us.

On Saturday, February 10, Ohio lost two of its finest when Westerville Police Officers Anthony Morelli and Eric

Joering were fatally shot responding to a 9-1-1 call. They rushed to the scene. When they arrived, they were under fire. Officer Joering was killed at the scene. Officer Morelli died in surgery later that day.

Officer Morelli was a 29-year veteran of the Westerville Police Department. He leaves behind his wife Linda, their daughter Beth, and son Chris. Officer Joering was a 16-year veteran of the Westerville Police Department, where he was a K-9 officer partnered with his dog Sam.

Eric loved working with Sam, but what he really loved were his kids and his wife. His most important job, he said, was being a husband and a father. He is survived by his wife Jami and his beautiful daughters Eva, Elena, and Ella.

Both men were loved and respected members of the Westerville community, and both will be sorely missed. I had a chance to talk to a number of their fellow officers, their colleagues, over the weekend and heard many stories about them, their bravery, and their commitment to service.

I also had the great honor to meet with the families of both of these fallen officers over this past weekend in Columbus, OH. Linda Morelli and Jami Joering are incredibly strong women and incredibly strong mothers. I expressed my thanks from all Ohioans for their husbands' service. I also had a chance to talk to four of the five children about their fathers' exemplary service; that they had fallen in service to all of us and how much we appreciated them.

The U.S. Capitol has flags that are flown for special occasions, and two flags were flown in honor of the sacrifices these two good men made protecting the people of Ohio.

Throughout this tragic situation, I will say the people of Central Ohio and, frankly, across the Nation have stepped up in big ways to support and assist these two families. I am encouraged by the kindness and generosity we have seen.

I want to take a moment to just say that these two brave officers, Tony Morelli and Eric Joering, were the best. They made the ultimate sacrifice for all of us. Today, we hold their families up in prayer.

(The remarks of Mr. PORTMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2456 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, tax reform is working. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has been the law of the land for just 2 months, but it is already helping American workers.

When it came time to draft tax reform legislation, we had one objective,

and that was to make hard-working Americans' lives better. To accomplish that, we focused on two important priorities.

First, we focused on immediately increasing Americans' take-home pay. We lowered tax rates across the board, we nearly doubled the standard deduction, and we doubled the child tax credit. All of those provisions went into effect on January 1, and by the end of this month, according to the IRS, 90 percent of the American people should see lower paychecks.

While immediate relief for hard-working Americans was crucial, we wanted more than that. We wanted to give the American people access to the kinds of jobs and the kinds of wages and opportunities that would set them up for long-term security. We wanted to give them the kinds of jobs and wages where they wouldn't be forced to choose between sending their kids to college and saving for a secure retirement or between paying the mortgage or medical bills. So in addition to lowering the tax burden on Americans directly, we set about improving the playing field for American businesses so that we could make things better for American workers.

Needless to say, in order for American workers to thrive, the American economy has to thrive, and that means that American businesses have to thrive. It is pretty hard for a small business to hire a new worker or to raise wages if the owner can barely pay the tax bill. It is unlikely that an American company is going to have a lot of spare cash for investing in its workforce if it is struggling to compete with foreign companies that are paying far less in taxes. It is unlikely that America's global companies are going to focus on reinvesting in the United States if they face a tax penalty for bringing foreign earnings back home. So we lowered our Nation's massive corporate tax rate, which, up until January 1, was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. We lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small- and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We expanded business owners' ability to recover investments they make in their businesses, which will free up cash that they can reinvest into their operations and their workers. We brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century by replacing our outdated worldwide system with a modernized territorial tax system so that American businesses are not operating at a disadvantage next to their foreign competitors.

The goal in all of this was to free up businesses to increase their investments in the American economy and in American workers, and that is exactly what businesses are doing. The list of tax reform good news keeps growing—wage increases, new jobs, increased in-

vestment, bonuses, benefit increases, and the list goes on and on.

Take utility bills. Lower utility bills might not be the first result we think of from tax reform, but tax reform is saving utility companies money, and they are passing those savings on to consumers.

Washington, DC, radio station WTOP reports:

In a flip-flop related to tax reform, [utility company] Pepco now says it wants to cut rates instead of raise them.

In December and January, the utility announced plans to raise rates in D.C. and Maryland respectively. . . . But the sweeping Federal tax bill signed into law late last year meant a significant tax savings for the utility. As a result, Pepco is now asking the Maryland Public Service Commission to approve a rate cut.

That is right—they were talking about a rate increase, but now they are talking about a rate cut in their utility rates.

Take this story from the Daily Energy Insider titled "Federal Tax Cut More Than Reverses Eversource Rate Increase in Massachusetts."

The Daily Energy Insider:

Many Eversource Energy electricity customers in Massachusetts who were expecting to see a rate increase this year instead will see a rate reduction because of the recent Federal corporate tax cut.

"What was expected to be about a \$36 million annual rate increase has turned into a \$20 million annual decrease," said the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities.

In my home State of South Dakota, Black Hills Energy in Rapid City is working with regulators to pass tax savings on to South Dakotans. So far, utility companies in at least 39 States are passing tax savings on to consumers, and that can be a real help to family budgets. Everybody knows how much gets spent out of every family's budget on utilities, on energy, and certainly in my part of the country in South Dakota, with the cold winters, that is even amplified. It can be a real help to family budgets, particularly families who are living paycheck to paycheck.

In Florida, Florida Power and Light Company announced that thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, it will no longer require its customers to pay a surcharge for Hurricane Irma restoration. Instead, the company reports:

Florida Power and Light plans to apply federal tax savings toward the \$1.3 billion cost of Hurricane Irma restoration, which will save each of Florida Power and Light's 4.9 million customers an average of approximately \$250.

Thanks to tax reform, good news for American workers seems to just pour in daily, whether it is lower utility bills, new jobs, bonuses, or, as Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina announced last week, lower rate increases on health insurance.

I am proud that tax reform is accomplishing our goal of making life better for hard-working Americans, and I look

forward to seeing even more benefits for American workers in the weeks and months to come.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATIONS OF RYAN NELSON AND SUSAN COMBS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Western Caucus and as a Montanan, I am here to urge the swift confirmation of two outstanding nominations to serve in the Department of the Interior. The first is Ryan Nelson, a native of Idaho Falls, ID, as Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. The second is Susan Combs, a rancher from Big Bend, TX. She is nominated to be Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget.

Both of these positions are critical to managing our public lands and wildlife. Yet these two well-qualified individuals have been waiting in a bureaucratic limbo. Mr. Nelson was first nominated over 209 days ago, and Ms. Combs received her first nomination over 231 days ago.

Mr. Nelson is a great choice to serve as Solicitor. He is a westerner, and he spends time fishing and hunting with his family in Idaho. He understands our western way of life, and he has the work experience to make sure our public lands are managed and protected in the right way.

His service includes serving as clerk on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, serving as special counsel for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and as Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Environment and Natural Resources Division of the Department of Justice.

At the Department of Justice, he worked to defend vital Federal programs and oversaw many complex cases involving our natural resources, wildlife, and environment. He also compelled polluters to limit harmful emissions into the air and worked with then-Solicitor of the Department of the Interior David Bernhardt on the listing decision for the polar bear. Like Mr. Bernhardt, Ryan is capable of upholding the law and the science, even when it is not easy.

If you want someone who values conservation, who knows the appropriate use of laws, like the Antiquities Act and the Endangered Species Act, then Ryan is your guy. The Department of the Interior needs Ryan's expertise to help make the best decisions possible for the benefit of our natural resources

and the people and wildlife living around them. His confirmation must be prioritized.

Ms. Combs is also exactly the right person for the job to serve as the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget. Ms. Combs has had a long and successful career both in business and in public service, including as a member of the Texas House of Representatives, as Texas's agriculture commissioner, and as Texas's comptroller of public accounts. Her proven management track record in public service and in business is crucial to making the Department of the Interior more efficient and effective to help ensure the responsible stewardship of western lands.

Both Mr. Nelson's and Ms. Combs's nominations have been pending longer than any of their predecessors'—now listen to this—over the past 25 years. This is not just bad governance; it is a complete lack of governance. Here is the problem. When you have qualified individuals like Mr. Nelson and like Ms. Combs who wait in this bureaucratic limbo for this long, it then puts them in a position to, maybe, find other employment. We need to find the best people who are willing to serve in these positions, and we need to give them the respect of moving them through quickly so that we can keep them with the thought of entering public service.

Colleagues, it is time to get the job done and move these critical nominations across the finish line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this morning, I had the opportunity to meet with some extraordinary young people. These were students from Parkland, FL, who attend the school where the mass shooting took place 2 weeks ago. What was amazingly impressive about these young people is that in the midst of their grief, in the midst of the unbelievably traumatic experience that they went through in seeing their best friends being shot and wounded in cold blood and their teachers killed, they resolved not just to mourn and grieve for their friends and neighbors; they resolved to stand up and fight back and come to Washington, go to Tallahassee, FL, and go around the country to do everything they can to make certain that no more children—no more young people—are mowed down and slaughtered in schools.

Nobody thinks that the issue of gun safety is going to be an easy issue to solve. There are literally hundreds of millions of guns throughout this country, and there are 5 million assault weapons throughout this country today. Tragically, there are many thousands of people, I expect in every State in this country, who are walking our streets and are at their wits end

emotionally, who are suicidal, who are homicidal. Many of those people have access to guns and guns of mass destruction. I think that in some respects, the slaughter at the high school in Parkland, FL, was kind of the straw that broke the camel's back.

Several months ago, the American people were stunned to see some very sick person in Las Vegas break a window and start mowing down people. He killed some 58 Americans and wounded 500 people within a period of a few minutes. That was on top of Sandy Hook. It was on top of so many gun slaughters that, I think, what has finally happened—maybe because of the extraordinary efforts of these young people from Parkland—the American people are saying that enough is enough, that we have a difficult problem. We may not be able to solve it completely overnight, but we have a moral obligation to do everything we can to make certain that no more children—no more people in this country—are mowed down by some sick person with a weapon.

That is not just I who is talking, and it is not just the young people from the high school in Florida. It is pretty much what the American people want. Let me refer the Presiding Officer to a few polls that were conducted fairly recently.

A Quinnipiac poll was done on February 20, just a week ago. This is what that poll showed.

It showed that 97 percent of the American people support universal background checks, which is not a radical idea. What the American people are saying and what gun owners are saying is that we should keep guns out of the hands of people who are not responsible and should not own guns. Universal background checks are almost universally supported by the American people.

In that same Quinnipiac poll, 83 percent of the American people indicated support for a mandatory waiting period for all gun purchases. You don't want somebody who is angry, who is upset, or who had something terrible happen to go running to a gun store, buying a gun, and then going out and using it.

There are 75 percent who, basically, want the Congress to address the issue of gun violence and to start taking action.

There are 67 percent of the people polled by Quinnipiac who support a nationwide ban on the sale of assault weapons. They believe and I believe that assault weapons are designed as military weapons to kill human beings. That is what those weapons are designed to do. I believe and have believed for 30 years—and a majority of the American people believe—that we should end the sale and distribution of those weapons. That was in a Quinnipiac poll.

According to a CNN poll that was done more recently, just a few days ago

on February 25, 70 percent of the American people want stricter gun laws. This is the highest number that CNN has registered since way back when the Brady Bill passed, in 1993.

According to CNN, 87 percent support laws to prevent convicted felons and the mentally ill from owning guns. There are 71 percent who support banning anyone under the age of 21 from buying a gun. There are 63 percent who support a ban on the sale and possession of high-capacity magazines. There are 57 percent who support an assault weapons ban, and 56 percent say that stricter gun laws would reduce gun-related deaths.

We have a difficult issue which is not going to be solved overnight, and nobody thinks that it will. Yet the American people are demanding that we have the courage to stand up to the NRA and finally take some action that will move us in the right direction. Let me just suggest some of the ways I believe we should go forward in a bipartisan way.

Once again, the American people believe and I believe in universal background checks. That means, among other things, ending the so-called gun show loophole, because background checks don't mean anything if somebody can go to a gun show or on the internet and buy weapons without undergoing any background check. Overwhelmingly, the American people say that before somebody is able to purchase a gun, we need to know: Is the person a killer? Is he a person who has engaged in domestic violence? Is he somebody who has a history of mental health problems? If that is the case, that person should not be buying a gun.

I think serious gun safety legislation must include addressing the so-called straw man purchases. This is a provision by which people can legally go to gun shops, buy the weapons that they want, but then they are going to sell those weapons or distribute those weapons to people who should not be owning those weapons and who could not have purchased those weapons on their own. I have indicated it is my view that we should ban assault weapons in this country—weapons that are designed for no other purpose but to kill human beings.

Furthermore, I think it is clear that we are a nation that is facing a mental health crisis. I know that in my office—and I expect in the offices of other Senators—we get calls all of the time from people who say: I am worried about my husband. I am worried about my brother. He is at his wits end. I don't know what he is going to do to himself or what he is going to do to somebody else. We have been searching for mental health treatment, but we cannot find anything that is available now or that we can afford.

I believe we should be moving forward to pass legislation which says

that Americans who suffer today from mental health crises should be able to get the mental healthcare they need now, not 2 months from now, because 2 months from now may be too late.

We also need to address the fact that, every year, women are being killed by their husbands or their boyfriends and that if somebody is a stalker, if somebody is convicted of domestic violence, if somebody is under a restraining order, we should be clear that that person should not be owning a gun. This is just some of what I think needs to be done.

We are at a moment when the American people have had it up to here. They do not want to turn on their TVs tomorrow or next week or next month and see the horrible, unspeakable things that we have seen in schools throughout this country.

At this particular moment in history, I hope that in a bipartisan way we can come together and do what the American people want us to do, which is to pass commonsense gun safety legislation that is supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak on behalf of my constituents and the tens of millions of Americans who rely on a free and open internet.

Make no mistake, we are locked in a historic battle to preserve the core principles of competition, innovation, and consumer choice that have made the internet the world's greatest platform for commerce and communications; a historic battle to restore the hallmark of American innovation and democratization; a historic battle to protect America's innovation incubator and job generator—a battle for net neutrality.

In December, the Trump FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, eliminated net neutrality. These rules prevented your internet service provider—Comcast, Verizon, AT&T, and Charter—from indiscriminately charging more for internet fast lanes or slowing down or even blocking certain websites entirely, the very rules that allow inventors, entrepreneurs, and small businesses, the lifeblood of the American economy, to connect to the internet.

The reason why is simple. The Trump administration sides with the rich and

the powerful first and consistently puts everyday American lives last. We have seen them wage an all-out assault on healthcare, on climate change, and now on net neutrality, but today the internet is fighting back, and we have a powerful tool at our disposal that will allow the average consumer to have their voices heard right here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Today I am officially introducing a CRA—Congressional Review Act—resolution that will fully restore net neutrality. The entire Senate Democratic caucus is now standing with the millions of Americans who want to reverse the FCC's partisan actions and restore net neutrality.

Net neutrality is not and should not be a partisan issue. I thank Senator SUSAN COLLINS for supporting my CRA, and I encourage other Republican colleagues to stand with all of us who support net neutrality. We are just one vote away in the Senate from restoring net neutrality. There will be a vote right here on the floor of the Senate sometime this spring. The clock is ticking. We just need a simple majority for passage, and that is just one more vote.

When we take that vote, every one of my colleagues will have to answer the simple question: Whose side are you on? Do you stand with hard-working American families for whom the internet is essential or do you stand with the Big Money corporate interests and their army of lobbyists? We should all be on the right side of history.

Millennials are motivated. Momentum is building. Citizens are joining together demonstrating, writing letters, calling their Members of Congress, and taking this message to social media. They are joined by groups that include Fight for the Future, Demand Progress, Free Press, the Center for Digital Technology, the Center for Media Justice, Color of Change, Common Cause, Consumers Union, Engine, the National Hispanic Media Coalition, the Open Technology Institute, Public Knowledge, and many others out across the country that are organizing right now as part of an effort that is going to bring millions of voices into the offices of every Senator and every House Member in our country.

This fight is not limited to the Halls of Congress. We are seeing a historic groundswell of activity at the State and local level. The Governors in Hawaii, New Jersey, Vermont, Montana, and New York have issued executive orders promoting net neutrality.

State legislatures in more than half of the United States are currently considering net neutrality legislation. Just today, 76 mayors across the Nation signed a letter opposing net neutrality repeal, and 23 State attorneys general have filed suit to reinstate the rule, and we plan to stand by them throughout this entire battle, in the

court and out here on the floor of Congress.

We cannot let net neutrality be another example of Congress disregarding public opinion and putting donor interests first. Net neutrality is our 21st century right, and we will fight to protect it. In fact, 83 percent of all Americans in polling say they want to protect net neutrality. By the way, that is pretty much every millennial, because for millennials, the internet is like oxygen. I will say that if you are 35 years old or younger, the poll is at pretty close to 100 percent.

I can see all the pages nodding their heads as I am speaking. They know no life without a device that they are carrying around. This is the world in which we are living, and they do not want to have any discrimination introduced into the relationship they have between the internet and their ability to control their own lives. That is what the battle is all about, those nodding heads of the pages in the well of the Senate. Those are the people who are going to be making a difference, the millennials, the generation Z young people who want this to be open for entrepreneurial activity and for democracy.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. President, I also want to speak for a few moments about the epidemic of gun violence in our country. Almost 2 weeks ago, a 19-year-old armed with an AR-15 semiautomatic rifle entered Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL, and killed 14 students and 3 teachers, and 14 others were injured. Time and again, we have seen this tragedy play out and time and again we are seeing Congress fail to act.

Each year we lose 33,000 American lives due to gun violence. In instances of disease, illness, natural disaster, this level of widespread death would be met with immediate and meaningful action by Congress. Yet we continually abdicate our moral responsibility when it comes to gun violence prevention. We don't have to accept this epidemic of gun violence in our country. It is not preordained. It is preventable.

So what should Congress do?

First, we should allow public health researchers to study the causes of gun violence so they can find solutions to this public health crisis. Right now, zero dollars are spent at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on gun violence prevention research. That is because since 1996, an appropriations rider has prohibited the Centers for Disease Control from advocating or promoting gun control.

Just last week, Secretary of Health and Human Services Alex Azar said he would not let the rider impede the CDC's research into the causes of gun violence. So there is no reason now not to fully fund this critical research agenda.

I have introduced legislation to fund research into the causes and prevention of gun violence. My bill now has 32 cosponsors in the Senate. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor this commonsense bill. It is long past time that we treat gun violence like the public health emergency it is, but we must also keep guns out of the hands of those who should not have them.

Currently, anyone can use a handgun in America—whether it is the gun's owner, a thief, or, tragically, a young child, but it doesn't have to be this way. Technology exists now that can authorize handgun use only by its owner. In the 21st century, we have to use advances in technology to our advantage, and we can save lives by using it.

That is why I used the opportunity to introduce smart gun legislation that will require all handguns manufactured in the United States to be personalized for operation only by the authorized user. That means, unless you are authorized by fingerprint or other technology, you will not be able to fire that handgun. If we can do it for an iPhone, we should be able to do it for a handgun so that if a child gets ahold of a gun, if it is not their thumb, they cannot fire it. If someone steals a gun from a home, it will not work because it will not be their thumb that is on the barrel of that gun. That is ultimately a way to reduce dramatically the amount of harm we see in our country.

We must also ban these military-style assault weapons like the AR-15, which are the guns of choice for those who seek to inflict mass casualties on civilians. These are weapons that belong in combat, not in our communities.

We must also pass legislation to ensure that all gun purchases include a background check. In fact, 97 percent of all Americans now support expanded background checks—97 percent of all Americans. No one should be able to purchase a gun through Facebook or Instagram without a background check. Instagram should not mean "Instagun," with no background check. That is crazy. That is crazy. You can go on Instagram and buy a gun without a background check. That is crazy in America in 2018.

We have the capacity to quickly do background checks to be able to find out whether somebody should be able to purchase a gun. It is crazy not to have that kind of a system put in place.

If you can buy a gun on Instagram, we should be able to check online whether or not that person, in fact, should be allowed legally to purchase the gun.

Let's close the gun show loophole, as well as the one that allows someone on the terrorist watch list to purchase a

weapon. Let's close the loophole that allows domestic abusers to buy guns. Let's close the loophole that allows straw purchasers to buy guns and flood our streets with them. Let's ban bump stocks. Let's repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, or PLCAA, and take away the gun manufacturers' immunity from civil liability. These are sensible steps.

What is not sensible is hoping that thoughts and prayers will prevent the next shooting. This generation of young people recognize this truth, and that is why they are leading this children's crusade. They are picking up microphones and raising their voices. They are saying enough is enough. It is my hope that this might just be the movement that pushes Republican leaders, once and for all, to take action on gun violence and make the NRA stand for "not relevant anymore" in American politics. This is the time for that to take place on the Senate floor.

This generation of young people is rising up, and they are demanding that we protect this country from the scourge of gun violence. Like generations past, this one is making the change they want to see in our society.

So, to them, let me say: I hear you. I am with you, and I will fight with you to ensure that not one more student has to endure what you did, not one more person has to be damaged because we did not put the laws on the books that should have been there to prevent this harm from occurring. I will fight with you to ensure that this does not happen in one more school in our country.

That is our challenge. That is the goal we should set. That is what should be the agenda here on the floor of the Senate in 2018.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

NO-FLY LIST GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of bipartisan legislation aimed at ensuring that those individuals who are on the Department of Homeland Security's no-fly list are likewise not able to have access to guns. I just met with several of the students from the shooting at the school in Florida and heard the very compelling case they have made to take this issue seriously and do what we can on a commonsense basis to make it more difficult for those who shouldn't have guns to have guns.

Regardless of what happened in Florida these past couple of weeks, this is a measure we should have taken before. It has been brought to the floor of the Senate, and it has received majority support here. I think it is simply common sense that someone who is not permitted to fly in this country and is considered by the Federal Government to be a potential threat to national security should not be allowed to purchase a firearm.

The no-fly list and the selectee list that we are talking about is composed of those who are not allowed to fly. With the selectee list, it is those who require additional screening. These are both narrowly tailored, defined, targeted lists.

This restriction would affect just a small number of people, all of whom would be afforded due process under the Constitution. Those who find themselves on either of these lists would have the authority to challenge that designation, and the onus would be on the government, not the individual; the onus would be on the government to justify the classification and to prove that they should not be allowed to purchase a firearm. These are strong, robust, due process protections that would make sure that these restrictions are constitutionally sound.

This bill also adds another layer of safety for citizens from those who would do us harm, ensuring that anyone who has been denied the right to fly cannot purchase a weapon without at least undergoing additional scrutiny. It simply stands to reason that if we fear that someone may use our commercial airlines as a weapon or to harm those on board, we should not allow that same person to purchase a weapon without additional scrutiny.

I encourage my colleagues to review this bipartisan legislation and to join me, along with Senator COLLINS and a number of our colleagues here—a bipartisan group of Senators—in supporting this commonsense piece of legislation.

I hope we will have a debate on some of these measures. I will be talking in the coming days about some of the other measures that we ought to take to make sure that we don't put guns in the hands of those who shouldn't have them.

My heart goes out to those in Florida, and my vote will go here to measures that will make schools safer.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate is voting to confirm Judge Elizabeth Branch to serve as a U.S. circuit court judge for the Eleventh Circuit. Judge Branch was favorably reported out of the Judiciary Committee on a 19-2 bipartisan vote. She has broad bipartisan support from her home State of Georgia. The American Bar Association rated Judge Branch as unanimously well-qualified. If the Senate confirms Judge Branch, as I am confident it will, she will be the fourth woman confirmed by the Senate to the Federal courts of appeals in the 115th Congress, three more than the one woman confirmed at this point in President Obama's first term.

Judge Branch's judicial career and broad range of legal experiences have well prepared her to serve on the Eleventh Circuit. Judge Branch was appointed to the Georgia Court of Appeals in 2012. In her time on the appel-

late bench, she has participated in over 1,500 cases. Before joining the bench, Judge Branch spent several years in private practice. She also served in government, including her role as a top lawyer for the Department of Homeland Security. Judge Branch received her B.A. from Davidson College and her J.D. from Emory. After law school, Judge Branch clerked for Judge Owen Forrester on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia.

As I noted earlier, if confirmed, Judge Branch will become the fourth female circuit court judge confirmed under President Trump. Her confirmation puts her in good company, joining a class of first-rate female jurists and legal scholars. She will join a group that includes: Seventh Circuit Judge Amy Coney Barrett, a former professor at Notre Dame University Law School and law clerk to Justice Scalia; Tenth Circuit Judge Allison Eid, a former Colorado Supreme Court Justice and law clerk to Justice Thomas; and Sixth Circuit Judge Joan Larsen, another clerk of Justice Scalia and former Michigan Supreme Court justice. I am confident that Judge Branch will serve as an excellent addition to this outstanding class of female circuit court judges.

Judge Branch's impressive background and bipartisan support suggest that she will be an excellent court of appeals judge. I am pleased to support her nomination today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Ex.]

YEAS—73

Alexander	Feinstein	Moran
Baldwin	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Nelson
Bennet	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hassan	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cardin	Heitkamp	Rubio
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Casey	Hirono	Scott
Cassidy	Hoeben	Shaheen
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Collins	Isakson	Smith
Coons	Johnson	Tester
Corker	Kaine	Thune
Cornyn	Kennedy	Tillis
Cotton	King	Toomey
Crapo	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Cruz	Lankford	Warner
Daines	Leahy	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Lee	Wicker
Durbin	Manchin	Young
Enzi	McCaskill	
Ernst	McConnell	

NAYS—23

Blumenthal	Heinrich	Sanders
Booker	Markey	Schatz
Brown	Menendez	Schumer
Cantwell	Merkley	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Udall
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Jones	Rounds
McCain	Sullivan

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Crapo, Orrin G. Hatch, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Michael B. Enzi, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, James M. Inhofe, John Thune, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 39 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Isakson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Johnson	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Young
Enzi	Moran	
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Harris	Nelson
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Jones	McCain	Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. HEINRICH pertaining to the introduction of S. 2458 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

REMEMBERING URSULA K. LE GUIN

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and work of one of Oregon's finest, Ur-

sula K. Le Guin, who, after a long life, passed away in my hometown of Portland on January 22 at the age of 88.

You would have a tough time overstating Mrs. Le Guin's impact on American literature, particularly on the genres of fantasy and science fiction. She didn't invent science fiction or fantasy literature, but what she did, in true Oregon fashion, is redefine them.

Millions of school children in Oregon and around the world know her best as the author of the unforgettable Earthsea series. She also wrote essays, poetry, and short stories throughout her life. To the end, she fiercely resisted the constant attempts to pigeon-hole her as a sci-fi author.

Over five decades, she upended conventions, shattered ceilings, and inspired generations of readers and authors. She is going to be missed, even as her legacy lives on.

Ursula Le Guin was born Ursula Kroeber on October 21, 1921, in Berkeley, CA. Her parents were both successful anthropologists who encouraged their kids to think and to question. Exposed to mythology and science fiction at an early age, she soon grew tired of what she would later describe as White men and soldiers going forth and conquering the universe.

A shy young woman, she escaped the anxieties of adolescence by reading authors like Austen, Shelley, and Tolstoy in her local public library. She went on to Radcliffe College, graduating Phi Beta Kappa in 1951. She earned a master's degree from Columbia University the following year and won a prestigious Fulbright scholarship to continue her studies in Paris.

She met fellow Fulbright scholar Charles Le Guin on her way there, and they were married shortly thereafter.

The pair returned to the United States and ultimately settled in Oregon in the late 1950s, when her husband took a job at Portland State University. She focused on the couple's three children and on her writing, returning to science fiction with "Rocannon's World" in 1966. Two years later, she published "A Wizard of Earthsea," the first in a series of highly acclaimed fantasy novels that have remained in print to the delight of millions.

I can't imagine it is an easy feat for any author to create an entire universe that sticks in the minds of readers for generations. In building Earthsea, Mrs. Le Guin joined that elite group of fiction writers, like Tolkien and C.S. Lewis, who have done just that.

More impressively, she used her writing to push back against social injustices and social constraints. She wrote about environmental destruction, about feminism and gender inequality, about racism, about war and peace. She wrote about women protagonists and about non-White heroes when they

were even less commonly highlighted than they are today. She wrote about multidimensional characters and others who sought to better themselves and their societies rather than bend others to their will.

The more Mrs. Le Guin wrote, the more people would read, and the more the awards started to pile up. She racked up awards in the course of her career like few authors have—multiple Hugo, Nebula, and Locus Awards, a National Book Award, a Newbery Medal, and a Pushcart Prize. In 1977, she was shortlisted for the Pulitzer Prize.

She twice won the Hugo and Nebula Awards in the same year, for 1969's "The Left Hand of Darkness" and in 1974 for "The Dispossessed."

I would be here until next week if I tried to list all of her achievements, but because we have a rule in the Wyden household against filibustering friends, let me just say that in 2000, the Library of Congress made official what all of Oregon had long known. It declared that Ursula Le Guin was a "Living Legend" for her contributions to American literature.

The fact is, we love our bookstores, and I very often kid Michael Powell and my wife Nancy that they are the LeBron James and Damian Lillard of bookstores. The fact is, Mrs. Le Guin has been in demand in bookstores and libraries for decades, and she has always been sharing that wisdom in her books with visitors near and far. Thanks to her example and her influence, generations of women writers have blazed new trails and defied old dogmas.

As a dad who knows full well the importance of reading in a child's life, this is really a special honor today to be able to stand before this distinguished body and remember Ursula K. Le Guin, her life and her legacy. Her pioneering writing is going to continue to make readers challenge their conceptions and contemplate their role in this enormously vast universe for decades to come. Her long career's worth of great works will be treasured far into the future. I especially appreciate the opportunity to recognize the extraordinary work of a woman who did so much to promote writing and attract young readers at home in Oregon and the chance to have been able to recognize Ursula Le Guin today before the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for my 198th “Time to Wake Up” speech with my increasingly dog-eared and beaten chart.

My last two speeches focused on, shall we say, the peculiar role two of this country’s largest trade associations play on climate change. They have dozens and dozens of member companies that support action on climate change. Renewable energy now provides more jobs than fossil fuels and lots of American manufacturing. Yet the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers spend millions and millions of dollars lobbying Congress against climate action, against renewables, and in favor of the fossil fuel industry. Go figure.

In 2016, Senator WARREN and I surveyed the 108 companies on the chamber of commerce’s board, and we couldn’t find a single one that would endorse the chamber’s anti-climate lobbying—not one. Many of these companies had very public pro-climate positions. None said they had even been consulted by the chamber about the chamber’s anti-climate crusade.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s war on climate action isn’t just in lobbying Congress. It also spends tens of millions of dollars in elections, using political attack ads to sink pro-climate candidates. So I asked in my last speeches: Why? Why does the chamber and NAM advance the special interests of the fossil fuel industry, opposing climate action, ignoring their own pro-climate members, and turning their backs on the whole renewable energy and green technology economy? Why, indeed.

Well, today I would like to talk about a fossil fuel trade association—the American Petroleum Institute, API. API is a slightly different beast than the chamber and NAM. It represents the oil and gas industry. You wouldn’t expect it to care about renewable energy or green technology. API’s policy positions should align with the big oil companies it represents, but it gets complicated. It gets complicated because the big oil companies all claim to support action on climate change. Here is what ExxonMobil claims: “The risk of climate change is clear and the risk warrants action.”

In 2009, then-Exxon CEO Rex Tillerson said the company supported a price on carbon. That is supposedly ExxonMobil’s position today.

Here is Shell on carbon pricing: “The transition to low-carbon solutions is best underpinned by meaningful government-led carbon ‘pricing’ mechanisms.”

On the Paris Agreement, Exxon publicly supported the Paris Agreement, as did Chevron, as did Shell, as did BP. In addition, BP and Shell signed on to

an initiative to eliminate methane flaring.

So summing up, all of the major oil companies supported the Paris Agreement. Three out of four, including ExxonMobil—the big kahuna—publicly support putting a price on carbon emissions, and two of them even support eliminating methane flaring.

So where is the American Petroleum Institute on these policies? Let’s start with the Paris Agreement. API funds a group called the American Council on Capital Formation, which, along with the Chamber of Commerce, funded the debunked study claiming that the Paris Agreement would cause massive job losses and huge costs. This debunked report was cited by President Trump as justification for withdrawing from the Paris accord. So API funded the report used as a basis for withdrawal—but wait. It gets better. The authors of this API-funded study are the same two characters API hired way back in 1997 and 1998 to write similar reports critical of the Kyoto Protocol. The Kyoto Protocol, of course, was violently opposed in the Senate by the fossil fuel industry and API.

So here we are 20 years after Kyoto, and API used almost exactly the same playbook—even the same personnel—against the Paris Agreement that they had used against the Kyoto accord, except that this time API paid for the report through a front group to hide API’s hand in torpedoing the Paris Agreement. How do you relate that to the stated position of the four oil majors for the Paris Agreement? You would have to ask API to explain.

So now let’s look at API’s position on carbon pricing, which three out of those four oil majors say they support. API’s President has claimed that his organization doesn’t have an official position on carbon pricing, but if you take a look at API’s website, it is loaded with comments critical of putting a price on carbon, and API also funded yet another study claiming that a price on carbon emissions would be bad for the economy.

On the issue of methane flaring, API out front led the charge against Department of the Interior and Environmental Protection Agency rules. Its lobbying campaign has paid off, as two of Trump’s fossil fuel stooges, Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke and EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, are busily trying to dismantle these rules. Luckily, they are not very bright about it, and courts keep upending their schemes.

Let’s look at the lobbying. Big Oil money provides much of API’s power in the Halls of Congress. API has spent over \$100 million lobbying the Federal Government, and apparently its lobbying goes against the wishes as stated by its biggest clients, the four oil majors. If you look, there is a big bump up in 2009 and here through 2016—the Obama years—when they wanted to go

in and stop all kinds of progress on climate change.

In this building, we all know perfectly well that API is not here lobbying for a price on carbon. We know perfectly well that if a Republican were to say, “I am for a price on carbon,” or sign on to a bill, they would probably get a visit from API saying, “Whoa, not so fast there, partner.” We know perfectly well that they are not in this building lobbying for the Paris accord.

So why the discrepancy? Is it possible that all of this money—\$100 million—is being thrown around without the approval of the big oil companies? Has the American Petroleum Institute sort of gone off on its own, off the leash, free range, running away from the oil companies? It is a puzzlement, this vast gulf between the pro-climate policies the oil majors say they support and the anti-climate policies the API lobbyists support.

I said one possibility is, Big Oil doesn’t know how its lobbying money is being spent. Maybe those CEOs have lost control of their own trade association and don’t even know it. I mean, after all, around here, who pays attention to their own lobbying operation, anyway? Maybe the \$100 million is such chump change to the big oil companies that they have just lost track of it, like we might lose change in our couch cushions.

Maybe—cover your ears, young pages, because I may say something shocking here—maybe it is a scam. It is totally shocking that a big corporation will say one thing and do another. What a concept, but it is a concept that works out great for Big Oil. The Big Oil CEOs get to go to cocktail parties in Davos or on Fifth Avenue. They get to go to international conferences, and with all their sophisticated friends, they get to say: Hey, we are not a bunch of science-hating, heads-in-the-sand climate deniers. We have sensible climate policies.

At the same time, they can send their lobbying goons out to make sure no one in Congress takes that “sensible climate policies” nonsense seriously. It is great. Have your front group do your dirty work for you, fill your websites with happy assurances, while you let API loose on Washington to crush any pro-climate policies that might actually reduce carbon emissions and threaten your bottom line.

Hypocrisy? Yes, but then hypocrisy is famously the tribute vice pays to virtue. I suppose it is at least a start. It is a sign that we have reached the point where Big Oil recognizes the need to try to at least look virtuous. That is a start, but it still leaves us with this huge disconnect between the pro-climate policies the big oil companies claim to support and their American Petroleum Institute’s relentless anti-climate lobbying.

Remember, throughout the oil industry’s decades-long campaign against

climate action, they knew all along. Exxon knew decades ago about the effects of carbon pollution, but they worked through an elaborate web of front groups to propagate doubt and denial about the science they knew.

Shell knew too. In 1991, Shell even produced a documentary warning about the serious threat climate change posed to the future of civilization. Despite acknowledging this threat, Shell, like Exxon, continued to fund API and other front groups that sought to mislead the public about climate change and opposed climate action here in Congress.

Exxon's trade group—this American Petroleum Institute—also knew. They knew of the reality of climate change. They knew it was caused by carbon emissions from fossil fuels, and they knew of the danger it poses. Way back in 1959—almost 60 years ago—API was warned by an eminent scientist that if we kept burning fossil fuels, we would increase the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Back in 1959, they were warned. The prediction they received was that it would warm the atmosphere, melt the icecaps, and submerge coastal cities and towns, as we are beginning to see along the Florida coastline right now. That was the prediction in 1959.

In 1959, the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere was 316 parts per million. Then, in 1968, a group of scientists API had itself commissioned warned API that significant temperature changes could occur by the year 2000 and that, ultimately, potential damage to the environment could be severe. By 1968, the atmosphere concentration of CO₂ was up to 323 parts per million.

In 1980, scientists hired by API again warned API that carbon emissions from burning fossil fuels were likely to have catastrophic effects. By 1980, the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ was 339. In 1983, API disbanded the scientific working group it had created to study global warming. Apparently, API didn't like what it was hearing so, in 1983, they shut it off. There is a legal term for when you are on notice but then just turn away; it is called "willful ignorance." By 1983, the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ was 343 parts per million.

Then came 1999, when James Hansen's famous Senate testimony threatened API's willful ignorance scheme. So API and its Big Oil members founded a front group with the misleading name Global Climate Coalition. What is it with these front groups and these people, anyway? Why is it always these front groups? Global Climate Coalition began to spread falsehoods and disinformation about climate science, even though in 1989 they knew. In 1989, they had known for 30 years, since that first report in 1959, and by 1989 the atmospheric concentration was 353 parts per million.

In 1993, API hired one of the same men who wrote those phony Kyoto and Paris reports that I mentioned to write a report attacking President Clinton's so-called Btu tax on fuel sources. In 1993, the CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere was up to 357 parts per million. In 1998, API did that report attacking the Kyoto Protocol. It also commissioned what it called its Global Climate Science Communications Plan, a plan designed to mislead Americans about climate science. By 1998, the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ was 367 parts per million.

In 2009, API fought and killed the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade legislation that would have controlled carbon emissions. By 2009, the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ was 387 parts per million.

Now here we are in 2018. API is still fighting climate action. The concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is now 407 parts per million, almost 30 percent higher than it was when API probably first learned what climate science meant. As we have kept dumping carbon pollution into the atmosphere, temperatures and sea levels have indeed steadily risen—just as API was told they would. They knew, but they lied.

For decades, they lied on a massive industrial scale. They lied through phony science. They lied through phony front groups and bogus studies. They lied through talk shows. They lied through rightwing media. They lied through AstroTurf, and well-paid PR firms. They lied for decades, and now the American people have to pay the price of climate change to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars.

So, from their point of view, what the heck? After decades of lying about climate change, what is a little discrepancy now between what Big Oil CEOs say and what Big Oil lobbyists do? The industry's sophisticated and expensive disinformation and lobbying campaign has blockaded climate action in this country for more than half a century. When you have been lying that long, maybe it is a hard habit to break.

Looking back at this whole scam, I guess API and its members actually see it as a win—nearly 60 years of industry profits they protected behind the barricade of lies, but at what price to our country? At what price to Americans whose lives have already, in many cases, been upended by climate change? At what price to people around the world who will suffer the effects of climate change and one day want an answer about why America, through all this period, let this take place—why America let them down.

The time for deception, the time for front groups, for misinformation, for inaction is over. API and its fossil fuel allies over at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and National Association of

Manufacturers have blocked climate action in Congress long enough. Look at the price we paid to allow the fossil fuel lobby to dictate climate policy in this great body. Four hundred seven parts per million is a measurement, and it is a measurement unprecedented in the full span of human history on this planet.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to call on President Trump to nominate a Director for the Indian Health Service.

There are many critical issues facing Indian Country—economic development, infrastructure, protection of Native lands, respect for Tribal governments—and after years and years of broken promises, discrimination, and neglect, Washington owes Tribes a fighting chance to build stronger communities and a brighter future.

The Federal Indian trust responsibility means that Washington has a basic legal obligation to the Tribes. Washington also has a fundamental moral obligation, and that starts with basic healthcare.

American Indians have treaty rights to healthcare from the Federal Government, but the U.S. Government cannot fulfill our treaty obligations if key posts, such as the Director of IHS, lay vacant for years.

The IHS is a big deal. It is the primary Federal healthcare provider for American Indians and Alaska Natives. It serves 2.2 million people spread across 36 States. It has a budget of nearly \$5 billion annually. The IHS provides care through more than 660 clinics, hospitals, and health stations on or near reservations, many of them in remote and rural locations located hours away from other health facilities. It serves more than 13 million outpatient visitors a year.

The doctors, nurses, and other healthcare providers at IHS hospitals and clinics do everything from delivering babies, to providing dental services, to fighting the opioid crisis.

Right now, more than a year into President Trump's term, there is still no permanent leader at the Indian Health Service. Two weeks ago, the nomination for IHS Director was withdrawn, and there hasn't been a Senate-confirmed Director for years. This leadership vacuum creates a serious problem. The IHS cannot engage in long-term planning without a permanent Director at the helm. It cannot officially fix problems at hospitals that

failed inspections and where Medicare and Medicaid funding is in jeopardy. It cannot move as decisively to ensure that IHS facilities stay open. It cannot implement agency-wide standards for quality of care, as the Government Accountability Office has recommended. The IHS cannot prioritize competing issues, solve serious and longstanding problems, or work through how to meet multiple goals more effectively.

Its relationship with other Federal agencies is weakened without a stable leader—critical relationships with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the Office of Management and Budget, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and the rest of the Department of Health and Human Services. It cannot ensure that programs like the Special Diabetes Program for Indians, which has created real, positive outcomes, is implemented as well as possible. The IHS cannot work out a direction for the Service and hold a single stable leader accountable for doing a good job.

The IHS faces serious challenges that require the attention of a permanent, dedicated Director. The agency is underfunded and has been underfunded for a long time. As a result, its facilities often lack medical equipment that many Americans take for granted when they visit a clinic or a hospital, like an MRI machine or a functioning operating room. A 2016 report by the inspector general of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found that IHS hospital administrators have had difficulty recruiting and retaining critical staff. Aging hospital buildings and outdated equipment also raise concerns about patient safety. The inspector general cites concerns about corroded pipes leaking sewage into the OR and not being able to find replacement parts to fix old equipment the hospitals are relying on. Doctors and nurses should be able to focus on helping their patients get well, not on whether the building is habitable and basic facilities are available.

There are also serious staffing shortages. At its Great Plains facilities, for example, IHS vacancy rates have reached 37 percent. Compare that to my home State of Massachusetts, where only 6 percent of nursing jobs were vacant in 2015.

Tribal leaders are understandably concerned about the direction of an agency that plays such a vital role in their communities. Here is what I heard from Chairwoman Cheryl Andrews-Maltais, of the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head—the Aquinnah—in Massachusetts: “This vacancy has created significant instability and negatively affects the already burdened IHS system.” She added: “Not only is it a failure on the part of the Federal Government to not adequately fund healthcare for Indians; the failure to

appoint someone to lead this critical service area is considered by many Tribes as gross negligence.” The chairwoman says that the United States is failing to keep its word and failing to fulfill its “solemn responsibility” to the Tribes. I agree with the chairwoman.

Healthcare is a basic human right, and everyone in this country deserves access to quality, affordable healthcare. But the stakes are particularly high for Native people.

An American Indian or Alaska Native baby born today has a life expectancy that is almost 4½ years shorter than the U.S. average. These little babies are also more likely to die before they ever reach their first birthday. Native infant mortality is about 25 percent higher than for the U.S. as a whole.

Chronic diseases like diabetes and heart disease hit Native Americans harder too. For instance, American Indians and Alaska Natives die from diabetes at a rate that is three times higher than that of the entire American population.

Mental health and addiction issues are also a very big concern. The opioid epidemic has devastated communities all over our country, but it is a particularly virulent problem for Native Americans, who have the highest per capita rates of opioid overdoses in the country.

Similarly, the alcohol-related death rate for Native Americans is about 500 percent higher than for the rest of the population.

Suicide rates are about 70 percent higher.

Everyone struggling with addiction deserves access to high-quality treatment, no matter who they are or where they live. That is the only way we are going to make progress in tackling this crisis. But right now, in a place where the need is great, the Federal Government is failing to provide adequate care.

With so much need, investing in improving the IHS should be a top priority for Washington. I am glad that the Trump administration's latest budget for the IHS includes a funding increase. Still, this government needs to do more—much more. A Senate-confirmed Director can serve as the advocate the IHS needs in order to get the resources it deserves. In fact, Federal law explicitly says that advocating good Indian health policy is one of the Director's job responsibilities. We should be doing that job.

We need a good person in this job, which means the nominee must be thoroughly vetted. But that is not an excuse for more delay or for the White House to drag its feet. It needs to work with the Tribes to find the right person for the job and then submit the nomination quickly.

The person who heads up the IHS should be knowledgeable and should

have a vision for how to deliver better healthcare to Native Americans. The person should have the determination and commitment to push Congress to meet its treaty obligations in providing healthcare to Native communities.

The Trump administration doesn't have a stellar record when it comes to nominating the right people for important jobs. I often strongly disagree with the President's picks. But leaving hundreds of critical posts across our government vacant, including the IHS Director, has a devastating effect all its own.

It wasn't until just 2 weeks ago that President Trump finally named a nominee to be Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans.

Several offices in the Federal bureaucracy have an important role in running important programs for Tribes, and the President hasn't nominated heads for some of those offices—for instance, the Director of the Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women, which administers key grant programs for Tribal programs to combat domestic violence and sexual assault, and the Assistant Secretary of the Employment and Training Administration in the Department of Labor, which provides workforce innovation and opportunity grants to Tribes and Tribal organizations. These vacancies hit Native communities hard, and they represent one more broken promise to Native people.

There is no excuse for delay. I urge President Trump to move quickly to consult with Tribes and to submit a nomination for IHS Director. The Native community should not have to wait any longer.

I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ILLINOIS FLOODING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, rainstorms and melting snow caused flooding across Illinois, with more than 20 counties throughout the State placed under a flood warning. As the water level of rivers continued to rise, several communities had to evacuate their homes for their own safety. Sadly, these storms were so severe that flooded roadways claimed the life of an Illinois resident after her car rolled into a rain-filled ditch. Multiple communities were evacuated, and in some

areas, residents had to be rescued by boat.

Some of the worst impacted areas were in Iroquois, Kankakee, and Vermilion Counties. The Governor declared a State disaster for these counties, and the American Red Cross established shelters for evacuated residents.

These floods were not just limited to communities in east central Illinois. Counties in western and downstate Illinois were also among the most impacted. In Ford Heights, a suburb of Chicago, at least 100 homes were impacted and seven residents were rescued by boat. In north central Illinois, a nursing home in LaSalle County had to be evacuated, and the next day, parts of the county were placed under mandatory evacuation order.

Downstate, rain continued through the weekend, and crews from the Department of Corrections worked to install flood gates in Hardin County, and the Department of Transportation delivered pumps, hoses, and sandbags to aid in recovery. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources also provided boats to aid with flood patrols.

Some of the areas that experienced heavy rains and flooding throughout last week, like Freeport in northwestern Illinois, were also impacted by flooding just last year. Freeport was flooded in July 2017, and on Friday night, the Red Cross once again opened an emergency shelter there. Situations like this are the reason that communities that often experience flooding need more assistance, both to plan for emergencies and to quickly mitigate the aftermath.

With extreme weather conditions like these becoming more frequent and more severe, I have heard from many Illinois constituents who are concerned about their ability to recover from repeated flood events like these. I stand ready to assist at the Federal level to help these communities rebuild and recover in a way that will allow them to be more resilient when the next flood occurs.

As is often the case when a disaster like this occurs, I was so impressed with the residents, first responders, and local officials who worked tirelessly to protect their communities. I want to thank our local law enforcement—firefighters and police—who always do the best job to keep our communities safe and work long hours because of it.

I also want to recognize the hard work of the State and Federal employees that have pitched in at every level, including the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Natural Resources, and the Illinois Emergency Management Agency.

Our thoughts are with the family and friends of the Illinois resident who lost her life and with all those who have experienced damage to their homes and

other property. We will rebuild—as the people of Illinois always do—and will once again be stronger for it.

HONORING COMMANDER PAUL BAUER

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Commander Paul Bauer, a 31-year veteran of the police force who was fatally shot on Tuesday February 13, 2018, while in the line of duty. Commander Bauer had a remarkable career with the Chicago Police Department and will be remembered by his colleagues as a model police officer. Commander Bauer made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting our city and its people, and I am thankful for all of his years of service. He leaves behind his wife, Erin, of 16 years and his 13-year-old daughter, Grace. May his service, sacrifice, and kind spirit serve as an inspiration to us all.

TRIBUTE TO HEIDEH SHAHMORADI

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to express my gratitude to Heideh Shahmoradi, who since 2011 has served as clerk for the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, or THUD, for her many years of distinguished public service.

Heideh's 24 years of public service have included time on both the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Environment and Public Works Committee, as well as the Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration, where she first started as a part-time employee at the age of 16.

In her 7 years with THUD, Heideh has played an instrumental role on a host of issues. Her programmatic knowledge and technical expertise have been critical in policy-making decisions that ensured air traffic controllers were able to get back to safely managing our Nation's air traffic control system following the across-the-board spending cuts in 2013. Heideh has also worked to make groundbreaking transformations in how we address youth homelessness, which afflicts far too many young people each year. Thanks to Heideh's dedicated efforts, we have successfully created targeted programs that are designed to meet the unique needs of teenagers through the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program, in ways that our traditional approach to homelessness was unsuccessful in addressing.

Heideh is truly a consummate professional, a brilliant expert, and most importantly, one of the kindest and friendliest people in the Senate. She is known by her colleagues as being an honest broker who is able to work in a truly bipartisan fashion in order to help us advance important legislation.

As Heideh leaves the Senate after years of hard work and dedicated public service, she leaves behind an impressive list of accomplishments and colleagues whose lives she touched because she was such an exceptional role model and mentor. I wish her continued success and much happiness in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DAVID COUSENS

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize David Cousens of South Thomaston, ME, who will soon retire from being the president of the Maine Lobstermen's Association after a tenure spanning three decades. Dave's skills as a leader and savvy as a lobsterman have steered the organization and members of the industry it represents with a strong and steady hand through a period of increased landings, innovative conservation, and improved regulatory structure. Dave's hallmark over his entire career was an ability to listen to and foster respect between a diverse crowd of harvesters, regulators, scientists, and other members of the industry.

When Dave became president of the Maine Lobstermen's Association in 1991, great change was afoot. Then, with annual landings in the range of 30 million pounds, lobstermen were not limited in the number of traps they fished, draggers were permitted to land large quantities of lobster, and, despite a vast majority of it taking place in State waters, the fishery was managed federally. Furthermore, many of the conservation measures that we now identify as integral to the fishery were, at the time, only practiced voluntarily by Maine lobstermen.

Over the past 27 years, while running one of the most prominent industry groups in the State, Dave has not backed off his primary occupation, that of a lobsterman. The time he has spent behind the wheel of his truck getting to meetings up and down the coast of Maine, in meetings from Washington, DC, to Nova Scotia and everywhere in between, and on the phone with anyone and everyone has not stopped him from continuing to fish a full complement of traps—800 these days. This commitment, personal and communal, to an iconic Maine way of life is a significant reason why the fishery, which recently landed a record annual catch of 130 million pounds, is today both a crown jewel of Maine's coastal economy and a shining example of sustainability envied around the world.

For generations, Maine lobstermen like Dave have known that to ensure their future livelihood and that of their children—(his three sons are also lobstermen)—they must responsibly

shepherd the resource. Under Dave's leadership, the Maine Lobstermen's Association successfully helped transition management of lobster fishery from the Federal New England Fishery Management Council to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and, as a result, expanded the Maine practice of marking egg-bearing females and returning them to the water so they may continue to breed to other States and Canadian provinces. He also oversaw successful efforts to significantly reduce the large amount of lobster that was being caught in the Gulf of Maine as bycatch in draggers' trawls, limit the total number of traps that lobstermen fish and increase the size of escape vents that allow juvenile lobsters to escape a trap. Most recently, as the fishery moves further offshore amidst warming ocean temperatures and concerns about its implications on whale population have arisen—Dave's trademark leadership style has set the stage for meaningful exchange and beneficial compromise on an issue that will likely get a lot of attention in the coming years.

As Dave looks forward to spending a little more time with his family and friends, I wish to commend him on the exemplary leadership over the years—listening, learning, and always keeping a clear, insightful, and good-humored eye on the horizon.●

RECOGNIZING ADVANCED WELDING AND STEEL

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, setting out to start a small business in America is not for the faint of heart. In many cases, it takes a great deal of self-sufficiency and perseverance, and, for most, success does not come easily. Success is often built through years of hard work, sacrifice, and dedication.

Today, I would like to recognize a small business from my home State of Idaho that exemplifies these very traits. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am proud to recognize a Grangeville, ID, small business, Advanced Welding and Steel, as the Small Business of the Month for February 2018. This small business demonstrates a dedication to producing quality goods while providing a unique service. Their story reminds us that, with hard work and dedication, Americans can accomplish almost anything to which they set their minds. With over 20 years in business, Advanced Welding and Steel has served as a great example of the determined entrepreneurial spirit found all across Idaho.

Advanced Welding and Steel's story is the quintessential story of American entrepreneurship. Ryan Uhlenkott grew up in a hard-working entrepreneurial family. He learned valuable traits such as a strong work ethic, timeliness, and honesty while working

on the family farm, splitting wood for the winter, and helping out at the family water well drilling business. While a college student, he worked part time sweeping floors in a welding shop, which led to a full-time welding job. Before he set out on his own, Ryan gained experience in a variety of positions across the fabrication industry, including as a crane operator, planner, mapper, welder, erector, and fabricator. After receiving certifications in boiler and pipe welding, he decided to introduce his own approach to fabrication. He drew upon his knowledge, experience, and his innate entrepreneurial mindset in 1998, when he founded Advanced Welding and Steel. Ryan started out with one welder mounted on the back of a pickup truck. The company quickly grew in both employees and capacity, going from a 6,000-square-foot shop in 2003 to the current state-of-the-art 60,000-square-foot shop with paint booths, shot blasters, and a railings shop. A major motivating factor in starting his own business was Ryan's desire to spend more time with his family. To this day, he considers his family and his employees' families to be the center of his business model.

Today, Advanced Welding and Steel delivers its products across the western United States, including Alaska and Hawaii. The company's attention to detail in its processes of estimating, detailing, and project management has turned the small business into one of the most respected fabricators in the region. A team of 15 highly qualified professionals work at the company, and over the years, they estimate that they have delivered over 15 million pounds of steel to their customers. Their hard work resulted in Advanced Welding and Steel being recognized in the July 2017 edition of Modern Steel Construction for their outstanding work as the prime fabricator for the new student center at Gonzaga University in Spokane, WA. The company is committed to excellence in their craft and also to the sustainable use of their products, as over 90 percent of the steel they work with has been recycled, adding to the overwhelmingly positive impact they bring to local Idaho communities.

The hard-working team members of Advanced Welding and Steel have decades of experience in multiple fields within the steel industry. Through their commitment to their customers, Ryan's team provides an excellent product with exceptional service, and they make a sizable impact in the local and national fabricating industry. They ensure that their projects are well planned and seamlessly executed. The State of Idaho is proud to be a home for small businesses like them who go above and beyond in pursuit of the American dream.

I extend my sincerest congratulations to Ryan Uhlenkott, his family,

and the entire team at Advanced Welding and Steel. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY STOKS

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee intern Anthony Stoks. Anthony hails from Adelaide, Australia, and is a law student at Flinders University.

While interning for the Commerce Committee, Anthony assisted the Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness. He is a dedicated worker who was committed to getting the most out of his internship. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Anthony for all of the fine work he did for the committee and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 767. An act to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system.

H.R. 880. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to support such centers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1222. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2410. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment.

H.R. 2422. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 772. An act to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, February 27, 2018, he has signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY):

H.R. 1725. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit certain reports relating to medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary.

H.R. 3122. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include on the internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs a warning regarding dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices targeting individuals who are eligible for increased pension on the basis of need for regular aid and attendance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4533. An act to designate the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Lexington VA Health Care System" and to make certain other designations.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 767. An act to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 880. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to support such centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 1222. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2410. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2422. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2464. A bill to improve border security and to provide conditional provision resi-

dence to certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-4362. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4363. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4364. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Distillates (petroleum), Solvent-Dewaxed Heavy Paraffinic; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9974-14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4365. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Quizalofop ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9972-30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4366. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indaziflam; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL No. 9973-10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 16, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4367. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methyl-alpha-D-mannopyranoside (Alpha Methyl Mannoside); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9972-04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 16, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4368. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal years 2011-2015 Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), funds and was assigned case number 17-01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-4369. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Military Helicopter Noise; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4370. A communication from the Counsel of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure; Rules of Practice and Procedure in Adjudicatory Proceedings; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustments" (RIN1557-AE14) received in the office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4371. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules Concerning Prepaid Accounts Under the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (Regulation E) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)" (12 CFR Part 1005 and 1026) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4372. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, four (4) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4373. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Cuba and of the emergency authority relating to the regulation of the anchorage and movement of vessels, as amended; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4374. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Quizalofop ethyl, Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9972-24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4375. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pendimethalin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9973-03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4376. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Arizona Plan Revisions, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality" (FRL No. 9974-68-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4377. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revisions to Implement the Revocation of the 1997 Ozone NAAQS" (FRL No. 9974-66-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4378. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; Non-attainment New Source Review Permit Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9973-18-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4379. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Strategic Plan for fiscal year 2018 through fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4380. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Rule Part 225, Control of Emissions from Large Combustion Sources" (FRL No. 9974-87-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4381. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Indiana NSR/PSD; Indiana PM2.5 NSR; Correction" (FRL No. 9974-88-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4382. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting proposed legislation entitled "Washington Aqueduct Divestiture Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4383. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a legislative proposal "Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4384. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of the Treasury's strategic plan for fiscal years 2018-2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4385. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure 2018-17" (Rev. Proc. 2018-17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4386. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Low-Income Housing Credit Disaster Relief for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico" (Notice 2018-17) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 21, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4387. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Review of Medicare Administrative Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4388. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendment to List of User Fee Airports: Name Changes of Several Airports and the Addition of Five Airports" (CBP Dec. 18-01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 16, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4389. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2018-0010-2018-0017); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4390. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Addition of South Sudan" (RIN1400-AE51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4391. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Australia to support the manufacture, assembly, and support of Gimbal Weapon Mounts for Remotely Operated Weapon System for ultimate end-use by the government of Saudi Arabia in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-021); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4392. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Japan to support the integration, operation, maintenance, test, repair, and general support of the Microwave Power Module Based Transmitter for the Japanese Ministry of Defense F-15J aircraft in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-115); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4393. A communication from the Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Congressional Budget Justification for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4394. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; China Basin, Mission Creek, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2017-1015)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4395. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-247, "National Community Reinvestment Coalition Real Property Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4396. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-248, "Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Clarification Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4397. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-249, "Electric Vehicle Public Infrastructure Expansion Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4398. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-250, "Africare Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4399. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-251, "General Obligation Bonds and Bond Anticipation Notes for Fiscal Years 2018-2023 Authorization Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4400. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-252, "East End Commercial Real Property Tax Rate Reduction Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4401. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-253, "Jackson School Lease Renewal Authorization Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4402. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-254, "East End Grocery and Retail Incentive Tax Exemption Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4403. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-255, "Washington Metrorail Safety Commission Board of Directors Appointment Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4404. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4405. A communication from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's FY17 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4406. A communication from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's FY17 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4407. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Pequonnock River, Bridgeport, CT" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0161)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4408. A communication from the Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Congressional Budget Justification for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4409. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's 2017 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Agency Privacy Management Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4410. A communication from the Vice Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board Annual Performance Report for FY 2017 and Annual Performance Plan for FY 2018 (Final) and FY 2019 (Proposed)" and the Board's Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4411. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4412. A communication from the Chief of External Affairs and Performance Branch, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, Office of Government Ethics, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4413. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4414. A communication from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Administration's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2018-2022; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-4415. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Economic Report of the President together with the 2018 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers; to the Joint Economic Committee.

EC-4416. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Services Surveys: BE-120 Benchmark Survey of Transactions in Selected Services and Intellectual Property With Foreign Persons" (RIN0691-AA87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 16, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4417. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications; Rural Broadband Experiments; and Connect America Fund Phase II Auction" ((WC Docket No. 10-90; WC Docket No. 14-58; WC Docket No. 14-259; and AU Docket No. 17-182) (FCC 18-5)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 16, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4418. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AH48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4419. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Oceanic Whitetip Shark as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act" (RIN0648-XE314) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4420. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Harmonization of Fire Protection Equipment Standards for Towing Vessels" ((RIN1625-AC43) (Docket No. USCG-2017-1060)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4421. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4422. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Pamlico River, Washington, NC" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No.

USCG-2017-1100)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4423. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Gasparilla Marine Parade; Hillsborough Bay, Tampa, FL" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2017-1102)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4424. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Canaveral Barge Canal; Canaveral, FL" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0161)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for Mr. McCain for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nomination of Col. Lee H. Harvis, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Michael L. Ahmann and ending with Col. John P. York, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 18, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Christopher R. Alderdice and ending with Col. David J. Mounkes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 18, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Timothy L. Adams and ending with Col. Karl D. Pierson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 18, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. John J. DeGoes and ending with Brig. Gen. Lee E. Payne, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Jeffrey P. Kramer, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Gordon D. Peters, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Brian B. Brown, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Col. John J. Allen, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Todd M. Lazaroski, to be Brigadier General.

Mr. INHOFE for Mr. McCain. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Paul Obi Amaliri and ending with Meoshia A. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2017.

Air Force nominations beginning with Carl P. Bhend and ending with Christopher M. Wolbert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 19, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Steven J. Acevedo and ending with Heather C. Yun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 19, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Nataliya A. Ables and ending with Michelle L. Zielinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 19, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with George Z. Aberth and ending with Veranika Zakharyeva, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 19, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kevin D. Alford and ending with Winnifred M. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 19, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Ann E. Alexander and ending with Patrick B. Parsons, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 19, 2018.

Air Force nomination of David J. Caswell, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Bruce P. Heseltine, Jr., to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michael T. Cain and ending with Ilda Y. Isaza, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kerry L. Hirzel and ending with Joshua S. Trice, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Air Force nomination of Miguel J. Morales, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Julie A. Bowman and ending with Larrin S. Wampler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Marc M. Adair and ending with Jesse B. Zydallis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Army nomination of Devry C. Anderson, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Andrew A. Arndt and ending with D013347, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 19, 2018.

Army nomination of Tyler M. Abercrombie, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Randolph S. Carpenter, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Angel Soto, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Matthew C. Dawson and ending with Lee C. Novy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 19, 2018.

Army nomination of Thomas A. Summers, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Christina M. Buchner, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Marcia L. Lewis, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Jack E. Shields III, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Jerzy M. Matyszczyk, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Alecia D. Biddison and ending with Roger R. Wold, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph W. Bishop and ending with Robert T. Utlaut, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nomination of Jennifer L. White, to be Major.

Army nomination of Patrick E. Mather, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Luis G. Fuchu and ending with Dexter C. Nunnally, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nomination of Olivia H. Ivey, to be Major.

Army nomination of Han S. Kim, to be Major.

Army nomination of John E. Richardson, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Paul A. White, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Robert T. Carter, Jr. and ending with Charles A. Phillips, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nomination of Kyle R. Stiefel, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Adam C. Miller, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Mathew M. Condry, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with David A. Amamoo and ending with D013799, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Army nomination of Jason B. Yenrick, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of David R. Addams, to be Major.

Army nomination of Pankaj A. Ksheersagar, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael P. Sargent, to be Major.

Army nomination of Nicholas E. Hurd, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael C. Agbay, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jay A. Iannacito, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Lonnie M. McGhee, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Michael E. Feuquay and ending with Heath E. Ruppert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Shawn P. Chabot and ending with Ricardo B. Rivera, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Enrique Luz, Jr. and ending with Jeremy J. Willoughby, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Jeffrey A. Bryant and ending with Joe A. Saenz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Andrew E. Cheatum and ending with Joseph

M. David, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brian K. Evans and ending with Jeremy F. Ortiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Daniel H. Flick and ending with Jesse C. Tallman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Ezra H. Bardo and ending with Michael C. Medley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Matthew C. Pampush and ending with Stephen T. Sutton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Odin Pineda and ending with James M. Rod, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Natalie E. Moore and ending with Brooke J. Speers, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2018.

Navy nomination of Henry J. Kennedy, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of John A. Mills, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Eric C. Correll, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jamal L. Headen, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Patrick P. Arrigo and ending with Oliver C. Zufelt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Navy nomination of Jessica M. Ferraro, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Vijay M. Ravindra, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Elisabeth S. Stephens, to be Captain.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 2453. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide the Secretary with information on the hospital's acquisition costs for 340B drugs and the total revenues received by the hospital for such drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2454. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require disclosure of payments for settlements of disputes regarding sexual abuse and certain types of harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2455. A bill to encourage United States-Ukraine cybersecurity cooperation and require a report regarding such cooperation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASSIDY, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2456. A bill to reauthorize and expand the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2457. A bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for military families; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2458. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms and explosives and Federal firearms and explosives licenses and permits to known or suspected terrorists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 2459. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for current year inclusion of net CFC tested income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 2460. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require e-prescribing for coverage under part D of the Medicare program of prescription drugs that are controlled substances; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 2461. A bill to allow for judicial review of certain final rules relating to national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with the rules by existing sources; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

S. 2462. A bill to place restrictions on searches and seizures of electronic devices at the border; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2463. A bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 2464. A bill to improve border security and to provide conditional provision residence to certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children; read the first time.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs.

GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KING, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. JONES):

S.J. Res. 52. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Restoring Internet Freedom"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. Res. 414. A resolution condemning the continued undemocratic measures by the Government of Venezuela to undermine the independence of democratic institutions and calling for a free and fair electoral process; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 415. A resolution designating March 2, 2018, as "National Speech and Debate Education Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 416. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Con. Res. 34. A concurrent resolution recognizing the rich history, heritage, and strategic importance of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Marshallese population residing in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. Con. Res. 35. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in

the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the members of the Office of Strategic Services; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 58

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 58, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 168

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 168, a bill to amend and enhance certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation.

S. 397

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 397, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure fairness in Medicare hospital payments by establishing a floor for the area wage index applied with respect to certain hospitals.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to prohibit sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 811

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 811, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1278

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1278, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 1539

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to establish an additional fund in the Treasury to meet existing statutory obligations to reimburse costs reasonably incurred as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum, and for other purposes.

S. 1674

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1674, a bill to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of public elementary schools and secondary schools, to establish a school infrastructure bond program, and for other purposes.

S. 1710

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1710, a bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit by closing big oil tax loopholes, and for other purposes.

S. 1879

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1879, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1945, a bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

S. 2073

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2073, a bill to establish a vegetation management pilot program on National Forest System land to better protect utility infrastructure from passing wildfire, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion

of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2278

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2278, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve health care in rural areas.

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2278, *supra*.

S. 2324

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2324, a bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes.

S. 2341

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2341, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes.

S. 2353

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2353, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the

estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes.

S. 2360

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, a bill to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2430

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2430, a bill to provide a permanent appropriation of funds for the payment of death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services in event of any period of lapsed appropriations.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2018, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself,
Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. CAPITO,

Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASSIDY, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2456. A bill to reauthorize and expand the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to address a critical issue today in Westerville, OH, and, frankly, every community I represent in my State and communities all over the country. Today, I want to talk about the opioid epidemic that is gripping our country.

Every State represented in this Chamber has had too many communities devastated, families broken apart, and lives taken by the opioid overdoses. The Centers for Disease Control now tells us more than 63,000 Americans died from drug overdoses in 2016, the last year for which they have records. It also looks like it was worse in 2017. More Americans are dying from drug overdoses than the total number of casualties during the Vietnam war. Every year, more Americans are dying from drug overdoses than the total number of casualties from the Vietnam war. Think about that. It is a staggering statistic.

On average, more than 174 Americans died every single day from a drug overdose in 2016. That is up from 143 Americans in 2015 and 105 Americans in 2010. In other words, it is getting worse, and 2016 was the deadliest year on record. Initial estimates for 2017 suggest it is going to be even deadlier, including in my home State of Ohio.

Opioids—prescription drugs, heroin, and synthetic forms of heroin—are increasingly the reason why. Opioids were involved in about two-thirds of all overdose deaths in 2016. Opioid overdose deaths were five times higher in 2016 than they were just back in 1999. In the past 17 years, we have seen a fivefold increase in these overdose deaths. It is a national epidemic.

It has unfolded in three different waves. It started with prescription drugs, overprescribing of prescription drugs—pain pills. The pill mills we saw in Southern Ohio and around our State exploded about 15 to 20 years ago. Next, there were the heroin deaths. Heroin moved in and spiked as people moved to less expensive and more accessible alternatives than prescription drugs. Now, I hate to tell you, there is a new danger and a threat, and it is deadlier than ever. It is these synthetic opioids—fentanyl, carfentanil—that have moved into our States, overcoming our law enforcement, and the results have been deadly.

By the way, it is a crisis that does not discriminate. Opioid addiction affects everybody, regardless of age, area code, class, or color. In Ohio, drug addiction and acts committed to support it have now become the No. 1 cause of crime in our communities—probably the same in your community.

Employers, of course, are increasingly pointing to the inability to find workers who can pass a drug test. They can't fill vacant positions. There is new data out with regard to people who are not showing up on the unemployment rolls but have given up looking for work altogether. There are probably 9 million men between 25 and 55 who are considered to be able-bodied who aren't even looking for work. Some really troubling statistics out there indicate that maybe as many as half—one study says 48 percent—of those individuals are taking opioids on a daily basis.

This is affecting all of us. Every aspect of our communities is affected. Everybody has a role to play overcoming this epidemic. There is an urgency coming up with better strategies to turn the tide on addiction. Although I believe progress has been made recently—and it is starting to be made in my State and other States—much more needs to be done and done urgently.

Part of that starts with understanding that addiction is a disease, and it is treatable. Too often it is not treated like that. The appropriate response should include much more aggressive prevention and education, absolutely, and more aggressive law enforcement keeping deadly fentanyl out of our communities through the STOP Act and other means, of course, but we also have to get more effective treatment strategies. We have a couple hundred thousand people in Ohio who are addicted. We need to get them into treatment, including more effective detox, medication-assisted treatment, and longer term recovery. We know, coupled with the right kind of therapy, the right kind of support and help, people can get into recovery and get back to their families, get back to work, and get back to being productive citizens.

We also know recovery results are a lot better with that kind of continuous support. Closing the gaps that occur is key to overcoming addiction. There is a gap between the crisis response, which is often a first responder—like the two brave officers I talked about earlier—finding someone who has overdosed. Often it is firefighters as well providing Narcan, this miracle drug that reverses the effect of the overdose. That is incredibly important to saving lives.

Narcan alone is not sufficient. The key is to get those people into detox and into treatment and longer term recovery. The gaps we have out there between the crisis response and Narcan, then going to detox, then going to treatment, and then going to recovery are creating a lot of the inability to solve this problem.

I have probably met a couple of thousand addicts or recovering addicts in the last few years. What they tell me is: I tried treatment, but it was for 6, 7, 8 weeks, and then there was nothing for me. It didn't work for me. Then there

are people who overdosed, not once or twice but several times, and they had never been in detox and treatment.

One young man I spoke to last weekend has been an addict for 7 years. Finally, his brother convinced him to seek help. The last time he overdosed, he did go into detox. He did go into treatment, to a facility where those gaps were closed, where there was no waiting time, where he was able to get the help, rather than going back to his old community and his old friends and a situation that was going to lead him back into more use and more addiction.

The key, again, is to get those who have overdosed into the treatment they need. Overdose reversal provides a second chance at life. Let's face it. Some of these people who are overdosing come out of this after Narcan is administered. They have seen their life flash before their eyes, and they are ready for something. We have to be ready for them. Just as the overdose reversal provides a second chance at life, it is treatment and longer term recovery that provides that second chance to live addiction-free—again, to get back with your family, get back to work, and get back to a productive life. It takes a comprehensive solution because it is a comprehensive problem.

That is what led some of us in this body, including my colleague Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and me, to introduce the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, back in 2015. We developed that bill over time by relying on experts in the field and those most affected by addiction.

Beginning in 2014, when we were in the process of putting together the legislation, we hosted five national forums here in Washington, DC. We brought experts and practitioners in from around the country—prevention, treatment, law enforcement, and recovery communities. We wanted to get the best practices to find out what was working, what wasn't working, and how we could improve the response. What role could the Federal Government play in all of this? We had forums focused on the science of addiction to understand it better, evidence-based prevention strategies that actually work; treating pregnant women who are addicted and babies at risk of being born drug-dependent. There is nothing more heartbreaking than going into the neonatal units in the hospitals in my home State and seeing these babies who were born dependent and watching them go through the painful withdrawal process as infants. Every neonatal unit in our country has seen this. If you go to your own hospital, they will tell you this is an increasing problem.

We had veterans come in, and we had experts come in to help veterans make that transition because, sadly, the use of opioids among veterans is also increasing. They sometimes use opioids

for injuries, for accidents, for PTSD, and they become addicted. How do you build support around those veterans? We also had people come in and talk about longer term recovery and housing and how, over time, you can get better results if you provide those kinds of services. Our goal was to leverage the expertise and perspectives of everyone involved in this epidemic, to find best practices, and to create an evidence-based education, treatment, and recovery bill that works.

With strong bipartisan support, we moved from hearings, to a unanimous committee markup, to Senate passage of this legislation. By the way, it passed with a vote of 92 to 2. That is not typical around here, certainly not for something so comprehensive. Yet everybody has experienced this back home and is desperate to figure out strategies to help. In July of 2016, President Obama signed CARA into law. It was the first comprehensive addiction reform in more than 20 years. It was the first time Congress had ever provided any support or help for this longer term recovery piece.

The CARA law targets prevention and education resources to prevent abuse before it even starts—the most effective way. It helps first responders reverse overdoses to save lives. It devotes resources to evidence-based treatment and recovery programs. It expands prescription drug take-back programs to get addictive pain pills off the bathroom shelves. More than \$180 million was authorized to assist communities in these efforts to combat this epidemic. Frankly, because of this crisis, the appropriators decided: You know, we need this so badly, we are actually going to appropriate more than the \$180 million. Last year, as an example, they appropriated \$267 million—almost \$100 million beyond our authorization.

Again, I think it is beginning to make a difference. I see it back home in Ohio. I see some of these strategies beginning to work. It is going to take some time, and we need to do more. In Ohio, we received about \$4 million. When I say “we,” I mean groups, people who are in the trenches doing the hard work.

We have also made progress in this fight with separate opioid legislation that was part of the 21st Century Cures legislation. That legislation was for substance abuse and mental health. Many of us successfully fought to help secure a 2-year commitment there of \$500 million a year, totaling \$1 billion. It goes directly to the States. This money goes to States that are hardest hit, and States are allowed to decide how to spend that money. The first installment of funding from that legislation awarded my State of Ohio with \$26 million, and we are using every penny of it.

I was at a facility over the weekend that gave me hope. It is called the

Maryhaven Addiction Stabilization Center, and it is in Columbus, OH. They talked about the gaps, where people who overdose are provided Narcan, and then they go back to their community, and what first responders will tell you is that sometimes in the same week or even on the same day on some occasions, there is another overdose. The revolving door continues without any treatment and without any solution. Maryhaven Stabilization Center is a response to that. They used the Cures money we talked about, they used some CARA funding from the county—the county is a part of the broader strategy of where the CARA money went—and they said: Let's put together an institution where there is an emergency room that focuses on overdoses.

I have been to other emergency rooms in Columbus, OH, and I have seen what they do with the people who overdose. They save lives, and that is fantastic, but frankly these emergency rooms are equipped for everything, and they have to be—for gunshot wounds, car accidents, trauma.

This emergency room would be focused specifically on overdoses, which makes it more cost-effective but also more effective for those recovering addicts, those addicts who are coming in. But most importantly, in that same facility, there is a detox center. In that same facility, there are 50 treatment beds. Whereas in the typical case when somebody overdoses, they go to the emergency room and end up going back to their community, back home, back to the gang, back to the family, in this case, 103 people who have gone through in the last month—it has only been open a month—80 percent of them have gone into treatment. I had the opportunity to meet someone who had been through that process, and we talked about the difference this makes. You literally walk through the door into treatment, there is strong encouragement to do it, and it is working.

These are the kinds of things that are going to make a difference in our communities. It seems to be common sense, but frankly it is not happening in other places. Programs like these are what are going to help us overcome addiction and are examples of how Federal funds can be used more effectively to leverage, in this case, a lot of private dollars, some State dollars.

Both of these landmark laws—the CARA Act that we talked about and the Cures Act—are providing increased resources to local communities, but this problem is not getting better, it is getting worse.

One of the problems is the availability and the low cost of these highly addictive, even more dangerous drugs coming in. There are synthetic opioids. Fentanyl is 50 times stronger than heroin on average. It is coming in through the mail. We need to do more to stop it

through law enforcement, but we also need to acknowledge that it has been sprinkled in other drugs and is creating a lot of these addiction overdoses and higher rates of death.

The degree of damage this is causing to our communities, our families, our local budgets, and our criminal justice system requires us to take a more aggressive stance, to do more to figure this out. We need to strengthen our resolve. We made progress recently with the bipartisan budget agreement President Trump signed into law just a few weeks ago. We included in there an additional amount of funding—\$6 billion over 2 years—to help combat the opioid epidemic. So instead of the \$500 million a year and the \$260 million a year that I talked about, it would be \$3 billion a year and then \$3 billion the year after.

I believe that the evidence-based programs we set out in the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act provide a good framework as to how to spend that money effectively. That is why I am pleased to stand here today as we introduce the next stage of this—CARA 2.0—to help provide a framework for how these funds to combat opioid addiction can be spent wisely. It is a roadmap for Congress to build on CARA's successes since becoming law.

The bipartisan CARA 2.0 act is being introduced by SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and me and also by six other colleagues—Senators SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, AMY KLOBUCHAR, DAN SULLIVAN, MAGGIE HASSAN, BILL CASSIDY, and MARIA CANTWELL—a bipartisan group of four Republicans and four Democrats who are passionate about this issue. It authorizes \$1 billion a year for specific evidence-based drug prevention, education, treatment, and recovery programs.

It is very important to have this \$6 billion of funding over the next couple of years. We need it. But we have to be sure it is spent wisely. It is not a matter of just throwing money at a problem; it is a matter of being sure we are effectively addressing the real issues.

As I mentioned earlier, the longer term recovery programs are what really help those gripped by addiction to overcome this disease. That is evidence that we have. I have certainly seen a lot of evidence of that firsthand and countless examples of this, where this longer term recovery and the support networks are what get people back on track, back with their families, back to work. We need to expand access to them to those communities that are in need and give everyone a second chance of living up to their own God-given potential. That is why, in this new CARA 2.0, we increase funding for recovery.

In addition to expanding the reach of CARA's evidence-based programs, this bill puts in place new policy reforms to strengthen the government's response in so many ways. We take what some would consider a pretty dramatic step

by limiting opioid prescriptions to 3 days for acute pain. Some will push back against that, but this is based on good evidence and good research. When someone goes in for a simple procedure—say, a wisdom tooth extraction—and that young person is given a bottle of opioids when he or she leaves, too often, that leads to addiction. I don't want more parents coming up to me and saying: My kid, when he or she was a teenager, was given these opioids by a doctor or a dentist, so we thought they were safe. Our child then turned to heroin because the pills became too expensive and less accessible and then turned to fentanyl and overdosed and died.

I have had two such parents from Ohio come to me and tell me their story. You probably know others. We need to ensure that these prescriptions are limited. For those who have chronic pain and those who have cancer, it wouldn't apply. And after those 3 days, you can go back to that doctor and tell them why you need it and explain it.

Experts say that about 80 percent of those who overdose from heroin started on prescription drugs. I am sure the same is true with regard to fentanyl. Four out of five heroin addicts in my State of Ohio who overdosed started on prescription drugs. We do need to deal with this overprescription problem.

By the way, the evidence is that after that fourth day, fifth day, sixth day—that is when you get into the bigger risk of becoming addicted to prescription drugs.

As I mentioned, this epidemic started with an explosion of pain pill use 15 to 20 years ago. We need to stop the addiction at the source, and for most people that begins with prescription drugs. By ensuring that clinicians prescribe the appropriate strength and supply of pain pills for non-life-threatening injuries, we can keep so many more people from becoming addicted.

The bill also includes legislation very similar to that which passed the Senate in 2015 but was dropped out in the House-Senate conference. It is very simple. It requires doctors and pharmacists to use the prescription drug monitoring programs to ensure that we are not overprescribing opioids for certain individuals. That helps us identify where the problems are and to get people into treatment. It also requires States to share data with other States to prevent people from crossing State lines to get prescriptions. One of our big problems in Ohio is people can cross the State lines in West Virginia, Kentucky, or other States and get their prescription filled even though it has already been filled once in Ohio. Across State lines, we need to have prescription drug monitoring programs that work.

CARA 2.0 is going to help turn the tide of this epidemic. The bill increases Federal funds for specific evidence-

based programs to better protect vulnerable groups—including infants, young adults, pregnant and postpartum women, and veterans—as well as resources for community programs, medication-assisted treatment, and first responders.

As the title indicates, it is a comprehensive solution. Every aspect of our communities is affected, so every aspect of our communities needs assistance. The opioid epidemic is one of the most urgent challenges we face as a country.

By the way, ultimately, this crisis is not going to be solved here in Washington, DC. It is not going to be solved by legislation we pass here. We get that. It is going to be solved in our communities. It is going to be solved in our families. It is going to be solved in our hearts. But this is a national crisis, and the national government needs to be a much better partner with State government, local government, communities, and nonprofits—those who are out there doing the hard work.

The \$6 billion commitment over the next 2 years is a real opportunity to help turn the tide—not by just throwing more money at the problem but by being sure that money is well spent on an epidemic that is taking too many lives and devastating too many communities.

CARA 2.0 will build on our accomplishments and continue to give communities the resources they need to address this issue. Yes, we have made some progress around here, and that is good, but we need to do much more. CARA 2.0 gives us that opportunity. It represents the next step toward helping our communities address this epidemic and helping our communities heal.

Thank you.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2457. A bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for military families; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. We rightfully honor the sacrifice of veterans and servicemembers and as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am proud of the work we do to ensure that we have the best equipped and most successful fighting force in the world. Military families are critical to the success and readiness of our military, but are too often unrecognized for their support to our servicemembers and left without necessary programs and assistance to help them succeed. Military families frequently face financial insecurity due to spousal unemployment, which impacts the overall success of our military. Somewhere between 12% and 25% of military spouses are unemployed.

Today, I am pleased to introduce with my colleagues Senators BOOZMAN

and TESTER the Jobs and Childcare for Military Families Act of 2018. This legislation encourages businesses to step up and play a bigger role in hiring military spouses who sacrifice so much by expanding the Work Opportunity Tax Credit to also include military spouses. The bill also further addresses a real obstacle to professional success for many military families: access to quality, affordable childcare by establishing a flexible spending account for military families to use to reimburse themselves for out of pocket child care costs.

Addressing these issues will help military spouses advance in their careers despite frequent moves. Being a military family member will never be easy, but if we can do something to ease the burden in any way, we should. This legislation follows the introduction of another bipartisan bill earlier this month, the Military Spouse Employment Act of 2018, which provides direct employment opportunities and additional access to childcare, improves educational opportunities and extends transition and counseling services. I believe if we make it bipartisan priority to support military families, we will see an improvement in the readiness of our military and reap the economic benefits of supporting this underutilized and resilient workforce of military spouses. I hope to see many of the provisions of these two bills incorporated into this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2458. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms and explosives and Federal firearms and explosives licenses and permits to known or suspected terrorists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Terrorist Firearms Prevention Act, which would prohibit suspected or known terrorists from legally purchasing a firearm.

I thank my colleagues—Senators HEITKAMP, FLAKE, HEINRICH, TOOMEY, BALDWIN, KING, NELSON, MANCHIN, and KAINE—for their cosponsorship of this bipartisan bill. I particularly recognize the leadership of Senator HEINRICH, who has joined me on the floor this evening as we introduce the bill and explain it to our colleagues.

Often referred to as “no fly, no buy,” this bill represents one of the sensible steps that we can take to reform our Nation's gun laws to better protect our people. Our bill is based on a simple principle: If you are considered to be too dangerous to board an airplane, then you are too dangerous to buy a firearm.

Our legislation would grant the Attorney General the authority to block the purchase of a gun by a person who is on either the no-fly or the selectee list. Remarkably, current law does not prohibit a person known or suspected of engaging in terrorism from walking into a gun shop and buying a firearm. The no-fly list and the selectee list are the narrowest subsets of all of the government's terrorist watch lists. These lists include the names of individuals who pose the greatest threat of committing an act of terrorism against aviation, against our homeland, or against U.S. interests abroad. This bill would also provide an immediate alert to the FBI and to local law enforcement if an individual who has been on the government's terrorist watch list at any time during the past 5 years purchases a firearm.

Our hearts are all broken by the horrific shootings of the students in Florida. There was another horrendous shooting in Florida in 2016 that demonstrates why this look-back provision in this legislation is so important. The gunman, Omar Mateen, was on the selectee list for approximately 10 months, but he was no longer on the list when he purchased the 2 guns that he used to murder 49 people and injure scores more. If our bill had been enacted, the FBI would have been notified immediately when Omar Mateen purchased his first firearm in the weeks leading up to the shooting. Then the FBI would have been notified a second time that Mateen had sought to purchase additional firearms. Surely, that would have caused the FBI to reopen its investigation of Omar Mateen. If our proposal had been law at that time, perhaps that massacre might have been prevented.

I note that our bill would provide robust due process procedures to protect the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Americans. Any American who would be denied a purchase under this bill would have the opportunity to petition a Federal district court and receive a decision within 14 days. If the government, which would have the burden of proof, would fail to prove its case, it would have to pay attorneys' fees for that individual, and, of course, the purchase of the firearm would go forward.

In 2016, when the Senate voted on our bill, it won majority and bipartisan support. Our bill was endorsed by a distinguished group of military and intelligence leaders. I note that during the 2016 Presidential debates, both candidates agreed with our principle of no fly, no buy. Surely, this is a sensible, reasonable policy around which we can build consensus.

Another step that we can take right now is to pass legislation I introduced with Senator LEAHY to explicitly outlaw straw purchasing. Straw purchasing is intended for one purpose

only, and that is to put a gun into the hands of a criminal who cannot legally obtain one. Our bill, the Stop Illegal Trafficking in Firearms Act, would provide law enforcement with an effective tool to fight the violence that too often goes hand in hand with drug trafficking and gang-related crimes.

Today, gun traffickers exploit weaknesses in our Federal laws by targeting individuals who can lawfully purchase firearms. Sadly, according to briefings that I have had from Federal officials, in the State of Maine gang members from other States have targeted addicts to go buy firearms for them, and then they swap firearms for drugs. Right now a straw purchaser can be prosecuted only for lying on a Federal form, which is treated far too often as just a paperwork violation. Instead of a slap on the wrist, our bill would create new, specific criminal offenses for straw purchasing and trafficking, punishable by hefty prison terms, particularly for those who have reason to believe that the firearms will be used to commit violent crimes.

Our bill would also outlaw firearms and ammunition smuggling out of the United States to another country. That is vitally important for combating drug trafficking near and across our southern border, which is contributing to the heroin crisis here at home.

Let me again be clear that the bill I have introduced with Senator LEAHY protects the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

These are just two commonsense reforms that we can pass while fully protecting the constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans. We can make it as difficult for a terrorist to obtain a gun as it is for him to board an airplane. We can outlaw straw purchasing by increasing the penalties to make a real difference. I urge my colleagues to support both the bipartisan Terrorist Firearms Prevention Act and the straw purchasing bill, as well as other commonsense reforms.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking my colleague, Senator COLLINS of Maine, for her work in crafting this legislation and the language of this bill and, more generally, for her leadership, formerly on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee and certainly for the time that I have been on the Intelligence Committee. Her contributions have not gone unnoticed, and she has been a pleasure to work with in trying to find reasonable places where we can make a material difference in the kinds of mass shootings we have seen.

I should start by speaking a little bit to the recent tragedy in Florida. As the father of two young boys, I can't begin to imagine the nightmare that families are living through as they mourn the

loss of their children in the wake of yet another horrific mass shooting.

Frankly, no parent should have to live in fear of their child not coming home from school. It is pretty unthinkable.

Just last week, one of my own sons went through an active shooter training at his school. Sadly, that is now the new norm in schools all across our country. In fact, 91 Americans are killed each day by gun violence, and we simply cannot accept the status quo as the new normal when there are real and concrete steps we can take to reduce gun violence while respecting constitutional rights.

Once again, Americans are looking to Congress to finally enact commonsense reforms to our gun laws, to protect our schools, to protect our children, to protect our communities. Like so many Americans, I have been deeply moved by the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School students and young people all across this country who have spoken out after losing classmates and friends to demand that we as lawmakers take action to prevent future tragedies.

It is no secret to my constituents or even my colleagues here that I am a passionate outdoorsman, hunter, and owner of firearms. I strongly believe that law-abiding Americans have a right to own guns for sport and self-defense. I am teaching my own sons how to safely and responsibly use those firearms. The vast majority of Americans, including gun owners like me, know that Congress must take action to close loopholes and reform our laws to keep those deadly weapons out of the hands of those who would turn them against our communities.

Today I am quite proud to join my colleagues from both sides of the aisle—Senators COLLINS, HEITKAMP, FLAKE, and others—to introduce one of those measures that should have broad bipartisan support. This is a poster child for the kind of policy that ought to get across the finish line even in these deeply divided, partisan times.

Our bipartisan legislation, the Terrorist Firearms Prevention Act, would deny firearms sales to individuals who appear on the Department of Justice's no-fly or selectee lists. These are the narrowest of databases, the kinds of lists one would have to work pretty hard to land on, and for good reason. Our legislation includes due process procedures for individuals to appeal their placement on those lists.

It seems pretty straightforward to most of my constituents that if the government and law enforcement have determined that an individual is so dangerous as to land on the terrorist watch list and is too dangerous to fly on a commercial airplane, that person should not be able to walk into a gun shop and purchase a gun. But unless we pass this legislation, this glaring loophole will continue to allow individuals

identified as terror suspects to buy firearms.

It is time for those Members of Congress who oppose commonsense reforms like this to finally step up and tell us what they are doing to protect the public. It is time for all of us to listen to the student leaders across this country who are rejecting the unacceptable status quo of our Nation's gun violence epidemic.

Those of us in the Senate who know firearms well have a special duty to lead these efforts and to get the details right on any legislation to reshape our Nation's gun laws. Inaction simply won't cut it anymore. We all need to listen to these students, parents, teachers, and to our own children who are calling on us to be part of the solution.

New Mexicans can count on me, despite the odds, to continue fighting for real solutions to keep our children safe, to reduce gun violence, and to keep our communities safe. That is what our communities and our constituents deserve.

Thank you.

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

S. 2462. A bill to place restrictions on searches and seizures of electronic devices at the border; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President. No American should have to relinquish all of their privacy rights in their cell phones, laptops, and other electronic devices, simply because they are coming home from a trip abroad. Yet that is exactly how our Government views it: currently, if a Vermonter crosses the border into Canada for a day, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) can search through the Vermonter's emails, text messages, photos, and anything else contained in their electronic devices without any reason to suspect the person is in violation of anything. Let me repeat that: without any suspicion at all. That is unacceptable.

That is why I am joining with Senator DAINES to introduce legislation to require the Government to have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to search or seize Americans' electronic devices at the border. This legislation is a vital step toward protecting our Fourth Amendment rights, while also ensuring that officers protecting our homeland have the lawful authorities they need to do their jobs.

Last year, CBP searched the electronic devices of over 30,000 travelers, and this number continues to grow. These searches can take place at any international airport, or at any land border point such as U.S.-Canada border crossings in my home state of Vermont or Senator DAINES's home state of Montana.

Nothing in this legislation will prevent CBP officers from doing their jobs

to protect the homeland, detect contraband, and enforce the law. Our legislation simply says that if an officer of the Government wants to search an American's electronic device at the border, at a minimum they should have reasonable suspicion. If they want to seize the device, they should have probable cause. And if they want to conduct a forensic examination of the device, they should get a warrant from a judge.

Our legislation also requires the Department of Homeland Security to collect statistics on such searches and seizures and report them to Congress. This will significantly increase transparency on the Government's use of these invasive tools, providing Congress and the American people an opportunity to assess the balance between the needs of law enforcement and the imperative of protecting privacy and civil liberties.

I urge other Senators to join us in support of this legislation. It should not be controversial to be concerned at the Government's ability to search our electronic devices at the border without any suspicion at all. All of us—Republican and Democrat—can support the goal of protecting our borders while also protecting the Fourth Amendment.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 2464. A bill to improve border security and to provide conditional provision residence to certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children; read the first time.

S. 2464

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Three-Year Border and DACA Extension Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—BORDER SECURITY

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Operations and support.

TITLE II—DACA EXTENSION

Sec. 201. Provisional protected presence for young individuals.

TITLE I—BORDER SECURITY

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated a total of \$7,639,000,000 to the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal years 2018 through 2020 for the purpose of improving border security.

SEC. 102. OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to establish a Border Security Enforcement Fund (referred to in this section as the “Fund”), to be administered through the Department of Homeland Security and, in fiscal year 2018 only, through the Department of State, to provide for costs necessary to implement this Act and other Acts related to border security for activities, including—

(1) constructing, installing, deploying, operating, and maintaining tactical infrastruc-

ture and technology in the vicinity of the United States border—

(A) to achieve situational awareness and operational control of the border; and

(B) to deter, impede, and detect illegal activity in high traffic areas; and

(C) to implement other border security provisions under this section;

(2) implementing port of entry provisions under this section;

(3) purchasing new aircraft, vessels, spare parts, and equipment to operate and maintain such craft; and

(4) hiring and recruitment.

(b) FUNDING.—There are appropriated, to the Fund, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a total of \$7,639,000,000, as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2018, \$2,947,000,000, to remain available through fiscal year 2022.

(2) For fiscal year 2019, \$2,225,000,000, to remain available through fiscal year 2023.

(3) For fiscal year 2020, \$2,467,000,000, to remain available through fiscal year 2024.

(c) PHYSICAL BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In each of the following fiscal years, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall transfer, from the Fund to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Procurement, Construction and Improvements account, for the purpose of constructing, replacing, or planning physical barriers along the United States land border, a total of \$5,013,000,000, as follows:

(A) For fiscal year 2018, \$1,571,000,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2019, \$1,600,000,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2020, \$1,842,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 1552(a) of title 31, United States Code, any amounts obligated for the purposes described in paragraph (1) shall remain available for disbursement until expended.

(d) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Other than the amounts transferred by the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State pursuant to subsections (b) and (c), the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide for the transfer of amounts in the Fund for each fiscal year to eligible activities under this section, including—

(1) for the purpose of constructing, replacing, or planning for physical barriers along the United States land border; or

(2) for any of the activities described in subsection (a).

(e) USE OF FUND.—If the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives do not provide for the transfer of funds in a full-year appropriation in any fiscal year in accordance with subsection (d), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall transfer amounts in the Fund to accounts within the Department of Homeland Security for eligible activities under this section, including not less than the amounts specified in subsection (c) for the purpose of constructing, replacing, or planning for physical barriers along the United States land border.

(f) BUDGET REQUEST.—A request for the transfer of amounts in the Fund under this section—

(1) shall be included in each budget for a fiscal year submitted by the President under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) shall detail planned obligations by program, project, and activity in the receiving account at the same level of detail provided for in the request for other appropriations in that account.

(g) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—At the beginning of fiscal year 2019, and annually thereafter until the funding made available under this title has been expended, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that describes—

(1) the status of border security in the United States; and

(2) the amount planned to be expended on border security during the upcoming fiscal year, broken down by project and activity.

TITLE II—DACA EXTENSION

SEC. 201. PROVISIONAL PROTECTED PRESENCE FOR YOUNG INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 4 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 244A. PROVISIONAL PROTECTED PRESENCE.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **DACA RECIPIENT.**—The term ‘DACA recipient’ means an alien who is in deferred action status on the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (‘DACA’) Program announced on June 15, 2012.

“(2) **FELONY.**—The term ‘felony’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense (excluding a State or local offense for which an essential element was the alien’s immigration status) punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

“(3) **MISDEMEANOR.**—The term ‘misdemeanor’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense (excluding a State or local offense for which an essential element was the alien’s immigration status, a significant misdemeanor, and a minor traffic offense) for which—

“(A) the maximum term of imprisonment is greater than five days and not greater than 1 year; and

“(B) the individual was sentenced to time in custody of 90 days or less.

“(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(5) **SIGNIFICANT MISDEMEANOR.**—The term ‘significant misdemeanor’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense (excluding a State or local offense for which an essential element was the alien’s immigration status) for which the maximum term of imprisonment is greater than 5 days and not greater than 1 year that—

“(A) regardless of the sentence imposed, is a crime of domestic violence (as defined in section 237(a)(2)(E)(i)) or an offense of sexual abuse or exploitation, burglary, unlawful possession or use of a firearm, drug distribution or trafficking, or driving under the influence if the State law requires, as an element of the offense, the operation of a motor vehicle and a finding of impairment or a blood alcohol content of .08 or higher; or

“(B) resulted in a sentence of time in custody of more than 90 days, excluding an offense for which the sentence was suspended.

“(6) **THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY.**—An alien is a ‘threat to national security’ if the alien is—

“(A) inadmissible under section 212(a)(3); or

“(B) deportable under section 237(a)(4).

“(7) **THREAT TO PUBLIC SAFETY.**—An alien is a ‘threat to public safety’ if the alien—

“(A) has been convicted of an offense for which an element was participation in a

criminal street gang (as defined in section 521(a) of title 18, United States Code); or

“(B) has engaged in a continuing criminal enterprise (as defined in section 408(c) of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 848(c))).

“(b) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary—

“(1) shall grant provisional protected presence to an alien who—

“(A) files an application demonstrating that he or she meets the eligibility criteria under subsection (c); and

“(B) pays the appropriate application fee;

“(2) may not remove such alien from the United States during the period in which such provisional protected presence is in effect unless such status is rescinded pursuant to subsection (g); and

“(3) shall provide such alien with employment authorization.

“(c) **ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**—An alien is eligible for provisional protected presence and employment authorization under this section if the alien—

“(1) was born after June 15, 1981;

“(2) entered the United States before reaching 16 years of age;

“(3) continuously resided in the United States between June 15, 2007, and the date on which the alien files an application under this section;

“(4) was physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, and on the date on which the alien files an application under this section;

“(5) was unlawfully present in the United States on June 15, 2012;

“(6) on the date on which the alien files an application for provisional protected presence—

“(A) is enrolled in school or in an education program assisting students in obtaining a regular high school diploma or its recognized equivalent under State law, or in passing a general educational development exam or other State-authorized exam;

“(B) has graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school;

“(C) has obtained a general educational development certificate; or

“(D) is an honorably discharged veteran of the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States;

“(7) has not been convicted of—

“(A) a felony;

“(B) a significant misdemeanor; or

“(C) 3 or more misdemeanors not occurring on the same date and not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct; and

“(8) does not otherwise pose a threat to national security or a threat to public safety.

“(d) **DURATION OF PROVISIONAL PROTECTED PRESENCE AND EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION.**—Provisional protected presence and employment authorization provided under this section shall be effective until the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Three-Year Border and DACA Extension Act.

“(e) **STATUS DURING PERIOD OF PROVISIONAL PROTECTED PRESENCE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An alien granted provisional protected presence is not considered to be unlawfully present in the United States during the period beginning on the date such status is granted and ending on the date described in subsection (d).

“(2) **STATUS OUTSIDE PERIOD.**—The granting of provisional protected presence under this section does not excuse previous or subsequent periods of unlawful presence.

“(f) **APPLICATION.**—

“(1) **AGE REQUIREMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An alien who has never been in removal proceedings, or whose proceedings have been terminated before making a request for provisional protected presence, shall be at least 15 years old on the date on which the alien submits an application under this section.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The age requirement set forth in subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an alien who, on the date on which the alien applies for provisional protected presence, is in removal proceedings, has a final removal order, or has a voluntary departure order.

“(2) **APPLICATION FEE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may require aliens applying for provisional protected presence and employment authorization under this section to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application.

“(B) **EXEMPTION.**—An applicant may be exempted from paying the fee required under subparagraph (A) if the alien—

“(i)(I) is younger than 18 years of age;

“(II) received total income during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section that is less than 150 percent of the United States poverty level; and

“(III) is in foster care or otherwise lacking any parental or other familial support;

“(ii) is younger than 18 years of age and is homeless;

“(iii)(I) cannot care for himself or herself because of a serious, chronic disability; and

“(II) received total income during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section that is less than 150 percent of the United States poverty level; or

“(iv)(I) as of the date on which the alien files an application under this section, has accumulated \$10,000 or more in debt in the past 12 months as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses incurred by the alien or an immediate family member of the alien; and

“(II) received total income during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section that is less than 150 percent of the United States poverty level.

“(3) **REMOVAL STAYED WHILE APPLICATION PENDING.**—The Secretary may not remove an alien from the United States who appears prima facie eligible for provisional protected presence while the alien’s application for provisional protected presence is pending.

“(4) **ALIENS NOT IN IMMIGRATION DETENTION.**—An alien who is not in immigration detention, but who is in removal proceedings, is the subject of a final removal order, or is the subject of a voluntary departure order, may apply for provisional protected presence under this section if the alien appears prima facie eligible for provisional protected presence.

“(5) **ALIENS IN IMMIGRATION DETENTION.**—The Secretary shall provide any alien in immigration detention, including any alien who is in removal proceedings, is the subject of a final removal order, or is the subject of a voluntary departure order, who appears prima facie eligible for provisional protected presence, upon request, with a reasonable opportunity to apply for provisional protected presence under this section.

“(6) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall protect information provided in applications for provisional protected presence under this section and in requests for consideration of DACA from disclosure to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the purpose of immigration enforcement proceedings.

“(B) REFERRALS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary may not refer individuals whose cases have been deferred pursuant to DACA or who have been granted provisional protected presence under this section to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

“(C) LIMITED EXCEPTION.—The information submitted in applications for provisional protected presence under this section and in requests for consideration of DACA may be shared with national security and law enforcement agencies—

“(i) for assistance in the consideration of the application for provisional protected presence;

“(ii) to identify or prevent fraudulent claims;

“(iii) for national security purposes; and

“(iv) for the investigation or prosecution of any felony not related to immigration status.

“(7) ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Three-Year Border and DACA Extension Act, the Secretary shall begin accepting applications for provisional protected presence and employment authorization.

“(g) RESCISSION OF PROVISIONAL PROTECTED PRESENCE.—The Secretary may not rescind an alien's provisional protected presence or employment authorization granted under this section unless the Secretary determines that the alien—

“(1) has been convicted of—

“(A) a felony;

“(B) a significant misdemeanor; or

“(C) 3 or more misdemeanors not occurring on the same date and not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct;

“(2) poses a threat to national security or a threat to public safety;

“(3) has traveled outside of the United States without authorization from the Secretary; or

“(4) has ceased to continuously reside in the United States.

“(h) TREATMENT OF BRIEF, CASUAL, AND INNOCENT DEPARTURES AND CERTAIN OTHER ABSENCES.—For purposes of subsections (c)(3) and (g)(4), an alien shall not be considered to have failed to continuously reside in the United States due to—

“(1) brief, casual, and innocent absences from the United States during the period beginning on June 15, 2007, and ending on August 14, 2012; or

“(2) travel outside of the United States on or after August 15, 2012, if such travel was authorized by the Secretary.

“(i) TREATMENT OF EXPUNGED CONVICTIONS.—For purposes of subsections (c)(7) and (g)(1), an expunged conviction shall not automatically be treated as a disqualifying felony, significant misdemeanor, or misdemeanor, but shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis according to the nature and severity of the offense to determine whether, under the particular circumstances, the alien should be eligible for provisional protected presence under this section.

“(j) EFFECT OF DEFERRED ACTION UNDER DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS PROGRAM.—

“(1) PROVISIONAL PROTECTED PRESENCE.—A DACA recipient is deemed to have provisional protected presence under this section through the expiration date of the alien's deferred action status, as specified by the Secretary in conjunction with the approval of the alien's DACA application.

“(2) EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION.—If a DACA recipient has been granted employ-

ment authorization by the Secretary in addition to deferred action, the employment authorization shall continue through the expiration date of the alien's deferred action status, as specified by the Secretary in conjunction with the approval of the alien's DACA application.

“(3) EFFECT OF APPLICATION.—If a DACA recipient files an application for provisional protected presence under this section not later than the expiration date of the alien's deferred action status, as specified by the Secretary in conjunction with the approval of the alien's DACA application, the alien's provisional protected presence, and any employment authorization, shall remain in effect pending the adjudication of such application.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 244 the following:

“Sec. 244A. Provisional protected presence.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 414—CONDEMNING THE CONTINUED UNDEMOCRATIC MEASURES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF VENEZUELA TO UNDERMINE THE INDEPENDENCE OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND CALLING FOR A FREE AND FAIR ELECTORAL PROCESS

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 414

Whereas Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro continues to take measures to consolidate an authoritarian government and undermine the independence of democratic institutions in the country;

Whereas the Government of Peru, as host of the upcoming Summit of the Americas, has indicated that President Nicolás Maduro is not welcome to attend because of his failure to uphold the region's shared commitment to strengthening democracy and improving citizens' well-being;

Whereas Venezuela's National Electoral Council (CNE) unilaterally called for a presidential election on April 22, 2018, despite the absence of an agreement between the Government of Venezuela and the political opposition on the conditions necessary for the electoral process;

Whereas, on February 13, 2018, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Saint Lucia, rejected the decision of the Government of Venezuela to hold elections on April 22;

Whereas these 14 Foreign Ministers stated that elections would not be considered legitimate if the elections do not—

(1) permit the participation of all Venezuelan citizens and political parties;

(2) include observation by credible international organizations; and

(3) meet recognized international standards;

Whereas despite these denunciations, on February 21, 2018, President Maduro stated that he wanted to hold elections for the National Assembly, state legislative councils, and municipal councils in conjunction with the presidential election scheduled for April 22;

Whereas, in January 2018, Venezuelan authorities banned the Democratic Unity Roundtable (MUD), the principal coalition of opposition parties, and leading opposition political parties Voluntad Popular and Primero Justicia, from participating in the presidential election;

Whereas Venezuela's December 2017 municipal elections and October 2017 gubernatorial elections failed to meet recognized international standards;

Whereas, in July 2017, Venezuela held fraudulent elections to install a National Constituent Assembly, a parallel legislature that undemocratically usurped the constitutional authorities vested in the country's democratically-elected National Assembly;

Whereas Smartmatic, the company that manufactured the electronic voting technology, confirmed that—

(1) the result of the July 2017 National Constituent Assembly election was manipulated; and

(2) a change of more than 1,000,000 votes occurred in the final tabulation;

Whereas a global coalition of more than 40 countries have rejected the installation of Venezuela's National Constituent Assembly and refused to recognize it as a legitimate institution;

Whereas the collapse of democratic governance and the proliferation of political corruption, criminal violence, failed economic policies, and hyperinflation have created a devastating humanitarian crisis in Venezuela;

Whereas the majority of Venezuela's citizens lack access to essential medicines and basic food supplies;

Whereas the precarious humanitarian conditions in Venezuela have prompted hundreds of thousands of Venezuelan citizens to emigrate, which is fueling a migration and refugee crisis in neighboring countries;

Whereas, the Chief Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court has stated that the Office of the Prosecutor will open a preliminary examination of the Venezuelan Government's use of torture and excessive force against demonstrators and the arbitrary detention of thousands of anti-government protesters;

Whereas, despite the presence of international mediators, the Government of Venezuela failed to credibly participate in negotiations with the country's political opposition in order to reach an agreement that would—

(1) restore democracy;

(2) free political prisoners;

(3) facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid; and

(4) establish conditions for legitimate democratic elections:

Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on the Government of Venezuela to postpone the presidential election and any concurrent National Assembly, state legislative council, or municipal council elections scheduled for April 22, 2018, until—

(A) international and local election observers from credible organizations are allowed to observe the electoral process, including

the pre-election period, and determine a legitimate process;

(B) the National Electoral Council is led and staffed by nonpartisan members that have the confidence of contesting parties;

(C) opposition parties and candidates are free to peacefully compete in the election without threat of arrest, harassment, or retaliation, including access to government controlled media;

(D) arrangements are made for all Venezuelan voters, including those residing outside of Venezuela, to be able to participate in the election; and

(E) there is no implied or direct link between an individual's vote and the government food rations to which the individual is eligible and no record is retained of a voter's choice for any reason related to government benefits, including retaliation;

(2) denounces as illegitimate any presidential election in Venezuela that fails to meet the standards described in paragraph (1);

(3) condemns the steps taken by President Maduro—

(A) to consolidate an authoritarian government in Venezuela; and

(B) to undermine the independence of democratic institutions such as the National Assembly of Venezuela, the Supreme Tribunal of Justice of Venezuela, and the National Electoral Council of Venezuela;

(4) rejects the Venezuelan Government's efforts to blame the country's economic, humanitarian, and political crisis on other actors instead of recognizing that the crisis was caused by its own malfeasance and criminality;

(5) urges the Government of Venezuela—

(A) to permit the unobstructed delivery of humanitarian assistance to the people of Venezuela; and

(B) to stop using food as a tool of political coercion;

(6) condemns the Government of Venezuela for failing to credibly participate in internationally mediated negotiations—

(A) to restore democracy;

(B) to free political prisoners; and

(C) to permit the delivery of humanitarian assistance;

(7) supports the decision of the Government of Peru, as host of the Eighth Summit of the Americas, to not invite President Maduro; and

(8) supports the efforts of the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court to examine the Venezuelan Government's use of torture, excessive force, and arbitrary detentions against Venezuelan citizens.

SENATE RESOLUTION 415—DESIGNATING MARCH 2, 2018, AS “NATIONAL SPEECH AND DEBATE EDUCATION DAY”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 415

Whereas it is essential for youth to learn and practice the art of communicating with and without technology;

Whereas speech and debate education offers students myriad forms of public speaking through which students may develop talent and exercise unique voice and character;

Whereas speech and debate education gives students the 21st-century skills of commu-

nication, critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration;

Whereas critical analysis and effective communication allow important ideas, texts, and philosophies the opportunity to flourish;

Whereas personal, professional, and civic interactions are enhanced by the ability of the participants in those interactions to listen, concur, question, and dissent with reason and compassion;

Whereas students who participate in speech and debate have chosen a challenging activity that requires regular practice, dedication, and hard work;

Whereas teachers and coaches of speech and debate devote in-school, afterschool, and weekend hours to equip students with life-changing skills and opportunities;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day emphasizes the lifelong impact of providing people of the United States with the confidence and preparation to both discern and share views;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day acknowledges that most achievements, celebrations, commemorations, and pivotal moments in modern history begin, end, or are crystallized with public address;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day recognizes that learning to research, construct, and present an argument is integral to personal advocacy, social movements, and the making of public policy;

Whereas the National Speech & Debate Association, in conjunction with national and local partners, honors and celebrates the importance of speech and debate through National Speech and Debate Education Day; and

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day emphasizes the importance of speech and debate education and the integration of speech and debate education across grade levels and disciplines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2, 2018, as “National Speech and Debate Education Day”;;

(2) strongly affirms the purposes of National Speech and Debate Education Day; and

(3) encourages educational institutions, businesses, community and civic associations, and all people of the United States to celebrate and promote National Speech and Debate Education Day.

SENATE RESOLUTION 416—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 416

Whereas a competitive global economy requires workers who are prepared for skilled professions;

Whereas, according to Deloitte and the Manufacturing Institute, 84 percent of executives agree that there is a talent shortage in manufacturing in the United States, including talent for front-line worker jobs such as machinists, operators, craft workers, distributors, and technicians;

Whereas career and technical education (referred to in this preamble as “CTE”) ensures that competitive and skilled workers are ready, willing, and capable of holding jobs in high-wage, high-skill, and in-demand career fields such as science, technology, engineering, mathematics, nursing, allied health, construction, information technology, energy sustainability, and many other career fields that are vital in keeping the United States competitive in the global economy;

Whereas CTE helps the United States meet the very real and immediate challenges of economic development, student achievement, and global competitiveness;

Whereas the United States has 30,000,000 jobs with an average income of \$55,000 per year that do not require a bachelor's degree yet increasingly require some level of postsecondary education;

Whereas nearly 12,000,000 students are enrolled in CTE across the country with CTE programs in thousands of CTE centers, comprehensive high schools, career academies, and CTE high schools, and nearly 1,600 2-year colleges;

Whereas CTE matches employability skills with workforce demand and provides relevant academic and technical coursework leading to industry-recognized credentials for secondary, postsecondary, and adult learners;

Whereas CTE affords students the opportunity to gain the knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to secure careers in growing, high-demand fields;

Whereas secondary CTE is associated with a lower probability of dropping out of high school and a higher likelihood of graduating on-time;

Whereas CTE students were significantly more likely than non-CTE students to report having developed problem-solving, project completion, research, math, college application, work-related, communication, time management, and critical thinking skills during high school;

Whereas, according to an American Federation of Teachers poll, 94 percent of parents approve of expanding access to CTE and other programs that prepare students for jobs;

Whereas students at schools with highly integrated rigorous academic and CTE programs have significantly higher achievement in reading, mathematics, and science than students at schools with less integrated programs; and

Whereas February 23, 2018, marks the 101st anniversary of the signing of the Act of February 23, 1917 (commonly known as the “Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917”) (39 Stat. 929, chapter 114), which was the first major Federal investment in secondary CTE and laid the foundation for the bipartisan, bicameral support for CTE that continues as of February 2018: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates February 2018 as “Career and Technical Education Month” to celebrate career and technical education across the United States;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education month;

(3) recognizes the importance of career and technical education in preparing a well-educated and skilled workforce in the United States; and

(4) encourages educators, guidance and career development professionals, administrators, and parents to promote career and technical education as a respected option for students.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, our Nation’s ongoing success and economic mobility depends on the skills and education of the American workforce and its preparedness to meet and adjust to the demands of today’s economy. Career and technical education (CTE) programs are an essential component to each student’s education, giving students the opportunity to gain knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to secure careers in growing, high-demand fields. Today, approximately 12 million students are enrolled in CTE across the country with CTE programs in thousands of CTE centers, comprehensive high schools, career academies, CTE high schools, and community colleges. Through applied learning, these students obtain technical and employability skills that parallel workforce demand.

According to the American Federation of Teachers, 94 percent of parents approve of expanding access to CTE and other programs that prepare students for jobs. CTE ensures that competitive and skilled workers are ready, willing, and capable of holding jobs in high-wage, high-skill, and in-demand career fields. Throughout Virginia, I’ve heard manufacturers express discontent with shortage of qualified skilled production employees—roles that require the instruction and training offered in CTE classrooms. It is vital that we heighten awareness of CTE’s role in helping the United States to meet the very real and immediate challenges of economic development, student achievement, and global competitiveness.

This is why today, with my Senate CTE Caucus co-chairs Senator PORTMAN, Senator BALDWIN, and Senator YOUNG and 41 colleagues in the Senate, I am proud to introduce a bipartisan resolution to designate February as Career and Technical Education (CTE) month. CTE Month offers an opportunity for students, parents, counselors, educators and school leaders to become more informed about the educational opportunities attainable in their communities, and acknowledge the importance of CTE in cultivating a skilled and well-educated workforce in our nation.

Through formal recognition of CTE Month through this resolution, it is our hope that we can foster greater support for the importance of improv-

ing access to high-quality CTE for millions of America’s students and our country’s continued economic competitiveness.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 34—RECOGNIZING THE RICH HISTORY, HERITAGE, AND STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS AND THE MARSHALLESE POPULATION RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. CON. RES. 34

Whereas the Republic of the Marshall Islands—

(1) is a sovereign country in free association with the United States under the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands (referred to in this preamble as the “Compact”), approved in the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-188; 117 Stat. 2720), which—

(A) is set to expire in 2023; and

(B) authorizes economic assistance, through Federal grants and programs, to persons in the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and

(2) has full authority and responsibility over security and defense matters relating to the Republic of the Marshall Islands;

Whereas, under the Compact, eligible citizens of the Republic of the Marshall Islands may reside, work, and study in the United States without a visa and may serve in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas an estimated ⅓ of the population of the Republic of the Marshall Islands has relocated to the United States; and

Whereas Marshallese individuals who live in the United States—

(1) offer positive economic and cultural benefits to the communities in which those individuals live;

(2) pay Federal and State taxes but are not eligible for benefits under—

(A) the Medicare program established under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

(B) the Medicaid program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.); and

(3) were undercounted in the 2010 census and, as a result, areas where those individuals live are underserved by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) commends—

(A) the rich history and heritage of the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and

(B) citizens of the Republic of the Marshall Islands who live in the United States for the contributions of those individuals to—

(i) the communities in which those individuals live; and

(ii) the national defense of the United States through their service in the Armed Forces of the United States;

(2) recognizes—

(A) the strategic importance of the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and

(B) the importance of the upcoming renegotiation of the Compact of Free Associa-

tion between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and

(3) encourages a continued commitment to improve census data to better serve citizens of the Republic of the Marshall Islands who live in the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL COLLECTIVELY TO THE MEMBERS OF THE OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on March 21, 2018, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February, 27, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing. COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February, 27, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Opioid Crisis: The Role of Technology and Data in Preventing and Treating Addiction.”

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February, 27, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Kevin Edward Moley, of Arizona,

to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Organization Affairs), Josephine Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the Peace Corps, Erik Bethel, of Florida, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Sean Cairncross, of Minnesota, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February, 27, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February, 27, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a closed hearing.

APPOINTMENTS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand appointments were made during the adjournment of the Senate. I ask they be stated for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, pursuant to section 30442 of Public Law 115-123, appoints the following as Members of the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform: the Honorable ROY D. BLUNT of Missouri, the Honorable DAVID A. PERDUE, JR. of Georgia, the Honorable JAMES P. LANKFORD of Oklahoma, the Honorable JONI ERNST of Iowa, the Honorable SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, the Honorable MICHAEL BENNET of Colorado, the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ of Hawaii, and the Honorable MAIZE K. HIRONO of Hawaii.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, pursuant to section 30422 of Public Law 115-123, appoints the following as Members of the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans: the Honorable ORRIN G. HATCH of Utah (Co-Chair), the Honorable LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee, the Honorable ROB J. PORTMAN of Ohio, the Honorable MIKE D. CRAPO of Idaho, the Honorable SHERROD BROWN of Ohio (Co-Chair), the Honorable JOE MANCHIN III of West Virginia, the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP of North Dakota, and the Honorable TINA SMITH of Minnesota.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 106-567, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Interest Declassification Board:

Alissa M. Starzak of the District of Columbia.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2464

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2464) to improve border security and to provide conditional provision residence to certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

NATIONAL SPEECH AND DEBATE EDUCATION DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 415, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 415) designating March 2, 2018, as "National Speech and Debate Education Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 415) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 416, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 416) supporting the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 416) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 35, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the members of the Office of Strategic Services.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on the Vought nomination expire at 4:30 p.m. tomorrow, February 28, and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; finally, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
FEBRUARY 28, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12:45 p.m., Wednesday, February 28; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Vought nomination; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Vought nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12:45 P.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:26 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at 12:45 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CHARLES P. VERDON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, VICE DONALD L. COOK, RESIGNED.

THEODORE J. GARRISH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS), VICE JONATHAN ELKIND.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE
COMMISSION

AMY KARPEL, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING

JUNE 16, 2020, VICE F. SCOTT KIEFF, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN CARY BITTICK, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE WILLIE LEE RICHARDSON, JR., RETIRED.

THOMAS T. CULLEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN P. FISHWICK, JR., RESIGNED.

TIMOTHY A. GARRISON, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ANGELA TAMMY DICKINSON, RESIGNED.

STEVEN L. GLADDEN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE WILLIE RANSOME STAFFORD III, TERM EXPIRED.

NICOLA T. HANNA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE EILEEN M. DECKER, RESIGNED.

DAVID C. JOSEPH, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE STEPHANIE A. FINELY, RESIGNED.

DAVID L. LYONS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE STEPHEN JAMES SMITH, TERM EXPIRED.

RODNEY D. OSTERMILLER, OF MONTANA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DARRELL JAMES BELL, RESIGNED.

KENJI M. PRICE, OF HAWAII, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE FLORENCE T. NAKAKUNI, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

PAUL R. LAWRENCE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR BENEFITS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE ALLISON A. HICKEY, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. TIMOTHY M. RAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID D. THOMPSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. CHRISTOPHER W. GRADY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. CHARLES A. RICHARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. MICHAEL T. MORAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TIMOTHY J. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID A. WELCH

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 27, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

WILLIAM NORTHEY, OF IOWA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES.

THE JUDICIARY

ELIZABETH L. BRANCH, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on February 27, 2018 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

ROBERT M. WEAVER, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE YVETTE ROUBIDEAUX, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON OCTOBER 24, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 27, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 27, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable PAUL MITCHELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 10:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I offer my deepest condolences to Reverend Billy Graham's children and grandchildren on this very sad occasion.

Reverend Billy Graham will be remembered by millions of people for millions of reasons, which is a testament to the people he inspired. When I consider Reverend Graham's life and all of his many accomplishments, I think of his humble beginnings and his dedication to bringing people to Christ.

Reverend Graham, North Carolina's favorite son, began as a farmer's son and was not born with the steadfast faith that we later observed. It was a faith he chose and that he dedicated himself to all of his life.

Later, he would be called America's Pastor, as he counseled Presidents and the poor alike. What is remarkable is how Reverend Graham heard the call and made the choice to follow the Lord and to take His word farther and more rapidly than it had ever gone before.

Mark 16:15 of the Good Book instructs us to, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to all creation." This is a charge that Reverend Graham took seriously and a charge which he spent a lifetime endeavoring to obey. This seemingly ordinary man went on to do extraordinary things because of his faith and because of his calling to follow the Lord.

In Chronicles 16:9, we observe that "for the eyes of the Lord move to and fro throughout the Earth that He may strongly support those whose heart is completely His." This scripture strikes true when we think of Reverend Graham's life and work. His heart was certainly filled with love for the Lord. Reverend Graham traveled the world preaching to the masses, but he did not crave fame or notoriety. Ever the humble servant, Reverend Graham craved the grace to bring others to Christ.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that Reverend Graham is no longer with us, but I rejoice that he has joined the Lord, whom he loved so dearly. I am proud to join thousands of Americans in paying my last respects to Reverend Graham as his body lies in honor in the United States Capitol. This is only the fourth time in history that a civilian has earned this high honor and the esteem of a grateful nation, and this honor is richly deserved.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that everyone here and those watching at home will remember all of Reverend Graham's many lessons and will let his life serve as a reminder to us all that ordinary people can accomplish extraordinary things if we put our trust in the Lord.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EDDIE OLCZYK

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a legendary Chicagoan, Mr. Eddie Olczyk, a former star player and a current voice of the Blackhawks. A native son of Chicago, Eddie exemplifies the heart, grit, and character of the city we both call home.

Eddie first made his way into Chicago's collective heart as a member of the 1984 U.S. Olympic Hockey Team at the young age of 17. From there, he went on to play 16 seasons in the NHL and later coached the Pittsburgh Penguins. In 2012, Eddie was inducted into the U.S. Hockey Hall of Fame.

Eddie currently works as a broadcaster for both the Blackhawks and nationally as a color commentator for NBC Sports. He is the best in the business. Those outside of Chicago may know Eddie from his time covering horse racing for NBC.

Today, Eddie is facing another battle. This one is off the ice. Last year, he was diagnosed with colon cancer. As he describes it, sometime last summer, he began feeling pain in his lower abdomen. Initially, the pain was intermittent and he thought nothing of it. But when it persisted for several days, he decided he should get things checked out. It was then that his doctor found a tumor, and he was quickly scheduled for surgery to have it removed. For the past 6 months, Eddie's been undergoing chemotherapy, and he just completed his 11th treatment. Thankfully, he has one more treatment to go.

Clearly, Eddie knows what it means to be tough. But to really be tough, men in particular must know that it is okay to say something when things don't feel right.

The American Cancer Society estimates that 1 in 22 men and 1 in 24 women are at risk for developing colorectal cancer in their lifetime.

Colorectal cancer is currently the third leading cause of cancer-related deaths in the United States. In 2017, it is expected to cause over 50,000 deaths. That is particularly important for men who don't want to consider the dangers of colon cancer. This doesn't have to be. When detected early, treatment for colorectal cancer is effective, especially when polyps are removed before they become cancerous.

More young men are being diagnosed with young-onset colorectal cancer than ever before. According to the Colorectal Cancer Alliance, 11 percent of colon cancers and 18 percent of rectal cancer diagnoses occur in those under the age of 50.

Young men, even those in their thirties and forties, must be aware of the risk for this disease and advocate for their health. Talk to your doctor regularly if you are feeling pain, and get screened regularly.

Back in his playing days, Eddie would have been nervous about what a coach or teammate would have thought if he complained of pain. But, in part, to voices like his, the sports culture is changing and more athletes are speaking up when something is wrong. We should all learn from his and their example.

After he was diagnosed, Eddie felt like his pride took a hit. Like many

others who have faced cancer, he was concerned that he was letting people down and he began to question his mortality. But as he went through treatment and reflected on this ordeal, he started to recognize that it was okay to be scared.

He has used this platform to speak out about colon cancer, about the need for screening, and for research for a cure. He knows it is important to emphasize that there is nothing wrong with people getting colonoscopies at an earlier age. He knows that if he can help just one individual get a checkup sooner, he will feel like his battle was worth it.

Eddie has many people to thank for their support; most importantly, his family: his wife, Diana; and four children, Eddie, Nick, Zandra, and Tom; the entire Blackhawk organization, especially John McDonough and Jay Blunk; his broadcasting partner, Pat Foley.

To Eddie and to all fighting cancer, stay strong and know that we are with you.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a great American, a messenger for our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and arguably the finest man North Carolina has ever produced: the Reverend Billy Graham.

William Franklin Graham, Jr., was born in 1919 in Charlotte, North Carolina, where he grew up the son of a farmer. In 1939, he was ordained as a minister; thus, beginning what would be his life's calling.

It was in 1949 that Reverend Graham gained the international prominence he is known for today. It was that year that he hosted his Los Angeles Crusade. Originally scheduled to last only 3 weeks, it ended up continuing for over 2 months. Throughout that time, huge crowds came to hear Reverend Graham spread the gospel of Christ.

In the years following the Los Angeles Crusade, Reverend Graham's stature only grew. He traveled across the United States and around the world to spread the good word and encourage his fellow men and women to find salvation with Christ and in Christ. He would fill everything from small churches to massive football stadiums.

According to the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, Reverend Graham preached to over 215 million people in over 185 countries and territories around the world during his life. But his influence did not stop there.

Throughout his ministry, Reverend Graham became known as America's

Pastor, serving as a moral compass for our Nation. He served as a spiritual adviser to countless American and international political leaders and civic leaders, including every American President since Harry Truman.

In the 1950s and 1960s, he joined with Martin Luther King, Jr., for integrated crusades, a powerful statement from a White southerner at that time. He delivered invocations at the inaugurations of four American Presidents. In 1983, he was awarded our Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, by President Ronald Reagan.

Following the horrific attacks on our Nation on September 11, 2001, it was Reverend Graham who comforted our Nation from the pulpit of Washington's National Cathedral.

While best known for his work as America's Pastor, there is much more to Reverend Graham. Foremost among those was his marriage to his beloved wife, Ruth. Reverend Graham and Ruth met at Illinois' Wheaton College, but it was Ruth's hometown of Montreat, a small town in western North Carolina's Swannanoa Valley, which I am honored to represent in North Carolina, that they chose to call home. It is a small town, a humble town.

It was at the Gaither Chapel on the campus of Montreat College where Reverend Graham and Ruth were married in 1943. From there, the Grahams built a home on Montreat's Little Piney Ridge. It was at that home that the Graham's raised their five children: Virginia, Anne, Ruth, Franklin, and Nelson. Certainly, Reverend Graham's public works were extraordinary, but what he and Ruth built as a family is enduring, indeed.

While an international icon for his work spreading the gospel of Christ, Reverend Graham and his family were simply great neighbors to the American people of Montreat and the nearby town of Black Mountain. According to a story in the Black Mountain News, Reverend Graham was known to occasionally attend services at Swannanoa's First Baptist Church, play golf at the Black Mountain Golf Course, and grab lunch at the Coach House restaurant in town.

One of the finest moments of my career was having the opportunity to serve as Reverend Graham's Representative in Washington when his home in Montreat was placed in the 10th District. It was then that I had the honor of traveling up Little Piney Ridge to visit Reverend Graham in his home. The personal kindness and hospitality he showed in inviting me into his home is something that I will never forget.

I extend my deepest condolences to each of Reverend Graham's five children, to all their grandchildren and great-grandchildren who have lost a mentor and a friend. As a nation, we are forever indebted to Reverend Gra-

ham for his years of service to our State, our Nation, and to this world. It is only befitting that tomorrow Reverend Graham will return here to Washington one final time to lie in honor in the rotunda of this great building.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by noting that Reverend Graham has passed on from this world, but he has moved into the kingdom he preached about for so many years. He has rejoined his beloved wife, Ruth, and has finally been called home to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ following a life well lived.

VOTING ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, when we left Washington before the Presidents Day recess, we watched our colleagues in the Senate vote on a series of bills to address immigration. Only one bill received 60 votes, but it was 60 votes against the bill offered by Senator GRASSLEY, the bill that most closely matches the President's hatred for immigrants.

So a supermajority in the Senate opposes the President's plan for massive cuts to legal immigration and massive deportations.

□ 1015

Then, yesterday, President Trump's campaign against immigrants received another blow. The Supreme Court declined to take a case from California and declined to lift an injunction requiring the Department of Homeland Security to continue to process renewals for the DACA program, which means that those who signed up for DACA over the past 5 years can renew their DACA now, and the arbitrary deadline the President set for kicking 1,000 people per day out of the program beginning next Monday has, like so much of what Trump does, been stopped for now.

Just take a moment to appreciate what happened. The Attorney General and the President, without offering any evidence, told the American people that they had to end the DACA program because it was illegal and the courts would strike it down, they said.

As it turns out, the truth is almost the exact opposite of what the President and the Attorney General have told the country. No court has ever found DACA illegal or even legally suspect. Their actions to kill the DACA program have been found highly questionable by the courts.

But let me be clear, Mr. Speaker, just because the courts have taken no action and the Senate failed to take action does not mean that the House and Republicans are off the hook for DACA. The President still plans to kill DACA and make hundreds of thousands of immigrants, who are currently documented and known to our government,

into undocumented immigrants forced underground—vulnerable, exploitable, and deportable.

The House has an opportunity—indeed, a responsibility—to step up to the occasion and craft a permanent solution. The good news is that the solution is supported by 8 out of 10 voters in the United States: a pathway to citizenship.

Can we, as a body, rise to the occasion to do something Americans want us to do? Can we set aside questions of who wins and who loses politically long enough to do what is right? We won't know unless we try.

Many on the other side say there should be only one option: leave or be deported, but that is not what we do to American children. And let's be clear, these are American children. We do not force American children to live in exile for 10, 20, 30 years. We do not educate and acculturate our youth and then force them out of the country.

If you are an American patriot, the last thing you want is for the world to see us deporting our own Americans. Just ask your donors, the Koch brothers, who know that saving the Dreamers is what they call something demanded as patriots.

So, Mr. Speaker, the ball is in our court. We need to take action now. If we can draft a compromise to protect Dreamers and allow them to live in their home country, America, if both sides concede something to the other, we may get to a solution. That is what leaders must do. A compromise will likely be painful for all. We need to show the country that we are willing to take the heat and that we are ready to legislate.

The President set us on this course. He pulled the legal rug from underneath the Dreamers and then cloaked his position on immigration in an ethnocentric, pro-European, pro-White agenda that will hurt America.

But the racists—and we must call them out for what they are—the racists who are driving immigration policy in the White House are defining the agenda for every House Republican and are shaping the brand of the Republican Party not just as the party opposed to illegal immigration, but, now, as the party opposed to legal immigration; not just as the party who doesn't want poor or Latin American immigrants, but doesn't want Brown or Black or anyone who isn't White in this country. If that is how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle define themselves and want to be remembered, then they should do nothing.

But I have a greater faith in this institution and in the ability of this Congress to rise above racism and to do something the American people want us to do without regard to race, religion, or national origin. I am a Democrat who will work with Republicans if Republicans are serious about reaching

a solution, but it must start with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying: "Yes, we want to solve the problem, and we want to rise above the racism emanating from the White House today."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on Valentine's Day was an incomprehensible act of violence.

I visited the school on Friday, an experience that was both moving and sobering. I walked through the horrifying events that took place there, and I witnessed the outpouring of love and support from so many who have deposited flowers, candles, and left beautiful messages in memory of the victims.

Upon reflecting on that visit and after meeting with the brave student and teacher survivors Sunday in south Florida and yesterday here in Washington, I believe the best way for elected officials to honor the fallen and their families is by taking meaningful action to prevent these tragedies in the future.

That means working to make sure law enforcement agencies have the resources to assess threats and intervene before it is too late. It means investing in mental health, reevaluating school security with measures like the bipartisan STOP School Violence Act, and securing stronger regulations on guns.

Mr. Speaker, the voices and engagement of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas survivors calling for change to our gun safety laws will be decisive. We, as a society, must work together to address loopholes and vulnerabilities in existing law while still protecting Americans' Second Amendment rights.

From strengthening the NICS system to banning bump stocks and preventing those with links to terrorist organizations from acquiring firearms, to raising the age for the purchase of long guns to 21, with exceptions for those in our military and law enforcement, there are commonsense solutions that will not prevent every tragedy but can certainly prevent some and mitigate others.

It won't be easy, but we must make progress on all these fronts. As a father and a husband, I will not accept that, in the greatest country in the world, the loss of innocent life becomes commonplace.

I am calling on congressional leaders in both Chambers and in both parties to work together and allow Congress to

craft, consider, and debate legislation that protects the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens while making all Americans safer. We have to do better, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to working with all my colleagues to honor the 17 innocent lives lost in Parkland.

HONORING MY GOOD FRIEND, DEPUTY CHIEF REPORTER ED JOHNSON, FOR HIS SERVICE TO THIS INSTITUTION

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and to give thanks to a very good friend of mine, our Deputy Chief Reporter of the House of Representatives, Ed Johnson, whose last day for us is this Friday before he returns to our home State of Wisconsin.

Ed began his official court reporting career back in Wisconsin in 1980, hooking up with a judge. He eventually made his way here to the House of Representatives in 2007 and, ultimately, became Deputy Chief Reporter in 2015.

Ed took his role as our guardian of the public record very seriously: with great integrity, with great professionalism, and with great respect from everyone who had a chance to work with him.

And what do these Official Reporters do for us? Like today, this young lady here to my left brings her stenograph machine down to the well of the House or to a committee that they might be assigned, and they record everything that is said. With a single stroke of the key, they are able to record whole words, phrases, sometimes whole sentences if they know what is being said, sometimes when Members are speaking over each other. It is an incredibly difficult talent that they have to learn, and they all do it so very, very well for us.

Now, some of Ed's highlights during his career here: He was able to report President Obama's State of the Union Address in 2015 by sitting here at the dais.

And listen to this: He served as "Mr. February" in the "2013 Men of Court Reporting" calendar, which is probably appropriate, given Ed's legendary sense of humor. He has also been known to do some standup comedy.

Having spent time with my good friend, Ed, here in Washington, I have a feeling that he is going to miss a lot of the aspects that he has been privy to Capitol Hill, given his appreciation for our history, politics, policy, the personalities of this place, and we will certainly be missing him.

So I want to wish him and his wife, Liz, and their two dogs, Bucky and Angus—I mean, what could be more Wisconsin than that—as they return home to our home State of Wisconsin

where they will be a little bit closer to their families.

I want to thank Ed for his service to this institution, but also to our country and the distinguished career that he had here in Washington.

I wish him and Liz all the best as they return home to Wisconsin where Tawni and I look forward to continuing our friendship.

HONORING THE LIFE OF AUDREY TUCKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Audrey Tucker of Upper Makefield in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. A committed public servant, Audrey, the CEO of the Family Service Association of Bucks County, passed away at 73 last week.

Joining Family Service as a social worker in 1978 and rising to become the organization's CEO in 1987, Audrey served as the face of Family Service for four decades. Audrey was a visionary leader credited with growing the organization into an entity that offered mental health services, helped the homeless, offered drug and alcohol treatment, and helped local families.

Her friends and colleagues of Family Service said it best: "Family Service has suffered a huge loss. Audrey was the heart and face of Family Service for four decades. But she built a strong team that will continue to carry out her vision of a community where anyone can achieve his or her full potential."

Our community will feel Audrey's loss tremendously, but it is clear to all that we are a better community for having had her in our community, and her important work will continue.

RECOGNIZING BUCKS COUNTY GIRLSTEM CONFERENCE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Bucks County GirlSTEM Conference.

The 2017 conference was attended by over 800 girls in grades 6 through 10 and focused on inspiring young women in our region to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and math.

The 2018 conference, scheduled for this May, is expected to be even larger. Attendees learn from professional women working in STEM fields, including agriculture, banking, physics, nursing, marine biology, real estate, engineering, app design, and more.

And the impact of this program is already clear in our community. As a result of attending GirlSTEM 2017, 95 percent of girls said they felt more motivated to do well in school; 96 percent felt more engaged in their own learning; and 93 percent said GirlSTEM helped them plan ahead, make career choices, and feel optimistic about their future.

As our economy continues to evolve, I commend projects like Bucks County GirlSTEM Conference for the important work they play in educating and exciting the next generation of female leaders. These young women are the future leaders of our Nation.

REPUBLICAN TAX SCAM CUTS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, Republican tax scam cuts really are only going to benefit giant corporations and the wealthy few, and what working people will ever glean from this is minimal in scope and really is just sort of a pittance in order to allow people who have more wealth than they can possibly even count to just get more.

This tax cut, this massive tax cut, would wipe away healthcare coverage for millions of workers, give multinational corporations and foreign investors a giant payday, and it paves the way for more cruel cuts, cutting programs that will benefit Americans.

It is a moral abomination. It is wrong. It is giving more to those who already have too much and taking from those who already are struggling to make ends meet. But, sadly, it is just another example of how Republicans and their billionaire buddies are in it for themselves and not the American people.

I would like to talk about another important example, because you have to look at what is going on in our Supreme Court together with these tax cuts and other programs to understand how much damage Republican leadership means to the American people.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court heard a case. It was Janus v. AFSCME. Janus, as the case is called, is yet another attack on the right to organize your workplace and negotiate for better wages and benefits and safer workplaces.

Over the last several decades, big companies and their conservative allies in Congress have attacked the right to collectively bargain.

□ 1030

The attacks on workers have led to stagnating wages for workers and greater income inequality. This case is no different. It is being bankrolled by the usual suspects: the Koch brothers and their billionaire allies.

Janus will determine whether public sector unions that represent teachers, firefighters, police officers, and nurses in States and cities across this country can collect fees from all of the employees in the workplaces that they represent.

This case is about whether millions of hardworking public sector workers will have the freedom and the resources to stand together and fight for

a better future for themselves and their families. But it is also about the corrosive power of money in politics. It is about the millions of dollars wealthy donors spent to hold a Supreme Court seat open for over a year; the millions more that were spent to elect President Trump so that he could fill that seat with Neil Gorsuch; and the millions of dollars that the Koch brothers and the Bradley Foundation, two organizations devoted to cutting government services for Americans and weakening unions, spent to fund the Janus case.

And today, now that the bought-and-paid-for court has heard the case that will deliver a blow—we hope it doesn't, but likely it will—to the public service workers and the unions that represent them, their investment appears to be paying off.

Here is the thing: millionaires and billionaires who fund these antiworker and antiunion attacks are petrified about the labor movement. They are absolutely afraid of it. That is why they have been working to attack it.

That is because the labor movement is premised on the simple idea that, when workers come together, they can fight for their fair share of the wealth that they helped to create and because the labor movement is about equality and a fair economy that works for everyone, not just a few.

That is why wealthy donors have worked to eliminate and cut union representation; that is why they engage in union busting; that is why they funded the Janus case; and that is why they continue to keep kicking working people in the teeth over and over again.

This Republican tax scam is only part of the restructuring of American democracy where we take from working Americans, give to the wealthiest, and then try to deprive through the courts people's right to organize collectively on their job.

But hardworking Americans are standing up, hardworking Americans are banning together, and hardworking Americans are not going to allow a prosperous life for themselves and their families to be taken away so easily.

This Janus case is something that I urge everybody to look into. It represents another attack on the American working class, but the American working people are standing up stronger than ever and will come back stronger than ever.

PORT WIDENING AND DEEPENING

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Trump on including \$13 million for widening and deepening the project at the Port of Corpus Christi in its fiscal year 2019 budget. Widening and deepening the port is critical

not only to the local economy in Corpus Christi, but to the entire Nation.

While getting the funding in the President's budget is a huge victory, it is still just an early step in a lengthy process. Congress still needs to approve and appropriate the funds for this project over multiple years.

I encourage my colleagues in the House and Senate to support this appropriation and grow the Port of Corpus Christi and our Nation's energy sector.

Corpus Christi is the Nation's largest port for energy exports, shipping out crude oil, petroleum products, and LNG. Widening the ship channel will allow for two-way barge traffic, and deepening it to 54 feet will allow for larger ships to enter and exit the port, creating more economic growth and good jobs for American workers.

This project has been one of my top priorities since coming to Congress in 2010 and will continue to be a priority as long as I am here.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in supporting this widening and deepening project.

CELEBRATING 100TH BIRTHDAY OF JOHN MCCAIN

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I suspect we all know Senator JOHN MCCAIN, but we should also know World War II veteran John McCain from Wharton, Texas, who just turned 100 years old.

Mr. McCain was born in Texas on February 15, 1918. When he was just 7 years old, he joined the workforce going door to door with his Shetland pony circulating fliers for local businesses. In the years leading up to World War II, he traveled to Los Angeles to learn to be a diesel mechanic and then promptly enlisted in the Texas National Guard, 36th Tank Company, as a diesel mechanic. On January 16, 1941, he was deployed to Fort Benning.

Following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, McCain was deployed to Hawaii. After we defeated the Japanese Navy at the Battle of Midway, McCain's unit was moved to Fort Chaffee before being deployed to Europe where he and his unit swept through southern Germany and eventually met the Russian Army in Czechoslovakia in 1945.

After the war, McCain worked for a natural gas pipeline company in Liberty, Texas, for 35 years. After retiring, he moved back to his hometown of Wharton. During his retirement, he has traveled by RV to all 48 continental States and nine provinces in Canada. He has also traveled the world, visiting 42 countries. He often says: When you are 100 years old, you just go wherever the wind blows you.

Mr. McCain, thank you for your service to our country and to your community. I hope you had a great 100th birthday.

REMEMBERING JOE FULTON

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to remember the life of

a great constituent and family friend, Joe Fulton, who passed away recently at the age of 83.

Joe not only lived in Corpus Christi, but he helped shape the city's skyline. His projects, as a general contractor, include the Art Museum of South Texas; Texas State Aquarium; the Bayfront Omni Hotel; Frost Bank Tower; the Nueces County Courthouse; the Hayden Head Terminal at the Corpus Christi International Airport; and Whataburger Field, home of the Corpus Christi Hooks, just to name a few. Fulton's work received national attention, when, in 1993, the Engineering News-Record named his company, Fulton Construction, one of the top contractors in the United States.

In addition to his work as a contractor, Joe was a member of the Port of Corpus Christi Commission from 1985 to 1998 and fought for the widening and deepening of the port. He served as chairman of the Port of Corpus Christi Commission from 1991 to 1996. He was also a board member of the Cullen/Frost Bank, trustee and chairman of the Driscoll Foundation, director of the Texas State Historical Association, chairman of the Greater Corpus Christi Business Alliance, and president of the Corpus Christi Tourist Bureau.

Joe's impact on our community will live on for a long time. We will miss you, Joe.

JANUS V. AFSCME AND THE IMPORTANCE OF UNIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I live in Broward County, Florida, where the Marjory Stoneman Douglas mass shooting tragedy took place nearly 2 weeks ago.

I am here to talk about our teachers and other public sector employees, but I want to take a moment to make sure that people within the sound of my voice understand what is at stake here. To hear the messages of these valiant students, in the memories of their friends whose lives were lost, their teachers whose lives were lost, and also on their own behalf as survivors. Their message is clear that we need to make sure that we are preventing weapons of war from being in the hands of civilians by banning assault-style rifles; by banning high-capacity magazines; and by closing gun show loopholes, and every other loophole, that exist today on background checks so that we can make sure that we take concrete steps to prevent mass shootings from happening in this country, anywhere.

If anything else, their message is a diversion tactic, whether it is more investment in mental health or arming teachers. In particular, the idea that we should put more guns into a school

environment is ludicrous to them. Their teachers already did everything they could to protect these children, and some of them lost their lives. That is unacceptable and something that we need to come together to prevent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, Congressman MAST, for taking a stand that was extremely difficult on banning assault weapons. I know that is not politically popular for me to do, but he deserves that credit, so I thank him.

The Janus v. AFSCME case is a case related to public sector unions. Simply put, teachers and other employees would be dealt a serious blow in terms of their ability to organize, organize on things like the conditions in a school and how we can keep them safe, all the way to wages and benefits.

Today, despite being more productive than ever, we have Americans who work longer hours for less money and fewer benefits. While working people continue to struggle, we have corporate CEOs, whether they are the CEOs of gun manufacturers or any other corporation, who continue to use their wealth to influence politicians and rig the economic rules to benefit the wealthy and the powerful at the expense of everyone else.

A major part of this effort is a decades-long attack on unions. Unions increase the bargaining power of workers by allowing them to negotiate collectively, together, rather than individually with employers. Imagine how a single or handful of employees would do if they were trying to negotiate with a major corporation for better benefits and wages on their own. When workers bargain collectively, employers have no choice but to work with them to pay them higher wages and offer more generous benefits and better working conditions, like school safety.

Big corporations and their overpaid CEOs don't like paying higher wages and offering generous benefits; so, as a result, they don't like unions. The latest battle in the corporate war on unions happened yesterday at the Supreme Court where the Justices heard the Janus v. AFSCME case.

This goes after public sector unions to continue the assault on all working people. It is a blatantly political and well-funded plot to use the highest court in the land to further turn the economic rules against the middle class.

When teachers, nurses, police officers, firefighters, and other public service workers are free to build strong unions, they win benefits like better working conditions, wages, healthcare, and retirement security and safety that are given not just to union members, but to everyone in the workplace covered by the contract.

I saw this firsthand, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Graduate Assistants United union when I was in graduate

school and I attended the University of Florida. Graduate assistants are the lowest rung on the ladder at colleges and universities, but are a linchpin to the success of educating college students. Having a union to fight for our wages was a key to being treated fairly by our university.

Public sector unions have also played a vital role in providing economic opportunity for women and people of color. Given that all workers covered by a contract gain the benefits of union negotiations, it has been standard practice that all workers governed by the contract contribute their fair share to the cost of organizing, through union dues paid by union members and fair share fees by workers who choose not to join the union. Fair share fees don't pay for any political activities, just the collective bargaining activities that directly benefit everyone.

We need to make sure that we continue to stand up for workers and for the middle class. I am hopeful that the Supreme Court will not side with the plaintiffs in this case.

RECOGNIZING THE WEISS SCHOOL

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Weiss School, a K-8th grade school in Florida, whose students designed the WeissSat-1 satellite selected by NASA to be launched into space.

I have had the opportunity to meet a number of these incredible students. They devote themselves fully to the pursuit of knowledge. Some of them remarked to me that the worst part about school was that they had to leave at the end of the day and they wished that there were apartments there. I think that speaks to the incredible high quality of their teachers and the faculty in that institution of learning.

The WeissSat-1 was selected for its outstanding design and scientific importance, as part of NASA's CubeSat Launch Initiative, an excellent program that, unfortunately, has a very uncertain future. The CubeSat Launch Initiative was established in 2008 as a mutually beneficial program to spur innovation in the STEM community and simultaneously advance NASA missions.

Since its inception, NASA has selected 149 CubeSats, built by 85 organizations across 38 States, and they have launched 58 of these CubeSats to date, all of them at a fraction of the cost of developing satellites in-house.

NASA's Office of Education is currently being restructured and the future of the CubeSat program is in jeopardy.

□ 1045

Students and teachers from the Weiss School are in the House gallery today

to witness the introduction of a resolution that they themselves helped to write.

The WeissSat-I resolution that I will introduce today with bipartisan support from my Florida colleagues will raise awareness of the CubeSat Launch Initiative and encourage continuance of the program as NASA reorganizes their Office of Education.

I would like to thank the students of the Weiss School for their dedication, their faculty, their teachers for their work in helping their students to reach the highest and fullest potential that any students could reach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that it is not in order to refer to or introduce occupants in the gallery.

KEEP YOUR WORD, MR. PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 1 minute.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a liberated Democrat with one request: I ask that the most powerful man in the world, the President of the United States of America, keep his word.

Keep your word, Mr. President. You have indicated that no one under the age of 21 should be able to buy an assault-type weapon.

Keep your word, Mr. President. Don't allow the NRA to veto your word. You are the most powerful man in the world.

Keep your word, Mr. President. Stay with those young people who have issued a clarion call to this country to do something about the killing that is taking place on our school campuses. These are children who are dying.

Keep your word, Mr. President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

PROVIDING SAFE AND NUTRITIOUS FOOD TO THOSE IN NEED

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of addressing more than 1,200 advocates who were in Washington this week for the National Anti-Hunger Policy Conference.

As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition, I am grateful for the work these groups do to alleviate hunger and ensure that people have access to nutritious food.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other Federal nutrition programs are vital to ensuring that all Americans have healthy foods

within reach, whether low-income populations, the elderly, or those living in areas with strained access to nutritious food.

SNAP, as well as the USDA's commodity distribution programs, support agriculture and lessen the effects of poverty on our most vulnerable citizens.

In advance of the next farm bill, we will continue to identify ways to work alongside State and local organizations to help provide safe and nutritious food for those who need it most.

Mr. Speaker, a healthy diet for many Americans may have nothing to do with commitment, but rather accessibility. Limited access to supermarkets and grocery stores with fresh, nutritious food can be a challenge in both rural and urban communities. These are called "food deserts."

This is a particular concern for SNAP, which intends to provide nutrition to millions of Americans.

According to the USDA, to qualify as a low-access community, at least 500 people, or at least 33 percent of the population, must reside more than 1 mile from a supermarket or a large grocery store. For rural areas, the distance is more than 10 miles.

It is difficult to eat healthy when the easiest store to get to primarily provides packaged and processed food. SNAP recipients may find a local market convenient, but it offers high-calorie foods with minimal nutrition value. These foods can often be a staple for families with limited resources.

It is my hope that we can redouble our efforts to increase access to fresh foods for communities throughout the country.

No one in America, Mr. Speaker, should go hungry, and everyone deserves a full shot at living a full, healthy, and productive life.

Through strong policy and the advocacy of our Nation's antihunger and antipoverty groups, we truly can work to end hunger once and for all.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

Chaplain Robert Vick, American Legion National Chaplain, New Port

Richey, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, we humbly ask Your blessings on our government and all our representatives gathered here today. We humbly ask Your blessing, Your wisdom, and protection for our country and for our flag, the symbol of our freedom and our home. Keep us always aware of the heritage which is ours and the freedom and opportunities we enjoy as Americans.

As we bow before You, may we pledge anew in our hearts and on our lips to preserve this country, its citizens, and our way of life. May we continue our commitment to You and to our fellow man. May we not take that small step from tolerance to tyranny in our deliberations.

May we keep foremost in our thoughts the welfare and the success of our great Nation and work together to solve our differences. May we emulate the great men and women of the past, who, through sacrifice, purchased our freedoms. Aid us to commit ourselves to preserving them.

I pray this prayer in the name of God, before whom every knee shall ultimately bow and every tongue confess that You are Lord and God.

Amen. And amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIANFORTE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING CHAPLAIN ROBERT VICK

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a constituent, a true American hero. What an honor it is to introduce Chaplain Robert Vick, who currently serves as the American Legion National Chaplain.

Chaplain Vick lives in New Port Richey, Florida, with his wife of 62 years. She is present today as well. Together they have 4 sons, 10 grandchildren, and 16 great-grandchildren.

In addition to his commitment to his family, the chaplain has a great love

for our country and a passion for service. A Korean war-era veteran of the U.S. Navy, Chaplain Vick has a distinguished record of service. He also has been a proud Legionnaire since 1983. I am also proud to say that he is a family friend.

Saying that he feels called to use his ministerial training to serve the spiritual needs of other veterans and their families, Chaplain Vick was appointed National Chaplain of the 2 million-member American Legion last year.

Even as the U.S. Capitol prepares in honoring another humble servant of God tomorrow, the Reverend Billy Graham, I am proud that Chaplain Vick offered this morning's prayer in the U.S. House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CUTTING TAPE FOR RECREATIONAL RODEO COMPETITORS

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight another example of Federal overreach that threatens our Montana and Western way of life. Unclear Federal regulations could force millions of Americans who recreationally compete in rodeos or participate in other equestrian events to get a commercial driver's license. But these are not folks competing for their livelihoods. In a recent story in the Billings Gazette, Andy Bolich, the head coach for the Montana State University rodeo team, said: "For the most part, around Montana, I would say rodeo is a hobby for most people."

Yet Federal regulations could force these rodeo participants to wade through unnecessary, costly red tape for their hobby. That is why I recently led a letter which a bipartisan group of 26 colleagues signed, to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. We urged the Department of Transportation to clarify how the CDL regulations treat those who participate recreationally in rodeo events.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue reforming, rolling back, and repealing unnecessary regulations to protect our Montana and Western way of life.

SUPPORTING SNAP

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today is the Anti-Hunger Day of Ac-

tion, and I rise to support the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, which helps feed 40 million Americans.

We live in the richest country in the world, yet many Americans struggle to get nutritious food to feed their families, including 1 out of 5 American children. President Trump's budget would worsen the problem by cutting SNAP by \$213 billion over 10 years. The President's proposal would also replace families' flexible monthly SNAP benefits with food boxes that contain no fresh produce. It basically puts people on rations.

So I ask my Republican colleagues: Did you really come to Congress to take food out of the mouths of hungry people, hungry children? Who are you?

Ending hunger in America is not a matter of resources; it is a matter of political will. We must invest in our nutrition programs to make sure that no one's plate goes empty in America.

AMERICAN LEGION STORMS THE HILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion convenes in Washington this week for its annual policy conference to meet with Federal lawmakers.

The American Legion was chartered and incorporated by Congress in 1919 as a patriotic veterans organization devoted to mutual helpfulness. It is the Nation's largest wartime veterans service organization, committed to mentoring youth and sponsorship of wholesome programs in our communities, advocating patriotism and honor, promoting strong national security, and continued devotion to servicemembers and veterans.

Hundreds of local American Legion programs and activities strengthen the Nation one community at a time. Whether it is connecting veterans through sporting programs, honoring fallen heroes through Legion Riders or advocating for homeless veterans, the American Legion plays a priceless role in creating a sense of community among veterans of all ages and service periods.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the American Legion. The Legionnaires have a tremendous sense of obligation to their community, their State, and their Nation. They advocate honestly for veterans in Washington, and I look forward to meeting with my local Legionnaires later today.

INTRODUCING THE GATEWAY AT BUFFALO

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we unveiled plans for a new, state-of-the-art land port of entry at the Peace Bridge in Buffalo, New York.

Deploying the most advanced detection technology, the Gateway at Buffalo will improve national security and public safety. It will cut wait times for both passenger and commercial vehicles in half. It will greatly improve air quality in the neighboring community. It will improve aesthetics with new L.E.D. lighting, landscaping, and public art.

This plan will improve our region's growing economic relationship with Canada, leveraging \$30 billion in commerce and over \$200 billion in economic activity, supporting over 1 million jobs. This plan is long overdue. It is a plan that our community deserves and a gateway that is worthy of the promise and potential of our future in Buffalo and western New York and our relationship economically and otherwise with the great country of Canada.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the wake of yet another mass shooting in this country to ask the House of Representatives to summon the courage to actually do something to prevent the next terrible tragedy.

Last evening we held a moment of silence on this floor, and what I fear is that, again, that moment of silence will be followed by days of silence by this House, by weeks of silence by this House, by months of silence by this House on the very question of gun violence in this country.

There are things we can do to move past the typical partisan response: the legislation that I and three others crafted, bipartisan legislation, to regulate these terrible bump stocks that could have prevented the tragedy in Las Vegas from being as bad as it was.

Other things we can do that we agree on: closing the background check loophole, making sure that if you are too dangerous to fly on an airplane, you can't buy a weapon.

These are the things that Congress ought to take up and that the American people have every right to expect us to act upon.

Let's do something.

REPEAL THE 2001 AUMF

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Speaker RYAN for a debate and a vote on our endless wars. It has been 16 years since Congress first passed the

2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force. At that time, of course, I knew then it was going to be a blank check to encompass conflicts all around the globe, and I couldn't vote for it.

It has been used for operations in Niger, Syria, Libya, Somalia, and many other countries. It has been used to justify the war against ISIS, which did not exist, of course, when this AUMF was first written.

Simply put, the 2001 AUMF has become a blank check for any President to wage war, anytime, anywhere, anyplace, without the consent of Congress. In 2016, the Congressional Research Service documented 37 times it had been used in an unclassified report. Now, in 2018, it has increased to 41 times.

The Constitution is clear: Congress, not the White House, is tasked with the solemn responsibility to declare war.

We have turned a blind eye to these conflicts. They have spiraled out of control. Today a bipartisan group of Members, the Progressive Caucus and the House Freedom Caucus, will be hosting an ad hoc hearing to demand a debate and vote on these ongoing wars.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. We need to repeal the 2001 AUMF and, yes, give at least 8 months while the current one is in place to debate and vote on a new AUMF.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, how many people must die for Congress to act and address the severe epidemic of gun violence in America?

We were devastated by the massacres in Newtown; Las Vegas; Orlando; and most recently in Parkland, Florida. On the Hill today are the courageous students from the Parkland high school, Marjory Stoneman Douglas. They came to Washington with one message: for Congress to take action now on gun violence.

Action doesn't mean holding moments of silence. Action doesn't mean tweeting thoughts and prayers. Action means passing meaningful legislation, like the overwhelming majority of Americans are pleading with us to do.

We should start by banning weapons of war, like the AR-15 and high-capacity magazines. We should allow the CDC to once again research the causes of gun violence that can better protect our communities. And we should also act to pass legislation to require universal background checks.

Yesterday, Democrats filed a motion to force a vote on universal background checks. Not a single Republican has signed on to the motion. I implore my Republican colleagues to sign up to

call for action because inaction means that more people will die and more families will grieve and our students will continue to feel unsafe.

HONORING BILLY GRAHAM

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to rise to honor the life of America's pastor. Last week we mourned the loss of Reverend Billy Graham, who passed away at the age of 99 in his beloved home of North Carolina.

As one of the most influential pastors of the 20th century, Reverend Graham traveled the world to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ to millions of people. In fact, he preached to more people than anyone who has ever lived.

As a young man, I have very fond memories of my family all coming together to sit in front of the television to watch Reverend Graham's crusades. His message of God's love, mercy, forgiveness, and justice deeply influenced not only me but also many in our Nation's history. In today's day and age, we desperately need another Billy Graham to give hope to a deceived, confused, and hopeless populace.

Reverend Graham preached the truth. He lived it. And we know that the truth will set us free. But more importantly, Billy Graham has heard the words from the Savior of the world: Well done, my good and faithful servant.

Billy Graham will be sorely missed, but his memory will live on in the hearts and minds of those millions of people he helped. And as Billy Graham would say, all glory be to God.

□ 1115

NATIONAL ANTI-HUNGER WEEK

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this is National Anti-Hunger Week. The United States is the richest nation on Earth. We are a land of abundance. And yet millions of people in our country go to bed hungry every single night.

They are called food insecure, but what it is is that they are hungry, and programs like the food stamp program, the SNAP program, have enjoyed bipartisan support for decades because great leaders, people like George McGovern, Bob Dole, Ted Kennedy, Jack Kennedy, and people like Jake Javits, said that we have a moral obligation to combat hunger in the United States.

What we need to do is to strengthen the SNAP program, not sabotage it.

This administration's new proposals to implement strict work requirements are a thinly veiled attempt to throw people off of the program.

The vast majority of SNAP recipients already work if they can. USDA's most recent data shows that work rates have been increasing year after year.

The food box proposal is an attack on the dignity of the families that have fallen on hard times. Undermining SNAP will not eradicate hunger. It throws many Americans into deep poverty and desperation at times when they need support the most.

Food insecurity affects veterans, working families, children, workers, the unemployed, and seniors. It is about lifting people out of poverty. It is about supporting our economy. It works for households with children.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY TO THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 1, 2018.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 2018, TO MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, March 1, 2018, it adjourn to meet on Monday, March 5, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1865, ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 748 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 748

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal

and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 748, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of

2017. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit.

In addition to an amendment offered by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the rule makes in order amendments offered by Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee received testimony from numerous Members, including Mr. MARINO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and the legislation's sponsor, Mrs. WAGNER.

In addition to consideration at the Rules Committee, the legislation was marked up at the House Judiciary Committee last year.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of any crime more debased than when one person forces a fellow human being into sexual slavery.

Through many pieces of legislation that the House considered this year, we have been fighting to rid our communities of sex traffickers and the anguish they leave in their wake. Today, we have the opportunity to pass an important piece of legislation that will further this fight by ensuring that we hold websites that turn a profit by aiding sex traffickers accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the committee for its hard work on this legislation, but also, more, importantly, I would like to thank the legislation's author, Mrs. WAGNER, for her tireless efforts in championing this bill, which extends both compassion and justice to trafficking victims. As a result of her efforts, the legislation we consider today will empower law enforcement, State attorneys general, and, most importantly, victims to fight against the sex trade and its predators.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would give Federal, State, and local prosecutors the tools they need to hold websites and their operators accountable for supporting the sale of sex trafficking victims. Specifically, it would create a new Federal statute with increased penalties for promoting sex trafficking online and would amend section 230 of the Communications Decency Act to permit State authorities to prosecute operators of trafficking websites for criminal acts.

In consideration of this legislation, we must also reflect on why this legislation is necessary.

Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act was created to ensure that websites would not be considered the publishers of, and thereby held responsible for, the content that actually originated with a third party. The statute was never intended to shield websites that profit by creating a marketplace for sexual slavery, like Backpage.com, from facing the legal consequences of their criminal enterprises.

Nevertheless, some websites have successfully invoked the section 230 immunity provision despite engaging in actions that venture far outside the scope of those envisioned by the statute. The authors of the Communications Decency Act did not imagine that wicked men and women would turn vulnerable young people into sexual commodities and then say, "Let's protect those predators."

Mr. Speaker, no law condones such sexual exploitation, and no law should be manipulated to condone such abuse. With the addition of Mrs. WALTERS' amendment, this legislation strikes the important balance of preserving section 230 of the Communications Decency Act for law-abiding websites, while ensuring that bad actors can no longer hide behind a misused statute.

This legislation will ensure that our society continues to protect the innocent and punish those who seek to profit from their sexual enslavement.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, too often, our laws passed with the best of intentions fail to keep pace with technology, and that is what we are seeing today with the Communications Decency Act.

The bill was passed in 1996 as Congress' first attempt to regulate inappropriate material online. This law prevented hosts and visitors of a website from being treated as a publisher for legal purposes. It is what allowed classified websites like eBay to flourish while being legally protected from third-party content posted on their sites.

But 20 years is an eternity in the digital age, and bad actor websites have created platforms designed to facilitate illegalities like child prostitution and sex trafficking, and they use provisions in this law to shield them from any liability.

One of the most notorious examples is online advertiser Backpage.com. Since 2011, more than 20 civil action lawsuits have been brought against this site for willingly facilitating sex trafficking and the prostitution of minors. However, each time a legal action was brought against Backpage, Federal law shielded them from liability.

Last year, The Washington Post reported that a contractor for this site was soliciting and creating sex-related ads, despite Backpage's repeated insistence that they had no role in the content of their ads. Backpage used longstanding Federal protections under the Communications Decency Act to shield itself from all liability.

In the Doe v. Backpage ruling by the first circuit, the judges held that, even if Backpage had facilitated the crime of sex trafficking, this law shielded the

company from the claims that were filed by the child victims. The first circuit recently reiterated that when it threw out yet another lawsuit against Backpage. The courts weren't able to help these victims, instead, encouraging them to pursue legislative changes, and that brings us here today.

H.R. 1865 finally creates a legislative solution to hold these bad actors accountable and allow the victims to seek the damages that they deserve. It creates a new offense in the Federal code for websites that facilitate this criminal activity and gives, to prosecutors, the tools they need to hold the wrongdoers accountable.

The bill is a product of a lot of great work, and I want to thank Congresswoman WAGNER for introducing it. The Rules Committee, last night, made in order an amendment from Congresswoman WALTERS that substantially strengthens the legislation and has Congresswoman WAGNER's full support. Its inclusion attached the text of bipartisan Senate language to drastically improve its implementation. This is language that has the support of both the tech industry and the victims advocacy groups.

Mr. Speaker, it is so nice to see Members of both parties from both sides of the Capitol come together on this. Through collaboration, we have crafted a bill that does more than just update a 20-year-old law. It fulfills our moral responsibility to protect the children that we represent.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the sponsor of this legislation and a tireless advocate for this issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I love this opportunity to testify on the rule for H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, or FOSTA. This legislation has been born, sadly, out of necessity, but has been truly a labor of love for me since I was first elected to Congress over 5 years ago. The bill is the result of meetings with trafficking survivors across the country who have been victimized by the online sex trade and unable to access either justice or relief in our court systems.

Today's consideration of the bill is an historic achievement, a long-awaited clarification from this Congress that the businesses that sell our children online can no longer do so with impunity. It is a clear statement that there are serious legal consequences for websites that actively profit from the exploitation of our most vulnerable. It is a wake-up call to America's judicial system, making clear that section 230 of the Communications Decency Act

does not provide immunity to websites that are actively engaged in modern-day slavery.

□ 1130

FOSTA is a recommitment to Americans that Congress never intended to create a system that allows businesses to commit crimes online that they could not commit offline. It is in many ways just a simple statement of the obvious: Congress does not believe—and did not ever believe—that rape was a prerequisite of a free and open internet.

This bill is a promise to our State and local law enforcement and prosecutors. Congress is making it clear that we believe in and support their missions to protect our communities. Combined with the Walters amendment, which reinstates victim-centered provisions from my original bill last April, this legislation is now a guarantee of the fundamental rights of the most vulnerable members of our society. It is a message to the children and victims who have been robbed of their basic dignities that Congress hears them and is responding to the injustices that they all have faced.

It has not been an easy journey to get to this point, to find middle ground with the tech industry and the victims' advocates to incorporate the concerns of prosecutors and the law enforcement community to move this bill through committee and to get both FOSTA and the SESTA Walters amendment to the floor today. So I am very grateful for the many, many people who joined my crusade to restore justice to the brave children, women, and men across our country who have been sold online.

I am grateful to Chairman GOODLATTE and his team for going the extra mile in helping us include a strong, new crime that will enable prosecutors to better target online trafficking and prostitution. I am grateful for the Energy and Commerce Committee and House leadership and their willingness to prioritize this issue.

I must give a big thank-you to Majority Leader MCCARTHY, our Whip SCALISE, and Speaker RYAN for leading the way in doing the right thing for America's children.

I am grateful for Senators PORTMAN and BLUMENTHAL and Senators CORNYN and MCCASKILL for carrying SESTA on their shoulders and advocating for a solution that allows victims to access the civil remedies that they deserve. I am grateful to each and every one of our 176 bipartisan cosponsors, many of whom personally stopped on the House floor to hear and express their concerns about victims of online sex trafficking. I especially want to mention Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY and Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY who fought the good fight on the other side of the aisle for what is truly a landmark, for a bipartisan piece of legislation that is going to save lives.

I am also so thankful for my dedicated staff who have poured their hearts, their minds, and their lives into this fight in more ways than the public will ever know.

FOSTA, combined with the Walters amendment, which is SESTA, will provide better civil justice for victims, more prosecutions of bad actor websites, more convictions, and more predators behind bars. Because of this package, fewer businesses will ever dare to enter the sex trade and fewer victims will be sold into modern-day sex slavery.

Last, but most importantly, I am in awe of and grateful for the contributions of the survivors in this fight to turn FOSTA and SESTA into law. It is heartbreaking to watch survivors struggle to piece their lives back together alone while our justice system shields the websites that sold them. That is why I introduced this bill, and that is why it must become law.

I expect this piece of legislation to sail through the Senate and make its way to the President's desk so that we can put those bad actor websites behind bars, deter others from entering this ecosystem, and make sure that there are rights and justice for our victims.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair and our colleagues because, when we vote today for FOSTA and the Walters amendment, our survivors will know that they are not alone and justice will indeed no longer be out of reach.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Trump tweeted over the weekend: "Dems are no longer talking DACA."

Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ. Democrats are still urging our colleagues yet again to act by helping us bring up the Dream Act for a vote on the House floor.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help hundreds of thousands of young people who are American in every way except on paper. President Trump set the official deadline for DACA to expire on March 5, so we can't afford to waste any more time, and Dreamers should not be forced to live in fear any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, ending DACA would be a nightmare for Dreamers. In fact, it would be a nightmare for businesses and a nightmare for America's economy.

You would think that that statement may have been said by the advocates for immigration rights or maybe by some of the faith-based groups that support immigration. But it wasn't. It was said by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Speaker, and that is so because DACA-eligible workers contribute \$1.4 billion in Federal taxes, \$2 billion in Social Security taxes, and \$470 million in Medicare every single year.

So this statement on its face we would think was made by folks who have traditionally supported immigration rights was made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the one entity that is really concerned about economic growth, job creation, and the well-being of our economy.

Ranking Member NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ's report on the impact of DACA on small businesses found that deporting Dreamers will cost \$60 billion and reduce economic growth by \$280 billion, including \$460 billion in economic output over a decade. So this is the dramatic impact that not resolving DACA and not bringing help to the Dreamers will have on our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, when we look into the eyes of these Dreamers, we just can't say no to them. You can't say no to a young person full of aspirations, full of dreams, and still full of so much hope for our Nation. Even under these very critical and challenging times for our Nation and the world, these Dreamers are full of aspirations.

So the question will be: Are we a nation of aspirations or a nation of deportation?

Nearly 8 in 10 voters support allowing Dreamers to remain permanently in our country. In red States and blue States, in Republican majority districts and Democratic districts, over 80 percent of Americans feel that these young people should stay in our Nation. Even three-quarters of Trump voters and only 14 percent believe that they should be forced out. Only 14 percent of our Nation feels that these young people should be kicked out, thrown out in the cold—only 14 percent. A very small minority of Americans believe that that should be what we do.

Ninety-one percent of DACA recipients younger than 25 are employed. They are no burden on our economy. Those who are over 25 years old have been employed at a rate of 93 percent. Ninety-three percent of DACA recipients over 25 years old are working residents of our Nation with an average earning of \$36,000.

Dreamers are students, teachers, healthcare workers, devoted members of our communities, members of our

Armed Forces, and first responders. That is who Dreamers are. They are not a load on our country. As we saw in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey, it was a Dreamer who made food and volunteered to set up beds for thousands of Americans who were displaced. Jesus Contreras, a Dreamer and a paramedic, worked as a first responder for 6 days straight after the hurricane.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor and stand with our Nation's Dreamers.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, and the rule that brings this bill to the floor. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time. I want to also commend the gentleman from Missouri for introducing this very important legislation.

According to the Department of Justice, more than half of sex trafficking victims are 17 years old or younger. According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, there was an astounding 846 percent increase from 2010 to 2015 in reports of suspected child sex trafficking. They found this to be "directly correlated to the increased use of the internet to sell children for sex."

This is something I have been concerned about for a long time. Before I came to Congress, I was a criminal court judge for 7½ years trying felony criminal cases. Far too many of those cases involved sexual abuse of minors. I was told my first day as a judge that well over 90 percent of defendants in felony cases came from father-absent households. Certainly family breakdown has been a major factor—maybe the major factor—in almost all serious crimes we have had through the years.

But certainly another problem is that we have addicted our children to the computers. Now, almost everyone is addicted to computers, iPads, iPods, and screens of all types. While some technology has been good, it has also in some ways been very harmful to many in our society.

In an article entitled "Have Smartphones Destroyed a Generation?," psychologist Jean M. Twenge wrote in the Atlantic magazine: "If you were going to give advice for a happy adolescence based on this survey, it would be straightforward: Put down the phone, turn off the laptop, and do something—anything—that does not involve a screen."

She wrote that too much time on the internet has caused teenagers to be more subject to mental problems of all types, even depression and suicide. While this advice pertains to teens, I

think it really applies to everyone. Even most adults today would be healthier, both mentally and physically, if they spent less time staring at screens.

Today, technology has made many things easier, but, unfortunately, this includes the crime of child sex trafficking. This is very important legislation, very necessary at this time, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, many of my colleagues today, as well as I, discussed the need to protect America's children. This bill is a great piece of that, and I am very grateful to have it on the floor today. But there is more that we can do. It must include acting to curb the Nation's gun violence epidemic.

Every day in America, 91 people are killed by a gun. Since Sandy Hook, there have been close to 1,000 mass shootings. A mass shooting is one where three or more people have lost their lives. Imagine that, thousands of them. Our Nation is still mourning the loss of 17 lives just last week when a gunman using an AR-15-style rifle opened fire at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. That gun is a weapon of war and should only be in the hands of the military and never on the streets of the United States.

Assault weapons were the weapon of choice not just in the Florida shooting but also in the mass shootings at the concert in Las Vegas; the movie theater in Aurora, Colorado; and the elementary school in Sandy Hook, Connecticut.

They were prohibited under the assault weapons ban that Congress let expire in 2004. I was here when we established that ban, and we saw a great decrease in gun deaths from that. So they should be prohibited today and not in the hands of people who simply want to kill the most people they can in the shortest time.

Why would we allow an insanity like that?

So I was pleased to cosponsor legislation this week to re-implement the assault weapons ban.

□ 1145

The students of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School are inspiring the entire Nation to push Congress to do our job and to act on gun violence.

I will tell you that I understand the pain that everybody feels from all of

this, but we can't maintain it. We go from one to the other, as though nothing had ever happened before.

But we have to also do what the NRA has forbidden us from doing, which is to have gun research at the Communicable Disease Center. That certainly should be lifted, as well.

We certainly should expand and strengthen the background check system. Keeping people on the terrorist watch list and the no-fly list from being able to purchase firearms and explosives seems to me to be a no-brainer, but we won't even do that. And, yes, reinstating that weapons ban again, I think, is critically important.

Perhaps the voices of those injured and grieving children can break the gun lobby's stranglehold on Congress. I hope so. The majority should heed their call because we, as Members of Congress, are in a unique position. Unlike the clergy or grief counselors or elected officials, we can actually do something to combat this violence. It certainly is, Mr. Speaker, past time that we do.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am proud to support H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017.

This legislation will prevent websites like Backpage from hiding behind section 230 of the Communications Decency Act while simultaneously empowering law enforcement, State attorneys general, and victims to fight against the sex trade and its predators. I look forward to supporting this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 748 OFFERED BY
Ms. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The pre-

vious question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee

on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4296, OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4607, COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 747 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 747

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4296) to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-60, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2.

Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4607) to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-61, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Just 3 weeks ago, we hosted a small lender in my district office who was being hindered in his efforts to serve home buyers in eastern Colorado. Why? Washington, in its unyielding effort to regulate every decision of Americans, lumped this lender into a broader regulation that came out of the housing crisis 10 years ago. This isn’t some theoretical exercise. These regulations have real impact on Coloradans.

The last time I was on the floor debating these issues, I discussed the affordable housing situation in Colorado. Without completely recounting that debate, I want to reiterate the basic facts.

From 2009 to 2016, Colorado had a net increase of 600,000 people. In that same time, housing costs skyrocketed by more than 57 percent.

Since 2016, our growth has begun to fall off considerably. When The Denver Post researched why a State with a high quality of life and decades more growth potential had a dramatically slowing growth rate, they found that a

substantial part of it had to do with rising housing costs.

We must reconsider our Washington-knows-best regulatory approach. We here in Washington can’t possibly know what is the best for a potential home buyer in Trinidad or Las Animas or Fort Morgan or Greeley or Castle Rock, Colorado.

I, for one, am tired of the arrogance of Washington telling us in eastern Colorado which banks we can and can’t use to finance our mortgages. It is time that we bring financial accountability to the place that needs it most: Washington.

That is what these two financial bills do. They return power to the American people. They reduce unnecessary regulations on small community banks and credit unions, thereby freeing up capital that small businesses and employers can access to create new jobs. They make commonsense changes to Federal laws so that regulators have to routinely review their regulations to ensure that the regulations are not overly burdensome.

Eastern Coloradans are frustrated with the Washington-knows-best mindset of their government, and I am listening to them.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which provides for the consideration of two bills from the House Financial Services Committee—H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, and H.R. 4296, legislation to undercut operational risk capital requirements—under a completely closed process.

These are the 66th and 67th closed rules of this Congress, Mr. Speaker. I am deeply concerned with the Republican leadership’s total lack of consideration for regular order.

For all intents and purposes, regular order is dead in this Congress. We consider one closed rule after another after another after another, and Republicans routinely rush bills to the floor without even holding hearings on the underlying legislation to help Members better understand the impacts of these bills and to benefit from expert witnesses.

What is especially shameful about the process today, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there were amendments submitted, but Republicans decided to self-execute these nongermane amendments with no debate or discussion on the House floor and to shut down the ability of Members to offer additional amendments. This is just bad legislation, plain and simple.

I hope that if November turns out the way I hope it does and we have a

change in leadership in Congress, when Democrats are in charge, we run this place like professionals, like adults, where we respect all points of view, where we go back to regular order, when we say we are going to go back to regular order, we mean it.

Why are we doing all of this, Mr. Speaker? What is possibly so urgent that we have to throw regular order out the window?

Today, we are considering another two pieces of deregulatory legislation that will benefit big banks at the expense of financial stability to our economy and consumer protections that help everyday families.

H.R. 4607 would create a lopsided approach to implementing regulations that force agencies to consider the cost of regulations on bankers without considering the benefit to consumers. H.R. 4296 would undermine the ability of regulators to establish operational risk capital requirements to protect our economy from another crisis.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. Our constituents expect Congress to put them first, not the big banks, especially the big banks that wrecked our economy and endangered the life savings of millions of families. We owe it to them to bring to the floor legislation that will help their lives and make our country better. But, sadly, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has failed to act on meaningful legislation that will do anything like that.

Mr. Speaker, today marks nearly 2 weeks since 17 people, including 14 students, were gunned down at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. This was one of the worst shootings our country has ever seen. It was the eighth school shooting this year, and it is only February.

Yet Republicans in Congress have not lifted a finger to take up bipartisan gun reform legislation that would help to prevent shootings like these and protect our kids. Instead, we are here considering a bill that will only help the already rich and powerful.

This is shameful. It is absolutely shameful, Mr. Speaker.

According to the Gun Violence Archive, a nonprofit that monitors gun violence, since 2014, there have been over 1,360 mass shootings in America. In 2018 alone, less than 2 months, there have been over 400 teens aged 12 through 17 and 90 children under the age of 11 killed or injured by guns.

Yet the majority in this House even refuses to bring to the floor legislation banning bump stocks, a reform agreed upon by both sides of the aisle, I thought. The NRA has even said that "devices designed to allow semiautomatic rifles to function like fully automatic rifles should be subject to additional regulations." I don't know if they meant it, but they said it.

President Trump: "I will be strongly pushing comprehensive background

checks with an emphasis on mental health. Raise age to 21 and end sale of bump stocks. Congress is in a mood to finally do something on this issue—I hope."

Now, it is true that we have a President who is so erratic that he changes his mind from one hour to the next, but so far, I haven't seen a retraction tweet. So I have every reason to believe he is still standing by his commitment to supporting these modest gun safety reforms.

Yet here we are, just days after this horrific mass shooting, and not one single gun reform or gun safety bill is being voted on or even scheduled for a vote. I am furious that, in the face of such tragedy and such senseless violence, this Congress continues to do nothing—not a thing—to protect our kids and our families and our communities.

Students from Amherst Regional Middle School in my district in Massachusetts sent me a letter last week that every Republican in Congress should read.

They write: "Seventeen innocent people lost their lives. . . . That scares us. It scares us that kids have to go to school wondering if they are next. That we even have to think that the next time we see some of our classmates or teachers may be in their open caskets. And what scares us most of all, is that our government fails to do anything to change this."

They continue: "They are gone because our country doesn't care enough to have better gun control, and we will not stop fighting until they get their justice. . . . We're writing this letter because we want to personally ask each and every one of our politicians: How many more killings must we bear before the laws are changed. . . . Our country is no longer safe. Not in school, church, concerts, parties, or even public meeting areas. Please choose to do something. All of our lives depend on your actions."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter written by these students.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: Seventeen innocent people lost their lives on February 14th, 2018. That scares us. It scares us that kids have to go to school wondering if they are next. That we even have to think that the next time we see some of our classmates or teachers may be in their open caskets. And what scares us most of all, is that our government fails to do anything to change this. Please don't forget. About the pain and suffering of all the families and the victims. About the children fearing that their school is next. About all of the lives that will never be lived. They are gone because our country doesn't care enough to have better gun control, and we will not stop fighting until they get their justice. And that's why we wrote this letter. We're not writing it to get some extra credit points or fame. We're writing this letter because we want to personally ask each and every one of our politicians; how many more killings must we bear before the laws are changed and regulations are tight-

ened. Before the government cares for our safety. Before the lives that were lost are never forgotten or regarded as yesterday's news. The time to talk about gun-control is now. It is not next decade or next year or even next week. It is now. Now is the time to strengthen the process involved in conducting a complete background check and lengthen the waiting period required in order to receive a firearm. Please stand with us and all of the of the students and children in our nation. Stand with all of the families of the victims. Stand with the tremendously brave people who lived through these terrifying events. Stand with the heroes who saved countless lives, and ended up losing their own. Our country is no longer safe. Not in school, church, concerts, parties, or even public meeting areas. Please choose to do something. All of our lives depend on your actions and support.

Sincerely,
STUDENTS AT AMHERST REGIONAL
MIDDLE SCHOOL.

□ 1200

Mr. MCGOVERN, I cannot say it better than these students, Mr. Speaker. These are young people writing to Congress begging us to do something to end the violence. They are young people who want a better future.

I would just ask my Republican friends: Are you so beholden to the National Rifle Association that you could possibly turn your backs on our country's young people? Can you really ignore these heartbreaking pleas for action?

You know, a recent poll showed that 80 percent of Americans support bans on assault-style weapons like the one used in the Florida school shooting and 90 percent support tougher background checks. These are commonsense reforms that have overwhelming support from the American people. This should be a bipartisan issue that we could come together on.

But I would say, even if you don't want to support what I think is commonsense legislation and commonsense reform, understand that the majority of the people in this country do support this and at least bring these bills to the floor so that we could have a debate, and then people can vote however they want to vote.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and these terrible bills that help big banks, put consumers in our country at risk, and do absolutely nothing to address the real priorities that we should be tackling. It is long past time for Congress to finally do something to stop these horrific mass shootings that are taking the lives of our kids and our families.

Mr. Speaker, we could just have easily spent this afternoon debating and approving one, or more, of any of the gun safety and gun reform measures that have bipartisan support. We could have shown high school and elementary students, our children, Mr. Speaker, that we heard them, that we care about them, and that we are starting to take action.

Instead, we are debating these worthless bills to help big banks and continue to ignore our children's suffering. Shame on this Congress, Mr. Speaker, shame on all of us.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), a member of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Colorado for yielding me this time to speak on this rule.

I have to admit, I was a little confused when I walked in, based on what I was hearing on the other side, of what bill we were actually discussing. And let me just say this, Mr. Speaker, before I get into why I am rising today in support of these important bills that have bipartisan support.

Being someone who has been on the receiving end of being shot at, we have to focus on how do we make our children safe. I think everybody in this Chamber is deeply, deeply concerned on that. We have to assume the next shooter is there and he already has a weapon, and the actions that we take must be focused clearly on how do we make these children safe. I don't think there is any person in this Chamber who would disagree with that, and especially, I know, on our side of the aisle, so we are committed to that.

But today, we are here speaking on a rule that is very important for two substantive bills that we are bringing up, and I rise in support of not only my bill, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, but also my colleague, Mr. LUETKEMEYER's bill, which we are also discussing here.

This week, the House is continuing to take up strongly bipartisan bills from the Financial Services Committee. The committee has passed, so far, Mr. Speaker, 91 bills in this Congress, and we have taken our remarkable productivity to the floor by passing 36 bills out of this Chamber, and six of them have been signed into law.

My bill, which we are beginning to debate here today, is another strongly bipartisan bill which will provide regulatory relief for financial institutions and increase access to capital and credit for businesses and consumers.

Mr. Speaker, there is a historical trend for the government to overregulate after an economic recession. The recovery from the financial crisis of 2008 to 2009 was weak and slow for many reasons, not least of which was overregulation of the financial sector by the Dodd-Frank Act and the previous administration.

Some would argue that there is also a trend to underregulate during good economic times like we are living in now. Some say that the regulatory relief legislation that we passed out of

the Financial Services Committee will lead to abuses by big banks and other financial institutions and cause another financial crisis.

But these bills will not cause the government to underregulate banks and credit unions. They will simply implement smart regulation. In other words, these bills do not gut or eliminate regulation. They right-size regulation and make it more efficient.

Back in 1996, Congress did a good thing by passing the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, or as we call it, EGRPRA. EGRPRA requires the banking regulatory agencies to go back once every 10 years—that is, once a decade—and review their regulations to identify those that may be outdated, unnecessary, or overly burdensome, and then they are to send a report to Congress. It also requires the agencies to eliminate regulations if they determine they are inappropriate.

Make no mistake, EGRPRA was a good idea back in 1996, and it is a very valuable tool, but far too often EGRPRA regulatory reviews have been viewed as merely a check-the-box exercise by these agencies and in the financial sector. Many believe the two EGRPRA reports, which were released in 2007 and then a decade later in 2017, were lackluster and could have produced more useful recommendations to policymakers; and under the current EGRPRA law, it will be another decade before we could actually look at those regulations again.

EGRPRA could also result in more action from the regulators to clean up outdated and unnecessary rules. That is why it is important for Congress to revisit EGRPRA and to revitalize this law.

My bill contains several reforms to the EGRPRA review process that will breathe new life into the law and make sure it is not simply a check-the-box exercise for regulators. This bill will require more frequent regulatory reviews by moving the review cycle from 10 to 7 years. It will expand EGRPRA to include all regulated financial institutions instead of only the insured depository institutions. It will expand EGRPRA to include the CFPB, and the bill will also codify the National Credit Union Administration into EGRPRA, since the NCUA participated in the latest review voluntarily.

The bill will also require the CFPB to use its findings from its Dodd-Frank regulatory reviews and its EGRPRA reports so the CFPB does not waste time on rules it has already reviewed. And most importantly, this bill will require the agencies to tailor rules they find to be unnecessary, outdated, or overly burdensome based on the size and risk profile of the bank or credit union—that is, the regulators making the determination, not the banks and not the institutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I am wrapping up.

This bill passed out of the committee with a strong bipartisan vote of more than two-thirds of the committee members, including all Republicans and eight Democrats. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

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

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleagues, I mean, let's be honest, the two bills that we are debating today are "nothing burgers." I mean, you know, I just figured this out. In the Rules Committee, we have spent 43—43 percent of the bills that have come before the Rules Committee have been financial service-related bills, mostly to undercut Dodd-Frank and to reward big banks and powerful special interests.

But, you know, we could debate that, but no matter what you think about some of this legislation, most of it, I think, has been either, you know, destructive to our economy or it doesn't add up to very much of anything. But no matter what you think about it—and we could say that banking issues are important—they are not as important as protecting our kids.

I mean, 43 percent of the bills that have come before the Rules Committee have basically been attempts to reward big corporations and big financial institutions in this country. We have spent zero time, zero percent of our time, discussing legislation to ban bump stocks. We have spent zero percent of our time in the Rules Committee considering legislation to strengthen and expand universal background checks. We have spent zero percent of the time debating a bill to ban assault weapons. We have spent zero percent of our time discussing how we can restrict high-capacity magazines.

I can go on and on and on. We spent zero percent of our time on the issue of guns, notwithstanding that we are seeing massacres occur on a regular basis in this country. There is something wrong here, and, I mean, we have the time; and if this were a priority, we would be talking about some of this commonsense gun legislation today rather than, as I said, these "nothing burgers" that are now before us.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago, a gunman walked into a school in Parkland, Florida, and gunned down 17 students and teachers. Unfortunately, senseless acts of violence like that one are far too common. According to Everytown for Gun Safety, every day, 96 Americans are killed with guns; and every year, there are 13,000 gun homicides in the United States.

With this most recent tragedy in Parkland, Americans have stood up and said: Enough is enough. We have all been inspired by these eloquent and passionate voices of these young students from Florida who have had the guts to stand up and speak truth to power. But you know, Mr. Speaker, according to a Quinnipiac poll from last week, over 90 percent of Americans are in favor of universal background checks for gun purchases; and according to a CNN poll from yesterday, over 70 percent are in favor of stricter gun control laws generally.

The American people are clamoring for action on this issue, and we have yet to do anything about it, not one thing. As I mentioned, all of our time has been spent mostly on legislation to help the well-off and the powerful in this country. We have not spent any time at all talking about this issue of guns, which are killing our kids. But today, my Republican colleagues have an opportunity to put the safety of our children over the power of the gun lobby.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up three commonsense gun safety bills: H.R. 4240, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act; H.R. 3464, the Background Check Completion Act; and H.R. 2598, the Gun Violence Restraining Order Act.

These bills would close the dangerous gun show and internet sale background check loopholes, prevent the sale of guns without a completed background check, and ensure that people who are a danger to themselves or others can be prevented from purchasing or possessing a gun.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I ask my good friend from Massachusetts, in the revision of his remarks, if he wouldn't just clear up one point. He had mentioned that this Congress has not done anything in regard to gun violence prevention, and while true, it is not completely accurate.

The fact of the matter is, this Congress is controlled by the Republican Party. The Republican Party determines what bills go for a hearing, what bills come up for a vote. So the fact is, this is a Republican problem. They are

the ones that are stopping commonsense gun violence prevention legislation from coming up for a vote to make the American people more safe.

Mr. Speaker, there are many important bills that this House could be considering, but none more important than legislation that would save lives and prevent gun violence. There is no single bill, nor policy, that will end gun violence in America, but we do know that background checks work. Every day, background checks stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun.

Unfortunately, those folks who were blocked from buying a gun from a licensed dealer can go around the block, around the corner, or down the street to a gun show or to an online site and get a gun, oftentimes the same gun, without having to go through a background check.

There is a reason that 97 percent of Americans want to expand and strengthen our background check system. Even the President has come out and said that he is in support of this. I can't think of many things that Americans agree on 90 percent of the time, but they do so on background checks.

We have a bipartisan bill ready to go. H.R. 4240, both Democrats and Republicans coauthoring that bill, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act, would help get more records into the NICS system and would expand background checks to all commercial sales.

□ 1215

We shouldn't have to wait for another mass shooting, and we shouldn't have to wait for the 44th moment of silence. Let's act now. Oppose the previous question and give us a vote on H.R. 4240.

How many more people have to die before Members of this body will muster the courage to bring background check legislation that will help to the floor of this House for a vote?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the combined rule for H.R. 4296, my bill that addresses difficulties with operational risk capital requirements imposed on financial institutions, and H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act. Both of these bills are commonsense reforms to regulation that will improve the efficiency of our financial system. My legislation, H.R. 4296, will replace misguided capital standards imposed by the international standard setters, the Basel Committee.

The Basel Committee requires U.S. institutions to hold excessive capital

based on a 'look back' approach of an organization's risks, previous earnings, and other provisions that provide no indication of future risks. The methodology employed by this international body has forced our banks to hold hundreds of billions of dollars in reserve rather than putting the money to work in the form of loans and investments. That is money that could be used to fund mortgage loans, car loans, and other day-to-day financing for American consumers.

I recognize the importance of our Nation's financial institutions to hold capital in the event of a future crisis or distress, and H.R. 4296 maintains those capital requirements. As a former regulator, I can tell you that it is important to have adequate capital to regard against loss. But there is a sweet spot that needs to be attained, and regulators can do that if you have proper regulation in place.

What this bill does is amend the method by which the reserve capital is calculated by focusing standards based on an organization's current business activities. This approach offers a better assessment of the amount of capital that should be held to withstand any future crisis.

The methods-based approach proposed in H.R. 4296 properly calibrates operational capital requirements. It maintains strong and healthy financial institutions, while unshackling billions of dollars for lending purposes.

The second bill we are discussing here today provides another opportunity to advance a more practical approach to regulation. H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, sponsored by Mr. LOUDERMILK from Georgia, offers a holistic approach to U.S. prudential financial regulation.

This bill requires all Federal financial agencies, including the CFPB and National Credit Union Association, to participate in the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act's, or EGRPA, comprehensive review of rules and regulations. The purpose of the review is to ensure that regulation is not overly burdensome, duplicative, or outdated, while maintaining standards to promote safety and soundness.

Additionally, H.R. 4607 requires the agencies to meet every 7 years for a comprehensive regulatory evaluation, as opposed to the current 10-year cycle in statute.

I am hard pressed to think of a less controversial bill than this one. Requiring regulators to review the impact of their actions on a more frequent basis is a simple and straightforward way to improve efficiency.

H.R. 4296 and H.R. 4607 have garnered bipartisan support, Mr. Speaker, because they are practical solutions that will properly guide supervisors to enforce more effective regulation. The result of these modest bills will be the

promotion of a vibrant and open economy that works for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I said at the outset. The rule we are considering would make in order two Financial Services bills that I think amount to “nothing burgers,” especially when compared to what we should be doing in terms of protecting our communities and protecting our kids from gun violence. That should take priority over this.

We have young people from Florida here, going door to door, talking to Members of Congress and Members of the Senate, begging us to do something. And what are we going to consider is the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, and then we are going to consider the operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations.

I did a couple of townhall meetings over the weekend, and I can tell my colleagues truthfully that nobody in the audience asked a question about the operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations. Nor did they bring up the need for us to rush ahead and pass the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, but they did ask what we are doing to protect their kids and to protect our schools.

We are living in a time when parents have to wonder when they send their kids to school in the morning whether they will come back alive. We are living in a time when going to the movie theater is a risk, when going to a concert is a risk, or when going to church is a risk. This is unacceptable, and people have had it.

I would say to my colleagues who are beholden to the National Rifle Association: I get it. If you don't want to stand up to them, that is fine, but don't stand in the way of this House having a debate on these issues and having a vote. Let the American people see where everybody stands, Democrats and Republicans alike.

It is unbelievable to me, in the aftermath of this tragedy, that we are here talking about the operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations, when we should be talking about strengthening our background checks and expanding our background checks; when we should be talking about banning bump stocks; when we should be talking about dealing with high-capacity magazines; and when we should be talking about banning assault weapons.

People don't have to vote for those things if they don't want to, but I think that is what the American people want. You see it in the polling data. I am hearing it when I go home and I talk in townhalls.

People are just frustrated that we are doing nothing. We hold moments of silence, and that is about it. I think some in the NRA are hoping that this is kind of business as usual. That we will have this terrible tragedy, then, as time goes on, people will focus less and less on it, the media will focus less and less on it, and then we will just kind of move on.

I remember, in the aftermath of the Las Vegas shooting, there was talk about banning bump stocks. The President said he thought that was a good idea. Even the NRA did. Time went on, the focus went off of what happened in Las Vegas, and we did nothing. Maybe that is what some of my colleagues are hoping for, is that time will pass and we will do nothing. But it is such an abrogation of our duty and our responsibility, and I just don't get it. I don't get it.

This is another closed rule that makes a mockery of regular order. But what is even more disturbing to me is that we are prioritizing banking issues over protecting our kids and our families, and I just find that unconscionable.

I think the anger in this country is just growing more and more and more. I have great hope that these young voices, not just those from Parkland, Florida, but high school students all across this country, who want a future where they don't have to worry about going to school, their voices are getting louder and louder and louder, and they are not going to cave and they are going to demand change. It is their future, and they want us to give them a future where they feel safer and more protected.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring up some commonsense gun safety legislation. Again, if you don't want to vote for it, you can vote “no,” but we have to have the debate.

I think that is what is particularly insulting to so many people across this country who are frustrated with this House when it comes to gun safety legislation, is that we don't even have the guts to have a debate. We don't even bring it up. It is not a priority. I think we have an opportunity now, if we defeat the previous question, to make it a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question, a “no” vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to close debate by reviewing a few basic truths.

In the aftermath of the financial meltdown last decade, Washington embarked on a campaign to reduce the power of Wall Street over Americans. In typical Washington fashion, we, instead, got a monstrosity of a new regulatory infrastructure that has all but

snuffed out Main Street lenders. The plan to reduce Wall Street's influence actually increased it.

This House—not the Senate, because the Senate has refused to act—listened to the American people and passed the Financial CHOICE Act. Instead of embarking on a campaign that hurt American people and propped up Wall Street, we set out with one goal: increase the financial freedom of Americans.

And we did that. We passed a bill that would make substantive changes to our financial regulations to the betterment of Americans.

These bills before us today continue on that path. They recognize that this government should work for all Americans, not just those who can afford political connections.

Eastern Coloradans should know that I serve them and them alone. As long as I have this responsibility to represent them, I will work to reduce Washington's role in their life.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on the Financial CHOICE Act and these bills. I hope that he will remain engaged in this effort as he commences the next chapter in his life at the end of this Congress.

I thank Chairman SESSIONS for his leadership in bringing this debate to the floor today.

We must never yield in putting Americans first in our public policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 747 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4240) to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House

shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 4240 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3464) to prohibit firearms dealers from selling a firearm prior to the completion of a background check. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 3464 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2598) to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4240, H.R. 3464, or H.R. 2598.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and

a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 27, 2018, at 9:24 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without an amendment H. Con. Res. 103.

That the Senate agreed to without an amendment H. Con. Res. 107.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1307

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the desk, which I have previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas, gun violence affects every community in our Nation;

Whereas, 30 people are killed every day by someone using a gun;

Whereas, more than 2,200 people have been killed this year by someone using a gun;

Whereas, there have been at least 34 mass shootings this year;

Whereas, while mass shootings often receive media attention, gun violence is present every day in every community;

Whereas, since the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School, the House of Representatives has held 43 moments of silence to

honor the memory of people killed by someone using guns;

Whereas, most gun owners are responsible and law-abiding;

Whereas, the Supreme Court, in its District of Columbia v. Heller decision, recognized the right to keep and to bear arms;

Whereas, the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act was enacted on November 30, 1993;

Whereas, background checks have been successful and every day stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun;

Whereas, over 2,000,000 gun sales were blocked since enactment of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act;

Whereas, 90 percent of all background checks are done instantly;

Whereas, the States that require background checks, 47 percent fewer women are murdered by intimate partners;

Whereas, in States that require background checks, there are 47 percent firearm suicides;

Whereas, in States that require background checks, 53 percent fewer law enforcement officers are killed by someone using a gun;

Whereas, 97 percent of Americans polled support background checks for all gun sales;

Whereas, in many States, no background check is required to buy a gun online or at a gun show; and

Whereas, the President has said, "Whether we are Republican or Democrats must now focus on strengthening Background Checks!" Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives should immediately consider H.R. 4240, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2017, and H.R. 3464, the Background Check Completion Act of 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California wish to present argument on the parliamentary question whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, yes, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is our duty as lawmakers and Representatives to pass laws that will make our communities safer. So far, Mr. Speaker, Congress has done nothing in regard to gun violence prevention, and that is shameful.

Every Member here knows that something must be done about gun violence. We may not all agree on what that is, but everyone, from the President of the United States of America to the inspiring young leaders who are leading a movement today out of Florida, agrees we must expand background checks. That is why we need this resolution and why we must take up the bipartisan background bill immediately. You cannot table the 30 people a day who are killed by someone using a gun.

Let us have this vote, Mr. Speaker. We have had too many moments of silence. We have got a bill that is ready to come to the floor. It is bipartisan, Democrats and Republicans supporting the bill, coauthoring the bill.

Ninety-seven percent of the American people believe that we should take up and vote for a measure regarding background checks. This is a good bill. It should be brought to the floor.

The Republicans should not be silencing the wishes of the American people. The Republican majority should not disallow hearings and votes on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The remarks of the gentleman must be confined to the question of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from California seeks to offer a resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX. The resolution offered by the gentleman from California provides that the House should vote on two specified measures.

One of the fundamental tenets of rule IX, as the Chair recently ruled on December 10, 2015, is that a resolution expressing a sentiment that the House should consider a particular bill does not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House. Similarly, on February 6, 2018, the Chair ruled that a resolution providing that the House should act on a specified item of business does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House.

By calling for a vote on two particular measures, the resolution expresses a legislative sentiment in violation of the principles documented in sections 702 and 706 of the House Rules and Manual. Accordingly, the resolution does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Burgess moves to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 748;

Adoption of House Resolution 748, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 747; and

Adoption of House Resolution 747, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 184, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Gosar	Olson
Aderholt	Gowdy	Palazzo
Allen	Granger	Palmer
Amash	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Perry
Arrington	Griffith	Pittenger
Babin	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Bacon	Guthrie	Poliquin
Banks (IN)	Handel	Posey
Barletta	Harper	Ratcliffe
Barr	Harris	Reed
Barton	Hartzler	Reichert
Biggs	Hensarling	Renacci
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rokita
Brat	Hultgren	Rooney, Francis
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rooney, Thomas J.
Brooks (AL)	Hurd	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Roskam
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Bucshon	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Budd	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Byrne	Jones	Rutherford
Calvert	Jordan	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Chabot	Katko	Schweikert
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	King (IA)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Shuster
Comer	Knight	Simpson
Comstock	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Conaway	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Cook	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Lamborn	Smucker
Culberson	Lance	Stefanik
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Stewart
Curtis	Lewis (MN)	Stivers
Davidson	LoBiondo	Taylor
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Tenney
Denham	Love	Thompson (PA)
Dent	Lucas	Thornberry
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Upton
Donovan	Marino	Valadao
Duffy	Marshall	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	Mast	Walden
Dunn	McCarthy	Walker
Emmer	McCaul	Walorski
Estes (KS)	McClintock	Walters, Mimi
Farenthold	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Faso	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	McMorris	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Westerman
Fleischmann	McSally	Williams
Flores	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Meehan	Wittman
Fox	Messer	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Woodall
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Yoder
Gallagher	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Garrett	Mullin	Young (AK)
Gianforte	Newhouse	Young (IA)
Gibbs	Noem	Zeldin
Gohmert	Norman	
Goodlatte	Nunes	

NAYS—184

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Barragán	Blunt Rochester	Bustos
Bass	Bonamici	Butterfield
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan F.	Capuano
Bera	Brady (PA)	Carbajal
Beyer		Cárdenas

Carson (IN) Hoyer
 Cartwright Huffman
 Castor (FL) Jackson Lee
 Castro (TX) Jayapal
 Chu, Judy Jeffries
 Cicilline Johnson (GA)
 Clark (MA) Johnson, E. B.
 Clarke (NY) Kaptur
 Clay Keating
 Clyburn Kelly (IL)
 Cohen Kennedy
 Connolly Khanna
 Cooper Kihuen
 Correa Kildee
 Costa Kilmer
 Courtney Kind
 Crist Krishnamoorthi
 Crowley Kuster (NH)
 Cuellar Langevin
 Davis (CA) Larsen (WA)
 Davis, Danny Larson (CT)
 DeFazio Lawrence
 DeGette Lawson (FL)
 Delaney Lee
 DeLauro Levin
 DelBene Lewis (GA)
 Demings Lieu, Ted
 DeSaulnier Lipinski
 Deutch Loebach
 Dingell Lofgren
 Doggett Lowenthal
 Doyle, Michael Lowey
 F. Lujan Grisham,
 Ellison M.
 Eshoo Luján, Ben Ray
 Espallat Lynch
 Esty (CT) Maloney,
 Evans Carolyn B.
 Foster Maloney, Sean
 Frankel (FL) Matsui
 Fudge McCollum
 Gabbard McEachin
 Gallego McGovern
 Garamendi McNerney
 Gomez Meeks
 Gonzalez (TX) Meng
 Gottheimer Moore
 Green, Al Moulton
 Green, Gene Murphy (FL)
 Grijalva Nadler
 Gutiérrez Napolitano
 Hanabusa Neal
 Hastings Nolan
 Heck Norcross
 Higgins (NY) O'Halleran
 Himes O'Rourke

NOT VOTING—18

Bergman Engel
 Black Graves (MO)
 Carter (TX) Huizenga
 Cleaver Long
 Cramer Payne
 Cummings Pearce

□ 1337

Messrs. TED LIEU of California, NEAL, PANETTA, RUSH, THOMPSON of Mississippi, MCEACHIN, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1865, ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 748) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act

does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 184, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—228

Abraham Gaetz
 Aderholt Gallagher
 Allen Garrett
 Amash Gianforte
 Amodei Gibbs
 Arrington Gohmert
 Babin Goodlatte
 Bacon Gosar
 Banks (IN) Gowdy
 Barletta Granger
 Barr Graves (GA)
 Barton Graves (LA)
 Biggs Griffith
 Bilirakis Grothman
 Bishop (MI) Guthrie
 Bishop (UT) Handel
 Blackburn Harper
 Blum Harris
 Bost Hartzler
 Brady (TX) Hensarling
 Brat Herrera Beutler
 Bridenstine Hice, Jody B.
 Brooks (AL) Higgins (LA)
 Brooks (IN) Hill
 Buchanan Holding
 Buck Hollingsworth
 Bucshon Hudson
 Budd Hultgren
 Burgess Hunter
 Byrne Hurd
 Calvert Issa
 Carter (GA) Jenkins (KS)
 Chabot Jenkins (WV)
 Cheney Johnson (LA)
 Coffman Johnson (OH)
 Cole Johnson, Sam
 Collins (GA) Jones
 Collins (NY) Jordan
 Comer Joyce (OH)
 Comstock Katko
 Conaway Kelly (MS)
 Cook Kelly (PA)
 Costello (PA) King (IA)
 Crawford King (NY)
 Culberson Kinzinger
 Curbelo (FL) Knight
 Curtis Kustoff (TN)
 Davidson Labrador
 Davis, Rodney LaHood
 Denham LaMalfa
 Dent Lamborn
 DeSantis Lance
 DesJarlais Latta
 Diaz-Balart Lewis (MN)
 Donovan LoBlundo
 Duffy Loudermilk
 Duncan (SC) Love
 Duncan (TN) Lucas
 Dunn Luetkemeyer
 Emmer MacArthur
 Estes (KS) Marchant
 Farenthold Marino
 Faso Marshall
 Ferguson Massie
 Fitzpatrick Mast
 Fleischmann McCarthy
 Flores McCaul
 Fortenberry McClintock
 Foxx McHenry
 Frelinghuysen McKinley

Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack

NAYS—184

Adams Garamendi
 Aguilar Gomez
 Barragán Gonzalez (TX)
 Bass Gottheimer
 Beatty Green, Al
 Bera Green, Gene
 Beyer Grijalva
 Bishop (GA) Gutiérrez
 Blumenauer Hanabusa
 Blunt Rochester Hastings
 Bonamici Heck
 Boyle, Brendan Higgins (NY)
 F. Himes
 Brady (PA) Hoyer
 Brown (MD) Huffman
 Brownley (CA) Jackson Lee
 Bustos Jayapal
 Butterfield Jeffries
 Capuano Johnson (GA)
 Carbajal Johnson, E. B.
 Cárdenas Kaptur
 Carson (IN) Keating
 Cartwright Kelly (IL)
 Castor (FL) Kennedy
 Castro (TX) Khanna
 Chu, Judy Kihuen
 Cicilline Kildee
 Clark (MA) Kilmer
 Clarke (NY) Kind
 Clay Krishnamoorthi
 Clyburn Kuster (NH)
 Cohen Langevin
 Connolly Larsen (WA)
 Cooper Larson (CT)
 Correa Lawrence
 Costa Lawson (FL)
 Courtney Lee
 Crist Levin
 Crowley Lewis (GA)
 Cuellar Lieu, Ted
 Davis, Danny Lipinski
 DeFazio Loebach
 DeGette Lofgren
 Delaney Lowenthal
 DeLauro Lowey
 DelBene Lujan Grisham,
 Demings M.
 DeSaulnier Luján, Ben Ray
 Deutch Lynch
 Dingell Maloney,
 Doggett Carolyn B.
 Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean
 F. Matsui
 Ellison McCollum
 Eshoo McEachin
 Espallat McGovern
 Esty (CT) McNerney
 Evans Meeks
 Foster Meng
 Frankel (FL) Moore
 Fudge Moulton
 Gabbard Murphy (FL)
 Gallego Nadler

NOT VOTING—18

Bergman Davis (CA)
 Black Engel
 Carter (TX) Graves (MO)
 Cleaver Huizenga
 Cramer Long
 Cummings Payne

□ 1345

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 84

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 175, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—235

Abraham	Gibbs	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gohmert	Noem
Allen	Goodlatte	Norman
Amash	Gosar	Nunes
Amodei	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Arrington	Gowdy	Olson
Babin	Granger	Palazzo
Bacon	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Banks (IN)	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Barletta	Griffith	Perry
Barr	Grothman	Pittenger
Barton	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Biggs	Handel	Poliquin
Bilirakis	Harper	Posey
Bishop (MI)	Harris	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Reed
Blackburn	Hensarling	Reichert
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Brat	Hill	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rokita
Buck	Hunter	Rooney, Francis
Bucshon	Hurd	Rooney, Thomas
Budd	Issa	J.
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Chabot	Jones	Royce (CA)
Cheney	Jordan	Russell
Coffman	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Cole	Katko	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Schneider
Comer	King (IA)	Schweikert
Comstock	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Kinzinger	Sensenbrenner
Connolly	Knight	Sessions
Cook	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Costa	Labrador	Shuster
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Simpson
Crawford	LaMalfa	Sinema
Crist	Lamborn	Slaughter
Culberson	Lance	Smith (MO)
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Smith (NE)
Curtis	Lawson (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Davidson	Lewis (MN)	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Smucker
Denham	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Dent	Love	Stewart
DeSantis	Lucas	Stivers
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Tenney
Donovan	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	Marino	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Marshall	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Turner
Dunn	Mast	Upton
Emmer	McCarthy	Valadao
Estes (KS)	McCaul	Wagner
Farenthold	McClintock	Walberg
Faso	McHenry	Walden
Ferguson	McKinley	Walker
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Walorski
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Flores	McSally	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Fox	Meehan	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Westerman
Gaetz	Mitchell	Williams
Gallagher	Moorenaar	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Gianforte	Mullin	Womack

Woodall
YoderYoho
Young (AK)Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—175

Adams	Garamendi	Nadler
Aguilar	Gomez	Napolitano
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)	Neal
Bass	Green, Al	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Gene	Norcross
Bera	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Panetta
Blumenauer	Hastings	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Peters
F.	Hoyer	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Huffman	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Jayapal	Polis
Bustos	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Raskin
Carbajal	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Keating	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Rosen
Cartwright	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kihuen	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kildee	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Sanchez
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky
Cohen	Langevin	Schiff
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Correa	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lawrence	Scott, David
Crowley	Lee	Serrano
Cuellar	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sires
DeGette	Loebach	Soto
Delaney	Lofgren	Suozzi
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lowe	Takano
Demings	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	M.	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Dingell	Lynch	Tonko
Doggett	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn B.	Vargas
F.	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Ellison	Matsui	Vela
Eshoo	McCollum	Velázquez
Españillat	McEachin	Visclosky
Esty (CT)	McGovern	Wasserman
Evans	McNerney	Schultz
Foster	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Moore	Welch
Gabbard	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Bergman	Engel	Roskam
Black	Graves (MO)	Smith (WA)
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Speier
Chu, Judy	Johnson (LA)	Torres
Cleaver	Long	Trott
Cramer	Payne	Walz
Cummings	Pearce	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1352

Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4296, OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4607, COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 747) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4296) to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4607) to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 185, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—227

Abraham	Davis, Rodney	Hollingsworth
Aderholt	Denham	Hudson
Amash	Dent	Hultgren
Amodei	DeSantis	Hunter
Arrington	DesJarlais	Hurd
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Bacon	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)
Banks (IN)	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (LA)
Barr	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Barton	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Biggs	Emmer	Jones
Bilirakis	Estes (KS)	Jordan
Bishop (MI)	Farenthold	Joyce (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Faso	Katko
Blackburn	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Blum	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Bost	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Brady (TX)	Flores	King (NY)
Brat	Fortenberry	Kinzinger
Bridenstine	Fox	Knight
Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	Kustoff (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Gaetz	Labrador
Buchanan	Gallagher	LaHood
Buck	Garrett	LaMalfa
Bucshon	Gianforte	Lamborn
Budd	Gibbs	Lance
Burgess	Gohmert	Latta
Byrne	Goodlatte	Lewis (MN)
Calvert	Gosar	LoBiondo
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Loudermilk
Chabot	Granger	Love
Cheney	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Coffman	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Griffith	MacArthur
Collins (GA)	Grothman	Marchant
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Marino
Comer	Handel	Marshall
Comstock	Harper	Massie
Conaway	Harris	Mast
Cook	Hartzler	McCarthy
Costello (PA)	Hensarling	McCaul
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	McClintock
Culberson	Hice, Jody B.	McHenry
Curbelo (FL)	Higgins (LA)	McKinley
Curtis	Hill	McMorris
Davidson	Holding	Rodgers

McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

NAYS—185

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stivers

Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—18

Allen
Bergman
Black
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Cramer
Cummings
Engel
Graves (MO)
Huizenga
Long
Payne
Pearce
Smith (WA)
Speier
Torres
Trott
Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1359

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 86.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris
McHenry
McCauley
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarelli
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Soto
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Bergman
Black

Blumenauer
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Cramer

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarelli
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Soto
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 177, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—230

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
Desantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)

Cummings	Payne	Speier
Engel	Pearce	Torres
Graves (MO)	Pingree	Trott
Huizenga	Rice (NY)	Walz
Jones	Shuster	Welch
Long	Smith (WA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1405

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was thus unable to cast my vote on rollcall votes 83, 84, 85, 86, and 87. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 83, "nay" on rollcall No. 84, "nay" on rollcall No. 85, "nay" on rollcall No. 86, and "nay" on rollcall No. 87.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL COLLECTIVELY TO THE MEMBERS OF THE OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 106, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 106

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on March 21, 2018, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1865.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 748 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1865.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1409

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, with Mr. DENHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today, this body will make tremendous progress towards ending online sex exploitation. This is a big deal.

I am proud to stand here as an original cosponsor of the important legislation we are considering today, H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act.

I have been so pleased to work closely with my colleague, Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, on this issue, and I know that I am not the only person here who greatly appreciates her leadership on this. It has been sobering, to say the least, to hear some of the personal accounts of sex trafficking victims, and several from my home State of Alabama.

It is our responsibility to provide justice for these victims and to do everything we can to protect the most vulnerable members of our society from trafficking. This is modern-day slavery.

As it stands now, the sad truth is that criminals can easily and anonymously

purchase women and children on the internet using various websites.

Thanks to broad interpretation of existing law, specifically section 230 in America's courts, these websites are, essentially, immune from State and local prosecutions. These websites make millions by enabling sex trafficking while facing very little risk of being punished for these crimes.

The bill we are considering today would change that by amending this law to ensure that websites that unlawfully contribute to the exploitation of sex trafficking victims are no longer immune to punishment.

H.R. 1865 will finally hold bad actor websites accountable for these unspeakable wrongdoings. The bill also provides increased criminal liability and, thus, deters websites and individuals from selling human beings online. Websites will no longer be able to turn a blind eye or actively conceal this horrific practice without facing very real consequences.

This legislation has been a work in progress for some time now, and I am excited today to have the opportunity to cast my vote in favor of it here today. I urge my colleagues to join me.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for managing this legislation. I thank Congresswoman WAGNER for her leadership and, as someone said, continued determination, joined by my friend and colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman BEATTY and Congresswoman MALONEY. We have all worked together over the years for the victims of human trafficking and sex trafficking.

In the last couple of hours, we heard in the Judiciary Committee the stories of the victims of rape, so we know that this is an important time and important legislation. Throughout this time, you will hear stories of victims who have been victimized and are in need of this legislation.

Just to recount my statement in the Rules Committee, yesterday, Monday, a week ago, in Houston, I sat down with victims who had been trafficked or who had been victimized through online sex trafficking or other aspects of sex trafficking. It was overwhelming to hear parents speak of a young girl, their daughter, who had been misled and driven away from their home or from her area and had been taken and abused for a long period of time until he had to rescue her himself, spending \$50,000, and then \$60,000, to be able to rehabilitate herself, which is now an ongoing process. Though, as every family and every parent, he is grateful that she is alive.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1865, Allow States and Victims to

Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017, an important bill intended to address the reprehensible crime of online sex trafficking by prosecuting the violators and providing relief to the violated.

□ 1415

First and foremost, H.R. 1865 makes clear that section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, which its interpretation was expanded in the first circuit court ruling of *Doe v. Backpage*, this bill makes it clear that section 230 of the Communications Decency Act was never intended to protect the facilitation of online prostitution or sex trafficking and calls out those websites that have acted recklessly in allowing the sale of victims of sex trafficking online or stood idly by while young boys and girls, many as young as 13 years old or even younger, were coerced, threatened, tortured, bought, and sold on the whims of their exploiters.

Secondly, this legislation will provide Federal prosecutors with an additional weapon to use against the immoral individuals who participate in the forced enslavement we know as sex trafficking.

H.R. 1865 creates the new offense of intentional promotion or facilitation of prostitution while using or operating a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce, such as the internet. A general violation of this offense will be punishable by a sentence of upwards of 10 years.

Websites have operated with impunity, hidden behind section 230, allowing traffickers to advertise, promote, sell minors and other vulnerable at-risk members of our society, children, parents' precious, precious children, who are forced to perform unspeakable acts under the threat of violence, gun violence, starvation, and emotional and physical abuse.

Under this legislation, an aggravated violation of the new offense, punishable by imprisonment, occurs if a defendant, such as Backpage, promotes or facilitates the prostitution of five or more victims or acts with reckless disregard of the fact that the conduct in question contributed to sex trafficking as defined in the Federal criminal code at section 1591, title 18.

Not only does H.R. 1865 create criminal liability and mandatory restitution for online sex traffickers and their enablers, this legislation goes even further. Victims harmed as a result of an aggravated violation of this new offense will have the ability—very important—to seek civil damages, while judges will be required to impose restitution upon defendants convicted of committing either the general or aggravated violation.

We appreciate law enforcement, U.S. attorneys, yet we know that State law enforcement agencies and prosecutors

are vital in the fight as well, and they have called on Congress to act and to fight more effectively. There are State task forces across the country working to protect young girls and boys, and H.R. 1865 allows State legislators to enact laws prohibiting the conduct that reflects the offense created in this bill.

Soon we will be discussing the Walters amendment, which is offered because of the victims groups who want a stronger response to helping victims. We thank them for that.

The Jackson Lee amendment, which I will offer, leads to be able to help understand what the level of recovery is and the mandatory restitution. It will tell the story. It will provide the GAO study to find out how this legislation is positively impacting, who is receiving the dollars, are they receiving the dollars.

Today, this account has swelled to \$99 billion a year, with a considerable portion of that money being generated through online advertising solicitation, and that is the account of dollars that are being used through sex trafficking.

My amendment will determine and help to bring information to us as to the effectiveness of this particular legislation, and I think it will be very important.

Let me conclude by saying that a letter to Congress from the National Association of Attorneys General indicated certain Federal courts have broadly interpreted the Communications Decency Act, which has left victims and State and local law enforcement agencies and prosecutors, who regularly confront the cruel realities of sex trafficking, feeling powerless against online ad services and websites that facilitate or allow sex trafficking.

My heart goes out, and I am grateful that we have moved. As we move forward, we will be able to build with more legislation that might include my second amendment that would have allowed victims of sex trafficking to file civil actions in State courts.

Mr. Chair, let me express my gratitude to the victims who have been courageous enough to tell their story.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017," an important bill, intended to address the reprehensible crime of online sex trafficking by prosecuting the violators and providing relief to the violated.

First and foremost, H.R. 1865:

(1) Makes clear that Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act was never intended to protect the facilitation of online prostitution or sex trafficking; and

(2) Calls out those websites that have acted recklessly in allowing the sale of victims of sex trafficking online, or stood idly by while young boys and girls—many as young as thirteen years old or even younger—were coerced, threatened, tortured, bought, and sold on the whims of their exploiters.

Secondly, this legislation will provide federal prosecutors with an additional weapon to use

against the immoral individuals who participate in the forced enslavement we know as sex trafficking.

H.R. 1865 creates the new offense of intentional promotion or facilitation of prostitution while using or operating a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce, such as the Internet.

A general violation of this offense will be punishable by a sentence of imprisonment of up to ten years.

Websites have operated with impunity and hidden behind Section 230—allowing traffickers to advertise, promote, and sell minors and other vulnerable, at risk members of our society, who are forced to perform unspeakable acts under the threat of violence, starvation, and emotional and physical abuse.

Under this legislation, an aggravated violation of the new offense, punishable by a maximum of twenty-five years imprisonment, occurs if a defendant, such as Backpage.com:

(1) Promotes or facilitates the prostitution of five or more victims; or

(2) Acts with reckless disregard of the fact that the conduct in question contributed to sex trafficking, as defined in the federal criminal code at section 1591 of title 18.

Not only does H.R. 1865 create criminal liability and mandatory restitution for online sex traffickers and their enablers, this legislation goes even further.

Victims harmed as a result of an aggravated violation of this new offense will have the ability to seek civil damages, while judges will be required to impose restitution upon defendants convicted of committing either the general or aggravated violation.

We appreciate the efforts of federal law enforcement and assistant U.S. attorneys who endeavor to rid the streets and virtual highways of sex trafficking.

Yet we know that state law enforcement agencies and prosecutors are vital to this fight as well, and they have called on Congress to help them fight more effectively.

There are state task forces across the country working on the frontlines to locate young girls and young boys—children—and return them to the arms of distraught mothers and fathers.

H.R. 1865 allows state legislatures to enact laws prohibiting conduct that reflects the offenses created in this bill and the existing sex trafficking statute that I previously mentioned.

Congresswoman WALTERS has offered an amendment, which is supported by many victims' advocacy groups, to further strengthen the legislation before us today.

Taking two key provisions from the Senate bill, known as SESTA, the Walters amendment makes clear that the Communications Decency Act does not impair or limit federal causes of action filed by victims of sex trafficking and creates a right of action for state attorneys general to file federal causes of action for sex trafficking on behalf of their citizens.

This leads me to my own amendment, which is intended to measure the effectiveness of the civil recovery and mandatory restitution provisions of H.R. 1865.

In every community across the country, soulless individuals bend, break, and use the minds and bodies of young girls, young boys,

men, and women—for a profit—over and over and over again.

Despite the reprehensible nature of this crime, sex trafficking is a widespread problem that is now the fastest growing criminal industry.

Today, it has swelled to \$99 billion a year—with a considerable portion of that money being generated through online advertising and solicitation.

Sex traffickers have harnessed the wide-reaching expanse of the Internet together with the ability to conduct their so-called business anonymously.

They are no longer restricted to dark, unsafe street corners, filthy truck stops, or seedy hotels and strip clubs.

Instead, websites have made sex trafficking easy, convenient, and less risky for traffickers and their cowardly customers.

Today, visitors to websites can scroll through virtual Yellow Pages of listings, on their cell phones or tablets, according to their location, tastes, and preferences, without leaving the privacy and safety of their homes.

According to the Polaris Project, U.S. law enforcement has identified online advertisements as the primary platform for buying and selling sex with minors. Over the past several years, more than 80 percent of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's reports regarding child sex trafficking relate to the sex trafficking of a child online.

When notified of the criminal activity occurring on their websites and platforms, many companies, have worked to remove the content and even collaborated with law enforcement to find the perpetrators and rescue victims.

On the other hand, there are companies that have made every effort to obfuscate the criminal nature of the activity that is allowed to continue unabated, while the companies continue to turn a profit, and traffickers continue to force their captives to perform sex acts, under the threat of violence and actual physical and emotional abuse.

Girls and boys, men and women, are brazenly advertised and sold for sex on roughly a dozen major websites—the most notorious of these is, of course, Backpage.com.

However, local law enforcement officials in Seattle, Washington have identified more than 130 websites where mostly women and children are bought and sold for sex.

Many attempts have been made to hold these websites, including Backpage.com, accountable for allowing sex traffickers to operate on their platforms and profiting from their conduct.

However, as was pointed out in a letter to Congress from The National Association of Attorneys General: "certain federal courts have broadly interpreted the Communications Decency Act," which has left victims and state and local law enforcement agencies and prosecutors, who regularly confront the cruel realities of sex trafficking, feeling powerless against online ad services and websites that facilitate or allow sex trafficking.

My heart aches for those who are taken advantage of, abused, robbed of their innocence, and then robbed again of the justice they seek.

As I said earlier, the legislation before us will allow victims to file civil actions in federal

courts under certain conditions and my amendment will determine if the civil actions are delivering relief and restoration.

I offered a second amendment that would have allowed victims of sex trafficking to file civil actions in state courts under the same conditions set forth in the underlying bill for federal civil actions.

Although I am disappointed that this amendment was not accepted, I look forward to building upon the work that has been done to address the needs of victims and survivors of sex trafficking, and introducing additional legislation to continue along the pathway towards a comprehensive solution.

I am inspired and energized by the countless survivors who, despite their suffering, are willing to stand against those who have exploited them. These brave individuals want justice and I want them to have it.

As a leader in the fight against Human and Sex Trafficking and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I am painfully familiar with the pervasiveness of sex trafficking in my own state of Texas—which has become a hot bed of human trafficking.

Among law enforcement and human trafficking authorities, Houston is known as the hub of human trafficking.

The highest number of calls to the National Human Trafficking Hotline in Texas comes from Houston, and a study conducted by the University of Texas stated that there are more than 300,000 victims of human trafficking in Texas, including almost 79,000 minors.

In the few minutes I have left, I would like to share the story of a young woman named Kathy, who moved to Houston in 1994 with her family.

Kathy was raised to be strong and independent; she was very involved in her church, community, and ROTC.

She graduated from high school, with hopes of pursuing a career in journalism.

Yet, Kathy became a victim of sex trafficking.

Like most girls, she wanted to be loved.

She met a charming young man who treated her like she had never been treated before.

After a fairytale year, her Prince Charming proposed something Kathy felt she could not refuse—a promising job with his company, an administrative position that would triple her income and provide financial security for her future, which seemed like a dream come true.

The job was in Dallas and, despite her initial hesitation, she saw the offer as an opportunity to provide for her family.

But, shortly after she arrived in Dallas, Kathy found herself in the dark world of sex trafficking and prostitution—a life she never imagined.

Graphic images were taken of her and placed on the Internet against her will.

She was forced to perform sexual favors multiple times, every day, throughout Dallas and surrounding areas.

Escape was not easy.

She was cut off from her family.

Her boyfriend, turned pimp, limited her phone calls to johns, and did not allow her to have money.

But, somehow she found an opportunity to get away and she never looked back.

After many years of living in silence, Kathy decided to journal her experience.

That journal became a book, which became a stage play.

Kathy found her voice and is now an inspirational speaker who hopes to use her story to encourage others to join the fight against sex trafficking.

Images of Kathy's horrific past linger on the Internet.

She says: "Sites like Backpage have chosen to revictimize survivors and keeps us in bondage by refusing to remove images taken against our will."

Kathy hopes that one day the voices of survivors will be heard.

Well, Kathy—know that I hear you.

Congress hears you.

We hear the voices of the victims, who remain in physical and mental bondage.

We hear the voices of the survivors, who are struggling to rid themselves of reminders of their torment—survivors like Liliana who was lured away from her home by a man she met on the internet, held captive, repeatedly raped by at least five different men, and suffers from PTSD.

H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017," together with Representative WALTERS's amendment, provides law enforcement, prosecutors, and courts at every level with the tools they need to hold responsible each and every bad actor who participates in, facilitates, contributes to, or profits from this modern-day form of slavery.

The proposed legislative combination will help defend and protect communities across the country, guard against the further spread of sex trafficking, and provide survivors with a path to justice of their own.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for the time and the work on this bill.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank Mrs. WAGNER from Missouri for sponsoring this bill, along with the help of our friends on the other side.

You notice, Mr. Chair, that everybody who is in line, mostly, who are here to speak are women, and I want to congratulate the women in Congress, because they have taken the lead for making sure that we stop this scourge of human sex trafficking.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank the different groups, victims groups, throughout the country who have continued to give us input on what we can do to make laws better. I call those groups the victims posse, because they are here all the time rounding us up, talking to us about what they want and think is necessary to make life better for victims.

Mr. Chair, according to most, Alexa was a normal and well-adjusted 15-year-old girl, teenager, but like many young people, she struggled with insecurity and loneliness. So when a handsome and sympathetic man reached out

to her on social media, she was immediately taken in by his kind and comforting words.

Most Americans don't realize that the evils of human trafficking are all around us. Traffickers lurk on the phones, on computers, and on the internet, constantly searching for vulnerable victims to lure into their traps.

After months of manipulation, Alexa agreed to meet her new online friend. As soon as she got into his car, she realized that this person was a different person than she believed him to be. He chained her and forced her to have sex for money, and he committed this evil numerous times.

Technology has changed our world in countless positive ways, but it has also given human sex traffickers a direct avenue to our children and their lives. We, as a society, must work harder to capture these criminals and shut down their online schemes. Only then can we protect others from Alexa's fate.

This is our job. This is our duty. We must stop the trafficking network. Not in our town, not in our city, and not in our State.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chair, as the co-chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus with my colleague Congressman TED POE, I am a proud cosponsor of this important legislation for victims in America who have suffered from these crimes.

A free and open internet, we all believe, is essential to economic growth, entrepreneurship, and enterprise in the 21st century, and America leads the way. This new technology age has reshaped our lives and allowed for greater access to learning, greater ability to shape our own futures as Americans, and with economic benefits we could not have imagined 15 years ago.

Sadly, there are some people who look at these freedoms and the openness of the internet and see ways to exploit, abuse, and prey on innocent children and teenagers in the name of profit. It is outrageous, and it is a crime. I am speaking of the scourge of sex trafficking, which has impacted the lives of too many young people in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent and throughout America.

Today, here in Congress, we look squarely at traffickers, pimps, and victimizers and say we must do a better job in protecting our citizens. As a result of this legislation, our laws will no longer be manipulated and used as a cover for their abuse. No longer will these people be able to hide behind the shield that the internet provides you when knowingly contributing to this horrible crime.

The Fresno Bee, a local daily newspaper in the San Joaquin Valley, recently ran a 6-week-long series about human trafficking in the Valley. The paper reported that nearly every 16-year-old girl in Fresno has been approached at one time or another by sex traffickers. Imagine that: nearly every 16-year-old girl in our county.

Police have seen sex trafficking victims from every high school in Fresno County and most of the junior high schools. It is horrible. This is a tragedy, and it cannot and should not be allowed to continue.

Today, we say it is time to make important changes. This legislation does that. It will help protect our children and provide them the ability to confront their abusers.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ADERHOLT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, as I had said, it is time to make these important changes, and this bipartisan legislation does that. It protects our children, providing them the ability to confront their abusers, including those who knowingly promote and advertise these crimes.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman, and I am thankful for the bipartisan leadership in this effort.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. Chair, let me just say thank you to her for her tireless work on this effort.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, my friend, Mrs. ROBY, for her fearless leadership and support on this issue.

Today we bring, Mr. Chair, H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, or FOSTA, to the floor, finally.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank my partners on the other side of the aisle, my dear friends, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY and Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, for their tireless support on this effort.

The sad truth is that sex trafficking is a crime as old as the Nation itself. Over the past few years, Congress has routinely taken bipartisan action to fight it, yet sex trafficking seems to continue unabated. This is largely because the methods of recruitment and sale of sex trafficking victims have evolved with technology, and U.S. laws have remained stagnant.

Today, when the House votes on FOSTA, we will be sending a clear message: businesses that sell human beings online can no longer do so with impunity. Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act explicitly allows enforcement of Federal criminal law, but courts have mistakenly found that it

does not allow robust enforcement of State criminal law.

Last summer, 50 State attorneys general called on Congress to untie their hands to allow them to bring justice to the websites that sell our children and the victims. Empowering our State and local prosecutors is in the best interests of the American people. Federal prosecution is discretionary, and the vast majority of crimes are prosecuted at the State and local level.

Most websites engaging in the online sex trade are first identified at the local level and should be quickly addressed before they ever reach the size of Backpage.com. Without proper State and local enforcement, there is no real criminal deterrent against businesses looking to enter the sex trade. Today, we will change that.

FOSTA will allow prosecutors across the country to protect their communities without fear of section 230 preemption. FOSTA will produce more prosecutions of bad actor websites, more convictions, and put more predators behind bars. It will provide a meaningful criminal deterrent so that fewer businesses will ever enter the sex trade and fewer victims will ever be sold and raped.

Clarification of section 230 is desperately needed. In August 2017, the Sacramento Superior Court dismissed charges brought against Backpage by the California attorney general, saying: "If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking."

Today, Mr. Chair, Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law to hold accountable websites that support exploitation. FOSTA also creates a new crime targeting websites that are intentionally promoting prostitution, and it encourages States to use or adopt similar laws.

Unfortunately, sex trafficking ads are written to evade law enforcement. Looking at these ads, you usually can't tell that force, fraud, and coercion were used against the victim or that the person depicted in the ad is a minor.

□ 1430

Because indications of knowledge of sex trafficking are typically hidden, it is nearly impossible for prosecutors to demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that the website operators knew that the ads involved sex trafficking. This is why prosecutors tell me that they would oftentimes prefer to use prostitution laws instead of sex trafficking laws when charging these websites.

Sex trafficking laws are written to target pimps, johns, and businesses, but are not always the best tool against the online sex trade. FOSTA gives prosecutors the freedom to use

both State sex trafficking laws and the State prostitution laws, and lets prosecutors decide how best to do their jobs.

Importantly, prosecutors will be able to seek a higher penalty for websites that promote prostitution and recklessly contribute to sex trafficking. Online sex trafficking is flourishing in America because there are no serious legal consequences for the websites that profit from the exploitation of our most vulnerable.

FOSTA, combined with the SESTA Walters amendment that adds back in victim-centered provisions from my original language, will finally create these serious legal consequences.

Today we are voting to keep our commitment to trafficking survivors, both by empowering them to hold accountable the websites that stole them and by arming prosecutors with the tools they need to ensure that the most vulnerable members of our society are never sold online in the first place.

I trust that my colleagues will join me in this vote to fundamentally transform the fight against online sex trafficking in America.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), a Democratic cosponsor of this legislation. I thank her very much for her perseverance and determination.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE not only for yielding me time, but for all her scholarship and all of her commitment to making a difference against sex trafficking.

Mr. Chair, today is a proud day for me. I am proud to stand here on this House floor to urge the support and passage of the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, known as FOSTA, as well as the Walters amendment.

Human trafficking and sex trafficking is happening in all areas: big cities, little cities, rural and suburban areas, Democratic districts, Republican districts. It happens in every congressional district in America, regardless of whether that district is red or blue.

Trafficking, Mr. Chair, is a non-partisan issue, and that requires bipartisan solutions. And if Congressman POE were still here, I would add, "And that is just the way it is."

I am so honored to be joined today with so many colleagues. I also want to thank Congresswoman ROBY for her leadership in managing the time. What an honor it is for me to join the leadership of Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, not only the sponsor of this bill, but a friend, a colleague, someone who is my classmate. And early on, she started talking about human trafficking, and we shared our mutual interest; and we have been, so to say, joined at the hip ever since. And I could not thank her enough for all of her leadership.

Mr. Chair, it tells you that we must work together. Congresswoman WAGNER has done that with this legislation and more. So I am very honored to be the lead Democrat. You have heard what the Fighting Online Sex Trafficking Act will do, so I won't go in great details with that again. But I will tell you, it will address a critical problem.

Our laws have not kept pace with how technology has been used to exploit the innocent. The internet has changed how humans are trafficked. It has taken something that was once done in the streets and made it easier and more anonymous. Trafficking online is a well-documented problem, yet we have seen a few websites turn a blind eye, even as they profit on the buying and the selling of children, women, and men.

FOSTA will help solve this in many ways, as you have heard. On this last point, I would like to say FOSTA is targeted in a way that will not only affect websites engaged in the online trafficking trade; it will recognize some of the concerns that some of the tech communities initially raised. But I think that the process that FOSTA has gone through in the Judiciary Committee and now with the Walters amendment shows how the legislative process can be used.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BEATTY. It shows how the legislative process can be used to result in a better product. The bill now has the support not only of the trafficking victims' advocates, but also of law enforcement and many of the internet and tech companies.

So, again, I thank the hard work of Congresswoman WAGNER. I want to say that we won't solve the problem of human trafficking overnight, but if we get this bill signed into law, we will make it harder for traffickers to exploit the innocent and we will keep countless children, women, and men out of the cycle of abuse.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, the internet was never meant to be a zone of impunity for traffickers and their accomplices, including classified ad websites, that turn a blind eye to or actively facilitate to profit from the sex trafficking of children. Yet we are seeing the internet used as a virtual slave market.

Today, because of ANN WAGNER's tenacity, her courage, her legislative skill and compassion, and this bipartisan effort that, again, comes to the floor to make a major change in law, we begin taking back the internet from traffickers by passing H.R. 1865. This

legislation will also allow those who have been hurt to sue. It empowers women, especially women, to take their cases into court and to get remedies there as well.

Today we say no to the status quo that allows our children to be bought, abused, and sold again with impunity online. Today we say no to courts slamming the door on trafficking victims who want to sue website owners complicit in sexual abuse and cruelty.

Mr. Chair, the statistics of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children show that backpage.com is the subject of the majority of the child trafficking tips that are received in the United States. In documents obtained by subpoena that backpage.com originally refused to share—and I see that Mrs. MALONEY will be speaking in a moment; she and I worked very hard on that as well—Congress has found that backpage.com was removing telltale words and signs of likely human trafficking from advertisements on its website but still posting the advertisements and making money. They made it harder to detect.

Backpage.com actively prevented U.S. law enforcement from detecting children being trafficked. Backpage wasn't prosecuted. Judges across the country wouldn't even allow civil suits by trafficking victims who were sold through backpage.com, as was pointed out by ANN WAGNER just a moment ago, all because of a law that was written before the internet or human trafficking was really understood: Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act.

Today, Congress will change that law. God willing it passes in the Senate and it will be signed by the President.

Today we can protect our children and free speech, too. H.R. 1865, as amended, will allow State prosecutors to prosecute, and it empowers trafficked women, victims, to sue the middleman who facilitated and profited from their slavery.

The status quo of rampant child online sex trafficking is more than unacceptable; it is absolutely abhorrent to anyone who believes in human dignity and human rights. This is a tremendous bill. Mr. Chair, again, I thank ANN WAGNER for her leadership.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who joined with Representative JOYCE BEATTY from Ohio and the lead sponsor, Congresswoman WAGNER, to be strong supporters of this legislation. She is an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I thank Congresswoman LEE for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership on this issue and in so many other areas.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong, strong support of H.R. 1865. It is transformative legislation. It is important

and it will save lives. It is a historic legislative achievement. I thank my colleague ANN WAGNER for her selfless, dedicated, effective leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I thank my colleagues, JOYCE BEATTY and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Congresswomen ROBY and WALTERS, really everyone, and the leadership of this body for bringing this bill to the floor. I hope we should all pass it. It is important.

This bill clarifies that internet companies that actively advertise the sale of trafficking victims, many of whom are children and minors, are not protected by the Communications Decency Act, Section 230. When Congress enacted it 22 years ago, it never, never intended to make the internet into a red-light zone and a protected area to shield sex traffickers and corporations from selling our young people, many of whom are stolen, doped, forced into sex trafficking, and then protect them from the appeals of their parents for some type of justification, some type of recognition of the harm that they have caused.

Now, this bill, like every other sex trafficking bill, has been a bipartisan effort between Democrats and Republicans. It is landmark. It is important. And we must continue to fight this modern-day form of slavery wherever it exists, and this crime has absolutely exploded online because it is so profitable.

You can sell a gun once. You can sell illegal dope once. But they sell the human body over and over again until they die.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BURGESS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, this is an important issue. I must tell you that we have a choice.

This has gone to the courts, and the courts have said Congress must decide whether Congress wants to shield corporations, profit-makers, exploiters—I would say—murderers of young children online, selling them for sex trafficking. So if you vote against this bill, you are shielding them. If you vote for it, you are protecting our children.

This bill removes obstacles for attorneys general throughout the country to enact State antitrafficking laws. That is why 50 attorneys general have supported it.

Victims and families will be given a pathway to justice through private civil action that they have been denied too long. Over 50 organizations have come out in support of H.R. 1865, and I include in the RECORD a list of those organizations.

Shared Hope International, Arlington, VA; Rights4Girls, Washington, DC; Covenant House International, New York, NY; ECPAT

USA, Washington, DC; World Without Exploitation, New York, NY; Mary Mazzio & I AM JANE DOE Community, Boston, MA; Courtney's House, Washington, DC; Legal Momentum, New York, NY; Equality Now, New York, NY; National Center on Sexual Exploitation (NCOSE), Washington, DC; My Life My Choice, Boston, MA; Truckers Against Trafficking, Englewood, CO; Sanctuary For Families, New York, NY; Trafficking in America Task Force, Gainesville, FL; CSA San Diego County, El Cajon, CA; Villanova Law School Institute on Commercial Sexual Exploitation, Villanova, PA; National Council of Jewish Women New York, New York, NY; Dawn's Place, Philadelphia, PA; Child's World America, Villanova, PA; Freedom From Exploitation, Inc., San Diego, CA.

Women's Justice NOW, New York, NY; Children's Law Center of California, Sacramento, CA; Carole Landis Foundation For Social Action, Haverford, PA; The Voices and Faces Project, Chicago, IL; NH Traffick Free Coalition, Milford, NH; The Samaritan Women, Baltimore, MD; Free to Thrive, San Diego, CA; Enough Is Enough, Great Falls, VA; The Lynch Foundation for Children, Rancho Santa Fe, CA; Bags of Hope Ministries, Boston, MA; Hope Ranch For Women, Wichita, KS; Wings of Refuge, Iowa Falls, IA; North Star Initiative, Lititz, PA; Zoë Ministries, Greenwood, DE; Abolition Ohio, Dayton, OH; Arrow Child & Family Ministries, Baltimore, MD; Consumer Watchdog, Washington, DC; Airline Ambassadors International, Arlington, VA; Journey Out, Los Angeles, CA; The Ricky Martin Foundation, San Juan, PR; Praesidium Partners, Richmond, VA; Worthwhile Wear, Silverdale, PA; Amirah, Woburn, MA; Saved in America, Oceanside, CA; Awaken, Reno, NV; Ala Kuola, Honolulu, HI; Glory House of Miami, Miami, FL; Generate Hope, San Diego, CA; Refuge for Women Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV.

INDIVIDUAL SIGNATURES

J.S., Child sex trafficking survivor, Chattanooga, TN.

Tom and Nacole S., Parents of a child sex trafficking survivor, Chattanooga, TN.

Kubiiki Pride, Mother of a child sex trafficking survivor, Boston, MA.

Ambassador Swanee Hunt.

Marian Hatcher, Senior Project Manager/Human Trafficking Coordinator, Cook County Sheriff's Office, Chicago, IL.

Penny M. Venetis, Clinical Prof. of Law/Director, International Human Rights Clinic, Rutgers Law School, Newark, NJ.

Michelle Madden Dempsey, Professor of Law, Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law, Villanova, PA.

Donna M. Hughes, Professor, Eleanor M and Oscar M Carlson Endowed Chair, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.

Jody Raphael, Senior Research Fellow, DePaul University College of Law, Chicago, IL.

Audrey Rogers, Professor of Law, Elisabeth Haub School of Law, New York, NY.

Katha Pollitt, Columnist, The Nation, New York, NY.

Sarah Robinson, Public Defender, Defender Association of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA.

Dayle Ann Hunt, Playwright, The Trauma Brain Project, Chicago, IL.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Some corporations, like Facebook, Sheryl Sandberg, and others have stood up and said: Enough is enough; protect our children.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the following statement from Sheryl Sandberg of Facebook.

Sex trafficking—particularly of young girls and boys—is one of the most heinous acts that takes place anywhere in the world. Those of us in the United States must recognize that these deplorable acts of buying and selling children for sex don't just happen in other countries. They happen here all as well—right under our noses, on our streets, and on the Internet. We all have a responsibility to do our part to fight this. That's why we at Facebook support efforts to pass amended legislation in the House that would allow responsible companies to continue fighting sex trafficking while giving victims the chance to seek justice against companies that knowingly facilitate such abhorrent acts.

I care deeply about this issue and I'm so thankful to all the advocates who are fighting tirelessly to make sure we put a stop to trafficking while helping victims get the support they need. Facebook is committed to working with them and with legislators in the House and Senate as the process moves forward to make sure we pass meaningful and strong legislation to stop sex trafficking.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, today, 22 years after Congress passed the CDA, we have the opportunity to declare that the intention of the law was never to protect traffickers and companies that actively sell and enable them to continue this incredible, horrible, life-taking crime of promoting sex trafficking and selling our young people.

I urge a strong "no" vote. Let's make it unanimous. Let's show the world, the courts, the families, the victims where we stand.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), our fearless leader, the chairman of our conference.

□ 1445

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, for her tremendous leadership; the leadership of the gentlewoman from Missouri; and so many more.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017.

There is no question that human sex trafficking is one of the most significant epidemics that we face today. It often takes place in our own backyards, like in my district in eastern Washington. It targets our children, families, friends, and neighbors.

Fortunately, there are so many organizations, and I am grateful for those in eastern Washington who have stepped up—the Coalition to Abolish Human Trafficking—working to stop

these horrific and heartbreaking crimes.

This bill will help fight online human trafficking through websites like Backpage, that serve as an illicit forum for traffickers.

I also rise in support of the amendment by my friend MIMI WALTERS from California, which I believe is crucial to the success of this bill.

By strengthening section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, we can restore victims' access to justice and hold accountable tech companies and online websites that make human trafficking easier and knowingly turn a blind eye.

We know these websites have the ability to sensor content, and we see it in the political world every day. So why can't they work harder to sensor and remove posts related to sex trafficking and enslavement of other human beings?

This isn't hard. It is common sense to hold websites accountable for the crimes committed on their sites.

We all must work together to put an end to human sex trafficking, which is why I urge my colleagues to support the Walters amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the Judiciary Committee, a distinguished Member, who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security and knows about violations of human beings.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, section 230 of the Communications Decency Act has been an important element of the law. It has allowed the internet to flourish. We support that.

But we never intended section 230 to protect people who are trafficking in human beings, who are abusing children, who are prostituting children. Really, modern slavery. It is an outrage.

And when we saw the court cases about Backpage where they basically used the CDA as a shield for action that was absolutely criminal, in my judgment, those guys belong in prison, as far as I am concerned. The good news is that the bill drafted by Representative WAGNER actually fixes this problem.

We just got a letter from the U.S. Department of Justice. I just received it. This is what they say: "Every day, trafficking victims in America appear in online advertisements that are used to sell them for sex. The Department works diligently to hold traffickers accountable for their crimes but faces serious challenges."

It goes on to say that the "high evidentiary standard needed" is a problem; but it also says that that bill, as drafted and reported from the Judiciary Committee, addresses the issues that are preventing prosecution, and it

"would take meaningful steps to end the industry of advertising trafficking victims for commercial sex."

I would just like to say thanks to the authors of the bill, as well as the Judiciary Committee, on which I serve. We worked together on a bipartisan basis to make adjustments. We had hearings so that we could have this bill that the Department of Justice says will allow them to successfully go after these guys who are trafficking these children and other victims.

A word of caution, however, and I will talk about this later when the amendment comes up, on the Walters amendment.

The Justice Department says in this letter that they believe "any revision . . . to define 'participation in a venture' is unnecessary," and, in fact, that the "new language would impact prosecutions by effectively creating additional elements." In fact, they say the amendment will make it harder to prosecute.

We get told in law school that bad cases make bad law. One of the ways to avoid that is to have the committee process work through it. That did not happen in the case of the amendment that will be offered later.

So based on the Justice Department's admonition, I am grateful to their celebration of the underlying bill, and I am mindful of their warning that the amendment could undo all of the good work that we have done on a bipartisan basis.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

This legislation will finally make a meaningful difference in combating online sex trafficking. For too long, bad actor websites have operated with impunity in selling young women and girls forced into the commercial sale of sex. They have, beyond any shadow of a doubt, profited off the misery of others. They have convinced courts to misapply the Communications Decency Act, a Federal law that was originally intended to encourage websites to police content and rid platforms of illegal content. They have misused the Communications Decency Act as a shield to avoid criminal liability in State courts.

Given the number of local websites that are deliberately selling women and children for sex, we must now take steps to allow Federal, State, and local prosecutors to hold these websites accountable and dismantle these illicit, heinous online markets.

H.R. 1865 will ensure vigorous criminal enforcement against bad actor

websites by creating a new Federal law to prosecute these sites and explicitly permitting States the ability to enforce comparable laws.

While the Federal code does not criminalize the knowing advertisement of sex trafficking, this statute is, unfortunately, of limited utility. Nearly all websites responsible for rampant sex trafficking advertisements host ads that rarely, if ever, state that the victim being sold is either underage or subject to force, fraud, or coercion.

Therefore, this bill takes measures to target websites that are deliberately promoting and facilitating prostitution.

Additionally, H.R. 1865 provides for an aggravated violation that applies to websites that promote prostitution in reckless disregard of the fact that sex trafficking is occurring on their platform.

I want to highlight, Mr. Chairman, an amendment that will be offered to this legislation. Though I applaud my colleague's dedication to this issue and fully appreciate the suffering of victims, I have concerns about this amendment which states that the provisions of the bill apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred or is alleged to have occurred before, on, or after such date of enactment.

Had regular order been followed, Mr. Chairman, the Judiciary Committee would certainly have fixed this issue, which I believe could subject this legislation to a constitutional challenge under the ex post facto clause, a concern shared by the Justice Department.

I hope we have an opportunity to fix this problem as we move forward with the bill, and I include in the RECORD a letter from the Department of Justice highlighting these constitutional concerns.

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2018.

Hon. ROBERT W. GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter presents the views of the Department of Justice (Department) on H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017." The Department supports H.R. 1865. We applaud House and Senate legislative efforts to address the use of websites to facilitate sex trafficking and to protect and restore victims who were sold for sex online. The Department appreciates this opportunity to provide technical assistance to ensure that these goals are fully met through narrowly tailored legislation. The Department also notes that a provision in the bill raises a serious constitutional concern.

Every day, trafficking victims in America appear in online advertisements that are used to sell them for sex. The Department works diligently to hold the traffickers accountable for their crimes but faces serious challenges. This is due in part to the high evidentiary standard needed to bring federal criminal charges for advertising sex trafficking, but also because the Communications Decency Act (CDA), codified at 47

U.S.C. § 230, bars our state and local partners from bringing any criminal action that is inconsistent with that section. H.R. 1865 addresses both issues and would take meaningful steps to end the industry of advertising trafficking victims for commercial sex.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Section 3(a) of the bill creates 18 U.S.C. § 2421A, a new federal offense that prohibits the use or operation of websites (and other means or facilities of interstate commerce) with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution. The bill also provides for an aggravated felony if the defendant recklessly disregards that the crime contributed to sex trafficking as prohibited by 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a). Section 2421A would stand as a strong complement to existing federal laws.

However, the Department notes that Section 2421A as originally drafted is broader than necessary because it would extend to situations where there is a minimal federal interest, such as to instances in which an individual person uses a cell phone to manage local commercial sex transactions involving consenting adults. Therefore, the Department would support amending the language of Section 2421A so that Congress can clarify its intent to target traffickers using or operating interactive computer services, as follows (with a corresponding change to 2421A(b)): “Whoever, using a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, owns, manages, or operates an interactive computer service, as defined in Section 230(f) of Title 47, United States Code, or conspires or attempts to do so, with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.”

The Department believes that any revision to 18 U.S.C. § 1591 to define “participation in a venture” is unnecessary. Section 1591 already sets an appropriately high burden of proof, particularly in cases involving advertising. Under current law, prosecutors must prove that the defendant knowingly benefitted from participation in a sex trafficking venture, knew that the advertisement related to commercial sex, and knew that the advertisement involved a minor or the use of force, fraud, or coercion. See *Backpage.com, LLC v. Lynch*, D.D.C., Civil Action No. 15-2155, Docket 16 (Oct. 24, 2016). While well intentioned, this new language would impact prosecutions by effectively creating additional elements that prosecutors must prove at trial. In the context of the bill, which also permits States to bring actions for conduct equivalent to Section 1591, we are also mindful that this language could have unintended consequences as applied by the States.

Section 4 of H.R. 1865 also sets forth critical revisions to the CDA to permit state prosecutors to bring criminal actions related to sex trafficking and the use of the internet with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution. The Department believes that the existence of this exception to the CDA will alter the landscape of the industry involved in advertising prostitution.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONCERN

We note that Section 4 of H.R. 1865 states that the changes to the CDA “shall apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred [sic], or is alleged to have occurred, before, on, or after such date of enactment.” This raises a serious constitutional concern. Insofar as this bill would “impose[] a punishment for an act which was not punishable at the time it was committed” or “impose[] additional punishment to that then prescribed”

it would violate the Constitution’s Ex Post Facto Clause. *Cummings v. Missouri*, 4 Wall. 277, 325–326 (1867); see *Beazell v. Ohio*, 269 U.S. 167, 169–170 (1925); U.S. Const. art I, § 9, cl. 3. The Department objects to this provision because it is unconstitutional. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to address this serious constitutional concern.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views in support of this legislation. We hope this information is helpful, and we look forward to continuing to work with Congress on this important legislation. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may provide additional assistance regarding this or any other matter. The Office of Management and Budget has advised us that from the perspective of the Administration’s program, there is no objection to submission of this letter.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN E. BOYD,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I will support this bill since its strong reforms will allow State and local prosecutors to vigorously enforce the law against some of the worst criminals in society today.

This bill will allow law enforcement to effectively dismantle this lucrative, expansive, immoral, reprehensible market. Our children and vulnerable women are not commodities to be sold. This legislation emphatically affirms that fact. It will truly make a difference.

I would like to commend my colleague Mrs. WAGNER from Missouri and her dedicated staff for their work on this legislation and for their continued dedication to combatting sex trafficking and supporting victims.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one of several we passed in the House that aims to combat the horrific and disgusting act of sex trafficking of minors on our borders.

Today, I want to share two stories of Ashton Talley and Arissa Farmer, both from my district, the First District of Arkansas, who were taken for the purpose of being trafficked, but, thankfully, were rescued before being lost in this abominable trade.

These young women were sought online by men preying on thousands of underage minors. Their stories, sadly, mirror one another and those of countless other minors across America.

Both were courted online by older men and believed they were engaging in harmless friendships. In both instances, these men traveled to my district from other States to take Ashton and Arissa to Washington State and Nebraska, respectively, for their horrific purposes.

It is believed that, for one of the victims, her eventual destination was to be the Super Bowl in Minneapolis, which reportedly draws an increase in trafficking activity for big events like that. In the other case, the victim was one of over 8,000 minors sought online by her predator.

Mr. Chairman, these girls are not unlike our own children. They are kids that we all see in our schools, our churches, and our neighborhoods. We must take the necessary steps like H.R. 1865 to protect America’s children from these repugnant individuals.

This bill will not be the end-all for stamping out this unfortunate segment of society. We must all recognize this despicable act for what it is and work together to protect our youth by enacting responsible policy and becoming educated in the tactics used by predators to groom and lure our children.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I remain committed to fighting the ongoing practice of sex trafficking.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time and offer a closing to this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated, I had offered an amendment that would have allowed victims of sex trafficking to file civil action in State courts under the same conditions set forth in the underlying bill for Federal/civil actions.

I believe, however, that we have laid a stupendous foundation for innocent victims and that we will have an opportunity to work with all of our friends who fought so hard for this legislation.

So again, I want to take the opportunity to thank Congresswoman WAGNER and her cosponsors, and as well Congresswoman MALONEY and Congresswoman BEATTY, and the work that we have done in the Judiciary Committee through a period of coming together, I believe, is extremely constructive.

It is so constructive that we have any number of support letters. I include in the RECORD a statement by John F. Clark, President and CEO of the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children.

STATEMENT BY JOHN F. CLARK, PRESIDENT & CEO, NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN

REGARDING HOUSE ACTION ON LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE JUSTICE TO CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS—FEBRUARY 23, 2018

The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children is pleased that the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider Representative Ann Wagner’s Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act (H.R. 1865) next week. We strongly urge all Members to support the crucial amendment offered by Representative Mimi Walters, which makes long needed updates to the Communications Decency Act (CDA) to ensure that children trafficked for sex online can have their day in court against online

traffickers and to clarify that there is no legal protection for anyone who participates in the sex trafficking of children.

We especially thank Senators Rob Portman and Richard Blumenthal for their powerful leadership in authoring the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act (S. 1693), which is the basis for Representative Walters' amendment, and for their ongoing support of the child survivors, their families, and the coalition of advocacy organizations who serve these survivors.

We look forward to continuing to work with Members of Congress to bring this legislation to a vote on the House Floor and through the Senate so that it can get to the President's desk to be signed into law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from Enough is Enough.

For Immediate Release: February 26, 2018

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH CALLS ON THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO PASS CRITICAL LEGISLATION TO HOLD WEBSITES ACCOUNTABLE FOR KNOWINGLY FACILITATING SEX TRAFFICKING

STATEMENT BY DONNA RICE HUGHES, PRESIDENT & CEO, ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

GREAT FALLS, VA.—H.R. 1865, the Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017 (FOSTA), originally introduced by Representative Ann Wagner, is scheduled for an historic floor vote on Tuesday. The need for legislation to clarify Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act (CDA) is necessary given the 1st Circuit ruling in *Doe v Backpage* which held that even if Backpage had participated in the crime of sex trafficking, Section 230 shielded the company from the claims filed by child victims.

"The urgency to amend Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act is long overdue," said EIE President Donna Rice Hughes. "Section 230, originally known as the Good Samaritan Defense, was intended to protect children from the online exploitation. Unfortunately, it has been anything but a Good Samaritan immunity for responsible Internet service and content providers, and instead has been misused by third party websites like backpage.com as a Trojan horse to knowingly facilitate sex and trafficking with women in children," said Ms. Hughes. "There must be accountability in the form of state and local criminal and civil liability for such sites which have been referred to by prosecutors as an 'online brothel.' Its time to put the dignity of women and children over corporate profit," said Hughes.

For years, EIE has encouraged Congress to amend Section 230 due to a series of devastating rulings in multiple court cases over the years which have misinterpreted Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act by granting anything goes immunity to websites whose advertising business model knowingly facilitates sex trafficking and exploitation.

"By passing FOSTA along with the crucial amendment offered by Representative Mimi Walters which mirrors S. 1693 'Stop Enabling Sex Trafficking Act 2017' (SESTA), each member of the House has the opportunity to send an 'enough is enough' clarion message to sites who exploit and traffic vulnerable children and women and to the federal courts who have failed to properly interpret Congress's original intent for #230. An overwhelming 'yes' vote by the House will say to child victims, 'we hear you, we see you and we are standing with you by providing the necessary legislative remedy to seek justice,'" continued Hughes, who applauded the resolution last week set forth unanimously by the Kentucky House of Representatives, which requested and petitioned the U.S. Congress to amend sections of the Community Decency Act (CDA 230) to "permit the prosecution of interactive computer service providers."

In 2016, during his candidacy, Donald Trump signed EIE's Children's Internet Safety Presidential Pledge in which he promised to "aggressively enforce existing federal laws to prevent the sexual exploitation of children online, including the obscenity, child pornography, sexual predation & sex trafficking laws." Ms. Hughes added, "We strongly urge the House to pass the FOSTA-SESTA compromise package and move it to the Senate, offering hope to and justice for those who have suffered from this unconscionable act of human exploitation." SESTA, originally introduced by Senators Portman and Blumenthal currently has 67 bipartisan Senate co-sponsors and is endorsed by the Internet Association (IA), as is H.R. 1865.

In 2013, Enough Is Enough voiced strong support of the effort of The National Association of Attorneys General (49 Attorneys General) calling on Congress to support a simple two word amendment that would enable state prosecutors to help fight prostitution and child sex trafficking. Unfortunately, Congress failed to act, resulting in more years of untold trauma and exploitation for trafficking victims and huge profits for websites and interactive service providers.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter from World Without Exploitation with many, many signatures.

For Immediate Release

NATIONAL ANTI-TRAFFICKING COALITION URGES CONGRESS TO PASS FOSTA WITH SECTION 230 PROVISION TO CURB ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING—AS INTERNET DEMAND EXPLODES, WORLD WITHOUT EXPLOITATION CALLS ON NATIONAL LAWMAKERS TO SUPPORT SURVIVORS AND STEM THE TIDE OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING BY HOLDING WEBSITES ACCOUNTABLE

NEW YORK, NY—FEBRUARY 26, 2018—World Without Exploitation (WorldWE), the national coalition to end human trafficking and exploitation, today urges members of Congress to pass legislation that would clarify Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act and allow state law enforcement and survivors to seek justice against websites that knowingly engage in facilitating human trafficking. The bill will help disrupt sex trafficking in the United States, much of which has shifted from the streets to the Internet.

The Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017 (FOSTA), H.R. 1865, was introduced by Rep. Ann Wagner (R-MO) and now includes a crucial amendment by Rep. Mimi Walters (R-CA) that seeks to close a legal loophole in Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act that allows websites that host online sex ads to operate with impunity. The Walters amendment echoes language from the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act of 2017 (SESTA), S. 1693 sponsored in the Senate by Rob Portman (R-OH) and Richard Blumenthal (D-CT).

"Every day, thousands of children and adults are being illegally bought and sold online, and the websites that facilitate these transactions have been able to hide behind legislation that was never designed to shelter this kind of activity," said Lauren Hersh,

national director of WorldWE. "WorldWE and our members are incredibly grateful to Reps. Wagner and Walters and Sens. Portman and Blumenthal, among many others, for listening to the voices of survivors and driving meaningful change with so much bipartisan support. The urgency we are seeing to stop human trafficking at the highest levels of our government is truly inspiring."

With the growth of the Internet, human trafficking that once happened mainly on street corners has largely shifted online. According to the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, 73 percent of the 10,000 child sex trafficking reports it receives from the public each year involve ads on the website Backpage.com. The anonymity and ease with which victims can be bought and sold on the Internet has created a multibillion-dollar industry, and a tremendous surge in exploitation across the United States.

"The illegal sex trade is no less odious simply because it is operating on the Web," said Anne K. Ream, founding co-chair of WorldWE. "Wherever it happens, whenever it happens, human trafficking is an industry in which profits are built on human pain. We need public policies that are responsive to the current face of trafficking, which is why passage of FOSTA with the Walters amendment is so critical."

"We urge the House to pass FOSTA with the Walters amendment and send the bill to the Senate for adoption," said Nikki Bell, founder and director of Living in Freedom Together (LIFT), a survivor-led organization. "We are hoping after today, we will be one step closer to bringing justice to survivors and disrupting the profitable model of online trafficking in our country."

To learn more about WorldWE, hear survivor stories, donate, and join our movement to create a world without exploitation, please visit <http://www.worldwithoutexploitation.org/>

ABOUT WORLD WITHOUT EXPLOITATION

World Without Exploitation (WorldWE) is a national coalition of more than 100 organizations and individuals committed to human rights, civil rights, and gender justice. WorldWE's mission is to create a world where no person is bought, sold or exploited. The coalition aims to create a culture where those who have been trafficked or sexually exploited are treated as victims of a crime, not criminals themselves, while those who purchase, sell or exploit another human being are punished.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. What was it like before this legislation? Simply, J.S., who is documented in the film "Jane Doe," will tell you. A bright young lady, 15 years old, ran on the track team here in this area and, for her own enthusiasm, went to Seattle, Washington.

When she went to Seattle, Washington, it would have been nice if a kind soul had found her, but that was not the case.

Within 15 days, she met a man twice her age, who seduced her with gifts and convinced her to stay with him. Once she trusted the 32-year-old, he quickly turned on her and raped her, and he would post explicit pictures of her in an ad on Backpage.com, and she was forced to continue to have sex for money.

□ 1500

One would think that there was relief. But when her family sought to file

in court, she lost. She lost. Only through the work of Congress has her case been able to move forward on an appeal.

So the work that we have done is vital to saving lives and to restoring lives. I am inspired and energized by the countless survivors, many of whom I have seen today and many of whom I have joined with last Monday in my district.

As a leader in the fight against human and sex trafficking and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I am painfully familiar with the pervasiveness of sex trafficking in my own State of Texas, which has become a hotbed of human trafficking in the city of Houston.

Among law enforcement and human trafficking authorities, Houston is known as a hub of human trafficking, not because of the lack of concern and energy in my law enforcement and social service community. It is just an epicenter because of the ability for people to come because of the warm weather, for children who have aged out of foster care, and for others who are victims of human trafficking.

The highest number of calls to the National Human Trafficking Hotline in Texas comes from Houston, and a study conducted by the University of Texas stated that there are more than 300,000 victims of human trafficking in Texas, including almost 79,000 minors.

The story of Kathy, right here in Houston, in the few minutes I have left, I would like to share the story of a young woman named Kathy who moved to Houston in 1994 with her family. Kathy was raised to be strong and independent. She was very involved in a church community and ROTC. So in the few minutes I have remaining, I will share the story of Kathy.

She graduated from high school with hopes of pursuing a career in journalism, but she became a victim of sex trafficking. Like most girls, she wanted to be loved. She met a charming young man who treated her like she had never been treated before.

After a fairytale year, her Prince Charming proposed something Kathy felt she could not refuse: a promising job with his company, an administrative position that would triple her income and provide financial security for her future. It seemed like a dream come true.

The job was in Dallas. Despite her initial hesitation, she saw the offer as an opportunity to provide for her family. But shortly after she arrived in Dallas, Kathy found herself in the dark world of sex trafficking and prostitution, a life she never knew she would be involved in.

Graphic images were taken of her and placed on the internet against her will. She was forced to perform sexual favors multiple times every day throughout Dallas' surrounding areas.

Escape was not easy. She was cut off from her family. Her boyfriend-turned-pimp limited her phone calls to Johns and did not allow her to have money. Somehow she found an opportunity to get away, and she never looked back.

After many years of living in silence, Kathy decided to journal her experience. The journal became a book, which became a stage play. Kathy found her voice and is now an inspirational speaker who hopes to use her story to encourage others to join the fight.

Images of Kathy's horrific past linger on. She said:

Sites like Backpage have chosen to revictimize survivors and keep us in bondage by refusing to remove images taken against our will.

Kathy hopes that one day the voices of survivors will be heard. Well, we hear Kathy today. Congress hears her. We hear the voices of the victims remaining in physical and mental bondage.

So, in conclusion, let me say, as we hear the voices of the survivors, we realize the importance of our First Amendment and the ability of free expression. But we know that the torment that these victims are going through, the PTSD that they are suffering, really is a statement of importance for H.R. 1865 that allows States and victims to fight online sex trafficking and to work with all of those who have worked so hard on this bill, from our Judiciary Committee to the Senate Judiciary Committee to the sponsors, and to go forward building on this legislation with more legislation, more victims being able to work with us, and, finally, Mr. Chairman, to be able to stomp out and extinguish human trafficking, sex trafficking, and online trafficking.

This is a powerful nation. There is no reason why we cannot do this. I look forward to that effort. With that, I ask for a vote of "yes" on this bill.

I want to say that Mrs. MALONEY, who sounded as if she said vote "no," really meant to say she wants a resounding "yes" on this legislation as well.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank my colleague, ANN WAGNER, for all of her hard work on this very, very important piece of legislation.

It is our responsibility here in Congress to provide the strongest, most effective tools possible to confront, punish, and, ultimately, prevent the horrific nightmare that is human sex trafficking. For far too long, we have seen a stark rise in the use of the internet to buy and sell trafficking victims and minors for sex.

This sick industry has been allowed to prosper because, due to broad inter-

pretation of existing law, there have been no serious legal consequences for websites that turn a profit by selling human beings. Today it is incumbent upon us to stop this horrifying injustice by passing H.R. 1865 to finally give prosecutors the tools they need to crack down on sites that promote and participate in the human sex trade.

Mr. Chairman, I call on all my colleagues to support this legislation today and to send a clear message that we will no longer tolerate this evil, atrocious behavior, and we will no longer be complicit in letting these bad actors get away with these hateful crimes against humanity.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD these excerpts from a series of articles entitled "Slaves of the Sex Trade" by Rory Appleton from the Fresno Bee: "Don't kid yourself. Sex slaves are all around us—and you may know some of them" (November 2, 2017), "She was a hospital worker. He sold her for sex before, during and after her shifts" (November 2, 2017), "Police: 'Every 16-year-old girl in Fresno' has been targeted by sex trade recruiters" (November 9, 2017), "Once sold for sex, she now helps lead the fight against human trafficking" (November 15, 2017), "How do you rescue women forced to walk the streets at night? It's not easy" (November 16, 2017), "To break the cycle of children sold for sex, the legal system is trying something new" (November 28, 2017), "All of us must help beat the scourge of human trafficking. Here's what you can do" (December 7, 2017). The full series can be found at <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/>.

These seven articles demonstrate the impact of sex trafficking on our communities. I commend the Fresno Bee on their important reporting.

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 2, 2017]

DON'T KID YOURSELF. SEX SLAVES ARE ALL AROUND US—AND YOU MAY KNOW SOME OF THEM

(By Rory Appleton)

Rebecca Rodriguez-Brown still remembers the room where he imprisoned her—the charming man she met and fell in love with while still a teenager. She mapped it out with her hands as she sat in a central Fresno office nearly 20 years later.

"They would have a little microwave there, and they would have a little ice chest right there by the sink," she said. "I still remember the color of the ice chest."

Rodriguez-Brown isn't sure whether the room was in an apartment or hotel. But she does remember that for seven months she was kept in this room under guard and forced to perform whatever sex act the strangers entering the room asked for. The room was punishment for refusing to do the same at her trafficker's home. Her captors brought her all of her meals. If she defied them, she'd be beaten—sometimes with her hands bound.

The Bee normally does not identify the victims of sexual assault, however Rodriguez-Brown agreed to be named.

Her story is not uncommon in Fresno, or anywhere in the world. It is one of cyclical abuse, habitual arrest and unspeakable trauma. Women and children are bought and sold

every day in Fresno—online, in street corners, while at school. They are raped, branded and beaten. They are taught that they are the problem, not the people who force them into this life—causing psychological scars that may never heal.

It is what many refer to as “modern-day slavery.”

Full article is available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article182090031.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 2, 2017]

SHE WAS A HOSPITAL WORKER. HE SOLD HER FOR SEX BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER HER SHIFTS

(By Rory Appleton)

At her lowest point, the days seemed to stretch on forever. Eight hours a day as a hospital administrator, five hours—sometimes more—as a prostitute.

He would wake her up at 4 a.m. to walk the streets. She hated it—not that the house calls were much better. But when she begged to stop, he would convince her the fault was hers. Eventually, she would apologize and allow him to drop her off before the sun was up.

“He wanted at least \$300 before I went to work at the hospital,” she said.

So she would work the streets for three hours before starting an eight-hour day scheduling appointments in the nephrology unit of a San Diego hospital—a job she had enjoyed before she met him. He eventually forced her to have sex with men during her lunch break, in addition to before and after work. On the weekends, he took her to neighboring cities—a common tactic to avoid law enforcement or reach a new clientele.

“If it were up to him, I would have never slept,” she said.

The mood-altering drug Xanax helped with the anxiety stemming from the intense guilt she felt. She was ashamed to talk to her friends and family—not that she could have if she wanted to. He had her phone now, and he made sure she never heard about her mother’s attempts to contact her.

This woman, now 34, is one of thousands who are sex-trafficked in California each year and one of hundreds of victims now living in the central San Joaquin Valley.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article182089821.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 9, 2017]

POLICE: ‘EVERY 16-YEAR-OLD GIRL IN FRESNO’ HAS BEEN TARGETED BY SEX TRADE RECRUITERS

(By Rory Appleton)

It was about 2 p.m. on a Tuesday when the 15-year-old girl left her central Fresno hotel room. She climbed into a car driven by a stranger, who would take her to another stranger with whom she had agreed to have sex for money.

If it had been a few minutes later, the girl could have easily blended in with children walking home from school. She was not dressed provocatively; she wore a red Fresno State sweatshirt and jeans. She was not wearing excessive makeup. She carried a backpack.

Who knows how many times she had followed this pattern—strange men and strange cars. Online advertisements showed her in various states of undress.

That’s how the vice unit of the Fresno Police Department found her. Today, these strangers were both undercover officers. Tonight, she will be safe.

“She said she hasn’t eaten in five days,” Sgt. Curt Chastain said. “No real family—an unreported runaway. She’s in the sex trade to survive.”

“She wants help,” he continued. “She wants to be in school, but mom won’t sign her up.”

One of Chastain’s undercover detectives confirmed this is not a rare occurrence.

“I’ve had (sex trafficking) victims from every high school in Fresno County—and most junior high schools,” the detective said. The Fresno Bee is not identifying him due to the sensitivity of his work. These traffickers, he added, use a variety of tactics to lure children and young women into “the life.”

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article183592286.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 15, 2017]

ONCE SOLD FOR SEX, SHE NOW HELPS LEAD THE FIGHT AGAINST HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(By Rory Appleton)

Arien Pauls doesn’t look like someone who’s been through hell.

She flashes an easy smile as she speaks. Her voice is soft, but her words are deliberate and flow with eloquence. She has a distinct rockabilly style, with one arm bearing a tattoo modeled from Disney’s “The Little Mermaid” and a hair clip featuring two large pink roses.

Looking at her, it’s hard to imagine that a man she loved forced her into slavery. For four years, Pauls was sold for sex on streets and in hotel rooms across the western half of the United States. She was barred from contacting her friends or family. She was arrested multiple times and treated like a criminal—a stigma that even now, five years later, is difficult to shake.

Her worst moments seem unimaginable.

Pauls’ trafficker—a man she believed to be her boyfriend—refused to take her to a hospital when one of the men he sold her to raped her. When she became pregnant with her trafficker’s baby, he forced her into an illegal, late-term abortion. When her reeling body began to produce breast milk after the abortion, her trafficker saw it as a money-maker: Those with certain fetishes would pay extra now, he told her.

It took a daring late-night escape—her trafficker’s SUV roaring behind her getaway car on a Las Vegas street—to get out of that life. But once she returned to Fresno, her arrest record kept her from working in her chosen career, and she has struggled with the mental scars inflicted during her past life.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article184943988.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 16, 2017]

HOW DO YOU RESCUE WOMEN FORCED TO WALK THE STREETS AT NIGHT? IT’S NOT EASY

(By Rory Appleton)

For decades, the women rescued from the hotel rooms and apartments in Fresno where they had been raped, beaten and forced to have sex with strangers for money had few alternatives.

The first—and it was seldom optional—was jail. They could also go to rehab, provided they had a drug problem. But more often than not, they returned to the sex trade.

That is no longer the case.

In 2012, human trafficking became a crime in California, carrying with it new language for dealing with the crime and harsher pen-

alties for traffickers. Local law enforcement found success against traffickers by treating girls and women in the sex trade as victims, not complicit criminals.

Over the past few years, a growing network of advocates has added new avenues of help for the hundreds of women who are trafficked. These groups have provided victims with shelter, counseling and the tools to rebuild their lives.

Many who work with human trafficking victims consider the practice to be modern-day slavery. If that’s true, this advocacy coalition is the underground railroad.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article184943793.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Nov. 28, 2017]

TO BREAK THE CYCLE OF CHILDREN SOLD FOR SEX, THE LEGAL SYSTEM IS TRYING SOMETHING NEW

(By Rory Appleton)

Defense attorney Kristin Maxwell remembers when a client came to her Fresno office shortly after being discharged from a hospital.

The teenage girl had been beaten, raped and dumped in a neighboring county. Police found her unconscious, lying naked in an alley.

“There are some parts of the body that bruise easily, and some that don’t,” said Maxwell, who’s worked in the Fresno County Public Defender’s office for 11 years. “Looking at her, you knew she had been through it. She had been beaten really badly.”

This case stands out for its brutality, Maxwell said. But it was the sheer number of human trafficking cases crossing her desk when she took control of the Public Defender’s juvenile office in 2015 that shocked her into action.

The legal community has partnered with advocacy groups, law enforcement and the Fresno County Probation Department to improve the criminal justice system in an effort to get children out of the sex trade permanently. Their work will soon bear fruit: On Jan. 19, Fresno County’s juvenile court will establish a courtroom dedicated solely to human trafficking cases.

This new court—patterned after similar courts in Sacramento, Los Angeles and other California counties—will allow a judge with specialized training to work with the various partner agencies to ensure children caught up in the sex trade receive help that’s customized for their needs.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article186937063.html>

[From the Fresno Bee, Dec. 7, 2017]

ALL OF US MUST HELP BEAT THE SCOURGE OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING. HERE’S WHAT YOU CAN DO

(By Rory Appleton)

Pimps have ensnared Fresno middle-school students who were selling their bodies for extra spending money. Young women have been tricked, blackmailed and forced into having sex with strangers to support men they believed were their boyfriends. People—especially children—with low self-esteem, mental illness, unstable home lives or living in poverty are the preferred targets of an industry operating in the shadows.

Human trafficking is a complex issue. Police, advocacy groups and the Fresno legal community have formed a unique partnership to tackle the growing problem in new ways. But what can the rest of Fresno do to fight human trafficking?

Talking to your children or younger family members about the issue can educate them and help keep them out of harm's way. Non-profits that help trafficking victims would welcome financial donations. Residents can urge governments to allocate more resources to those policing and prosecuting traffickers. And far larger strides can be made to address a major underlying issue in the sex trade: the people, mostly men, who buy sex.

Full article available at: <http://www.fresnobee.com/news/special-reports/human-trafficking/article188526804.html>

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DONOVAN). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1865

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230; commonly known as the "Communications Decency Act of 1996") was never intended to provide legal protection to websites that unlawfully promote and facilitate prostitution and contribute to sex trafficking;

(2) websites that promote and facilitate prostitution have been reckless in allowing the sale of sex trafficking victims and have done nothing to prevent the trafficking of children and victims of force, fraud, and coercion; and

(3) clarification of such section is warranted to ensure that such section does not provide such protection to such websites.

SEC. 3. PROMOTION OF PROSTITUTION AND RECKLESS DISREGARD OF SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) PROMOTION OF PROSTITUTION.—Chapter 117 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2421 the following:

"§2421A. Promotion or facilitation of prostitution and reckless disregard of sex trafficking

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Whoever uses or operates a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or attempts to do so with the intent to promote or facilitate the prostitution of another person shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

"(b) AGGRAVATED VIOLATION.—Whoever uses or operates a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to promote or facilitate the prostitution of another person and—

"(1) promotes or facilitates the prostitution of 5 or more persons; or

"(2) acts in reckless disregard of the fact that such conduct contributed to sex trafficking, in violation of 1591(a),

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 25 years, or both.

"(c) CIVIL RECOVERY.—Any person injured by reason of a violation of section 2421A(b) may recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees in an action before any appropriate United States district court. Consistent with section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230), a defendant may be held liable, under this subsection, where promotion or facilitation of prostitution activity includes responsibility for the creation or development of all or part of the information or content provided through any interactive computer service.

"(d) MANDATORY RESTITUTION.—Notwithstanding sections 3663 or 3663A and in addition to any other civil or criminal penalties authorized by law, the court shall order restitution for any offense under this section.

"(e) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—It shall be an affirmative defense to a charge of violating subsection (a) where the defendant proves, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the promotion or facilitation of prostitution is legal in the jurisdiction where the promotion or facilitation was targeted."

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2421 the following:

"2421A. Promotion or facilitation of prostitution and reckless disregard of sex trafficking."

SEC. 4. COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT.

Section 230(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) NO EFFECT ON STATE LAWS CONFORMING TO 18 U.S.C. 1591(A) OR 2421A.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to impair or limit any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law—

"(A) if the conduct underlying the charge constitutes a violation of section 2421A of title 18, United States Code, and promotion or facilitation of prostitution is illegal in the jurisdiction where the defendant's promotion or facilitation of prostitution was targeted; or

"(B) if the conduct underlying the charge constitutes a violation of section 1591(a) of title 18, United States Code."

SEC. 5. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to limit or preempt any civil action or criminal prosecution under Federal law or State law (including State statutory law and State common law) filed before or after the day before the date of enactment of this Act that was not limited or preempted by section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230), as such section was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-583. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-583.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, beginning on line 12, strike "contribute to sex trafficking" and insert "websites that facilitate traffickers in advertising the sale of unlawful sex acts with sex trafficking victims".

Page 6, beginning on line 8, strike "Whoever uses or operates a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or attempts to do so" and insert "Whoever, using a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, owns, manages, or operates an interactive computer service (as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f))), or conspires or attempts to do so,".

Page 6, beginning on line 13, strike "Whoever uses or operates a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce" and insert "Whoever, using a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, owns, manages, or operates an interactive computer service (as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f))), or conspires or attempts to do so,".

Page 7, line 1, strike "Consistent" and all that follows through line 7.

Page 7, line 11, strike "offense under this section." and insert the following: "violation of subsection (b)(2). The scope and nature of such restitution shall be consistent with section 2327(b)."

Page 7, line 13, insert after "subsection (a)" the following: ", or subsection (b)(1)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

This amendment makes small but important changes to the bill.

Most significantly, the bill narrows the class of defendants covered in the new section 2421A, which criminalizes the deliberate promotion or facilitation of prostitution. As the creation of this law is designed to target bad actor websites, this amendment narrows defendants covered to those who own, manage, or operate an interactive computer service with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution. This amendment avoids creating a broad Federal law that covers conduct that is not necessarily Federal in nature.

Second, the manager's amendment strikes language from the underlying bill's civil recovery provision that was intended to encourage victims to successfully plead their cases. However, the language could have created a risk of confusion by the courts, and so it has been removed.

Further, the manager's amendment clarifies that mandatory restitution provision is only applicable to victims of sex trafficking, not to those who voluntarily have engaged in prostitution.

Finally, the manager's amendment adds language inadvertently omitted from the original bill, which permits defendants who face an aggravated charge for promoting or facilitating more than five people to assert the statute's affirmative defense if a defendant can prove that advertisements were targeted to a locality where promotion or facilitation is legal.

Mr. Chairman, this manager's amendment is the product of the Judiciary Committee's repeated and thoughtful effort to produce a workable and technically sound piece of legislation. This bill will do a great deal to protect victims of sex trafficking. I am proud of the hard work by my colleagues and staff to ensure that the criminal law is appropriately tailored to achieve that goal.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Goodlatte amendment, and I thank the chairman along with our ranking member, Mr. NADLER, for their hard work in working together.

I think this amendment is particularly important because it clarifies that the restitution provision applies to victims of sex trafficking and ensures that the affirmative defense applies to both of the criminal offenses created in the underlying bill. These changes are simple and reasonable.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Goodlatte Manager's Amendment, which makes technical changes to H.R. 1865.

The amendment adds "attempt" language that was inadvertently omitted from the bill and is consistent with, and tracks the typical language used in the federal criminal code to define criminal offenses.

The amendment also clarifies that the restitution provision applies to victims of sex trafficking and ensures that the affirmative defense applies to both of the criminal offenses created in the underlying bill.

These changes are simple and reasonable and maintain the overall spirit of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. MIMI WALTERS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-583.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 21, strike "COMMUNICATIONS DE-CENCY ACT" and insert "ENSURING ABILITY TO ENFORCE FEDERAL AND STATE CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LAW RELATING TO SEX TRAFFICKING".

Page 7, line 22, strike "Section 230" and insert "(a) IN GENERAL—Section 230".

Page 8, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 13, and insert the following:

"(5) NO EFFECT ON SEX TRAFFICKING LAW.—Nothing in this section (other than subsection (c)(2)(A)) shall be construed to impair or limit—

"(A) any claim in a civil action brought under section 1595 of title 18, United States Code, if the conduct underlying the claim constitutes a violation of section 1591 of that title;

"(B) any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law if the conduct underlying the charge would constitute a violation of section 1591 of title 18, United States Code; or

"(C) any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law if the conduct underlying the charge would constitute a violation of section 2421A of title 18, United States Code, and promotion or facilitation of prostitution is illegal in the jurisdiction where the defendant's promotion or facilitation of prostitution was targeted."

Page 8, after line 13, insert the following:

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred, or is alleged to have occurred, before, on, or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 5. ENSURING FEDERAL LIABILITY FOR PUBLISHING INFORMATION DESIGNED TO FACILITATE SEX TRAFFICKING OR OTHERWISE FACILITATING SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 1591(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) The term 'participation in a venture' means knowingly assisting, supporting, or facilitating a violation of subsection (a)(1)."

SEC. 6. ACTIONS BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1595 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of that State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by any person who violates section 1591, the attorney general of the State, as *parens patriae*, may bring a civil action against such person on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1595 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "this section" and inserting "subsection (a)"; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "this section" and inserting "subsection (a)".

Page 8, line 14, strike "5" and insert "7".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act.

I also want to thank my colleague, ANN WAGNER, for her dedication to this issue and her efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

The underlying bill will help crack down on online facilitators of human sex trafficking to end this modern-day slavery. My amendment will allow enforcement of criminal and civil sex trafficking laws against websites that knowingly facilitate online sex trafficking activities.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is of significant local concern in the heart of my district in Orange County. Last year, a major international sex trafficking ring was uncovered in a quiet Irvine, California, neighborhood. Young women from overseas were sold repeatedly through the website Backpage.com.

Websites like Backpage, which are essentially storefronts for the facilitation of sex trafficking, have been able to operate with impunity. My amendment, in conjunction with the underlying bill, will help prosecutors crack down on websites that knowingly facilitate or promote sex trafficking, while keeping in place safeguards for those who responsibly publish third-party content. This legislation will empower sex trafficking survivors to come forward and seek justice.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and putting an end to the human sex trafficking industry in America, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, section 230 of the Communications Decency Act stands for a very simple, powerful idea: a website should not be liable for the actions of its users.

Because of section 230, we have the internet as we know it today. Also, because of section 230, the vast majority of websites can safely and effectively report and coordinate with law enforcement on various crimes, including sex trafficking, child pornography, and the like.

Unfortunately, section 230 has been utilized by bad actors, including a notorious one, Backpage, to traffic in children and to exploit victims. Really, they are slavery victims. The underlying bill, H.R. 1865, puts a stop to that. As the Department of Justice has noted, it will allow for the prosecution of people who are trafficking in victims online.

The Walters amendment, however, for the first time, would carve a hole in section 230 and make it actually more difficult than the underlying bill to prosecute traffickers online. By creating potential liability for “knowing” that a user is using their website for facilitating sex trafficking, the Walters amendment would create what legal experts call the moderator’s dilemma.

There is no obligation under law to moderate your website. In fact, if you have 2 million users or 10 million users, you really don’t know what is being posted by your users. But under this amendment, if you made any effort to try and find out what was happening among your users—as many websites do today, especially for child pornography, but also for trafficking—you would incur liability because you would then have a reason to know.

□ 1515

Other laws that deal with intermediary liability, such as a requirement to report child pornography or copyright safe harbors of the DMCA, have very clear and specific provisions on when a website has sufficient knowledge and what express actions it should take. The Walters amendment has none of these. There is no case law on it either.

So the amendment really would put web owners in a very weird place. If you do anything to moderate, you are risking liability. The safe incentive would be to not monitor at all. That would be tragic and it would be a gain for child predators, although I know that that is not the intention. You can’t stop moderating just for trafficking. You either moderate or you don’t moderate.

We do know that there have been tremendous advances for machine-operated filters to find child pornography. Actually, that is one of the easiest things to find, using filters, and it is very important that websites cooperate with law enforcement to catch those bad guys.

Under the Walters amendment, the disincentive would be huge not to do that. I think that is why the Department of Justice does not support the Walters amendment.

As I said earlier—and the chairman put the letter into the RECORD—the Department believes that any revision to define participation in a venture is unnecessary. They say that, while well-intentioned, this new language would impact prosecutions by effectively cre-

ating additional elements that prosecutors would have to prove at trial.

That is why it is a bad idea to adopt this amendment. As the chairman of the committee has said, section 4 of the amendment also violates the *ex post facto* clause of the Constitution by attaching criminal liability to actions that preceded the enactment of the bill. This is clearly unconstitutional.

Although I don’t have any doubt as to the good intentions behind the offering of this amendment, it would actually impair the ability to protect victims. It would make it more difficult to prosecute, as the Department of Justice has pointed out.

It didn’t go through the Judiciary Committee. I think that is a major fault. One of the things we were able to do in the committee—and we did this together, on a bipartisan basis—was to sort through the unintended consequences of seemingly simple language.

Nothing in writing law is simple. Certainly, nobody wants a provision that is going to negatively impact prosecutions; have unintended consequences for State actions, as the Department of Justice has pointed out; and would provide a disincentive for people to moderate activities to try and catch bad guys and to work with law enforcement.

So, although the intentions are good, the amendment is flawed. I hope we vote “no” on it, and then I hope we give a resounding unanimous vote “yes” for the underlying bill.

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

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the time I yielded back.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for bringing up the Walters amendment to H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, called FOSTA.

The Walters amendment reinstates critical pro-victim provisions from my original bill. It also reflects the work that has been done in the Senate on these provisions, which are the meat of S. 1693, the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA.

FOSTA has over 175 House cosponsors and SESTA has over 67 Senate cosponsors. These two bills depend on each other to address the problem of online sex trafficking.

Mr. Chair, we should not allow Big Tech money and special interests to try and overdefine this conversation and override our criminal justice system.

FOSTA amends section 230 to allow for stronger criminal enforcement against websites that profit from human trafficking, and SESTA amends section 230 to allow for stronger civil enforcement against websites that profit from human trafficking.

They are two sides of the same coin and they must pass together. We need both criminal and civil tools to properly combat the highly “lucrative” industry of online sex trafficking.

Moreover, it is imperative that we clarify that section 230 does not impair or limit the ability of trafficking victims to use the Federal private right of action that Congress clearly provided in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act.

Two years ago, the First Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that there is a fundamental tension between these private right of action and section 230. Today, by voting “yes” on the Walters amendment, the House will dispel this tension. No website is immune from civil liability for knowingly facilitating the sale of trafficking victims.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, a 16-year-old was found beaten and stabbed to death after being advertised as a prostitute on Backpage.

I might suggest that we follow one great philosopher in California who asked: Can we all get along?

This amendment is needed in order to give enhanced powers to State attorneys general that they can provide the extra litigation leverage for individuals who are impacted in a devastating manner.

As I said, we have to be concerned about the First Amendment, but we have got to protect our children. Every time I think of this precious young lady, Desiree, and the tears of her mother who testified before the other body in the Senate hearing, I think it is important that we move forward. If we move forward, we can build on this legislation.

I intend to offer additional legislation that we will need so that we can put a stop sign in front of the dastardly behavior of online sex trafficking.

So I ask my colleagues to support the Walters amendment in order to ensure that we can move forward and, as we move forward, make a difference in the lives of these children.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Walters Amendment, which addresses problems states and local law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and advocates have faced in their attempts to hold online sex traffickers responsible for their despicable behavior.

Congress decided more than 150 years ago that no person—no woman, no child, no boy or girl—deserves to be bought, sold, or owned by another person.

And, as I have said many times before, trafficking in human beings has no place in a civilized society.

Our country is facing a crisis that touches urban cities, rural areas, and suburbs, and violates the fundamental American ideal of liberty—which sets this country apart from so many others.

Traffickers hold their victims captive both physically and mentally, employing extreme forms of psychological abuse and coercion to main control over them and prevent them from escaping, while stripping them of their humanity.

This is an ongoing battle with very high stakes. Several years ago, I, along with Chairman MCCAUL, held the first field hearing on human trafficking in Texas before the Committee on Homeland Security. At the time of the hearing, a stash house was raided and 115 people were rescued. I visited that location and saw first-hand, the atrocious conditions in which those people were forced to exist.

Without the hard work of those Texas officers, I cannot fathom the torment that might have befallen those poor souls.

As Ranking Member of the Judiciary Crime Subcommittee, I support the eradication of Human and Sex Trafficking. This vile cruelty must end.

Anyone who aids, assists, facilitates or promotes such behavior must be held accountable.

Just last week, I sat down with a room filled with anti-human trafficking advocates and representatives of anti-human trafficking advocacy groups, including Real Beauty Real Women and Break the Cycle. I heard stories of suffering and stories of frustrations.

Victims and survivors are crying out for a change in the law and they are crying out for justice. They have tried to bring cases against the people, websites, and online service providers, who contributed to their suffering and profited from their victimization—to no avail.

Prosecutors have tried to bring online sex traffickers and the companies who provide them safe harbor—and, unfortunately failed.

It is imperative that we do all that we can to provide for victims of this disgusting crime, protect vulnerable members of society from becoming victims as well, and tell websites like Backpage.com.

Sex trafficking is a callous and brutal crime that unquestionably deserves the nation's upmost attention. It is particularly difficult to see the victimization of the very young who are sold into the sex trafficking market.

The SESTA amendment provides law enforcement, prosecutors, and courts at every level with the tools they need to hold responsible, both civilly and criminally, each and every bad actor who participates in, facilitates, contributes to, or profits from sex trafficking.

Many of the groups that work with victims and survivors of sex trafficking support passage of H.R. 1865 only if Ms. WALTERS's amendment passes as well.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-583.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 6. GAO STUDY.

On the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a report which includes the following:

(1) Information on each civil action brought pursuant to section 2421A(c) of title 18, United States Code, that resulted in an award of damages, including the amount claimed, the nature or description of the losses claimed to support the amount claimed, the losses proven, and the nature or description of the losses proven to support the amount awarded.

(2) Information on each civil action brought pursuant to section 2421A(c) of title 18, United States Code, that did not result in an award of damages, including—

(A) the amount claimed and the nature or description of the losses claimed to support the amount claimed; and

(B) whether the case was dismissed, and if the case was dismissed, information describing the reason for the dismissal.

(3) Information on each order of restitution entered pursuant to section 2421A(d) of title 18, United States Code, including—

(A) whether the defendant was a corporation or an individual;

(B) the amount requested by the Government and the justification for, and calculation of, the amount requested, if restitution was requested; and

(C) the amount ordered by the court and the justification for, and calculation of, the amount ordered.

(4) For each defendant convicted of violating section 2421A(b) of title 18, United States Code, that was not ordered to pay restitution—

(A) whether the defendant was a corporation or an individual;

(B) the amount requested by the Government, if restitution was requested; and

(C) information describing the reason that the court did not order restitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have already raised the picture of

Desiree, who is dead. Her death was driven by being exposed as a so-called prostitute in the sex trafficking of a little girl on Backpage.

Or J.S., who, in fact, was victimized in Seattle. She was raped. She was put on Backpage. Then she was rescued by her family. Since it was before this legislation, it failed in court.

My legislation is very simple: Does this bill work? What more can we do?

I am asking for a study where the GAO would be instructed to assess the damages awarded to victims and restitution amounts imposed against defendants as a result of this bill.

Victims of sex trafficking require a multifaceted response to rebuild their life. That includes housing; counseling; job training; and, in many cases, drug treatment and rehabilitation. We as Members of Congress need to be able to know if it works.

A citizen-led movement called Fight for Us, along with a team of influential citizens called The Houston 20, work to fill in the gaps and strengthen the services for victims and survivors in the city of Houston.

I was very proud to meet with them at the Community of Faith Church, a socially motivated church, led by Bishop James Dixon. Jackie is the lead. They were all committed, Children at Risk and many other organizations, to eliminating some of the gaps for The Houston 20, which will allow them to utilize resources for greater work.

So I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1865 which requests the Government Accountability Office to study the effectiveness of the civil and restitution provisions enacted by H.R. 1865.

In an effort to determine if we are actually providing justice to victims of sex trafficking through this legislation, GAO would be instructed to assess the damages awarded to victims and restitution amounts imposed against defendants as a result of this bill.

Victims of sex trafficking require a multifaceted response to rebuild their lives that includes: housing, counseling, job training, and, in many cases, drug treatment and rehabilitation.

There are well-meaning, dedicated victim advocacy groups all over the country, that offer their help and services that are dependent on state and federal grants, charitable donations, and private funding.

A citizen-led movement called Fight For Us, along with a team of influential citizens called the Houston 20, work to fill in the gaps and strengthen the services for victims and survivors in my city of Houston. I commend these selfless individuals and hope that they continue their important work.

Fortunately though, H.R. 1865 creates a civil cause of action for victims of the aggravated violation, and requires judges to impose mandatory restitution orders in criminal cases involving such victims.

It is my hope that this measure will eliminate some of those gaps for the Houston 20 and

allow them to utilize their resources for even greater work. Through this legislation, victims will be empowered to take control of their own recovery and restoration.

My amendment will collect data on the civil awards and restitution orders, to determine whether victims are actually receiving the relief, assistance, and justice they require and deserve.

My amendment primarily asks GAO to:

(1) report the amounts of the damages awarded and the restitution amounts ordered; but also

(2) report the amounts that are requested by victims and the government, on behalf of victims;

(3) the nature and descriptions of the losses that are claimed and proven; and

(4) the justifications for the amounts that are requested and eventually ordered to be paid.

My amendment further asks GAO to report cases that are dismissed and provide information describing the reason or reasons for the dismissals.

While it is Congress's duty to address the needs of our citizens by enacting sensible legislation, we are also responsible for monitoring the legislation we enact and determining whether we have truly responded to the needs of our citizens.

For this reason, and all reasons previously stated, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I support Ms. JACKSON LEE's amendment requiring a GAO study. It is always helpful to require more information on the efficiency of a new law. This study will provide useful information to determine whether this legislation has proven to be the meaningful tool that we anticipate it will be. I commend Ms. JACKSON LEE for introducing this amendment and for her commitment to combating sex trafficking.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Chair, in recent years, sex trafficking has moved from the streets to the internet. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has witnessed an 846 percent increase in suspected child sex trafficking reports. Eighty-one percent of these reports concern online trafficking facilitated by websites that help traffickers post advertisements of child victims.

I find it hard to imagine that if a neighborhood business hosted a slave auction, the auctioneer would not be considered liable. But that is actually

what is happening with websites like backpage.com and hundreds others.

I have spoken with State and local prosecutors across America who want to hold online advertisers accountable for facilitating traffic and promoting prostitution, but they cannot.

Section 230 has been interpreted so broadly that courts have ruled in favor of backpage.com in criminal and civil cases, despite the website's clear criminal conduct. These rulings defy congressional intent.

Twenty-two years ago, Senator Jim Exon from Nebraska, the sponsor of the Communications Decency Act, stated that "the information superhighway should not become a red-light district."

Section 230 was an amendment to the CDA that intended to motivate websites to screen explicit content in "good faith," and to shield websites from unfair liability for third-party content. However, section 230 was never intended to shield websites from liability for criminal conduct.

Congress did not intend to allow businesses to commit trafficking crimes online that they could never commit offline. It never meant to imply that criminal conduct can hide behind the defense of legitimate publishing or editing.

H.R. 1865 is a long-overdue clarification of section 230 explaining to America's courts that State and local prosecutors are not handcuffed from protecting their communities and that the State laws should be freely enforced against websites that unlawfully promote prostitution and sex.

Mr. Chair, the Jackson Lee amendment will help us track the use of this new crime, and I am delighted to support it. I thank the gentlewoman for offering it.

Mr. Chair, I am horrified that children and adults are sold on the internet like a T-shirt or takeout. I am horrified that human beings are sold with impunity and have no access to justice.

Today, please vote "yes" for justice.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. More importantly, I thank her for her amendment. As the lead Democrat sponsor of this bill, I proudly join her with that amendment.

Like my colleague Congresswoman ROBY said, it is always good when you have a great bill that you can have an amendment that asks for a study to make sure that it is effective.

□ 1530

Lastly, let me just say, I thank the Congresswoman for sharing those stories, whether it is the story of Cathy, whether it is the story of Erika, or in my district, Theresa, it makes me proud to stand with her. And I thank her not only for this amendment but for her work in judiciary because what we know her amendment will do, it will protect the innocent.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, does the gentlewoman have any additional speakers?

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I have no additional speakers.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will close at this time.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewomen from Ohio and from New York. I thank Congresswoman WAGNER. I thank Congresswoman LOFGREN for her concern, as evidenced by her statement, but I want to focus on building blocks, and I want to say to fight for us in the coalition of 20 that I met with.

My promise is that we are in building blocks. We are going to build on what we are doing today, and we are going to continue to mount the assault on sex trafficking and human trafficking, and we are going to literally wipe it out.

We are going to wipe it out because of Shaundra. We are going to wipe it out because of this young, beautiful lady, 16 years old, Desiree. We are going to wipe it out because of Desiree. We are going to wipe it out because of J.S. We are going to wipe it out because Desiree was found beaten, stabbed to death, after being advertised as a prostitute on Backpage. We want her mother to know that we are outraged that children are treated in this way.

My amendment will be the guidepost: Is what we are doing working? It will provide a report on the amounts of damages awarded, the restitution awarded, report the amounts that are requested by victims and the government on their behalf, the nature and description of the losses that are claimed and proven, the justification for the amounts that are requested and eventually ordered to be paid.

My amendment asks GAO to report cases that are dismissed and provide information to describing the reason for those dismissals. We don't want anything to go under the rug. Our children are too important. I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

And in conclusion, I would say to those who I met with, to those groups around the Nation meeting in local communities thinking that they are alone fighting this dastardly act of sex trafficking and human trafficking, and, of course, a moneymaker like Backpage, you are not alone, we are

starting today, we have done work before, and we are not going to stop. I will work with you for the ongoing blocks that are going to continue to stamp out online sex trafficking and human trafficking. With that, I ask for support of the legislation and my amendment.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I support Ms. JACKSON LEE's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PITTINGER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. PITTINGER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

TRID IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5078) to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5078

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "TRID Improvement Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 4(a) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2603(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "itemize all charges" and inserting "itemize all actual charges";

(2) by striking "and all charges imposed upon the seller in connection with the settlement and" and inserting "and the seller in connection with the settlement. Such forms"; and

(3) by inserting after "or both." the following new sentence: "Charges for any title insurance premium disclosed on such forms shall be equal to the amount charged for each individual title insurance policy, subject to any discounts as required by State regulation or the title company rate filings.".

SEC. 3. POSITIVE CREDIT REPORTING PERMITTED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) FULL-FILE CREDIT REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitation in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may furnish to a consumer reporting agency information relating to the performance of a consumer in making payments—

“(A) under a lease agreement with respect to a dwelling, including such a lease in which the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides subsidized payments for occupancy in a dwelling; or

“(B) pursuant to a contract for a utility or telecommunications service.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Information about a consumer's usage of any utility services provided by a utility or telecommunication firm may be furnished to a consumer reporting agency only to the extent that such information relates to payment by the consumer for the services of such utility or telecommunication service or other terms of the provision of the services to the consumer, including any deposit, discount, or conditions for interruption or termination of the services.

“(3) PAYMENT PLAN.—An energy utility firm may not report payment information to a consumer reporting agency with respect to an outstanding balance of a consumer as late if—

“(A) the energy utility firm and the consumer have entered into a payment plan (including a deferred payment agreement, an arrearage management program, or a debt forgiveness program) with respect to such outstanding balance; and

“(B) the consumer is meeting the obligations of the payment plan, as determined by the energy utility firm.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions shall apply:

“(A) ENERGY UTILITY FIRM.—The term ‘energy utility firm’ means an entity that provides gas or electric utility services to the public.

“(B) UTILITY OR TELECOMMUNICATION FIRM.—The term ‘utility or telecommunication firm’ means an entity that provides utility services to the public through pipe, wire, landline, wireless, cable, or other connected facilities, or radio, electronic, or similar transmission (including the extension of such facilities).”.

(b) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Section 623(c) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) subsection (f) of this section, including any regulations issued thereunder; or”.

(c) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the impact of furnishing information pursuant to subsection (f) of section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2) (as added by this Act) on consumers

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of my bill, H.R. 5078, the TRID Improvement Act. This important package will cut through the red tape and level the playing field for making sure that regulations are smarter, fairer, clearer, and more efficient, while, at the same time, ensure that consumers and investors are protected.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when the CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, was first initiated as a part of the Dodd-Frank Act, one of now-Senator ELIZABETH WARREN's goals was simpler regulation, that we would streamline regulation, that we would take bulky complex consumer forms and make them simpler. And the TILA-RESPA, truth-in-lending form and the real estate settlement form, were examples in those early days that they were going to make these forms simpler and easier for consumers.

Well, that is what we are talking about today, Mr. Speaker, for it did not become simpler and easier. It became costly, complex, and difficult for consumers.

Today, we are back on the floor on this issue. It is not a new issue or a new concern because the confusion related to TRID has been apparent for years.

In November 2013, the CFPB finalized TRID, combining, as I said, the truth-in-lending form with the real estate settlement procedures form necessary for consumers in this country to close a home loan to have that American Dream. The effective date for this final rule was originally set for mortgage applications received on or after August 1, 2015, but due to the administrative errors of the CFPB, the agency delayed it until October 3, 2015.

In October, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3192, the Homebuyers

Assistance Act, which I proudly sponsored, and it passed with a bipartisan vote in this House of 303-121. It would have provided a hold-harmless period for those trying to make a good faith effort to comply with this complex rule.

In April 2016, with complaints pouring in from both homeowners, homebuyers, consumers, bankers, title companies, the CFPB decided to reopen the rulemaking on TILA-RESPA and the TRID rule. The CFPB issued a final rule clarifying and amending certain mortgage disclosure provisions.

So as you can hear from this long story, Mr. Speaker, this rule is complex. So we are here today to try to fix a part of it, a small part of it that will make it easier, better, and more clearer for consumers.

The American Bankers Association stated that if there was one thing to fix about the current regulatory system, it would be the TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosure rule, TRID—not qualified mortgage definitions, not the Volcker rule, the TRID rule. Mortgage lenders have seen regulatory change around every aspect of their lending for the last 8 years, and this rule is no exception.

Today, Mr. Speaker, over in the House Small Business Committee, the GAO testified. They have issued a report about the TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosure rule. They told the committee today that this rule was one of the most expensive facing community banking across the country, the most burdensome.

So here, the TILA-RESPA rule before our House Small Business Committee says that we are burdening community banks, and they, in turn, are not able to do the kind of work that we want, that we expect for our homebuyers of homes across this country.

CFPB Associate Director David Silberman said the Bureau agreed with the GAO's recommendation, that it assessed the effectiveness of the TRID guidance and that it intended to ask the public for input on ways to improve regulatory guidance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this report from the GAO, but we have been calling for this for almost 2½ years that we want this rule made simpler and more direct and better for our consumers.

H.R. 5078 fixes the title insurance disclosures so that consumers actually know what their expenses are going to be for title insurance. And despite our best efforts, the CFPB has been unwilling to fix this problem on its own; so today, Congress comes to act.

The other aspect of this bill—and I want to thank my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) for the second portion of this bill, the Credit Access and Inclusion Act of 2017.

The Credit Access and Inclusion Act amends the Fair Credit Reporting Act to allow the reporting of certain positive consumer credit information for consumer reporting agencies. Specifically, a person or the Department of Housing and Urban Development might report information related to a consumer's performance in making payments either under a lease arrangement for a dwelling or pursuant to a contract providing utility or telecommunication services. This kind of positive reporting on a consumer's ability to make their payments on time will help more families in our country build a credit record.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, allow me to just thank the gentleman from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and also Congressman PITTENGER, as well as many other members of the Financial Services Committee on both sides of the aisle. It is always a pleasure to be able to work together on things. This is what our constituents expect, and that is what the Credit Access and Inclusion bill actually represents.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I told you that we could help millions of people get access to an apartment, lower the cost of a loan, lower the deposit they may have to put down on a phone or utility deposit, and we could do all these things without creating a new government program, we could do it without government mandate, and we could do it with virtually no new tax dollars, would you take that deal? Because I would. I would say: Wow, help millions of people be able to afford services that they need before, lower the cost of loans? Yeah, why wouldn't we do that? Well, the truth is that we can if we vote "yes" on the Credit Access and Inclusion bill.

I am proud to tell you that this particular piece of legislation, which is bipartisan, will bring about basic fairness in the credit scoring system. Credit is currency in our society. It unlocks credit for access to goods and services. Hardworking Americans need to build some economic security for themselves and their families.

There are currently about 26 million people, or 1 in 10 Americans, who do not have a credit record; and there is another 19 million Americans who do not have enough information to even score. Low-income individuals and even racial and ethnic minorities are even in worse shape. About one in four Latinos and African Americans either don't have a credit score or don't have enough information in the file to get a score.

□ 1545

And almost half of the residents of low-income communities do not have a score of any background.

This bill allows credit rating agencies to use on-time rent, phone, and utility payments when determining credit scores.

Now, you should know, Mr. Speaker, if people are late with these lines of information, it can, and often does, show up on their credit score now. And if people take out loan products which they pay back on time, that helps those people's credit score now.

But what about the people who pay phone bills and utility bills, and they pay their bills every month on time? They are not building anything to help them get in a better credit situation. This bill allows them to do that.

As a result, more than a third of previously unscorable Americans will now have access to prime credit and the opportunities that come with it when we pass this bill.

This bill isn't just about access to credit, though. It is also about saving hardworking Americans real money, thousands of dollars, on car loans and their mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, if you are unscorable, you can often get a loan, but the interest rate is always higher when that happens. So, if people are scorable and they get a credit score, they will be able to save money for themselves and put it into their household budget.

The money that used to be going to auto lenders and mortgage brokers is now going to go into the pockets of consumers so that they can improve the lives of their family. That sounds like a pretty good day's work to me.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota for his work on this bill and providing the chance to build a credit file for those who really need it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), my friend, who, this week, I know, is having a touching time with his almost five decades of friendship with Reverend Billy Graham—we all salute their work together for the betterment of our world—and who is the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great support for Congressman HILL's bill, the TRID Improvement Act. This bill will lower consumer costs and lessen regulatory burdens for growing businesses, which will lead to healthier and well-functioning financial markets.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman HILL for his great work and leadership on this issue.

I am pleased that this legislation does include the Credit Access and Inclusion Act, H.R. 435, which I cosponsored with Congressman ELLISON, and which we introduced together.

H.R. 435 is designed to give hard-working Americans better access to affordable credit by providing more opportunities for them to build their credit on their own merit without Federal funds or new bureaucracy. At a time when access to credit is a practical necessity for economic and social mobility, tens of millions of Americans are hamstrung because they have little or no credit history.

Currently, on-time utility and rent payments are not reflected in credit scores. The Credit Access and Inclusion Act amends the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act, or FCRA, to allow for non-financial service providers, such as telephone, cable, wireless, electric, and gas companies, as well as landlords, to report their customers' on-time payments to credit reporting agencies, or CRAs.

By incorporating these on-time payments, called alternative or additional data, into credit reports, more Americans can access affordable and responsible financial products and services, buy homes and cars, and build wealth, thus strengthening or entire economy.

In total, our bill would enable nearly 100 million Americans to establish or raise their credit score, all without Federal mandates. Ultimately, this legislation will give every American the ability to build a better life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ELLISON for actively working together on this very important issue, and I thank Congressman HILL for his work on the TRID Improvement Act. Please join me in supporting this common-sense legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I urge a "yes" vote on the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I again thank Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. ELLISON for their work on this measure, and for all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have brought these bills to the floor and, particularly, for speaking out for consumers on bills that will help consumers have more access to credit, whether it is a mortgage and a speedier, easier, more transparent mortgage closing or the chance to build credit, with the work from my friend from Minnesota and my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5078, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 747, I call up the bill (H.R. 4296) to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 747, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-60, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-582, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4296

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

SECTION 1. OPERATIONAL RISK CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not establish an operational risk capital requirement for banking organizations, unless such requirement—

(1) is based primarily on the risks posed by a banking organization's current activities and businesses;

(2) is appropriately sensitive to the risks posed by such current activities and businesses;

(3) is determined under a forward-looking assessment of potential losses that may arise out of a banking organization's current activities, businesses, and exposures, which is not solely based on a banking organization's historical losses; and

(4) permits adjustments based on qualifying operational risk mitigants.

(b) *DEFINITIONS.*—For purposes of this section:

(1) *APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.*—The term "appropriate Federal banking agency"—

(A) has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

(B) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(2) *BANKING ORGANIZATION.*—The term "banking organization" means—

(A) an insured depository institution (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

(B) an insured credit union (as defined under section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act);

(C) a depository institution holding company (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

(D) a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act; and

(E) a U.S. intermediate holding company established by a foreign banking organization pursuant to section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 2. REDUCTION OF SURPLUS FUNDS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is

amended by striking "\$7,500,000,000" and inserting "\$7,468,571,428".

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—Subsection (a) shall take effect on May 1, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, in strong support of H.R. 4296, an important bill authored by Mr. LUETKEMEYER, who is a real leader on our committee. He is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit and has led many bills on this floor. This particular one addresses the burden that unnecessary operational capital requirements have imposed on our financial institutions and then, consequently, on our hardworking families and small businesses that are seeking credit.

The Basel Committee requires U.S. financial institutions to hold excessive capital based upon a look-back approach to an organization's risk, previous earnings, and other provisions that provide no indication of future risk.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is about holding operational capital for past activities.

This methodology employed by the international standard setters has forced our banks to hold hundreds of billions of dollars in reserve rather than putting that money to work in the real economy—in loans and investments—for people to buy cars, to launch small-business enterprises, or maybe to make a downpayment on that first home.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me say it so that all can hear. Hundreds of billions of dollars is currently sitting in banks across the country not being utilized to fund mortgage loans, car loans, and other day-to-day financing that American families and individuals demand.

On top of this is the increased cost of compliance that banks have had to shoulder under Dodd-Frank's onslaught of regulation. Banks like Coatesville Savings Bank, the only remaining bank in Coatesville, Pennsylvania, has

told us that, now, 25 percent of their annual budget is nothing but compliance cost, Mr. Speaker. This is detrimental to the Coatesville, Pennsylvania, community. That is 25 percent. That is a huge figure, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be used to fund the American Dream in Coatesville, Pennsylvania.

So, again, Chairman LUETKEMEYER brings us a very commonsense reform and a very necessary reform.

Most agree and recognize the importance of our financial institutions to hold capital in the event of future crisis or distress. Nobody denies that, and this legislation does not remove those requirements. But, Mr. Speaker, requiring banking organizations to look back in the rearview mirror and hold operational capital against discontinued activities or products is just not nonsensical, it is crazy. It makes no sense.

H.R. 4296 simply amends the method of how reserve capital is calculated by establishing standards based on an organization's current business activities, making the requirements more accurate and tailored to a bank's current risk profile. Again, Mr. Speaker, it is just common sense. That means banks would still retain sufficient reserves to weather an economic storm, but they would be able to put the billions of dollars currently sitting on the sidelines to work to help make the economy grow, to make it healthier.

In short, this method-based approach proposed by H.R. 4296 properly calibrates operational capital while also ensuring strong, healthy financial institutions and, thus, a stronger economy for our constituents.

Again, to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4296, does not prevent Federal financial regulators from instituting operational risk capital requirements. It does not eliminate the authority of a regulator to assess operational risk, nor does it prevent regulators from requiring that capital be held against riskier activities or businesses. The bill simply puts forth a thoughtful framework that sets parameters, while allowing regulators the flexibility needed to ensure that capital standards are appropriately tailored.

A healthy financial system, Mr. Speaker, will enhance individuals' financial freedom and will lead to a healthier and better regulatory system.

H.R. 4296 has garnered strong, bipartisan support in our committee, passing by a vote of 43-17, again, because it is practical and common sense.

I again want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who chairs our Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, for his leadership on this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bipartisan measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4296. This bill is simply another rollback of rules put in place after the financial crisis. It would undermine the stability of our country's largest financial banks by restricting the way regulators set capital requirements for these institutions.

Before I get into why this bill is problematic, let me take a moment to clarify what capital is and what it is not.

Some have said that capital is money that is held on the side or in reserve and cannot be used to lend to borrowers. This couldn't be further from the truth. Capital is not a reserve. Capital refers to the terms of the financing a bank receives.

In the most simplistic example, a bank receives funds from customers making deposits, loans it receives from other institutions, and stock it has issued to investors. The bank uses all of these sources of funding to make mortgages and other loans to customers. However, there are important differences.

Bank debt has terms like regular interest payments that, if it stops paying, the bank fails.

□ 1600

However, a bank can stop paying dividends on a stock without it failing. Banks funded with lots of debt are described as being higher leveraged and risky because only a small drop in the value of their mortgages and other assets can cause them to default.

Funding a bank through higher levels of capital makes the bank stronger, because even if the loans it has made lose value, the bank can avoid default by temporarily halting payments to their investors or lowering the value of the stock.

H.R. 4296 would impact something called operational risk capital, which is the capital used to cover the possibility of losses to the largest banks caused from their operational failures, such as rogue traders, fraudulent sales practices, and cyber breaches.

H.R. 4296 would diminish this type of capital, which only about 10 megabanks are required to maintain under an enhanced framework, by restricting the information that regulators can use to determine the appropriate balance of safe funding, like bank stock versus debt, that megabanks should have to address potential operational losses that may occur.

The bill would direct regulators to primarily consider a megabank's current activities and not their past behavior when setting the capital level, thereby enabling the bank to take on more debt.

According to Americans for Financial Reform, a nonpartisan coalition of

more than 200 civil rights, consumer, labor, business, investor, faith-based, and civic and community groups:

"While current activities are obviously central to operational risk, and are already treated as such, the recent loss experience of banks is the best concrete evidence regulators usually have as to the magnitude of current and future risks. Recent past activities are also vital to understanding the future exposures of the bank, including potential legal exposures."

Thus, this change to how regulators determine the appropriate amount megabanks should maintain for operational risk is imprudent. A megabank's past actions are often the best indicators of future potential risks that it may experience.

Well, memories seem to quickly fade in Congress about the problems that led to the last financial crisis, so let me list some of the examples of past megabanks' operational failures by J.P. Morgan's "London Whale" trades and Wells Fargo's long list of violations that have ripped off millions of consumers, including those harmed by their fraudulent accounts scandal.

Given these examples of past misconduct, the megabanks have collectively paid more than \$160 billion in fines since 2010. It is absurd to suggest that their past behavior shouldn't be taken into account when determining how much capital they should hold.

Even the Basel Committee, which several of President Trump's appointees now serve on, agreed in December, when they finalized Basel III reforms from where the operational risk capital originates, writing:

"Banks which have experienced greater operational risk losses historically are assumed to be more likely to experience operational risk losses in the future."

So it makes no sense to have a forward-looking assessment that deemphasizes a megabank's past failures in setting these capital requirements. It is almost as if this bill is saying: "Don't pay any attention to that. No matter how bad they have been, don't look at their past performance. We don't want you to look at that, because we know if you do, you will make a different decision about capital requirements."

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that the bill's changes would cost the Federal Government \$22 million. This calculation was based on the fact that the capital change would not only affect the bank's probability of failure, but also the magnitude of future losses to our entire financial stability, which, in turn, affects the overall U.S. economy.

This is not a bill to help community banks. It has nothing to do with community banks. Let me repeat that. This is not a bill to help community banks, so what we wish we would not

hear is someone coming up talking about how it is going to hurt community banks. That is often used as an excuse. When we are trying to rein in these megabanks, they always lop in the community banks with it. This has nothing to do with community banks. This is a bill for the 10 largest banks in this country.

So the megabanks on Wall Street are hoping Congress will let them take on riskier debt by directing the regulators to downplay, if not outright ignore, their recent and extensive operational failures.

Mr. Jamie Dimon, the CEO and chairman of JPMorgan Chase, wrote in his 2016 annual letter to shareholders that: "Operational risk capital should be significantly modified, if not eliminated."

Let's think about it like this: most adult consumers in this country have a credit score. Banks use those credit scores to determine whether or not to lend to a consumer and, if so, under what terms.

These credit scores are based on a consumer's what?

A consumer's past payment history, because this information is considered one of the best indicators of a person's likelihood to default on future credit obligations.

Now, we all know that credit scores are problematic, but no one, including me, is proposing to get rid of them, because we can all agree that past payment information is a good indicator of how someone will handle credit in the future, but this bill takes that principle and throws it out the window when it comes to the 10 largest banks in this country.

Keep in mind, these same banks will continue to use a consumer's credit score for underwriting and rating of mortgages and other consumer loans, but the megabanks themselves are asking this Congress not to judge them on their past behavior, as they judge consumers, and to let them have a clean slate moving forward. If that isn't a double standard, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what is.

Mr. Speaker, bank profits reached an all-time record high in 2016. Compensation for Wall Street CEOs has shot back up to levels last seen in 2006, and business lending is up 75 percent since 2010. All this happened while U.S. banks added more than \$700 billion in capital to absorb potential losses. There is a simple reason for this: healthy banks lend.

U.S. banks also lent significantly more than their European counterparts, because our banks boosted their capital levels, while the European banks did not.

So despite Republicans' "Chicken Little" arguments about the dire consequences of the Dodd-Frank Act and related regulatory reforms, the data speaks for itself. Banks are making

more money than ever and lending more than ever, but apparently that is not enough.

So I am here again today appealing for Congress to continue to uphold the commonsense safeguards for consumers, the broader economy, and the megabanks. I reject this Wall Street giveaway.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, and the bill's sponsor.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his great leadership and for helping us with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4296, legislation that would set reasonable parameters for Federal financial regulators when establishing operational risk capital requirements so that banks can best leverage their capital to grow their local economies.

In the wake of the financial crisis, operational risk capital requirements were first agreed to at the Basel Committee. That is a foreign group of folks who get together. We have accepted some of their advice, unfortunately, and then it was implemented in the United States by the FDIC, the OCC, and the Federal Reserve.

Like many concepts fashioned at the Basel Committee, the original intent may have seemed to be a good idea, but the implementation has brought about confusion and unintended consequences.

The committee, realizing it didn't get it right, has revised its recommended operational risk standards on more than one occasion in the last few years. The first was in the fall of 2014, when the committee found that its original standards were under-calibrated. The second came in 2016, when the Basel Committee suggested a requirement that would force banks to look back and hold capital against discounted activities and products. This is not an appropriate way to determine capital requirements.

So what does this mean?

It means that today a bank that exited a particular line of business must still hold the same amount of capital as another bank that is still engaged in that business. It also means that a bank that spends money to improve risk management will be saddled with the same capital standards as a bank that has done nothing to improve its risk management.

My legislation would instill confidence by instituting clear guardrails for operational risk capital requirements. This is particularly important considering that the European regulators have moved the goalposts on

U.S. regulators and financial institutions several times.

H.R. 4296 will also ensure that the imposition of forward-looking capital requirements focus on the bank's current activities and businesses.

Equally important, this bill would incentivize institutions to mitigate operational risk, creating safer banks and a safer financial system.

To be clear, this legislation does not prevent Federal financial regulators from instituting operational risk capital requirements. It does not eliminate the authority of a regulator to assess operational risk, nor does it prevent regulators from requiring that capital be held against riskier activities or businesses.

In other words, it would allow the regulators to continue their business of regulating, but putting some common sense in the regulation and allowing the flexibility to be able to use a forward-looking way of assessing risk rather than being forced to do a look-back-type of risk analysis.

This bill puts forth a thoughtful framework that sets parameters while allowing regulators the flexibility needed to ensure that capital standards are appropriately tailored.

Given my background as both a banker and a regulator, I am often one of the loudest voices in favor of strong capital standards. At the same time, those standards need to make sense, Mr. Speaker. They need to reflect the actual risk posed by the institution to the financial system.

These standards have a tremendous impact on a bank's capital levels, and it is important that the regulators get them right so that they don't hamstring the bank's ability to meet the credit needs of its local economy and community.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting in favor of this commonsense bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the chairman for his support.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, for yielding me time and also for her steadfast leadership in opposing the Financial CHOICE Act and many of the provisions included in the bill, including the one that we are considering on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill flies in the face of the old maxim: Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

This bill would effectively blindfold our regulators when calculating operational risk capital at our largest institutions—it is worth repeating again: not our community banks, but our

largest financial institutions—by precluding them from looking at an institution's historic losses as an indicator of possible future losses.

Now, earlier, the ranking member injected an example of asking about our credit scores. I think it is worth elaborating on this, Mr. Speaker. Imagine if I go to a bank for a mortgage loan and they ask me for my credit score, and I simply told them they couldn't look at my past financial behavior in order to decide whether or not they are going to give me the loan.

So when you talk about good or commonsense regulation, we all know the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker.

Well, this bill would effectively do just that to our regulators. Instead of a credit score, which determines creditworthiness, operational risk determines the risk of loss resulting from inadequate or failed internal processes, people, and systems.

I would tell our regulators, when determining the appropriate level of capital a financial institution needs to hold against operational risk, you cannot look at an institution's past losses, especially if they got out of that business.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is common sense. I think whether you are a banker or a regulator, you clearly understand that we need to make sure that we don't blindfold our regulators.

So I oppose this bill, which would reduce capital in our country's largest financial institutions and blindfold our regulators' ability to safeguard the stability of our economy. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no."

□ 1615

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

As I listen to my colleague from Ohio, she uses the complete wrong analogies. What happens is we don't pay our home insurance premiums on the home we sold; we pay it on the home we own.

If you lived in a swamp and then you moved to a mountaintop in Colorado, you pay different insurance premiums; and if you cease to be a skydiver and you become an accountant, maybe you pay different life insurance premiums. This has to do with your risk profile today, not yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4296, sponsored by my colleague BLAINE LUETKEMEYER. This bipartisan bill makes important corrections in the bank capital requirements for operational risk. Under the legislation, regulators would continue to be able to consider the bank's operational risk, but would do so in a forward-looking manner.

Currently, financial institutions are required to hold risk-based capital,

even for discontinued activities and products. Accounting and the capital markets often use the concept of pro forma financials, which means you consider the ongoing operations, or the way that it would look if it looks like it is today, going forward. This bill would institute that same approach for regulators to use pro forma operational risk, so they wouldn't have to continue to charge a capital charge on operations that have been discontinued.

I think the chairman made a great comment about you don't buy home insurance on a home you have already sold. My colleague, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, during the markup of this bill, talked about how the Basel Committee has revisited this specific capital requirement several times, but it is still a work in progress. This legislation is just a commonsense change to make sure that banks are not charged capital charges against things that they aren't doing anymore.

This approach will free up capital that is needlessly on the sidelines and put it back in reach of America's job creators. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 4296.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY). She has raised a question about the analogies that the chairman made, and those analogies seem to escape ordinary logic.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Maybe I should try to right that wrong analogy that our chairman thought; but maybe if I take his analogy that it is not based on the house I sold but it is based on the house I am living in, well, what is the difference?

If I went to the bank and wanted to put my house up for collateral but I hadn't paid the payment on it in 4 months and it was getting ready to be foreclosed on, I think they would want to know that. And that would be maybe a better analogy on it, because what we are trying to say to the people who are out there watching and listening to this: You cannot let our larger banks put us at risk, what we know also happened in 2008.

So that was the point I was making. So let's say the analogies don't work so we don't have to go back and forth. Let me just say that I am voting "no" on this because I don't want to blindfold or tie the hands of the regulators' being able to do their jobs.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for all of his work moving this important regulatory reform through.

I speak today in support of H.R. 4296, to place requirements on operational

risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency. This bill is one of many that are being reported by the Financial Services Committee with bipartisan support.

I want to commend Congressman LUETKEMEYER and Congressman MEEKS for working together to get a very strong vote from the Financial Services Committee. I hope that is something we can accomplish today on the House floor.

This legislation acknowledges that we can make improvements to the regulatory framework that has been implemented or is still pending in response to the financial crisis. My constituents and I are very pleased to see the economic growth over the last year, but that does not mean we shouldn't take additional steps to ensure that we have an efficient regulatory system. For example, the Fed is likely going to continue tightening rates, and I am not sure Congress will always be able to provide the progrowth fiscal policy that we have seen as of late.

One of our other tools for affecting the performance of the economy is a progrowth but sensible regime that permits for investment, job creation, and financial security. H.R. 4296 will ensure our banking regulators institute operational risk capital standards that make sense for the U.S. financial system.

This legislation ensures that operational risk-based capital requirements are reflective of the banking organization's current activities and businesses. This seems logical, but the current approach is dependent on historical performance and does not provide for adjustments based on changes made by a banking organization.

So, for example, a banking organization might suffer from a cyber attack that results in losses for the organization. In fact, cyber attacks and data breaches are considered to be one of the largest categories of operational risk. In response, this banking organization could choose to overhaul its ability to detect and respond to such operational risk incidents.

Shouldn't our capital framework reflect that work, or should the banking organization continue to suffer from a punitive framework that disincentivizes proactively addressing operational risk?

I, for one, am supportive of policies that will encourage investment by banking organizations to address reputational risk, such as those that might pose a risk for a data breach. I would encourage all of my colleagues to vote in support of this bipartisan legislation. I would encourage our financial sector to proactively address operational risks, and it will also free up capital to permit for economic growth.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for her leadership in opposing this bill and standing for the protection of everyday Americans.

We can't forget that it was only 10 years ago that millions of hardworking families watched their life savings entirely wiped out. They lost their homes. They couldn't afford to send their kids to college. And all of this heartache, this pain, this suffering that they went through was the direct result of risky predatory lending practices and too-big-to-fail banks that did not have sufficient capital in place to support and absorb their financial losses.

It was in the aftermath of this financial disaster in 2008 that Congress passed protections to prevent this from happening again, but here we are today where these big banks now believe that we should simply forget the past mistakes that they made and, instead, only evaluate their current activities to determine certain capital requirements. I guarantee you those families that have suffered have not simply forgotten about what they went through and what they are still struggling to overcome and recover from.

By ignoring critical indicators of past activities, this bill would allow big banks, like Wells Fargo, for example, who defrauded the American people just in the last several months by opening millions of fake accounts, to get away with a slap on the wrist. And the American people are set up to take the fall for their actions.

Now, supporters of this bill claim that current capital requirements stifle lending and hurt our banks and the economy, but the facts say otherwise. In 2016, bank profits reached an all-time high, and today business lending is up 75 percent since 2010. Our country's banks added more than \$700 billion in capital to absorb potential losses and protect Americans and our economy from financial disaster.

Higher capital requirements don't restrict lending. They simply ensure that big banks that are even bigger today than they were in 2008 can absorb their losses without depending on taxpayers for a bailout.

The American people deserve a financial system that works for them and their families, not one that bets against them to boost Wall Street profits. We need to pass legislation that increases these capital requirements of banks with assets greater than \$50 billion and continue to enact and strengthen reforms that will protect our economy and American families from another massive collapse. That is why I am strongly urging our col-

leagues to reject this dangerous bill and, instead, work together towards efforts to build a financial system that serves the American people, not special interests or Wall Street banks.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle, there are over 20 different capital levels that are already applied to our banking organizations, including the Total Loss-Absorbing Capital, the TLAC.

I would also point out, if my friends are so concerned about capital levels, maybe they should have supported the Financial CHOICE Act, which is a tradeoff between greater levels of capital and Washington micromanagement of our financial institutions.

Last but not least, Chairman Powell of the Federal Reserve appeared before our committee just this morning to say safety and soundness considerations allow the Fed to, for all intents and purposes, impose any capital level they want to on our banking institutions, thus undercutting all the arguments we have heard from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, for his active work on this important legislation.

In the aftermath of the financial crisis, the Basel Committee expanded regulations on operational risk requirements imposed on financial institutions. Unfortunately, like many of the implemented regulations, unintended consequences were brought about. The complexity and nature of the current operational risk capital requirements have greatly diminished the availability of credit for consumers, resulting in increased costs and prices for families and small businesses.

To address these concerns, H.R. 4296 limits the burden of operational risk capital requirements to a bank's current activities and businesses and permits adjustments to lessen operational risk. This will ensure that banks are holding increased capital more efficiently and will expand the credit market to better meet the needs of hardworking Americans.

Let me be clear: This bill does not eliminate operational risk capital requirements but, prudently, ensures that requirements are forward-looking and appropriately tailored to a bank's current financial risk profile. As a key provision of the CHOICE Act, which passed the House in June, I want to thank Mr. LUETKEMEYER for his persistence and continual leadership on this important issue.

I urge all of my colleagues to please join us in supporting this common-sense, bipartisan bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In addition to the concerns I have raised about this bill, I also want to mention a change to H.R. 4296 made in the Rules Committee just last night.

Because H.R. 4296 makes the 10 largest banks more likely to fail, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office determined that there was a higher likelihood that taxpayer funds would be used to wind down a megabank. To offset these costs, Republicans have taken funds from the Federal Reserve's surplus account.

So what is the Fed's capital surplus account? Effectively, it is a rainy-day fund intended to ensure adequate capital is available to absorb possible losses. Several stakeholders have raised concerns that, by reducing the Fed's surplus account, Congress could negatively affect the Federal Reserve's independence in monetary policy decisionmaking by rendering it dependent on Treasury for recapitalization in the event that total Reserve bank capital is depleted.

Put simply, this bill not only makes the 10 largest banks more likely to fail, but it also makes it more likely that the Federal Reserve will be unable to address problems in the financial system going forward.

I would like to also mention that, in a letter opposing this bill, the Center for American Progress highlighted, again, several budgetary considerations we should keep in mind as we debate this bill. And, of course, I have either mentioned or alluded to it, but it is important that we understand that the Center for American Progress is very concerned, and the CBO also projects, that H.R. 4296 will increase the deficit due to an increase in expected losses to the Federal Government stemming from an increase in the likelihood of another financial crisis.

□ 1630

The bill would pay for these costs by lowering the Federal Reserve System's surplus funds, once again treating the Fed like a piggy bank and shifting privately generated losses to the public.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a very hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for all of his leadership and for recognizing me to be able to rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation introduced by my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, Congressman BLAINE LUETKEMEYER and Congressman GREGORY MEEKS.

Like so many regulations imposed by the 2010 Dodd-Frank law, the current set of operational risk capital requirements imposed on America's financial institutions place a one-size-fits-all solution on banks, regardless of their capitalization, their various lines of business, and the customers they serve.

The current standard under Dodd-Frank requires banks to look back and hold operational risk capital against discontinued business activities or products. In plain English, this means banks are being forced to hold capital to hedge against a fictitious risk of a loan or a product discontinued years ago.

This is not an effective way to determine capital requirements, nor is it in line with the real risk these standards are meant to protect consumers from.

This is hurting consumers by making credit less available in the marketplace, and this especially hurts the small- and medium-size hometown banks that our communities rely on.

To my constituents on Long Island, and to hardworking American families across our country, the consequences of these misguided regulations are more costly loans and less available mortgages. These are the financial products that help small-business owners expand and hire or help families buy a new home.

H.R. 4296 reforms operational risk requirements so they can be focused on a bank's current activities and line of business. This legislation keeps sound standards in place so that banks must avoid risky behavior while also freeing up needed capital so that it can be lent to consumers, not be needlessly held up in a vault to meet a misguided government mandate.

By ensuring that capital standards are transparent, fair, and based on real-life economic conditions, this bipartisan solution removes a troubling roadblock to capital that would otherwise be allocated to consumers, homeowners, and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again applaud the bipartisan teamwork of my colleagues BLAINE LUETKEMEYER and GREGORY MEEKS. I also want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for all of his leadership on this important issue and so many others, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bipartisan bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, early in my statement, I warned that there would be someone who would come on the floor and claim that it was going to hurt community banks, small town banks; and this bill has nothing to do with community banks or small town banks.

This is about megabanks. This is about SIFIs. This is about the banks that can cause harm in the whole system. This is about those banks that we must be concerned about because of the displacement that they can cause, not

only in this country, but internationally.

Mr. Speaker, I just remind you again this has nothing to do with community banks. This has nothing to do with small town banks. This is just the big banks that are significantly important banks.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), a very thoughtful member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for H.R. 4296 and for the bipartisan work of our committee, the work our chairman has helped lead; and I am encouraged that this bill will establish clear guardrails for operational risk capital requirements and improve U.S. capital framework as a whole.

This legislation is another example of ensuring regulators work in the best interest of the U.S. economy rather than abiding by international standards that hold American businesses back rather than move them forward.

In fact, the very premise of this legislation reminds me of a song. I remember when Bill Clinton was running, he had a song about: "Don't stop thinking about tomorrow. Yesterday is gone; yesterday is gone." It is all about the future.

Well, this piece of legislation that is in place today, established by the Basel Committee in 2006, is thinking about tomorrow, is thinking about yesterday. What happened in the past is constraining what could happen in the future.

So banks are reserving against past losses in an era that holds them from being able to adopt the business plans that maybe even under new leadership, new board members, and a whole new set of governance requirements that will get the company moving forward at a better growth rate. This is better for not just the company, not just the executives or the board members, but the consumers that would be served by this market.

Take, for instance, historic losses being reserved against. That capital is sitting there not actively employed in the market. Even the Basel Committee saw how ridiculous this rule is; so they updated their guidance, in 2016, to include historical loss experience as a relevant indicator instead of as the sole factor.

It is time that we move forward in the best interests of our country and make rules that help American businesses instead of hold them back.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time to speak on this important bill and also for his tremendous and strong leadership on our committee.

H.R. 4296 would set reasonable standards for regulators that are based primarily on the risk posed by a banking organization's current activities and businesses, not on past activities, as you have heard.

Operational risk standards were created and are a product of the European Basel Committee and have been amended twice, actually, since that time. But their adaptation still doesn't hit the mark, and that is why, though the Basel Committee's proposal is well intentioned, this bill and this proposal will amend that to tailor it to the needs and to the effectiveness and efficiency of our banks.

The current framework is based on past activity and will hold operational capital on discontinued products, products that banks don't even have in their portfolios. This bill will correct those errors by allowing our U.S.-based financial regulators to tailor the capital requirements they need based on their unique business model.

H.R. 4296 limits the burden of operational risk capital requirements to a bank's current activities and businesses, gives the bank the ability to determine risk under forward-looking assessment, and would permit adjustment on risk-mitigating factors.

This bill, as you have heard over and over, does not eliminate the Federal Government's ability to assess operational risk or alter the regulators' authority to set capital requirements when doing business on high-risk customers.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER's bipartisan legislation would create a commonsense reform to the Basel standards, and I urge all Members to support it.

I also want to thank Congressman MEEKS, a fellow New Yorker, for co-sponsoring this legislation.

Again, I want to thank Mr. Chairman for his great work on our committee and also Mr. LUETKEMEYER for his hard work, his bipartisan work on this bill, for a person who is a banker, a business person from a rural area of our country who really understands the need to protect consumers.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). The gentlewoman from California has 9½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let's put aside the complex terminology we often use with Financial Services legislation and call this bill what it really is: a short-sighted giveaway to Wall Street megabanks.

Approximately ten banks we are talking about, the very largest banks

in our Nation, have to abide by operational risk standards under an enhanced framework. They are required to maintain this additional capital so when they continue to engage in risky behavior, like opening millions of fake accounts to drive up profits, they will not immediately become insolvent, sparking a financial crisis.

And may I just stop here for a moment and say: it is odd that, given the information that we have discovered about some of our megabanks, particularly Wells Fargo, that was involved not only in creating fake accounts, false accounts in their clients' names, but also selling them basically insurance that they did not need, I am wondering why my friends on the opposite side of the aisle are not more concerned about this operational risk that they take.

For example, when we talk about operational risk, include in that the fines, the fines that we have placed on Wells Fargo and other banks that have been caught committing fraud on its clients. It seems to me that this would be taken into consideration, and I don't think they are going to stop.

We have gone through a crisis. In 2008, we had this meltdown. We had a recession, almost a depression. We had to bail out all of these banks, yet we have Members, particularly on the opposite side of the aisle, who are doing everything that they can to go back to some of the practices that will cause us to be in the same situation we found ourselves in in 2008.

So I would just simply say that this attempt to basically say: don't look at our past, no matter how bad we have been, no matter how many fines have been placed on them, forget about that. We don't like that.

So in saying that, what they are basically saying is they are going to create more risk and they are going to put banks in the position of possibly failing.

So with that, I would just like us not to forget that our current operational risk capital standards didn't come out of nowhere. They are still recovering from the 2007 to 2009 financial crisis, which was largely caused by unsafe practices by large internationally active megabanks and inadequate regulation that ignored past misconduct and risky activities.

The crisis stripped wealth from millions of American families and destroyed the economy. Since we passed the Dodd-Frank Act and the regulators have implemented standards from the international Basel III accord, including our operational risk capital rules, we have made tremendous progress to create a better capitalized and more stable banking system, and this is bearing results.

Megabanks have experienced record-breaking profits for the past several years. Now they expect us to believe

that these commonsense rules that take into account their previous behavior was keeping them from providing more affordable credit to hardworking consumers in search of the American Dream?

As I mentioned earlier, a bank can still make loans to credit-worthy consumers while funding those loans with capital instead of debt.

□ 1645

Operational capital is not cash locked away at night, but, rather, it is the value of a bank's assets minus its liabilities or debts. A well-capitalized bank that has adequate sources of funding can accommodate losses without reducing its lending. In fact, it would be able to lend in good times and in bad.

We should direct the regulators overseeing megabanks like Wells Fargo with its years of numerous consumer abuses and JPMorgan Chase with its London Whale trading scandal not to ignore these past failures and put our constituents at risk.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are rushing through deregulatory measures to help their friends on Wall Street. But Congress must not forget that it was hardworking consumers across the country who paid dearly for Wall Street's faults in the last financial crisis. So I would urge Members to vote "no" on this bill.

I am very pleased that while my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle keep talking about this being a bipartisan bill and they mention Mr. MEEKS' name from New York, et cetera, we have the support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus in opposition to this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this legislation because I think it addresses a fundamental flaw in how we have looked at operational risk capital.

Fundamentally, we want banks to hold capital necessary for the risks they are taking today and the likely risks that they may incur losses into the future. By purely looking backwards, we are driving down the Interstate in the financial system driving by looking in the rearview mirror only. That is a terrible mistake by only looking at past risks instead of the risks they have today.

If we want to encourage institutions to become less risky, then we need to ensure that they can reduce the amount of capital buffer if they are doing less risky activities. This is basically incentivizing the right behavior.

If we continue to say to institutions: You are going to be penalized for the past irrespective of what you may be doing today, irrespective of the less risk you may be taking into the future, then we are essentially providing them no incentive to become less risky.

I think the lesson after 2008 is making sure that we allow the free markets and institutions to act with the right incentives, not the wrong incentives. We want them to become less risky over time by their own decisions and by their own elections.

This doesn't change anything about the basic operational risk capital that they must maintain, except that it says it should match what they are doing today and the activities that they are going to be engaged on in the future.

So I do think this is commonsense legislation. I do think this is a thoughtful response to a genuine problem that I hear about back home in Indiana frequently. So I continue to support H.R. 4296, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, for the perhaps two dozen people who are watching us on C-SPAN at the moment, I think it is important to add a little bit of clarity to what we are debating here.

What we are debating is: What is the proper capital level for a federally insured financial institution?

We know that if that capital level is set too low, then perhaps the financial institution could fail. If it is set too high, then they will not have the capital to help fund the American Dream—car loans, home loans, and small business loans.

So we have heard a lot about a very simple bill that helps clarify one of perhaps two dozen different capital levels that are already applicable to our banking institutions, the total loss-absorbing capacity, the supplementary leverage ratio, the enhanced supplementary leverage ratio, the liquidity coverage ratio, the G-SIB surcharge, and the list goes on and on and on.

We are talking, about, Mr. Speaker, one capital level, the operational capital—operational risk capital. So, number one, there are a multitude of different capital levels and liquidity levels that are already applied to our financial institutions.

What we are saying is, if we are measuring operational risk, we should focus on current risks. Then, if in doubt, Mr. Speaker, I always recommend that Members actually read the bills that are being debated. It is an always helpful exercise. If you

would actually read the bill, you would discover in section 1 of the bill, Mr. LUETKEMEYER's bill says that operational risk capital is based primarily on the risks posed by a banking organizations' current activities and business.

If you look at subparagraph (3) of paragraph (a), it says: "... which is not solely based on a banking organization's historic losses."

So it is not prohibited to look at historic facts, but, primarily, we must be focused on the current operational risk.

As I used earlier in the debate the analogy of who would want their life insurance premiums based on the fact that in an earlier point in their life they were a skydiver or a scuba diver and now today they are facing life as an accountant? Those are different risk profiles.

If you build a home 4 feet below sea level, yet you sell that home, I doubt you want your flood insurance premiums based on the home that you already sold. It makes no sense.

As I also said earlier in this debate, when it comes to proper levels of capital, as Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell stated earlier today before our committee, safety and soundness considerations trump all. The regulators have the power to adjust the capital levels.

Now, this friend on the other side of the aisle talks about, oh, my God, this is a huge risk to the economy. It is \$22 million. Now, that is real money. But, Mr. Speaker, we all know that is not even a rounding error here; \$22 million over the 10-year budget window is approximately a \$2 million risk. And from the Congressional Budget Office report, they say that it is a small, small chance that the FDIC would incur additional costs. So this is not creating more risk to the system.

What we are trying to do is calibrate the appropriate risk. If we are going to measure operational risk as opposed to the other 20-some odd capital levels, then we ought to be focused on current risk, because if we are not, Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans are losing current credit opportunities in order to pay for past operational risk. That is not right, that is not fair, and that is not smart.

We ought to ensure that we have the proper capital level not only to make sure that we have a safe and sound financial system but to make sure that we are capitalizing the American Dream for our constituents.

My constituents in the Fifth District of Texas, who live in places like Mineola and Forney, who are desperately trying to fund their American Dream and put that down payment on a first house, we have got to make sure that they are able to.

So many Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. They need these

credit opportunities, Mr. Speaker. Let's calibrate one capital ratio properly. Let's add a little common sense, and let's not allow the good people in Basel, Switzerland—as good as they may be—de facto impose what is an irrational capital system on our banking system as we are trying to help our small businesses and our families.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 4296, a strong bipartisan bill to help credit opportunities for all families.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 747, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Maxine Waters of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4296 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 1(b)(2), redesignate subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) as clauses (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively, and adjust the margins accordingly.

Page 2, line 16, strike "means—" and insert the following:—"

(A) means—

Page 3, line 7, strike the period and insert "; and";

Page 3, after line 7, insert the following:

(B) does not include a global systemically important bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof, if the global systemically important bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof has engaged in a pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm.

(3) FEDERAL CONSUMER FINANCIAL LAW.—The term "Federal consumer financial law" has the meaning given that term under section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(4) GLOBAL SYSTEMICALLY IMPORTANT BANK HOLDING COMPANY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "globally systemically important bank holding company" means—

(i) a bank holding company that has been identified by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as a globally systemically important bank holding company pursuant to section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(ii) a global systemically important foreign banking organization, as defined under

section 252.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(B) TREATMENT OF EXISTING GSIBS.—A company or organization described under clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A) on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed a global systemically important bank holding company for purposes of this Act.

(5) PATTERN OR PRACTICE OF UNSAFE OR UNSOUND BANKING PRACTICES AND OTHER VIOLATIONS RELATED TO CONSUMER HARM.—The term "pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm" means engaging in all of the following activities, to the extent each activity was discovered or occurred at least once in the 10 years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act:

(A) Having unsafe or unsound practices in the institution's risk management and oversight of the institution's sales practices, as evidenced by—

(i) an institution lacking an enterprise-wide sales practices oversight program that enables the institution to adequately monitor sales practices to prevent and detect unsafe or unsound sales practices and mitigate risks that may result from such unsafe and unsound sales practices; and

(ii) an institution lacking a comprehensive customer complaint monitoring process that—

(I) enables the institution to assess customer complaint activity across the institution;

(II) adequately monitors, manages, and reports on customer complaints; and

(III) analyzes and understands the potential risks posed by the institution's sales practices.

(B) Engaging in unsafe and unsound sales practices, as evidenced by the institution—

(i) opening more than one million unauthorized deposit, credit card, or other accounts;

(ii) performing unauthorized transfers of customer funds; and

(iii) performing unauthorized credit inquiries for purposes of the conduct described in clause (i) or (ii).

(C) Lacking adequate oversight of third-party vendors for purposes of risk-mitigation, to prevent abusive and deceptive practices in the vendor's provision of consumer products or services.

(D) Having deficient policies and procedures for sharing customers' personal identifiable information with third-party vendors for litigation purposes that led to inadvertent disclosure of such information to unintended parties.

(E) Violating Federal consumer financial laws with respect to mortgage loans, including charges of hidden fees and unauthorized or improper disclosures tied to home mortgage loan modifications.

(F) Engaging in unsafe or unsound banking practices related to residential mortgage loan servicing and foreclosure processing.

(G) Violating the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

We have talked at length today about how H.R. 4296 is a bill for Wall Street megabanks, and I deeply disagree with the bill's approach. So I offer this motion to recommit not in a manner that sends the bill to the committee and kills the bill, but, rather, to attempt to improve the bill before the House votes on final passage of the measure.

Let's discuss the elephant in the room. We all know megabanks have been given a free ride in Washington for far too long. During the savings and loan crisis, the government had no problem throwing bankers in jail for breaking the law. Over 1,000 bank executives were prosecuted. But now megabanks just get a fine, a slap on the wrist, for harming consumers.

Since 2010, megabanks have racked up over \$160 billion worth of fines, yet they keep breaking the law. We have talked about Wells Fargo's growing list of illegal actions that have harmed millions of consumers. Sure they have been fined, but these fines are just the cost of doing business. This soft enforcement approach is just increasing their operational risk and losses, which, at the end of the day, will impact not only all of their customers, but the broader economy as well.

I hope Republicans and Democrats can all agree that any megabank that engages in a pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other egregious violations that has resulted in profound consumer harm in the last 10 years is not entitled to any benefit of regulatory relief provided under this bill.

So my amendment excludes a megabank like Wells Fargo that has fraudulently opened millions of accounts without their customers' consent, enrolled consumers in life insurance policies without their consent, and forced nearly 1 million Americans to purchase automobile insurance that they didn't even need.

Since 2016, I have been calling for Wells Fargo to face real penalties. Last year, I introduced H.R. 3937, the Megabank Accountability and Consequences Act, to compel the Federal bank regulators to fully utilize existing authorities to stop these megabanks from repeatedly flouting the law and harming millions of consumers.

So I was glad to see Janet Yellen on her last day at the Federal Reserve take bold action to cap the bank's size until it cleans up its act. I am talking about Wells Fargo. This is what Janet Yellen did on her last day at the Federal Reserve.

But we must do more to send a strong message to all megabanks that

there will be real consequences for their bad actions that mislead, abuse, or deceive its customers.

H.R. 4296, in its current form, would send the opposite message to recidivist megabanks. They should not reap the profit of easier operational capital requirements while their operational breakdowns are only increasing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this motion to recommit so that we do not reward a recidivist megabank like Wells Fargo for repeated operational failures that ripped off millions of consumers.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again, there are roughly two dozen different capital and liquidity levels that are applied to our banks. We are talking about, one, operational capital, and whether or not operational risk capital ought to be based on current risk.

Now, I know my friend on the other side of the aisle always likes to wave the Wells Fargo flag. Wells Fargo needs to be held accountable. There needs to be justice for all who have been wronged. There have been roughly \$142 million now paid in restitution. There have been over \$200 million in fines paid.

□ 1700

The board of Wells Fargo has been replaced. The CEO was fired, and the Federal Reserve capped their growth, all under existing authorities.

But under this motion to recommit, potentially, other financial institutions could be included. It is not the financial institution that counts, at the end of the day. It is capital that could be used to fund car loans. It is capital that could be used to fund homes. It is capital that could be used to fund the next Apple or the next Amazon. Instead, that capital would be put onto the sidelines.

Again, we are talking about operational risk capital only and should it be calibrated for current risk or past risk. That is a completely different issue from ensuring that customers of Wells Fargo, who clearly have been wronged, receive justice and that Wells Fargo has been held accountable.

Again, I would point out this might not have happened if the CFPB under the previous administration had been doing their business. They should have caught this. But they didn't. Instead, it was the LA Times and the Los Angeles city attorney. The CFPB was asleep at the wheel under the previous administration.

So, again, there is existing authority. But if the regulators and then-Director Cordray had been doing their job, this

wouldn't have happened. The evidence was there and it was simply overlooked. We see way too many instances of that, Mr. Chair.

Again, we want to properly calibrate one capital level, operational risk capital. That is what the bill of the gentleman from Missouri does. We should not be confused about the jihad against banks, because banks, ultimately, are still funding the American Dream. You punish our constituents, you punish small businesses every time you needlessly take away capital that can fund their American dreams.

I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit. I urge an "aye" vote on Mr. LUETKEMEYER's bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 228, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—185

Adams	Davis, Danny	Jeffries
Aguilar	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Barragán	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Delaney	Jones
Beatty	DeLauro	Kaptur
Bera	DelBene	Keating
Beyer	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Deutch	Khanna
Blunt Rochester	Dingell	Kihuen
Bonamici	Doggett	Kildee
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Kilmer
F.	F.	Kind
Brady (MD)	Duncan (TN)	Krishnamoorthi
Brown (MD)	Ellison	Kuster (NH)
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Langevin
Bustos	Espallat	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Esty (CT)	Larson (CT)
Capuano	Evans	Lawrence
Carbajal	Foster	Lawson (FL)
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Lee
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Levin
Cartwright	Gabbard	Lewis (GA)
Castor (FL)	Gallago	Lieu, Ted
Castro (TX)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Chu, Judy	Gomez	Loeb sack
Ciçilline	Gonzalez (TX)	Lofgren
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Lowenthal
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lowe
Clay	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham,
Clyburn	Grijalva	M.
Cohen	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Connolly	Hanabusa	Lynch
Cooper	Hastings	Maloney,
Correa	Heck	Carolyn B.
Costa	Higgins (NY)	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Himes	Matsui
Crist	Hoyer	McCollum
Crowley	Huffman	McEachin
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	McGovern
Davis (CA)	Jayapal	McNerney

Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Ruppersberger
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)

Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema

Sires
Slaughter
Soto
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Cleaver
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes

NAYS—228

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen

Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley

McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao

NOT VOTING—17

Black
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Cramer
Cummings
Engel

Huizenga
Long
Payne
Pearce
Smith (WA)
Speier

Torres
Trott
Velázquez
Walz
Wilson (FL)

□ 1728

Messrs. RUTHERFORD, COLE, REED, GROTHMAN, YODER, STIVERS, and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. COHEN, KHANNA, and RICHMOND changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 88.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 169, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (IN)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte

Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.

Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Nadler
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin

Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

NAYS—169

Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Soto

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela

Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Black
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Cramer
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)

Engel
Huizenga
Long
Payne
Pearce
Smith (WA)

Speier
Torres
Trott
Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1737

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 748 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1865.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1739

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARTER of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-583, offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. MIMI WALTERS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-583, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 308, noes 107, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

AYES—308

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Arrington
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch

Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Dunn
Ellison
Española
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gallo
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter

Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Tonko
Turner

Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOES—107

Allen
Amash
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Blum
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Comer
Davidson
Davis, Danny
DelBene
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer
Eshoo
Farenthold
Ferguson
Foster
Fox
Fudge
Gabbard

Gaetz
Garrett
Gohmert
Gomez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Harris
Heck
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (NY)
Hudson
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (LA)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
Lamborn
Lee
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lynch

Massie
McClintock
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Moore
Napolitano
Nolan
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pocan
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rouzer
Rush
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Takano
Titus
Tsongas
Walker
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—15

Black
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Cramer
Cummings

Engel
Huizenga
Long
Payne
Pearce

Smith (WA)
Speier
Torres
Trott
Walz

□ 1746

Ms. GABBARD changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. EVANS, BROWN of Maryland, GRIJALVA, DEFAZIO, ZELDIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 748, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 388, noes 25, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

AYES—388

Abraham	Bonamici	Cartwright
Adams	Bost	Castor (FL)
Aderholt	Boyle, Brendan	Castro (TX)
Aguilar	F.	Chabot
Allen	Brady (PA)	Cheney
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Chu, Judy
Arrington	Brat	Cicilline
Babin	Bridenstine	Clark (MA)
Bacon	Brooks (AL)	Clarke (NY)
Banks (IN)	Brooks (IN)	Clay
Barletta	Brown (MD)	Clyburn
Barr	Brownley (CA)	Coffman
Barragán	Buchanan	Cohen
Barton	Buck	Cole
Bass	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Beatty	Budd	Collins (NY)
Bera	Burgess	Comer
Bergman	Bustos	Comstock
Bilirakis	Butterfield	Conaway
Bishop (GA)	Byrne	Connolly
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Cook
Bishop (UT)	Capuano	Cooper
Blackburn	Carbajal	Correa
Blum	Cárdenas	Costa
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Costello (PA)
Blunt Rochester	Carter (GA)	Courtney

Crawford	Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Veasey	Wasserman	Wittman
Crist	Johnson (GA)	Palazzo	Vela	Schultz	Womack
Crowley	Johnson (LA)	Pallone	Velázquez	Waters, Maxine	Woodall
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Visclosky	Weber (TX)	Yarmuth
Culberson	Johnson, E. B.	Panetta	Wagner	Webster (FL)	Yoder
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Pascarell	Walberg	Welch	Yoho
Curtis	Jordan	Paulsen	Walden	Wenstrup	Young (AK)
Davis (CA)	Joyce (OH)	Pelosi	Walker	Westerman	Young (IA)
Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Perlmutter	Walorski	Wilson (FL)	Zeldin
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Perry	Walters, Mimi	Wilson (SC)	
DeFazio	Keating	Peters			
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Peterson			
Delaney	Kelly (MS)	Pingree	Amash	Griffith	McClintock
DeLauro	Kelly (PA)	Pittenger	Beyer	Huffman	Rohrabacher
DeBene	Kennedy	Pocan	Biggs	Jayapal	Sanford
Demings	Kihuen	Poe (TX)	Davidson	Jones	Scott (VA)
Denham	Kildee	Poliquin	DeSaulnier	Khanna	Takano
Dent	Kilmer	Polis	Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Watson Coleman
DeSantis	Kind	Posey	Eshoo	Lee	Williams
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Price (NC)	Gaetz	Lofgren	
Deutch	King (NY)	Quigley	Gosar	Massie	
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger	Raskin			
Dingell	Knight	Ratcliffe			
Doggett	Krishnamoorthi	Reed			
Donovan	Kuster (NH)	Reichert	Black	Huizenga	Smith (WA)
Doyle, Michael	Kustoff (TN)	Renacci	Carter (TX)	Long	Speier
F.	LaHood	Rice (NY)	Cleaver	Payne	Torres
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Cramer	Pearce	Trott
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Richmond	Cummings	Simpson	Walz
Dunn	Lance	Roby	Engel	Smith (NE)	
Ellison	Langevin	Roe (TN)			
Emmer	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)			
Espallat	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)			
Estes (KS)	Latta	Rokita			
Esty (CT)	Lawrence	Rooney, Francis			
Evans	Lawson (FL)	Rooney, Thomas			
Farenthold	Levin	J.			
Faso	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen			
Ferguson	Lewis (MN)	Rosen			
Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted	Roskam			
Fleischmann	Lipinski	Ross			
Flores	LoBiondo	Rothfus			
Fortenberry	Loebuck	Rouzer			
Foster	Loudermilk	Roybal-Allard			
Fox	Love	Royce (CA)			
Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Ruiz			
Frelinghuysen	Lowe	Ruppersberger			
Fudge	Lucas	Rush			
Gabbard	Luetkemeyer	Russell			
Gallagher	Lujan Grisham,	Rutherford			
Gallego	M.	Ryan (OH)			
Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez			
Garrett	Lynch	Sarbanes			
Gianforte	MacArthur	Scalise			
Gibbs	Maloney,	Schakowsky			
Gohmert	Carolyn B.	Schiff			
Gomez	Maloney, Sean	Schneider			
Gonzalez (TX)	Marchant	Schrader			
Goodlatte	Marino	Schweikert			
Gottlieb	Marshall	Scott, Austin			
Gowdy	Mast	Scott, David			
Granger	Matsui	Sensenbrenner			
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Serrano			
Graves (LA)	McCaul	Sessions			
Graves (MO)	McCollum	Sewell (AL)			
Green, Al	McEachin	Shea-Porter			
Green, Gene	McGovern	Sherman			
Grijalva	McHenry	Shimkus			
Grothman	McKinley	Shuster			
Guthrie	McMorris	Sinema			
Gutiérrez	Rodgers	Sires			
Hanabusa	McNerney	Slaughter			
Handel	McSally	Smith (MO)			
Harper	Meadows	Smith (NJ)			
Harris	Meehan	Smith (TX)			
Hartzler	Meeks	Smucker			
Hastings	Meng	Soto			
Heck	Messer	Stefanik			
Hensarling	Mitchell	Stewart			
Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar	Stivers			
Hice, Jody B.	Mooney (WV)	Suozi			
Higgins (LA)	Moore	Swalwell (CA)			
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Taylor			
Hill	Mullin	Tenney			
Himes	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)			
Holding	Nadler	Thompson (MS)			
Hollingsworth	Napolitano	Thompson (PA)			
Hoyer	Neal	Thornberry			
Hudson	Newhouse	Tipton			
Hultgren	Noem	Titus			
Hunter	Nolan	Tonko			
Hurd	Norcross	Tsongas			
Issa	Norman	Turner			
Jackson Lee	Nunes	Upton			
Jeffries	O'Halleran	Valadao			
Jenkins (KS)	O'Rourke	Vargas			

NOES—25

Amash	Griffith	McClintock
Beyer	Huffman	Rohrabacher
Biggs	Jayapal	Sanford
Davidson	Jones	Scott (VA)
DeSaulnier	Khanna	Takano
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Watson Coleman
Eshoo	Lee	Williams
Gaetz	Lofgren	
Gosar	Massie	

NOT VOTING—17

Black	Huizenga	Smith (WA)
Carter (TX)	Long	Speier
Cleaver	Payne	Torres
Cramer	Pearce	Trott
Cummings	Simpson	Walz
Engel	Smith (NE)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1759

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 91.

FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, sex trafficking is a modern-day slavery that violates the human rights of nearly 21 million victims every year. It is a rampant crime, committed around the world, but what many don't realize is that human trafficking is unfortunately a big problem right here in the United States.

Online trafficking is booming because there are no serious legal consequences for the websites that exploit or profit from the exploitation of innocent and vulnerable young children. Websites like backpage.com are able to evade responsibility for their role in trafficking in this industry as they continue to profit from ads selling girls for sex.

That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, bipartisan legislation that will give Federal, State, and local prosecutors the tools that they need to hold websites accountable for supporting this horrendous industry and help put an end to the online sale of trafficking victims.

PASS THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN OF 2018

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, Sandy Hook, Orlando, Las Vegas, Sutherland Springs, and now Parkland. The common denominator between all these awful tragedies has been the use of assault weapons. Built to kill, these customizable weapons have allowed gunmen to slaughter dozens of innocent people swiftly, easily, and with no special training.

Since the ban on assault weapons lapsed in 2004, far too many of these weapons have ended up in the wrong hands. There is no one solution to reducing the mass shootings and other forms of gun violence in our Nation, but reinstating the ban on assault weapons would be a critical first step. I urge all of my House colleagues to put public safety before the gun lobby and pass the Assault Weapons Ban of 2018 to keep weapons of war off the streets and out of our schools.

I have heard from students across Maine who want to feel safe in their schools. They do not want their classrooms to look and feel like prisons. They do not want to live in fear that someone could enter their school with a firearm that is capable of committing mass murder. We owe it to the generation of students who are growing up against a backdrop of lockdown drills and mass shootings. We need to act like adults and protect them by banning assault weapons.

STOLEN: THE INNOCENCE OF A CHILD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Jane was 9 years old—9—when she was first trafficked in Brownsville, Texas. For 3 years, Maria Losoya trafficked the child. That is her right there. She trafficked Jane from town to town in south Texas. Losoya filled her own pockets by selling Jane at the marketplace of modern-day sex slavery.

Mr. Speaker, filthy criminals steal children like Jane's youth, innocence, and they try to steal their souls. Jane's story finally came to light when she alerted authorities at her school in 2015. Now she is trying to cope with the guilt and shame of her past.

Mr. Speaker, it is not Jane who should be ashamed; it is the dastardly human traffickers like Maria Losoya who should be ashamed. That is why my legislation, the Shame Act, gives Federal judges the ability to publish the names and photographs of convicted buyers and sellers of our children. Buyers and sellers will no longer be able to hide in plain sight under the

cloak of being anonymous. Those who sell and buy the innocence of children should be shamed for all to see.

And that is just the way it is.

MISSILE DEFENSE FUNDING FOR ISRAEL

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am filing a bipartisan bill to ensure our ally Israel has adequate missile defenses.

Threats to Israel come from Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Assad regime in Syria, Hamas in Gaza, and Iran. Each has an arsenal that can target Israel. The U.S. and Israel recently signed an agreement that the U.S. would provide Israel with \$500 million a year in missile defense funding and that Israel can seek additional support when the two nations agree exceptional circumstances exist.

My bill would codify this law. This would affirm Congress' recognition that the \$500 million is a floor, not a ceiling, and signal Congress' intent to provide more funds where conditions on the ground justify it. My bill reflects the view that the term "exceptional circumstances" should be interpreted in a reasonable and not overly restrictive manner. Providing Israel with additional missile defense funding could deter Israel's foes from launching an attack and help prevent conflict. The goal of my bill is to preserve the peace and to ensure that Israel prevails if its enemies choose the path of war.

REMEMBERING REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Roxanne and I will be forever grateful for the positive impact Reverend Billy Graham has had for American families and the world. Reverend Graham had the amazing ability to digest the stories and lessons in the Bible and relay that information in ways that were understandable, relatable, and powerful.

He was followed and adored by millions across the world but still remained humble, with his home in Montreat in the beautiful mountains of western North Carolina, from Grandfather Mountain to Cashiers, where Psalms 72 proclaims the mountain shall bring peace.

Over 200 million people worldwide attended his crusades in over 185 countries. In 1987, our family was grateful to participate in the crusade organized by Harry Dent in Columbia, South Carolina.

Reverend Graham's accomplishments outside of his ministry were inspiring.

In 1983, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom award by President Ronald Reagan; and in 1996, he and his wife, Ruth, together were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian honor. That was also followed by the outpouring of love for Reverend Billy Graham, which will serve as a reminder for his family and staff of how much he was admired and respected.

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

SECURING AMERICA'S ELECTIONS

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security has confirmed that 21 State electoral systems were targeted in the 2016 election, revealing vulnerabilities and jeopardizing the integrity of our elections and our democracy as people lose confidence that their vote matters and that it will actually and accurately be counted.

In 2016, DEF CON, the world's largest hacking conference, revealed startling vulnerabilities in our election's infrastructure. We must take action now to safeguard our electoral infrastructure and ensure that each and every American vote is counted accurately.

I am introducing the Securing America's Elections Act, which will not only provide the American people with a voter-verified, reliable, and independent paper record of their votes that can be implemented before the 2018 elections but will also address the effectiveness and security of our electronic voting software.

We must act now to secure our elections and renew our citizens' faith in the integrity of those elections.

TRIBUTE TO MARIA DELITHA GREEN

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, as Black History Month draws to a close, I wanted to recognize one of my constituents who left her own mark on history.

Just 2 days ago, on February 25, 2018, Beaver County lost one of its treasures. A Mississippi native and alumni of Viterbo University in La Crosse, Wisconsin, Maria Delitha Green, fondly known as Dee, received a registered nursing license from the St. Francis School of Nursing in 1954. In 1955, she moved to Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, where she was hired on at Providence Hospital as the first African-American registered nurse in Beaver County. Eventually, she was promoted to head nurse.

Dee faced many obstacles as an African-American nurse in the 1950s, such as the reality of segregated dormitory housing. However, she did not let those barriers discourage her, believing that people would accept her for who she was.

A trailblazer and diligent worker, Dee loved her job and continued her career as a nurse for 36 years, until she retired in 1990. She was a blessing to those with whom she came in contact and remained a caregiver until her health declined at the end of 2017. We are grateful for her decades of exemplary service and the outstanding model that she was.

May God grant her eternal rest, and may her family be consoled with many blessed memories.

GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the question is: When? In 2017, there were 11,600 deaths linked to gun violence. In 2017, nearly four 911 attacks. There were more than 15,000 killed by gun violence in 2016. There were 383 mass shootings.

The United States ranks number one in the world in terms of firearms per capita. The problem is so epidemic that gun violence is now the third leading cause of death of our children, which includes those dear souls who died in Florida just a couple of weeks ago. We heard those children's voices. We have heard many voices.

So let me explain to the American people: no one is grabbing the Second Amendment. I honor the amendments of this Nation. For your information, in order to change an amendment, you need a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate and three-quarters of the States. The last time we changed an amendment was 1933, where we repealed the prohibition amendment.

This is a cause of the heart and the mind. It is not a Second Amendment debate. It is a debate on sensible gun legislation to save lives.

Ban bump stocks.

Extend the waiting period.

Ensure that multiple munitions are banned and automatic weapons are banned.

When is there going to be, Mr. Speaker, the coming together of a bipartisan effort to save the lives of our children? Enough is enough. We need to answer the call. Our children are dying.

HONORING REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and ministry of Billy Graham. Billy Graham shared a simple message of the good news of salvation through Jesus. He never tired nor wavered from the story of how, as humans, we all have a relationship problem with God because of sin in our lives. But God loves us so much that He doesn't give up on us. In fact, God has offered us an escape from the punishment due for our sin through the free gift of salvation, a gift that we can receive but we cannot earn because Jesus paid the price for our sins when He gave his life on the cross. Jesus overcame death; and through faith in Christ, we can, too.

Billy Graham shared this message out of a deep love for God and his fellow man. Not for fame. Not for fortune.

I thank God for the ministry of Billy Graham and the example he lived. May God comfort his family and a grateful nation as we mourn his loss, and may we never tire of sharing the good news of Christ.

□ 1815

HOPE IN THE WAKE OF SENSELESS TRAGEDY

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about something that gives me hope in the wake of the senseless tragedies and attacks on our communities: the power of students to change the course of history.

Fifty years ago this week, 15,000 students in East Los Angeles rose up in solidarity to demand culturally relevant education, better facilities, and diverse teachers. I rise in honor of those students from Wilson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Belmont High Schools, who started a movement that would be known as the East Los Angeles walk-outs.

I also rise in honor of current student activists everywhere. Student activism has always been a powerful response to social injustice, that when those in power fail to listen or to act in the interests of all people, it is time for a new generation of Americans to speak up, walk out, and organize.

Whether you were in East Los Angeles in 1968 or in Parkland, Florida, in 2018, you will be heard, you will be remembered, and you will become the change that we all seek.

MICHAEL KENNY NAMED 2018 GRAND MARSHAL OF SAVANNAH'S ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Michael Kenny for being named the 2018 grand marshal of the Savannah St. Patrick's Day Parade, the second largest St. Patrick's Day Parade in the United States. It is important for everyone in Savannah, but most specifically, it is important for the Savannah Irish.

Savannah has a historically large Irish community, integral to the fabric of our city, and the St. Patrick's Day Parade is a direct result of this impact. The first public observance of the holiday began in 1824, and now the parade has around 280 bands, families, soldiers, and floats, all marching through the streets of Savannah.

A family affair, the Kenny family owns a successful local roofing company and has worked with the parade for over 40 years. His father, Nicolas Kenny, Jr., was the grand marshal in 1978.

In past years, the committee has chosen between many candidates for grand marshal, but this year, Mr. Kenny was the only person nominated, a testament to the support and respect he maintains throughout Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Mr. Kenny will do a great job with this year's festivities, and I look forward to the celebration.

SNAP PROVIDES FOOD SECURITY

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, Congress has funded the bipartisan Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

For close to 42 million Americans, SNAP provides food security and the freedom to choose what you want to eat, from fresh fruits and vegetables to milk and meat, to sandwich bread and even ice cream sandwiches.

But last week, the Trump administration released a budget proposal that would gut this critical lifeline by a third and completely change what food they get and how they get it.

Instead of being able to go to the store and select fresh food at the supermarket, the corner market, the rural market, or even the farmer's market, half the benefits would now come in a periodic delivery of a cardboard box filled with cheap peanut butter, canned goods, uncooked pasta, dry cereal, and something called shelf-stable milk.

I get that we want to get people who can work to work, but on the central coast of California, 63,000 people rely on over \$127 million worth of SNAP benefits to meet their own family's needs.

Those same benefits provide local businesses with over \$227 million in economic activity. That is why the administration's proposal to change

SNAP won't work for the families and the store owners that I represent, and it will not work for many of the Americans that you represent.

BIPARTISAN SOLUTIONS TO REVISE FISA PROCESS

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America, cash at a political party should never be convertible to a warrant to spy on American citizens.

Because I expect Republicans and Democrats will both be empowered at some point in the future, we should be looking for bipartisan solutions to revise the FISA process so that what happened to President Trump never happens to a future American President.

I went looking for solutions, and I found that, in 2013, the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, wanted to give the President of the United States the power to appoint FISA judges. He argued that then judges would be more ideologically diverse. They would come from different areas in the United States, and they would be subject to Senate confirmation.

Today, I filed that legislation, and I would encourage the gentleman from California to join me as a cosponsor so that we could advance bipartisan legislation to improve the FISA process, because, Mr. Speaker, if it was good enough to give President Obama these powers, it is good enough to give President Trump these powers.

MAKING ENDING GUN VIOLENCE A PRIORITY

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, we don't want to go to school in a prison. That was the message I heard today from five incredible students from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

As they get ready for their school to reopen, what kind of school will we be sending them and all of our children back to? It should not be one of armed teachers. They should be there to teach. What they need are real solutions.

Military-style assault weapons and high-capacity magazines are designed for the sole purpose of killing as many people as possible. They have no place on our streets.

No matter what gun you are buying, nobody should be able to complete a purchase without clearing a background check. That is common sense.

But Republicans are refusing to act because the NRA and gun manufacturers value profits over safety. That is not right.

The students told me today that they want to make ending gun violence a priority for their generation, and that means acting today.

IN RECOGNITION OF ALAN WILLIAMSON OF GREENE, NEW YORK

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alan Williamson from Greene, New York, in New York's 22nd District.

Alan Williamson is a true craftsman who keeps history and tradition alive through his business ventures in Greene. Each of his businesses is inspired by trades that are slowly becoming a lost art in our country.

Alan runs an antique sawmill, a shingle machine, a shoelace business, a rope-making business, and a broom-making business.

Alan recently created a one-of-a-kind broom for President Trump. It is alternating red and white, with stars wrapped up the handle. The "Presidential Broom" is fitted perfectly inside a wooden and glass case that Alan also crafted.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Alan the best of luck and hope that his beautiful, patriotic, and handcrafted broom makes it to the White House.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REGINA FARR ROSS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Regina Farr Ross, lovingly known in her North Side, Fort Worth community as Big Mama.

Ms. Ross was born in Fort Worth, Texas, on the Fourth of July in 1914 in Stick Town, which was a Fort Worth neighborhood. She attended Ninth Ward Elementary School and graduated from historic I.M. Terrell High School in Fort Worth.

She worked as a dishwasher and a general helper for several restaurants, including the famous Pig Stand drive-in, the Farmer's Daughter, and the Cattlemen's Steakhouse in the stockyards, where she spent 39 years and retired at the age of 80.

Ms. Ross was active in the community and volunteered her time to teach young children how to read, and on her birthday, every Independence Day, she had a huge party on Prospect Avenue in the North Side near the stockyards for everybody to come out and celebrate.

Through her membership with the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, she traveled across the East Coast advocating for lower utility rates for senior citizens.

On Wednesday, January 31, Ms. Ross passed away at her home at the age of 103. She is survived by five daughters, two sons, hundreds of grand-, great-, great-great-, and great-great-great-grandchildren.

I know the Fort Worth community will miss seeing Big Mama from her porch, waving to every passerby while she sits in her favorite chair.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of Reverend Billy Graham. He was America's pastor. He was a humble man, and he devoted his life to helping people of all backgrounds discover the true peace and joy found in the life of service to Jesus Christ.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of problems to solve in this country, much of which are too deep for mere legislation. We need prayer more than we need policy solutions. We need repentance more than we need reform.

Mr. Speaker, we need God more than we need government. Billy Graham understood that.

We need more of what Billy Graham talked about for six decades, that simple story that God so loved the world that He gave His only son to die for us, and that if we believed that, we would have eternal life with Him. That is what we need.

Thank God for Billy Graham.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BRIAN FRASER

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Brian Fraser, who attended the Route 91 Festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Brian loved adventures. He enjoyed hunting, deep-sea fishing, snowboarding, and above all, attending the sporting events of his four kids. When he wasn't working as the vice president of sales at Greenpath, he was out flying a plane with his newly earned pilot's license.

Brian was known for being willing to help anyone and everyone. He loved giving back to the community and acted as a mentor for so many. He will be remembered for his love and passion for his children and family.

I would like to extend my condolences to Brian Fraser's family and

friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the entire country grieve with you.

THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, tonight, the U.S. House is joining together to begin honoring a man known worldwide but who embodied the humility of who Christ called the poor in spirit, Reverend Billy Graham.

Tomorrow, Reverend Billy Graham will be just the fourth person in the history of this great country to be laid in honor in the United States Capitol. But tonight, we want to briefly try to describe the life of this man, his ministry, his impact on the Nation and on the world, the impact he has had on all of our lives.

I am so grateful for the outpouring of support from my many colleagues who are wanting to join tonight to remember and to celebrate the amazing life of Billy Graham. I want to get to my colleagues immediately, and then hopefully have a couple minutes to wrap up at the end of this hour.

I want to first yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) to share with us.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for arranging this opportunity for us to remember the life and legacy of Dr. Billy Graham, although I have to say it is not an easy task to find words that sum up his life, not because Billy Graham is not worthy, but because words and a few sentences seem incapable of describing a life that had such a large impact on, literally, the entire world.

I had the great opportunity to meet Dr. Graham just a few feet from here several years ago at one of the many Presidential inaugurations he attended.

□ 1830

While I only had that chance to meet him one time, Billy Graham was one of those people whom you felt like you knew. His honesty and his openness in preaching the gospel made him seem like a close, personal friend.

I have fond memories growing up in my hometown of Haleyville, Alabama, of being at my grandparents' home, and if a Billy Graham Crusade was being televised, you can rest assured that we were watching it around their television, regardless of what was on the other networks.

He was very clear in how he presented the gospel, that whosoever believeth in the son would have eternal life.

He will be greatly missed by a world that desperately needs more people like Billy Graham, but we can take great comfort in knowing that he has now made it home with his Maker.

Author James Allan Francis, in writing about the impact of Jesus Christ on the world, wrote this: "All the armies that ever marched, all the navies that were ever built; all the parliaments that ever sat and all the kings that ever reigned, put together, have not affected the life of man upon this Earth as powerfully as has that one solitary life."

That one solitary life, of course, is of Jesus Christ, who brought salvation to the world through faith in Him and in Him alone.

While no one could ever come close to having an impact on the world like Christ did, I believe the late Billy Graham was one of those great messengers, probably the best that we have seen any time in recent history, and he will long be remembered for the message that he gave about a personal salvation in Jesus Christ.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what an honor it is to likewise stand.

I remember the first live crusade I ever went to where Billy Graham was there in Atlanta in the early 1970s. As a young pastor and as a pastor for almost 20 years, I likewise had the opportunity to meet him. As a young pastor, he signed a Bible for me, which today still remains a treasure.

But what we don't need to forget is the message that he gave us. It is the message of Scripture. It is the message of God. It is a message that talks about all of us and our condition, that we are sinful, that we are separated from God, that we have committed things that separate us eternally unless they are dealt with.

That gospel message from the Scripture that Billy Graham so eloquently shared was that God loves us, and He gave His son to die in our stead.

I noticed the other day we are told that archeologists may have found the signature of the Old Testament prophet Isaiah. When I thought of that, I actually thought of Billy Graham and how he would have taken that Isaiah passage in chapter 53 and made a gospel message from the Old Testament

prophet, where he said in chapter 53 that all of us, like sheep, have gone astray, that every one has gone his own way. Yet God has laid on him the iniquity of us all.

Here we are, and here is our sin. Here comes Christ without sin, and God laid on Him the iniquity of us all.

As much as we remember Billy Graham these days, let us never forget the importance of his message and never forget the message.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and I urge America to hear the gospel message and to respond in faith to the love and the grace of God through Jesus Christ that Billy Graham so powerfully presented to all of us.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HULTGREN for assembling this great group together. We treasure this opportunity to honor Dr. Billy Graham. Each of us has a special memory of Billy Graham.

I can recall having graduated from college, my first job was with Campus Crusade for Christ. I lived in Dallas, Texas, to prepare for a big meeting, a convocation that brought 84,000 young people. I was asked in 1971 if I would like to caddy for Billy Graham. He was playing in the Byron Nelson Golf Classic with Arnold Palmer, Bob Hope, and Byron Nelson. I can assure you we chased golf balls all over the golf course. It was a great occasion.

But what I saw as a young believer in Christ—I had come to Christ in my senior year in college—I saw a man who looked you in the eye. He didn't look at his watch. He cared about people. Billy Graham didn't walk over people to reach the world. He understood the importance of every person before God. I think that is why his ministry and his mission was so outstanding with Presidents, kings, or cab drivers, whoever it might be, the millions of people who came to Christ because of him.

On this meeting that we planned in Dallas, 250,000 people came to downtown Dallas. They heard Billy Graham and Johnny Cash. It was a great assembly. But through my years, the next decade, working for Dr. Bright with Campus Crusade, I had the occasion to be around Dr. Graham on many occasions.

On one such occasion, I picked him up at the airport in 1975 here in Washington and was taking him back to the hotel. He said to Dr. Bright: the next challenge we have in the world today is terrorism. He said that this group who doesn't honor God and they don't honor Christ are going to be the force we deal with.

How remarkable that it was Billy Graham who helped heal our Nation after 9/11 as he spoke to that National Cathedral to bring the message of hope in God.

Yes, I went with Billy to his crusades in Cleveland, Dallas, and Charlotte. In fact, the first time he ever brought together young people, he had a Friday night big crusade for young people. They came out by the tens of thousands. Michael W. Smith played, Jars of Clay, and D.C. Talk.

Billy could reach anybody because he was real and he was personable. They understood him. His message was clear—so simple—that God loves us, He has a plan for our life, and Jesus Christ is the means to that plan. He died on the cross for our sin, that we could receive Christ, know Him, and know eternal life.

He gave that message all over the world. I have met people in Romania, Czech Republic, and the former Soviet Union—now Russia—all over the world who met Christ because Billy Graham came, and he took the gospel to them.

Probably in my funniest moment to have a conversation with him was with Franklin, his son. Now, Franklin will charge hell with a water gun. Franklin will go anywhere. He was headed to Moscow. I was with him on a little plane, it was a twin engine Mitsubishi. We stopped in Burlington, Vermont, and then we stopped over in Nova Scotia to stay overnight at a little \$6 motel. The phone rang while we were checking in. The man said: Yes, he is here, and he gave the phone across the counter to Franklin.

Franklin said: Hello? Yes, Daddy. Yes, sir, I am headed to Moscow. Yes, sir. I have got another pilot. Yes, sir. ROBERT PITTENGER. He is going with me.

At that point, his father, said: ROBERT PITTENGER? I thought he had more sense than that.

That was Billy. He knew his son, and he loved his son. But Franklin will take his gospel just like his father, just like every single person in that family.

Probably the greatest legacy to Billy Graham is the testimony in all of our lives through his own children who followed him into the ministry.

So I commend our Nation for honoring him in the way that we are. He will lay and he will be a part of this great assembly, this great Capitol, forever as a statue. I thank Mr. HULTGREN for bringing us together, and I thank the Lord for sending His messenger, Billy Graham.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the incredible life of a great man. The Reverend Billy Graham spent his life serving God and proclaiming the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Many who heard him share the Good Word considered him to be America's pastor. But throughout his life, he was always a humble and faithful servant.

Decades ago, I had the opportunity to attend a Billy Graham Crusade at

Notre Dame with my family. I will never forget seeing so many people having the opportunity to hear the message that God loves you—a very simple message. No matter who you are, no matter your background, Billy would declare: God loves you.

Billy Graham brought this message of compassion, hope, and the power of God's grace to millions of people from all walks of life. He also brought it to the leaders of the free world as a friend and counselor to the Presidents of both parties.

Tomorrow he will lie in honor in the Capitol rotunda. It is fitting to honor him as we honor our Nation's leaders, not just because they changed history, but because he changed our hearts.

His greatest legacy is the people he helped to be closer to the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, Billy Graham is home now. We give thanks to God that He raised up such a humble man with a servant's heart, and we pray that his powerful message will live on.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is an incredible honor to stand today in honor of the legacy of the Reverend Billy Graham.

The population of the United States when Reverend Graham was born was 103 million. Over the course of his life, Reverend Graham spoke to more than twice as many people who existed in the country the day he was born in person about the greatest gift that one can ever be given, and that is the gift of eternal life and salvation by a Creator so benevolent as to look the other way on the undeniable sins of each of us.

So as I look to try to leave an impact on the world, I understand that people far greater than me have left far greater an impact than I could ever leave. I want to use Reverend Graham's words in closing to honor Reverend Graham not for who he was, but for his commitment to his Savior Jesus Christ.

Reverend Graham said: When wealth is lost, nothing is lost. When health is lost, something is lost. And when character is lost, all is lost.

Reverend Graham said: The greatest legacy one can pass on to one's children and grandchildren is not money or material things accumulated in one's life, but a legacy of character and faith.

I think most appropriately, in closing, he said: I look forward to death with great anticipation to meeting God face to face.

Finally, he said: I haven't written my own epitaph. I am not sure I should. Whatever it is, I hope it will be simple and it will point people not to me, but to the God that I served.

I thank Billy Graham, and I pray God would send us more. Amen.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN).

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, many decades ago, a missionary named John Williams made the long and difficult journey in the 1800s to bring Christianity to the people of the Pacific islands, including American Samoa.

He and the others in his footsteps in those early years probably surpassed their fondest hopes. Today, faith and church provide a strong foundation to a very large percentage of our population. I think he and Billy Graham would have understood each other very well, though their ministries are separated by more than a century.

Billy Graham's influence went around the world rapidly and powerfully, and seemed divinely timed to coincide with the rise of the communications and travel of the 20th century.

As he lies in honor this week at the U.S. Capitol, it is a new opportunity for a younger generation to learn more of his exceptional life and hear his message once more—that God loves each of us, and when times seem troubled around us, there is someone greater to depend on.

As Scripture says: "How shall they hear without a preacher?"

Billy Graham answered that call.

He described himself simply: a preacher of the gospel of Jesus Christ. That life's purpose defined him, and what a life it was.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Billy Graham.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for putting this on. Let me say that as many of the people who have spoken here tonight have talked about how Billy Graham spread the gospel of Jesus Christ, at a young age, Billy Graham, if you read his history, took a walk through the woods and devoted his life to Christ.

He understood what was written in Matthew 22 when Christ was asked, Which is the greatest commandment? He said that the greatest commandment is to love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. The second is like unto it, to love your neighbor as yourself.

He understood those commandments. But most of all, he understood the commission that was given at the end of Matthew: Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

Billy Graham understood this. He understood it, and he was also very, very humble. I want to take, if I can, just a moment to go over something that was written by the author Max Lucado about a meeting that Michael W. Smith and his pastor had. I will just read it:

"A few hours before the event," where Michael W. Smith and Max

Lucado were going to go on stage together, "Michael and I met to go over the weekend's schedule. But Michael was so moved by what he had just experienced, he could hardly discuss the retreat. He had just met with Billy Graham for the purpose of planning Reverend Graham's funeral. The famous evangelist was, at the time, 94 years old. He was confined to a wheelchair, on oxygen. His mind was sharp and spirits were high. But his body was seeing its final days. So he called Michael. And he called for his pastor. He wanted to discuss his funeral. He told them that he had a request."

They both said: Of course, anything. What is it?

He said: It is to do with the funeral. They said: Yes?

He said: Would you not mention my name?

They said: What?

He said: Could you not mention my name? Just mention the name of Jesus.

Mr. Speaker, you see, Billy Graham has preached to over 1 billion people. He has filled stadiums on every continent.

□ 1845

He has advised every President of the last half century. He has consistently been the top of every "most admired" list, yet he wants to be anonymous at his funeral and only call on Jesus' name.

1 Peter 55 said:

God resists the crowd, but gives grace to the humble.

For a man like this to hold and be humbled when the world knew him.

John 15:8 says:

By this my Father is glorified, that you bear much fruit and so prove to be my disciples.

There is no question whose disciple Billy Graham was.

On February 21, I don't doubt that he heard these words: "Well done, my good and faithful servant."

We just pray that God sends us more like him.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that I get to speak on behalf of someone who has changed the lives of millions of people across the globe, but today, I do.

Billy Graham, who passed away last week, was known as America's pastor, and rightly so.

When I was spending time this week in the district, someone who is a baseball fan came up to me and said: Do you know who's got the most saves in Yankee Stadium?

I said: "Sorry, I don't know my baseball history that well."

He said: It was Billy Graham, in 1957.

I had to laugh to think that it was truly God who did the saving.

But let's think for a minute about Billy Graham. He was born in 1918 on a

dairy farm in Charlotte, North Carolina, just south of my district. His crusades in the 1950s attracted thousands of people and shaped the beliefs of a generation by introducing many to the evangelical faith.

In July of 1957, Graham invited Martin Luther, King, Jr., to preach in front of his audience at Madison Square Garden on the issue of racial justice. This was just months after the Montgomery Bus Boycott.

Graham was a White pastor from North Carolina, and King was an African American pastor from Alabama. But both of them knew that the Lord doesn't see skin color and that the love of Christ could heal any racial division. Mr. Speaker, in today's polarized political culture, we could learn a thing or two from their friendship.

Throughout his life, he met with 12 Presidents, dating back to Harry Truman. President Eisenhower called Graham "one of the best ambassadors our country has," and John F. Kennedy brought Graham in before his inauguration to express his worry over the moral and spiritual condition of the Nation.

Aside from his role in the civil rights movement and vocal opposition to communism, he uplifted the souls of millions of Americans. By introducing them to the love of Christ, Graham gave hope to the hopeless and love to those who were in need.

Mr. Speaker, while our economy now is growing and wages are rising, Americans have still become increasingly more isolated, more lonely, and more depressed. This social crisis needs to be addressed but can't be solved by a bill that we pass in Congress or an executive action by any President.

We have gotten to a point in our country where too many people put their hope in elected officials. These people will most certainly be let down, because elected officials, like everyone else, are fallen, imperfect, sinful people.

Graham knew this, and he knew that the only person who would not let us down is Christ himself, and that we should trust in him for the forgiveness of our sins and have everlasting life. This is now the life Billy Graham will enjoy forever.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for putting this together.

The loss of Billy Graham to this country, to this world, is more profound than any lips can ever express.

As TED mentioned, he was born in 1918, and married Ruth in 1943. What a dynamic couple they were. How devoted they were to each other. They had five children. I have come to know and dearly love Anne. I have met and come to know Franklin to a lesser extent.

But he knew, he believed, he preached that you don't go to Heaven by being a grandchild of someone. You have to have that personal relationship with the Lord as an individual child of God. It is not something you can inherit.

He has been called home.

He spent his life trying to persuade people that he loved to accept Jesus with the words that Jesus uttered:

I am the way, the truth, the light. No one gets to the Father, but by me.

He believed with all his heart that, unless someone professed Jesus Christ as Savior, they had no chance of getting to Heaven.

We know from Jesus that greater love hath no one than a man that lay down his life for his friends. We have paid tribute to people who have laid down their life in one great moment of saving others. We have heard of those type of heroic actions at the school in Parkland in trying to save others.

Yet, this man, for 99 years, or at least after he accepted Christ, laid down his life day after day after day for others, trying to help them come to a personal relationship with Jesus so that he could share eternity with Him in Heaven. That is his belief. That is my belief.

Yet, several years ago, we passed what is called a hate crimes bill. I said at some point it would be used to prosecute a preacher for simply reading Scripture from the Bible, so I can't help but wonder if he has been called home so he can never be charged with a hate crime.

We live in a time when things have gotten so perverse that there are actually people who say that these evangelical Christians are so hateful, so mean, they actually believe that if you don't think exactly like they do, you go to hell.

Well, that is a perversion of the one religion that is 100 percent based on love. God so loved the world, He sent His son. His son so loved the world, He laid down His life for others.

Billy Graham has laid down his life. He has put a marker down. In his memory, we can give no greater memorial than that we persevere and we perpetuate that love in bringing others to eternal life with us.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute today to the late Reverend Billy Graham, a very cherished Christian leader and exemplary North Carolinian.

Born on a dairy farm almost 100 years ago in Charlotte, North Carolina, Billy Graham grew up learning the value of hard work, personal commitment, and developed an unwavering commitment to our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

After being ordained and graduated from Wheaton College, Billy married

the love of his life and fellow student, Ruth McCue Bell. Shortly after, he began preaching throughout the United States and Europe, emerging as a rising young evangelist.

By 1949, at the young age of 31, Billy was launched into international prominence following his Los Angeles crusade. Originally scheduled for just 3 weeks, the crusade in Los Angeles had to be extended to more than 8 weeks, due to the overwhelming interest and overflow crowds.

During his lifetime, Reverend Graham preached all over the world, from remote villages in Africa to the Middle East to the former Communist bloc. I find this feat quite notable, considering the hostility that communists and tyrants of all stripes have for Christianity and their hatred for the spread of the Gospel.

Without question, Billy Graham was preaching in hostile territory; and without question, God protected him. It is said that his ministry reached an estimated 215 million people in more than 185 countries, and probably many more than that. After hearing the messages and teachings of the Holy Scriptures, many of those millions accepted Christ as their Lord and Savior.

There is no doubt that Billy Graham was called by God to share His Word, and he did so with wisdom and humility. In fact, I believe he heeded that call as well, if not better, than anyone else ever has.

His legacy and influence in the world will continue to be felt for generations to come. If there has ever been a good and faithful servant, it is most certainly Billy Graham.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Mr. HULTGREN, for arranging this opportunity to honor Billy Graham.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will we witness something that we have never seen before: the laying in honor of the body of an American who was not a government official, didn't lead a political movement, and wasn't a war hero or social movement hero.

The Nation will mourn a man who was single-minded in his devotion to one thing, whose life and vocation centered on one thing and one thing only: proclaiming the saving grace of God through Jesus Christ.

I hope we pay close attention to this. We will most likely never see it again.

In Mark, Jesus tells his disciples to "go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Few people followed this instruction more faithfully than the Reverend Billy Graham and with as much success and impact.

Billy Graham has been called America's Preacher. But the fact of the matter is that he was, for many decades, the most recognized and respected evangelical in the world.

Reverend Graham preached the Gospel to more than 200 million people during his more than 400 crusades and rallies in more than 185 countries and territories. The impact of those reached through TV, radio, video, and the internet is unquantifiable.

Reverend Graham did this sacrificially, giving up opportunities for other, much more lucrative opportunities that most people would have jumped at were they given the opportunity. Moreover, Reverend Graham estimated that he was gone from home for about 60 percent of his children's adolescence.

Despite being a pseudo-single mom, his wife, Ruth, understood the importance of the sacrifice. She once said: "I'd rather have a little of Bill than a lot of any other man."

At a time when Christians are so often shunned and ridiculed, particularly those who have major followings, Billy Graham was almost universally regarded as a steady and well-respected voice. He appeared on Gallup's list of most admired men in America 60 times since 1955. That is every year since the research firm began asking the question.

He counseled and covered in prayer every President, from Truman to Trump. Former President Clinton said: "When he prays with you in the Oval Office or upstairs in the White House, you feel he's praying for you, not the President."

That is the magnitude of this man: no matter how big or small you were, he cared about you, not your position. Titles and wealth and social status didn't matter to Reverend Graham. The only position of a person that mattered to him was their eternal position before God. Race did not matter either.

Reverend Graham was courageous. When other church leaders remained silent, he was an outspoken advocate for racial equality, consistently stating: "Christ belongs to all people."

In 1951, he called for the Southern Baptist Convention to accept Black students at their colleges. At a 1953 crusade in Tennessee, he personally took down ropes segregating the audience. In 1957, during his crusade in New York, he invited Martin Luther King, Jr., to open one night with a prayer. Despite his actions, he later said he wished he would have done more to help Dr. King.

In 1964, just months after the bombing at the 16th Street Baptist Church, Reverend Graham brought his crusade to Birmingham, Alabama. Before he agreed to come, Reverend Graham insisted that the audience be integrated. Over 30,000 people attended, making it, at the time, the largest integrated audience in the history of Birmingham.

The next year, he spoke to an integrated audience in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, with University of Alabama

President Frank Rose and head football coach Paul "Bear" Bryant with him on the stage.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there is or will be anyone else in our lifetime who so clearly and effectively called people out of spiritual darkness into the light than Billy Graham.

□ 1900

Untold millions were exposed to the saving message of the Gospel through his ministry. I mourn the void of moral and spiritual authority that, with his death, has been left in this world, but I rejoice in knowing that he is finally at home and at rest with God.

As it is written about David in Acts 13:36, so it can be said of Billy Graham. He served God's purpose for his generation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am next honored to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to share and reflect, just briefly, on Reverend Billy Graham. What a tremendous legacy he leaves in so many forms, and I think of how his humility has had such an impact on so many.

I was one of the thousands in a stadium at a crusade in California back, I believe, in 1985, and to personally witness the impact that that meeting had was a great opportunity. But I also realized how one person can really impact the world and how his efforts have led to humanitarian efforts, whether it is his family members or others, really stepping out and ministering to others all around the world.

So I am very grateful to honor Reverend Billy Graham for certainly his stewardship of religious freedom. I hope that we can all reflect on our country and religious freedom and how important it is and hopefully follow in the footsteps of someone who, I think, as the list of most admired Americans would reflect, with Reverend Graham being on that list for 60 years—that someone like that can have such a great impact. So I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am next honored to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Representative HULTGREN, for taking this time to do something that is so worthy.

You know, we live in a city where we have vast monuments erected for people who have left an impact on this Nation or on the world. When you walk the Halls of this grand and beautiful Capitol, there are statues of those who have made significant marks and changes to this Nation.

As I stand here today, I think of the gentleman who is going to lay in honor in the rotunda tomorrow, how he left such an impact on the world. He is probably the greatest impact on this

Nation and this world of modern times. The monument to him is in the hearts of literally billions of people who he touched with one simple message: God loves you.

That was as simple as Billy Graham would speak to the hearts of millions of Americans that God loves you and he cares about you individually as a person. That resonated so strong that it is estimated that—and this was in 2008—that through his ministries and his radio and television and his crusades, he reached over 2.2 billion people with a simple message that God loves you, and it is a message of truth.

He has had such an impact, as had been spoken of earlier, on a number of world leaders that he impacted with that simple message. The words that he shared—and he left us many quotes, and many of us are inspired by those quotes—but the words that he used that were most impactful were the words of Jesus. He just repeated the words that Christ had given us.

He was also a man of great, great courage. A lot of people don't realize the close relationship he had with Martin Luther King, Jr. And in the 1950s, when Billy Graham came to the south and he was going to preach at one of the crusades, he noticed that there was a rope running through the middle of the congregation, a rope that separated Whites from Blacks. He was so offended, he went and asked that that rope be removed; and when the ushers refused to do it, Billy Graham went and moved the rope himself.

That sparked a friendship with him and Martin Luther King, Jr. When Martin Luther King, Jr. penned his famous "Letter from Birmingham Jail," he condemned a lot of churches for not being engaged in what we believed that God created everyone in his image and that they should all be equal. But Billy Graham was not one of those. He stood strong.

In fact, in 1960, when Martin Luther King, Jr., was in prison, Billy Graham paid his bail. Billy Graham has left a mark, but we still fight some of the battles that he warned us of and he fought back then.

A couple of the quotes that have meant so much to me that Billy Graham left us with is one that God's will will not take us to where God's grace will not sustain us, knowing he was preparing us for battles that we have to fight.

He also stated that the Founders who pinned our Constitution believed in a freedom of religion, not a freedom from religion. And finally, even though we are in a time of crisis in this Nation, things are happening we don't understand, the last quote that I will leave you with that Billy Graham said is: "I've read the last page of the Bible. It's all going to turn out all right."

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am next honored to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. HULTGREN for leading this effort here tonight but also his great spiritual counsel and partnership in this building here. It is very much appreciated. Indeed, he is one of God's great servants.

So, you know, as I harken back on my years of when we saw Billy Graham on TV and the inspirational character he was, and all my colleagues here tonight have alluded to it as well, he lived a very, very full life, a selfless life. And when I think about the leaders that have come through Washington, indeed, what is this town named for? George Washington, who is probably the single most selfless politician I can ever think of in terms of giving of service, putting himself last and the country first. He didn't want to be king. He didn't really want to preside so much, but he wanted to help. God was always on his side.

And I see in Billy Graham that same kind of greatness of the founding policies, the founding values of George Washington's and some of our Founders manifested, in a man who reached and saved millions in this country over those years with his crusades.

A couple of my colleagues already mentioned his interaction with Dr. King. And with this being Black History Month, the last couple of days of it here, I thought it would be appropriate to touch on that as well because Billy Graham helped be a force in the civil rights movement, showing the way for others who may have been hesitant or breaking down the barrier for those who still wanted to sustain segregation.

My colleague mentioned the Chattanooga rally there where he himself went down when the ushers would not do it, and he removed those ropes so it would be integrated because, in God's eyes, all are equal, and then setting out in the Constitution all are created equal.

So Billy Graham sustained that in his years of friendship with Dr. King, and showing that he was a nonpartisan, nonracial leader, helped saved the lives of all men who are created equal. So that goes so far that he is willing to put it on the line. He made people mad. He made the head usher resign that day when he made that courageous—but what he probably felt wasn't courageous at all—but the right action.

So Billy Graham, even to his last day when he made a short video, was all about informing people about Jesus, about the salvation they could have if they would just embrace Jesus and find what eternal life really is all about, that it isn't what treasures we store here on this planet but the ones we store in Heaven when we embrace Him.

There will never be another like him, but we can always remember him with pride. And as he would say himself, that his stores of treasure are up in

Heaven. And he will be even stronger up there with his legacy and his memory and his family members that go on to do what he did.

So God bless Billy Graham, and I thank, again, Mr. HULTGREN for this opportunity tonight.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Congressman LAMALFA's words.

I am next honored to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois. No one knows how many lives and souls Reverend Billy Graham saved. We know that for every one he saved, he saved two, two saved four, four saved eight, et cetera.

One life we know he saved was Louis Zamperini. Louis' story is in a book called, "Unbroken," and a movie by that same name. He was a track star, a silver medalist, 1936 games, Olympic games in Munich. In World War II, he flew B-24 bombers. That was a dangerous plane. Twice, his plane crashed. The second time, he floated the Pacific Ocean for 47 days. He said: "God, if I survive this ordeal and get back to America alive, I'll seek You and serve You."

He was captured by the Japanese and spent the rest of the war in a prison war camp in Japan. A guard there he called, "The Bird," knew of Louis' fame, and he beat him to a pulp every single day. Louis said: "I was constantly being tormented by the guy. And you talk about hate. I wanted to kill him."

His nightmares of the POW camp came home. He was consumed by anger. One night, Louis dreamed he was strangling The Bird to death. Instead, he woke up to find out he was strangling his wife, Cynthia. He started getting drunk as a skunk every night to forget about the horrors that plagued him.

With her husband getting drunk every single night, Cynthia filed for divorce, and that is when a friend invited her to see the Reverend Billy Graham crusade in a Los Angeles tent dubbed, "The Canvas Cathedral." She accepted Christ that night.

She convinced Louis to attend Reverend Graham's service. After storming out of that tent the first night, Louis returned for one more evening. That time, the Bible verse Billy Graham quoted went straight to Louis' heart. He said: "Of all my near-death experiences, my life never passed before my eyes. But when Billy Graham quoted Scripture, my life did pass before my eyes." For the first time in years, Louis remembered the promise he made God when he was floating in the South Pacific.

That night, he went forward and accepted Christ, and the biggest miracle of his life was set in motion. Louis' transformation was so complete that he returned to Japan to share the Gospel with the hundreds of Japanese

troops that tortured him that he once hated. He watched many of them accept Jesus Christ.

He went to share his faith all around the world, speaking at several Billy Graham crusades, and had a great friendship with Reverend Graham that lasted until Louis' death on July 2, 2014.

Before he died, Louis said these important words: "This Billy Graham thing is a phenomenal miracle the way it started, the way it spread out. I'm one guy that got saved, and I've spoken to hundreds of thousands and had my testimony in papers where millions read it. One person. Think of the spider-web effect all over the world."

Thank God for Reverend Billy Graham. Amen, Louis. Thank God for Reverend Billy Graham.

□ 1915

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful for so many of my colleagues who were able to join us tonight to remember Reverend Billy Graham, born November 7, 1918, and died February 21, 2018.

Billy Graham was a lion of the Christian faith and a believer in the all-encompassing love of God for all people.

I knew Billy Graham from such an early age: knew of him, knew of his ministry, and was struck even more so most of my growing up years in Wheaton, Illinois, where Billy Graham went to school, met his wife. Much of his ministry started in Wheaton and in that area around Wheaton.

His ministry spanned generations of American religious thought and culture, but his core message remained unchanged throughout his entire lifetime. His evangelistic gatherings attracted millions throughout the globe for decades. His name is known around the world, as many have said tonight, maybe one of the most recognized names and most respected throughout his entire lifetime.

I remember way back in 1971—I was 5 years old—my mom and dad brought me down to McCormick Place down in downtown Chicago, to be part of the 1971 Billy Graham crusade. My dad was a counselor at that crusade. I was a little 5-year-old boy, but I still remember that night. I remember the power of the message, I remember the power of this messenger of God sharing his love for us, but also the truth of the love that Jesus has for us. That he gave everything so that I could have hope, so that I could have new life.

Even as a little boy, that affected me. It moved me. It moved me so much that it had me ask more questions of my own mom and dad when I got home. And, ultimately, it was that same year, right around that time, when I recognized that I was sinful, even as a little boy, that I was selfish, that I needed help, I needed a savior, and that I needed someone to pay a price that I couldn't pay.

And as Billy Graham had stated, and as my mom and dad had taught me, and as my own grandpa had taught me, only Jesus could pay that price, and he wanted to do it to give me that free gift of redemption, the hope that we can have only through Jesus. That was the story and the message of Billy Graham.

Jumping forward quite a few years, I had the privilege, just 12 years ago, of being down in Louisiana. I went to the Louisiana State Penitentiary. It is also known as Angola. Louisiana State Penitentiary was known as the bloodiest prison in all of America for decades and decades and decades—more killings and more violence than any other prison. And then something happened.

God used some people, specifically a warden there, Warden Cain, who came, and others, to change the hearts of these inmates. They brought a seminary into this Louisiana State Penitentiary.

Now, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of prisoners in Louisiana State Penitentiary have gone through seminary—New Orleans Seminary—that is right there in the prison, and have gained their own Bible graduate degrees of being pastors, although they are still in prison.

One of the things that changed in Louisiana State Penitentiary—it had been when prisoners died in prison, and almost all of them die there, because life means life in Louisiana—what happened before was, when prisoners died, they would just be thrown in a ditch in the back behind the cafeteria and thrown some dirt on top of them. The warden and others felt like this was absolutely inhumane treatment for anybody, even prisoners, so they changed something.

They have a woodworking program there, and the inmates of Angola, Louisiana State Penitentiary, started making caskets for their fellow prisoners who would die in prison. They handcraft these caskets so that they are actually gorgeous, handcrafted, recognizing that every life is of infinite value because God lived and died for that life.

Well, Franklin Graham, Billy's son, was down in Louisiana State Penitentiary a few years ago. He went on a tour there, saw these caskets that were being made for inmates, went back and talked to his mom and dad.

Billy Graham and Ruth Graham said: Do you know what? We want to be buried in caskets that were made by prisoners.

I am so excited. Tomorrow, this unbelievable honor of Billy Graham being laid in honor in the United States rotunda, one of only four people who have had that great honor, but also the story that is going to be told, that Billy Graham is going to be laid in the rotunda in a casket that was made by prisoners in Louisiana State Peniten-

tiary. What an amazing statement of humility of recognizing that we are all the same. We are all broken people, we all need saving, whether we are preaching to millions and millions of people, or whether we are in prison for the rest of our lives because of the mistakes we have made. We all cannot reach that standard, that perfect standard, to be with God forever. We need someone to help us reach that, and only Jesus can help us do that.

Billy Graham recognized that. The statement is going to be very clear in the rotunda, just outside of these doors tomorrow over the next day and a half, of recognition of his life, and then, ultimately, he will be buried there.

I remember back—and I will end with this—just the message of Billy Graham very clear. Two questions that I think were so important for Billy Graham. One he talked about in his book, "Just As I Am."

He said: The first question I have for God when I get to heaven is, Why me? Why me, a farm kid from North Carolina that could barely make it through school? Why me? Why did you choose me as an instrument?

And I think the answer to that question goes back to Isaiah 6:8. That when Isaiah heard the Lord say, "Whom shall I send," Isaiah said, "Here I am, Lord, send me."

That is exactly what Billy Graham did. He said: Here I am, Lord, send me. Broken, imperfect, not a great speaker, but here I am, send me.

And through that willingness, millions and millions and millions of lives were touched.

The last question was one that I heard when I went to that crusade in 1971. And it was: Who is Jesus to you? This person of Jesus that has impacted more people in this world than any other person, who is Jesus to you?

It was a question that I had to struggle with, even as a 5-year-old. I continue to learn and grow and understand Jesus. And different people have different ideas of who Jesus is. No one can deny he was a real person who had more impact on this world than anybody else.

We talk about the impact that Billy Graham has had. Jesus is the reason for the impact that Billy Graham had.

So he asked the question: Who is Jesus?

And I think it is worth the study, to take the time to look into who was this man who lived 2,000 years ago, yet affected everything. Even our calendar is adjusted to his life.

Who is this Jesus?

As you dig in and you ask questions and study, the question is either: Is this Jesus who he said he is or isn't he? Is he a liar? Is he a lunatic? Or is he Lord?

Lord and Savior, the only hope, the light of this world, I believe that that is exactly who this Jesus is. It was what Billy Graham talked about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with a verse many people remember from the Billy Graham crusades. The closing of those crusades were led with a call for people to come forward, but also with an amazing hymn, "Just As I Am." I want to read a verse or two, and then close.

Just as I am, without one plea,
But that thy blood was shed for me,
And that though bidst me come to thee,
O lamb of God, I come, I come.
Just as I am, and waiting not
To rid my soul of one dark blot,
To thee whose blood can cleanse each spot,
O lamb of God, I come, I come.

Thank you, Billy Graham. Thank you for your faithfulness. Thank you for sharing this message of hope with so many people.

We are so honored to recognize him and to thank his family.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the late Reverend Billy Graham who is just the fourth private citizen to lie in honor in the U.S. Capitol.

In 1918, Rev. Graham was born in Charlotte, North Carolina where he was raised on a dairy farm. At the age of 15, the young Billy Graham made his personal commitment to Christ during a tent revival meeting in Charlotte. Following graduation from Wheaton College and his marriage to classmate Ruth Bell in 1943, Rev. Graham began his ministry. While his ministry would take him to every corner of the globe, Billy Graham never forgot his purpose or his roots in the Old North State.

As the Lord's faithful servant, Billy Graham lived a simple life in North Carolina with his dear wife Ruth and their five children. Yet his ministry touched the lives of millions, as he taught God's word and spread the good news of the gospel. It has been estimated he preached to nearly 215 million people in more than 185 countries and territories, embracing innovation and new technologies to reach as many people as possible.

Affectionately known as "North Carolina's Favorite Son" and "America's Pastor," Billy Graham's counsel was sought by presidents and leaders throughout the world in times of despair and prosperity. No matter his audience, he preached a constant message of finding "strength for the present and hope for the future" in Jesus Christ.

I join with our entire community, state, nation and world in mourning his passing, while rejoicing in the knowledge that Billy Graham is home with his beloved Ruth in the presence of our Father in heaven.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Billy Graham holds a special place in the hearts of millions of Americans and people throughout the world. He is most deserving of this honor and I urge our fellow Americans to join me in paying their respects to America's Pastor and celebrating the life of Reverend Billy Graham.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Reverend Billy Graham, America's Pastor, who passed away on February 21, 2018 to return home to his Lord and Savior. As a nation, we mourn the passing of Billy Graham, and send our deepest condolences to the Graham family. Billy

Graham preached the Gospel, and his influence can hardly be quantified. His ministry career and crusades inspired and motivated millions, and carried out his mission to save souls around the world.

Early in his career, Reverend Graham served the Midwest as a pastor in Western Springs, Illinois. He attended Wheaton College and in 1981, they opened a center in his honor. During his time in Illinois, Graham took on a radio ministry program based in Chicago and expanded his activism. From there, he began to completely transform American religious life through his compelling sermons and preaching. Billy Graham went on to serve across the country, in many ways and on many platforms. He provided spiritual counsel to every President of the United States from Harry Truman to Barack Obama, and was a strong figure in the civil rights movement urging for integration.

Mr. Speaker, Billy Graham was a humble servant to the Lord who changed countless lives for the better. His was a life well lived. And I know his legacy will live on forever. Today, let us look up in the sky and give thanks to our faithful, steadfast friend who is finally at home with God and resting in eternal peace.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for reminding us of the enormously important work that was done for tomorrow's session here on the floor and here in the Capitol, where he will be lying in state.

I recall very clearly the day that my wife and I met Reverend Graham in Sacramento when he was having one of his ministries there in the city. We attended, and it was an incredible experience. We met with him personally after the event. And like the millions and, indeed, billions of people that heard him speak, we, too, were moved.

Earlier, when I learned of his passing, I said that, while he is no longer with us physically, his work remains with us. His speeches, his recordings, and his videos are all there for future generations and, indeed, for our generation. So I thank my colleagues for bringing to our attention what is a profoundly important event here in the Nation's Capitol when Reverend Billy Graham lies in state.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other things I would like to bring to the attention of the floor. One, fortunately, is not a death, but rather a retirement. This one is for Debbie Davis, the editor and assistant publisher of the Davis Enterprise, for her service to the Davis community and to congratulate her on her retirement.

For over 38 years, Ms. Davis has helped unite and inform the Davis com-

munity through her work at the Davis Enterprise, the local paper. Her work expertise earned her a reputation as a respected journalist, and there is no doubt in my mind that her legacy will have a lasting impact on the Davis community.

The breadth of Ms. Davis' accomplishment is in itself an achievement. Some of her most notable milestones include the development of the 2017 centennial magazine that celebrated the businesses and leaders that built the Davis community, the "Those Who Make Memories" book, and over 10,700 editions have been used at the Davis Enterprise.

I speak on behalf of the entire Davis community when I say "thank you" to Debbie Davis for her generous service to the community of Davis, California. We all wish her the best as she enjoys her well-deserved retirement.

If I might, Mr. Speaker, move on to other events, some of them events here in Washington, D.C., in the days ahead. If I might retrieve my chart, Mr. Speaker. Normally I would bring this out with me, but I wanted to cover the Billy Graham event. I think he might have enjoyed this particular saying from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I use this whenever I start my presentations here on the floor because it reminds me of values, at least a value that I think ought to be basic to our work here in Congress. So allow me to repeat not for the first, but maybe for another dozen times:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

The test of our progress. It is interesting that there is so much we need to do, so much we need to do here in America, particularly for those who have too little. It is interesting to note what has actually happened over the last several years.

Are we really making progress?

Well, I think we ought to spend some moments talking about our infrastructure.

Are we making progress?

Well, no, not really. We once were the most advanced infrastructure—highways, rail systems, transit systems, airports, maritime ports—in the world. We had great drinking water systems. You could come to America and drink water anywhere and not have to worry about the quality or the contamination of that water.

But here it is from the American Society of Civil Engineers: aviation, we are ranked a D; bridges, a C; dams, a D; drinking water, a D; parks and recreation, a D; ports, a C; rail, we are doing okay; roads, a D—we see that every day when we travel back and forth.

School systems—and we want to talk about safe schools; lots of talk as a result of the tragic shooting in Florida about making schools safe. Well,

schools really rank in the D category. Whether they are safe or not, they are ranking as Ds.

Transit is a D. Declining wastewater is a D.

We are familiar with places around the Nation.

□ 1930

This bridge, about 6 years ago, this was a bridge that connected the United States to Canada. This was the Interstate 5 bridge, a road, Interstate highway from Vancouver, British Columbia, to Tijuana, Mexico. Infrastructure. The bridge collapsed.

On the water side of life, I think most of us would be familiar that, 1 year ago, the spillway at the Oroville Dam, the highest dam in the United States and quite possibly in the world, gave way during the heavy rains of the 2017 year, and we created the biggest waterfall in the world. It went on for some time.

It also threatened the lives of over 200,000 people downstream that had less than 3 hours to evacuate; because had this spillway further eroded, a 30-foot wall of water would have descended upon those communities and the water would have been more than 50 feet deep within 1 hour. Fortunately, the rain stopped; otherwise, who knows.

So we have a need for infrastructure. Just 2 weeks ago, the President announced his great big infrastructure plan. Two hundred billion new dollars, \$1.5 trillion of public and private investment beyond the Federal participation. Sounds good until you read the big print; not even the small print, but the big print.

So what does the Trump infrastructure plan bring to us? Well, the \$200 billion of Federal money, it is not new money; it is existing money, it is the reprogramming of existing money. In fact, it takes \$168 billion from existing transportation programs, highways and transit, and repurposes it over to some new programs that are supposed to do the same thing. No new money; just money taken from an existing program that is working, underfunded to be sure, but working, and transferred over to a new program that the President can then put his gold letters, T-R-U-M-P, on it, and, wow, what a wonderful thing that has been done. Oh, yeah. Well, confusion and the like.

It also paves the way; it doesn't pave the highways, but it does pave the way for Wall Street and foreign investors to set up toll roads on our interstate freeways. Well, there is a great idea. It slashes Federal investments and passes the buck to cash-starved States and local governments.

You see, right now the Federal Government for highways and transit, about 80 percent of that money comes from the Federal Government, 20 percent from the locals.

In levies—I represent one of the most flood prone areas. I can put that pic-

ture of Oroville Dam back up. Seventy-five percent Federal, 25 percent local. So what does the great Trump infrastructure plan do? It flips that over, and guess what? The Federal Government will pay 25 percent for levies and the locals will pay 75 percent. Wow. That is helpful. Where are they going to get the money?

For transit, 80 percent Federal, 20 percent—no, not in the Trump plan. It flips it over: 20 percent Federal, 80 percent local. Where are they to get the money? Big question.

So where did the money go? Why is it that the President's big, new, fabulous, wonderful transportation/infrastructure program has no money, just existing money taken from existing programs and put into new labeled programs that are to accomplish the same thing but with less Federal support?

So one might wonder, what happened here? Why is there no new Federal money? Why aren't all of those Ds supported by new Federal programs so that we have a robust infrastructure program for the United States, one in which men and women would be employed building the foundation for tomorrow's economy? Tens of thousands, indeed hundreds of thousands, millions of people, could be employed if the \$1 trillion, \$1.5 trillion that he talks about, were real money. It is not.

Where did the money go? Well, I suppose some of you may have been listening when the President signed the legislation and then took his Air Force One jet to Florida, entered his resort at Mar-a-Lago, and announced to his guests: I just made you a whole lot richer.

Well, indeed he did. One person that he made richer was this gentleman, who has said repeatedly over the last 2 years: I don't need more money; I am quite wealthy, thank you; don't do a tax cut that makes me even more wealthy. Warren Buffett.

What did the tax cut do for Warren Buffett and Berkshire Hathaway? Well, it was a \$29 billion Christmas gift.

Mr. Speaker, the President was quite correct. He did make the rich even richer.

I thank Mr. Buffett for being brutally honest and saying he doesn't need more money. He would undoubtedly look at what FDR said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much."

Warren Buffett said this last line: "It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

I thank Mr. Buffett. I don't know what he is going to do with the \$29 billion, but I know what we could have done with \$29 billion. We could have repaired the bridges of America. We could have repaired the tens of thousands of dams across America that are at risk. That is what could have been done with the \$29 billion that went to Mr. Buffett.

And he wasn't the only one who benefited from those tax cuts. One of the Wall Street companies, Morgan Stanley, did an analysis of the corporate tax cuts, that about \$1 trillion of the \$1.5 trillion tax cut went to corporations.

So what did the American corporations do with that \$1 trillion windfall? Morgan Stanley, just this last week, reported that their analysis is that 62 percent of that \$1 trillion windfall will be used by the corporations to buy other companies; mergers and acquisitions, about 19 percent; and 43 percent will go for buybacks of stock and dividends.

All the talk about the employees benefiting. Well, let's see. About 13 percent is headed for bonuses and raises. Just 17 percent of that \$1 trillion is expected to be used to increase the size of the business, not through mergers and acquisitions, which usually result in layoffs, not in new jobs, but rather in what are called savings, in other words, known as layoffs—just 17 percent.

So where are the jobs? I will give you an example. Nine of the large pharmaceutical companies in America have already announced that they are going to spend \$50 billion of that tax cut that they received in buybacks, not in creating new pharmaceuticals and drugs for such illnesses as Alzheimer's. In fact, Pfizer, one of the large pharmaceutical companies, the day that they announced that they were going to stop their research on Alzheimer's, decided that they would spend their money instead on buying back their stock.

So thus far—we haven't finished all this; this is where they expect to go—American corporations have already announced \$178 billion, nearly one-fifth of that \$1 trillion tax cut, would be used to buy back stock. That is the largest amount ever reported in any single quarter in American history.

Now, many folks here on the floor say: Oh, but look at what Walmart is doing; they are giving over \$400 million of bonuses.

Well, if you average that out among all of their workers, it is \$190 per worker. Now, that is not chump change, and that is certainly not crumbs. That is \$190, and that is important, but the total tax cut to Walmart was \$18 billion. The \$400 million is 2.2 percent for bonuses. And so it goes.

There is more. Boeing said it will spend \$300 million on employees in increased wages or bonuses, and, at the same time, they will spend \$18 billion to buy back shares.

Did I explain what a buyback of shares really does? Well, it reduces the number of shares that are in the market, and, therefore, simultaneously raises the price per share.

And how are executive salaries and bonuses determined? By the share price. The share price goes up, bingo,

more money for the corporate executives.

So if you were given a huge \$1 trillion windfall in reduced taxes, would you use that for capital investment, where the actual return to the corporation may take 3, 4, 5 years, or would you use it to buy back stock, which automatically will, in virtually every case, raise the share price and immediately reward the executives' bottom line salary? Not a tough decision. Or would you give it to your employees in bonuses and raises, when you could use it to buy back stock? Raise the share price, and, lo and behold, guess what? The corporate executive's pay increases, because his pay is based on the stock price. Pretty simple stuff.

Did I mention Comcast laid off over 500 employees after reportedly saying that they would use their tax cuts to give a \$1,000 year-end bonus? And at the same time, they announced a \$5 billion stock buyback for 2018.

It goes on and on.

Apple, \$38 billion reduction in taxes; Microsoft, \$6.3 billion; Citibank, \$22 billion reduction; Johnson & Johnson, \$13 billion; Qualcomm, \$5.3 billion.

So if we wanted to repair the dams or the bridges, we would have to have money.

Where did the money go? Well, it didn't go to the bridges, it didn't go to the roads. The great infrastructure plan from the President is simply a shell game, moving money from under this shell to under that shell, no new money, and making the local governments and State governments pay even more.

And for those of us who represent California, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, there is one more, and that is we get to pay taxes on taxes that we pay to the State and to the local governments.

□ 1945

Now, that is a change. When the first income tax law was written nearly a century ago—in fact, more than a century ago—they said that you would not pay taxes on the taxes that you paid, and so they allowed for the deduction of State and local taxes. But, hey, that changed. Our President said it is a wonderful gift. Well, it is not for California, not for New York, not for New Jersey.

So where are we going to get the money? We are going to have to go back and look at this. We already know that, for every 1 percent reduction in the corporate tax rate, there is a \$100 billion reduction in revenue to the Federal Government. We might want to look at that.

I am going to wrap this up in just a few moments.

We have been talking about a better deal for America for a long time. What we have from the Trump tax cut is a raw deal, a bad deal, a terrible deal for

America. The Federal Treasury was gutted.

Yes, there are benefits for the broad American public, but that is like 17 percent of the total tax cut goes to the broad American public: middle class, upper middle, and the bottom quartile of Americans. It is useful. It is certainly going to be helpful.

But more than 80 percent went to American corporations, which, as I just showed, are not using it for their employees, not using it to build their capital infrastructure, their ability to manufacture more, but, rather, for those who already have a great deal of wealth: the stockholders of America, who happen not to be the bottom 80 percent.

We need a better deal. We really need to invest in America. We need that infrastructure, not the phony infrastructure program that the President has proposed, but a real infrastructure with real money. And we need to make that infrastructure in America.

And so make it in America, invest in America. It adds up for a better deal for America.

My colleague, AL GREEN from Texas, has some important things to add to the discussion tonight on a different subject, but I just want to remind the public that, when we talk on the floor here, we talk about infrastructure, we talk about real concrete, steel, programs that actually build infrastructure. We talk about trying to collect resources so that we can pay for this. We talk about how we might engage in various financing programs so that we can, over time, build the solid foundation for economic growth.

And as we do all of this, we are talking about a better deal for the American public, not the raw deal that this tax scam gave to Americans, not the kind of deal that The New York Times says: "Well-Heeled Investors Reap the Republican Tax Cut Bonanza."

Mr. Speaker, I include this New York Times editorial, dated February 25, 2018, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From The New York Times, Feb. 25, 2018]
WELL-HEELED INVESTORS REAP THE
REPUBLICAN TAX CUT BONANZA
(By The Editorial Board)

After President Trump signed the Republican tax cut into law, companies put out cheery announcements that they were giving workers bonuses because of their expected windfalls from the tax reductions. The president and Republican lawmakers quickly held up these news releases as vindication for their argument that cutting the top federal corporate tax rate to 21 percent, from 35 percent, would boost workers' incomes even as it added \$1.5 trillion to the debt that future generations would have to pay off.

Now corporate announcements and analyst reports confirm what honest observers always said—this claim is pure fantasy. As executives tell investors what they intend to do with their tax savings and their spending plans are tabulated into neat charts and graphs, the reports jibe with what most experts said would happen: Companies are rewarding their stockholders.

Businesses are buying back shares, which creates demand for the stocks, boosts share prices and benefits investors. Some of the cash is going to increase dividends. And a chunk will go to acquiring other businesses, creating larger corporations that face less competition.

In addition to benefiting investors, these maneuvers will end up boosting the pay of top executives because their compensation packages are often tied to the price of their companies' stock. Finally, a small sliver of the money will find its way into paychecks of rank-and-file employees, but it won't be a big boost and will probably come in the form of a temporary bonus, rather than a lasting raise.

Morgan Stanley analysts estimated that 43 percent of corporate tax savings would go to buybacks and dividends and nearly 19 percent would help pay for mergers and acquisitions. Just 17 percent would be used for capital investment, and even a smaller share, 13 percent, would go toward bonuses and raises.

Other Wall Street analysts have issued similar reports. If more evidence was needed, Axios reported that just nine pharmaceutical companies have announced \$50 billion in buybacks since the tax law was passed.

Mr. Trump might argue that it doesn't much matter that the tax cuts will be a boon for investors because many Americans own stocks. The president has recently touted the rising value of 401(k) accounts as a benefit of the tax law. But roughly half of all families own no stock, and most people have holdings that are worth less than \$5,000. Most stock holdings, a whopping 84 percent, are in the hands of people whose incomes put them in the top 10 percent of households.

Republicans might further argue that none of this matters because the tax law is becoming more popular as people learn more about it. Indeed, a recent poll for The Times found that the law now has more supporters than opponents. But this swing in public sentiment might be less important than it appears. Consider the results of a recent Politico/Morning Consult poll that shows that just 25 percent of registered voters said they had noticed an increase in their paycheck because of lower tax withholding while 51 percent had not. The poll also found that high-income people were more likely to notice that their take-home pay had gone up. That's because Republicans designed the law to principally benefit wealthy families while offering crumbs to low-income and middle class families.

Those crumbs, by the way, disappear after a few years. Further, many taxpayers in states like California, New Jersey and New York will be hit with higher tax bills when they file their 2018 tax returns and realize that they can now only deduct up to \$10,000 in state and local taxes.

There was a legitimate argument for reforming the tax code in a way that reduced the corporate tax rate, closed loopholes and made the economy fairer and more productive. But Republicans chose a plan that rewards the rich at the expense of workers. They had to lie to make this scheme seem legitimate. Now the true effects are coming to fruition.

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

RESOLUTION HONORING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored tonight to present a resolution on behalf of the NAACP, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a great organization founded in this country on February 12, 1909. It just happens to have been the centennial of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

I am honored to be a proud member of the NAACP. I hold a life membership, and I look forward to acquiring an even higher membership in the NAACP.

I am honored to say that this resolution has the support of the Congressional Black Caucus, and it is a bipartisan resolution as well. Also, I am honored to say, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is one that I hope will shed some additional light on the NAACP, its purpose, and some of its accomplishments.

The NAACP is the Nation's oldest civil rights organization. It is an organization that was founded in a time when African Americans were being lynched, a time when it was not commonplace and not every place, but it did take place with a great degree of regularity in this country, such that African Americans were being lynched with impunity, I might add.

It is an organization that has always been integrated. It was integrated from its genesis and continues to this day to be an integrated organization.

Some of the notable founders of the NAACP were Mary White Ovington, a white female; Ida Wells-Barnett; and also, I would add, Oswald Garrison Villard; William English Walling. Many of these persons were persons of goodwill who simply concluded that there had to be something done about the conditions impacting African Americans. And so they decided to move forward, and they formed, at that time, the organization known as the National Negro Committee, which has, of course, evolved into the NAACP that we know today.

Let me pause for a moment with the history and remind people that in Houston, Texas, we are very fortunate. The Houston branch of the NAACP has a president who is a former dean of the law school, Thurgood Marshall School of Law in Houston, Texas, former president of Texas Southern University, James Douglas—very fortunate to have a lawyer of his standing as the president of the NAACP.

Currently, at the law school, there is a person who is working who happens to be the State president of the NAACP. We have a national board member in Houston, Texas. Gary Bledsoe, State president, is working at the law school as the interim dean. The

national board member, Howard Jefferson, is in Houston, Texas.

Houston's NAACP has its own facility, one of the few around the country to hold its own facility, but I am proud to say that that is something that we worked hard to acquire. The Houston NAACP is one of the outstanding branches of the NAACP in this country. The NAACP has branches in all 50 States.

Continuing, the NAACP's national headquarters, located in Baltimore, Maryland, the NAACP was founded to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination.

I am proud to say that the NAACP has always used the tactics of non-violence in its movement forward, in its effort to help all persons benefit in this country because, quite frankly, everyone has benefited from the NAACP and its movement in this country. It has used negotiation, litigation, and protestation as its tactics.

The NAACP was there to win lawsuits before the Supreme Court, was there to protest so that persons might acquire not only the right to vote, but also the opportunity to elect people of their choice.

The NAACP has been there with the great litigator, Thurgood Marshall, who was the first African-American Justice on the Supreme Court, was the chief litigator for the NAACP for many years. He won 29 of 32 cases before the Supreme Court. He was there to fight on behalf of the NAACP.

The NAACP is the organization that won *Barrows v. Jackson*, *Shelley v. Kraemer*, *Brown v. Board of Education*. These are lawsuits that allow us to live in the neighborhoods that we live in, to go to the schools that we attend.

The truth be told, we eat where we eat and sleep where we sleep because of the NAACP. It is an organization that has brought not only desegregation to American life, but also integration to American life.

Many of our institutions were desegregated. That meant that a lot of institutions were lost in the process when we desegregated. But we also have integrated, and we have brought together persons in new institutions.

The NAACP can claim a good deal of responsibility for the integration that we see in the House of Representatives and in the Congress of the United States of America. I can say to you, truthfully, that I believe I am standing here tonight because of the good works of the NAACP, and a good many other persons are here because of the good works of the NAACP as well.

I am also proud to tell you tonight that the NAACP has fought for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Civil Rights Act of 1960 and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The NAACP has fought for human rights as well as civil rights. The

NAACP, in 2005, went beyond human rights and civil rights, in a sense, when it developed a disaster relief fund to help hurricane survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama.

So the NAACP has metamorphosed into an organization that not only deals with the rights of people in the sense of their needs when they are voting and when they are being brought before the justice system, but it has also now metamorphosed into an organization that helps in times of need in general.

If there is a storm, you can depend upon the NAACP to be there to be of some help. If persons are suffering as a result of some sort of disaster related to fires, the NAACP is likely to be there to help.

The NAACP is also helping abroad. It has been there to help persons in Haiti after the disaster that took place.

The NAACP, in 2008, supported the passage of the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007. It was an act that allowed us to have the resources to solve some of the heinous crimes that occurred in the early days of the civil rights struggle here in the United States of America.

The NAACP celebrated its centennial anniversary in New York City on July 16 of 2009.

The NAACP continues to, in 2010, advocate for sentencing reform, something that is still needed to this day and is still being worked on.

In 2011, the NAACP led the charge to defend the constitutional right to vote. The NAACP has fought voter suppression laws across the length and breadth of the country.

The NAACP elected its new president, unanimously, Derrick Johnson, in 2017.

This organization has been on the front line for justice for all in the United States of America. And I would dare say that, if we did not have the NAACP, we would create it because we need an organization that is willing to step forward and take on the needs of people who, but for the NAACP, wouldn't have a voice.

It is a bold organization. It does not fear the powers that be. It does not, in any way, concern itself with the consequences of challenging the establishment. It is an organization that has sought to change the status quo. It is an organization that moves people from poverty, in many cases, into an opportunity to move forward into the middle class. So it is an organization that truly benefits all.

I am proud to be a member of this august organization.

□ 2000

I will mention a few more things about the organization, and then bring this to closure. But I do want people to know especially that the NAACP does

not and has not ever segregated itself from any part of society. It has always sought to bring society together. It has always sought to find some sort of common ground for people to stand on so that we might all move forward together. It has always been an organization that not only wanted to integrate schools, integrate various parts of our social order, but also wanted to bring a sense of brotherhood to our country.

Dr. King indicated that we must transform neighborhoods into brotherhoods. This has also been the work of the NAACP.

Rosa Parks, the great NAACP member who took that seat on the bus and, in so doing, challenged the segregation in the South, the NAACP was there to do these things to bring people together and to help us understand each other.

I do believe that America is a much better place because the NAACP has made it such. And if not but for the NAACP, I do believe that the Congress of the United States of America would not be the integrated institution that it is.

I think there is still much work to be done, but I am proud that the NAACP has done the work that it has because, in so doing, it has made opportunities available for a good many people who would not have them.

So, tonight, I wanted to have it resolved that the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America recognizes the 109th anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for February 26 and today on account of health issues.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 1:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4116. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification that no United Nations agency or United Nations affiliated

agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 287e note; Public Law 103-236, Sec. 102(g) (as amended by Public Law 103-415, Sec. 1(o)); (108 Stat. 4301); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4117. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4118. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 17-115; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4119. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-75, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4120. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-01, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4121. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-66, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4122. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report to Congress on Gifts Given by the United States to Foreign Individuals for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 22 U.S.C.A. 2694; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4123. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 17-021; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4124. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Annual Privacy, Data Mining and Semi-annual 803 Reports for FY 2017, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-2(a)(6); Public Law 108-447, Sec. 522(a)(6); (118 Stat. 3268) and 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-3(c)(1); Public Law 110-53, Sec. 804(c)(1); (121 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4125. A letter from the Secretary and Treasurer, Financing Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2017 Audited Financial Statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4126. A letter from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's FY 2017 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4127. A letter from the Secretary and Treasurer, Resolution Funding Corporation,

transmitting the Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2017 Audited Financial Statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4128. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Low-Income Housing Credit Disaster Relief for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico [Notice 2018-17] received February 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4129. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2019, including the Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867) and 45 U.S.C. 231(f); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 7(f) (as amended by Public Law 93-445, Sec. 416); (97 Stat. 436); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Appropriations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ESTES of Kansas (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 5099. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a fusion center technical assistance program; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 5100. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States to establish and operate recovery home certification programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 5101. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay rewards under an asset recovery rewards program to help identify and recover stolen assets linked to foreign government corruption and the proceeds of such corruption hidden behind complex financial structures in the United States and abroad; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 5102. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a loan repayment program for substance use disorder treatment employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois,

Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BASS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 5103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax and special occupational tax in respect of firearms and to increase the transfer tax on any other weapon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, the Judiciary, Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 5104. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a special enrollment period under Medicare for individuals enrolled in COBRA continuation coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 5105. A bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 5106. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers to disclose in an annual report any substantial financial relationship with any manufacturer or dealer of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5107. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to secure elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOGETT (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for current year inclusion of net CFC tested income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5109. A bill to amend the 21st Century Cures Act to ensure the equitable distribution of resources to address the opioid epidemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to report revenue generated by each sports team, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 5111. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide certain purchasing authority for recipients or subrecipients of grants under chapter 53 of title 49 of such Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 5112. A bill to reduce, from 21 years of age to 18 years of age, the minimum age at which a person may obtain a handgun from a Federal firearms licensee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BARRAGAN (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 5113. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to require sexual harassment training for the employees of Federal contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 5114. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take action to eliminate human exposure to asbestos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5115. A bill to expand and improve the programs and activities of the Department of Health and Human Services for awareness, education, research, surveillance, diagnosis, and treatment concerning rare diseases and conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 5116. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the jurisdiction of courts of the United States and of the States over certain foreign entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 5117. A bill to authorize the President to enter into a cooperative project agreement with Israel to counter unmanned aerial vehicles that threaten the United States or Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5118. A bill to establish USAccounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5119. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a STEM grant program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 5120. A bill to require Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 5121. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 to provide mandatory funding for grants to upgrade agricultural and food sciences facilities at 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 5123. A bill to abolish the Conscience and Religious Freedom Division in the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself and Mr. SMUCKER):

H.R. 5124. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a community action opioid response grant program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself and Ms. STEFANK):

H.R. 5125. A bill to improve and expand authorities, programs, services, and benefits for military spouses and military families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 5126. A bill to authorize assistance for procurement of missile defense systems for Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 5127. A bill to establish a grant program for the funding of water recycling and reuse projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 5128. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to tribal health programs located on reservations impacted by uranium mining or milling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 5129. A bill to reauthorize the Global Food Security Act of 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of a military department to grant veterans access to certain fitness centers under the jurisdiction of such Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 5131. A bill to improve the effectiveness of Federal efforts to identify and address homeland security risks to surface transportation, secure against vehicle-based attacks, and conduct a feasibility assessment of introducing new security technologies and measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HECK, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BEYER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WELCH, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CRIST, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SABLON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York,

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MENG, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BERA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. CARDENAS):

H.J. Res. 129. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Restoring Internet Freedom"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. COLE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BOST, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ARRINGTON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BACON, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BARR, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Ms. FOX):

H.J. Res. 130. A joint resolution honoring the life of William (Billy) F. Graham, Jr.; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 109th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DUNN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the CubeSat Launch Initiative and recognizing the development of WeissSat-1; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HILL, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. GABBARD):

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution recognizing the rich history, heritage, and strategic importance of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Marshallese population residing in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H. Res. 752. A resolution recognizing the rise of cardiovascular disease as the world's leading cause of preventable death and disability and as the global public health crisis of our generation and recognizing February 2018 as "American Heart Month"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. KHANNA):

H. Res. 753. A resolution encouraging people in the United States to recognize March 2, 2018, as Read Across America Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 754. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Dominican Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 755. A resolution recognizing and celebrating Black History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H. Res. 756. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 21, 2018, as "National Rosie the Riveter Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 757. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 17 as "National Vitiligo Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H. Res. 758. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of February 2018 as "National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ESTES of Kansas:

H.R. 5099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and clause 18 of section 8 of article I

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 5104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 5105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 5106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—interstate commerce clause

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 5110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1, "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare" of Americans.

In the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96-88), Congress declared that "the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, will help ensure that education issues receive proper treatment at the Federal level, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its education activities more effectively." The Department of Education's mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 5112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the authority to enact legislation that ensures access to firearms.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 5113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution
"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 5116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 5117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article 1:

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 5119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 5120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 5121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 5122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. McEACHIN:

H.R. 5125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 5127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 5131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—"necessary and proper" clause.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.J. Res. 130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 34: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 51: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 113: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 389: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 392: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 525: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 592: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 754: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 785: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 816: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 820: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
H.R. 846: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 878: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 911: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 914: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 936: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 959: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1002: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1060: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1120: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1134: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1150: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1200: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 1227: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 1276: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1278: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1295: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1326: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 1409: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1434: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1444: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1456: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1458: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1472: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1478: Mr. MAST and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1515: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1552: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1612: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1683: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1784: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1802: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1813: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1836: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1903: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1928: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1953: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1957: Ms. BASS and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2005: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2012: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2050: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2150: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 2174: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2278: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2285: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2345: Mr. GALLEG0.
H.R. 2380: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2452: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2553: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2561: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2598: Mr. SIREs, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BASS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BERA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 2599: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2640: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2652: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2723: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2784: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2827: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2841: Mr. COHEN and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2851: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2895: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2902: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2913: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MAST, and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 2952: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2987: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 3144: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 3174: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3222: Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 3249: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 3252: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3301: Mr. ROSS, Mr. TROTT, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 3349: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3378: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3464: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASCRELL, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3520: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3574: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3586: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3592: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3605: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3642: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3654: Mr. TONKO and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3671: Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 3692: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3709: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 3751: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3767: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3889: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3918: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3938: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3975: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3999: Mr. MAST and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4022: Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LOVE, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4057: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 4097: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4099: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 4107: Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4177: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 4180: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 4198: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4202: Ms. BASS and Mr. FASO.
H.R. 4222: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 4229: Mr. POCAN and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4234: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4240: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. LEE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MAST, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KIHUEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MENG, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 4275: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4327: Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 4342: Mr. SIREs and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4343: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4344: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4345: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4392: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4445: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4471: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 4490: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4548: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4575: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4635: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 4673: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 4677: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 4706: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4747: Mr. POSEY, Mr. FASO, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 4766: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4770: Mr. TROTT and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 4775: Mr. SABLAN and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4811: Mr. COLE, Mr. MAST, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4827: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 4829: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 4830: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4831: Mr. BLUM and Mr. FASO.
H.R. 4846: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4859: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4881: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 4904: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4912: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 4916: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 4922: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4942: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 4949: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 4957: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4973: Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 5001: Mr. YARMUTH and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 5006: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 5012: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 5022: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5041: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5071: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5074: Mr. KATKO and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 5087: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. COOPER, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 5090: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. DENT.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. LATTA.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. LATTA.
H.J. Res. 122: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. ROUZER.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Con. Res. 66: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 157: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H. Res. 188: Mr. PETERSON.	H. Res. 621: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. CAPU-	H. Res. 746: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr.
H. Res. 274: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS	ANO.	CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAL-
of Illinois, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MESSER, Mr.	H. Res. 673: Mr. GROTHMAN.	LONE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms.
GROTHMAN, and Mr. CAPUANO.	H. Res. 730: Mr. PERLMUTTER.	EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
	H. Res. 738: Mr. GOMEZ.	

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING READ ACROSS AMERICA DAY AND IMAGINATION LIBRARY

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, this week, teachers, students and families across the country will celebrate the importance of reading by taking part in the National Education Association's Read Across America Day. Research shows that literacy begins before school even starts. Young children who have been read to at home and have had access to a variety of reading materials, develop into stronger readers. That's why programs like Dolly Parton's Imagination Library are so important.

Each month, Imagination Library mails over one million free books to children around the world, including seven thousand in Baltimore. Today, as Dolly donates her hundred millionth book to the Library of Congress, I thank her for her inspiring dedication to children's literacy and I applaud everyone participating in Read Across America Day.

IN HONOR OF DON AND BETTY JO MATHIS' 72ND WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Don and Betty Jo Mathis on the celebration of their 72nd Wedding Anniversary.

This significant benchmark is a symbol of their commitment to each other and to their family. I am happy to join their friends and family in extending my best to them on this special occasion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Don and Betty Jo on the celebration of their 72nd Wedding Anniversary. I wish them the best today and for many more blessed years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House Chamber on Thursday, February 15, 2018, due to official business in my district. Had I been present, I would have

voted NO on roll call no. 80, on the passage of H.R. 620—legislation that I strongly oppose. This bill would prevent Americans with disabilities from getting their day in court when their right to access is violated. In the twenty-eight years since the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act was passed, people with disabilities have made important gains in access and inclusion to public buildings, schools, workplaces, and businesses. The ADA is a fundamental part of American civil rights law; like many of our other civil rights statutes, it depends on voluntary compliance and private rights of action for its enforcement. Shifting the responsibility for compliance to persons with disabilities undermines the spirit of the law and the structure of civil rights statutes more broadly.

H.R. 620 requires a victim of discrimination to provide specific notice of the ADA violation to a business, and then allow 120 days for the business to make "substantial progress" toward remedying the violation. The bill does not define substantial progress, further weakening the business's incentive to comply, and loosening enforceability of the ADA, in turn allowing discrimination against persons with disabilities to continue. While some egregious portions of this bill were removed during floor consideration, including the requirement that a claimant name the specific section of the ADA violated before even notifying the business, its underlying purpose remains clear: making it harder for persons with disabilities to fight for their day in court.

As members of Congress, it is our duty to promote the welfare and dignity of all of our constituents, particularly those who have spent so long on the outside looking in. We ought to defend and strengthen the ADA, reforming it where needed and building on its successes, rather than dismantling its efficacy and closing our legal system off from those who need it. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 26, 2018 I missed the following votes and was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 81, and YEA on Roll Call No. 82.

LAMAR CONSOLIDATED HIGH SCHOOL'S AIR FORCE JUNIOR ROTC EARNS HIGHEST ASSESSMENT SCORE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the instructors and cadets of Lamar Consolidated High School's Air Force Junior ROTC for receiving the assessment score of "Exceeds Standards."

The JROTC program received the "Exceeds Standards" designation, the highest rating attainable by a JROTC program, based on a formal Unit Evaluation on December 4. Major Jeffrey M. Shelton and Senior Master Sergeant Jeffrey T. Moffet have created a learning environment where cadets take great pride in accomplishing their goals and making a positive impact on their community. They are outstanding leaders and role models for their cadets, Maeseille Calonia, Jesus Lopez, Christopher Coats, Manuel Arriaga, Carolina Garcia, Adrianna Rios, Matthew Alfaro, Azahel Vazquez, Julian Vinsonhaler and Isabel Arviso, who performed exceptionally well during their evaluation. Thanks to this JROTC program, they are paving the way to make outstanding military leaders.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second District of Texas, congratulations again to Lamar Consolidated High School's Air Force JROTC for receiving this high assessment score. Keep up the fantastic work.

SPRINGFIELD CLINIC LEADS ILLINOIS IN OPENNOTES

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to recognize the Springfield Clinic, one of the first multi-specialty clinics in downstate Illinois. With more than 400 physicians and advanced practitioners practicing in 80 medical specialties and sub-specialties, Springfield Clinic now proudly stands as one of Illinois' largest private multi-specialty clinics and serves nearly one million patients throughout the central Illinois region.

In 2010, as part of their "leading the way" initiative, all Springfield Clinic offices began working with the OpenNotes movement. This puts them among the nation's leaders in integration of electronic health record technology, which enables clinicians to share their visit notes with patients through fully transparent medical records. This secure system encourages patients to become active participants in

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

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

their health care by providing a convenient way to access and manage personal medical records, communicate directly with medical professionals, schedule appointments and prescriptions, receive email and text reminders for preventive care and upcoming appointments, and pay bills online.

This dynamic state-of-the-art system provides Springfield Clinic the necessary tools to expand patient services. However, we cannot hope to automate and streamline provider workflow unless more patients sign up for and participate in these portals. I'm proud to represent Springfield Clinic, which is on the forefront of this innovative approach to the doctor-patient relationship. 19 million patients are already taking advantage of their new ability to access medical information online through OpenNotes, and my hope is that this number only continues to grow both in my district and across the country. More and more medical professionals and citizens should take advantage of this patient-centered program so we can focus on what matters most—patient care.

THE TRAVIS LETTER

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, February 1836: Texas was in the heat of the fight for our independence. A small volunteer band of 180 patriots stood defiant at the Alamo, fighting tooth and nail against Santa Anna's massive army. They were outnumbered, 10 to 1. Col. William Barrett Travis, a 27-year-old lawyer from South Carolina, led the Texans into battle, ready to defend the Alamo. Surrounded by the enemy, Col. Travis put pen to paper, composing his immortal letter, seeking aid for the defense of Texas. He wrote:

BEJAR, FEBY. 24TH. 1836.

Commandancy of The Alamo,

TO THE PEOPLE OF TEXAS & ALL AMERICANS
IN THE WORLD—

Fellow Citizens & compatriots—I am besieged, by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained a continual Bombardment & cannonade for 24 hours & have not lost a man—The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken—I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, & our flag still waves proudly from the walls—I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of Liberty, of patriotism & everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in four or five days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible & die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor & that of his country—Victory or Death.

WILLIAM BARRETT TRAVIS,

Lt. Col. Comdt, The Alamo

Mr. Speaker, Col. Travis and his group of tenacious volunteer soldiers were killed at the Alamo, defending Texas' freedom. No more than sixty days later, outnumbered, General Sam Houston and his 'Texians' triumphed over Santa Anna and his professional army in

the marshy plains of San Jacinto, winning independence from Mexico. Still to this day, remarkable and inspirational statement for freedom and the spirit of liberty. Col. William Barrett Travis is one reason my oldest grandson is named Barrett Houston. And that is just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF KELLY AND MERRY
TRUJILLO'S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Kelly and Merry Trujillo on the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary.

This significant benchmark is a symbol of their commitment to each other and to their family. I am happy to join their friends and family in extending my best to them on this special occasion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Kelly and Merry on the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary. I wish them the best today and for many more blessed years to come.

CONGRATULATING THE PHILADELPHIA EAGLES

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Philadelphia Eagles on their incredible victory in the 52nd Super Bowl. This hard-fought success could not be sweeter as it finally rings throughout the City of Brotherly Love after 52 years of hope and anticipation. As the representative of the First District of Pennsylvania, I could not be more proud to celebrate this win with my city.

While I am happy that our team won, I am even more pleased at their amazing triumph in the face of adversity; fighting through a challenging season full of injuries and difficulties, this team of underdogs never once gave up. This spirit of resilience and determination was exemplified by our quarterback Nick Foles, who carried the team to the championship after quarterback Carson Wentz injured his ACL.

I am proud of the Philadelphia Eagles for serving up that indescribable "Philly Special," in more ways than one, for all Americans to see. Today, I celebrate this team, the Philadelphia Eagles organization, and most of all, the city of Philadelphia as we cherish this historic win.

As Eagles Head Coach Doug Pederson said, "not only do we have the best fans in the world, we now have the best team in the world." If this season of football has taught us anything, it has shown us never to underestimate the underdogs. Mr. Speaker, I believe

there is just one more thing to say: Fly Eagles fly.

HONORING ROBERT LEE BEASLEY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Robert Lee Beasley.

Mr. Robert Lee Beasley is a native of Greenwood, MS. He is the second child born to Hattie B. Lewis-Beasley and Willie B. McQueen. He is a 1977 graduate of Greenwood High School. While in High School, he participated in the Bulldog Marching Band and NJROTC drill team. His senior year he was voted "most likely to succeed". After graduating from High School he joined the United States Army and trained to be a Military Policeman. After completing Basic Training and AIT, he was shipped off to West Germany. He served most of his military tour in Karlsruhe, West Germany as a physical security Military Policeman.

In April of 1979, Mr. Beasley's mother became ill and he hopped a Concorde cargo jet from Frankfurt, Germany to John F. Kennedy airport in New York on emergency leave. In May of 1979, his mother passed away. His First Sargent granted him a hardship discharge under honorable conditions. After returning home, he became the youngest policeman in the city of Greenwood, Mississippi at age 20. The fall of that same year he enrolled in the undergraduate criminal Justice program at Jackson State University, Jackson, Mississippi. While at Jackson State University, he became President of the American Criminal Justice Association. He represented the criminal justice department at the 1984, Black Caucus Banquet in Jackson, Mississippi. He played trumpet as a member of Jackson State University "Sonic Boom of the South Marching Band". Robert was also a candidate for officer school through the JSU Army ROTC program. The 114th Military Police Unit in Clinton, MS would not allow him to participate in the Officers slow, a part of the ROTC requirement.

In May of 1986, he graduated from Jackson State University with a B.S. degree in Criminal Justice. That same year he became the Director of Security for JSU Marching Band. That next year in 1988, he was hired as a Campus Policeman for the University. In 1985, he was hired at Tougaloo College as Campus Security. The fall of 1986, he was hired as a Correctional Officer for The State of Mississippi Department of Corrections, Rankin County Correctional Facility. Mr. Beasley remained there until June of 1988. The Fall of 1988, he enrolled in JSU graduate Criminal Justice program. Robert completed 30 hours of academic credits toward graduation. In the spring of 1993, he moved to Milwaukee, WI. Within two weeks he was hired as a Learnfare Case Manager. He was responsible for assisting families with determining barriers for children not attending school regularly or dropped out. He engaged with local school officials and principals to reintegrate the child back into a

traditional classroom or find an Alternative School so the child may graduate with a High School Diploma. Robert worked as a Foster Care Case Manager for the Institute for Child and Family Development, Milwaukee, WI. He investigated allegations of abuse and/or neglect for minors. Testified in Court as to the suitability to return the child home or place him or her in a foster home. He developed a dispositional order to terminate parental rights. I worked as a Wraparound Coordinator for at risk kids for the Center for Child and Family Services, Milwaukee, WI. His last employment in Milwaukee was with the Wisconsin Welfare Reform Program as a Financial Employment Planner III. He assisted families and individuals to move from dependency on the government to self-sufficiency.

In March of 2004, Robert returned to Mississippi as a caretaker for two mentally ill brothers. The only job he could get in Greenwood was in the meat department at the Greenwood Market Place. Four months into the job, he met Dr. Roy Hudson, Vice President of University Relations at Mississippi Valley State University. Shortly after meeting Dr. Hudson in June 2005, he was hired as the Technical Assistant for Department of Admissions and Recruitment for the Valley. In 2006, while working full-time and attending graduate criminal justice program at Valley, he survived a heart attack and had to drop out of school and stop working for a while. February of 2008, he became a Career Specialist with Arbor Education and Training. Robert taught a job readiness program called C.E.O. to young adults under the age of 20. In 2010, he joined Thompson-Clemons Post 200 of the American Legion in Greenwood, Mississippi. He was appointed as Public Relations and has served in that capacity since joining the organization. He is responsible for reflecting the Post to the public through media. My office and Mr. Beasley conduct a Veterans Town Hall meeting annually. The Directors of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center and Regional Office are invited to attend this meeting, which allow Veterans to speak directly with those in charge of servicing that population.

Presently, he is a candidate for a Masters of Social Work from Mississippi Valley State University. He is married to Dorothy F. Smith-Beasley. Robert has three grown children and a step-daughter. He is a Veterans Resource Coordinator for AmeriCorps, Mississippi Veterans Support Network. Robert is passionate about outstanding customer service for those who served this great country honorably. He assists Veterans with filing compensation claims and gathering evidence to support their claims. Mississippi Veterans Support Network Program works in collaboration with AmeriCorps, Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Rehabilitation. Our mission is to connect veterans and/or family members of active duty military members to existing resources, dealing with military benefits, connections with the Veterans Administration on line registration, financial training, suicide prevention, and PTSD available treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Robert Beasley, a Veteran, Educator, Leader and Public Servant, for his dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

RECOGNIZING PATRICIA M. LOGUE, AN EXTRAORDINARY CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Judge Patricia M. Logue for her extraordinary leadership in establishing the civil rights of LGBTQ Americans and for her service to the state of Illinois.

In 1993, Pat brought the fight for LGBTQ civil rights to the heartland when she opened the Midwest Regional Office of Lambda Legal in Chicago. Over the next fourteen years, Pat built the office into a formidable force. Working with cooperating attorneys from law firms across the Midwest, Pat won groundbreaking legal victories that helped redefine equality and freedom for students, parents, and families throughout the Midwest.

Pat's deep understanding of constitutional law, ability to select and advance compelling cases, and brilliant strategic thinking made her a leading voice of the LGBTQ civil rights movement. She has been a hero to many in the Chicagoland area and across the country, including to me. I am one of many who have relied on Pat to inform us and to inspire us.

In 1995, Pat helped win the right for gay men and lesbians to adopt children in Illinois. Four years later, Pat acted swiftly to preserve that right against a rogue circuit court whose extraordinary actions put adoptions for three small children at risk. In two separate cases involving lesbian couples, the judge disregarded social workers and court-appointed guardians who testified that the children were thriving in these couples' care and "highly recommended" the adoptions. Instead of crediting these experts, the judge appointed the Family Research Council—an organization that opposes all gay and lesbian adoptions—to represent the children's best interests. Pat immediately appealed these rulings and, minutes after hearing her argument, a unanimous three-judge panel moved to affirm the adoptions for both families. Reading from the bench, Judge Morton Zwick rebuked the lower court's rulings as "an inexcusable injustice" and a discredit to the "people of Illinois."

Pat played a similarly critical role in securing protections for students. For four years, Jamie Nabozny endured extraordinary cruelty and abuse at his Wisconsin high school. Students urinated on him, pretended to rape him, and at one point beat him so badly that he required surgery. Jamie asked for help, but school officials told him that this was what he could expect for being gay. When Jamie sued, the school argued that it was not legally obligated to protect gay students from harassment. Pat took Jamie's case on appeal and won the nation's first ruling that schools cannot turn a blind eye to anti-gay abuse in the landmark 1996 case *Nabozny v. Podlesny*. By protecting students from anti-gay harassment and abuse, Pat opened the door for the gay-straight alliances that now flourish in high schools and colleges across the nation.

Pat was one of the lead lawyers in *Lawrence v. Texas*. At the heart of the majority

decision in *Lawrence* is the understanding that the Constitution's fundamental protections of liberty, equality, and freedom are guaranteed to all Americans. Affirmation of the equal dignity and respect of LGBTQ Americans set the stage for the Supreme Court's 2015 decision to recognize marriage equality in *Obergefell v. Hodges*.

When Pat opened Lambda's Midwest office twenty-five years ago, law and public policy reflected stereotypes and prejudice against the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community. Children were removed from gay and lesbian parents; LGBTQ workers were denied employment or fired from their jobs; and elected officials cited state sodomy laws to deny equal protection under the law. To win cases for clients and lasting change for the nation, Pat helped change that landscape by opening minds and hearts to the realities of LGBTQ lives. She did this time and again, changing public attitudes and legal policies and proving that we are stronger as a nation when we recognize equality and freedom for all.

In 2007, and after leading Lambda Legal's Midwest office for fourteen years, Pat was named as an Associate Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County. Pat brought the same clear-eyed sense of justice and fairness to the bench, where she has served in the Domestic Relations Division.

Pat has enriched the lives of thousands of individuals, couples and families—those she represented directly and the many others who have benefitted from the landmark systemic changes brought about by her work—creating a lasting legacy of opportunity and hope for generations to come.

Pat's life and work are a call to action, a reminder that each of us has the power to effect significant change. For her leadership and courage, her intellect and compassion, we owe Patricia M. Logue a debt of gratitude.

IN HONOR OF JAY WARD'S RETIREMENT FROM THE PARK COUNTY LANDFILL

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Jay Ward on his retirement.

This is a momentous occasion and I hope that he will take the time to reflect upon all his hard work over the past 23 years working for the state of Wyoming and the Park County Landfill. I thank him for his contributions to the Park County Landfill and to our community.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Jay Ward on his retirement. I wish him the best in future endeavors.

HONORING LOIS RICHARD

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lois Catherine Banks

Richard, who passed away after a life of devotion to her family and service to her community.

Born in Pasadena, California in 1931, Lois was instilled with the spirit of activism from a young age by her parents. She graduated from Pasadena High School at the age of 16 and went on to become the only African American student on the English Council, Red Cross Council and elected to the Pasadena City College Associated Student Body Cabinet. She transferred to UCLA, where she earned a Bachelor's Degree in Education. After graduating in 1952, Lois married her husband, Rodney Richard, Jr., at All Saints Church in Pasadena. She and Rod soon returned to Pasadena, where Lois pursued teaching and dedicated her career to the students and families of her hometown.

Lois taught elementary school in the Pasadena Unified School District, where she was known for her positive and encouraging teaching style. In 1966, she spearheaded the development of the Pasadena Head Start Program, working to expand early education to underprivileged children and families in the community. Under her guidance, Pasadena saw the development of three new care centers, the Home Start Program, and the Head Start Enrichment Program—services that supported education, child care, and housing for those in need.

Always looking for ways to further her own education, Lois earned a Master's Degree from Azusa Pacific University by taking night classes while working full-time and caring for her family. After completing graduate school, she went on to be elected as State President of the Association of Head Start Administrators and was appointed to the National Executive Board, where she served before retiring from Head Start after 13 years of service.

Lois was a leader in her community and an activist for social progress throughout her life. In 1979, she ran for Pasadena's City Council, but despite winning a majority of her district's votes, she lost the ensuing citywide runoff election. Seeing how this system prevented fair representation for her community, Lois sought to make a difference. She was joined by organizations like the ACLU and the NAACP in a lawsuit that changed Pasadena's civic voting rules to allow district representation, a cause that sparked similar movements across the country.

Lois made an impact in the lives of countless students, families, coworkers, and friends, and was recognized for her long career of service by the National Head Start Association and by the California State Assembly, which honored her as their 1988 Woman of the Year. On behalf of our community, it is my distinct honor to commemorate the life of Lois Catherine Banks Richard.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF
EILEEN F. GOOD

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplished career of Eileen F.

Good. For 52 years, Ms. Good served the people of Canton, Ohio at Aultman Hospital and the Aultman Health Foundation. We are grateful for her service and devotion to our community.

Eileen Good began her career with Aultman Hospital in 1965 as a student nurse. After graduating from the Aultman School of Nursing, she attained a Master's Degree in Nursing Administration from the University of Akron and a Master's Degree in Business Administration from Ashland University. Good carried her affinity for learning with her throughout her impressive career.

While at Aultman, Good led several initiatives and programs that improved patient safety and earned the hospital national acclaim. She led the development and implementation of that Aultman Level III Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Clinical Information Systems Patient Safety Program, and the care coordination system for MediPlan for the AultCare Health Plan. Additionally, she led the successful completion of numerous Joint Commission on Accreditation Surveys and Ohio Department of Health Clinical Program Certifications. These efforts contributed to the recognition of Aultman Hospital as a Magnet Hospital, earning distinction for excellence in nursing.

Good also made significant contributions to the hospital through executive leadership. She served as the Vice President of Recruitment and Education, Senior Vice President of Human Resources and Education, Senior Vice President of Nursing Services, Chief Nursing Officer, CEO of Post Acute Care Services, and Senior Vice President of Clinical Advocacy for the Aultman Health Foundation.

As a life-long resident of Wayne County, Ohio, Eileen Good spent her accomplished career not only serving patients of Aultman Hospital but the greater Northeast Ohio community. Over the span of 52 outstanding years, Good proved herself as a generous servant leader who undoubtedly improved countless lives. She earned a reputation as a mentor for many nurse professionals, a superb educator and administrator, and effective advocate for patient safety. It is my honor to rise in recognition of such a deserving and accomplished professional and offer my sincerest congratulations to Eileen Good upon her retirement.

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP HARRY L.
SEAWRIGHT

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 133rd Elected and Consecrated Bishop in the African Methodist Episcopal Church, Bishop Harry L. Seawright. After more than 30 years in ministry, Bishop Seawright is currently presiding prelate of Alabama's 9th Episcopal District for the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Bishop Seawright was born in Swansea, South Carolina as the youngest child to the late Joe Nathan and Mary L. Seawright. Born into a family of sharecroppers, Bishop Seawright says, "the work was hard and the

profits were few but the family cared deeply for one another." Bishop Seawright was just five years old when his father passed away, leaving his mother to raise seven children alone. "The insurance we got after my father passed was just enough to cover my father's casket and that was it," Bishop Seawright said. "The next eight years after that was a real struggle for my family."

Equipped with only a ninth grade education, Mrs. Mary Seawright decided to relocate the family after her husband's death in hopes of providing her children with a better life. The decision would move them through six different homes over the course of the next eight years. "My mother was a praying woman," Bishop Seawright said. "She had a lot of faith and courage." His mother took on various domestic jobs in order to facilitate her children's growth. She stressed to her children that with faith, education and hard work anything was possible.

His mother's passion for education became a driving force for Bishop Seawright, who with the help of his family, enrolled at Benedict College in South Carolina. Bishop Seawright says it was during his sophomore year of college while working with a student Christian organization that he first heard his call to ministry. He began speaking at Vespa services on January 23, 1977.

After graduating from Benedict College with his Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, he enrolled at the Howard University School of Divinity, where he received both his Master of Divinity and Doctor of Ministry degrees. Following graduation, Bishop Seawright began his appointment as Interim Pastor of St. Stephen AME, in St. Matthews, SC.

He served on the ministerial staffs of Reid Temple AME and Pilgrim AME, both in Washington, D.C. His pastoral appointments were: Payne Memorial AME, Jessup, MD; Hemingway Temple AME, Washington, D.C.; and Union Bethel AME, Brandywine and Temple Hills, MD. He served Union Bethel for 30 years, the longest tenure of any other pastor in the church's 130-year history.

In 1991, Bishop Seawright led Union Bethel in the construction of a \$1.6 million sanctuary. Union Bethel has over 50 innovative ministries. In 2001, Union Bethel opened a satellite church in Temple Hills, MD, and Union Bethel North (previously known as Union Bethel Intergenerational Center, Inc.—IGC) was birthed. This second church location holds Sunday worship services, Church School, weekly Bible Study and Intercessory Prayer. For nine years, Union Bethel operated FOCUS (For Our Children's Unity School) daycare and kindergarten. FOCUS students received a strong Christian and academic foundation. Union Bethel's ministries and services blessed thousands of people in the county annually. Bishop Seawright spent over 39 years in ministry, specializing in community leadership, church construction and development.

It was early during his ministerial journey that Bishop Seawright met his future wife, Sherita Moon Seawright. "She was beautiful, accepting and very smart," Bishop Seawright said. "And she always encouraged me in her way." He was just a sophomore in college when they met and the two would go on to

marry in 1982, two years after they started dating. The union brought about two beautiful children, Shari Nicole and Harry Matthew. "They are my world," Bishop Seawright said. "Having them brought love to a new meaning."

In 2016, after more than 30 years with Union Bethel, Bishop Seawright prepared to take on his new appointment in Alabama's 9th Episcopal District. The opportunity relocated the Bishop and his family to Birmingham, Alabama. The move allowed Bishop Seawright to focus on encouraging other pastors and also provided an opportunity to develop a few programs including the Life Center at Daniel Payne Plaza.

Daniel Payne Plaza provides people struggling in the community with an opportunity to earn their GED and gain certifications in a multitude of vocational areas, including food preparation and construction. The goal is to transform how the 9th district serves not only the church, but the community. Bishop Seawright says because of his upbringing he understands the value of education and is determined to provide that opportunity to those he serves.

Bishop Seawright has preached for over 30 years and has faithfully served the AME church and his community. His exemplary work has earned him the respect and admiration of his fellow ministers, church members, government and community leaders. On a personal note, I want to thank Bishop Seawright for his continued support and encouragement of my home church, the Historic Brown Chapel AME Church in Selma, AL.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the many accomplishments of Bishop Harry L. Seawright. We pay tribute to his distinguished career for the betterment of the State of Alabama and extend deep appreciation for his exemplary service as the Presiding Prelate of the 9th Episcopal District.

IN HONOR OF JOHN STUART
BRUCE

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Stuart Bruce of Raleigh, North Carolina.

John Bruce was born in Winston-Salem and grew up in Raleigh. He attended the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, graduating in 1975. John then chose to pursue law school, also at UNC, where he graduated in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, after practicing with a Raleigh law firm for about four years, John decided to enter public service with the U.S. Department of Justice. He was appointed as an Assistant U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina on April 18, 1983, and excelled at his job.

John received two Director's Awards from DOJ; one in 2002 for superior performance in a managerial role, and another in 2004 for superior performance as an Assistant United

States Attorney for his work on a prosecution that was called at the time the most successful public corruption case in North Carolina history. This case resulted in the conviction of the North Carolina Commissioner of Agriculture and four of her top aides for multiple felonies associated with their corrupt activities, including extortion under color of official right, mail and wire fraud, and obstruction of justice. The North Carolina Bar Association also recognized John that year with an award as the Outstanding Public Sector Attorney.

Mr. Speaker, when my nomination to serve as U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of North Carolina was confirmed by the Senate in 2006, I selected John to serve as First Assistant U.S. Attorney, working as second-in-command during my five years as U.S. Attorney. His professionalism, integrity, and experience were invaluable as we prosecuted drug trafficking, public corruption, and terrorism cases all across Eastern North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, John Stuart Bruce twice served as U.S. Attorney for the EDNC on an interim basis; first, for a year prior to the confirmation of Frank D. Whitney as U.S. Attorney in 2002, and most recently for 21 months prior to Robert J. Higdon, Jr. taking the oath of office to become the United States Attorney for the Eastern District on October 10, 2017.

Following 34 years of government service, John recently retired on February 9, 2018.

I will always consider John a valued colleague and a friend from our time together in the U.S. Attorney's office. I wish him well in his retirement and any future endeavors.

HONORING ST. CAJETAN PARISH
ON ITS 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize St. Cajetan Parish, a vibrant Catholic parish on the Southwest Side of Chicago, who will celebrate its 90th Anniversary with a Mass on March 4th.

Father Daniel Murphy was given the task of establishing St. Cajetan Parish in what was then the far reaches of Chicago, and the first Mass was celebrated on July 3, 1927. A tiny prefabricated frame church was soon set up at the corner of 112th and Artesian. From a very humble beginning, parish leaders went to work on an intense fundraising and building campaign. In 1932, Fr. Meade became pastor and succeeded in building a school and rectory, enlarged the Church, and found a place to live for the Sinsinawa Dominicans who faithfully taught in the school.

Fr. Sharp, who became pastor in 1943, enlarged the rectory and the school, constructed a convent, and built the Church that is in use today. Father Schomburg built the new rectory in 1970 and Fathers Boyle, Sivore, Burke, Maloney, and Barkemeyer all kept improving and building the community of faith. In the early 2000s, the buildings of the parish were modernized and improved. In 2005, Fr. Kurucz was appointed the 10th Pastor of St. Cajetan and the church was completely renovated in 2015.

St. Cajetan's continued commitment to the Catholic faith and service continue to make it a tremendous asset to the community. The parish has a Ministry of Care which provides prayer, comfort, and healing to those who are unable to physically attend Mass. There is a Special Religious Development Ministry for those with disabilities that helps to integrate people into the wider community. In addition, St. Cajetan's PB & J Ministry works tirelessly to provide meals for the homeless by putting together sack lunches for those in need. It is with this in mind that we remember all the compassion and care this parish has for everyone in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing St. Cajetan Parish and congratulating them as they celebrate their 90th Anniversary. I am confident that St. Cajetan will continue to be an inspiration to all of us through their faith and dedicated service.

MUNICH SECURITY CONFERENCE
AND NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the opportunity to attend the Munich Security Conference, highlighted by Defense Secretary James Mattis and National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster, and senior representatives from more than 70 countries. During the conference, we met with General Curtis Scaparrotti, NATO Supreme Allied Commander, and General Christopher Cavoli, Commander U.S. Army Europe, who are successfully implementing President Donald Trump's European Deterrence Initiative to promote peace through strength, preventing further Russian aggression.

I was grateful for the opportunity to meet with British Prime Minister Theresa May, Prime Minister of Iraq Haider al-Abadi, and Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko, who are on the front lines of advancing democracy. A highlight was Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu exposing Iranian drone wreckage.

I also had the opportunity to participate with Congressman MIKE TURNER at the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Brussels, where we reinforced the bonds with our NATO allies of 29 countries and discussed joint efforts to confront threats of Russian aggression in Moldova, Georgia, and Ukraine.

In conclusion, God Bless our Troops, and may we never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

CONGRATULATING HAILEY HODGE
ON BEING NAMED THE SYRACUSE DISTRICT YOUNG ENTREPRENEUR OF THE YEAR

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Hailey Hodge for being named

the Syracuse District Young Entrepreneur of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration, an annual award presented to outstanding individuals for their dedication to small business.

Ms. Hodge is being recognized for her remarkable achievements as a small business owner. After graduating from Drexel University in November 2014, Ms. Hodge returned to her hometown of Canton, New York, at the age of 22 to open Luna Boutique. Luna Boutique is a successful women's clothing store, the first of its kind in the small town of Canton. Ms. Hodge also served as a role model to other aspiring businesspeople by participating in SUNY Canton's Roopreneur competition, which challenges students to develop innovative ideas for local businesses. In just a few short years, Ms. Hodge not only established a thriving business, but also became a pillar of her community.

Since 1963, the U.S. Small Business Administration has recognized individuals for their commitment to small business during National Small Business Week. The Young Entrepreneur Award recognizes business owners younger than 30 for creating successful small businesses by generating profit, increasing opportunities for employment, developing innovative methods, and demonstrating the potential for long-term business growth.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to congratulate Ms. Hodge for her well-deserved award as the Syracuse District Young Entrepreneur of the Year and wish her continued success in the years to come.

KYLIE POWERS EARNS SILVER MEDAL AT 6A SWIMMING FINALS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kylie Powers, of Ridge Point High School for earning a silver medal in the 6A 100-yard breaststroke.

Powers finished an impressive high school swimming career with a 100-yard breaststroke silver medal with a time of 1:01.15. She is a signee at Texas A&M. Her accomplishments in the pool have made her family and our Missouri City community proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Kylie Powers. We look forward to seeing what she will accomplish in the future.

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL MUJAHID RAMZZIDDIN

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I attended the funeral of a hero. Prince George's County lost a dedicated Corporal last Wednesday, who was shot and killed while off duty but still doing his duty. Corporal Mujahid

Ramzziddin, a fourteen-year veteran of the force, stepped in to protect a neighbor from an abusive spouse. As Chief Hank Stawinski said: 'He saved her life by giving his own.' He is the thirtieth Prince George's County police officer to die in the line of duty. Corporal Ramzziddin's courage is an example of the kind of devotion to duty that our law enforcement officers in Prince George's County and across Maryland and the United States demonstrate each day they serve.

At the funeral in Lanham, I joined state and county officials in comforting Corporal Ramzziddin's wife Tammi and his four children as they paid their final tributes to him and laid him to rest according to traditional Muslim rites. I was honored to present Tammi with a flag flown over the U.S. Capitol in memory of her husband, and I was deeply moved by the outpouring of support and love from the community to the Ramzziddin family. They are in my thoughts at this difficult time, as is Corporal Ramzziddin's heroic example.

Corporal Ramzziddin was not only a dedicated law enforcement officer; he was also a volunteer in the community. He served in several ways with the Nation's Mosque, including as a leader for its Boy Scout Troop 1517, on its safety and security committee, and with the men's group that engaged in neighborhood litter removal projects. Corporal Ramzziddin was a man of faith and service, a patriot and a hero to his community. It surprised no one who knew him that he gave his life while trying to protect someone else.

I hope all of my colleagues in this House will join me in paying tribute to Corporal Mujahid Ramzziddin for his life of service and his ultimate sacrifice protecting the people of Prince George's County, Maryland.

HONORING HENRY LUCKETT

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an intuitive and self-motivated man, Mr. Henry Luckett.

Mr. Henry Luckett was born and raised in Canton, MS, to Hemy and Lucille Luckett. He is the second of six children born. His parents instilled in him at an early age, that if you want to be a productive citizen you must take education seriously, work hard, and never make excuses.

Mr. Luckett has lived in Holmes County since 1982. His family and faith are very important. He's married to Mrs. Charlie M. Luckett and they are the proud parents of four children.

Mr. Luckett currently serves as Chancery Clerk of Holmes County since January 2012. He is an active member of: Holmes County School and Community, serving as a Charter member of Leadership Holmes since 1993; Board of Directors of Holmes County Chambers of Commerce, (2002–2008), as President (2008–2010); and he was President of the William Sullivan School PTA from 2005 to 2010. He currently serves as a member of board of the State PTA of Mississippi. to

Mr. Luckett received a B.A. in Business Administration from Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn., in 1974. He has 26 years of public service with the Department of Human Services (1982–2008), and served as County Director of Holmes County from 1992 to 2008. During this Administration, he was a member of the Six Million Dollar Club, which were counties who were issued six million dollars or more annually in food stamps benefits. Only twenty-five States had that distinction. Being one among the National Six Million Dollar Club members Holmes County received numerous awards from the USDA for exceptional management of the program. As Director he always made sure that everyone was treated with respect and those eligible received their benefits in a timely manner.

Mr. Luckett previously served as Project Director for the Mississippi Parent Information Resource Center Program for the Community Students Learning Center. The Program serves parents of Title 1 students Statewide with information, resources, and training that supports student achievement. Continuing with the support of the community and his involvement with Holmes County Students, the program provides summer employment to the students which teaches them professional work ethics and preparation for future leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Henry Luckett for his desire for continued excellence in his community.

SERBIA AND AMERICA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor for me to talk about the great relationship we have with Serbia as co-chair of the Congressional Serbia Caucus along with my friend EMANUEL CLEAVER (D-MO).

Serbia is a great friend of the United States.

As a Texan, I have great admiration for the people of Serbia. Our strong opinions and habit to speak our minds make us natural allies.

In fact, one of the first people to settle Texas was a Serbian named Dorde Sagic, or George Fischer as he was known in the U.S.

After settling in Texas, Sagic went on to become a justice of the peace in my hometown of Houston, Texas.

But Serbia has contributed much more to the cause of justice than just Mr. Sagic keeping the early streets of Houston safe.

Today we honor the service of Serbia's armed forces who have fought side-by-side with Americans to preserve justice during history's most horrific conflicts.

In 1918, President Woodrow Wilson gave a speech marking the fourth anniversary of Austria-Hungary's invasion of Serbia. Speaking of the bravery of the Serbian armed forces, President Wilson said:

"Nobly did they respond. So valiantly and courageous did they oppose the forces of a country ten times greater in population and resources . . . While their territory has been devastated and their homes despoiled, the

spirit of the Serbian people has not been broken."

As a Texan, I admire such defiance against overwhelming odds.

Like President Wilson, I am proud to share the stories of Serbia's bravery here in Washington.

I believe the most meaningful for Americans is the story of the Halyard Mission during the dark days of the Second World War.

While under Nazi-occupation, the Serbian people demonstrated their bravery as they played a crucial role in the largest rescue operation of American airmen in history.

In 1944, American bombers were flying frequent missions to strike Germany's vital oil supplies in Romania as part of the allied advance into Europe.

The 15th Air Force led this effort by launching nearly 20,000 sorties into Eastern Europe, with many of the missions flying over Nazi-occupied Yugoslavia. As many as 1,500 pilots and airmen were shot down during these courageous air raids.

Serbians, who had been resisting German forces since 1941, risked their own lives to rescue American aircrews and hide them from patrolling Nazis.

For months these brave and noble Serbians cared for and protected American and allied pilots.

By August 1944, the allied forces, including the 15th Air Force and Office of Strategic Services, devised a daring operation to evacuate the hundreds of allied pilots being sheltered by the Serbian resistance.

American aircraft flew into enemy territory and evacuated these airmen from an air field built and protected by local Serbians near the village of Pranjani.

For over 60 years this operation was kept secret. But now we can remember the courage of our Serbian friends and say thank you.

The spirit of the Halyard mission still lives on today as a remarkable story of resistance and heroism.

As was the case in both World Wars, Serbia and the U.S. still face shared threats.

About 600 foreign fighters in Syria have come from the Balkan states. ISIS and al-Qaeda terrorists present a threat to Serbia and the region just as they present a threat to the U.S.

We must continue coordinating with our Serbian partners to stop returning terrorists and neutralize networks that recruit fighters in the Balkans.

The U.S. is also working with Serbia to improve its independent judiciary and fight corruption. A democratic Serbia with a strong rule of law is in America's interests.

But there are others who do not share this goal.

Russian disinformation efforts are designed to keep Serbia in its sphere of influence and poison our warming friendship.

Nevertheless, Serbia's integration to the West has continued to move forward.

In 2006, Serbia joined NATO's Partnership for Peace program and, in 2015, signed an Individual Partnership Action Plan with the alliance to strengthen cooperation.

Recently the European Union announced that Serbia could join the EU as early as 2025. I applaud this step which will strengthen

Belgrade's political institutions and economic ties with the west.

Together we share the same dreams of a bright and free future for both our countries.

We are blessed to have brave men and women that ensure our futures are bright and free.

I want to thank the Serbian armed forces for standing with America in the wars of the past and in the challenges we will face together in the future.

And that's just the way it is.

JACK ARMSTRONG BREAKS CLASS 5A SWIMMING RECORD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jack Armstrong, of Manvel High School, for earning a pair of gold medals at the Class 5A Swimming and Diving meet in Austin.

Armstrong broke the 5A record with a time of 44.57 seconds in the 100 free in the preliminary round on Friday. On Saturday, he won both the 50 and 100 free events. His accomplishments in the pool have made his family and our Manvel community proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Jack Armstrong. We look forward to seeing what he will accomplish in the future. Hoka Hey.

RECOGNIZING THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF THE ELKS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks of the United States of America on their One-hundred fiftieth Anniversary for their outstanding and unparalleled service to the United States.

The Elks started their charitable organization on February 16th, 1868. Since then they have grown nationwide creating and advocating for different services to our communities by advocating their mission to include the principles of charity, justice, brotherly love and fidelity; to recognize a belief in God; to promote the welfare and enhance the happiness of its Members; to quicken the spirit of American patriotism; to cultivate good fellowship; to perpetuate itself as a fraternal organization, and to provide for its government.

The Elks are committed to America's Promise, an alliance of organizations building a better future for our youth through our Scholarship Program, the Hoop Shoot free throw program, and our Drug Awareness Program.

The Elks have pledged NOT to forget our nation's veterans. Each year we visit VA Med-

ical Centers, Outpatient Clinics and State Veterans Homes providing companionship and enhancing their level of comfort.

The Elks also adopt by state its own charitable project. These include summer camps for children with disabilities or who are financially disadvantaged; in-home treatment for people with disabilities; children's hospitals; cancer research; and providing safe, temporary heavens for abused families.

Mr. Speaker, The Order of the Elks have become cornerstones in their individual communities all throughout the United States. These lodges are a source of knowledge, expertise and leadership for our communities, and I once again congratulate them on their momentous milestone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 2018, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on No. 81 and 82.

TAX REFORM WORKS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last year, Congress passed landmark legislation, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

This legislation cuts taxes in every income group.

Now, Texans are seeing the impact of this pro-family, pro-growth tax reform.

And so are the employees of Insperty.

In 1986, Insperty launched with little more than a 600 square foot home office and two employees in Texas's Second Congressional District.

But the small startup quickly began growing, eventually turning into one of the largest HR outsourcing firms in the country.

Earlier this month the company announced bonuses to its employees—made possible through the U.S. tax reform act.

The amount of the bonuses will range from \$1,000 to \$4,000 per employee dependent upon the employee's tenure with the company.

These bonuses total approximately \$9 million and will not be awarded to the management team and other senior leaders.

The company says: "We believe the passage of tax reform is positive news and should provide for stronger growth of Insperty, the small business community and the broader U.S. economy."

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats may call \$1,000–\$4,000 "crumbs . . ."

But to the people of the Texas Second Congressional District this is money that will go directly back into the pockets of a community hit hard by Hurricane Harvey.

This extra money will help families rebuild their homes, restore their possessions that

were ruined by the floodwaters and recover from the devastation brought forward by the Hurricane.

Mr. Speaker, Insuperity is just one example of the good work that this tax reform package has done.

The latest data shows that a typical middle-income family of four in Texas's Second Congressional District will see a Tax Cut of \$2,788.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has put more money in the pockets of employees and allowed industry to grow.

And that's just the way it is.

**MO'S PLACE CELEBRATES
30 YEARS**

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mo's Place, of Katy, TX, on its 30th Anniversary.

Mo Jeloudarzadeh came to America with only his suitcase in hand, and worked his way through college as a dishwasher. He was later promoted to bartender and it was during this time that Mo fell in love with country music. In March 1988, he opened Mo's Place in a small strip center in the Katy area. Mo's passion for serving others and his welcoming hospitality have been the key ingredients to his success. Last year, Mo was awarded the Pioneer Award from the Texas Country Music Hall of Fame for his continued support of Texas Country music artists.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Mo Jeloudarzadeh for celebrating 30 years of success at Mo's Place. We're excited to see what the next 30 years bring.

HONORING CHIEF KENNETH PARKINSON FOR 25 YEARS IN THE PLATTSBURGH CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chief Kenneth Parkinson on his retirement from the Plattsburgh City Police Department after 25 years of service.

Originally from Au Sable, New York, Ken entered the Police Academy in 1993 after graduating from Clinton Community College. In 2003, Ken was promoted to the rank of Patrol Sergeant. As Patrol Sergeant, he served on the Special Response Team, which received a mayoral commendation for service in the 2015 Dannemora Manhunt. Soon after, Ken was promoted to Administrative Lieutenant. After 24 years of service with the Police Department, Ken was appointed in 2017 by Mayor Colin Read to serve as Police Chief, where he worked tirelessly to promote community policing and made combating the opi-

ate epidemic a priority. Ken is a lifelong resident of the Plattsburgh area, and is an exemplary member of his community.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to thank Chief Parkinson for his years of hard work and dedication to his community, and wish him all the best in the years ahead.

MICHAEL VISSER RECEIVES DISTINGUISHED EDUCATION SERVICE AWARD FROM VVC FOUNDATION

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michael Visser who will receive the Distinguished Education Service Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 24, 2018.

Michael was selected for this award by the foundation because of his commitment to encouraging his students to pursue careers in law enforcement. After retiring from three decades in law enforcement, Michael began teaching courses at VVC and was instrumental in opening the Regional Public Safety Training Center on campus. He also played a vital role in assisting the VVC Campus Police Department in obtaining new firearms and improved training. He has gone above and beyond in supporting the campus by facilitating emergency drills such as "The Great Shake-out" and "Active Shooter Training." Michael's passion for giving back to his students is evident in everything he does.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate Michael Visser for his tireless effort on behalf of his students at VVC. Undoubtedly, he is well-deserving of the Distinguished Education Service Award.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RARE DISEASE ADVANCEMENT, RESEARCH, AND EDUCATION (RARE) ACT

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Rare disease Advancement, Research, and Education (RARE) Act. This important, bipartisan legislation would address many of the issues facing rare disease patients and families. Today, Rare Disease Day, many of these individuals are sharing their stories and educating communities of researchers, health professionals, governments, families, and friends about how rare diseases affect them. I am proud to introduce the RARE Act not only in recognition of these efforts, but moreover to address the many unique challenges facing the rare disease patient community.

Almost 7,000 rare diseases affect nearly 30,000,000 Americans, and many lack an ef-

fective treatment. There remains much Congress can do to improve rare disease awareness, education, research, surveillance, diagnosis, and treatment, and to address common challenges faced by rare disease patients.

Over the course of my time in Congress, I have met with countless rare disease patients and their families. Each story is unique—and in many cases heartbreaking—but it is essential that Congress address some of the root causes behind these stories.

Rare diseases cross the medical spectrum, but individuals with rare diseases face some common challenges. In large part due to their limited patient population size, these individuals may have difficulty obtaining an accurate diagnosis, finding physicians or treatment centers with expertise in their disease, and ultimately finding appropriate treatment options and cures. While over 450 drugs have been approved for the treatment of rare diseases, millions of Americans suffering from a rare disease have no approved treatment options.

For decades, Congress has worked to support advancements in rare disease, with legislation ranging from the Orphan Drug Act to the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act to most recently, the 21st Century Cures Act. In addition, the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health have made important strides, prioritizing research, development, and approval of treatment targeting rare diseases. Nonetheless, it remains clear that there remains much policymakers can do to further these critical efforts.

The RARE Act would represent an important step in this direction, addressing some of the commonalities between rare diseases and aiming to improve rare disease treatment, research, and diagnostics.

First, the RARE Act would expand our understanding of rare diseases by enhancing an existing and successful program: the Rare Diseases Clinical Research Network. The Rare Diseases Clinical Research Network at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is made up of 21 research 'centers of excellence' studying rare diseases in an interdisciplinary way, working with patients and others on clinical studies and other research.

Second, the RARE Act would fill critical gaps in our healthcare system, improving coordination, surveillance, and awareness of rare diseases. For example, the RARE Act would require the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to create a National Rare Disease or Condition Surveillance System. Modelled off of similar systems for other conditions, this formalized infrastructure would track rare disease data, helping researchers to understand commonalities between diseases. The RARE Act would also require the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) to expand and intensify its work to ensure that health professionals are aware of rare disease diagnoses and treatments. And it would mandate an updated report on rare disease efforts from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, to ensure that Congress has the best tools possible to address these issues.

Passage of the RARE Act would represent a major stride in combating these unique diseases and conditions, and enhance the federal government, non-profit, and private sectors capacities to improve patients' lives. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the RARE Act.

**SUBURBAN SUGAR LAND WOMEN
HONOR FORT BEND COUNTY
LEADERS FOR WOMEN'S HIS-
TORY MONTH**

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Bend County women honored by the Suburban Sugar Land Women (SSLW) for Women's History Month 2018.

The National Women's History Project celebrates the diverse and historic accomplishments of women. Every year, SSLW recognizes women who have made a positive impact upon our community. There are six women from Fort Bend County who received this honor—Evelyn Peters Dean, president of the Suburban Houston Fort Bend Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., Ammie Blahuta, president of Gigi's Playhouse Down Syndrome Achievement Centers, Tran Pham Rich, president of Cookie Joe's Dancin' School, Sugar Land, Manuela Arroyos, CEO of Fort Bend Seniors Meals on Wheels, Cynthia Ginyard, a passionate retired educator and public servant and Lupe Uresti, former mayor of Rosenberg and current Rosenberg Housing Authority director and treasurer for the board of directors of the Fort Bend Hispanic Heritage Forum. Each of these women contributes to the strength and vibrancy of our community and we thank them.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Suburban Sugar Land Women honorees. Thank you for all you do for our community.

**IN RECOGNITION OF JIM WAG-
NER'S LIFE OF DISTINGUISHED
PUBLIC SERVICE**

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Wagner as he retires from a lifetime of distinguished public service to the Downrivers of Michigan. This week he will retire as Trenton City Administrator, but his service has been long and extensive. He has brought our community together for years through his leadership.

A lifelong resident of Wyandotte, Michigan, Mr. Wagner grew up with a passion to serve the community that he loves. He operated Wyandotte Sporting Goods in his early adult life and was known for his kind demeanor, friendliness and helping anyone that needs it. At age

34 in 1979, Mr. Wagner was approached and told that he would be a good candidate for Wyandotte Mayor. He served as Mayor for 8 years and later served in various capacities before being appointed as Trenton City Administrator in December 2011. In his role as Trenton City Administrator, he was responsible for identifying the city's top priorities and effectively utilizing the city's resources. He has held this role for over 6 years and leaves behind a legacy of passionate and successful leadership as he retires from this position. He has helped guide Trenton, Wyandotte and surrounding areas through tough economic times and challenging circumstances and is an important reason that the Downrivers remain strong.

Mr. Wagner is known by community members throughout the region as someone who has a deep knowledge of the area and worked hard to create local partnerships to make continued improvements. One of the most successful projects spearheaded by Mr. Wagner was the "Say Yes to Downriver" slogan that increased the area's visibility and brought new families and businesses to Trenton and the surrounding cities. Other successes included creating the yearly business summit held by the Southern Wayne County Regional Chamber of Commerce, helping establish the Downriver Community Conference, assisting residents who have lost their jobs, authoring a national grant to retrain workers, addressing serious environmental issues in both Brownfield and superfund sites and continuing to renovate the International Wildlife Refuge. His colleagues have said that there need to be more public servants like him and that he is leaving behind a legacy of excellence. Mr. Wagner looks forward to seeing the Downriver area continue to flourish in his retirement, and his hard work and expertise is valued and the community will continue to tap his wisdom in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Jim Wagner's lifetime of leadership and public service. Mr. Wagner has effectively served the Downriver area throughout his career.

**RECOGNITION OF MS. FRANCESCA
ALFANO**

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to rise today to honor Ms. Francesca Alfano, for her outstanding community service work in her hometown of West Palm Beach, Florida.

Ms. Alfano was one of five students selected by Florida's Hometown U.S.A. Program, Inc. this year. She is a high school junior at Alexander W. Dreyfoos School of the Arts, a public high school located in West Palm Beach, Florida. She is the daughter of Monique McCall and Gianpaolo Alfano.

Throughout this year, Ms. Alfano will proudly represent West Palm Beach as she travels to visit nursing homes, children's hospitals, Veteran's hospitals, charity events, and other activities throughout the State of Florida.

She certainly reflects the values of Florida's Hometown U.S.A. Program, Inc., which encourages and supports students who have a desire to volunteer. There is truly no limit to the difference students like Ms. Alfano can make in the lives of their neighbors with the support of organizations like Florida's Hometown U.S.A., Inc.

Florida's Hometown U.S.A. Program, Inc. is a non-profit educational youth organization, which has received Disney's Helping Kids Shine Award, Disney's VolunteAR of the Year, the Governor's Points of Light Award from former Governor Jeb Bush, and the national President's Daily Points of Light Award from former President George W. Bush.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Ms. Francesca Alfano represents my district. She is a student and community member whom we can all admire and respect. I commend her for her deep commitment to volunteer work, and wish her the best as she pursues her high school diploma and beyond.

**KISD BRINGS HOME FIVE STATE
SWIMMING MEDALS**

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate five Katy ISD state swimming medalists.

Kaloyan Bratanov, a senior at Katy High School, won the 6A championship in the 200-yard medley and won the silver medal in the 100-yard freestyle. Emma Sticklen, a sophomore at Taylor High School, brought home a bronze medal in the 100-yard backstroke. Cinco Ranch High School senior, Aria Bernal earned her third consecutive state silver medal in the backstroke, finishing with a time of 52.72. William Coakley, a junior at Seven Lakes' High School, earned a bronze medal in the 200 free. Senior Brayden Rudd of Seven Lakes' High School finished his high school career with a bronze medal in the breaststroke. Each of these students has made Katy and all of Texas proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to each of you on your accomplishments. We look forward to seeing what you will accomplish in the future.

**TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S PASTOR
AND GOD'S MAN—BILLY GRAHAM**

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Paul wrote in the book of Galatians "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." This was Billy Graham's favorite bible verse. He chose only to boast in humility, sacrifice, and the cross of Christ. He was America's Pastor, who lived his

life to bring the lost and hurting to Christ. Today, as his body lies in honor, inside the Capitol's Rotunda, I am proud to pay tribute to long time famed evangelist, Billy Graham.

On a dairy farm located outside Charlotte, North Carolina, Billy Graham was born November 7, 1918. He grew up like most rural 1920s American children. He was raised in a colonial-style house with indoor plumbing. He lived a quiet country life where he helped work the farm, played baseball, and went to church on most Sundays.

In 1934, at the age of 16, he was saved during a revival meeting led by Dr. Mordecai Ham. After high school, he moved to Tennessee and enrolled in a small Christian school, Bob Jones College, for half a semester before leaving. He found the school too strict. He transferred to Florida Bible Institute where he continued his education and prepared himself for his future ministry. He soon felt called to preach.

In Florida, he joined a Southern Baptist Convention church, and was ordained to preach in 1939. He began preaching at small churches and revival meetings. He graduated with a bachelor's in theology and decided to further his spiritual training at Wheaton College in Illinois.

With a deep faith in God, 21 year old Graham arrived at Wheaton College in 1940 as a tall, gentle man with a booming voice whose one goal was to preach the gospel. Here he met his future wife, Ruth Bell. Ruth, the daughter of medical missionaries, was raised in China. She prayed that God would let her live out her life as a missionary. God gave her Billy Graham. After graduating with a bachelor's in anthropology, Graham married Bell on August 13, 1943 in the Blue Ridge Mountains of North Carolina. "There would have been no Billy Graham . . . had it not been for Ruth," said the late T. W. Wilson. She was his anchor and advisor for over 63 years.

Graham discovered God's call was to lead others to Christ by becoming an evangelist. He first made national attention during his Los Angeles Crusade in fall 1949. Under a white tent, 30 year old Graham preached over 65 sermons to more than 350,000 people. Overnight, he became a household name.

The Billy Graham Crusades were heard all over our world between 1947 and 2005. He filled large arenas and stadiums across our country with a focus of bringing people to Christ. Long before churches were ready for racial integration, he integrated his crusades. His Crusades made it to my neck of the woods three times: in 1952, 1965 and 1981. In 1952, half million Texans came out to hear Graham preach. Roy Rogers and Dale Evans gave their testimony, too. The brand new Astrodome opened its doors for 10 days to Graham in 1965. Lyndon B. Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson attended. At 63 years old, Graham preached at Rice Stadium in 1981.

The Billy Graham Evangelistic Association was founded in 1950. It was made up of a core team who created the "Modesto Manifesto," a covenant to ensure the integrity of his ministry. Millions more could now hear him on the radio and see him on TV. Graham understood the power of the media. He also became one of the world's best-selling authors. He became a world evangelist called to spread the good news.

Graham was called the Pastor to our Presidents. He met with all post war Presidents up to Obama. Our country called on him in times of celebration and tragedy. He delivered invocations at presidential inaugurations. He preached at the Washington National Cathedral, three days after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. His message gave hope and healing to a shocked nation. At the age of 77, he jointly received the Congressional Gold Medal in the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol with his wife, Ruth.

Ruth passed away in the summer of 2007 at their home in Montreat, North Carolina. They had five children: Gigi, Anne, Ruth, Franklin and Ned. They had 19 grandchildren. They are all involved in the ministry. In his later years, Graham was asked if he has any regrets. He replied, "although I have much to be grateful for as I look back over my life, I also have many regrets. I have failed many times, and I would do many things differently. For one thing, I would speak less and study more, and I would spend more time with my family."

At his 95th birthday celebration, Graham delivered his last message. He recorded a video that featured clips from his home in Montreat, North Carolina. His message was delivered in a quieter voice but provided a powerful message. He expressed concern for our nation, "Our country's in great need of a spiritual awakening," he declared. "There have been times that I've wept as I've gone from city to city and I've seen how far people have wandered from God."

Today, I honor the life of Billy Graham and his ministries that have touched millions of people worldwide. There can never be another Billy Graham. God used a farm boy with a gentle heart to preach his truth.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING DEMI WASHINGTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable young lady, Ms. Demi Washington of Clinton, MS.

Demi Washington is a senior at Clinton High School, where she currently holds the title of Miss Clinton High School and has a 3.5 GPA.

Demi is a very athletic and competitive young lady and was recently awarded a full scholarship to the University of Alabama (Roll Tide), beginning Fall '17. Throughout her years she has been awarded several awards: 2014 Gatorade Athlete of the Year; No. 1 Sprinter in the State of MS, since 8th grade; and the 1st female to win the State championship in the 8th grade. In April of 2017, Demi finished first in three events: 100 M Dash with a time of 11.85; the 200 M Dash with a time of 24.10; and set a new PR in the long jump with a mark of 17-1 at the MHSAA Division 4-6A meet. Her coach stated that, she is looking forward to winning the 100m and 200m dashes at the state meet this year to end her high school year on top.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and congratulating Ms. Demi

Washington for such a job well done throughout her athletic path in and throughout Clinton, MS.

WOMEN AND TERRORISTS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the spread of terrorism and extremist ideas has claimed countless lives, destroyed hundreds of communities, and spawned radical groups around the world. Women, in particular, have long been the victims of these radical ideologies.

Just last week, the terrorist group Boko Haram targeted a girl's school in Nigeria and abducted more than 100 young girls. This incident follows the 2014 abduction of 270 Nigerian school girls, of which 112 are still missing. These acts are far from uncommon among Islamist terrorist organizations. Across the globe, jihadist networks subject women and young girls to horrendous human rights abuses. These male-dominated extremist groups frequently deny basic rights, like access to education or political representation to women as a core component of their ideology.

Terrorist groups like ISIS and Boko Haram are often the worst abusers of women, forcing them into marriages and sexual slavery. It should be no surprise that the status of women in a society is often an important indicator as to how vulnerable that society is to violence and radicalization.

Yet, while being one of the primary targets of terrorist groups, women are also being radicalized and recruited into these groups. Some support the group's operations, enforce its laws, or marry and bear the children of terrorist fighters. Others actually commit these heinous acts of terror. In recent years, as many as 3,000 women have traveled to the Middle East to join ISIS with many becoming female suicide bombers.

Despite the marginalization and brutality of women in extremist-held lands, repressive regimes, persistent conflict, and poor development policies can create conditions that make groups like ISIS be seen as an opportunity for women. Extremist groups exploit female grievances and claim to offer women greater empowerment and increased status—luring them into joining their extremist cause. Once radicalized, terrorist organizations will leverage the societal status of women to further their violent goals. For example, Boko Haram has exploited cultural perceptions of women in Nigeria as non-violent and unlikely to be involved in terrorism, to use them as intelligence and recruiting tools.

In our efforts to combat terrorism and extremism abroad, we have neglected the important role women can play to actually prevent radicalization and facilitate peace-building in areas long-worn by violence. Women are well placed in homes, schools, and communities to challenge extremist narratives. Research shows that anti-terrorism messages can be more effectively spread by women because they are more directly involved with those most vulnerable to terrorist recruitment: the

world's youth. Given their importance in families and communities, it is essential that women, both at home and abroad, are more meaningfully enlisted in the fight against terrorism.

Two years ago as French police hunted for the mastermind behind the Paris attacks that killed 130, it was a woman who reported his whereabouts to police. Her role as a surrogate mother to family members of the attacker allowed her access and trust that men unfamiliar to the family would have never have gained. Her brave action prevented a planned follow-on attack.

Meanwhile in Kosovo, it was women who were first in their communities to voice concerns when young men began stocking weapons and conducting training exercises in 1998. Unfortunately, these women's warnings of impending conflict were ignored. Such an example demonstrates the critical role of women in spotting emerging violence and gaining trust within families and communities. Unfortunately, we often lack their perspectives because women are underrepresented in governments where terrorist groups are most active. Because of their better ability to build trust, women have proven to improve the outcomes of conflict mediation and peace building.

A study of 40 peace processes in 35 countries over the past 30 years, found that when women were involved, more agreements were reached, implemented, and sustained. As more and more terrorist groups threaten our country, our allies, and our interest throughout the world, it is vital that we leverage the talents and perspectives of women as part of a multifaceted approach to ensure security at home and abroad. It must be policy of the United States, that as we work in societies damaged by years of war and political unrest, we empower women to have a larger voice. While the men in these male-dominated cultures have continued to fight and disagree, it is the women, who are often the biggest victims that have demonstrated an ability to reach peaceful settlements.

By taking important steps to integrate women into its security strategies, the U.S. will unleash untapped skills and abilities to defeat radical terrorists that would rather have them subjugated. In the fight against terrorism, we need everyone at the table—especially women. And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE DANVILLE SCHLARMAN GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2018 IHSA Class 1A State Champions the Danville Schlarman High School Girls Basketball Team.

The Lady Hilltoppers won the state title game 53–31 to cap off a season with a record of 31 wins and just one loss. Schlarman was led in scoring by Janiah Newell, Caprina Brown, and Anaya Peoples all scoring in dou-

ble digits. But this was a team effort and team victory as the Hilltoppers were equally impressive on defense as they were on offense.

I would like to congratulate the entire Danville Schlarman Girls Basketball Team on their victory and on a superb end to a great season: Anaya Peoples, Cece Damilano, Destiny Dye, Emma Bogen, Janiah Newell, McKaylee Allen, Suzet Sermensheim, Sydney Gouard, Tannah Ceader as well as Head Coach Keith Peoples.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the Danville Schlarman Girls Basketball Team in winning the 2018 IHSA Class 1A State Title. I wish the team and their coach all the best in the future.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DUBLIN VICE MAYOR DON BIDDLE

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Dublin Vice Mayor Don Biddle. We lost Don on February 21, 2018 at the age of 80. Don lived in the city of Dublin, California for 44 years and worked tirelessly to serve his community.

After serving four years on the Dublin Planning Commission, Don was appointed as a member of the Dublin City Council in 2008 and retained his seat in subsequent elections. It was my privilege to serve alongside Don on the City Council from 2010 to 2013. His colleagues repeatedly recognized Don's character and commitment by nominating him to serve as Vice Mayor on multiple occasions.

His achievements as a city councilmember received national acclaim. One of Don's proudest achievements was the redevelopment of the former federal housing project, Arroyo Vista, into the region's largest mixed-income housing development, Emerald Vista. He was a consistent champion of affordable housing who also worked to develop an apartment complex tailored to the needs of active military members, veterans, and their families. Don's leadership led Dublin to be named an "All American City" while he was on city council.

Don also was steadfast in his commitment to children, serving as a school board trustee for 12 years. As a trustee, he was instrumental in the creation of the Dublin Unified School District and was a leader in the rebuilding and improvement of the city's aging schools. Beyond the school board, he remained passionate about education, serving the Dublin Partners in Education for nearly two decades, including as president and board member.

Don served as an active representative of the Dublin community, on a variety of commissions throughout Alameda County. Additionally, Don supported the growth of non-profit organizations within Dublin such as the School of Imagination, Dublin Rotary Club, Dublin Integrity in Action, the YMCA, the American Cancer Society, and Hope Hospice.

Throughout his life, Don selflessly served the greater Tri-Valley community. I am grateful

to have known Don Biddle, and he has left behind an unforgettable legacy of kindness, charity and service. My thoughts and prayers are with his family, and he will forever be remembered for his invaluable contributions to the community.

IN RECOGNITION OF FIRE CHIEF KENNETH BRISCOE

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief Kenneth Briscoe of Caldwell County, North Carolina. On behalf of the people of Lenoir, I congratulate Chief Briscoe on his retirement and thank him for 23 years of service to Caldwell County, and 45 years of service to North Carolina.

Chief Briscoe began his career in 1973 as a volunteer firefighter in Hudson, North Carolina. He joined the Lenoir Fire Department as a paid firefighter in 1975 and was promoted to Captain in 1983. Chief Briscoe joined the North Carolina Department of Insurance in 1984 and was made the Deputy Director of the North Carolina Department of Insurance and the Fire and Rescue Commission. Chief Briscoe left the North Carolina Department of Insurance in 2004 to become the Chief of the Lenoir Fire Department.

During his career, Chief Briscoe has received many awards and honors for his exceptional service. In 2007, Chief Briscoe was selected Fireman of the Year by the North Carolina State Fireman's Association and was also recognized by the North Carolina State Senate for his outstanding service to North Carolina and the City of Lenoir. Chief Briscoe has been recognized by this Congress on three separate occasions for his service to the people of Lenoir and the State of North Carolina. In 2011, Chief Briscoe was awarded the National Chief Fire Officer designation and was made a member of the Institution of Fire Engineers. Furthermore, Chief Briscoe has attained many certifications through the International Fire Service Accreditation Congress.

Chief Briscoe was the first member of the North Carolina Association of Fire Chiefs to serve as President and Past President for two terms. As President of the North Carolina Association of Fire Chiefs, he represented over 1,500 fire chiefs and 45,000 firefighters. Chief Briscoe has also served as the Vice-Chairman of the North Carolina Fire and Rescue Commission. In 2014, Chief Briscoe was aptly named Western North Carolina Fire Officer of the Year. Western North Carolina is proud to have such an accomplished and caring public servant. Chief Briscoe is married to his wife, Paula, and they have one son, Joe.

Chief Briscoe's long list of awards and accomplishments does not paint the full-picture of the meaningful impact he has made on Caldwell County and the State of North Carolina. For his service to Western North Carolina, I am honored to express the gratitude and best wishes of the people of North Carolina to Chief Briscoe on his retirement.

HONORING CIVIL RIGHTS ICON
ANNE MOODY**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the late Civil Rights icon, Anne Moody.

Ms. Moody was a native of Centreville, Mississippi, and was vital to the Civil Rights Movement in the state. While a student at Tougaloo College, she became heavily involved in organizations, such as Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). In 1963, Moody became a pivotal figure in the Civil Rights Movement when newspapers featured a photograph of her participation in a sit-in at Woolworth's lunch counter in Jackson, Mississippi. Ms. Moody is best remembered for her best-selling novel 'Coming Age of Mississippi' released in 1968.

During the last years of her life, Ms. Moody suffered from dementia. On February 5, 2015 at 74-years-old, she passed away.

Today, we honor the life and legacy of Ms. Anne Moody and family.

MARCH 2, 1836—TEXAS
INDEPENDENCE DAY**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, independence came to Texas differently than it did for the 13 colonies. Let me explain.

Texas was a part of Spain for over 100 years when Mexico fought a successful revolution in 1820 against Spain to form a democracy, which included Texas. However, Santa Anna, the president of Mexico, declared himself Dictator of Mexico and he abolished the Mexican constitution. This was unacceptable to people living in Texas—both Anglos and Tejanos (Texas-born Mexicans). Dissent against the government spread through Texas.

War broke out in 1835 in the small town of Gonzales when a detachment from the Mexican army tried to take a cannon from the townspeople. The cannon was for protection against hostile Indian raids on the community. Shots rang out between the Mexican army and the armed townspeople. There were a few wounded on both sides, and neither side claimed victory.

Skirmishes continued between both sides. The Texians, as they were called, drove out the Mexican army from the town of Bexar—now called San Antonio. A small Texian army of volunteers occupied the Alamo in February 1836 in Bexar, under the command of Lieutenant Colonel William Barratt Travis—a 27-year-old lawyer from South Carolina. Other Texian volunteers took the town of Goliad under Texian Colonel James Fannin. General Sam Houston was the commander of all Texian forces in the struggle for independence.

Meanwhile, on March 2, 1836 (ironically Sam Houston's birthdate), "officials"—both Anglos and Tejanos—from Texas gathered in a place called Washington on the Brazos, and declared independence from the Dictatorship of Mexico. The Republic of Texas was born.

However, the defenders in the Alamo fell on March 6, 1836, and Fannin was defeated and he and his men were executed by the Mexican army.

General Sam Houston continued to rebuild a Texas army and marched east towards the marches of San Jacinto (near present day Houston, Texas).

On April 21, 1836 the Texas army surprised and met the vastly larger army of Santa Anna, and defeated it in a brutal, but short, 18-minute battle. Santa Anna was captured along with half of his army. The rest were casualties of the battle. The Texian losses were minimal.

The Texas war for independence and freedom was successful.

Texas remained a Republic for nine years then was admitted to the Union in 1845, by the slim vote margin of one.

The rest, they say, is Texas history.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING JUDGE DANIEL
HEATH**HON. JIM BANKS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Allen County Judge Daniel Heath and to congratulate him on his retirement. For years Judge Heath has been an integral figure in our community. After graduating from what is now the Indiana University McKinney School of Law in Indianapolis, Judge Heath and his family returned to Fort Wayne, wherein he began his career in public service.

Judge Heath took a job as a District Representative for then-Congressman Dan Coats. In this capacity, Judge Heath managed an outstanding constituent service operation that served the people of northeast Indiana. Judge Heath then served as Fort Wayne Mayor Paul Helmke's Chief of Staff and Safety Director, before running for Congress in 1989. Though he was defeated in a close race, Judge Heath never stopped serving his community. In 1996, he was elected to the bench in Allen County.

Having served in the Civil Division of the Allen Superior Court for 17 years, Judge Heath went on to serve in the family division in 2013. In this role, Judge Heath spearheaded many important initiatives in our community, including the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, a program designed to lower the number of young offenders incarcerated in Allen County, and BrightSteps, a program designed to enhance early childhood development.

Allen County benefited greatly from Judge Heath's dedication to the community, and we will miss his leadership. I wish him and his family the best in his retirement and future endeavors.

RICHMOND POLICE DEPARTMENT
HONORS DEDICATION OF EM-
PLOYEES AND CITIZENS**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the men and women honored by the Richmond Police Department at their annual awards banquet last month.

The banquet honors dedicated employees and citizens committed to the mission of the Richmond Police Department. Each Division Commander picks someone from their division to honor. Officer James Williams was named 2017 Officer of the Year and Officer Vladimir Golovine was named 2017 Employee of the Year. The department awarded the Business Sponsor of the Year to The Church of Rosenberg for outstanding support to the department during 2017. Josh Landry was honored as 2017 Citizen of the Year. Also receiving awards were Rookie of the Year Officer Ruben Robles, Top Gun Division Winner Officer Robert Oliver, Co-Detective of the Year Detective John Dawson, Top Gun Division Winner and Overall Champion Sgt. Steven Rychlik, Co-Detective of the Year & Top Gun Division Winner Detective David Childs, Top Gun Division Winner Detective Andrew Runge and Telecommunicator of the Year Danell Gaydos. Our communities are safer thanks to strong police departments and the critical organizations that support them. Thank you to each of these honorees.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Richmond Police Department honorees. I thank them for all they do to keep the Richmond community safe.

HONORING FANNIE'S NEST, INC.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group of innovators who have shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to serve their community, Fannie's Nest, Inc.

Fannie's Nest, Inc. is a Mississippi based nonprofit organization and with its ministry incorporated on January 22, 2016 by founders Pamela Scott Bracey, PhD and Darrell Scott, Jr. The founders along with several other cousins were interested in carrying out the legacy of "educated communities of Christian unity" instilled by their grandmother, the late Fannie Lee Jones Scott. Fannie was the mother of 12 children, and mother-like figure to several other children in the community of Yazoo City, Mississippi. She also served as a devoted choir leader of Tulane Missionary Baptist Church in Yazoo City for many years until her untimely passing to be with the Lord in 1996.

As a charitable organization and ministry, Fannie's Nest, Inc. vision is to exhibit a sincere hands-on Christian approach to encourage the development of well-rounded youth

that grow to make positive impacts in all areas of society. Their mission is to educate, empower, and expose youth to a variety of stimulating experiences with the ultimate goal of nurturing them to soar beyond mediocrity, negative stereotypes, and unfavorable statistics.

The organizers and members of Fannie's Nest, Inc. are committed to designing and implementing innovative mentoring programs, conferences, and events that cater to youth in pursuit of aiding Mississippi students and communities to grow in the following areas: Educational Scholarship, Career Development, Leadership, Service Learning, Financial Education, Physical Fitness, Self-Awareness, Cultural Awareness, Music Appreciation, and Communication.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Fannie's Nest, Inc. for its dedication and desire to serve others and giving back to the community.

HONORING CRECENCIO CRUZ PADILLA

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a lifelong LULAC member and community activist of the Central Coast community, Crecencio Cruz Padilla.

Born in Mexico City, Mr. Padilla arrived in Monterey County in 1953 and worked as a farmworker for Driscoll's Berries. During the 1960s, Castroville's Head Start Program hired Mr. Padilla as a Community Liaison where he had an opportunity to work with farmworker families. Education was very important to Mr. Padilla, and he decided to take part-time classes at Hartnell College focusing on criminal law. That experience led him to advocate for community members accused of committing crimes. Mr. Padilla went on to become an investigator at the Monterey County Public Defender's Office in 1974 where he worked until his retirement in 1997.

Mr. Padilla was also a pioneering civil-rights activist in Monterey County. In 1972, he founded the North Monterey County Chapter of the League of United Latin American Citizens, a civil rights advocacy organization. Mr. Padilla, alongside Cesar Chavez, was also a strong supporter of the United Farm Workers in their fight for unionization.

Mr. Padilla spent his life fighting to help those in the community of little means. In one account, Mr. Padilla demanded that the city of Salinas form a police review board after a string of officer involved incidents. Mr. Padilla also helped community members in generous ways that did not make headlines. He defended a countless number of people and was known to take in families he found without shelter at the courthouse. In 2012, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the La Raza Lawyers Association, and the Alisal Betterment Association dedicated a Lady Justice statue at the National Steinbeck Center in honor of Mr. Padilla's work. Mr. Padilla's legacy as a passionate advocate for his community will stand the test of time.

Crecencio Padilla's legacy is defined by his dedication to his family as well. His children remember him as "an amazing father and husband," who gave love and support to all his family. He was a role model for his family and the Central Coast community. His legacy will live on in the memories of those of us who had the honor to know him. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring Crecencio Padilla.

SEXUAL ASSAULT SURVIVOR BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every six months, Amanda Nguyen begins her search for her rape kit.

Despite being sexually assaulted, the burden to ensure it's not destroyed lies on Amanda—the victim.

In her home state, there is a 15-year statute of limitations for prosecuting sexual assault crimes.

But untested rape kits are only required to be stored for six months.

Mr. Speaker, conflicting laws like this defy common sense.

Because of stories like Amada's, Congress passed a bill in 2016 that implements, on the federal level, a Sexual Assault Survivors Bill of Rights.

This important legislation grants survivors the right to have a rape kit preserved for a full 20 years.

It gives survivors the results of forensic exams and notification if an evidence kit is destroyed.

Two years after passage, it's clear that this legislation is needed now, more than ever.

This week the House Judiciary Committee will be reviewing this imperative law.

Ensuring it is implemented effectively and improves the experience of survivors as they fight for the justice they rightfully deserve.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE MDWFP SPECIAL RESPONSE TEAM

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks' Special Response Team led by Major Dale Bell.

On July 11, 2017 at approximately 0700 hours, the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks (MDWFP) Special Response Team (SRT), made up of 36 SRT members and seven conservation officers, were deployed to Leflore County, Mississippi, to assist the local Emergency Management Agency with the C130 Aircraft crash, where the lives of 16 servicemen were lost. After arriving to the Central Operation Center,

MDWFP was assigned as the lead agency for the search and recovery of this mission. The SRT members had a daunting task of recovering the remains of four servicemen. But I am proud to say they recovered the remains of all 16 servicemen ensuring they would be flown home.

Other responsibilities included, finding 50 missing weapons and providing daily supervision to a large number of Marine members on the ground. The SRT team demonstrated resilience operating in 105-degree daily heat, while handling venomous snakes and infestations of chiggers, ticks and mosquitoes.

This tragic event was the largest aviation accident to happen in Mississippi and in the history of the United States Marine Corps. The MDWFP SRT's role in the law enforcement community is very important. The skills, training, dedication, and technology that they bring to deployments are second to none.

Today, I am honored to recognize these brave public heroes for the hard work, dedication and courage they exude each and every day protecting Mississippians.

FOSTER HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS VARSITY SWIM TEAM EARNS 5A SILVER MEDAL

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Foster High School Girls Varsity Swim Team for earning a silver medal in the 200-yard freestyle.

Kalissa Niles, Maddie Jacks, Sophie Gibson and Meagan Clark finished in second place with an impressive time of 1 minute and 39.47 seconds. Their accomplishments in the pool have made their families and the Richmond community proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to the ladies of the Foster High School Girls Varsity Swim Team. Keep up the great work.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PASSING OF MR. JOHN PAGEL

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the life and legacy of Kewaunee County native, Mr. John Pagel.

Mr. Pagel was a successful businessman, a revered community leader, and, most importantly, a beloved husband, father, and grandfather. He was taken too soon, but John leaves behind a proud and enduring legacy that lesser men could not hope to forge in a dozen lifetimes.

While reflecting on John's time with us, I turned to scripture and was reminded of him in one of my favorite verses. "And to make it your ambition to lead a quiet life: You should mind your own business and work with your

hands, just as we told you, so that your daily life may win the respect of outsiders and so that you will not be dependent on anybody." (1 Thessalonians 4: 11-12)

A dairy farmer by trade, John's passion for his family and community, entrepreneurial spirit, and respect for nature brought him tremendous success in life. A towering figure in Wisconsin industry and a renowned public servant, John never shed the humble hometown qualities that earned him respect and happiness from the start. Beloved by his family, community, and employees, good and honest men like John are hard to find and even harder to lose.

John's extraordinary memory will be cherished by countless people across Wisconsin and America. May his humility, decency, and uncompromising integrity be remembered and emulated by all who knew him.

TRIBUTE TO BILL HILLMAN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bill Hillman of Shenandoah, Iowa on his selection as the 2017 Outstanding Individual Leader, awarded by the Iowa Tourism Office and Travel Federation of Iowa. Bill received this honor for his work with the Everly Brothers Childhood Home, Wabash Trace Nature Trail and many other community activities.

Bill has worked tirelessly in promoting economic development and tourism opportunities in Shenandoah and the surrounding communities. Through Bill's determination and dedication, and with the use of his time and resources, he has had a direct impact on the economic future of Shenandoah.

Mr. Speaker, Bill has made a difference by helping and serving his community. It is with great honor that I recognize him today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in honoring his accomplishments and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO CLAYTON SAEUGLING

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Clayton Saeugling of Atlantic, Iowa, for receiving the American Future Farmers of America Degree Award. The American Future Farmers of America (FFA) Degree is the highest honor an FFA member can achieve. According to Eric Miller, FFA Advisor at the Atlantic High School, "less than one percent of the 653,359 FFA members will receive this prestigious award."

In earning this degree, Clayton had to earn and invest at least \$10,000 through a supervised agricultural program that he started,

owned, and in which he held a professional position. He also had to complete 50 hours of community service, demonstrating his community commitment and leadership skills. FFA Advisor Eric Miller further added, "I am very proud of Clayton and all his hard work he has put into his project and his education." Clayton said, "getting my American FFA Degree was a once in a lifetime experience that I am glad I could be a part of. All of the time and hard work that I have put into FFA was well worth it."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Clayton for earning this award and it is with great pride that I recognize him today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO JEAN AND KENNETH POLSLEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jean and Kenneth Polsley of Blanchard, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on December 23, 2017.

Jean and Kenneth's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO NOLA AND WALT PRITCHARD

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Nola and Walt Pritchard of Clarinda, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on December 23, 2017.

Nola and Walt's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 65th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 65th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join

me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but the best.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD BLODGETT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Rev. Richard Blodgett of Council Bluffs, Iowa on his recent retirement as the Pastor of Emanuel Church of the Nazarene. Rev. Blodgett has served his congregation for over 31 years.

Originally from Wisconsin, Rev. Blodgett and his family have made Council Bluffs their home for the past three decades. After high school, he studied to become a teacher and wrestling coach, but he said it just did not feel right. He entered Olivet Nazarene University in Bourbonnais, Illinois. After graduating, Rev. Blodgett began his work in Dubuque, Iowa before answering the call to serve in Council Bluffs. Rev. Blodgett plans to stay active in the community by volunteering with his spiritual experience at Fox Run Assisted Living, Jeanne Edmundson Hospital, and at the Iowa Share Food Program.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Rev. Blodgett for his 31 years of dedicated and devoted service to Emanuel Church of the Nazarene. He has made a difference by helping and serving others and it is with great pride that I recognize him today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on his retirement and in wishing him nothing but the best.

TRIBUTE TO JACOB BAUDLER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jacob Baudler, of Fontanelle, Iowa for earning the American FFA Degree. Jacob was recently awarded this degree at the National FFA Convention in Indianapolis, Indiana. He was a member of the Nodaway Valley FFA Organization and is the son of John and Darla Baudler.

The American FFA Degree is awarded to members who have demonstrated the highest level of commitment to FFA and made significant accomplishments in their supervised agricultural experience. Jacob had to meet certain requirements, such as studying agriculture for three years in high school, earning money in an agriculture field and investing that money into their business, participation in community service and having a record of outstanding leadership ability and community involvement. The work toward this degree involved many years of hard work and dedication in agricultural pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Jacob in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to reach his goals. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Jacob on receiving this esteemed designation and in wishing him the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BETTY AND RONALD
CONLEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Betty and Ronald Conley of Mount Ayr, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on January 3, 2018.

Betty and Ronald's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO CLEO HAWTHORNE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Cleo Hawthorne of Atlantic, Iowa, on the very special occasion of celebrating his 105th birthday on December 31, 2017.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Cleo's life. Since his birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones, and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism, and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Cleo has lived through nineteen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In his lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent Cleo in the United States Congress and I'm proud to recognize him today on this momentous occasion. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him and in wishing nothing but the best.

TRIBUTE TO DARLENE AND
DONALD WIMMER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Darlene and Donald Wimmer. They were awarded the 49th Annual Community Christmas Candle in December 2017 at the Afton Methodist Church.

Service to their community and their church began over 70 years ago. Donald has served as a key leader at the Arispe Methodist Church for years and has served on the Food for Life committee. Darlene taught Bible and Sunday school for many years while Donald also outfitted his barn so Arispe kids had a place to play basketball. They have both also volunteered their time at Greater Regional Medical Center and with hospice.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Darlene and Donald for receiving this award and I am proud to represent them in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Darlene and Donald and in wishing them both nothing but the best.

TRIBUTE TO KARLA AND BILL
LIVINGSTON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Karla and Bill Livingston on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary on December 30, 2017.

Karla and Bill's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

SENATE—Wednesday, February 28, 2018

The Senate met at 12:45 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we praise and thank You for the gift of this wonderful day. Your wondrous works can be seen in the world around us. Even in the storms of life, You keep us steady and fill us with Your peace.

Continue to use our lawmakers for Your glory. Make them people who live to honor Your Name. Lord, give them strong minds, brave hearts, true faith, and ready hands. Make them willing to stand for right though the Heavens fall. Challenge them to become salt and light to their generation, daring more boldly and venturing more widely to ensure that Your will is done on Earth even as it is done in Heaven.

And Lord, we thank You for the life and legacy of Your servant, Evangelist Billy Graham.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, yesterday, I met with a group of survivors from the Stoneman Douglas High School shooting in Parkland, FL. Two weeks after losing classmates, friends, and teachers, these kids have not given themselves over to grief or cynicism. They organized and resolved to change their country. They went to Tallahassee. They traveled to Washington. They are committed, and they are inspiring.

We just went to the observance of Billy Graham's death in the Capitol

Rotunda, and a man of the cloth probably would have said that instead of cursing the darkness, these kids are lighting a candle, which is a beautiful thing to do.

As I was sitting with them, I remembered meeting with the young people who survived the shooting at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando. I remember sitting with parents of the kindergartners and first graders killed at Sandy Hook Elementary. I still ache for them and their parents, parents who had presents stashed under the Christmas tree that were never opened. Photos of those beautiful children still sit on my desk.

All of them—the students of Stoneman Douglas, parents from Newtown, parents of the victims in Orlando, Las Vegas, Columbine, Charleston, and everyday gun violence in cities and towns all across our country—all of them are calling on us to act. The slow-motion massacre of American children must end. The time has come to make meaningful changes to our laws to keep Americans safe from the epidemic of gun violence.

Let me tell you, the students of Stoneman Douglas will not stop until we achieve meaningful change. They know small measures will not get the job done. That is why they told me, every one of them: The Fix NICS bill is not close to enough of what we need to do. Fix NICS has wide support in this Chamber. I am a cosponsor. But it is just the first tiny step that addresses one specific issue. We have a whole host of other issues to address, not one.

It is true that the records of NICS need to be fixed, but it is also true that we need to close the gun show loophole. It is also true that we need to make sure online sales go through background checks so that felons or those adjudicated as mentally ill or spousal abusers can't get guns. Over 90 percent of America agrees with that. But our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so afraid of the NRA that they can't even embrace universal background checks, which 90 percent of America addresses. Special interest lobbying—the kind of thing President Trump campaigned against, the NRA is doing it. The NRA is doing it.

We need to stop writing bills that address only the last shooting and start making laws that prevent the next one. When you have a sick patient, you don't just treat one symptom; you cure the disease. That is what universal background checks will do. Fix NICS would be a good thing to do, but it is a tiny step when we need a giant leap. It can't be the only thing we do. In fact, the only reason it hasn't cleared this

Chamber already is that the Republican Senator from Utah objected to it. Such is the vice grip that the ideologues from the gun lobby have on the entire Republican Party. They are so against what America wants. They are so against what rank and file Republicans want. Even on something as limited as Fix NICS, the gun groups find a way to get in the way.

I believe the priority of this Chamber should be to pass universal background checks. That would accomplish what Fix NICS does and a lot more. President Trump has said that he would push “strongly comprehensive background checks” in the wake of Parkland. We Democrats are calling on him today to keep his word. We sent him a letter asking him to support existing legislation, bipartisan legislation, to close the loopholes that allow anyone to purchase a gun at a gun show or on the internet without a background check. These loopholes make no sense. Leaving these loopholes unclosed would be as if we checked someone's ID at the liquor store but not at the bar. That is what you could say about Fix NICS. It would be as if we checked someone's ID at the liquor store but not at the bar. We should have the same checks across the board.

Today, I call on President Trump to come out in support of legislation that would close dangerous loopholes in our background check system. The NRA vehemently opposes that, but I say to President Trump: Show some leadership, buck the NRA. They are way out of touch with the American people, with gun owners, and rank and file Republicans. I say to the President: Show some leadership, buck the NRA, endorse these policies, and you can finally break the gridlock and get something meaningful done.

RUSSIA'S INTERFERENCE WITH AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, there is one other matter. I know my colleagues from North Carolina are waiting, and I salute them for being here in praise of a former member who just passed from their State, Billy Graham.

Yesterday, the commander of the U.S. Cyber Command, ADM Michael Rogers, testified that Putin's efforts to interfere with American democracy have not abated since the 2016 election and likely have intensified. According to several reports, Kremlin-linked bots continue to stoke political divisions in the United States via misinformation on social media. Here is what Admiral Rogers said:

President Putin has clearly come to the conclusion that there's little price to pay and that therefore [he thinks] 'I can continue this activity.' Clearly what we have done hasn't been enough.

He is absolutely right. It is extraordinary, confounding, and dangerous how little the Trump administration is doing about Putin's campaign to undermine our grand democracy. President Trump refused to punish Putin after he took office, despite the consensus view of 17 American intelligence agencies that Putin interfered in our elections. President Trump has still refused to fully implement the package of sanctions passed by this Congress with only five dissenting votes combined in both the House and Senate, two here and three there. Yesterday, when my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, asked Admiral Rogers, the Director of NSA, if the Trump administration had directed him to counter Russian meddling, he replied: "No, I have not [been directed]."

That is astonishing. A hostile foreign power interferes in our election, continues to interfere with our democracy, is planning to interfere in our next elections, and the President of the United States is hardly lifting a finger. It is as if they were preparing for war and tanks or planes were lining up, and we decided to do nothing. Cyber attacks and manipulation of the news media are other ways that hostile powers attack us.

People have to wonder why President Trump is so soft on Russia, so unwilling to criticize President Putin, and so slow to stand up for America and protect our democracy.

NOMINATION OF MARVIN QUATTLEBAUM

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, one final word on a pending judicial nomination, Marvin Quattlebaum. First, for the benefit of the Senate, I would like to note that the only reason the current nomination is up, the nomination of Quattlebaum is up is because the two Republican Senators from South Carolina refused to return a blue slip for two judges nominated for the same vacancy by President Obama. Their right as the home State Senators to not return a blue slip was respected by the Democratic majority, Chairman LEAHY, in 2013, unlike the Republican majority, which has already ignored the blue slip precedent and confirmed a circuit judge without the approval of both home State Senators. I want my colleagues on the other side to remember that their blue slips were respected during the Obama administration and to think long and hard about continuing to ignore them now that their party is in the White House.

Second, the nomination of Marvin Quattlebaum speaks to the overall lack of diversity in President Trump's selec-

tion for the Federal judiciary. Mr. Quattlebaum replaces not one but two scuttled Obama nominees who were African American. As of February 14, 83 percent of President Trump's confirmed nominees were male; 92 percent were White. That represents the lowest share of non-White candidates in three decades.

It is long past time that the judiciary starts looking a lot more like the America it represents. Having a diversity of views and experience on the Federal bench is necessary for the equal administration of justice. After years of improvement, the Trump administration, as in so many other areas, is taking a giant step backward—this time, when it comes to the diversity of their nominations. I will be voting no on the Quattlebaum nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM "BILLY" F. GRAHAM, JR.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I rise with my colleague from North Carolina, my colleagues in the U.S. Senate, and the American people to honor the life of a North Carolinian, Billy Graham—a man whose life has literally reached millions around the globe.

Reverend Graham's grace marker will be inscribed this way: "Preacher of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ."

As the son of a minister myself, I am uniquely aware of the sacrifices and the responsibility that come with this calling. Indeed, this is a calling that Reverend Graham fulfilled honorably and nobly, bringing hope and comfort to millions around the globe. Reverend Graham was someone who was shaped by his roots on a North Carolina dairy farm, who committed his life to Jesus Christ at the age of 15, and who lived the commitment with faithfulness for the next 84 years.

He was married for 64 years to Ruth Bell Graham and was the father of 3 daughters, 2 sons, and now 19 grandchildren. As his casket was laid in honor in the Rotunda, all of a sudden, I realized that one of those grandchildren was a graduate of West Point, one of my nominees, and a soon-to-be lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army. It was certainly good to see him.

Reverend Graham preached to almost 215 million people in more than 185 countries and territories on 6 continents. He prayed with soldiers on the battlefields of South Korea and Vietnam. He preached in poor villages and at Britain's Windsor Castle, and he provided counsel to every President from Harry Truman to Barack Obama. He also stood up for what was right—denouncing segregation and oppression and preaching jointly with the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., in the

1950s. He lived a life of integrity and of honor.

He spoke words of comfort and hope at the National Cathedral following the September 11 terrorist attacks, reminding America: "God is our refuge and strength, an ever-present help in trouble."

Reverend Graham will be deeply missed. I send my condolences to his children, his grandchildren, and his numerous great-grandchildren. Yet Graham himself said: "My Home is in heaven, I am just passing through this World." Today, we honor the life that he lived, his faithfulness to the calling, and his impact on millions of individuals around the globe.

If I may take just another moment before my colleague from North Carolina speaks, I will read some remarks that were made by individuals who played important roles in American history.

President Bill Clinton said: "Some were pressuring Graham to segregate his audiences by race but he refused." Clinton remarked: "Graham would cancel the crusade rather than preach to a segregated audience" because everyone deserved the chance to hear God's Word.

President Obama said this in his condolences: "Billy Graham was a humble servant who prayed for so many—and who, with wisdom and grace, gave hope and guidance to generations of Americans" and, I would say, Americans to come.

Lastly, Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "Had it not been for the ministry of my good friend Dr. Billy Graham, my work in the civil rights movement would not have been as successful as it has been."

The country mourns the loss of Dr. Graham, but the country understands the impact of his life—that life as a servant of God, to preach His Word to everyone he could find, and a career of 84 years. He exhausted the opportunities that were given to him and will proudly affect generations that have yet to be born by the work that he did as a disciple of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I thank my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina, for his words about Reverend Billy Graham. I will only add a few comments.

At one level, mine are very personal. I was telling someone just yesterday that I have two very distinct memories of times with my father. One of them was of watching Walter Cronkite, and the other one was of watching Billy Graham. I was talking to my mother earlier this week, and she talked about how much my father loved Billy Graham. I remember, vividly, sitting in front of that console TV with my father, watching him as he preached the Word of God.

This week is amazing because I find, when one loses somebody so precious like Reverend Graham, it is a very sad time, but in his case, America's pastor had brought so much joy to everyone's lives that it really is a celebration.

Earlier, Senator BURR and I had had an opportunity to offer our condolences to the Graham family. What was remarkable was that in the face of every one of them was, maybe, a hint of sorrow but, really, just a fullness of joy in knowing what their father did when he was on this Earth and now what he will do in the Kingdom of Heaven.

I think that today is a day we should all look back and ask ourselves: Could we actually come anywhere close to living the kind of life that this man lived? With his ministering in some 180 countries, with over 200 million people actually attending some of his unbelievable celebrations of the Gospel, and then his touching the lives of hundreds of millions of people—and billions of people like me who were watching on TV—the Graham legacy is something that is going to live on for generations.

I am happy to be a proud Senator from the State in which he was born. In fact, I live only about 20, 30 minutes from where he lived his early years. I look forward to going to the funeral on Friday to celebrate his life, to celebrate his legacy, and to celebrate the many lives that were changed because he had brought the Word of God to them wherever they may have been on this planet.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak about America's pastor.

To the Graham family, all of them—the sons, the daughters, the children, the grandchildren—God bless you all. Thank you for sharing the gift of your family member with so many people across this great Nation and across this world.

I thank Senator BURR for his kind words. I thank him for his leadership and for moving forward with the resolution that honors Reverend Billy Graham's life and legacy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, on behalf of Senator TILLIS and me, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 53, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 53) honoring the life of William "Billy" F. Graham, Jr.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered read a third time and passed, the preamble be passed,

and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 53) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was passed.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 53

Whereas William "Billy" F. Graham, Jr., was born on November 7, 1918, in Charlotte, North Carolina;

Whereas, in 1939, Reverend Graham was ordained by Peniel Baptist Church in Florida;

Whereas Reverend Graham studied at Florida Bible Institute and graduated from Wheaton College in Wheaton, Illinois, in 1943;

Whereas Reverend Graham married his wife of nearly 64 years, Ruth McCue Bell, in 1943;

Whereas Reverend Graham had 3 daughters, 2 sons, 19 grandchildren, and numerous great-grandchildren;

Whereas, in 1950, Reverend Graham founded the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, which is based in Charlotte, North Carolina;

Whereas Reverend Graham preached to nearly 215,000,000 individuals in more than 185 countries and territories on 6 continents;

Whereas Reverend Graham provided spiritual counsel for every President since Harry Truman;

Whereas Reverend Graham prayed with members of the Armed Forces in combat zones in South Korea and Vietnam;

Whereas Reverend Graham spoke against the communist Soviet Union, saying, "Communism has decided against God, against Christ, against the Bible, and against all religion.";

Whereas Reverend Graham—

(1) fought for racial integration;

(2) invited Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to preach with him in New York City in 1957; and

(3) bailed Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., out of jail when Dr. King was arrested for protesting segregation;

Whereas, following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, Reverend Graham spoke words of hope and comfort to the people of the United States at the Washington National Cathedral;

Whereas Reverend Graham authored 34 books, including the bestselling autobiography, "Just as I Am", which began by discussing his early days on a dairy farm in North Carolina and continued through his career as a preacher and evangelist; and

Whereas Reverend Graham received numerous honors, including—

(1) the North Carolina Award for Public Service;

(2) the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

(3) the Ronald Reagan Freedom Award; and

(4) the Congressional Gold Medal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) extends its sympathies to the family of William "Billy" F. Graham, Jr.; and

(2) honors—

(A) the life and ministry of Reverend Graham; and

(B) the contributions of Reverend Graham to—

(i) the State of North Carolina;

(ii) the United States of America; and

(iii) the moral and religious lives of millions of individuals.

Mr. BURR. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GUN SAFETY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I hope we rise to the moment before us and get something done, over the course of the next week or two, to try to make this country safer. I am glad to be joining the President in a few hours to hear more about his thoughts on how we can put the safety of our kids ahead of any political considerations and try to figure out how to make sure that Parkland is the last.

As I have told some of the kids from Parkland who have come into my office, the ripples of grief will never, ever end. Newtown, CT, is a place that has been fundamentally changed. When you lose that many young lives in a short period of time, there is no true recovery. Unfortunately, Parkland will find that as Charleston did, as Orlando did, and as so many did before them.

We need to remember that while the country tends to pay attention to the epidemic of gun violence when there is a mass shooting, this is an epidemic that doesn't take a day off. Yesterday, it is likely that 80 to 90 people died from gunshot wounds. The majority of those were suicides. That is an epidemic in and of itself. A chunk of those were accidental shootings, another chunk of those were gun homicides; but the rate of gun deaths in this country just has no parallel anywhere else in the world. There is not another First World nation that has the rate of gun violence we do. In fact, it is not even close. The rate of gun violence in our country is 20 times higher than the average in the OECD.

We have to remember that when we try to craft a public policy response, it just cannot be about school shootings. One is much more likely to die from an accidental gunshot than in a school shooting. We have to be comprehensive in our approach, which is why the Fix NICS Act just isn't good enough.

I am proud Senator CORNYN and I and many others in this body came together to put forward a piece of legislation that will improve the background check system. It will make sure people who shouldn't buy guns aren't able to buy guns, but it is a modest change. In

fact, it is really just about making sure people who are in law enforcement and inside the NICS system comply with existing law. It doesn't actually add any new background checks, it doesn't solve the gun show loophole, and it doesn't solve the internet loophole. So my hope is, we can bring this bill before the Senate, but then we can have a debate on other measures that might enjoy bipartisan support that will do 10 times more than fix NICS to keep this country safe.

Let's talk about expanding background checks to make sure everybody who is buying a gun in a commercial sale has to prove they are not a criminal and prove they are not seriously mentally ill. Let's talk about the experience that Connecticut and Indiana has had in allowing courts to use protective orders to take away guns from people who are showing evidence of doing harm to the people around them. Let's have a conversation about whether we think it is right for people to be able to walk into schools with a gun equipped with a 30-round or 100-round magazine.

I don't know if any of those measures will get 60 votes, but I think we owe it to the American people to not limit debate, to not shut down debate in the U.S. Senate Chamber.

I know it is probably a scary thing for some Republicans that votes are changing. Many of my Republican colleagues have acknowledged they might be thinking about supporting things today that they might not have supported before. Because minds are changing, it behooves us to make sure we have a full debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I am supportive of the bill that Senator CORNYN and I have worked on. I hope it can become the foundation of a much more comprehensive set of measures that we take a look at in the coming days. I think we have to pay attention to where the American public is on this issue. I understand polls shouldn't dictate all of the decisions we make here. We pay attention to public opinion, we respond to it more often than not, but it doesn't guide every single decision we make because public opinion changes.

On this issue, it has been a slow and steady build, the number of Americans saying the U.S. Congress bears responsibility for the epidemic of mass slaughter in this country because we have not changed a single gun law, except to make them weaker, since Sandy Hook. Remember, the only thing this Congress has done since Sandy Hook is allow hundreds of thousands of seriously mentally ill people to get weapons. That law was passed last year by the President—nothing to restrict guns.

In fact, 97 percent of Americans want us to pass universal background checks. Apple pie isn't as popular as

background checks are in this country today. No other public policy we are considering gets a 97-percent approval rating from the American public than universal background checks. Let's listen to that. Let's listen to them.

I encourage Senator MCCONNELL not to limit debate, not to constrain the Senate. Let's use this week and next week to have a set of measures we can debate and have up-or-down votes on, and let's hope, in the meantime, the President fleshes out what he is for and against.

The President tweeted that he is in support of comprehensive background checks. Maybe later today we will find out if that is really true. Comprehensive background checks tend to mean the closing of the loopholes that exist, but hopefully the President can help lead us to a conclusion that is something much more than Fix NICS. As my colleague from Florida who has lived through the last several mass shootings in his State remarked, Fix NICS is simply not enough to meet this moment. I hope we build upon it in the coming days.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2464

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2464) to improve border security and to provide conditional provision residence to certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.

Mr. CORNYN. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

FIX NICS BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, my colleague from Connecticut is here in the room and mentioned the bill we have been working on together, the Fix NICS bill. I want to remind all of us what the motivation was, at least on my part, for introducing this legislation and express my gratitude to the Senator from Connecticut, as well as the Democratic leader Senator SCHUMER, and others who have cosponsored this legislation.

It was just a few short months ago when someone murdered 26 people worshipping in a small church just outside San Antonio in Sutherland Springs. He

had purchased these firearms having lied on the background check when they asked him whether he was a convicted felon, whether he was honorably discharged from the military, and whether he had ever committed any domestic violence. He lied.

If he had told the truth, he would have been prohibited from buying those firearms and perhaps—maybe, perhaps—he would have been dissuaded, slowed down, or perhaps would not have committed that terrible atrocity that day when 26 people lost their lives, and 20 more were injured.

We have come to find out that the Air Force, which had convicted him of two of those offenses—domestic violence and the felony—failed to upload the information that was required in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. If they had, then he would not have gotten away with lying because the FBI background check system would have revealed the truth.

I can state that I have the utmost confidence that if the Fix NICS law were in effect at the time he was attempting to purchase those firearms, in all likelihood, he would have been prohibited from purchasing those guns, and I would conclude from that, lives would have been saved, and the lives which were changed forever because of the terrible injuries that the other 20 received would not have been changed in such a terrible way.

I told myself at the time that I cannot go to another church service—we went to the church that met in a tent just down the street from the place where the shooting took place a week after the shooting. The pastor and his wife who lost their teenage daughter were there. The wife was distraught, as you can imagine. The pastor summoned a power that is greater than human power to preach that day. It was emotional, it was inspirational, but it was a terrible tragedy. I told myself that day that I never wish to look another family in the face and say we failed to do everything that was in our power to prohibit or to stop something like that from happening again.

Fix NICS, as I think people who are familiar with it understand, basically takes the laws that currently exist and makes sure it is applied so people like this shooter in Sutherland Springs can't lie their way out of it and get access to firearms and ruin people's lives in the process.

I realize it may not be as comprehensive as some people would like. The problem is around here, if you ignore the things you can agree on and just look to fight about things you can't agree on, nothing ever happens—no problems ever get solved. I think a good place to start would be to pass this bipartisan Fix NICS piece of legislation.

I hope our colleagues would consider it. I understand they have a different

view on some aspects of guns, but what we had here was a catastrophic failure. We had a systemic failure. The school system failed, the mental health authorities failed, the local law enforcement, the Federal law enforcement failed. Our society failed to provide the tools to identify people who cry out, in essence, on social media like this young man did when he posted on YouTube essentially the threat he actually carried out, which was going to go shoot up a school. When that was referred to the FBI, they didn't follow up on it and nothing ever happened.

Looking back on this particular young man, he was sending signals out on a regular basis that he was a ticking timebomb and people were going to get hurt and potentially die, as they did.

I hope that rather than leave here this week with nothing to show for our efforts, we would at least agree to pass what enjoys broad bipartisan support and to perhaps prevent another shooting like that which occurred at Sutherland Springs.

The President has made clear, thinking now about the Las Vegas shooting, that he believes bump stocks ought to be regulated by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. I agree with that. So those are two things we could do, perhaps, that might save lives in the future, but to just say it is not enough, we ought to do more, and to fail to do what is within our grasp, which we can agree to, to me, seems like a bizarre way of doing business, and I think it is an abdication of our responsibility.

I don't want to see another family who has lost a loved one as a result of one of these mass shootings that might be prevented by some action we might take on Fix NICS or the bump stock issue, for example.

There may be other things we need to do. We have done some things, such as trying to address the mental health challenges that people like Adam Lanza's mother had. Adam Lanza, the Sandy Hook shooter, was obviously mentally ill, but he wouldn't accept the treatment his doctor prescribed.

What we did last December—during the Obama administration—passed something called the 21st Century Cures Act, which included a bill I sponsored called the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act, which encouraged the use of assisted outpatient treatment. For example, if Adam Lanza's mother couldn't handle her son—he wouldn't take his medication or comply with doctor's orders—she could go to a civil court and essentially get a court order requiring him to comply with his doctor's orders and to take his medication.

Again, I am not suggesting that any one of these in isolation is a panacea, but there are things we can do step-by-step, bit-by-bit, to reduce the likelihood that these terrible mass shootings occur in the future.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another note, we heard some great news yesterday, in terms of our economy. Consumer confidence has jumped to a 17-year high. Optimism continues to surge as employers and payroll services across the country continue to implement the reforms to our Tax Code that we passed last December in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

What is more, the Treasury Department has now released the new withholding tables that went into effect earlier this month and reflect the changes passed as part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

I got a call from someone close to me. I will leave it at that—I don't want to embarrass her—who said she opened her paycheck, and she had \$240 more in her paycheck than she had in the previous month as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. She didn't regard this as crumbs; she thought it would make a positive difference in her life.

I think many Americans are having the same experience, seeing an increase in their take-home pay even in the month of February. As I said, for some, it is several hundred dollars extra each pay period, which is money that can be saved for a rainy day or invested for their retirement or future, or it could be used to pay for their child's education or to put new tires on their car. A married couple with two children, making about \$75,000 a year, will see an estimated tax cut of approximately \$2,000.

That is just on the individual side. What we are seeing across the country is greater than just what is happening to single families and households, though. It is good to see at the micro level or the personal level, so to speak, what the impact is, but we also have to see the bigger picture in terms of our economy, the jobs created, the investment opportunities, and the way to grow our economy, and the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has had a profound impact on that.

So far, at least 417 companies have announced new investments, pay raises, bonuses, and charitable contributions. They have added new employee training and increased contributions to pensions and 401(k) retirement accounts. According to the White House, more than 4.4 million workers have been positively affected. It is no wonder the tax law is becoming more and more popular as people have learned more about it. Even the New York Times has had to agree that the public is learning to love the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act because of the positive impact on hard-working American lives.

I see the wide-ranging effect of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act in my State. Thanks to a competitive tax system, for example, Fort Worth-based companies like American Airlines paid large

bonuses to their employees. AT&T, which is headquartered in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, paid \$1,000 to more than 200,000 men and women across the country who work for that company. Just as important, AT&T announced \$1 billion in capital investments, which could create as many as 7,000 jobs.

Texas also proves that the effects of tax reform are more than just a one-time-only impact. Waste Management, based in Houston, has already paid bonuses to drivers and landfill workers, but its CEO emphasized in an interview that the company will continue to spend money on its people beyond 2018. ExxonMobil, headquartered in Las Colinas in the Dallas area, will expand oil production in West Texas. Oncor, one of the largest investor-owned utilities in the State, will issue future refunds to customers on their utility bills. And Walmart, which is the largest employer in Texas, increased starting wages, expanded parental leave, and offered financial assistance to employees who choose to adopt.

It is not just the big players, though; small businesses are doing the same thing. In Corpus Christi recently, I visited with the owners of Groomer's Seafood, who plan to expand distribution facilities serving thousands of restaurants statewide. American Bank in Corpus Christi is projecting that it can lend an additional \$120 million as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. That is money it can lend to small businesses to grow or start a new business. In San Antonio, my hometown, Cox Manufacturing will move up construction of a new 8,000-square-foot plant. In Amarillo, up in the Panhandle of Texas, Happy State Bank made news to go with its name, which is higher hourly pay. In Lumberton, TX, the women running an engineering company called Leak Sealers paid tax savings forward to employees, calling on other businesses to do the same.

Our colleagues here in Washington who voted against the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act made a big mistake. I think they are beginning to realize that now, as the good news is rolling in. They have mostly kept quiet in terms of the criticism they lodged against the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act as we were debating it because they can't deny the facts, and they can't deny what is happening all across America—more take-home pay, more jobs, more money being invested and coming back home from overseas, and its generally being a very positive piece of legislation.

Some have said—like Ms. PELOSI—that the tax cuts we passed just help job creators and give crumbs to others, but that is not true. Individuals will benefit from lower rates across the board. They will see an increase in the standard deduction and the child tax credit too.

One overlooked part of the law will help bring investments and jobs to distressed communities, creating opportunity zones in every State. That is something our colleague Senator SCOTT championed and made sure was part of the bill.

So, Mr. President, amidst our pain, anguish, and the horror of terrible incidents like that which occurred in Parkland, FL, there is good news to be found, but it is hard to focus on the good news when our constituents are looking at us and asking what we are going to do to make sure that the next potential mass shooting is prevented and that we have done everything in our power to try to stop it. I am not sure we will be able to stop all of them, but we can stop some of them. We can make sure that incidents like that which occurred in Sutherland Springs, TX—that somebody who is already illegally disqualified from purchasing a firearm doesn't get their hands on one.

Well, we know what we have to do, and what I am asking all of our colleagues to do—including the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, who is a cosponsor of Fix NICS, along with the Republican majority leader—let's do this. Let's pass this bill. We could do it in one day, give people an opportunity to debate it and vote on it. If we keep looking for the perfect and make sure that the perfect is somehow the enemy of the good, we will end up with nothing. But we can't end up with nothing. America deserves something that will make a difference. The people in Parkland, FL, and in Sutherland Springs, TX, deserve something better, and I believe that Fix NICS is the best place to start.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, we heard a whole lot about the tax bill the Republicans passed, and it basically works like this: We borrow \$1.5 trillion from our children and we give that money to the richest Americans. And then when there is a little bit of help for middle-class workers—and I mean a little—we say: Well, that is really cool.

I like that we are doing a little for the middle class, but I don't like the fact that for every dime to help a middle-class worker, we gave away a dollar to the richest Americans. In other words, America has been robbed in the biggest bank heist ever, and then it was justified by distributing a modest amount to our workers. Even then, they included a provision that will drive up the premiums for healthcare by more than 10 percent next year, on top of whatever rises are driven by the drug companies. So whatever modest gain there is for the middle class is wiped out by more expensive healthcare in America.

So we hear these big, sophisticated arguments: Oh, well, a worker here or there got a bonus. A worker here or there got their wages increased. But they don't tell you that they gave \$1 trillion to the richest Americans. Why not? Why not be honest about the whole entire scope of this tax rip-off, borrowing from our children to enrich the richest Americans?

As one House Member said, here is what this is all about: This is about the fact that my rich donors won't vote for me and won't support me in the next election unless I vote to give them all this money.

That is what happened here, and it is not OK because we see the consequences. We have a budget that attacks the foundations for families to thrive. It takes a trillion dollars out of healthcare. Well, that trillion dollars went to the richest Americans. Then the President gets to the budget and takes a trillion dollars out of healthcare, takes money out of affordable housing. Housing is a very important foundation for families to thrive. So it attacks healthcare and housing, and then it attacks public education.

Quite frankly, because all those resources were taken off the table that could have been invested in infrastructure and jobs in America, it also undermines the concept of a living-wage job, which is the principle that nobody who works full time in America should live in poverty in America.

The majority has conducted the biggest bank heist in history, and they come to the floor and defend this time and time again without sharing the honest facts with the American people, as I have just shared them with you.

THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, let's turn to another attack on workers. Our entire Constitution had a theme, had a mission statement, and that mission statement was "we the people," government of, by, and for the people. My colleagues might be surprised to discover that the Constitution didn't say "we the privileged; we the wealthy; we the well-connected; we the powerful" because they bring bill after bill to the floor of the Senate that is exactly government of, by, and for the wealthy and the well-connected.

Now we see that the Supreme Court is getting in on the act in this effort to undermine the ability of workers to organize, to get a fair share of the wealth that they create.

Former President Jimmy Carter once said:

Every advance in this half-century—Social Security, civil rights, Medicare, aid to education, one after another—came with the support and leadership of American labor.

Well, he was absolutely right. I would also add a few more things to the list, such as 8-hour workdays, the 40-hour

workweek, overtime pay, the minimum wage, family and sick leave, health and safety working standards. When workers have organized, they have fought for better conditions for every American—better pay, better safety, better and fair working conditions—and America is a better nation because of it. It is a much better nation because of the men and women of the labor movement who have fought tirelessly to ensure that our country lives up to that "we the people" vision statement. Thanks to their work, an honest day's work means an honest day's pay for millions of Americans. But that is exactly what the Supreme Court is poised to undo. All the powerful and the privileged—they want even more squeezed out of the workers, so they have spent decades really demonizing and attacking the ability of workers to organize.

During the three decades after World War II, workers got a fair share of the wealth they were creating. Their wages went up as productivity went up, and it turned out that this is good for business as well because workers who have paychecks are able to buy products, and then the companies can sell more. The companies do well when people get paid fairly, but that concept is about to be undermined in a massive way with an attack on what are called fair share fees.

When workers organize and bargain for better benefits, there is a cost of developing that organization and conducting those negotiations, and every worker who benefits chips in a share under fair share fees. Everyone wins, so everyone contributes.

This is not about contributing to political activity. It is not about contributing funds that are distributed to causes. This is simply the cost of the negotiating process. For this foundation to be able to negotiate successfully, people have to share in that effort.

The heart of the right to organize has been absolutely embodied in law for well over half a century in a case called *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*. Collective bargaining among workers doesn't work if you create a strategy for workers to freeloader; that is, to get all the benefits without putting in any of the effort.

I am reminded of a story that I read as a very young child just learning to read. It was about the barnyard. It was about some member of the community baking bread and asking for help from all the other animals—would they help with this aspect or that aspect of making the bread. They all said: No, we are not interested in helping. At the end, when the bread was baked, all the animals in the barnyard wanted their share. They wanted a share of it without having contributed a thing.

That system is what the Supreme Court is trying to foist on America, undermining the fundamental right to organize and allowing freeloaders to essentially create a situation where you can't afford to represent the group. Well, that undermines the success of our workers to get a fair share of the wealth they create. It undermines their ability to negotiate for a safer workplace.

Again, this is not about political activity; this is simply about the function of representing a group in negotiations with the owner.

That is the case in Illinois, where Mark Janus works as a specialist for the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. He works under a contract negotiated between the State of Illinois and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, or AFSCME. He is not a member of the union. He is not required to be a member of the union. But Mark Janus says: I want all the benefits that are produced by the union organizing and negotiating on my behalf, but I don't want to have to share any of the costs.

Everyone knows that if people are given a permission slip to not share in the cost of organizing, the ability to organize is undermined. It is a fundamental part of it: You negotiate together; you benefit together. He is challenging that portion of the contract.

The powerful and privileged titans of industry have been waging a decades-long campaign against the workers of America. They are excited about this. Don't worry, the Koch brothers are in control. Well, we have certainly seen their control here in the Senate. This certainly bears on the case right before us. They invested vast sums in 2014, and they supported and pushed campaigns in Arkansas, Louisiana, North Carolina, Iowa, Colorado, and Alaska, and they turned those seats in favor of folks who supported the Koch brothers. They took a majority of this body.

What happened in 2016? Well, there was a vacant Supreme Court seat. We have all taken a pledge to support the Constitution. We have an advice and consent responsibility. But the majority leader came down here and said: We are not going to do our responsibility of advice and consent on any nominee from President Obama—none. It doesn't matter who the nominee is; we are not going to do this. Why? Because the Koch brothers said: Don't allow a debate or a vote on a nominee from President Obama.

The majority leader said that this was justified because it was an election year. Let's look at American history. Fifteen times in an election year, there has been a vacancy on the Supreme Court. All 15 times previous to 2016, the Senate debated and the Senate voted.

There were Members of my colleague's team across the aisle who

thought we should honor that responsibility of advice and consent. You can vote somebody down or you can vote somebody up, but we should have the debate and we should have the vote. As soon as they said one word about how there should be a debate or there should be a vote, they got their chain yanked. In one case, the Koch brothers said they would immediately put in millions of dollars against their primary opponent.

That is why the Koch brothers are known as the puppet masters of this body right here in which I stand right now. When they say "jump," the majority says "how high?" That certainly came to fruition in 2016 when they refused to exercise their constitutional responsibility to debate and vote on a nominee for the Supreme Court. That was done so that the empty seat would be passed on to the next President. That is the first time in U.S. history a Supreme Court seat has been stolen and passed on to the next President—the only time.

Well, what does that result in? That results in a Supreme Court that now has been selected where we know four people stand on one side of the issue and four stand on the other side. Then you have, essentially, an illegitimate process for the ninth Justice—a Justice who by every indication is willing to join the other four in attacking the foundation of the right to organize in our Nation. That right to organize was envisioned in the Constitution, in the "we the people" Constitution, not "we the powerful," not "we the privileged," not "we the wealthy," and not "we the well-connected."

Mr. Janus is being represented and funded by the National Right to Work Foundation. Let's call it the right to freeloader because that is what it is. You don't contribute your share, but you get all the benefits.

It reminds me a little bit of the conversation about citizenship in America. People talk about the rights of citizenship and their responsibilities of citizenship too. There are responsibilities of being part of a group when you bargain for wages. That means paying your fair share. So it is their share. It is the heart of the ability to organize versus the position orchestrated by the Koch brothers to assault the ability to organize in this country so that workers can get a fair share of the wealth they work to create.

We have seen these right-to-freeloader bills pass with the influence of the titans across this country in State after State. Here is what we know. In those States that protect the constitutional vision of the right to organize, workers earn over \$5,000 a year more than in other States. In the right-to-freeloader States, workers earn a lot less. And that is apparently why the owners of the companies love that action so much—because they can squeeze more

out of the workers. The right-to-freeloader States have higher poverty. They have higher infant mortality. They have higher workplace deaths than other States. They support public schools less than other States.

It is a mistake to have a Court assembled through an illegitimate process of stealing a Supreme Court seat proceed to gut the constitutional right to organize and assault the workers of this Nation just to put more zeros on the bank account statements of the millionaires and billionaires and titans and wealthy and powerful Americans.

Let's have a remedial course in this Chamber about what our Nation and our Constitution are all about. It is not about coming here and getting elected by the wealthiest Americans to serve the wealthiest Americans; it is about coming here to form laws that serve "we the people." Thomas Jefferson made this point again and again. He said that if you concentrate power in the few, you will get power from the powerful—you will get decisions from the powerful. You will never get the will of the people if you concentrate power. He called on every voter to have an equal voice—not just a vote but an equal voice.

So let's remember Jefferson. Let's remember that our Forefathers put together this document so that we wouldn't have government by the few and the powerful, such as they have in Europe, but this would be different here in the United States of America, where we would try to forge laws that gave all families the opportunity to thrive.

We can see the impact that the reversal of this principle has had. We spent half of last year on a healthcare bill or versions of a healthcare bill designed to rip healthcare from 22 to 30 million Americans, depending on the version. Then we spent the other part of the year on a tax bill designed to borrow \$1.5 trillion from our children and deliver the vast amount of the benefits to the wealthiest of Americans. That is government for and by the powerful. Let's return to government for and by the people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

REMEMBERING BILLY GRAHAM

MR. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to spend a few minutes talking about your fellow North Carolinian, Billy Graham. It is very appropriate that you are in the Chair as I do this—and some of my colleagues are going to follow—as we honor the life and legacy of Billy Graham.

He was sometimes called America's Preacher, and sometimes called America's Pastor, but he went to Heaven last week. And what a 99 years he had while he was here.

He lies in honor today. You and I were over there earlier today in the

Rotunda of the Capitol. Only three private citizens prior to today have been granted that honor: civil rights champion Rosa Parks in 2005 and two U.S. Capitol police officers who died in the line of duty in 1998, Officer Jacob Chestnut, Jr., and Detective John Gibson.

Somebody observed this morning while we were in the Rotunda of the Capitol that he is surrounded there by friends he made during his life. President Eisenhower, President Ford, President Reagan, Dr. Martin Luther King all are memorialized with statues and a bust in the Capitol. So Billy Graham is right at home today with people he made friends with during his life, gave advice to during his life, but never really saw as uniquely his ministry. His ministry was for people everywhere.

I might mention that President Truman—and I stand right here behind one of the desks he used when he was a Senator from Missouri. He was the first President that Billy Graham met with, in 1950. President Truman, like lots of us midwesterners, closely held with his faith. When Billy Graham, at the end of their meeting, said “Can we pray?” President Truman said “I guess it wouldn’t hurt anything.” That was the first opportunity Billy Graham had to pray with the many Presidents he prayed with and, I am sure, prayed for after that.

Billy Graham’s mom and dad were dairy farmers like mine. He was born in Charlotte, NC. President Trump said this morning that there was a prayer meeting in 1934 on the Graham farm. Billy Graham’s father made the place available to have a prayer meeting. The focus of that prayer group of leaders from the Charlotte, NC, area was to pray that God would send a leader who would take the Gospel around the world. Probably nobody at that prayer group had any sense how close they were to somebody who was just about to begin the process to do that.

That was the year Billy Graham became a Christian. From that point on, he would say: “My one purpose in life is to help people find a personal relationship with God, which, I believe, comes through knowing Christ.” That is the end of a quote on his view. For so many times and in so many different ways, that was a simple statement that defined his life.

Five years after that, in 1939, he was ordained and became a pastor. He was pastoring at a church in Illinois while he went to college at Wheaton College. His Wheaton College education was important, but I am sure he would say that the best thing that happened there was that he met his wife, Ruth Bell. They were married for 64 years. It was a partnership. As one person went all over the world, the other person raised their five children and took care of things at home and on rare occa-

sions was able to go with him. Her mom and dad were missionaries. This was clearly a committed life that she understood.

All five of their children were in the Rotunda of the Capitol today and in their own way, in each case, have pursued the work their parents thought was so important.

Reverend Graham didn’t just preach the Gospel from inside the four walls of the church; in fact, I think it was a rare occasion when he preached in a church as opposed to the places that he preached all over the world.

In 1949, he spoke to 350,000 people over 8 weeks in Los Angeles. He began to call those efforts crusades, and eventually over 200 million people would hear the message from him directly, in person. Millions more would hear the message from television, print, and movies.

By the way, I read recently that Billy Graham—a young, handsome guy—was offered a movie contract not too long after that 1949 Los Angeles crusade. He said that was not his job and that he wouldn’t do it for \$1 million a day. His work was clearly understood by him.

He shared Christianity with more people directly than any other person in the history of the world.

He led his first crusade in St. Louis, MO, in our State, in 1953. He returned in 1973 for another St. Louis crusade and to celebrate his 55th birthday. The Post-Dispatch reported that the revival’s opening night had 20,000 people, and 4,000 people were in the choir most of the nights at that revival in St. Louis.

He made several trips to Kansas City. In 1967, the Heart of America crusade in Kansas City drew 364,000 people. The then-mayor of Kansas City, Ilus Davis, made Reverend Graham an honorary citizen and gave him a key to the city. He returned to Kansas City, MO, many times doing that work.

In 1959, he came to my hometown of Springfield, MO. I was pleased to read just recently that he said that the Ozarks reminded him of his native North Carolina.

In 1982, he spoke to a crowd at Evangel University—and this was inside—of 2,200 people.

For seven decades, Billy Graham brought the Gospel to nearly 215 million people. Despite his widespread recognition, he was always known for his humility. Whether speaking with a person on the street or the President, his main purpose was for them to share his sense of the importance of knowing his Lord, Jesus Christ. He had a message of grace, not justice; that God could forgive anything, God would forgive anything; and that nobody gets to Heaven based on their works, they get to Heaven based on their understanding of the grace of God.

He defended civil rights for African Americans. He insisted from the early

1950s on—actually, from the beginning of his crusades—that they would be integrated. He was a friend of Dr. Martin Luther King’s. In 1957, he invited Dr. King to speak at one of his revival meetings. He later bailed Dr. King out of jail. Dr. King said: “Had it not been for the ministry of my good friend Dr. Billy Graham, my work in the civil rights movement would not have been as successful as it has been.”

Reverend Graham spoke about critical issues. His faith inspired him to build bridges for decades. He was included in the Gallup organization’s 10 most admired men in the world 61 times—more than anyone else in the history of that poll. He led a remarkable, faith-filled life. He touched many lives.

I ask unanimous consent that the February 23 Wall Street Journal article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 23, 2018]

HOW BILLY GRAHAM CHANGED MY LIFE

(By George W. Bush)

Billy Graham was, with C.S. Lewis, one of the 20th century’s most influential figures in evangelicalism. I never had the honor of meeting Lewis, but I did know Billy, who died last week at 99. He changed my life.

I first met him on my grandmother’s porch in Kennebunkport, Maine, in 1985. In her 80s, she was frail but sharp. They sat together and Billy held her hand while talking about the Bible. Later she described it as one of the most peaceful days of her life.

Soon after, I had my own personal encounter with Billy. As I wrote in “Decision Points,” he asked me to go for a walk with him around Walker’s Point. I was captivated by him. He had a powerful presence, full of kindness and grace, and a keen mind. He asked about my life in Texas. I talked to him about Laura and our little girls.

Then I mentioned something I’d been thinking about for a while—that reading the Bible might help make me a better person. He told me about one of the Bible’s most fundamental lessons: One should strive to be better, but we’re all sinners who earn God’s love not through our good deeds, but through His grace. It was a profound concept, one I did not fully grasp that day. But Billy had planted a seed. His thoughtful explanation made the soil less hard, the brambles less thick.

Shortly after we got back to Texas, a package from Billy arrived. It was a copy of the Living Bible. He had inscribed it and included a reference to Philipians 1:6: “And I am certain that God, who began the good work within you, will continue his work until it is finally finished on the day when Christ Jesus returns.”

God’s work within me began in earnest with Billy’s outreach. His care and his teachings were the real beginning of my faith walk—and the start of the end of my drinking. I couldn’t have given up alcohol on my own. But in 1986, at 40, I finally found the strength to quit. That strength came from love I had felt from my earliest days and from faith I didn’t fully discover until my later years.

I was also fortunate to witness Billy’s remarkable capacity to minister to everyone

he met. When I was governor of Texas, I sat behind Billy at one of his crusades in San Antonio. His powerful message of God's love moved people to tears and motivated hundreds to come forward to commit themselves to Christ. I remember thinking about all the crusades Billy had led over the years around the world, and his capacity to open up hearts to Jesus. This good man was truly a shepherd of the Lord.

Perhaps his most meaningful service came on Sept. 14, 2001. After the 9/11 attacks, I asked Billy to lead the ecumenical service at Washington National Cathedral. It was no easy task. America was on bended knee—frightened, angry, uncertain. As only Billy Graham could, he helped us feel God's arms wrapped around our mourning country.

"We come together today," he began, "to affirm our conviction that God cares for us, whatever our ethnic, religious or political background may be. The Bible says that he is 'the God of all comfort, who comforts us in all our troubles.'" God comforted a nation that day through a very special servant.

In a difficult moment, Billy reminded me—and us all—where we can find strength. And he helped us start to heal by offering three lessons: the mystery and reality of evil, our need for each other, and hope for the present and future. "As a Christian," Graham said at the 9/11 service, "I have hope, not just for this life, but for heaven and the life to come."

A final story: One night while dad was away on a trip during his presidency, mother and I had dinner at the White House. Eventually we got to talking about religion and who gets to go to heaven. I made the point that the New Testament says clearly that to get to heaven, one must believe in Christ. Mother asked about the devout who don't believe in Jesus but do God's work by serving others. She then took advantage of one of the benefits of being first lady. She picked up the phone and asked the White House operator to call Reverend Graham.

It wasn't long before his reassuring Southern voice was on the line. He told us, as I recall, "Barbara and George, I believe what is written in the New Testament. But don't play God. He decides who goes to heaven, not you." Any doctrinal certitude gave way to a calm trust that God had this figured out better than I did.

Those of us who were blessed to know Billy Graham benefited from his deep convictions and personal example, his wisdom and humility, his grace and purity of heart. We knew that his life was a gift from the Almighty. And I rejoice that he is now in the company of God, whom he loved so much and served so well.

Mr. BLUNT. In that article, George W. Bush talked about the impact Billy Graham had on his life. My favorite line from that article talked about when George W. Bush's father was President, and his father was gone, and he and his mother Barbara were having dinner at the White House. They began to argue a little bit about what it took to get to Heaven. So Mrs. Bush just decided, well, we will call Billy Graham and ask him what it takes to get to Heaven. If anybody would know, Billy Graham would know. According to President Bush, here is what Billy Graham said to them:

Barbara and George, I believe what is written in the New Testament. But don't play God. He decides who goes to heaven, not you.

We spend a lot of time arguing about lots of things, but a grace-filled life, a life built on the fundamental principles of the Gospel, is a life that we have benefited from and we uniquely recognize today. I am glad to be here with my colleagues on the floor as we talk about this great life and the impact it had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I also want to join my colleague from Missouri, Senator BLUNT, and others today to pay tribute to the life of Billy Graham.

Last week we lost a man of great faith. At the end of the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus gives his disciples the Great Commission, where he says: "Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you."

If any one man may be said to have fulfilled that charge, it is Billy Graham. Over a ministry that spanned more than 60 years, Billy Graham truly made disciples of all nations, preaching the Gospel in the United States and around the world.

In the days since his death, many have remembered Billy Graham as a spiritual adviser to several Presidents, which he was, but neither his association with Presidents nor the famous of this world ever distracted him from his primary purpose, which was making sure that the Good News of Christ reached everyone. From China, to South Africa, to Russia, to Australia, to his home State of North Carolina and his countless appearances on television, video, and the internet, Billy Graham labored tirelessly for the Gospel. I think it is fair to say that no one in our lifetime has lived a life of greater impact for the cause of Christ.

I remember, as a young child growing up in my home State of South Dakota, when the crusades would come on—my parents and I we would turn them on—you would have Billy Graham, George Beverly Shea, Cliff Barrows, and the message of hope, grace, and redemption that came across so clearly. It impacted so many people, not only here in the United States but all around the world.

It was great to hear Michael W. Smith today singing that great song, "Just As I Am," that was always sung at the end of every Billy Graham crusade as an invitation for people to come to know the Lord whom he knew.

My wife Kimberley and I am were privileged to sing in the choir for Billy Graham's 1986 crusade here in Washington, DC. It was an experience that neither of us will ever forget. He reminded everyone that ultimately, there is one thing that matters in life, and that is serving Christ.

In the days since his death, many people have repeated one of Billy Gra-

ham's quotes where he paraphrased the American evangelist Dwight L. Moody. I think it sums up Billy Graham's message pretty effectively. It said:

Someday you will read or hear that Billy Graham is dead. Don't you believe a word of it. I shall be more alive than I am now. I will just change my address. I will have gone into the presence of God.

I remember in that 1986 crusade, there was a story that was written—presumably in the Washington Post—in which he was interviewed. I am paraphrasing, but I remember that a question was asked about what he wanted to be remembered for, what he wanted his epitaph to be when he died, and he said "that I preached the Gospel of Christ. That I had opportunities to do other things, but that I never deviated." Mr. President, he never deviated.

Billy Graham has departed this life, and we mourn him, but I am confident that right now he is rejoicing in the presence of the Lord.

In the Book of Acts, it talks about King David, and it says that he served God's purpose for his generation. I think it can be said that Billy Graham truly did serve God's purpose for his generation. Many generations of Americans and many generations of people all over the world have been so impacted by his life and his very consequential ministry.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today America and the world have lost a great man in Billy Graham. As Senator THUNE said in his own remarks quoting Billy Graham, don't grieve for Billy Graham—he has not gone anywhere except to be at the right hand of his Father Almighty at home in Heaven. He has left us, but he is in Heaven.

For his entire life, 99 years, he witnessed on behalf of that place called Heaven and his Father to try to take his message around the world and to people around the world.

I spend a lot of time working with young people, and when I do, many times I work with them in my church. I taught Sunday school for 30 years. That is a hard challenge sometimes, trying to figure out what it is you are going to do to get through to people, especially young people, but I learned from Billy Graham that the best way to teach people about God is to witness for God. Billy Graham was the pre-eminent witness for faith, if there ever were one.

We all could turn on the TV tonight and find a televangelist who, for a \$25 donation, will send you a Bible and a cross and tell you that you are saved. That is not true. You may be saved from him, but you haven't been saved with Jesus.

Billy Graham lived the kind of life that teaches all of us that we should

respect and understand and honor what Jesus Christ stands for and what Christianity means, and we should live our lives as an example to others of what it is like to be a Christian.

In the sadness of the loss of Billy Graham, I am reminded of the Book of Thessalonians and Paul's letter to the Thessalonians, where in two of the shortest verses in the Bible, he says:

Rejoice evermore. Pray without ceasing.

In terms of Billy Graham's life, I think we are in that period of time right now. We should rejoice for the great service that he gave to all of us, the great messages he brought in his crusades around the world, and we should pray without ceasing that the world will continue to be blessed by God and by great people like Billy Graham and those who would follow him and, in our small way, if we will do the witnessing we need to do to see to it that we are disciples of that faith and for Jesus Christ.

For me, coming to the floor today, I have an important task, because witnessing and evangelism is about other people taking the message for other folks.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY HOLLEY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, back in my home State of Georgia, in my neighborhood in east Cobb County, there is a man by the name of Henry Holley. In my few minutes left, I want to honor Henry Holley because he is an interesting individual.

Although there is no such thing as a former marine, he was a U.S. marine for 22 years. He met Dr. Graham at a crusade. He volunteered to help him in his off-duty time and so impressed Dr. Graham that Billy Graham asked him to join his crusades.

He said: I can't do it right now. I have 2 more years in my commitment.

Billy Graham said: If you come to me at the end of those 2 years, I will put you on my team.

Forty-eight years ago, Henry Holley joined the team of Billy Graham. He became his Asian representative. In fact, today Henry Holley is the last of the original Billy Graham team who is left alive on this Earth. Henry is 90 years old, living in east Cobb County, and witnessing every single day all that he learned from Billy Graham and what Billy Graham's crusades meant to him.

They set up crusades in Rio de Janeiro, Seoul, South Korea, and all over the world. Henry Holley has been in and out of North Korea more than anybody in this country. He goes there with Samaritan's Purse to help people who are oppressed, taking to them the message of Jesus Christ, working and doing everything he can to improve the plight of those people who are oppressed and depressed by a rogue regime.

Henry Holley is one of the finest people I have ever known. I know when Dr. Graham passed away, Henry was not sad but happy because he has always talked about knowing that ultimately Billy Graham's place in Heaven would be his just reward. Henry could not wait until he could join Billy Graham there so they could be together at the end.

So I know Henry is probably watching, or if he isn't watching, somebody will tell him about my mentioning his name. I am doing it to honor Henry but also to honor Billy Graham, because the one-on-one passing of the Word from me to someone else, from Henry Holley to someone else, from Dr. Graham to someone else, is the way Christianity was built over the decades and over the years and will continue to be preserved in the years to come.

So as we honor in the U.S. Senate and in the United States of America a great man, a great leader, a man of God, and a servant of God, I am just so thankful I had the opportunity to be in this Chamber on the day we honored Billy Graham and his life. I am so happy I had the ability and the opportunity to know his servant, Henry Holley, and be one of those along the way whom Henry helped to live a more responsible and loving life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

REMEMBERING BILLY GRAHAM

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it was an exceptionally moving service in the Rotunda today. For a man to be able to lie in honor in the Rotunda, for the Nation to pause for a moment, and for the leadership of the House and Senate, on both sides of the aisle, and the President of the United States to all stop and for a moment look at a wooden casket, simple as it was, and remember the legacy of a man who gave his life telling people that Jesus loves you, it is a remarkable day. It is not a common day in the U.S. Senate, in the House, to break in the middle of the day to be able to go to the Rotunda and just contemplate this simple fact: There is a God whom you can know who loves you.

It is interesting to think back on some of the legacy of Dr. Graham. He had been to Oklahoma many times. In 2003, I had the opportunity to be the chair for the Youth Night of that mission. It was a moving night, and there were a lot of people there, as there were at all of his events. That night, there were thousands and thousands of teenagers there, and Dr. Graham unpacked a message about Solomon, a person who had everything. He challenged them—for this person who had everything—but he always came back to say all of these things were vanity, and, really, at the end, it is knowing God that is going to matter.

He even challenged people of power. In that message that night in Oklahoma City, he said:

People like power and prestige. Solomon had more power than any man in his generation. No nation dared to defy him. But he looked upon all his mighty military power and said that even power brings no sense of fulfillment, or joy, or peace.

The Bible talks about another power—the kind of power that helps when the crisis comes. 2Timothy 1:7: “God did not give us a spirit of timidity, but a spirit of power, of love and of self-discipline.”

And then he said this:

Jesus Christ said, “All authority in Heaven and on Earth has been given to me.”

Then he quoted Paul's words: “For I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God to salvation.”

That night, many students responded to that simple invitation to be able to know a God who doesn't give you power, but He is power.

If you asked most Oklahomans, though, what was the moment they remember most about Dr. Graham coming to Oklahoma, they would say it was in 1995 after the Federal Building was destroyed by a domestic terrorism event. Dr. Graham was there the Sunday after that tragic attack on Oklahoma and on the Nation. He gave a message to Oklahoma City, to Oklahomans, and to the Nation, and he laid out a sense of hope. Toward the end of his sermon he said this:

This event also reminds us of the brevity and uncertainty of life. It reminds us that we never know when we're going to be taken. I doubt that even one of those who went to that building to work, or to go to the children's place, ever dreamed that it was their last day on earth. That is why we each need to face our own spiritual need and commit ourselves to God.

It's ironic that this terrible event took place just three days after the churches of this city were filled with people celebrating Easter. Just one week ago today. And throughout the world, the Eastern Orthodox churches celebrate Easter on this day. And Easter always brings hope to all of us. For the Christian, the Cross tells us that God understands our suffering, for He took upon Himself at the Cross all our sins and all of our failures and all of our sufferings. And our Lord on that Cross asked the question: “Why? My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” And he received his answer. He knew: To redeem the world. To save you and me from our sins. To give us assurance that if we died we're going to heaven. He was saying from the Cross, “I love you!” And I know the heartaches and sorrows and the pain that you feel.

Easter points us beyond the tragedy of the Cross to the hope of the empty tomb. It tells us that there is hope for eternal life, that Christ has conquered death. And it also tells us that God has triumphed over evil and death and hell. This is our hope, and it can be your hope as well.

Dr. Graham ended his conversation by saying: “My prayer for you today is that you will feel the loving arms of God wrapped around you and will know in your heart that He will never forsake you, as you trust Him.”

This was a significant day for Oklahomans to begin the healing process together.

It is quite remarkable to have America's pastor be laid to rest. Dr. Graham would assure all of us that the same hope he experienced, that he shared with as many people as he possibly could, was not unique to North Carolina. It wasn't unique to his family. It wasn't even unique to America. It was God's great affection for all people. The offer of that love that could turn around a heart like his, could turn around the heart of a nation, and it could turn around the heart of all people.

It is a good day to remember. It is a rare moment for us to be able to stop and pause in the way we have today. I think it is a significant message that should not be forgotten.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, for the elite, the powerful and the well connected, the Republican tax law has turned out to be manna from Washington. The benefits of the tax law are about as one-sided as it gets, and middle-class Americans come up on the losing end.

It sure is one-sided when the price of admission for any middle-class tax relief is an investor handout big enough to pave Wall Street in gold. Democrats pushed for a tax cut that was centered on the middle class, but Republicans turned their one-sided wish list into law.

It sure is one-sided to have a massive tax handout to multinational corporations, a lower top rate for the fortunate few, and a massive tax cut in the estate tax that touches only the wealthiest, while working families get handed only temporary relief.

Those are the policies that are the essence of the Republican tax law. Yet the American people hear over and over again that the benefit of the proposals are going to work their way to the middle class and that those folks will get bulging wage increases.

So I would like to start by getting a few facts straight. First, just a few hours ago, corporations crossed the \$200 billion mark in stock buybacks this year. These stock-buyback bonanzas drive up the value of investment portfolios for CEOs and high fliers, and they are now coming in at a rate 30 times greater—30 times greater—than worker bonuses. They are on pace to double the amount from the first quarter of last year.

Now, there was a whole lot of happy talk about this Republican tax bill last winter, but I don't remember—and I sat through a lot of markups in the Finance Committee and debates on this

floor—I didn't hear anybody say there ought to be a stock buyback stimulus act.

The wealthiest 10 percent of earners own 84 percent of all of the stock held by Americans. So when it comes to these buybacks, a huge majority of families are on the outside looking in. All the moms and dads who balance the rent, the groceries, and the cost of gas and electricity don't get much of anything out of a corporate handout that gets swallowed up by these buyback bonanzas for big-time investors.

Second, when you talk about tax cuts producing massive stock buybacks, you are talking about sending huge amounts of cash overseas directly into the pockets of wealthy investors. That is because more than one-third of all U.S. corporate stock is owned by investors outside of the country. So under the Republican tax law, American taxpayers are on the hook, borrowing billions and billions of dollars to make wealthy foreigners even wealthier.

We heard a whole lot about how working families were going to get lifted up in Portland and in Topeka and in San Antonio, but the reality is, the folks who are getting enriched are in Beijing and Moscow and Panama City.

Finally, you don't have to take my word for it that these corporate windfalls overwhelmingly benefit those at the top. Fourteen years ago, the Federal Government gave corporations what is known as a repatriation holiday—a big tax break to bring back cash from overseas. What the American people heard back then sounds pretty familiar today. Corporations were going to invest in workers and equipment, and the money would trickle down to the middle class. That didn't work out either. More than 90 percent of the corporate cash windfall went to goodies for investors and CEOs. Once again, very, very one-sided.

Not even two decades later, the American people are still being fed the line about how their one-sided tax plans are going to deliver bulging paychecks to the middle class.

A few weeks ago, Treasury Secretary Mnuchin came to the Finance Committee. He was asked who really benefits when the Republican tax bill shows all of this cash on multinationals. He said: "Even if there are share buybacks . . . that capital is recycled back into the economy. It just doesn't sit in banks, it goes back into the economy." That sounds an awful lot like trying to put a new spin on the failed theory of trickle-down economics.

In my view, middle-class families are sick and tired of being told to wait for the benefits to somehow trickle down to them. From the get-go, our message on taxes was that if Senators were interested in real middle-class tax relief, we would be at the head of the line to work on it. I have been involved in a bipartisan bill. On this side, we were

ready to go for a bipartisan approach focusing on the middle class. Instead, Republicans moved at breakneck speed to pass a one-sided bill that would fatten the accounts of the wealthy, the powerful, and CEOs around the world.

It is time for the Treasury Secretary to stop peddling the old huckster's line that somehow all of this is going to work out for the middle class if they would just wait long enough. That is not going to work because this bill was never about middle-class folks. We see it in the numbers. We see it in the fact that what the middle class gets is temporary, but now we know, while middle-class families keep waiting for the promises to come true, these stock buyback bonanzas, these investor windfalls are just going to keep rolling on in.

NOMINATION OF RUSSELL VOUGHT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Mr. Russell Vought is nominated to be the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. My view is, he has radically misguided budget priorities. He has long opposed bipartisan compromise. I am especially concerned about his well-documented history of inflammatory rhetoric. If confirmed, he would be the point person in charge of the President's budget. He is on record supporting an extreme fiscal strategy—one that would really threaten the full faith and credit of the country by engaging in debt ceiling brinkmanship, but I also oppose Mr. Vought's nomination because of his extreme vote on the budget and refusal to reach across party lines.

So we have an obligation to look at his extreme views, especially his vitriolic comments he has made, and to consider them among the recent examples of individuals who made similar comments and were deemed unfit for service.

Carl Higbie, a Trump surrogate during the 2016 campaign, was appointed as chief of external affairs at the Corporation for National and Community Service. He resigned from his taxpayer-funded post in shame after his history of hateful, bigoted rhetoric was brought to light. That history included saying he didn't like Muslims because he hated their religious ideology and even flatly admitted he was proud to be a racist if it meant being against Muslims.

Rev. Jamie Johnson was appointed last April to lead the Center for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships. He, too, resigned in disgrace after media reports drew scrutiny to his use of racist rhetoric. During a 2008 interview, he said that African Americans had "turned America's major cities into slums because of laziness, drug use, and sexual promiscuity." He also said extremist terrorist groups were representative of all people of the Muslim faith.

For a person taking a job intended to promote partnerships, it was certainly important to call his job performance into question.

William Bradford was appointed to lead the Energy Department's Office of Indian Energy in 2017. He resigned after the media drew attention to comments he made calling for the military to target Muslim women and children and equating American colleges to "Jihadi training camps."

None of these individuals resigned because of their religion. In the United States—and I feel this so deeply—every person is free to practice the religion of their choosing and hold any and all beliefs. The reason these three individuals resigned from their positions was because their intolerant comments cast serious doubt on whether they were capable of working on behalf of all Americans.

That brings me to Mr. Vought's nomination. He has a long history of using inflammatory rhetoric to demonize his political opponents, and he just seems to abhor compromise. He has said that if Republicans fail "to beat back the forces of the left," then "we will lose our country to tyranny." Addressing a group of conservative activists in 2014, he said: "The left increasingly elects ideological storm troopers to Congress." After he was nominated, the American Civil Liberties Union criticized his nomination because he had previously claimed that Muslims had a "deficient theology" and flatly stated that all Muslims "stand condemned."

When I met with Mr. Vought, I asked him to clarify his inflammatory rhetoric. I always think it is important to give somebody a chance to break from the past, and I hoped to hear a softer approach. He chose to stand by what he said. In fact, he doubled down.

So I will close with this. In my view, nothing should have changed in the time since Mr. Higby, Reverend Johnson, and Mr. Bradford resigned in shame. This incendiary, vitriolic rhetoric is disqualifying.

One of the first requirements of nominees for public office is to respect Americans from all walks of life. This is true when you are talking about a position like the OMB Deputy Director which holds enormous influence over the Federal budget. Mr. Vought has a clear, documented record of disrespecting and demonizing those who think differently than he does, and I consider that disqualifying.

This administration may tolerate those who spew vile rhetoric, and maybe they believe it is right to reward them with powerful roles in government, but the Senate does not have an obligation to let the standards of decency and tolerance degrade in this manner.

For this reason, I oppose the Vought nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

RUSSIAN FINANCIAL INFLUENCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I come to the floor to give the first of several speeches on Russia's hybrid warfare operations against the West. Today, I want to highlight one aspect of this ongoing destabilization effort: the Kremlin's malign financial influence.

It is clear we need a whole-of-government approach and a comprehensive strategy to counter Russian aggression. A particular focus should be devoted to reducing secrecy in our financial system. It is a simple fact: Bad actors need money to conduct their activities. Yet our current financial system's opaqueness serves the interests of malevolent forces.

Greater transparency will make it harder for the Kremlin and its cronies to exert malign financial influence on our shores. The lack of transparency in our system is problematic for our banks here at home. The global nature of our financial system means that foreign actors can take advantage of our institutions for their own gain, which has implications for our national security.

I have looked at this issue through the lens of my work as ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, as well as my service on the Banking Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence. Money laundering and other financial crimes are among the tools deployed by Russia as part of the Kremlin's larger influence campaign, which has been used against the United States and our allies and partners to advance the strategic and political goals of Russia. These activities are being used as weapons which threaten U.S. national security.

The Kremlin's use of malign financial influence is subtle and is part of a larger, coordinated operation of hybrid aggression by the Kremlin using a broad spectrum of military and non-military tools at its disposal. Russia recognizes that, for now, its military capabilities are limited relative to the United States and NATO, and it will seek to avoid a direct military conflict with the West. Instead, Russia deploys tactics that leverage its strengths and exploit our systematic vulnerabilities.

As laid out in the Russian National Security Strategy of 2015, the Kremlin's approach to conflict includes weaponizing tools and resources from across government and society. The Russian strategy states: "Interrelated political, military, military-technical, diplomatic, economic, informational, and other measures are being developed and implemented in order to ensure strategic deterrence and the prevention of armed conflicts."

This describes what may be called a Russian "hybrid" approach to con-

frontation below the threshold of direct armed conflict, a method that has been developing and escalating since the earliest days of Putin's rise to power in Russia. The main tenets of the Kremlin's hybrid operations are: information operation with cyber tools—which people commonly think of as hacking—propaganda and disinformation, manipulation of social media, and malign influence, which can be deployed through political or financial channels.

As a nation, we are beginning to unpack what happened in the 2016 Presidential election with respect to certain aspects of Russian hybrid operations. For example, we are learning how the Russians combined hacking operations with the release of information timed for maximum political damage. We have also learned more about Russia's manipulation of social media with Kremlin-linked cyber armies. But we have yet to understand the depths of how the Kremlin has used money as a weapon and how it has harmed our national security and our democracy. For this aspect of its hybrid arsenal, Russia is using money as a tool of warfare to exploit the vulnerabilities of our democratic institutions to its advantage.

The Russian system of corrupt financial influence rests on Putin's domestic power structure. The Putin regime is fundamentally a kleptocracy, which is a system where corrupt leaders use their power to exploit their country's people and natural resources in order to extend their personal wealth and personal power. Putin has systemically fostered kleptocratic conditions by exploiting state funds and resources to reward a group of close associates, commonly referred to as oligarchs. Many of these associates have a personal connection to Putin and have gained their positions of power or fortune due to their relationship with him. Often these political and personal relationships were forged in childhood, early adulthood, or during Putin's days in the KGB and the St. Petersburg government.

In exchange for wealth, privilege, and often impunity, this group of Putin's cronies are readily deployed to act on behalf of Kremlin interests. As Russian scholar and journalist Joshua Yaffa detailed, "Oligarchs finance the 'black ledger,' . . . money that does not go through the budget but is needed by the state, to finance elections and support local political figures, for example." Funds leave the state budget as procurement orders, and come back as off the books cash, to be spent however the Kremlin sees fit."

Russia's kleptocratic system reinforces Putin's power in several ways. First, he controls who profits from state coffers, making the recipients of state largess indebted to him. Second, he can outsource projects of financial influence, which provides him with access to private wealth streams and

gives him plausible deniability if the projects have a nefarious aspect. Finally, this system allows Putin to ensnare oligarchs who may have enriched themselves through a corrupt deal or committed crimes that were state-sanctioned.

Not only has Putin been able to use corruption to protect his power base at home, but he has then exported his kleptocratic system as part of his arsenal of hybrid warfare. The Kremlin has studied the gaps in Western society and leverages the oligarchs' wealth through the system of power Putin created, to buy our influence, distort our markets, and warp our democratic institutions.

As the Center for Strategic and International Studies report, "The Kremlin Playbook," notes, "Corruption is the lubricant on which this system operates, concentrating the exploitation of the state resources to further Russia's networks of influence." A by-product of this malign financial influence is the use of ill-gotten gains to further fuel the cycle of corruption and fund other aspects of the Kremlin's hybrid aggression.

As I mentioned, Putin and his inner circle often deploy these financial influence tactics through an oligarch. These intermediaries are not officially affiliated with the government and appear to operate independently, which makes them harder to detect and gives the Kremlin plausible deniability.

In conventional warfare, the tools of war are implements of physical destruction, but under Putin's tactics of financial malign influence the tools are the same as any large-scale criminal organization: offshore tax havens and banking centers, shell companies, money laundering, with the addition of Russian majority-owned state banks.

Russian malign financial influence and the proceeds from this activity are harming our national security and corrupting our democratic institutions. As described in "The Kremlin Playbook," "The mechanisms of Russian influence are designed to thrive in Western democracies because they use Western rules and institutions and exploit their systematic weaknesses."

And these tactics appear to be updated versions of similar tools used against us in the past. As Russian expert Brian Whitmore wrote, "In many ways, Russian corruption is the new Soviet communism. The Kremlin's black cash is the new red menace."

He further described this threat as "a web of opaque front corporations, murky energy deals and complex money laundering schemes which ensnare foreign elites and form a ready-made Kremlin lobby."

Let's think about that for a second. The Kremlin is buying off foreigners to do its bidding within its own societies. And the way they are buying influence is obscured through exploiting Western banking laws and international finan-

cial systems. We have no way of knowing whom this money is going to or what it is buying. Russia is using our blind spot to advance their political and strategic goals and, in the process, corrupt and warp our institutions from within.

Let's take a look at how they are doing it. One way the Kremlin is asserting malign financial influence is through personal relationships, established by oligarchs or through other Kremlin-linked business executives. As Vice President Biden and former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Michael Carpenter warned in a recent article in *Foreign Affairs*, this arrangement "gives the Kremlin enormous leverage over wealthy Russians who do business in the West and over Western companies that do business in Russia. Moscow can ask (or pressure) such businesspeople and companies to help finance its subversion of political processes elsewhere."

One oligarch who used this method is Oleg Deripaska. Deripaska has been a close Putin ally for decades. Deripaska is transparent about how his wealth was deployed as a tool for the Kremlin, stating:

If the state says we need to give it up, we'll give it up. I don't separate myself from the state. I have no other interests.

He served as the benefactor for a variety of political activities that advanced Kremlin interests. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, this financial backing included paying Paul Manafort, who later became Trump's campaign manager, \$10 million a year to advance Kremlin interests in Ukraine, Georgia, and Montenegro. Investigations from NBC News and the *New York Times* found that Deripaska fronted Manafort an estimated \$60 million for other business ventures and loans, moving the funds through shell companies in Cypress and the Cayman Islands.

A second way these influence activities can be deployed is through Russian majority state-owned banks. These banks do not function like the ones we deal with every day. In fact, these banks often don't care about making profits at all. Instead, they are using money as a weapon of influence, to advance the Russian state or enrich people who may ultimately advance the Kremlin's aims.

An example is the Vnesheconombank, commonly known as VEB. The U.S. Treasury Department described VEB as a "payment agent for the Russian government." This bank is essentially controlled by Putin's inner circle as the President picks the chairman and the Prime Minister sits on its supervisory board. Foreign Policy journalist Elias Groll deemed the bank "a precision-guided diplomatic weapon." As such, VEB has taken on a range of projects with one common goal—to advance Kremlin interests. VEB financed

a large share of the \$50 billion Sochi Olympics, attempted to shore up the troubled Ukrainian steel industry, and underwrote the losses of key Putin cronies whose financial interests were hurt by U.S. and EU sanctions.

VEB is under sanctions for its role in financing Kremlin aggression against Crimea and eastern Ukraine. VEB garnered headlines because it was used as a cover for a spying ring with efforts to recruit people such as Carter Page, who later became a Trump campaign associate. According to the Department of Justice, conversations recorded between these Russian spies reveal that they saw tactics of financial influence as a way to gain Page's cooperation. In addition, VEB Chairman Sergey Gorkov, a close Putin ally, met with Jared Kushner in December 2016, while VEB remained under sanctions. While the Trump administration said that the meeting was in Kushner's capacity as an incoming government official, a spokesman for Putin said that it was for business reasons. This bank is losing billions of dollars funding projects of political and strategic value to the Kremlin, bailing out oligarchs and being used as cover for spies. These activities don't match with those of a "normal bank."

Another tool of Russian financial influence is offshore banking centers or tax havens, which refers to financial institutions in a place that is different from where the depositor lives. Usually this is done for the financial and legal advantages the location provides, including secrecy and little or no taxation. The Russians have used these centers to facilitate the movement of money out of Russia. Once money finds a home in an offshore banking center, it can be relabeled as "foreign" and then can move back to Russia or to a third destination with the origin and ownership of the funds obscured.

The Panama Papers—a leak of over 11 million files from one of the world's largest offshore law firms—showed that between 2007 and 2013, nearly \$2 billion had been funneled through offshore accounts to those in Putin's inner circle. Top centers for Russian offshore banking include Cyprus, the Bahamas, the British Virgin Islands, Switzerland, and Bermuda. Russian experts, Michael Weiss and Peter Pomerantsev, noted: "These destinations, prized for their secrecy laws and tax havens, often make cameos whenever Russian corruption scandals are exposed in the international press."

Cyprus became a particularly important haven for the Kremlin after the United States and the European Union issued sanctions against Russia for its aggression in Crimea and eastern Ukraine. Cyprus provided a haven for Russian oligarchs and others from Putin's inner circle to keep their money safe from sanctions and served as a launching point for the money to

be used to finance further malign influence activities.

Often the Kremlin and Kremlin-linked actors utilize offshore tax havens and shell companies together. Shell companies are legal entities that generally have no physical assets or operations and may be used solely to hold property rights or financial assets. Russia has exploited these shell companies as a tool to obscure true ownership, fund shady deals, launder ill-gotten gains, and further the cycle of corruption.

One Kremlin-linked money laundering operation, commonly referred to as the laundromat, moved an estimated \$20 billion out of Russia through Eastern Europe and then to banks around the world. The Russian journalists who uncovered the scheme found that the beneficiaries were Russian business executives who had state contracts with Russian Government or government-owned entities worth the equivalent of hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars. The money was laundered by 21 shell companies based in the United Kingdom, Cypress, and New Zealand.

While it is easy to dismiss this as a problem that occurs in other countries rather than our own, Kremlin and Kremlin-linked actors are also exploiting our own laws in the United States to deploy these tools of financial influence. They are taking advantage of laws that do not require disclosure of who really owns a company or whose money is really funding these entities. They are taking advantage of the secrecy permitted in our system to continue their corrupt practices and intertwine their money into our systems.

As Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General Day testified at a recent Banking Committee hearing, “the pervasive use of front companies, shell companies, nominees and other means to conceal the beneficial owners of assets is one of the great loopholes” in the anti-money laundering regime of the United States. Similarly, the 2015 Treasury Department’s National Money Laundering Risk Assessment estimates that \$300 billion is generated annually in illicit proceeds of the United States and cites shell companies as a means to move these funds into our domestic banking system.

The global, interconnected nature of our financial system has also been manipulated by Kremlin-linked actors to hold or move illicit funds and launder their ill-gotten gains across the West. In one prime example, Deutsche Bank was revealed to be helping Russian clients illegally launder \$10 billion between 2011 and 2015 in a mirror-trading scheme in which rubles were surreptitiously converted into dollars. This scheme would begin with Deutsche Bank’s Moscow branch buying Russian stocks in rubles. Shortly after, sometimes on the same day, a related party would sell the same Russian stock in

the same quantity and at the same price through Deutsche Bank’s London office, but in dollars.

The New York State Department of Financial Services found that the parties doing the buying or selling were closely related to both sides such as through common ownership and that none of the trades demonstrated any legitimate economic rationale. The New York State Department of Financial Services concluded: “By converting rubles into dollars through security trades that had no discernible purpose, the scheme was a means for bad actors within a financial institution to achieve improper ends while evading compliance with applicable laws.” Deutsche Bank paid \$425 million to New York State in fines and an additional \$204 million to U.K. regulators for this money laundering scheme.

Kremlin-linked actors have also used real estate to launder illicit Russian funds in the United States and elsewhere. Often the purchase of real estate is done through an intermediary, which both obscures the true ownership of the property and hides the origin of the funds. These purchases are often all-cash deals, which is particularly problematic to trace and cut banks out of the process, which removes a crucial layer of oversight. Indeed, FinCEN, the Treasury Department’s Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, called out all-cash real estate deals in August of 2017 as an area of particular concern due to its lack of anti-money laundering protections.

One recent example of using all-cash real estate as a means to launder funds is the case of the Russian firm Prevezon. Prevezon is a firm owned by Denis Katsyv, the son of the former Kremlin Transportation Minister and a key Putin ally. Prevezon was charged by the Justice Department in connection with laundering the proceeds of an elaborate \$230 million tax refund fraud scheme, including buying real estate in Manhattan with some of the profits from this scheme.

As described, these tactics of financial influence, part of the Kremlin’s hybrid arsenal, have a corrupting and destabilizing effect on our democracies. Beyond the tactic itself, which is deployed to advance Kremlin aims, the ill-gotten gains created from these tactics continue to serve to concentrate Putin’s hold on power and fund other aspects of Russian hybrid warfare operations.

Profits gained from tactics of financial influence have underwritten the following malign activities: raising private militias to fight in Ukraine and Syria; assisting Russian military intelligence with conducting signals intelligence operations and other specialized technology and training against the United States in the 2016 election; funding troll operations that manipulate social media platforms in informa-

tion operations against us and our allies; paying construction costs for a bridge between Crimea and the Russian mainland, which, once completed, will help the Kremlin to solidify its illegal annexation of Crimea.

The common link through all of these tools is secrecy. Putin and his kleptocratic system thrives on secrecy and on hybrid operations that blur the lines between legitimate economic activity and corruption, and between conflict and cooperation.

We need to take a serious look at how our government is organized to counter Kremlin hybrid operations in their totality. But one thing is for certain; we need to reduce secrecy in our banking system, which leaves us more vulnerable to the manipulation of our free market system by the Kremlin and Kremlin-linked actors.

We are getting a reputation around the world as a place to go if you want to hide money. This is contrary to both American values and the traditional role of the United States as the enforcer of international norms.

Starting in May of this year, many financial institutions will have to collect and verify the identity of the beneficial owners of companies at the time of an account opening as a result of Treasury’s customer due diligence rule. While this is a start, we need to go further and pierce the veil of secrecy that has shrouded our system. We heard testimony in the Banking Committee on ways to improve U.S. disclosure requirements, including requiring disclosure of all beneficial owners, regardless of ownership stake.

I applaud those who have already been thinking about this issue. This includes recommendations, put out earlier this month by the Center for American Progress, that call for concrete reforms, including curbing abuses of shell companies, increasing FinCEN’s budget, and amending portions of the Bank Secrecy Act and Money Laundering Control Act in a way that would provide greater transparency and regulation regarding the sale of real estate.

There are also legislative fixes that have been proposed in the Senate. I appreciate that my colleagues Senators WHITEHOUSE, FEINSTEIN, and GRASSLEY have introduced legislation, the True Incorporation Transparency for Law Enforcement Act. I also recognize my colleagues Senators WYDEN and RUBIO for introducing the Corporate Transparency Act in the Senate. I know similar efforts have been made in the House of Representatives.

I intend to take a close look at these legislative proposals but the key, in my opinion, is making sure that we are able to trace these shell companies back to who is specifically benefiting and directing them; that is, any serious effort to determine ownership must stop only when a specific individual or

individuals have been identified. Too often we take one step and find another shell company and stop right there. That doesn't lead us to anyone. We have to find the individuals who are benefiting from and directing these activities.

The use of these shell companies, as I have said repeatedly throughout my comments, has a real effect on our national security. As the Special Counsel indictment against what is commonly called the "troll factory" shows, close Putin ally Yevgeny Prigozhin was funding an organization conducting what it called "information warfare against the United States." Prigozhin used 14 affiliated shell companies to fund this operation as a way to hide the true source of funds. Without the full investigatory power and subpoena power of the Special Counsel's office, we probably would not have uncovered the true ownership behind this operation. The Kremlin designs it that way, and we can't let them keep getting away with it.

Part and parcel with exposing beneficial ownership would be to stand up an interagency task force led by FinCEN to follow the flow of illicit Russian money into the United States. This task force should leverage the intelligence community, the State Department, and other relevant government agencies to take a comprehensive approach to uncovering where the money is going and how these ill-gotten gains are being spent. Remaining passive and waiting, is not going to deter, disrupt, and finally defeat these deliberate Russian efforts to undermine our basic institutions.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and others to ensure that our national security apparatus has the requisite authorities.

What we need now is initiative by the administration to fully resource and to direct a comprehensive approach to detect, disrupt, and prevent this Russian interference. We need to put the appropriate resources against this threat. The heart of our democracy—our election process—was attacked by the Russians. As we learned yesterday from Admiral Rogers of Cyber Command, it is under attack as we speak today, and we can expect the attacks against the 2018 election cycle to increase with both frequency, boldness, and, unfortunately, effectiveness if we remain passive—indeed, paralyzed—as we are today. We have to recognize that the money that is being generated through these malign financial activities is being used not only to enrich Putin and his cronies but is being used to attack the United States very effectively. Putin has exploited our own laws that favor financial secrecy and

has used clandestine tactics to his advantage at a relatively inexpensive cost.

Increasing, for example, resources to FinCEN in the Treasury Department or standing up and funding a task force, as I described, and devoting the necessary resources to tracing shell companies back to the people responsible would be a small fraction of what it would cost to use conventional forces to deter Russian aggression. Indeed, deploying a combat team to the Baltics is more expensive, I would suspect, than setting up a team of experts here in Washington that will go after these funding streams, and without the money, they cannot conduct their operations.

Mr. President, we often hear the expression "follow the money" as a way to identify the cause of a problem, and that is true here. Today, we know that our democracy and many others are under attack by the Government of Russia. Responding to this reality will require a comprehensive strategy to counter Russian asymmetric and hybrid tactics. However, as I laid out, an immediate step we can take is a concerted effort to bring greater transparency to our financial system. If we fail to do so, we will continue to have that very secrecy used against our national security interests and the interests of all of our allies.

Now is the time to act. We are being attacked. To sit back and absorb the punches will lead only to defeat, not to a final victory over our adversaries.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO SALLY-ANN ROBERTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is very hard, as the Presiding Officer knows, to become an icon in television news as station owners change, as demographics change, and as on-air personalities change. The "Guinness Book of World Records" actually tracks the longest serving television news broadcaster. In case one is curious, the current record holder is a broadcasting

legend named Don Alhart, who has been delivering the news in Rochester, NY, for 51 years. I am happy for Mr. Alhart, but Sally-Ann Roberts could have taken that title from him had she not decided it was time to pass the baton.

After 41 years at WWL-TV Channel 4, in the great city of New Orleans, Sally-Ann Roberts is embarking on a new chapter in her life. She is retiring today. If anybody is worthy of icon status, it is Sally-Ann, and she is absolutely humble about it. If you talk to her about her career, she will probably turn the conversation around to you. If you insist on talking about her career, she will always give credit to her parents for instilling such a strong work ethic and a love for the Lord in their children.

Ms. Roberts came to WWL-TV from Laurel, MS. She was working as the weekend anchor in that small, wonderful town. She didn't even work every weekend; she worked every other weekend. Talent, though, does not stay hidden in America. A WWL-TV journalist by the name of Angela Hill, an icon in her own right, stopped near Laurel for the night. She turned on the television, saw Sally-Ann, and immediately told her news director to hire Sally-Ann. Angela recognized intelligence and talent when she saw it. Very shortly thereafter, Ms. Sally-Ann Roberts had the city hall beat in New Orleans, and the rest, they say, is history.

For the past 26 years, Sally-Ann has anchored the morning show on WWL-TV Channel 4 in New Orleans. She is as much a part of the morning routine in New Orleans as eggs and beignets. Part of the reason people feel so comfortable with Sally-Ann is her positive attitude and pleasing personality. During cooking segments, she has been known to sneak bites of the crispiest bacon. During stories about neglected children—stories that would break anyone's heart—she would often tell us that she was shedding light on the need for foster parents, always trying to be positive.

The Presiding Officer probably knows Ms. Sally-Ann Roberts's little sister. Her name happens to be Ms. Robin Roberts. Robin is an anchor on "Good Morning America." A few years ago, Robin was diagnosed with a very rare blood disorder. A bone marrow transplant saved Robin Roberts's life. Sally-Ann Roberts provided that lifesaving bone marrow. Here is a typical story about Sally-Ann. She went through the bone marrow collection process on a Tuesday and a Wednesday. By Thursday, she was dressed to the nines and doing a national interview to emphasize how quick the recovery time is. She wanted to educate America about bone marrow donation.

Let me say again that Sally-Ann Roberts is an icon, and I don't use that word lightly. If she had wanted, she

would have probably been anchoring the evening news before a national audience, but she loved and still loves New Orleans, and that was where she chose to remain.

She has had an extraordinary career as a broadcast journalist. I know she is excited about what comes next. I suspect she will spend some time with her grandchildren. I suspect she will continue writing books and also driving home the importance of bone marrow donation. Sally-Ann, I know, will not just put her feet up and sit. Audience members like me are grateful she devoted such a lengthy chapter of her life to Louisiana and to our great city of New Orleans.

God bless you, Sally-Ann Roberts. Thank you for giving so much to our community and to our State.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TAX REFORM

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have been coming to the floor to talk about the many ways the tax relief law has helped people all across America.

Last week, there were even more examples. One thing we saw was the "Economic Report of the President" that came out last Wednesday. This is a report from the top economists at the White House. According to the report, the tax relief law that we have passed and signed into law is going to raise the average wages for working families across this country by over \$4,000 in the long run. That is a huge raise. This report said that more than 4 million workers are also getting one-time cash bonuses and other benefits. These one-time cash bonuses mean a great deal to American families. It says that so far, over \$2 billion in cash bonuses have been given.

Today in Wyoming, we heard another great report that Taco John's—an establishment at which I frequently ate lunch when I was in the Wyoming Legislature, as did so many members of the Wyoming Legislature. They are providing bonuses for employees. That is another case in point. The reason they say they are doing it is the tax relief tax cut benefits that people all across the country are receiving as a result of the tax law we passed.

If you remember, a lot of Democrats predicted gloom and doom if we were to pass this piece of legislation. NANCY PELOSI actually said it was Armageddon. She said it was the end of the world. Well, with all of these workers getting bigger paychecks and more take-home pay, Democrats have now

started to panic. NANCY PELOSI said all the benefits people are getting under the tax law are "crumbs." That is what she called them, but that is not what people across the State of Wyoming are calling them.

I received a note the other day from a man who said he heard all the rhetoric from NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats. He said: "Here is what the crumbs mean to a fellow working in Casper, Wyoming." He said that the first thing he noticed was that his take-home pay was higher in his latest paycheck. He figures that the tax cut works out to about a 2-percent raise for him. He and his wife decided to put that money straight into his retirement savings plan and invest it. He figures that over time, as those investments grow, it could add up to an extra \$97,000 by the time he is ready to retire. He said: "A few crumbs over time really do matter."

There was a second part of his story about what the Republican tax relief means for him and his family, and that is the bonus. Because of the tax cuts, his employer gave him a bonus of \$1,500. He said: "I plan to enjoy the summer just a little bit more with this surprise income." He said he is investing the tax cut in his retirement, and he is investing the bonus in creating additional memories with his family today. He said that it means they are going to take an extra camping trip to Yellowstone this summer. They will enjoy "a few more cookouts with families and friends this summer to savor the memories that this tax reform is providing."

That is what it means for people across the country—memories, family activities, vacation, and a better retirement—all of those things because of the tax law and tax relief passed for the American people. They are going to do things they like doing, everything from going on vacation to going out for ice cream.

Tax reform has been very good for people in Casper, WY. It is good for his family. He wrote to tell me about it. It is good for the local businesses that he will be supporting, where he will be spending his money, traveling around the State, going on vacation, camping trips, cookouts, and making memories. They are not crumbs.

I don't know why Democrats who voted against the tax cuts even came to Washington in the first place. I do know that Republicans came here with a purpose—a purpose to give families more opportunities to invest in their futures like this man is doing.

There was another new survey that came out last week. They talked with heads of companies across America, and they talked about the confidence index that we are seeing nationwide. That is because of the tax relief law. The survey found that 89 percent of these business leaders are confident in

the U.S. economy's prospects this year. It is at an alltime high.

Look at 2016—the last year of the Obama administration—and 2017 and 2018. That is an enormous jump from the 39 percent that business leaders were feeling in terms of confidence back in 2016. It is even bigger than last year, when 80 percent said they were confident. The reason for the jump is simple. When we look at what has changed since 2016, there were a couple of very big things.

First is the way that Republicans have been cutting back on Washington's burdensome, punishing, and destructive regulations. It is going to save Americans a lot of money and a lot of time.

The second thing that happened is that Republicans in Congress passed the tax relief law. That is why millions of Americans are getting a pay raise. That is why Americans are more confident about our economy. The business leaders are right. They should be confident about the state of America's economy because Republicans are just getting started.

Our economy should have been growing much more quickly ever since the recession ended almost 9 years ago, but it didn't during the last administration because the politics and the policies of the Democrats in Washington held our economy back. Now we have Republican policies, and the economy is much stronger. America's economy grew by just 1.8 percent in 2016. That is tepid growth compared to what we expect and what we are used to. Last year, it grew by 2.5 percent. We added 2.2 million jobs in 2017. Confidence is soaring.

Democrats don't want to hear about it. They don't want to talk about it. They don't want to hear from their constituents who are getting a raise and getting more money in their paychecks. They consider it crumbs. They almost appear to be rooting for the economy to stall. Some may want the economy to look more like it did when they were in charge.

The American people are going to look at what the Democrats did and realize that what the Republicans did made a huge difference in their lives. People are going to look at the fact that every Democrat in the Senate voted against the tax cuts. Then people are going to look at what Republicans have done and what it means for people's take-home pay. That is why Republicans are here. It is what we promised to do. That is what we are going to continue to do.

ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. President, I would like to speak about energy infrastructure. President Trump has shown that he intends to be a champion for upgrading our country's aging highways, bridges, and water infrastructure. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment

and Public Works, I will be working with President Trump to modernize our infrastructure. This includes working to upgrade America's energy infrastructure, things such as electric transmission lines and natural gas pipelines. These facilities need to be repaired and modernized, and we need to build new facilities as well.

Often, these investments can be made without any taxpayer funding. People get the benefit of new jobs, economic growth, and the affordable and reliable energy that these projects supply. It is good for everybody, including the taxpayers. We just need to make sure the government doesn't get in the way.

Recently, there was an important reminder of the need for energy infrastructure development. It was that blast of cold weather and heavy snow that hit the Northeast part of the country earlier this year. Normally, natural gas accounts for about 48 percent of the power generated in New England. During this big winter storm in January, gas accounted for only 16 percent. That is because there aren't enough natural gas pipelines in the region to deliver all of the gas they needed for heating and for power. This shouldn't happen in America, where we are the No. 1 natural gas producer in the world.

To meet the demand in New England, powerplants and utilities have had to take the drastic step of importing liquefied natural gas from Russia. Can you imagine such a thing? This is a tanker, and it carried gas from a Russian company called Yamal LNG—liquefied natural gas. The gas came from a facility in Siberia, and they were taking it right into the Boston Harbor last month. This is the location of the Boston Tea Party, and we are bringing in Russian LNG.

You might think that local leaders in the region would want to avoid importing gas from our adversaries, like Russia. You might think they would want more American pipelines to power our communities. That is not what is happening in the Northeast part of this country. Instead, leaders in that region have been vocal opponents of new pipelines. They blocked the pipelines.

People who have been vocal opponents of the new pipelines include some of the Democrats who represent that part of the country right here in the Senate. They refused to allow responsible and safe energy development to give people in the Northeast the natural gas the families and businesses need. These Democrats claim they are protecting the environment. That is simply not true.

There was a headline in the Boston Globe a couple of weeks ago. The headline was "Our Russian pipeline, and its ugly toll." That was in the Boston Globe. The article pointed out that Russia actually has much lower standards than the United States when it

comes to protecting the environment. Democrats are just playing the old game of "not in my backyard." We see the same thing so often when it comes to energy infrastructure projects.

We should be looking for ways to make energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, without raising costs for American families. When it comes to actually producing the energy, Democrats put up roadblocks to keep it from happening.

If we are going to build America's infrastructure, we need to streamline the process, and we need to start cutting the redtape. We need to build faster, better, cheaper, and smarter. It is true for roads and bridges and also true for our energy infrastructure.

Let me conclude by telling you that this article in the Boston Globe called on leaders in the Northeast to stop prioritizing short-term political gains at the expense of energy security and the environment. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to do the same. We should be talking about not just energy security and energy independence and not being dependent on foreign sources of energy from our enemies but focus on American energy, U.S. energy, and American jobs. We certainly shouldn't put America in a position of being dependent on Russia or others to heat our homes and power our economy. We should all support responsible energy infrastructure development so American communities can run on American energy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his remarks on American energy and American energy independence, particularly the work we have done in Wyoming and Colorado. When you think about the opportunities we have to free up markets for Colorado and Wyoming produced oil or gas, it is truly remarkable.

The Senator and I also share the great work that takes place at F.E. Warren Air Force Base. F.E. Warren Air Force Base has a significant role to play in the nuclear triad, with facilities in both Colorado and Wyoming. That is obviously something very important to our national security.

One of the other things I think is important to bring to this conversation that the Senator from Wyoming talked about is the national security component that energy can play and the important role that it has. We can export our energy not just to the Midwest or to the eastern parts of this country, but we can take that gas produced in Wyoming and Colorado and export it to Asia and Europe, to countries that want American energy, that desire American energy resources, not energy resources from tyrants and dictators

like Russia and other places we see around the globe.

This is an opportunity for us to really show, and I commend my colleague for his leadership on energy.

MODERNIZING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to talk primarily about the work Secretary Zinke has done in the Department of Interior and to thank him for taking a bold approach to modernizing the Department of the Interior. I commend him for taking this approach.

The Secretary knows that 93 percent of all Federal land is located in the western part of the United States. This map shows the Federal lands around our country. If you look at the eastern seaboard, you can see a lot of patches of white, with a few patches of red in Virginia, West Virginia, the George Washington National Forest, the Shenandoah National Park. In Florida, you can see the Everglades National Park, the Great Smoky Mountains, but you can see the predominant shade of the western part of this country is red. Red signifies all the areas that are owned by the Federal Government.

Look at the State of Nevada. Almost the entire State of Nevada is owned by the Federal Government—is public land. Look at the State of Colorado. It is public land owned by the Federal Government.

Nationwide, the Bureau of Land Management is responsible for managing approximately 700 million acres of Federal mineral estate located underground and all of the Federal land management agencies' holdings. So it is not just land that is held by the Bureau of Land Management in Colorado, in fact, they hold even more when it comes to our mineral holdings.

The BLM is also responsible for administering 245 million acres of Federal surface lands. As this map points out, nearly all of it in this country is in the 11 western-most States and Alaska.

Historically, local BLM field offices have been diligent and effective managers of the public land for multiple use, as they are charged to do under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

In fact, when I meet with county commissioners and others in the West, they all talk about the good relationship they have with their field offices and the good decisions they are able to reach with those field offices.

Although, unfortunately, in recent years, directives and management coming from the BLM headquarters in Washington, DC—a long ways away from these publicly held lands out West, the 200-plus million acres of Federal land held by the BLM thousands of miles away from Washington, DC—have favored deep-pocketed, radical special interests over field office decisions and the opinions of those who

live near and who actually use this land.

Whether it is the withdrawal of mineral leasing or the reduction of grazing permits, the concept of multiple use—something that was fundamental to the founding of our public land agencies—has fallen out of favor with the Bureau of Land Management.

When you don't live in the communities that are among and surrounded by these lands, it is easy to make these decisions that close off energy development or close off recreational opportunities or close out cattle ranching because the consequences are felt out West, 1,000-plus miles away from the decision makers in the Potomac.

The BLM Headquarters Relocation Act is legislation I have introduced to fix this problem.

I was pleased to see within its budget request that the Department of the Interior is planning a modernization of their organization and infrastructure for the next 100 years. At the very top of this modernization plan should be relocating the BLM headquarters out West. Move it out of Washington and put it exactly in the middle of these lands.

Grand Junction, CO, the Western Slope of Colorado, is a beautiful place, a great city that can accommodate an agency headquarters and has the benefit of a populous that is intimately familiar with public land management policy and decision making. It makes perfect sense. It has a great airport, interstate access, a county with well over half of its land held by public land agencies. It is a community surrounded by public land. It is a community that is surrounded by people who are affected by those public land decisions. Doesn't it make more sense to have those decisions coming from the lands that they are regulating than from the beltway of Washington?

This proposal has strong bipartisan support—Republicans and Democrats who agree. Let's put the decision makers into places where those decisions are felt first and foremost. Making this agency more accountable to the people who have to deal with its management decisions by putting its headquarters among the land managers would be a huge start and a great recognition that we can modernize this agency and this Department for the next 100 years.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this critical piece of legislation, and I look forward to working with Secretary Zinke and the Department of the Interior to achieve this goal.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 3 minutes as in morning business.

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR TIP PROPOSAL

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, earlier today I talked to a server who worked in a restaurant in Northeast Ohio, in Trumbull County, north of Youngstown, and she is concerned, as I am, about a proposal from the U.S. Department of Labor that pretty much legalizes wage theft.

We know, in this country right now, servers, or tipped workers, can be the person who pushes the wheelchair in the airport. I spoke to somebody the other day who drove one of those airport carts in the Cleveland airport. She makes \$5 an hour because she is supposed to rely on tips to get up to the minimum wage, but she doesn't always get tips, or a server who works in a restaurant, in a diner in Garfield Heights or in Chillicothe, OH, and makes sometimes only \$2.10 an hour and relies on tips. That is enough of a problem—that companies that employ tipped workers can pay such low wages—but that is compounded by this rule that comes out of the White House and the Department of Labor that really is tantamount to wage theft. The rule simply says the tips you put on the table at a Denny's or at a Bob Evans, the management—the employer—can take those tips and distribute them however he or she wants to other workers in the restaurant.

Now, plenty of waitresses and plenty of waiters and servers give out some of their tips, distribute them to the bartender or others, and that is their choice, but for the employer to be able to take the tips from a worker, from a server, and decide whom to give it to in the back office or in the kitchen—someone they are not paying enough to anyway; to make up for that—or for the employer to just take the money and put it in their pockets, under this rule coming out of the Department of Labor—this is the Secretary of Labor and a government that is supposed to represent workers, supposed to advocate for labor. This administration has turned that upside down, where the Secretary of Labor is advocating for employers and basically legalizing wage theft—taking that money from tipped workers who work so hard.

We know how hard everybody at a diner works. They are not making a lot of money. They rely on those tips. We are going to say—the U.S. Government, the Department of Labor, the President of the United States—is going to say: Oh, it is all right to take some of these tip dollars and put them in my pocket as the employer. Give it to the workers in the kitchen whom the com-

pany underpays because they are going to supplement their underpaid wages with tips. It is mean-spirited, it is legitimatizing wage theft, and we have no business doing it. There are 24 of us who have sent a letter to Secretary of Labor Acosta condemning his decision.

First of all, they did a study and found that this would take literally billions of dollars from the pockets of workers. They buried that study. We are saying, at least let that study out. Let people comment. Almost \$6 billion in tips every single year will be lost because of this decision. It is a really bad idea. It is mean-spirited, and it frankly legalizes wage theft. It should be defeated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 40 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Isakson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Johnson	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Young
Enzi	Moran	
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Harris	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Rounds

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 49. The

Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, John Kennedy, Richard Burr, Mike Lee, David Perdue, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jeff Flake, Lindsey Graham, Patrick J. Toomey, Marco Rubio, Tom Cotton, James E. Risch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 41 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Alexander	Donnelly	Lankford
Baldwin	Enzi	Leahy
Barrasso	Ernst	Lee
Bennet	Fischer	Manchin
Blunt	Flake	McCaskill
Boozman	Gardner	McConnell
Burr	Graham	Moran
Capito	Grassley	Murkowski
Carper	Hassan	Nelson
Cassidy	Hatch	Paul
Cochran	Heitkamp	Perdue
Collins	Heller	Portman
Coons	Hoeven	Reed
Corker	Inhofe	Risch
Cornyn	Isakson	Roberts
Cortez Masto	Johnson	Rubio
Cotton	Jones	Sasse
Crapo	Kaine	Scott
Cruz	Kennedy	Shaheen
Daines	King	Shelby

Sullivan
Tester
Thune

Tillis
Toomey
Warner

Whitehouse
Wicker
Young

NAYS—29

Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Casey
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand

Harris
Heinrich
Hirono
Klobuchar
Markey
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Peters

Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Smith
Stabenow
Udall
Van Hollen
Warren
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 29.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon—and I know I will be joined by a number of my colleagues on the floor—to talk about gun violence and to talk about what happened most recently and tragically in the State of Florida. I hope we can cover a number of aspects of this challenge, but I wanted to start with the victims who were killed at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14. I will make reference to the individuals more specifically a little later, but we are remembering them today. We are thinking of their families and certainly thinking as well of the surviving students.

We are praying for the families, the victims, and the survivors. I can't imagine what these families are dealing with right now just days after this tragedy. There are a lot of ways to express grief, a lot of ways to somehow articulate the loss. I can't do it adequately, so I will turn to, in this case, a songwriter, recording artist Bruce Springsteen. We all know a good bit of his music, but years ago, after 9/11, he wrote the lyrics to a song which was entitled, "You're Missing." Of course, it has application for those who have loved and lost, especially in this instance, so tragically.

Bruce Springsteen's words go, in part, like this, and the refrain of the song is "You're missing." At one point he says:

You're missing when I shut out the lights
You're missing, when I close my eyes

You're missing, when I see the sun rise

He is giving us a sense of the loss—all day, every day, all night, every night—for that family member. He was speaking and reflecting upon the losses of 9/11, but anyone who has lost a loved one, especially this way—in this case, victims of murder in the school—must be thinking the same about what is missing in their lives and who is missing in their life, whether it is a son, a daughter, or another loved one.

Gun violence in our country is all too common. It is almost hard to comprehend how common it has become, and unfortunately it is all too common not just for our country but especially for the younger generation. I will not provide lines of demarcation, but a lot of young people have known little else in their young lives but reading about or seeing on television stories about gun violence or being in the midst of an act of gun violence. At least hundreds of Americans have been in schools that have been the site of gun violence in the last 20 years or so.

What we ought to do here is, in addition to giving speeches and pointing out where we should go—that is helpful, I guess, but the most important thing the Senate can do is to debate and vote. It would be ideal if we would debate one bill and then vote on it, then have another debate on another bill and vote on that, and do that again and again and see where we end up. I think most people here would be willing to do that even if we knew the result, even if you could prove to us that this particular measure will not pass or this one will be close or that one might pass. Whatever the circumstance, we should debate this issue. This institution is supposed to be all about open debate on the issues of the day. That is what I think that not only young people across the country but people of all ages are expecting of us. They expect us to debate and vote and keep trying to pass a measure that might reduce or maybe even substantially reduce the likelihood of further gun violence in schools and all other kinds of places in our society.

Of course, we are thinking particularly about schools, where students should have a reasonable but sometimes cannot be sure of a reasonable expectation of security. I can't imagine this as a student. In all the years I was in school, we never even thought about this as a reality in our lives. People my age probably never thought about it for 1 minute. People who grew up in the 1960s or 1970s or 1980s never thought about this. It is only in the last generation or so that students have had to worry about and think about and unfortunately, for some, experience this kind of violence.

I was a teacher for 1 year. I was a volunteer in North Philadelphia in a fifth grade classroom. I only taught for a year and knew I would only be teaching for a year of volunteer work, but I

never thought about this. I can't imagine what I would do even if I had some training in law enforcement. Even if I had some training in how to handle a weapon, I can't imagine having to defend a classroom against this kind of killer with a high-powered weapon, where he can shoot bullets, one after another, into a classroom. I can't even imagine, and most people can't imagine.

Schools are supposed to be places of teaching, of learning, of friendship, of competition, and of engagement with all kinds of activities in a school. Of course, schools are supposed to be places of growth, where young people start high school or grade school—high school for 4 years, grade school for longer—come through that, and grow into the kind of person their families hope they will be. Schools should not be places of fear and trepidation and uncertainty about what might happen in that school. This is not a common thought that students in years past had, that they would go to school and not be safe, that they would go to school and potentially not come home.

What has been heartening and inspiring in the aftermath of this tragedy is what young people have done in Parkland in the State of Florida and, frankly, throughout the country. The other day, one of my colleagues said something that made a lot of sense. My colleague made the statement that the Senate is not where the focus of attention is. This Senator said that the focus of attention is on these young people. They are leading. In this case, Congress might have to follow, but we should follow them. They are leading on this. They are showing us the way. Young people are charting a new course on this issue, and they are not going away. They are going to be voting for 50 more years or longer. They are not going away, and this issue won't go away. They are leading us, and we should follow them. They and their families expect us to act. That means debating and voting. It doesn't just mean giving speeches or expressing condolence.

Many of us were moved and inspired by their leadership, and we continue to be so inspired. Many of us were moved to tears and outpourings of emotion on all of these tragedies. I will never forget what I was thinking and responding to when it came to the Newtown massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School. That, for me, was a seminal moment in my life in the Senate. That tragedy informed how I would vote going forward. That tragedy moved me to take a different approach to these issues and, frankly, to vote a different way.

Starting in 2012 and 2013, in the aftermath of that tragedy, the one question I had to ask myself at the time—and I think we are still asking ourselves tragedy after tragedy—is there no ac-

tion Congress can take that will substantially reduce the likelihood of gun violence in a school? Is there no action that the most powerful country in the history of the human race can take to reduce this likelihood? If our answer is no, then I guess that is the way some will vote, and they will move on to other issues. I don't think many Americans believe that. I think most Americans believe there are actions we can take. It won't be one bill or one amendment or one vote, but there are a series of steps we can take over time, and it will take too much time, but we have to start now to consider, debate, and vote on a number of measures.

I want to turn to my colleagues in just a moment.

In the time after the Sandy Hook Elementary tragedy, I was, as many of us were, reading about these young children and the horror in that classroom. I happened to tear out a newspaper page from the Wall Street Journal. These were printed in all kinds of newspapers across the country. You can't see it from a distance, but it is a yellowed copy of that page. It is from the Wall Street Journal dated December 17, 2012, page A6. The inscription above it is "Shattered Lives." It has pictures of the students and pictures of their teachers and others in the school as well. They were all victims of gun violence. I won't go through the stories, but these are powerful stories of their lives. We have to ask ourselves, in the aftermath of that kind of a tragedy—just like the most recent tragedy—are we going to celebrate their lives and tell the world how much they contributed to the life of America but then in the same breath say: But we have to move on to another issue. I don't think that is an American approach. I don't think that is the approach of a great nation, of a great people.

When we are at our best, we tackle problems. We know it will take a long time. We know it will take a number of votes and a number of actions. But we have to begin. I think we should begin.

In this instance, I am not going to go through all the names or all the names from every tragedy, of course, but let me read just the first names of the victims in Parkland. I know the senior Senator from Florida, because of his concern for these victims and their families and his knowledge of his home State, will go into even more detail. I will read the first names. As we are reading them, we should think about what we can do, what we should do as a people, or should we just do what has been done too many other times and move on?

Alyssa, Scott, Martin, Nicholas, Aaron, Jaime, Chris, Luke, Cara, Gina, Joaquin, Alaina, Meadow, Helena, Alex, Carmen, and Peter—17 individuals who are missing in the lives of their family, missing what their class-

mates are experiencing every day; missing from the lives of those classmates, sometimes their best friends. As the songwriter says, those 17 are missing when they shut out the lights. They are missing when they close their eyes at night. And they are missing when they see the sunrise.

We have an obligation. We are dutybound as an institution but maybe more importantly, as a people, to take action. The time is now—maybe not to finish action, but the time is now to take action.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, as the Senator from Pennsylvania is leaving, those are the people whose names he just read. That is why I am here to tell you that teachers, students, and staff at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School returned to school for the first time since that shooting 2 weeks ago. Some were ready. Some who returned were scared. Some didn't go back; they are going to a different school.

What happened at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School 2 weeks ago should never happen anywhere in this country, ever, ever, never again.

Look at those faces so full of promise. Here is the coach. He saved some of the kids' lives. He jumped in front of them. This is another adult who tried to save lives. Here is another adult who tried to save lives. It shouldn't happen in a school. It shouldn't happen at a nightclub, like Pulse. It shouldn't happen in an airport or a church or an outdoor concert. It shouldn't happen.

So why does it happen? Why does this keep happening over and over again? Well, I am going to tell you why. It is because of us. It is because all 100 Members of this Senate and all 435 Members down the hallway in the House of Representatives—it is our refusal to act. It is our failure to convince one another that there are some things that should be done regardless of party politics or polls or what the special interests want. They ought to be done simply because they are the right things to do.

What about a commonsense approach, like a background check every time somebody buys a gun? What about a comprehensive or universal background check that would expand if there is a restraining order? How about if there is a mental problem other than just an adjudicated mental order? How about the terrorist watch list? If you are on that list, you can't get on an airplane because you are suspected to be a terrorist. Why should they be able to buy a gun? How about if you had been on the terrorist watch list and are no longer? That would have caught the shooter in Orlando because Omar Mateen had been on the terrorist watch list and was no longer when he walked in and bought that Sig Sauer MCX and mowed down 49 people.

It is our refusal to act. It is our failure to convince one another that there are some things that should be done. If you take the commonsense approach of requiring a background check, that is the right thing to do. Banning the military-style assault rifles, that is the right thing to do.

People get confused. There is a difference between a semiautomatic rifle and an assault rifle. Ever since I was a little boy, I had a .22 semiautomatic rifle with a clip. That is not an assault weapon. Even a bullet coming from a handgun—as one of the trauma surgeons who tended to some of the victims in Broward County points out—that handgun bullet will go in and come out through a victim the same size as it went in. If it goes through an organ such as the liver, they can save that person. That is in contrast to an assault rifle weapon—a bullet that has three times the speed of a handgun bullet and that has three times the energy when it hits the victim. So if it goes into an organ such as the liver, it doesn't go through like a handgun bullet. It pulverizes the liver, and when it comes out on the other side of the body, it is as big as an orange. That is what an assault rifle is. Listen to the trauma surgeons. They will tell you.

We could take up commonsense legislation right now and enact these simple, commonsense measures to make our communities safer and help prevent another mass tragedy, but unfortunately I think it is going to be very difficult. For weeks now, even in the face of parents, students, and teachers across this country calling for action, we have done nothing. We have seen an entire community turn its grief and its outrage into a massive call for change, and we have done nothing.

Across this country we have seen gun owners destroy their own assault weapons. We have seen major corporations distance themselves from groups like the NRA and their discounts. Just today, we heard announced that private companies such as Dick's Sporting Goods are taking it upon themselves to stop selling these weapons of war. They are not going to sell AR-15s anymore. They are not going to do it because they were told to, because Congress passed a law, but because it was the right thing to do.

So if Congress fails to act now, when will we act? If these brave, young students who lost their fellow students and faculty aren't enough to break through the gridlock in Congress, what is it going to take? If this tragedy doesn't spur us to action, lead us to change, what will? When will enough finally be enough?

I say to my colleagues, the time to act is now. Let's not let what happened at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High fade into memory like so many other tragedies. Let's take this tragedy and make it a pivotal moment in our Na-

tion's history. Let's not have to go through these massacres again. Let's let this be the last one.

Let's come together as a Senate and do what needs to be done. Let's do what so many before us have been unable to do—let's take action. Let's let this massacre be the last massacre.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate the senior Senator from Florida, and the grief he represents through his State, coming to the floor and speaking about the lives which were lost and the clarion call for us to act.

I come to the floor today because 2 weeks ago, once again, a weapon of mass murder was used to commit mass murder in an American school, and, once again, our hearts are heavy with a grief that has become too routine.

Once again, the gun lobbyists say we are powerless to do anything about it, but this time it feels different. That is because the students of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School have started a movement to turn "once again" into "never again."

Unfortunately, too many of my colleagues act as if mass shootings are inevitable, when, in reality, they are preventable. The American people are sick and tired of it. That is why they have been so inspired by these students from Parkland.

I saw it with my own eyes last Sunday. A few of these Marjory Stoneman Douglas survivors came to visit New Jersey, and my constituents came out in droves to support them. Together with the Jewish Federation of Greater MetroWest and Moms Demand Action, we rallied well over 2,000 people in support of their "Never Again" movement.

What is remarkably refreshing about these students is, they are not yet jaded by the ways of Washington. They have spent their lives practicing active shooter drills. They have grown up being told that mass shootings are just a fact of life, but they know they deserve better.

After being thrust into a tragedy, they have turned their mourning into a movement. By speaking out, the students of Parkland have pricked the conscience of this country, and the American people are answering their call to action.

We see it at rallies across the country calling for tougher, smarter, commonsense gun safety laws. We see it in students across America organizing the March for Our Lives, and we see it in corporate America.

Companies such as United Airlines have already parted ways with the NRA. Retailers such as Dick's Sporting Goods have announced they will take AR-15s off their shelves and stop selling guns to teenagers.

As Americans take action, the question is whether Congress will do the

same. Far too many of my colleagues still fear a backlash from the NRA. That is why, after Las Vegas, they refused to ban the bump stocks that make mass shootings more deadly. That is why, after Sandy Hook, they refused to pass tougher background checks. That is why, after Orlando, they refused to even consider my own bill to ban the sale of high-capacity magazines. High-capacity magazines are designed for one thing and one thing only—high-capacity killing. They are the grim hallmark of mass shootings in America, linking Parkland to Newtown, and Las Vegas to San Bernardino, and Aurora to Orlando.

Certainly, I have been encouraged to hear some of my colleagues say they may consider supporting limits on magazine sizes now. I have a legislation here I introduced months ago to do just that. The Keep America Safe Act is narrowly focused. It doesn't infringe on anyone's right to bear arms. I challenge all of my colleagues to sign on. However, in my view, we must do more than ban high-capacity magazines.

I, for one, voted for the assault weapons ban of 1994, when I was in the House of Representatives, and I am a cosponsor of the bill to reinstate it today. These weapons have no place in civilian society. They are not designed for self-defense. They are modeled after weapons our soldiers use on the battlefield, but if we are going to get anywhere, we must stop letting the NRA set the agenda in Washington.

It is amazing to me that some of my colleagues are effectively holding gun safety legislation hostage until they can pass their NRA-backed concealed carry bill.

I spent a lot of time hearing from my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, talk about State rights—State rights. Well, apparently, New Jersey's right to enforce our own gun laws doesn't count when it comes to State rights.

Our State has some of the toughest gun laws in the country, and it is no coincidence that we have the sixth lowest rate of gun deaths in the Nation. We want to keep it that way, but this bill, hot off the NRA's wish list, would let concealed carry permit holders from States with looser standards bring their weapons to New Jersey.

At the end of the day, the NRA has 5 or 6 million members. We are a nation of 320-plus million people. While millions of responsible gun owners believe in the Second Amendment, poll after poll tells us they also believe in universal background checks and commonsense gun laws.

It is time we call out those who spout the same old NRA talking points, such as "Guns don't kill people, people kill people." Well, that is why we don't run background checks on guns; we run them on people.

The NRA would have us believe that all we need to do is to have comprehensive background checks, when in reality what we need are universal background checks. This means requiring background checks for all private sales, transfers, and online sales on the internet. Why should you be able to buy, with a click of the mouse, a significant weapon without ever going through a background check?

Likewise, they say it is time for teachers to be armed and our schools to be “hardened.” Well, I haven’t met many teachers who want to be charged with assessing threats and taking lives in front of their own students. Let’s be serious. Arming teachers wouldn’t stop the next Las Vegas. Only we can do that by passing sensible and reasonable gun safety measures that limit the sale of deadly weapons and keeping guns out of the wrong hands.

After running for their lives on February 14, the students of Marjory Stoneman Douglas will march for their lives on March 24. It is inspiring to see that despite all the dysfunction in Washington, young Americans still believe in their power to make change.

How tragic would it be if we in Congress proved them wrong and, once again, let business as usual in Washington prevent us from taking action to save lives? For my part, that is not going to happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my senior Senator from New Jersey. His passion and his commitment to this issue, not just after this mass shooting, has been consistent in fighting for commonsense gun safety for years, and I am grateful for his leadership as my senior Senator.

It has now been 2 weeks since a gunman took the lives of 17 children, teachers, and school administrators in Parkland, FL. In the days and weeks since, we have seen young people from that community lead a movement for change that is growing in our country, standing up to special interests, standing up to the small minority of folks who seem to want to let the status quo continue, standing up to the NRA and the gun industry and making clear the fierce urgency of now, of this moment, of this day. These young people are showing what true courage is. They are showing it at a time of great grief, of great pain in their lives.

I know what they are fighting for. It is not a fringe issue. I know what they are fighting for. It is not representative of some small minority; they are fighting for the majority of Americans who agree with them, the majority of Americans who want commonsense gun safety in America. Those folks who own guns and those who don’t want background checks for all gun buyers,

including those between private dealers and gun shows.

The majority of Americans don’t want people who are suspected terrorists to be able to go to a gun show and go to a private seller and drive off with a trunkful of weapons. The majority of Americans know that we should be keeping people with a history of domestic violence from getting their hands on a gun. The majority of Americans want to choke the pipeline of illegal guns that are flooding American communities from sea to shining sea, from the Great Lakes to the gulf coast.

The overwhelming majority of Americans know that we can do more to prevent gun violence. Sure, we can’t stop everyone, but we can do things that will reduce the violence, reduce the number of deaths, and save lives. These are commonsense things that the majority of Americans—gun owners, non-gun owners, Republicans and Democrats—a majority of Americans support these policies that are proven.

For example, we know it is true that in States like Connecticut, when they instituted commonsense background checks, they saw firearm homicides drop by 40 percent. And we know that States that implement laws blocking perpetrators of domestic violence from getting guns see a significant reduction—upward of 10 percent—in homicides by people’s intimate partners.

We know that between 2009 and 2013, States that have required background checks on handguns saw 35 percent fewer gun deaths per capita than States that didn’t.

This is fact. We know that commonsense gun safety, supported by over 80 percent of gun owners and over 90 percent of Americans, will save lives.

Dr. King once said—and I am paraphrasing here—that morality can’t be legislated, but behavior can be regulated; that the law can’t make someone love me, but it stop them from lynching me; that the law can’t change the heart, but it can restrain the heartless.

We know we have the power to make the change.

This is no panacea. These ideas will not solve all of the problems, but they can make a difference, and they can save lives.

The time to act is right now. To not act is to be complicit in the continued levels of violence in our communities.

Every day that passes with no action—every single day we see, on average, 96 Americans in this country killed by a gun, including children. Every day that we do not act in this body, dozens and dozens of our American fellow citizens are dying due to gun violence, much of it preventable. Too many families in this country, too many fellow Americans know the pain and the grief and the agony of what we see in the faces of the children from Parkland.

Gun violence isn’t just manifested in uniquely horrifying mass shootings in

our schools and in our churches and in our movie theaters; it is a pervasive, everyday public health epidemic. It is an everyday reality for Americans across the country. It is an everyday reality for women in America. Fifty women every single month are shot to death by intimate partners in this country, making the United States the most dangerous country in the developed world when it comes to gun violence against women. We know that over half of all women killed by an intimate partner are killed with a gun. We know that when a gun is involved in a situation of domestic violence, a woman is five times more likely to be killed. We can do something to lower this kind of carnage.

Gun violence is an everyday reality for children and for young people in this country. On an average day in America, 7 children and teens will be killed with a gun, and 40 more children will be shot and survive, often being crippled or severely wounded, often costing American taxpayers millions of dollars for their healthcare. We can lower this rate of carnage.

Gun violence is an everyday reality for people living in cities, like where I live. In the last year there was a shooting on my block. We know that for Black Americans living in a city or urban area in this country, they are almost 500 times more likely to be killed by gun violence than they are by terrorism. This is an urgent problem. It is an everyday problem. This is pressing on us every single day to act, and every day that we don’t, our inaction will cost lives.

Since the tragedy in Parkland, in New Jersey alone we have seen children, young people, the elderly, women, Black and White Americans killed by gun violence. I have a stack of examples of this right here—news reports of the violence in my State.

One week ago, it was a 10-year-old boy. Yovanni Banos-Merino was killed with a gun, and his mother was wounded in Asbury Park, NJ.

The day before that, on February 20, an elderly man killed his wife—domestic violence. He killed her with a gun and then took his own life, a suicide.

Just 6 days ago, a teenager in my city of Newark, NJ, Ishmail Anthony, was killed with a gun.

Every single day we do not act, dozens and dozens of Americans are killed.

Look at this chart. We can’t even read the font. Look at these American citizens—young people, old people, Black people, White people, men, women, Republicans, Democrats.

Look at this chart. We know that right now, in the past 2 weeks since the tragedy, according to the Gun Violence Archive, which compiled this list from news reports, 477 Americans have been killed with a gun—in the past 2 weeks alone, 477 American citizens.

This government was formed with a purpose. It says clearly in our founding

documents “for the common defence.” In 2 weeks, there were 477 people who we did not defend—477 people whom we could have done more to save. Again, 477 people, 2 weeks since Parkland, and we have a nation that speaks to the purpose of ensuring life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They lost their lives.

We may not have the power to stop all gun violence, but gun owners and non-gun owners, Republicans and Democrats, and our Nation as a whole agree, with a chorus of consent, that we should do things like commonsense background checks. Our inaction, our unwillingness to do the will of the people is costly, not just to the integrity of this body, but it is costly in the most grievous of ways every day. Every day, dozens die; in 2 weeks, 477.

We must do better. We can do better. With the help of God almighty, we will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for their words on this difficult, challenging topic.

On this day 2 weeks ago, the Parkland, FL, community “took 17 bullets to the heart” as Cameron, a junior at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, so devastatingly put it.

Over the past years, the epidemic of gun violence has touched every aspect of American life, from schools and churches to concerts and night clubs and movie theaters, in homes and in the workplace. After each of these tragedies, we say enough is enough, yet time and again Congress fails to take action, and the discussion fades until this deadly cycle once again repeats itself. But we cannot allow this vicious cycle to continue.

Like many Americans, I have been inspired and touched by the bravery of the students of Stoneman Douglas and by their determination to create from this tragedy a legacy of positive change. They are looking to us to help ensure that they are the last students who suffer through a mass shooting. They will hold us accountable, as they should.

I have been inspired by students like Sam, who said that he doesn’t feel safe in his own country and powerfully asked at the White House: “How did we not stop this after Columbine? After Sandy Hook?”

And Emma, who has been calling out elected officials for the excuses they make for putting the priorities of the gun lobby ahead of the safety and well-being of their constituents. Emma and her classmates rightly have called these excuses BS.

We must actually listen to these students, and we must act to protect them and all of our children.

People across New Hampshire own guns for hunting, sport, and protection.

New Hampshire has a long tradition of responsible gun ownership that I respect and that I am committed to upholding. But I also know that the people in New Hampshire do not want dangerous weapons in the wrong hands. It is our job to keep our citizens safe, and we owe it to the students and survivors who are speaking out, to those whom we have lost to tragic violence, and to their families and loved ones to come together and make our communities safer.

The level of gun violence in America is a public health crisis that is unique to our Nation, and like all public health challenges, there are actions we can take to mitigate harm and save lives. We can put in place responsible, commonsense policies that will do just that.

To start, we know that the shooter in Parkland displayed warning signs that, if properly heeded and addressed, may have prevented the incident, the massacre. But when law enforcement was called because of these warning signs, it is not clear that they had tools that would have allowed them to confiscate the shooter’s weapons. So one of the things we must do is ensure that every State has what are known as red flag laws—laws which allow courts to issue time-limited restraining orders to restrict access to firearms when there is evidence that an individual is planning to harm himself or others.

It is also long past time that we improve our background check system to close loopholes and ensure that people who are already legally barred from owning guns cannot easily access them—a step that we know is supported by the vast majority of Americans.

Studies have shown the correlation between gun violence and people with a history of domestic violence. We must close loopholes that enable domestic abusers to access guns.

Additionally, for too long, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have been barred from conducting public health research on gun violence. We must change that.

Finally, from banning the use of bump stocks to raising the purchasing age of semiautomatic weapons to 21, we must look at responsible steps to reduce access to deadly weapons of war that fire at high rates and inflict massive harm.

No one gun safety measure is perfect, and no gun safety measure will stop every act of gun violence, but that should not stop us from taking action. After all, we take public health measures all the time that don’t prevent all diseases but vastly reduce the incidence of them.

In a country with a government of, by, and for the people, it is simply an outrage to suggest that there is nothing the people who govern themselves can do to ensure that their gun safety

laws evolve as firearm technology creates weapons of increasing lethality. I also refuse to accept the notion that we cannot pass any law to address gun safety because it is too hard or the challenges are too insurmountable. That has not stopped our Nation before, and it shouldn’t now.

Students in Parkland and young people across the country are speaking out and making clear that they don’t want to live this way. They don’t want the horror that they experienced to be inflicted on more of their peers. These young voices are speaking up and sparking a conversation that has been absent or has been pushed to the wayside for far too long. It is up to us to meet them in this moment.

The purpose of self-government is to make sure that we all do, in fact, feel safe and valued and that we each have a chance to build a life for ourselves. Let’s take action to give all of our citizens those opportunities and keep our people safe from senseless acts of gun violence.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, like all great cities, Chicago is a city of neighborhoods, and one of its most storied neighborhoods is an enclave on the South Side. It is called Bronzeville. Bronzeville was born a century ago, during the first wave of the Great Migration, when tens of thousands of African Americans left the oppression of Jim Crow laws and lynching in the Deep South and headed north, to Chicago, in search of industrial jobs. By 1920, Bronzeville was home to so many African-American-owned businesses that it took on a prestigious new moniker: “Black Metropolis.”

Among the famous African Americans who called Bronzeville home were Ida B. Wells, journalist, civil rights activist, and cofounder of the NAACP; Bessie Coleman, the first African-American woman pilot; and Rube Foster, founder of the Negro National Baseball League, the league that gave America such greats as Josh Gibson, Cool Papa Bell, and the legendary Satchel Paige.

Black History Month, which America celebrates each February, also has its roots in Bronzeville. It began as a modest proposal, but it seemed revolutionary at the time. In 1926, the distinguished historian and journalist Carter

G. Woodson launched America's first Negro History Week.

Carter Woodson, the "father of Black history," had earned his bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Chicago in 1908. He had gone on to become only the second African American ever—after W.E.B. DuBois—to earn a doctorate from Harvard University. Years of studying history convinced Carter Woodson that the contributions of African Americans were, in his words, "overlooked, ignored, and even suppressed by the writers of history textbooks and the teachers who use them." The result, he believed, was an incomplete and inaccurate account of history that perpetuated racial inequality and stunted the dreams of many African Americans. So Carter Woodson made it his life's mission to fill in the missing chapters in America's history books. He returned to Chicago often, almost always staying in Bronzeville at the Wabash YMCA, the first African-American Y in the United States.

In 1915 in Chicago, he and four other African-American historians founded the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, later renamed the "Association for the Study of African American Life and History." In 1916, the association began publishing *The Journal of Negro History*, "particularly targeted those responsible for the education of black children."

Woodson chose the second week in February to mark Negro History Week—to commemorate the birthdays of the great abolitionist Frederick Douglass and the "Great Emancipator" Abraham Lincoln.

In the 1970s, Negro History Week became Black History Month.

As we near the end of this year's Black History Month, I want to tell you about an amazing woman from the Chicago area who is making history today by helping to free women and children from modern-day slavery. Her name is Marian Hatcher, and she follows in the footsteps of two earlier "she-ros" of American history: Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman.

Sojourner Truth was born in upstate New York in 1797, three decades before that State abolished slavery. She was separated from her family at 9, and she was bought and sold four times before escaping to freedom with her infant daughter in 1826.

She began her life as a free woman working first as an itinerant preacher. She later became an outspoken advocate for abolition, civil rights, and women's rights. When the Civil War broke out, Sojourner Truth urged young men to join the Union cause and organized supplies for Black troops. For her efforts, she was invited to meet President Lincoln in the White House in 1864.

After the war, Sojourner Truth moved to Washington, DC to work with

the Freedmen's Bureau, helping freed slaves find jobs and build new lives. In the mid-1860s—90 years before the Montgomery bus boycott—a Washington streetcar conductor tried violently to block her from riding his car. Sojourner Truth insisted that he be arrested and tried.

Harriet Tubman was born in Maryland to enslaved parents around 1820—the youngest of nine children. She escaped to freedom in the North in 1949 and became one of the most famous and fearless "conductors" on the Underground Railroad. She risked her life repeatedly to return to the South and lead hundreds of slaves, including her own parents, to freedom.

Harriet Tubman risked her life again during the Civil War to work as a Union Army cook and nurse—and later as an armed scout and spy. Many called her Moses for her fierce courage in leading others out of bondage.

Marian Hatcher is a sort of modern-day Moses. Like Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman, she knows the pain and despair that comes from being bought and sold like a commodity. For 2 years, she was trafficked for sex by a violent pimp. And like Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman, Marian Hatcher escaped her bondage, and she has dedicated her life to helping other trafficked persons regain their freedom and dignity.

Let me tell you about this incredible woman. Marian Hatcher grew up in a home with loving, supportive parents. She earned a finance degree from Loyola University. She was married and had five children. But Marian also had painful secrets, including a history of childhood sexual abuse, untreated depression, and a husband—a former Vice Lords gang member—who beat her.

Marian started smoking crack to ease her pain. When she could no longer stand the beatings from her husband, she left her family and survived for 2 years by working as a prostitute. Her pimp gave her crack so she wouldn't return to her family. On Mother's Day, he gave her extra crack because she grieved so deeply for the children she had left behind.

During those 2 years on the street, Marian was beaten and raped more times than she can count. She was in and out of jail repeatedly. As she says, "I tried to smoke enough crack to bust my heart, but God would not let me die. He had another plan for me."

That plan began to unfold in 2004, when Marian was arrested again—this time for violating probation on a drug charge. She expected to be treated like a criminal. Instead, in the Cook County jail, Marian Hatcher found the compassion and care she needed to begin to heal from her trauma and rebuild her life.

The Cook County Women's Rehabilitative Alternative Probation, WRAP, Drug Court—one of the Nation's most

successful drug courts—took a chance on Marian. A judge there sentenced Marian to a jail-based, therapeutic treatment designed specifically for women struggling with trauma and substance abuse. When Marian was released 18 months later, she began working as a volunteer with that same program. She was so good that the Cook County Sheriff's Office hired her to work full time at the jail. She has never left.

Fourteen years later, Marian Hatcher has been promoted five times. She is now coordinator of the Cook County Sheriff's Office pioneering efforts to combat human trafficking, and she is one of America's leading experts on how to help victims of sex trafficking to escape that life and heal from the trauma. On behalf of her boss, Cook County sheriff Tom Dart, she has recruited a network of more than 100 law enforcement agencies, including the FBI, as well as research and nonprofits groups, to work together to reduce the demand for sex trafficking and prostitution.

Like Sojourner Truth, she is also an ordained minister.

Her work has won acclaim and respect. Marian Hatcher received a Presidential Achievement Award from President Barack Obama. Oprah has told her story. She has spoken on human trafficking at the United Nations and participated in President Jimmy Carter's summit to end trafficking globally. And just before Christmas, the Governor of Illinois granted Marian Hatcher clemency for offenses in her old life—official recognition of her tireless work to break the chains of bondage for others.

I have introduced a bill to expand the availability of trauma-informed care for survivors of gun violence and other forms of trauma and toxic stress. Marian Hatcher's remarkable redemption is proof that such care can help to heal shattered lives and help break the cycle of recidivism that too often results from untreated childhood trauma.

Like Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman, Marian Hatcher struggles with chronic, painful health conditions as the result of the beatings and abuse she endured. She also lives with multiple sclerosis and fibromyalgia, and she is a cancer survivor. There are days when every step she takes hurts. But she never stops working to end the modern-day slavery that is sex trafficking. I respect her greatly and am proud to tell her story during this Black History month.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for February 2018. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the

budget resolution for fiscal year 2018, H. Con. Res. 71. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

The enforceable levels included in this report reflect all of the numerical adjustments made to the resolution since its passage. The information contained in this report captures legislative activity from the passage of the budget resolution through February 26, 2018.

Republican Budget Committee staff prepared tables 1–4 of this report.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. For this reporting period, 11 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations. As previously reported, the Senate Veterans' Affairs, Energy and Natural Resources, and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committees remain in breach of their allocations. Since my last report on January 18, 2018, both the Finance and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committees have increased spending beyond allowable levels. Through the enactment of both the fourth continuing resolution, H.R. 195, P.L. 115–120, and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, BBA18, H.R. 1892, P.L. 115–123, which contained packages of healthcare extenders, the Finance Committee breached its allocation by \$76.9 billion in budget authority and \$7.8 billion in outlays over 10 years. Enactment of the BBA18 also produced the Agriculture Committee breach. That law changed the treatment of seed cotton, dairy, and livestock under Federal farm programs, increasing both budget authority and outlays by \$1.2 billion over the 2018–2027 period.

Table 2 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in section 312 and section 314 of the CBA. While no full-year appropriations bills

have been enacted for fiscal year 2018, subcommittees are charged with permanent and advanced appropriations that first become available in that year and any full-year standalone provisions included in continuing resolutions. This table reflects one change from my January report. The continuing resolution portion of the BBA18 included full-year authority for the Secretary of Energy to draw down and sell oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, reducing budget authority and outlays by \$315 million in 2018.

The budget resolution contains two points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPS. Tables 3 and 4 show compliance with fiscal year 2018 limits for overall CHIMPS and the Crime Victims Fund CHIMP, respectively. This information is used for determining points of order under sections 4102 and 4103 of H. Con. Res. 71, respectively. Notably, there have not been any full-year bills enacted thus far for fiscal year 2018 that include CHIMPS.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by the Congress.

CBO provided a spending and revenue report for fiscal year 2018, which helps enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under CBA section 311. In its report, CBO annualizes the temporary effects of the latest continuing resolution, which provides funding through March 23, 2018. For the enforcement of budgetary aggregates, the Budget Committee excludes this temporary funding. As such, the committee views current-law levels as being \$814.6 billion and \$463.7 billion below budget resolution levels for budget authority and outlays, respectively. Details on fiscal year 2018 levels can be found in CBO's second table.

Current-law revenues continue to be in excess of the levels assumed by the budget resolution. On-budget revenue levels currently exceed assumed levels by \$3.5 billion in fiscal year 2018, \$41.9 billion over the fiscal year 2018–2022 period, and \$98.4 billion over the fiscal year 2018–2027 period. Since my last filing both the fourth continuing resolution and BBA18 contained provisions that reduced revenues compared with current law. The fourth continuing resolution included \$25.4 billion in on-budget revenue loss over 10 years related to delays in several health-re-

lated taxes. The BBA18 contained an \$11.6 billion revenue loss largely as a consequence of a package of tax extenders. This BBA18 figure omits \$1.8 billion in revenue increases attributable to language related to Federal Reserve Surplus Funds, which are required to be omitted under current scorekeeping rules.

Social Security outlay levels are consistent with the budget resolution's figures for all enforceable periods. Social Security revenues, however, are \$446 million below levels assumed for fiscal year 2018, \$1.9 billion greater over the next 5 years, and \$28.8 billion greater than assumed over the next 10 years. These revenue effects are attributable to the tax provisions from the fourth continuing resolution, BBA18, and the tax reconciliation bill enacted in December 2017.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. The Senate's PAYGO scorecard currently shows deficit reduction of \$24 million in fiscal year 2018, \$14 million over the fiscal year 2017–2022, and \$13 million over fiscal year 2017–2027 periods. For fiscal year 2018, legislation has been enacted that would reduce outlays by \$24 million. Over the fiscal year 2017–2022 period, legislation has been enacted that CBO estimates will decrease outlays by \$13 million and increase revenues by \$1 million. Over the fiscal year 2017–2027 period, legislation has been enacted that CBO estimates will decrease outlays by \$11 million and increase revenues by \$2 million. Notably absent from these amounts are the direct spending and revenue effects from the fourth continuing resolution and BBA18. This is due to provisions in those measures that mandated the exclusion of those budgetary effects both from the Senate and statutory PAYGO scorecards. The Senate's PAYGO rule is enforced by section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71.

Also included in this submission is a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since Congress adopted the budget resolution. No points of order have been raised on the floor since my last filing.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2018	2018–2022	2018–2027
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry			
Budget Authority	47	629	1,163
Outlays	47	711	1,249
Armed Services			
Budget Authority	–33	–102	–76
Outlays	–24	–15	–16
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Energy and Natural Resources			
Budget Authority	0	2	5
Outlays	0	2	5
Environment and Public Works			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Finance			
Budget Authority	21,966	69,462	76,896
Outlays	5,206	14,002	7,822
Foreign Relations			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Judiciary			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions			
Budget Authority	705	–46	–46
Outlays	205	318	–39
Rules and Administration			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs			
Budget Authority	2,100	2,100	2,100
Outlays	1,050	2,100	2,100
Indian Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Total			
Budget Authority	24,785	72,045	80,042
Outlays	6,484	17,118	11,121

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2018	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	549,057	515,749
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	46	0
Energy and Water Development	0	–315
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,698
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	63,878
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	46	92,679
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	–549,011	–423,070

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2018
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017	17,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)—Continued
[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2018
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	– 17,000

TABLE 4.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND
[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2018
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2018	11,224
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	– 11,224

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2018.
Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2018 budget and is current through February 26, 2018. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of sec-

tion 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 71, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

Since our last letter dated January 18, 2018, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority, outlays, and revenues in fiscal year 2018:

An Act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (Public Law 115–120); and

Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123).

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF FEBRUARY 26, 2018
[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,169.6	3,440.5	271.0
Outlays	3,112.6	3,276.6	164.0
Revenues	2,497.1	2,500.7	3.5
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^a	849.6	849.6	0.0
Social Security Revenues	873.3	872.9	– 0.4

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF FEBRUARY 26, 2018
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^{a b}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,658,139
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,106,043	2,004,065	n.a.
Appropriation legislation		513,307	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	– 866,685	– 866,685	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,239,358	1,650,687	2,658,139
Enacted Legislation			
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (P.L. 115–91)	– 33	– 24	0
Department of Defense Missile Defeat and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division B)	4,686	803	0
CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (P.L. 115–96, Division C)	705	205	0
An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 . . . and for other purposes (P.L. 115–96, Division D)	2,100	1,050	0
An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (P.L. 115–97)	– 8,600	– 8,600	– 143,800
An act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–120, Divisions C and D)	14,509	1,203	– 1,263
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Divisions A and C–G) ^{b c}	7,504	4,050	– 12,424
Further Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 1)	84,436	11,185	0
Further Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 3)	– 315	– 315	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	104,992	9,557	– 157,487
Continuing Resolution			
Further Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 3) ^{c d}	1,085,570	627,733	0
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	1,010,879	988,931	0
Total Current Level ^{b c}	3,440,536	3,276,645	2,500,652
Total Senate Resolution ^f	3,169,583	3,112,609	2,497,139
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	270,953	164,036	3,513
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2018–2027			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,094,337

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF FEBRUARY 26, 2018—
Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	30,995,967
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	98,370
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the budgetary effects of the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues and were cleared by the Congress during the 1st session of the 115th Congress, but before the adoption of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018: the VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–46); the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–48); a joint resolution compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metropolitan Safety Commission (P.L. 115–54); the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 and Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–56); the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of Hurricanes Irma and Jose Overseas Act (P.L. 115–57); the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–62); the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63); the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–64); and the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–72).

^b Emergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Deficit Control Act does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. These amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63)	263	263	0
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123)	2,217	1,469	–509
Total	2,480	1,732	–509

^c The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123) contains seven divisions: Division A, Subdivision 2 of Division B, and Divisions C–F contain authorizing legislation, of which the budgetary effects of Subdivision 2 of Division B were designated as being for emergency requirements. Subdivisions 1 and 3 of Division B contain appropriations legislation: Subdivision 1 provided supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for disaster relief and designated those amounts as being for emergency requirements; Subdivision 3 provided continuing appropriations until March 23, 2018, while Section 158 provided authority, for the duration of fiscal year 2018, for the Secretary of Energy to draw down and sell crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Division G of P.L. 115–123 provided for the budgetary treatment of Divisions A–F.

^d Pursuant to sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255), certain funding provided to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—in 2017 through 2026 shall not count for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) or the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act). The amounts shown in this report do not include \$866 million in budget authority and \$706 million in estimated outlays from such amounts.

^e For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^f Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in H. Con. Res. 71, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The total for the Initial Senate Resolution shown below excludes \$47,660 million in budget authority, \$22,467 million in outlays, and \$150,003 million in revenues assumed in H. Con. Res. 71 for discretionary spending not constrained by the budgetary caps established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–25) and subsequently amended, including spending that qualifies for adjustments pursuant to section 4205 of H. Con. Res. 71.

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Initial Senate Resolution	3,089,061	3,109,221	2,640,939
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71	–8,600	–8,600	–143,800
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	4,686	803	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	84,436	11,185	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,169,583	3,112,609	2,497,139

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS, AS OF FEBRUARY 26, 2018

(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2017–2022	2017–2027
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b,c,d}			
Protecting Patient Access to Emergency Medications Act of 2017 (H.R. 304, P.L. 115–83)	*	*	*
TSP Modernization Act of 2017 (H.R. 3031, P.L. 115–84)	*	*	*
FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017 (H.R. 3243, P.L. 115–88)	*	*	*
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (H.R. 2810, P.L. 115–91)	–24	–16	–21
Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017, Improvements Act (S. 371, P.L. 115–94)	*	*	*
An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes (H.R. 1370, P.L. 115–96) ^e	*	n.a.	n.a.
An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (H.R. 1, P.L. 115–97) ^f	*	n.a.	n.a.
To amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation (H.R. 560, P.L. 115–101)	*	*	*
400 Years of African-American History Commission Act (H.R. 1242, P.L. 115–102)	*	*	*
Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act (H.R. 1306, P.L. 115–103)	*	2	5
Rapid DNA Act of 2017 (S. 139, P.L. 115–118)	*	*	*
An Act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (H.R. 195, P.L. 115–120)	*	*	1
To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps (H.R. 4641, P.L. 115–122)	*	*	*
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 ^{g,h} (H.R. 1892, P.L. 115–123)	*	*	1
Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017 (S. 534, P.L. 115–126)	*	*	*
Kari's Law Act of 2017 (S. 582, P.L. 115–127)	*	*	*
Current Balance	–24	–14	–13
Changes to Revenues	2018	2017–2022	2017–2027
Changes to Outlays	0	1	2
	–24	–13	–11

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: P.L. = Public Law; * = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.

^a On October 26, 2017, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.

^b The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.

^c Excludes off-budget amounts.

^d Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.

^e Pursuant to Division E of P.L. 115–96, the budgetary effects of Divisions C and D are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO Scorecard.

^f Section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, granted the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee the authority to revise balances on the Senate PAYGO ledger to fully incorporate the budgetary effects of P.L. 115–97. The Chairman exercised this authority with a filing in the Congressional Record on December 19, 2017.

^g Pursuant to section 70101(b) of Division G, the budgetary effects of Division A, Subdivision 2 of Division B, and Divisions C through F are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO Scorecard.

^h Pursuant to section 232(b) of H. Con. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the scoring effects related to the Federal Reserve Surplus Funds are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO Scorecard.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 115TH CONGRESS

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waiver ¹	Result
294	December 1, 2017 ...	S. Amdt. 1720 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—created a point of order against legislation that cuts Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid benefits.	313(b)(1)(A)—Byrd violation ²	Sen. Sanders (I-VT)	46–54, Not Waived
295	December 1, 2017 ...	S. Amdt. 1854 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the Child Tax Credit.	302(f)—Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation ³ ..	Sen. Brown (D-OH)	48–52, Not Waived
296	December 1, 2017 ...	S. Amdt. 1850 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—increased the refundability of the child tax credit	302(f)—Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation ⁴ ..	Sen. Rubio (R-FL)	29–71, Not Waived
299	December 2, 2017 ...	S. Amdt. 1846 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—provided for middle class tax relief	4105—Unknown Budgetary Effects ⁵	Sen. Kaine (D-VA)	34–65, Not Waived
301	December 2, 2017 ...	S. Amdt. 1717 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—struck title II	302(f)—Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation ⁶ ..	Sen. Cantwell (D-WA) ...	48–52, Not Waived
322	December 20, 2017	H.R. 1—provided for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.	313(b)(1)—Byrd Rule violations ⁷	Sen. Enzi (R-WY)	51–48, Not Waived

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 115TH CONGRESS—Continued

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waiver ¹	Result
324	December 21, 2017	H.R. 1370—continuing resolution	306—Budget Committee Jurisdiction ⁸	Sen. Collins (R-ME)	91–8, Waived

¹ All motions to waive were offered pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

² Senator Enzi raised a 313(b)(1)(A) point of order against the Sanders amendment because the amendment did not produce a change in outlays or a change in revenues and was extraneous to the reconciliation instruction.

³ Senator Enzi raised a 302(f) point of order as S. Amdt. 1854 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Finance Committee's section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays.

⁴ Senator Wyden raised a 302(f) point of order as S. Amdt. 1850 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Finance Committee's section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays.

⁵ Senator Toomey raised this point of order because the budgetary effects of the Kaine amendment were unknown at the time of consideration.

⁶ Senator Murkowski raised a 302(f) point of order because the Cantwell amendment, if adopted, would have caused the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to exceed its section 302(a) allocation of budget authority or outlays.

⁷ Senator Sanders raised a 313(b)(1)(A) point of order against section 11000(a), and 313(b)(1)(D) points of order against page 75, line 17 through page 76, line 9 and against the phrase "tuition-paying" as it appeared on page 309, line 12, and page 309, lines 14 through 15.

⁸ Senator Paul raised a section 306 point of order in relation to the statutory pay-go scorecard.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT CLAYSON R. CULLEN

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize and honor the extraordinary service and sacrifice of U.S. Army 1LT Clayton R. Cullen of Bicknell, IN. Dedication to his country, loyalty to his fellow servicemembers, and a deep love for his family and faith defined Clay's life.

Clay graduated from North Knox High School in 2011. During his time at North Knox, Clay excelled both in the classroom and on the soccer field. Clay was a member of the National Honor Society and served as student body president. He was also recognized as the most valuable player on the school's varsity soccer team, and a two-time Academic All-State player. Following graduation, Clay attended Indiana University, where he earned a bachelor's degree in history. Clay went on to join the Indiana University ROTC program, from which he graduated as a commissioned officer in 2015. He was described as "the kind of guy who would always open his arms to you," according to Shawn Stachula, the executive officer of IU Army ROTC and fellow classmate. A dedicated friend, student, and leader, Clay was resilient, kind, caring, and a mentor to his peers. After graduation, he was a pilot with the rank of first lieutenant in the U.S. Army.

In the Army, he was a member of the 4th Combat Aviation Brigade, 4th Infantry Division in Fort Carson, CO. There he distinguished himself as a selfless soldier who always put the mission, his country, and fellow servicemembers before himself. For his service, he earned several commendations, including the Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, and Army Service Ribbon.

On Saturday, January 20, 2018, Clay and Warrant Officer Kevin Burke, of California, tragically passed away when the AH64E Apache helicopter they were piloting crashed at the National Training Center in Fort Irwin, CA. Unit Commander COL Scott Gallaway said that Clay "left an indelible mark on the entire Iron Eagle team" and that the lessons he taught his fellow servicemembers would resonate for years to come.

Clay was a devoted patriot, son, and brother, who loved soccer, golf, kick-

ball, reading, traveling, history, and trying new foods. Above all, he was a genuine and caring friend. Clay loved music and enjoyed attending concerts with friends, including Dave Matthews Band, Jimmy Buffett, and Zac Brown Band. Clay was selfless, brave, and passionate. He dedicated his life to serving others, whether it was through a mission trip to Sri Lanka or protecting his fellow Americans.

Clay helped bring happiness to those he encountered and loved sharing his faith with others. He is survived and will be deeply missed by his parents, Robert and Julie Cullen; brother, Ian Cullen and Ian's wife, Katie; grandmother, Kathleen Curry Pack; aunt, Kay Mengedoh, along with numerous aunts, uncles, cousins, friends, and his U.S. Army family.

As Clay's brother said, "He didn't want to be a hero. He just wanted to be Clay. Not 'thank you for your service' Clay. Not 'you're so brave' Clay. Just Clay. For all these reasons and so many more, he is a hero." Clay set an example for others and will be remembered for his dedication and love for his country.

Let us emulate the shining example this brave man set for us and honor his commitment to serving his fellow citizens. May God welcome Clay home and give comfort to his family and friends.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING TILLIE FAY WALKER

• Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, on February 2, 2018, Tillie Fay Walker, 88, passed away in Bismarck, ND. Tillie was an enrolled member of the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation, born on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation on July 11, 1928, and was a member of the Alkali Lodge Clan.

Tillie was a fierce champion for the rights of her tribe and a passionate advocate for the dignity of all American Indians, particularly women. Her energy and intellect were used to progress positive change, mentor future Native leaders, and push government institutions to acknowledge and address the serious problems facing Indian Country. During a period when many thought a Native woman attend-

ing college was a foolish idea, she was that much more driven to receive her degree. At times when Tribes and Federal officials were at odds, Tillie brought elders and officials together to improve Federal policy positions on tribal sovereignty and land rights.

Her work on the national level caught the attention of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as he began to organize for the Poor People's Campaign. Tillie served as one of the key Native organizers for the campaign and recruited Tribal members and leaders from across the country to participate in the marches, sit-ins, and testimonies. She also gave fiery and memorable testimony to the Interior Secretary and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs during the campaign. Through these decades of work on the national scene, Tillie influenced the very direction of activism and Federal Indian policy. She considered the implementation of Indian preference hiring for the Indian Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to be her biggest professional accomplishment.

Above all, Tillie was a lifelong keeper of cherished Mandan and Hidatsa history, practices, and language, and many tribal traditions now live on in younger generations due to Tillie's careful stewardship. Her legacy of Native pride and community activism survives on Fort Berthold and in those who work to improve the lives of Native Americans across the country. My deepest sympathies are with her family and many friends.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1865. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4296. An act to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency.

H.R. 5078. An act to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify

requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes.

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

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the members of the Office of Strategic Services.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 4296. An act to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5078. An act to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

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

S. 2464. A bill to improve border security and to provide conditional provision residence to certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1865. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-4425. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2017-2018 Marketing Year" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0107; SC17-985-1A FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4426. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, De-

partment of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighing Services under the United States Grain Standards Act (USGSA)" received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4427. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Increased Continuing Assessment Rate for Processed Pears" (Docket No. AMS-SC-17-0045; SC17-927-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4428. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Regulations Under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA); Growers' Trust Protection Eligibility and Clarification of 'Written Notification'" (Docket No. AMS-FV-15-0045) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4429. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Onions Grown in South Texas; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-SC-17-0040; SC17-959-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4430. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Watermelon Research and Promotion Plan; Redistricting and Importer Representation" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0097; FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4431. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Decrease of Continuing Assessment Rate for Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington" (Docket No. AMS-SC-17-0033; SC17-922-1 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4432. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methyl Bromide; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL No. 9971-19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4433. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the re-

port of a rule entitled "Investment Company Liquidity Risk Management Programs; Commission Guidance for In-Kind ETFs" (RIN3235-AM26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4434. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran as declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4435. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4436. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commission Statement and Guidance on Public Company Cybersecurity Disclosures" (Release Nos. 33-10459; 34-82746) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4437. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4438. A communication from the Regulations Specialist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—2017-18 and 2018-19 Subsistence Taking of Fish Regulations" (RIN1018-BA76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4439. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Rocky Mountains National Park; Bicycling" (RIN1024-AE31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4440. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2017-18 Season" (RIN1018-BB40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4441. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Recovery and State Grants, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing *Oenothera avita* ssp. *eurekensis* from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants, and Reclassification of *Swallenia alexandrea* from Endangered to Threatened" (RIN1018-AW04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President

of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4442. A communication from the Enforcement Specialist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalties; 2018 Inflation Adjustments for Civil Monetary Penalties" (RIN1018-BC05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4443. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Taxonomical Update for Orangutan" (RIN1018-BC54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4444. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief of the Species Assessment Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Black Warrior Waterdog and Designation of Critical Habitat" (RIN1018-BA78, RIN1018-BA79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4445. A communication from the Manager of the Species Assessment Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Texas Hornshell" (RIN1018-BB34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4446. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Recovery and States Grants, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Eastern Puma (= Cougar) from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" (RIN1018-AY05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4447. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Redesignation of the Illinois Portion of the St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, Missouri-Illinois Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9974-86-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4448. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 2011 Base Year Inventory for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Maryland Portion of the Philadel-

phia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9974-98-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4449. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Approval of Texas Motor Vehicle Rule Revisions" (FRL No. 9974-51-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4450. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9974-67-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4451. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Section 112(l) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Perchloroethylene Air Emission Standards for Dry Cleaning Facilities; State of Vermont" (FRL No. 9972-97-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4452. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination to Defer Sanctions; Bay Area Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9974-97-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4453. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Computation of Annual Liability Insurance (Including Self-Insurance), No-Fault Insurance, and Workers' Compensation Settlement Recovery Threshold"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4454. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological Material from Belize" (RIN1515-AE37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4455. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Data Mining Activity in the Department of State for calendar year 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4456. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Human Subject Protection; Acceptance of Data From Clinical Investigations for Medical Devices" ((RIN0910-AG48) (Docket No. FDA-2013-N-0080)) received in

the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4457. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program" (RIN1840-AD28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4458. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Secretary's Final Supplemental Priorities and Definitions for Discretionary Grant Programs" (RIN1894-AA09) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4459. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of the Treasury 2017 Annual Privacy, Data Mining, and 803 Reports"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4460. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Fiscal Year 2017 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Privacy Management Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4461. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Student Loan Repayment Program Calendar Year 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4462. A communication from the Executive Secretary, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Office of Personnel Management, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4463. A communication from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, a report relative to a case pending before the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (NJ Work Environment Council v. State Emergency Response Commission); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4464. A communication from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Administration's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2018-2022; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-4465. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revise and Streamline VA Acquisition Regulation to Adhere to Federal Acquisition Regulation Principles (VAAR Case 2014-V002)" (RIN2900-AP82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4466. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory

Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Fisheries for 2018" (RIN0648-BG72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4467. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition of Children's Toys and Child Care articles Containing Specified Phthalates: Revision of Determinations Regarding Certain Plastics" ((16 CFR Parts 1308) (Docket No. CPSC-2016-0017)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4468. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "CPSC Acceptance of Third Party Laboratories: Revision to the Notice of Requirements for Prohibitions of Children's Toys and Child Care Articles Containing Specified Phthalates" ((16 CFR Parts 1112) (Docket No. CPSC-2017-0043)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4469. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wireless Emergency Alerts; Amendments to Part 11 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Emergency Alert System" ((PS Docket No. 15-91 and PS Docket No. 15-94) (FCC 18-4)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Rohit Chopra, of New York, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of seven years from September 26, 2012.

*Noah Joshua Phillips, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2016.

*Joseph Simons, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2017.

*Christine S. Wilson, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of seven years from September 26, 2011.

*Christine S. Wilson, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2018.

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Michael K. Atkinson, of Maryland, to be Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and tes-

tify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2465. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2466. A bill to encourage and facilitate international participation in the performing arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. NELSON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2467. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to obtain a statue of Shirley Chisholm for placement in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2468. A bill to provide access to counsel for unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2469. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance efforts to address antibiotic resistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 2470. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the purchase of certain firearms by individuals under 21 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2471. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the compassionate release process of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2472. A bill to reauthorize the Coastal Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 2473. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish organ transplant care to veterans at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2474. A bill to increase portability of and access to retirement savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2475. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the illegal modification of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 2476. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that valid generic drugs may enter the market; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS,

Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MORAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SASSE):

S.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution honoring the life of William "Billy" F. Graham, Jr.; considered and passed.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. MURPHY):

S.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 417. A resolution congratulating the Minnesotans who competed on Team USA at the 2018 Olympic Winter Games in PyeongChang, South Korea; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. Res. 418. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 21, 2018 as "National Rosie the Riveter Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator

from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 378

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 378, a bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require the maintenance of databases on awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes.

S. 503

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 503, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make publicly available certain regulatory records relating to the administration of the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the use of an alternative depreciation system for taxpayers violating rules under the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 898

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 898, a bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

S. 2009

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2009, a bill to require a background check for every firearm sale.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM)

were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2236

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2236, a bill to require covered discrimination and covered harassment training for Members, officers, employees, interns, fellows, and detailees of Congress within 30 days of employment and annually thereafter, to require a biennial climate survey of Congress, to amend the enforcement process under the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights for covered discrimination and covered harassment complaints, and for other purposes.

S. 2289

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2289, a bill to create an Office of Cybersecurity at the Federal Trade Commission for supervision of data security at consumer reporting agencies, to require the promulgation of regulations establishing standards for effective cybersecurity at consumer reporting agencies, to impose penalties on credit reporting agencies for cybersecurity breaches that put sensitive consumer data at risk, and for other purposes.

S. 2324

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2324, a bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes.

S. 2334

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. 2334, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide clarity with respect to, and to modernize, the licensing system for musical works under section 115 of that title, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of that title, and for other purposes.

S. 2343

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2343, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force for meeting the connectivity and technology needs of precision agriculture in the United States.

S. 2393

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2393, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide Federal protection to the digital audio transmission of a sound recording fixed before February 15, 1972, and for other purposes.

S. 2398

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2398, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide that activities relating to the training and readiness of the reserve components of the Armed Forces during a lapse in appropriations shall constitute voluntary services that may be accepted by the United States.

S. 2403

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2403, a bill to modify a provision relating to adjustments of certain State apportionments for Federal highway programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2430

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2430, a bill to provide a permanent appropriation of funds for the payment of death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services in event of any period of lapsed appropriations.

S. 2455

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2455, a bill to encourage United States-Ukraine cybersecurity cooperation and require a report regarding such cooperation, and for other purposes.

S. 2456

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2456, a bill to reauthorize and expand the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016.

S.J. RES. 46

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Missouri

(Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 46, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. RES. 404

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 404, a resolution recognizing the coordinated struggle of workers on the 50th anniversary of the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers strike to voice their grievances and reach a collective agreement for rights in the workplace.

S. RES. 407

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 407, a resolution recognizing the critical work of human rights defenders in promoting human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and good governance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2465. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as we close out Black History Month this week, I wanted to recognize a few people and initiatives that we are really excited about.

Yesterday, I joined Congressman MARK WALKER, Chairman of the Republican Study Committee in the House, to host our Second Annual Historically Black Colleges and Universities Fly In.

We hosted Presidents and Administrators from HBCUs throughout the country, including four from my home State of South Carolina—South Carolina State University, Claflin University, Allen University and Benedict College.

We were able to host some great panels on ensuring curricula are matched with the needs of the workforce, how to best encourage entrepreneurship among students, and what steps we are taking at the Federal level to help our HBCUs provide an invaluable education for students for generations to come.

Representatives from the HBCUs heard from Google, McDonalds, Starbucks, Bank of America the Morehouse College Entrepreneurship Center, John Deere, Wal-Mart, the Center for Entrepreneurship & Economic Develop-

ment, and the Koch Foundation. I also want to thank my friends Senator LANKFORD and Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL for joining us on our member panel.

For decades, HBCUs provided Americans of color with educational opportunities they would not have otherwise had. For generations, they have given low-income students an education they could not otherwise afford.

We have stood by them with the restoration of year-round Pell Grants, a top legislative priority from last year's fly-in, which benefits more than one million students.

I joined a bipartisan group of members of Congress, including Representative ALMA ADAMS, to ensure an increase in the Department of Defense's HBCU and PMI grant program, boosting funding for this important collaboration to \$40M.

And earlier this month, we saw the Environmental Protection Agency renew its partnership with Bowie State University to provide professional experiences and advanced resources to Bowie State students.

We will continue to stand with our HBCUs, and help ensure they are providing the opportunities sought by so many people of color and low-income families from across the Nation.

I also want to talk about legislation my friend Senator BOOKER and I introduced today to help combat Sickle Cell Disease.

Our Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention and Treatment Act will do exactly what the title suggests . . . aid in fighting sickle cell through research, surveillance, prevention and treatment.

Currently, we don't really know exactly how many people have Sickle Cell Disease. There's no real surveillance and reporting in place at the Federal level, and only a handful of states have a reporting process.

To best battle Sickle Cell, we have to know the universe of what we're fighting against. So, our bill establishes the National Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment program to collect data on the demographics and prevalence of Sickle Cell as well as identify and evaluate strategies for prevention and treatment.

We're also reauthorizing the Sickle Cell Disease Treatment Demonstration Program (SDTDP) for four years, making some smart reforms and expanding support services for kids and young adults making the transition to adult care.

If you've ever met someone with Sickle Cell Disease, you know the pain they go through. You see how hard it is on their families to watch them suffer.

The Medical University of South Carolina has put so much effort into finding a cure, and over the past few years I've gotten to know some of the

patients. Their perseverance is amazing.

We have taken some great steps forward, but we have to keep that momentum going. I want to thank Senator BOOKER again for joining me in this effort, and I look forward to our colleagues supporting the Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention and Treatment Act.

Mr. President, Black History Month allows us to not only study and learn from our past, but to see where we can go in the future. Our Nation has made amazing progress in the past 50 years.

Without a doubt, there are still challenges ahead of us, and by remembering the strength of folks like Dr. Martin Luther King, the Friendship Nine, Cleveland Sellers, and so many other civil rights heroes, I am heartened that despite those challenges, we will continue to make progress.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2466. A bill to encourage and facilitate international participation in the performing arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont has a rich history of supporting vibrant arts in communities throughout our State and across the world. Local and foreign visiting artists alike make invaluable social and economic contributions to our communities. Today our complex, overloaded, and outdated immigration system often prevents foreign artists from coming to the United States and engaging in international cultural exchange.

That is why I am reintroducing the bipartisan Arts Require Timely Service, ARTS, Act with Senator ORRIN HATCH. Our bill would assist nonprofit arts organizations in obtaining visas for foreign artists by ensuring enforcement of current statutory requirements. The O visa is available to individual foreign artists, while the P visa is available to groups of foreign artists. The Immigration and Nationality Act currently requires that O visa and P visa petitions be processed within 14 days. However, artists and nonprofit arts organizations routinely confront lengthy and uncertain wait times in the adjudication process. Many nonprofit arts organizations are unable to afford the exorbitant filing fee necessary for expedited processing of petitions.

The ARTS Act would require USCIS to provide premium processing services, without a fee, if an O visa or P visa is not adjudicated within the statutorily required 14-day timeframe and if the petition is filed by or on behalf of a nonprofit organization.

The many problems plaguing our immigration system demand responsible reforms. This bill is just one small piece. As we look ahead to comprehensive immigration reform, I hope that

Congress will consider commonsense legislation like this that will help create permanent solutions. Foreign visiting artists provide an important public service and support our international diplomacy. It is time we start working to create results that can best help our communities as a whole.

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

S. 2470. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the purchase of certain firearms by individuals under 21 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the introduction of the "Age 21 Act" by Senator FLAKE and myself.

Two weeks ago, at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, our Nation experienced yet another horrific mass shooting that has shocked the conscience of us all.

The shooter—a 19-year old former student of the high school—used an AR-15 military-style assault rifle that he legally purchased at a gun store, to kill former classmates and educators. Along with 14 wounded, 17 beautiful lives were lost in this horrific attack. Many of them were children and young adults. Their whole lives were ahead of them.

The overwhelming agony so many victims and their loved ones are experiencing is all too familiar to gun violence victims and survivors all across America. This palpable agony and grief has emboldened students from Parkland and all across this Nation to speak out about gun violence and demand that we as lawmakers act. I am deeply inspired by the courage of these young people, and I hope my colleagues will join me in working with them.

The bill that Senator FLAKE and I are introducing is straightforward and simple—it raises the minimum age to purchase a military-style assault rifle and high capacity ammunition magazines to age 21. In so doing, this legislation closes the loophole in current law that allows teenagers to legally walk into a gun store and buy an AR-15. It further prohibits private individuals from selling or transferring AR-15s to teenagers under the age of 21. In this way, it brings the minimum age requirements for buying handguns and military-style assault weapons into parity.

It makes perfectly clear that in America, if a person is not old enough to buy a handgun—or, for that matter, old enough to buy a beer—they should not be able to purchase a military-style assault weapon. In my view, this bill is one small step in the right direction. It was developed following the attack in Parkland that had students asking "why was this teenager able to legally walk into a gun store and buy

an AR-15?" In fact, one student named Samuel Zeif, who lost his best friend in the shooting, asked President Trump why a young person in America "can still go in a store and buy a weapon of war?"

So we worked in the spirit of bipartisanship to let Samuel, and these students, know that as lawmakers we hear them. And we will work together to make sure that they feel safe in their schools and in their neighborhoods.

So I'm proud of this bipartisan piece of legislation and would urge that this body take it up and pass it immediately. However, I would be remiss not to mention that so much more remains to be done. Already this Congress, I have introduced legislation to ban bump stocks and assault weapons from our streets. I've also introduced legislation that would provide states with a legal framework for courts to issue gun violence restraining orders to prevent dangerous individuals from accessing firearms. Additionally, nearly 100 percent of Americans support legislation that would require universal background checks on all gun sales, something that ordinary Americans are shocked is not already the law.

I ask my colleagues to work with us on these common-sense, broadly supported proposals. I strongly believe that lives are at stake. We can't continue to watch our children get slaughtered.

Martin Luther King, Jr. once said that "we are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history there is such a thing as being too late" and "we must move past indecision to action."

Today, as students and communities all across our nation cry out for stronger gun laws, this message continues to ring true. Now is the time for us to act, and to show the American people that we can come together when they are looking for leadership.

I yield the floor.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MORAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SASSE):

S.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution honoring the life of William "Billy" F. Graham, Jr.; considered and passed.

S.J. RES. 53

Whereas William "Billy" F. Graham, Jr., was born on November 7, 1918, in Charlotte, North Carolina;

Whereas, in 1939, Reverend Graham was ordained by Peniel Baptist Church in Florida;

Whereas Reverend Graham studied at Florida Bible Institute and graduated from Wheaton College in Wheaton, Illinois, in 1943;

Whereas Reverend Graham married his wife of nearly 64 years, Ruth McCue Bell, in 1943;

Whereas Reverend Graham had 3 daughters, 2 sons, 19 grandchildren, and numerous great-grandchildren;

Whereas, in 1950, Reverend Graham founded the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, which is based in Charlotte, North Carolina;

Whereas Reverend Graham preached to nearly 215,000,000 individuals in more than 185 countries and territories on 6 continents;

Whereas Reverend Graham provided spiritual counsel for every President since Harry Truman;

Whereas Reverend Graham prayed with members of the Armed Forces in combat zones in South Korea and Vietnam;

Whereas Reverend Graham spoke against the communist Soviet Union, saying, "Communism has decided against God, against Christ, against the Bible, and against all religion,";

Whereas Reverend Graham—

(1) fought for racial integration;

(2) invited Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to preach with him in New York City in 1957; and

(3) bailed Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., out of jail when Dr. King was arrested for protesting segregation;

Whereas, following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, Reverend Graham spoke words of hope and comfort to the people of the United States at the Washington National Cathedral;

Whereas Reverend Graham authored 34 books, including the bestselling autobiography, "Just as I Am", which began by discussing his early days on a dairy farm in North Carolina and continued through his career as a preacher and evangelist; and

Whereas Reverend Graham received numerous honors, including—

(1) the North Carolina Award for Public Service;

(2) the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

(3) the Ronald Reagan Freedom Award; and

(4) the Congressional Gold Medal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) extends its sympathies to the family of William "Billy" F. Graham, Jr.; and

(2) honors—

(A) the life and ministry of Reverend Graham; and

(B) the contributions of Reverend Graham to—

(i) the State of North Carolina;

(ii) the United States of America; and

(iii) the moral and religious lives of millions of individuals.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 417—CONGRATULATING THE MINNESOTANS WHO COMPETED ON TEAM USA AT THE 2018 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES IN PYEONGCHANG, SOUTH KOREA

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 417

Whereas, of the 243 athletes on the 2018 United States Olympic Team (referred to in this preamble as "Team USA"), 23 have ties to the State of Minnesota, making it the third-most represented State on Team USA;

Whereas, if the State of Minnesota had competed in the 2018 Olympic Winter Games as a country, that State would be tied for twelfth place in the number of gold medals won;

Whereas Minnesota has a long tradition of winter sports and has produced some of the most talented winter Olympians in the world;

Whereas Jessie Diggins of Afton, Minnesota, won a gold medal in the cross-country skiing team sprint and was chosen by the members of Team USA as the United States flagbearer for the Olympic closing ceremony;

Whereas the gold medal won by Jessie Diggins is the first gold medal for the United States in Olympic cross-country skiing;

Whereas the women's Olympic hockey team beat Canada and won the first Olympic gold medal for the team since 1998;

Whereas the following 8 members of the women's Olympic hockey team have ties to Minnesota: Hannah Brandt, Dani Cameranesi, Amanda Kessel, Gigi Marvin, Sidney Morin, Kelly Pannek, Maddie Rooney, and Lee Stecklein;

Whereas the men's curling team defeated Sweden to win the first gold medal for Team USA in curling;

Whereas the following 4 members of the men's curling team have ties to Minnesota: John Shuster, Tyler George, John Landsteiner, and Joe Polo;

Whereas Lindsey Vonn, born in St. Paul, Minnesota, and a member of the Buck Hill Ski Team, won a bronze medal in downhill skiing;

Whereas the following members of Team USA also have ties to Minnesota: Will Borgen, Cory Christensen, Rosie Frankowski, Aileen Geving, Annie Hart, Leif Nordgren, Tabitha Peterson, Ryan Stoa, and David Chodounsky; and

Whereas Minnesota stands united in respect and support for the athletes on Team USA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Minnesotans who competed on the United States Olympic Team at the 2018 Olympic Winter Games in PyeongChang, South Korea; and

(2) commends the dedication and perseverance of all of the athletes on the 2018 United States Olympic Team.

SENATE RESOLUTION 418—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 21, 2018 AS "NATIONAL ROSIE THE RIVETER DAY"

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 418

Whereas National Rosie the Riveter Day is a collective national effort to raise awareness of the 16,000,000 women who worked during World War II;

Whereas the people of the United States have chosen to honor women workers who contributed from the home front during World War II;

Whereas those women left their homes to work or volunteer full-time in factories, farms, shipyards, airplane factories, banks, and other institutions in support of the Armed Forces overseas;

Whereas those women worked with the United Service Organizations and the American Red Cross, drove trucks, riveted airplane parts, collected critical materials, rolled bandages, and served on rationing boards;

Whereas it is fitting and proper to recognize and preserve the history and legacy of working women, including volunteer women, during World War II to promote cooperation and fellowship among those women and their descendants;

Whereas those women and their descendants wish to further the advancement of patriotic ideas, excellence in the workplace, and loyalty to the United States; and

Whereas March 21, 2018, during Women's History Month, is an appropriate day to designate as "National Rosie the Riveter Day": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of March 21, 2018 as "National Rosie the Riveter Day"; and

(2) acknowledges the important role played by women during World War II.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February, 28, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight: FBI Headquarters Consolidation Project."

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Wednesday, February, 28, 2018, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February, 28, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation and the following nomination: Michael K. Atkinson, of Maryland, to be Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February, 28, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February, 28, 2018 at 11 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern Jonah Harris be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

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

TAIWAN TRAVEL ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 310, H.R. 535.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 535) to encourage visits between the United States and Taiwan at all levels, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 535) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TARGETED REWARDS FOR THE GLOBAL ERADICATION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 311, H.R. 1625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1625) to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLES.

This Act may be cited as the “Targeted Rewards for the Global Eradication of Human Trafficking” or the “TARGET Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) *FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:*

(1) *Trafficking in persons is a major transnational crime, as recognized by the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.; division A of Public Law 106-386).*

(2) *Trafficking in persons is increasingly perpetrated by organized, sophisticated criminal enterprises.*

(3) *Combating trafficking in persons requires a global approach to identifying and apprehending the world’s worst human trafficking rings.*

(b) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of State’s rewards program is a powerful tool in combating sophisticated international crime and that the Department of State and Federal law enforcement should work in concert to offer rewards that target human traffickers who prey on the most vulnerable people around the world.*

SEC. 3. REWARDS FOR JUSTICE.

Section 36(k)(5) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(k)(5)) is amended—

(1) *in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “means”;*

(2) *by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and moving such clauses, as redesignated, 2 ems to the right;*

(3) *by inserting before clause (i), as redesignated, the following:*

“(A) means—”;

(4) *in clause (ii), as redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;* and

(5) *by adding at the end following:*

“(B) includes severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving at least 1 jurisdiction outside of the United States.”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1625), as amended, was passed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 106, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the members of the Office of Strategic Services.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) was agreed to.

RECOGNIZING THE COORDINATED STRUGGLE OF WORKERS ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1968 MEMPHIS SANITATION WORKERS STRIKE TO REACH A COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT ON WORKPLACE RIGHTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 404.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 404) recognizing the coordinated struggle of workers on the 50th anniversary of the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers strike to voice their grievances and reach a collective agreement for rights in the workplace.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate Black History Month, when we declare that Black History is American history, and that our Nation is a better, fairer, and more perfect union thanks to the Black Americans who helped forge it.

Fifty years ago, in 1968, a crowd of 25,000 people gathered outside Bishop Charles Mason Temple in Memphis, TN. They congregated there in support of the city’s 1,300 Black sanitation workers—men who were being underpaid and subjected to abusive and unsafe working conditions—all of whom

had been protesting those conditions, day after day, for months. The sanitation workers had organized, unionized, and exercised their right to peaceful protest; yet the mayor of Memphis refused to heed their calls for justice and change.

So they gathered there, alongside thousands of supporters, outside a church in Memphis, waiting for someone to tell them—to show them—their path forward.

One man spoke to the crowd, saying, “You are reminding not only Memphis, but the nation, that it is a crime for people to live in this rich nation and receive starvation wages.” He went on, “You are here tonight to demand that Memphis do something about the conditions our brothers face, as they work day in and day out for the well-being of the total community. You are here to demand that Memphis will see the poor.” The speaker encouraged the sanitation workers to continue their fight and vowed to stand by them. He showed them their path forward.

The speaker who addressed the crowd that day was the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. His voice boomed from behind the podium to the crowd—and to all Americans—about the intersection of racial and economic equality. Dr. King argued that fair pay and basic dignity and safety in the workplace should be extended to all people, regardless of their race or profession.

Dr. King addressed the crowd on March 18, 1968. On April 3, 1968, Dr. King addressed another crowd at Mason Temple, declaring, “I’ve been to the mountain top” and continuing, “Like anybody, I would like to live a long life. Longevity has its place. But I’m not concerned about that now. I just want to do God’s will. And He’s allowed me to go up to the mountain. And I’ve looked over. And I’ve seen the Promised Land. I may not get there with you. But I want you to know tonight, that we, as a people, will get to the Promised Land!”

Dr. King was assassinated the next day. Four days later, 42,000 people marched to honor Dr. King and support the strike, which was resolved 2 weeks after Dr. King’s death when the Memphis City Council voted to recognize the sanitation workers’ union. Finally, after months of turmoil and violence, the sanitation workers were promised the higher wages and more equitable treatment they deserved. On April 29, 2011, the Memphis sanitation workers were inducted into the Department of Labor’s Labor Hall of Honor.

Senator ALEXANDER has introduced a resolution—S. Res. 404—to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Memphis sanitation workers’ strike, and I am honored to be an original cosponsor of the measure.

Every February, we celebrate Black History Month because stories like this one are too often lost or overlooked.

Every child in America learns about the greatness of our country: the democratic principles that birthed us; our victories in battle throughout two World Wars; the American ingenuity that led to the invention of the automobile, the plane, the personal computer. But how often do our children learn about the difficult and dark periods of our history, wherein Thomas Jefferson's proclamation that "all men are created equal" was reserved only for those with White skin? How often do they learn about the sacrifices of those who demanded that we actually live up to the ideals on which we were founded? How often do they learn that greatness, equality, and justice has always come with a price in this country—and that price has often been paid disproportionately by men and women of color?

Black History Month is a solemn reminder of these truths. This month is a reminder of what the Black community has long understood—that, in the words of Frederick Douglass, "if there is no struggle, there is no progress." And it is a reminder that we all have a responsibility, to our country and to each other, to be part of the struggle, and through it, part of the progress.

We must rise to honor that struggle. Doing so begins with celebrating the Americans who shouldered its burden, and Frederick Douglass is, in fact, a tremendous example.

Frederick Douglass was born in Maryland around 1818. He learned to read and write in Baltimore before escaping slavery. Despite unknowable hardship and systemic discrimination, he went on to become one of the most influential writers, orators, and abolitionists of his time. Though Douglass fiercely and vocally opposed slavery, he would want us to remember that he stood for the rights of all Americans regardless of race, color, religion, gender, or national origin. These views—revolutionary for the time—earned him increasing prominence, leading to 1872, when Victoria Woodhull chose him as her Vice Presidential nominee. Frederick Douglass was the first Black American ever to hold such a title.

We also celebrate Harriet Tubman who, with sheer grit and courage, not only escaped slavery, but dedicated her life to saving countless men, women, and children from it. "I had reasoned this out in my mind, there was one of two things I had a right to: liberty or death," she famously said. "If I could not have one, I would have the other."

As one of the Underground Railroad's most effective conductors, Harriet Tubman was given the nickname "Moses" for how dogged and devoted she was to shepherding her people to safety. Tubman went on to become a Union spy during the Civil War and an iconic suffragist thereafter.

We celebrate scientists and inventors like Baltimore's own Benjamin

Banneker, a self-taught mathematician and astronomer, and author of several groundbreaking almanacs; or Dr. Shirley Jackson, whose discoveries in the field of theoretical physics paved the way for the invention of the touch-tone telephone, solar panel cells, and fiber-optic cable; or Marie Van Brittan Brown, a nurse by profession, who invented the first home security system; or George Carruthers, a member of the National Inventors Hall of Fame, who invented the ultraviolet camera, allowing scientists at the National Aeronautics & Space Administration, NASA, to observe more of the universe, forever changing our perception and understanding of it.

We also celebrate the countless men and women whose names and heroism will never grace the history books, such as the Memphis sanitation workers. Throughout the American Revolution and the Civil War, from Reconstruction to today, for every civil rights leader or scientist we can name, there have been thousands we could not name.

In our eagerness to validate the importance of this month, let us not reduce Black history to stories about individuals—as important as they are—and forget the broader truth, that the Black community, as a whole, deserves to have its collective story told, not just this month, but every month. Let our history books reflect the experiences of all those who suffered discrimination in silence, who endured civil rights abuses without recognition, who sat in and stood up to oppression without accolade.

Such individuals would be the first to tell us that there is a lot of work left to do. Systemic prejudice is a specter that haunts us still today through practices like racial profiling. I have introduced a bill, S. 411—the End Racial and Religious Profiling Act—which would eliminate this harmful practice and offer resources for more police training, mandate greater accountability, and provide legal recourse for Americans who have been unduly profiled; yet this bill remains in the Judiciary Committee, with no hearing held on it so far, while too many African Americans and other people of color continue to be unjustly targeted.

The Voting Rights Act, which safeguarded every citizen's fundamental right to vote, was upended by the Supreme Court's decision in 2013's *Shelby v. Holder*. It is up to Congress to remedy that decision with a new, updated law, and it is up to the people of this country to hold this body accountable for passing it. For my part, I will do everything in my power to make that a greater priority.

Fifty years after the Memphis sanitation workers' strike, the Southern Poverty Law Center, SPLC, has released a deeply troubling report, "Teaching Hard History: American Slavery,"

which traces today's persistent racial tensions to the failure of our schools to teach students properly about the great stain of slavery in America. According to the SPLC, "Schools are not adequately teaching the history of American slavery, educators are not sufficiently prepared to teach it, textbooks do not have enough material about it, and—as a result—students lack a basic knowledge of the important role it played in shaping the United States and the impact it continues to have on race relations in America."

So, yes, we still have much work to do, even 155 years after the Emancipation Proclamation and 50 years after the Memphis sanitation workers' strike; yet Dr. King believed in us. Despite all of our faults and shortcomings and all the hardship Dr. King witnessed and endured, he believed in this country. We should, too. This Black History Month, we vow not to let him—or the countless others whose names we will never know—down. We will march forward together, united, just as those sanitation workers and their supporters did 50 years ago, compelled by a shared desire to see justice "roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream," as the Prophet Amos put it, Amos 5:24. We will pause to reflect on the legacy of the civil rights hero who showed us all the path forward, the man who pointed all Americans in the direction of the Promised Land. It is up to us to reach it.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 404) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 13, 2018, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

HONORING THE DEDICATION AND COURAGE OF THE BUFFALO SOLDIERS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 409 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 409) honoring the dedication and courage of the Buffalo Soldiers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 409) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 15, 2018, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE
DESIGNATION OF MARCH 21, 2018
AS "NATIONAL ROSIE THE RIV-
ETER DAY"

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 418, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 418) expressing support for the designation of March 21, 2018 as "National Rosie the Riveter Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 418) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—H.R. 1865

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREE-
MENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that at 11:45 a.m. on Thursday, March 1, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Quattlebaum nomination, and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. I further ask that following disposition of the Quattlebaum nomination, the Senate vote on the Scholer and Self cloture motions, and that following the cloture vote on the Self nomination, the time until 1:30 p.m. be equally divided prior to the cloture vote on the Doughty nomination. I further ask that if cloture is invoked on any of the nominations, the postcloture time be yielded back, the confirmation votes, in the order invoked, occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 5, and that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made

and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, to sum it up, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will conduct three rollcall votes at 11:45 a.m. tomorrow and a fourth vote at 1:30 p.m. This will be the last vote of the week, and Senators should plan to return for three votes at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH
1, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, March 1; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Quattlebaum nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:46 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 28, 2018:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

RUSSELL VOUGHT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 1, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 6

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine worldwide threats; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of James Reilly, of Colorado, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

SD-366

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine protecting e-commerce consumers from counterfeits.

SD-215

2 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

MARCH 7

Time to be announced

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider the nominations of John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, Frank T. Brogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, and Mark Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Institute of Education Science, both of the Department of Education, Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and other pending nominations.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine stopping senior scams.

SD-562

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To continue a business meeting to consider H.R. 2825, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John B. Nalbandian, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kari A. Dooley, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Dominic W. Lanza, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, Jill Aiko Otake, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii, and Joseph H. Hunt, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine Department of Defense audit and business operations reform at the Pentagon.

SD-608

2 p.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President.

SH-216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Joseph E. Macmanus, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts

To hold hearings to examine small business bankruptcy, focusing on assessing the system.

SD-226

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States European Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

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

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

SENATE—Thursday, March 1, 2018

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O Lord our God, as our lawmakers take up the duties of this day, give them Your wisdom and guidance. Remind them that You already know their needs, motives, hopes, and fears. Lord, keep them from being awed by difficulties and frightened by problems, as You provide them with wisdom in their decisions and harmony in their interactions. May the work they do today on Capitol Hill have eternal significance.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1865

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

REMEMBERING BILLY GRAHAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday we welcomed the President, the Vice President, and the family of the late Reverend Billy Graham as he lay in honor in the Capitol. This is a very rare tribute—even rarer for an American without government or military service—but it perfectly suits the remarkable man whose preaching inspired millions worldwide, who counseled Presidents and world leaders across generations, and whom an entire nation came to know as America's pastor.

Billy Graham's powerful preaching and his historic revivals brought so many closer to God because his work was not ultimately about him. "The secret of my work," he explained, "is God. I would be nothing without him." His personal strengths and talents were mighty, but it was his kindness, his humility, and his total fidelity to faith and family that defined his life and his ministry.

I am glad that Congress could honor the great Reverend Graham in this way. Yesterday, thousands—thousands—of Americans packed the Rotunda down the hall to pay their respects. All across the country, people are giving thanks for the extraordinary contributions of this good and faithful servant.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on another matter, it has been just over 2 months since the united Republican government delivered historic tax reform to middle-class families all across the country. How is it working? We have all seen the national news. Walmart is giving raises or new benefits to more than 1 million hourly workers. Boeing is investing \$300 million in workforce development and corporate giving. Apple is bringing hundreds of billions of dollars

back home. But no less important are the stories making front-page news in hometown newspapers all across our country.

Thanks to tax reform in North Lima, OH, Sheely's Furniture & Appliance is planning to issue \$1,000 bonuses to full-time workers and expand the sales floor by 4,500 square feet.

In Cushing, OH—population of 220 people—tax reform is allowing John Anfinson to give \$1,000 bonuses and 5 percent pay raises to all of his employees at the farm store that his grandfather founded in 1918, 100 years ago.

"I work every day shoulder to shoulder with everyone," Mr. Anfinson explained. "When you work every day with a group of people, you know them and their family. . . . They are the most valuable asset in any business."

His customers will also likely be breathing easier. Tax reform is enabling farmers and ranchers across America to immediately expense the cost of important investments, and it is taking a big bite—a big bite—out of the death tax.

Senators heard stories just like these during last week's State work period. Just ask Senator TOOMEY what tax reform is doing in Pennsylvania. He stopped by New Hudson Facades, a manufacturer in Linwood. Tax reform enabled them to increase wages by 5 percent, and a partner company is contributing \$3,000 to every factory worker's 401(k).

How about in Montana? Senator DAINES' trip across his State took him to Pacific Steel in Great Falls, where sales are up 25 percent—sales are up 25 percent—since tax reform passed.

In West Virginia, Senator CAPITO joined a roundtable at the Huntington Regional Chamber of Commerce. She heard from local business leaders about "increased optimism."

In Nevada, 90 percent of the small business owners Senator HELLER recently spoke with said they plan to raise wages, increase benefits, award bonuses, hire more workers, or invest in their operations.

It is a shame our Democratic colleagues still haven't been able to extract themselves from their lockstep opposition to this historic law. If they had gotten their way, none of this good news would have happened—none of it. Only one of the Senators from Pennsylvania voted for the law that is allowing that Linwood manufacturer to expand. Only one Senator from Ohio voted for the new law that is helping those workers in North Lima. Only one Senator from Nevada voted to give small businesses the flexibility to invest more in

their employees. Only one Senator from West Virginia and one Senator from Montana voted to take money out of Washington's pocket and put it back in the pockets of the middle class.

Every single Senate Democrat—every one of them—did all they could to block tax reform. Fortunately, every Republican voted to pass it. And because Congress passed tax reform and the President signed it into law, workers and small business owners are already reaping the benefits.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on Friday, I visited Wilde Lake High School in Columbia, which is located in Howard County, MD, between Washington and Baltimore. I wanted to talk to students about the tragic Valentine's Day shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, in Parkland, FL, which left 17 students and faculty members dead. This is the deadliest high school shooting in American history. I went to Wilde Lake because one of their own teachers, Laura Wallen, was shot to death in September 2017, and her former boyfriend is now on trial for her murder.

I was extremely impressed by the passion of these students. They had a great deal of interest in the subject matter; they were extremely articulate; and they asked great questions. I found it extremely encouraging for the future of Howard County, MD, and this Nation. These students are rightfully concerned about their safety and the safety of their classmates. It has been 2 weeks since a disturbed young man invaded Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

The reaction seems to be like clockwork after each shooting. There is bipartisan shock, anger, and horror. Predictably, the question comes out: Will this time be different? The answer for the Republican leaders in Congress has always been "no" as the outrage and call to act quickly falls back to NRA talking points versus reality. This time, the students of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School and the students in Maryland and across the country are not taking "no" as the final word. This time, the survivors are leading the way and are speaking out in a forceful way like we have not heard before.

Students like Ryan Deitsch, a senior at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, want to know why these students—the children—need to be the ones to speak out "just to save inno-

cent lives," he said. He wants to know why the adults cannot be the adults and do what is necessary to protect children.

I think the students of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School have had a clear, articulate message that this carnage needs to stop. They want to feel safe in their schools again. Armed with their cell phones and their stories, they have taken up the banner of hashtag "never again" and are changing the face of this debate to make this country safer from gun violence.

Alex Wind, another survivor from Stoneman Douglas, laid out the larger problem of why students are mobilizing:

We're marching because it's not just schools. It's movie theaters, it's concerts, it's nightclubs. This kind of stuff can't just happen. You know, we are marching for our lives, we're marching for the 17 lives we lost. And we're marching for our children's lives and our children's children and their children.

So what can we do?

There are several pieces of legislation that are ready to go. The Democrats and some Republicans have been willing and ready to act. Leader MCCONNELL could move any one of these bills right now. Let's start by making it clear that weapons of war are not needed by civilians of any age. I have cosponsored S. 2095, the Assault Weapons Ban of 2017, offered by Senator FEINSTEIN.

This legislation would, one, ban the sale, manufacture, transfer, and importation of military style assault weapons; two, ban any assault weapon that accepts a detachable ammunition magazine and has one or more military characteristics; three, ban magazines and other ammunition feeding devices that hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition, which allow shooters to quickly fire many rounds without needing to reload.

The bill also requires a background check on any future sale, trade, or gifting of an assault weapon that is covered by the bill, and it prohibits the transfer of high-capacity ammunition magazines. It also bans bump fire stocks and other devices that allow semiautomatic weapons to fire at fully automatic rates. Congress should also pass the Background Check Expansion Act, S. 2009, which I have cosponsored and has been offered by Senator MURPHY.

This bill would expand Federal background check requirements to include the sale or transfer of all firearms by private sellers, just as licensed dealers are required to conduct checks for sales under the existing Brady Law. The bill requires background checks for the sales or transfers of all firearms from one private party to another even if either party is not a federally licensed dealer. This requirement extends to all unlicensed sellers whether

they do business online, at gun shows, or out of their homes.

According to a recent poll, a record 97 percent of those surveyed said that they support requiring background checks for gun buyers—97 percent. Why can't we get this done? It is not a heavy lift. Americans are with us on this. We need to recognize that saving children's lives is more important than the National Rifle Association.

Congress also should ease restrictions on gun violence research and prevention efforts by removing onerous restrictions on the Centers for Disease Control research. We can improve States' sharing of information with Federal databases that screen gun buyers.

At a townhall last week, Senator RUBIO, when questioned by an audience of students and parents from Stoneman Douglas, said that "the problems we are facing here today cannot be solved by gun laws alone." With that, I agree, but these gun laws will make a difference. Yes, there is no single solution, but we should be united in our willingness to do what we can to save lives.

I agree with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we must devote more resources to mental health priorities to identify young people who may be about to cause harm to themselves or others.

Let's attack this problem from multiple directions. We cannot raise our hands in the air and give up because there is no one law that can solve the problem. Sitting on the sidelines is not an option when our children are being killed, sometimes by other children, and surrendering to the false logic that the problem is too big to address falls well short of what the American people deserve. We were sent here to our Nation's Capitol to make the tough decisions and to do the right thing.

I agree with Alex Wind that this problem we need to tackle is larger than simply school safety, but I would like to talk about that specifically for one moment.

In an effort to turn the conversation away from an assault weapons ban or closing loopholes in background checks, the President decided to latch on to this idea that we should arm teachers and educators in our schools. We do not need, as President Trump has suggested, more guns in the schools, and we do not need teachers carrying guns. We do know that teachers are hired to teach, not to be security guards.

Let's listen to our educators and say no to this proposal. The answer to keeping guns and gun violence out of our schools is not to bring more guns into the school. The students I talked to at Wilde Lake High School in Columbia, MD, understood that adding more guns would not help the situation and could lead to more problems in the

schools themselves. They certainly want to see their buildings more secure, but we can do that through infrastructure improvements, technology, and school resource officers.

Why are these things happening in the United States with such alarming frequency and not elsewhere around the world? Gun-related deaths unfold in tragic circumstances across this country daily, with more than 1,800 people killed by guns this year alone, according to the Gun Violence Archive, a not-for-profit group. Mass shootings often shine the spotlight on the United States and its position as a global outlier.

The number of firearms available to American civilians is estimated to be around 310 million, according to the 2009 National Institute of Justice report.

According to the Small Arms Survey, the exact number of civilian-owned firearms is impossible to pinpoint because of a variety of factors, including arms that go unregistered due to illegal trade and global conflict. Estimates indicate that Americans own nearly half of the 650 million civilian-owned guns in the world today, which is nearly one gun for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Our Nation is well armed. India is home to the second-largest civilian firearm stockpile, estimated at 46 million.

Americans own the most guns per person in the world, with about 4 in 10 saying they either own a gun or live in a home where there is a gun, according to the 2017 Pew Center study. Forty-eight percent of Americans said they grew up in a house with guns. According to the survey, a majority—66 percent—of U.S. gun owners own multiple firearms. The No. 2 country in the world for the largest number of guns per capita is Yemen—a country that is in the throes of a 3-year-old civil war. They trail significantly behind us. They have 54 guns per 100 in Yemen; we have 88 guns per 100 in the United States.

When it comes to gun massacres, the United States is an anomaly. There are more public mass shootings in America than in any other country in the world. The United States makes up less than 5 percent of the world's population but holds 31 percent of global mass shooters. In Australia, for example, four mass shootings occurred between 1987 and 1996. After those instances, public opinion turned against gun violence, and Parliament passed stricter gun safety laws. Australia hasn't had a mass shooting since.

Gun safety laws work. The public demands that we take action to make our communities safer.

Gun homicide rates are about 25 times higher in the United States than in other developed countries. The United States has one of the highest

rates of death by firearms in the developed world, according to World Health Organization data. The calculations based on OECD data from 2010 show that Americans are 51 times more likely to be killed by gunfire than people in the UK.

Most American gun owners say that a major reason they own a gun is for personal protection, according to the Pew study. However, the majority of firearms-related deaths are attributable to self-harm. Gun-related suicides are eight times higher in the United States than in other high-income nations.

Thinking of Stoneman Douglas High School, we all wonder out loud, what drove this young man to kill indiscriminately? There is no one single reason, but that is no excuse for Congress and lawmakers in all of our States to remain frozen and fail to act to try to stop a future shooting from happening. If anything, it should be the impetus for us to move forward on many fronts and to take many actions to support our children and support our communities so more lives are not lost in such a violent way.

We cannot allow the story of this shooting to end like all the others in recent history. We should have taken action after three students were killed and five wounded in December 1997 at a high school in West Paducah, KY. We should have taken action after two students opened fire on April 20, 1999, in Columbine High School in Littleton, CO, killing 12 classmates and a teacher and wounding 26 others. We should have taken action after a gunman fatally shot 32 people in a dorm and classrooms at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, VA, on April 16, 2007.

Columbine, Virginia Tech—for a period, these names became a code for some of the worst killings in our history. Nearly 5 years later, it happened again. Three students were killed and two wounded in a shooting on February 27, 2012, that started in a school cafeteria in Chardon, OH, as students waited for buses to other schools. Then there was Sandy Hook. I know we all remember a 20-year-old gunman, in December of 2012, killing 20 first grade children and 6 educators inside Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT—elementary school students. These were first graders, for goodness' sake, young children who should clearly have moved us to action. But no. The killings continued because the Republican leadership has been unwilling to budge from the NRA-approved message.

We have had bipartisan support for some of this legislation, as we do today, but too many are so afraid of the NRA response that they lose sight of the fact that children are being killed right before our eyes.

On September 8, 2016, a 14-year-old girl died of a self-inflicted gunshot wound after shooting and killing an-

other female student at Alpine High School in West Texas.

Just 20 days later, on September 28, a 6-year-old boy was fatally shot on the playground of Townville Elementary School in South Carolina by a 14-year-old boy who had just killed his father. Another child and a teacher were struck by bullets but survived.

I know some of you are thinking: I haven't heard about these shootings. That is a problem in and of itself. School shootings have become so commonplace and so much a part of our lives that children dying in our schools may not make it into the paper. We might miss it. We cannot let this become commonplace. It cannot be the new norm.

Another incident you may not have heard of happened last April. A gunman opened fire in the special education classroom of his estranged wife at North Park Elementary School in San Bernardino, CA, killing her and an 8-year-old boy and wounding another child.

In September of last year, in Rockford, WA, a 15-year-old boy was killed at Freeman High School and three female students were wounded when authorities say another 15-year-old boy opened fire with a handgun.

In December of last year, two students at Aztec High School in New Mexico were killed by a gunman disguised as a student.

Barely a month ago, in January, 2 students were killed and 14 wounded by gunfire when a student opened fire before classes began at Marshall County High School in West Kentucky. A 15-year-old—a 15-year-old—is being charged for this crime.

This time, the survivors are speaking out in a forceful way like we have not heard before. I think the students speaking out have had a clear, articulate message that this carnage needs to stop. I am not sure I know any lawmaker or American who would disagree with the idea that our students need to be safe in their schools. It means that we need to act—really act this time.

Setting aside the outrageous idea of arming teachers, it has been heartening to see the President move in the direction of legislative solutions, such as expanding background checks and banning bump stocks. The devil is always in the details, and we will see how far the President is willing to stray from the NRA and whether the Republican leadership will back the President or remain on the sidelines of protecting the American people and especially our children.

On that Valentine's Day, February 14, when I heard about the shooting in Parkland, FL, my immediate reaction was horror, pain, and outrage. How could we allow this to happen yet again? Schools should be a safe harbor for our children, not a place of killing and terror. I was in my office thinking

about how tragic this is, not only for those who were killed but for all the children who were there. I am as frustrated as the people across this country. I want to pass commonsense gun safety legislation. Why shouldn't we get these military-style weapons off the streets?

It is hard to know what will motivate the congressional leadership to bring up this issue, what will jar them to action. I want action. We may not solve the problem entirely, but we need to try. We need to do something.

A new CNN poll released just this Sunday finds that 70 percent of Americans now back tougher gun laws. This is a huge jump from 52 percent after the tragic, horrific October shootings in Las Vegas. This number includes 49 percent of Republicans, which I think is encouraging. Saving lives should not be a partisan issue. Commonsense gun safety legislation should not be a partisan issue.

Public opinion polls may not be perfect, but they are generally helpful to show trends. Americans are getting it. It is time that we do. This trend toward protecting the American people, and especially our children, is moving in the right direction. The American people are letting their voices be heard on this issue.

Thoughts and prayers might console the grieving for a moment, but action speaks louder and will have a lasting impact. From my hometown of Baltimore to the many towns across America that have had their names in the headlines because of gun-related tragedies or mass shootings, people are calling upon Congress to act.

I don't care what the reasons are for a change of heart, but let's get bills on the floor. What we are proposing are logical next steps to address the deadly problem that has been festering in this country for too long. Too many young lives have been lost. Will this time be different?

Mr. President, in honor of the victims of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed in the RECORD.

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

Alyssa Alhadeff, 14; Scott Beigel, 35; Martin Duque Anguiano, 14; Nicholas Dworet, 17; Aaron Feis, 37; Jaime Guttenberg, 14; Chris Hixon, 49; Luke Hoyer, 15; Cara Loughran, 14; Gina Montalto, 14; Joaquin Oliver, 17; Alaina Petty, 14; Meadow Pollack, 18; Helena Ramsay, 17; Alex Schachter, 14; Carmen Schentrup, 16; Peter Wang, 15.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, to all the victims of gun violence who have preceded them, let's make the answer a resounding yes.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this morning, I would like to start off

speaking about a very important day in the history of my State, a day that inspires pride in the hearts of all those who were born in Texas. I am here to commemorate Texas Independence Day, which will be celebrated tomorrow.

On March 2, 1836, Texas adopted its Declaration of Independence from Mexico. It is worth reading, and I would recommend it to anyone. This happened in the context of a struggle that is perhaps best remembered by the Battle of the Alamo, which laid some of the groundwork for Texans' eventual victory.

On February 24 of that year, with his position under siege, an important figure named William Barret Travis wrote a letter, which I would like to read. He was a lieutenant colonel in the Texas Army, and during the battle, his fellow soldiers were outnumbered nearly 10 to 1 by the forces of the Mexican dictator Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna. Here in the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats have had the honor of reading the fabled Travis letter since 1961, when then-Texas Senator John Tower started that tradition. The letter was addressed "To the People of Texas & All Americans in the World." Travis wrote:

I am besieged, by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained a continual Bombardment & cannonade for 24 hours & have not lost a man—The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken—I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, & our flag still waves proudly from the walls—I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of Liberty, of patriotism & everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch—The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily & will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in four or five days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible & die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor & that of his country—Victory or Death.

Signed, "William Barret Travis."

What a letter it is. It is a reminder for all of us that the 189 defenders of the Alamo lost their lives, but they did not die in vain. In fact, Texans wouldn't be around today if it weren't for them.

The Battle of the Alamo bought precious time for the Texas revolutionaries, allowing General Sam Houston to maneuver his army into a position for the decisive victory at the Battle of San Jacinto. I would just note that I am honored to occupy the same Senate seat first occupied by Sam Houston when he became a U.S. Senator after Texas became annexed to the United States in 1845.

With that victory at the Battle of San Jacinto, Texas became a sovereign nation—the Republic of Texas—for 9 years. For 9 years, it thrived as a separate nation, and then in 1845 it was an-

nexed to the United States as the 28th State.

Many Texas patriots who fought in the revolution went on to serve in the U.S. Congress—Sam Houston being one of them. Every single day, I am honored to have the opportunity to serve 28 million Texans—a chance I wouldn't have had without the sacrifices made by the brave men like William Barrett Travis 182 years ago.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on another matter, we have come a long way since the days of the Texas revolution, but Texas remains a place of optimism, fortitude, and dedication to worthy causes. It is also a bustling State, full of entrepreneurs, investors, and risk-takers who have created jobs and opportunities for the people who live there. I would like to mention briefly two iconic companies that are showing their devotion to Texas in a much different but important manner.

In Tyler, they are spreading the good news of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the law we passed in December, which overhauled our Tax Code. For those not familiar with where Tyler is, it is out in East Texas. We sometimes refer to that as "behind the pine curtain." The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act effects have been far-reaching. They have positively affected communities all across the country for the past 2 months, and Tyler is no exception.

The first company I would like to mention is Greenberg Turkeys, a family-owned operation that sells the famous Thanksgiving bird to around 200,000 customers each holiday season. Four generations of the Greenberg family have worked in the company since the 1940s, and its turkeys have been featured on Oprah Winfrey's website as one of her favorite things—twice, in fact. As a result of the tax reforms we have passed, the company plans to refurbish its plant and give hourly employees a raise. Sam Greenberg, the president, said:

This is a really good deal for businesses. It pays to treat people right, and so we want to share this with our workers.

I couldn't have said it better myself.

The second Tyler company I want to mention briefly is Don's TV & Appliance. The staff there has more than 150 years of combined experience. It buys products direct from manufacturers at the lowest possible cost in order to provide customers with prices that are competitive with national chain stores. Recently, the owner, Don Thedford, and his son Donnie announced they would give their employees raises in 2018, which they were not able to do for the past several years, and they would not have been able to do it but for the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Thanks to those reforms, Don has been able to help out his employees to provide them more take-home pay, and I am sure they appreciate the extra money in

their paycheck each pay period. They can use these savings to invest, to pay for their children's education, prepare for their retirement, or whatever they find best.

So I just wanted to say to Don and other small employers who are making sure their employees see the benefit of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act reforms: Thank you for paying the savings forward. I can't wait to continue to hear more stories like these two in the months ahead.

FIX NICS BILL

Mr. President, on a final note, I would like to bring up one last topic we have been discussing a lot this last week; that is, ways we can prevent mass shootings from happening in the future. Of course, the most recent one occurred at Parkland, FL, at Stoneman Douglas High School.

Last fall, my State saw another in-sidious shooting at Sutherland Springs near San Antonio, TX. Twenty-six people lost their lives that day worshipping in a small Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, and 20 more were wounded, including a 6-year-old boy named Ryland Ward, who was shot five times. We are ecstatic Ryland survived and is now out of the hospital and has gone home.

What we all learned in the aftermath of that event is that sometimes these horrific crimes are perpetrated by individuals who never should have been able to purchase firearms in the first place. That is because, under current law, convicted felons, like the gunman at Sutherland Springs, are prohibited from legally purchasing firearms. The problem was that his convictions were not uploaded in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, what is commonly referred to as the NICS system operated by the FBI.

I have introduced a bill that has already passed the House that would address this problem and, I believe, would save lives in the future. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation cosponsored by the junior Senator from Connecticut, Senator MURPHY, along with his colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL, come from the State that saw the horrific killings at Sandy Hook. We added 10 new cosponsors just this week, bringing the total number to 50 cosponsors for this legislation. In my experience, it is rare to see a piece of legislation enjoy such broad, bipartisan support—50 cosponsors.

I have been saying all week that we need to pass this bill now. We should not wait, we should not go home emptyhanded, and we should not have to face the grieving families who lost a child or a loved one as a result of a future shooting that might have been averted had we acted. America is tired of the government's response to these catastrophes which rip families apart, take lives, and pit people against each other. The response of their govern-

ment has been largely either silence or bickering with no outcome, no result.

There are other proposals we can consider as we continue to grapple with the questions posed in Parkland—questions about failures of local law enforcement, social media platforms, and the FBI. Yesterday, the President hosted an amazing meeting of 17 Members of Congress on a bipartisan basis and brainstormed about other things we might be able to do, but right now—right now—fix NICS is our best and only option to act in response. It is supported by the President, the majority and minority leaders are cosponsors, and it is supported by gun groups like the NRA and Everytown for Gun Safety, which are at opposite ends of the ideological spectrum when it comes to the Second Amendment. As I said, this bill has 50 cosponsors in the Senate and is ready for action, having already passed the House of Representatives.

I pledged to myself, after my wife and I visited Sutherland Springs a week after the terrible shooting there and attended a church service led by the pastor who lost his 14-year-old daughter in that shooting just 1 week before—it was a gut-wrenching, emotional service, but it was inspiring in its own way. I pledged then that I would never face another grieving family with empty hands, saying we could have done something that might have saved your child's life or your loved one's life by fixing the broken background check system. I pledged I would never face them again, saying we didn't try our best to save lives in the future by passing commonsense, bipartisan legislation like the Fix NICS bill.

As I said, there are other things we might do, but, as we all know, the threshold for actually passing legislation is 60 votes. What I don't want us to do is to end up like we did on the DACA debate, where we started with a neutral bill—a shell which really did nothing—and all of the various proposals failed to get 60 votes, so we ended up emptyhanded on the DACA issue. I don't want that to happen again, and I am not going to go home and tell my constituents in Texas I didn't do my very best to make sure we did something and something meaningful that would save lives in the future. Fix NICS is the best way to do that and do that now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the tragedy in Parkland and the responsibilities of the Senate to try to make our communities safer. I am going to talk very personally about my own experience in confronting gun violence as a mayor of an urban area, Richmond, VA, and as the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I will start by saying, I am a gun owner. I am a Second Amendment supporter. When I was an attorney in private practice, I was the lawyer who worked with an effort to amend the Virginia constitution to guarantee Virginians the right to hunt and fish. The Second Amendment and private gun ownership is an important part of our framework. I support it, but I obviously believe that we can do things consistent with the Constitution that will make our Nation safer, and I ask my colleagues to join in that effort.

When I was elected to the Richmond City Council in 1994, Richmond, at that time, was only on one top 10 list that I am aware of. It is not the one you want to be on. We had the second highest homicide rate in the United States. We were not a high-crime area generally, if you looked at all crime, but in homicides and aggravated assaults—assaults committed with weapons—we were unusually high. The weapons of choice in these homicides and aggravated assaults were guns.

I remember very early in my time at the city council getting called to a neighborhood, Gilpin Court, which is a public housing community in my city council district. There had been a gun crime that killed an entire family of five—adults and little children.

Over the course of my 8 years of working in local government, I went to too many crime scenes and funerals and wakes. In some ways, the things that were the most memorable were the meetings in church basements of the families of homicide victims. We embarked upon a set of strategies to make our communities safer. Amidst all the bloodshed and the tears, we actually found strategies—some dealing with reductions in guns, some dealing with law enforcement strategies, some dealing with police and community relations. We found strategies that, over the course of about 8 years, reduced the homicide rate in Richmond by 60 percent and the aggravated assault rate by an equivalent number.

Out of the pain, what we learned is you can actually take concrete steps that will make your community safer and that will reduce gun violence. You will not eliminate it. That is beyond our power as humble people to do, but you can reduce it. If you know you can, then you must. You have a responsibility to do what you can.

I was elected Governor of Virginia in 2005, and I will never forget April 16,

2007. I had just embarked on a trade mission. I had landed in Japan with a delegation to recruit business to my State. I had gone to the hotel, and I got a call after midnight from my chief of staff, who said: There is a shooting under way at Virginia Tech.

I said: Book me on the next flight home. I have been here for just a few hours on what was going to be a 2-week trade mission, but let me fly back home.

I flew back to what, at the time, was the worst shooting in the history of the United States. In April of 2007, 32 people were gunned down on the campus of Virginia Tech by a deranged youngster who had been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous and was thus prohibited from having a weapon. But because of glitches and flaws in the background check system, he had been able to purchase multiple weapons, and he committed that horrible crime.

I empaneled a commission. I told them: Let the lawyers and lawsuits be damned. I want to know everything that went wrong, and I want to make public everything that went wrong and everything we can do to fix it. Over the course of a number of months, they produced a report with hundreds of recommendations.

The recommendations were about campus safety. The recommendations were about mental health, but there were also recommendations about fixes to our State and Federal gun laws to reduce the risk of this happening. I was able to make some changes on my own as an executive. I took other changes to my legislature that they rejected.

Again, out of the painful situation—and it is a funny thing to say about your own State, about my State of Virginia, about a place I love like Virginia Tech—I always hoped it would be the worst. I had always hoped that would have been the worst shooting in the history of the United States, but the Pulse nightclub shooting and the Las Vegas shooting now have claimed more victims. Other shootings, like those in Newtown and now Parkland—if the number of victims aren't the same, the tragedy is nevertheless of equal magnitude.

We learn through pain that you can make changes and improve. When I fixed a piece of the background check system flaw, it made us safer. It reduced the risk of gun violence and gun deaths.

My experience as mayor and Governor were painful, but I learned a lesson in both, which is you can take steps, including steps dealing with the rules about firearms that will make your communities safer. That is a powerful thing. You can take steps that will make communities safer.

I dealt with three lies—three falsehoods—over the course of these efforts as mayor and Governor, as I tried to help us take steps to make us safer.

The first lie was it is not about guns. It is about mental health; it is about other things. But that is just false. Equally false would be if we said that it is only about guns. That would be false as well. To say it is not about guns is a lie perpetrated by an organization headquartered in Virginia, the National Rifle Association. It turned out to be false.

The key to reducing the homicide rate in Virginia ultimately was that we embraced strategies to reduce the gun carry rate. That is a phrase that law enforcement professionals use for the percentage of time where people, in normal interactions with the police, are found to be carrying a weapon. In Virginia, the gun carry rate was unusually high, and that meant when something broke bad or there was an argument, there would often be an aggravated assault or homicide committed with a weapon. We undertook strategies that drove down the gun carry rate. That didn't make bad people good people, but it made it more likely that when things broke bad, there wouldn't be an aggravated assault or a homicide.

So it was about the guns. That is the first lie or falsehood that gets perpetrated: It is not about guns. It is not only about guns, but it is definitely about guns.

A second lie or falsehood perpetrated by the same organization is that they would always say: You can't improve. They would say: That will not solve every problem. You can't solve every bit of gun violence if you do this. They would say this over and over again with any shooting. They would point out the number of things that wouldn't have stopped it, as if not being able to eliminate gun violence means that you shouldn't do anything to try to reduce gun violence. That is just a lie or a falsehood. I have learned from my experiences that if you take steps, you can make communities safer.

The third lie or falsehood we had to confront repeatedly from the National Rifle Association was that gun safety rules violate the Second Amendment. That is just flatout wrong. In fact, the Second Amendment is the only amendment whose text even uses the word regulation. The need for a well-regulated militia gives individuals the right to bear arms.

What does the term "well-regulated" mean? It is not a reference to the length of somebody's beard or the kind of hat they should wear. There is an understanding that firearms are dangerous, and if individuals are to have the right to have them, there also must need to be some appropriate level of regulation. We are familiar with this in the rest of the Constitution.

I am passionate about the First Amendment. There should be freedom of the press, but you can't just libel or slander without consequence. The Framers, Madison and others, who put

these amendments together, understood that the amendments to the Constitution included some limitations because we have to live together, not just as individuals who are free agents, but we have to live together in society.

Those three lies—it is not about guns; we can't do anything about it; and the gun rules violate the Second Amendment—are wrong.

I came to the Senate after the shooting in Sandy Hook. The first meaningful debate we had after I came here was whether we would do something to respond to this horrible carnage of kids in an elementary school.

The Presiding Officer was not in the Senate. I know you followed this as a citizen. I remember standing here in this Chamber in April 2013, casting a vote on a bill that I thought would have been a very good bill to do background record checks. We were surrounded in the Chamber by Sandy Hook families. Many of them were sitting next to Virginia Tech families who had come to be in solidarity with them. There was a feeling of despair, with them around, that was like the great cloud of witnesses referred to in the letter of Paul to the Hebrews. We fell short. They were praying for us to succeed, and we fell short. In the aftermath of that horrible tragedy, this body did precisely nothing.

Well, now we have experienced yet another horrible tragedy. There have been others since Sandy Hook, but it is my deep hope that after this horrible shooting in Parkland, something may be different in this body. The reason I think this one might be different is that these students are standing up and challenging us. The children of our Nation are asking adults to be adults. They are asking us to look in the mirror. They posed the question starkly: What is more important to you, your children or campaign contributions from an interest group?

I think the advocacy of the children of Parkland who suffer, not only their advocacy but the advocacy of students all over the United States—I have held meetings with Moms Demand Action in Richmond and Northern Virginia in the last couple of days, and many students were in these meetings. The advocacy of students and their challenge to us may show us a way.

I will conclude with a story that gives me hope and that suggests there may be some resonance to this moment. Sometimes there is a movement, but there isn't a moment. Sometimes the movement needs a moment to achieve a victory.

Fifty-five years ago, in the spring of 1963, Dr. Martin Luther King was trying to desegregate public accommodations in Birmingham, AL, with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. He had been going from community to community. In some places, they were able to desegregate public

accommodations relatively easily. Other places were tough but none tougher than Birmingham. At drug stores and department stores, Dr. King and others would have adults go sit in—African Americans and their allies—and be arrested. Yet wave after wave of arrests notwithstanding, including the arrest of Dr. King, the city leaders would not back down. They would not shed the discrimination that violated the equality provisions of the Constitution.

As this was going on, children in the Birmingham schools started to come to Dr. King and say: We want to march too.

Dr. King and his lieutenants really struggled with this. They were parents. They didn't want their kids to be arrested. They didn't want their kids to face guard dogs attacking them. They didn't want their kids to face firehoses directed at them. They had a natural parental reaction: We are going to do this; we want to protect you.

But the children kept coming and saying: We want to march too.

Finally, they said: Isn't this about us? As much as it is about adults, isn't this about us, your children? And if it is about your children, why can't we march?

Dr. King, after a lot of prayer and discussion, finally said: It is about you.

Mr. President, you know this, and for our pages especially, it was those children advocating—and they marched, and they did have firehoses turned on them, and they did have guard dogs released on them. The photos of those children braving that ugly face of discrimination landed on the front pages of papers all over the United States and all over the world, and it was transformative of the civil rights movement.

Adults in the United States knew there was discrimination, but they had become complacent to it or indifferent to it or had even said: I think it is wrong, but it will probably never change. But their children demanded of them: Adults, just be adults. Adults, you say you care about children; prove to us you care about children. And when the adults of America were confronted with the example of their own young people, they had to shake themselves out of their complacency and indifference and shoulder the burden that adults must shoulder.

That is what these students at Parkland are saying to us now. That is what these students all over the country are saying to us now. They are saying: This is about our future. This is about your children. And they are asking us whether children matter more or political contributions matter more.

I urge my colleagues, finally, let's not produce another goose egg in this body. Let's not come together after a horrible tragedy—when there are meaningful steps, such as background

record checks, that we can put on the table to make us safer—and fail them yet again.

I ask my colleagues and especially the majority leader to enable us to have this debate on the floor so that we can take meaningful steps of the kind that we know will make our communities safer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

YEMEN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, there should be no issue of more importance to Members of Congress than the issue of war and peace and when it is appropriate to send the young people of our country into harm's way, knowing that some of them will not return home alive.

It goes without saying that every armed conflict the United States of America is engaged in must be consistent with the Constitution of the United States and be lawful.

Let's make no mistake about it—article I, section 8 of the Constitution states in no uncertain terms that "Congress shall have the power to . . . declare war." The Founding Fathers gave the power to declare war to Congress because Congress is that body most accountable to the people.

For far too long, Congress—under Democratic and Republican administrations—has abdicated its constitutional role in authorizing war. The time is long overdue for Congress to reassert its constitutional authority. If you think that a military intervention makes sense, then let's have that debate on the floors of the Senate and the House and cast a vote. But that is not what we have been seeing for a number of years.

What Senator LEE and Senator MURPHY and I are doing with privileged resolution S.J. Res. 54 is demanding that Congress once again take its constitutional responsibility for war and peace seriously. I thank Senators DURBIN, WARREN, and BOOKER for coming on board that resolution. I hope this bipartisan resolution will gain more and more support in the coming days.

Many Americans are unaware that the people of Yemen are suffering today in a devastating civil war, with Saudi Arabia and their allies on one side and Houthi rebels on the other.

In November of last year, the United Nations emergency relief coordinator said that Yemen was on the brink of "the largest famine the world has seen for many decades." So far, at least 10,000 civilians have died, 3 million have been displaced, and over 40,000 have been wounded in this war. Fifteen million people lack access to clean water and sanitation. More than 20 million people in Yemen—over two-thirds of that country's population—need some kind of humanitarian support, with nearly 10 million in acute

need of assistance. More than 1 million suspected cholera cases have been reported—1 million cholera cases have been reported—representing potentially the worst cholera outbreak in world history.

Many Americans probably are not aware that U.S. forces have been actively engaged in support of the Saudis in this terrible war, providing intelligence and aerial refueling of planes whose bombs have killed thousands of people and made this crisis far worse.

We believe—and I speak for Senator LEE and Senator MURPHY—that as Congress has not declared war or authorized military force in this conflict, U.S. involvement in Yemen is unconstitutional and unauthorized, and U.S. military support of the Saudi coalition must end. Without congressional authorization, our engagement in this war should be restricted to providing desperately needed humanitarian aid and diplomatic efforts to put an end to this terrible conflict. That is why yesterday we introduced a joint resolution pursuant to the 1973 War Powers Resolution calling for an end to U.S. support for the Saudi war in Yemen.

The War Powers Resolution defines the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces to include "the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities." That is from the War Powers Resolution. Assisting with targeting intelligence and refueling warplanes as they bomb those targets clearly meets this definition.

This is not a partisan issue. Support for the Saudi intervention in Yemen began under a Democratic President and has continued under a Republican one. Senator LEE is a conservative Republican. I am a progressive Independent who caucuses with the Democrats.

In November of last year—and it is important that Members of the Senate hear this—the U.S. House of Representatives, by a vote of 366 to 30, passed a nonbinding resolution stating that U.S. involvement in the Yemen civil war is unauthorized. Every Member of the Democratic leadership voted for this. Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI voted for it. Minority Whip STENY HOYER voted for it. The ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, ELIOT ENGEL, voted for it, as did the Republican chairman of that committee, ED ROYCE.

Here is the bottom line: If the President or Members of Congress believe that support for this war is in the U.S. interest and that we should be involved in it, then let them come to the floor of the House and Senate, make their case, and then let's have a vote.

I believe we have become far too comfortable with the United States engaging in military interventions all over the world. We have now been in Afghanistan for nearly 17 years—the longest war in American history. Our troops are now in Syria under what I believe are questionable authorities, and the administration has indicated that it may broaden that military mission even more.

The time is long overdue for Congress to reassert its constitutional role in determining when and where our country goes to war. I am very proud to be working with Senators LEE, MURPHY, and others on this vitally important issue.

Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the mass murder in Florida this month, and I rise to ask a simple question that millions of Americans in every part of this country are asking at their kitchen tables right now: Is Congress finally going to do anything meaningful about gun violence? When will enough be enough? What will it take for this body to move beyond the same talking points that we hear after every mass shooting and actually do something to prevent more deaths? Will Congress finally see what the vast majority of Americans see—gun owners and non-gun owners alike—that America's gun problem isn't going away unless Congress musters up the courage to take it head-on, or will Congress continue to give the lipservice of thoughts and prayers and then do absolutely nothing?

We have to act because once again there was a massacre on American soil. Once again it was inside a school. Once again American children were gunned down. We keep living through a nightmare of gun violence that repeats itself in schools, movie theaters, churches, nightclubs, concerts, and every single day on the streets of cities in every State around this country—Sandy Hook, Aurora, Charleston, San Bernardino, Orlando, Las Vegas, Sutherland Springs, and most recently, Parkland, FL.

We can help stop this. We have the power to help stop this. The question is whether Congress has the political will to do it, whether this institution will finally put families first, our children first, and stand up to the gun manufacturers and the NRA.

I urge every Member of Congress to reflect on why they first ran for office. We are here as public servants to serve the people who sent us here, not to serve the gun industry's profits, not to serve the organizations and companies and lobbyists who demand political retribution when we do the morally right thing. Does Congress have the will to act? Does Congress have the basic cour-

age this country needs? I am sorry to say, I don't know, but we can put it to the test.

There has been a lot of talk—more than normal even—about our need to act in this Chamber. So I will say this to my colleagues: Let's make this time different. Let's listen to the children from Stoneman Douglas High School. Let's seize this moment. Let's take action.

I implore my colleagues to listen to what the country is saying about gun violence today, listen to the families, listen to the survivors from Parkland and tune out all the other noise. I did. It is possible.

Ten years ago, I had an A rating from the NRA, just like many of my colleagues today, but then I met the mother of Nyasia Pryear-Yard. Then I met her classmates. Nyasia was an honor student from Brooklyn. She was dancing with her friends, having fun, loving life. She was killed by a stray bullet in her community. Now I have an F rating from the NRA.

I don't understand how, after meeting with all of these families, after meeting with all of these children whose lives have been destroyed and torn apart by gun violence—I don't understand how any public servant would not vow to do what is necessary to make sure it never happens again.

It is what we do after a terrorist attack, rightfully so. It is what we do as a country. We come together. We say never again, and we do whatever it takes to protect our country. We have to have the very same sense of urgency now.

Plain and simple, it is a lie to say we have to choose between protecting law-abiding gun owners' rights and protecting our children from being murdered by assault rifles. It is a false choice to say we cannot end gun violence without violating people's constitutional rights. It is time for Members of Congress to stand up for what is right for America and do what is right for our communities, and say no to the NRA.

I commend one of our colleagues in the House of Representatives—a Republican from Florida and an Army veteran—who is seeing this crisis differently now too. He wrote:

I know that my community, our schools, and public gathering places, are not made safer by any person having access to the best killing tool the Army could put in my hands. I cannot support the primary weapon I used to defend our people, being used to kill children I swore to defend.

That is what leadership looks like.

I implore my colleagues in the Senate to see our gun violence problem differently. See it with your heart. See it for what it is. It is a matter of national security, of public health, of public safety that will never go away unless Congress does its job.

So, once and for all, let's pass laws that actually are meaningful, that ac-

tually can do something, not just something simple so we can say we did something and move on. I strongly agree with my colleagues that we need to improve the mental health system. Let's make those investments, but it should not stop there.

We have to address the fact that we have weapons of war on our streets today. We have to address the fact that it is so easy for people to buy a gun—people who should never have that privilege. Let's vote to ban semiautomatic assault rifles.

Congress has already banned fully automatic weapons. Congress has already recognized that some weapons have no place in the civilian world, and a weapon of war that was designed for military use, that can fire up to 100 rounds in 1 minute or 100 rounds if you just add a bump stock, a weapon that can completely outgun a police officer has no place in the civilian world.

Will my colleagues vote with me to ban semiautomatic assault rifles?

Then, let's vote to ban the high-capacity magazines that go with them. They are made for wars; they are not made to be in our schools, not in our cities. High-capacity magazines let killers fire dozens of rounds without having to frequently stop and reload. They are designed to let someone fire bullets at as many people as possible in the shortest amount of time.

Let's vote to ban high-capacity magazines, and let's vote to pass universal background checks. That is something that is so commonsense, so obvious. Too many people who should not get their hands on these weapons are easily able to get them, and there are so many loopholes that allow people to buy semiautomatic assault rifles online, where there are no background checks. They allow people to buy semiautomatic assault rifles at gun shows, where there are no background checks.

It simply doesn't make sense that every person who buys a firearm doesn't go through a basic background check system. Do you know who agrees with that? Ninety-seven percent of the American people. I can't think of any other issue where there is such near-universal agreement across our entire population.

So let's do what our constituents are demanding from us—not what the NRA is demanding from us—and vote to pass universal background checks. When we do it, let's make sure the effort is actually sincere. If we are only voting on universal background checks, when it is tied to the issue of concealed carry reciprocity, then that is not a sincere attempt to fix our broken background check system. If Congress is saying we will only pass universal background checks if we pass a new law that says a stranger from one State has to be allowed into my State or your State when he has a gun hidden under his jacket, that is an insult to 97 percent

of the American people who want Congress to pass universal background checks now.

Then, let's finally vote to overturn the outrageous law that has banned the Centers for Disease Control from even studying the issue of gun deaths. The CDC can study any other cause of death—heart disease, cancer, car crashes, plane crashes—unless it involves a gun. Don't you think it is strange that when we debate this issue, the two things related to gun violence that Congress has actually banned in recent years are research—research on gun violence—and a ban on the ATF from using computers to keep records? Let's vote to allow the CDC to conduct research on gun violence so we can finally have the information and the data we need to fight gun violence as effectively as possible.

Let's also pass a law that finally makes gun trafficking a Federal crime. Over and over again, law enforcement officers keep finding illegally obtained guns being used in crimes. Numerous NYPD officers have been killed by guns that were illegally obtained by criminals, and there is literally no Federal law to stop someone from loading his truck with guns in Georgia, driving up I-95, and selling them in a parking lot in the Bronx directly to criminals and gang members.

I have a bill that would make this illegal. It is called the Hadiya Pendleton and Nyasia Pryear-Yard Gun Trafficking and Crime Prevention Act. It is bipartisan, because both parties agree that gun trafficking is a source of gun violence in our cities.

This bill is named after Nyasia, whom I mentioned earlier, and another teenager from Chicago who was also killed by a stray bullet. Both guns in those crimes were trafficked. So let's pass this bill and finally make gun trafficking a Federal crime.

If we are not trying to solve this problem now, then we are failing as elected leaders. Congress must solve America's gun violence crisis now. It is urgent. Our country is demanding it. Americans deserve more from Congress than just banning bump stocks, just fixing NICS, which, while I strongly support both of them, will not do enough on their own. So let us not fail our country again.

I would like to ask our colleagues to immediately vote to ban semiautomatic assault rifles and bump stocks, to pass a universal background check system and close all of the loopholes, to allow the CDC to research gun violence as a cause of death, to close the gun show loophole, and to finally make gun trafficking a Federal crime.

I yield the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, it was 2 weeks ago yesterday that the tragic incident in Parkland took place—one of many that have impacted our country over the last decade and beyond. That community in Parkland, FL, and the residents of the State of Florida whom I represent—and, frankly, the entire Nation—have demanded not just action but immediate action.

We know—and anyone who watches this process is well aware—that there are deep differences on how far and how much we should restrict the Second Amendment right of every American. We know there are deep differences about whether some of those proposed restrictions work. I imagine those debates and those differences will not be easily resolved and will continue, but I also know there is widespread support and agreement that we must act now—as soon as possible—to do everything we can to prevent another tragedy like Parkland from happening anywhere else ever again. That is a consensus position. No matter where one falls on this debate, no matter how one feels about how far or how restricted restrictions on gun sales in America should be, no matter what your views are on that, I don't know of anyone who is in favor of school shootings, and I don't know anyone who is in favor of seeing another one happen. There is common ground in that regard.

What I have tried to do, over the last couple of weeks, is undertake efforts to determine what changes in Federal law not only could have prevented this attack but could prevent future ones. In that vein, I have met with State and Federal law enforcement investigators involved not just in this case but in gun laws in general. I have met with students and with teachers from Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School, including two teachers who were injured in the attack. I have met with school board administrators. I have met with the community at large, including an appearance last week at a nationally televised townhall. I have been in contact with several of the parents of the victims who lost their lives. I have also spoken to experts in firearm sales. I have spoken to a number of federally licensed firearm dealers who talked about some of the frustrations they have with our existing law and their inability to address people who ultimately turn out to be individuals who should not own any gun of any kind.

So based on these meetings, based on all of this input, and based on all of the other research that is out there leading up to now, the first thing I want to say is, I actually believe this attack could have and should have been prevented if current law had been fully enforced.

This killer was a well-known danger to the school district. He was a well-known danger to the Broward Sheriff's office. He was a well-known danger to

his neighborhood. He was also the subject of two separate and specific warnings to law enforcement agencies: a call to the Broward Sheriff's office last November, a call to an FBI hotline in January.

In essence, we are always telling people, if you see something, say something. People saw something and people said something and other people saw it as well over a course of time. Yet somehow this deranged and violent individual was able to pass a background check and purchase not 1 but 10 separate firearms, and this deranged and violent individual was ultimately able to walk right into the school a few minutes before dismissal and take the lives of 17 innocent Floridians.

This tragedy is the result of a massive multisystemic failure—a failure involving Federal agencies, State agencies, and local authorities who all failed to both identify the threat he posed and coordinate a response to stop him before he took action. It is this failure I hope we will focus on by addressing the shortcomings and vulnerabilities in our current laws and in our current policies. We may still have a debate on the broader issues of regulating gun sales, but irrespective of that debate, we still must and should do this.

So today I wanted to come here for a few minutes and announce a comprehensive plan—not a simple bill you just vote on and move on but a series of measures I believe could prevent these attacks before they happen and that also help schools protect their students and their teachers. I believe these ideas should all enjoy bipartisan support, and, if passed, could and should help prevent the next potential mass shooting.

These are ideas I outline not just because they work, but because I believe we can get the votes to pass them. Sixty votes in the Senate, a majority in the House, and the signature of a President—that is what it takes to turn an idea into a law, and these ideas I am about to outline both work and, I believe, could enjoy that widespread support.

One of the things we have learned is, our schools are woefully unprepared to prevent an attack before it occurs. Furthermore, during my visits to the site of the attack and my followup meeting with teachers at the school, I learned of various changes to school facilities and practices which could have stopped this attack or improved the response. Therefore, I will be joining later today with Senator ORRIN HATCH and others in introducing the STOP School Violence Act.

If passed, this law would provide Federal grants to do some important things that would have been really helpful in this case: strengthen school security infrastructure of the school, provide school training for everyone—

administrators, teachers, even students—to be able to identify threats and to report them. Something that really would be helpful is the creation of a school threat assessment and crisis intervention team. There is a successful program in Los Angeles that does this. That is a team that is a coordination between law enforcement, other State agencies, school districts and the like where they are all talking to each other about students and former students who may pose a threat of violence and intervene before they act.

A second issue we identified is that even if law enforcement, school administrators, or family members believe an individual poses the risk of committing an act of violence, they have very few options to prevent them from purchasing any gun or taking away the guns they already have.

Therefore, I intend to present a new law—perhaps in coordination with others who are working on it now—that will lead to the creation of gun violence restraining orders, something that will give law enforcement and close family members the option of obtaining a court order to prevent gun sales or remove guns from individuals who pose a threat. To be clear, the due process in such a situation would be on the front end, not on the back end.

The third issue we uncovered is, Federal law appears to discourage school systems from reporting dangerous students to law enforcement. I don't support criminalizing all school misconduct, but a student who has threatened violence, who has exhibited violent behavior needs to be reported to law enforcement. A student who has committed a crime by issuing a threat of death using social media—a crime under Florida law—that needs to be reported, but under Broward County school policies, pursuant to something called the PROMISE Program, reporting a student, a dangerous one, to law enforcement is the sixth step—step 6—in their plan. Therefore, I intend to propose changes to the Federal Youth PROMISE Program so a school district plan under this program does not delay and does not discourage law enforcement from being alerted to dangerous and violent or hazardous behavior.

Fourth, we need to strengthen background checks. That is why I have joined with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle pushing for the immediate passage of Fix NICS—something that will require all Federal agencies and incentivize every State to fully report relevant information to the national background check database—because a background check is only as good as the information that is on it. This deranged killer was able to buy guns on 10 separate occasions because he would have passed any background check because none of this stuff that was known about him was reported to that system.

Fifth, we must begin to prosecute the purchase of guns by people prohibited from doing so. Next week, I hope to be joining a bipartisan group, led by Senators TOOMEY and COONS, in filing the "Lie and Try" bill, which will require the FBI to notify States when someone who is not allowed to buy a gun, tries to buy a gun and fails the background check, so they can be investigated, so they can be prosecuted.

In addition, we will be presenting a new law to provide more prosecutors to go after straw purchases, which is where someone buys a gun on behalf of someone else because that someone else could not pass the background check.

Now, there are some additional reforms that I am open to: the possibility of looking at age limits on semiautomatic rifles, the notion of looking at what could be done with high-capacity magazines. We will continue to explore and look at those. These reforms do not enjoy the sort of widespread support in Congress that the other measures I have announced do, and, in order to successfully pass, these ideas will have to be crafted in a way that actually contributes to greater public safety but also do not unnecessarily or unfairly infringe on the Second Amendment right of all law-abiding adults to protect themselves and their families, to hunt, or to participate in recreational shooting.

Ultimately, there are things we can do that have widespread, bipartisan support that we can act on, that we can get passed, that will actually make a difference. These are impactful things.

I urge the Senate and the House, all of my colleagues here, do not hold hostage a piece of legislation that would work and that we all support because it doesn't have everything you want. There are things we can act on and do, and there are things we can continue to argue over, debate, and perhaps do in the future, but on the things we agree on—and they happen to be things that could have prevented this attack and will prevent future attacks—let's get those done. I have outlined those here today. There may be others, but we owe it not just to the victims and the families of Parkland but to all Americans everywhere; for this attack may have happened in Southern Florida, but there is no reason it can't happen somewhere else and, I fear, will happen somewhere else if we do not fix the deficiencies and the flaws in our policies, in our laws, and in the way they are enforced.

We have learned from this incident what is wrong with our system. Let us fix it. We have an opportunity to do so while we continue to debate and work on the issues we do not agree on. That is what I hope we will do, and that is what I commit to doing everything I can to achieve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 42 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Baldwin	Gardner	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hassan	Perdue
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Reed
Capito	Heller	Risch
Carper	Hirono	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Coons	Johnson	Shaheen
Corker	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kaine	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Tester
Cotton	King	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Leahy	Toomey
Daines	Lee	Warner
Donnelly	Manchin	Whitehouse
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	Young

NAYS—28

Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Markey	Stabenow
Cardin	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—3

Flake	McCain	Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Karen Gren Scholer, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, John Kennedy, Richard Burr, Mike Lee, David Perdue, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jeff Flake, Lindsey Graham, Patrick J. Toomey, Marco Rubio, Tom Cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Karen Gren Scholer, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 43 Ex.]

YEAS—96

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

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—3

Flake	McCain	Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Tilman Eugene Self III, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, David Perdue, John Kennedy, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, Bill Cassidy, John Barrasso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Tilman Eugene Self III, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 85, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Ex.]

YEAS—85

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

NAYS—12

Booker	Markey	Sanders
Gillibrand	Menendez	Schatz
Harris	Merkley	Stabenow
Hirono	Peters	Warren

NOT VOTING—3

Flake	McCain	Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 85, the nays are 12.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tilman Eugene Self III, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1:30 p.m. will be equally divided.

The Senator from Mississippi.

IRAN LEGISLATION

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, this Chamber is familiar with deadlines and has a habit of running up against them. We cannot lose sight of May 12, the deadline when President Trump will make a decision about sanctions on Iran.

In January, the President waived sanctions for the last time, calling on Congress to “either fix the deal’s disastrous flaws, or the United States will withdraw.” We now have less than 3 months—a period in which bipartisan consensus on the issue of Iran is absolutely necessary.

To reimpose sanctions would effectively signal the end of America’s participation in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the JCPOA, an agreement better known as the Iran nuclear deal. The plan is flawed, and we cannot fix it without action.

I ask my colleagues for cooperation and collaboration so that we can act in the national interest and prevent the nefarious aims of the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism. When it comes to Iran, we must put aside our differences and work together on a bipartisan bill.

I know that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER, has been working with Senator CARDIN on this issue. Their efforts are commendable and necessary.

Let me stress again that this effort must be bipartisan. One-sided legislation would signal division and weakness on the issue of Iran. A partisan bill would also undermine our diplomatic efforts with the P5+1 countries to improve the JCPOA through a supplemental agreement. I am confident we can do our part.

First, Congress has repeatedly demonstrated its support for countering Iran’s malign activities. Second, President Trump has laid out a clear road map for legislation that he would sign. Finally, this President has the will to

walk away. He has made this promise, and I believe he will keep it.

Let me explore these three points in turn. No. 1, we have a long history of acting in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion on this issue. Last August, the President signed the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act. The legislation included tough new sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program, on its sponsorship of terrorism, and its human rights abuses. The Senate approved it by a vote of 98 to 2, and it earned a vote of 419 to 3 in the House—bipartisan majorities. We also passed by voice vote Senator RUBIO and Senator SHAHEEN's bill to crack down on illicit financing for Iran's client Hezbollah. The House companion also passed by a voice vote.

We have a blueprint for what to do. The President has outlined four proposals addressing critical flaws in the nuclear deal.

One of those proposals is that Iran allow anytime, anywhere inspections. Currently, Iran is blocking international inspectors from accessing military sites, such as the Parchin facility. Inspectors also have to follow elaborate rules even to request and receive access, despite Iran's long history of concealment and deception. If Iran has nothing to hide, then it has no reason to object to anytime, anywhere inspections.

Second, the bill would ensure that Iran never comes close to getting a nuclear weapon. The current nuclear deal attempts to keep Iran 1 year away from breakout—the point at which Iran can rapidly develop a nuclear capability. One year is not much of an insurance policy, especially against the top state sponsor of terrorism. The bottom line is that Tehran should never come close to a nuclear weapon.

Third, the bill needs to maintain restrictions in perpetuity. The so-called sunset clauses are perhaps the most flawed part of the nuclear agreement. The way it currently reads, Iran does not need to cheat. They can simply wait us out. The conventional weapons ban sunsets in 2020. The ban on receiving ballistic missile assistance sunsets in 2023. The ban on replacing old centrifuges with advanced models sunsets in 2026. And all nuclear restrictions—on centrifuges, on enrichment facilities and levels, and on heavy water production—sunset in 2031. The sunset clauses do not stop Iran but kick the can down the road—a road ending in just over a decade.

Finally, the bill cannot overlook the connection between Iran's ballistic missile and nuclear weapons programs. The legislation must severely sanction the ballistic missile program. This is another no-brainer. A nuclear warhead is effective to the extent that it can be launched on a missile. Iran is not developing long-range and sophisticated ballistic missiles to deliver conven-

tional payloads. The architects of the Iran deal, unfortunately, took great pains to keep it focused solely on nuclear. That has to end.

These four demands constitute a sensible framework for the kind of bipartisan legislation that Congress can achieve.

The final reason for my cautious optimism is that we have a President who keeps his promises. When President Trump calls May 12 the last chance, I take him seriously. I would encourage my colleagues to do the same. This President is dead serious about countering Iran's agenda. He said that he would decertify the deal last October. He followed through. That should have erased any doubts.

We should not wait until the eleventh hour to deal with this issue. It is too important. By putting aside personal or political feelings, we can absolutely achieve a bipartisan bill that fixes the Iran deal using the President's framework.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

CONGRATULATING TEAM USA AND THE MINNESOTA OLYMPIC ATHLETES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Team USA and to recognize the contributions of so many Minnesotans at the 2018 Olympic Winter Games in South Korea.

I am happy to be joined here by my Senate colleague from Minnesota, Senator SMITH. Why are Senator SMITH and I here today? We are here because we had an incredible Olympics, with Minnesota really leading the way when it came to the gold medals.

Of course, our State is no stranger to the Olympics. We have sent athletes to compete in women's basketball and cycling. But it shouldn't be a surprise that it is the Winter Olympics where the bold northern State really shines. We have a couple of things going for us. The weather is kind of cold. There is snow, so people are able to practice. We also have a great athletic program at our high schools, and we have a lot of team spirit, which is especially helpful in the teams we were a part of that won the gold, including men's curling and women's hockey.

Of the 243 athletes who were on Team USA, 23 have ties to Minnesota, making it the third highest represented State. These athletes competed at the highest level and showed the world just what our State could do. If Minnesota were competing as a country, it would be tied for 12th, globally in the number of gold medals won. But we are not a country; we are a proud State. This success is something all Minnesotans can celebrate.

Mr. President, here are some examples for you. Winning a gold medal was a first for Afton native Jessie Diggings and a first for the United States. Her

road to the Olympics started on the cross-country skiing trails that cover Minnesota. Jessie worked to keep spirits high in training and during the Olympic competition. She put glitter on her cheeks as a reminder of what made her fall in love with cross-country skiing as a little girl. Her relentless energy and drive were on full display. She and her teammate, Kikkan Randall, became the first Americans to bring home a gold in cross-country team history. It is no surprise that they voted Jessie to be the flag-bearer for the closing ceremony.

Jessie and Kikkan weren't the only American women to bring home gold. The women's hockey team won their first gold medal since 1998.

It is no coincidence that the "State of Hockey" sent some serious talent. The American team included six current or former Gopher College players and two current or former Minnesota Duluth players. From Warroad to Minnetonka, the Minnesotans on Team USA brought pond hockey toughness and the experience that comes from growing up on the ice. This gold medal will help inspire the next generation of hockey players in Minnesota.

I want to make a special note of our incredible goalie, Maddie Rooney. If anyone stayed up—which I did—to watch that shootout at the end, she showed such poise and such grace under pressure.

I also want to make a little note of Warroad, MN, which produced the incredible Gigi Marvin, along with many other gold medalists from the past.

While Americans were fans of hockey well before the 2018 games, these Olympics helped introduce the country to a sport already loved by so many Minnesotans—curling. I will note that Senator CORNYN of Texas sent out a tweet saying that curling was an obscure sport. I don't think anyone thinks that anymore. They might think it is kind of an interesting sport, but it has gone from obscure to cool. A lot of that has to do with the men's curling team. Four out of five of the members of that team were from our home State of Minnesota. In that game, the match went from 1 to 4 in the morning or midnight to 3. I can't tell you how many Minnesotans were up all night watching that and celebrating the gold medal.

The success of Minnesotans has been inspiring, and I know Senator SMITH agrees. From frozen ponds to backyard hills, Minnesota helps bring the winter athlete out in everyone.

I congratulate Team USA and all Minnesota athletes who made these games such a success.

Senator SMITH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. President.

Thank you, Senator KLOBUCHAR, for organizing this colloquy on the Olympic contributions of Minnesotans. I was

proud to work with you on this resolution honoring our Olympians. While I have not yet given my first floor speech—which I plan to do in a couple of weeks—I couldn't pass up the opportunity to come down and talk about our State's amazing athletes.

As I am sure Senator KLOBUCHAR knows, as you have just heard from her, once a Minnesotan can walk, you can bet that his or her parents will try to get them on skis, skates, a sled, or maybe even on the curling rink. That early start—not to mention the fact that Minnesotans are the hardest working and most resilient people I know—helps explain why 23 of our athletes took part in this year's Winter Games. As Senator KLOBUCHAR said, that is the third most of any State in the country. And, boy, did they steal the show. Minnesotans brought home gold medals in women's hockey, women's cross-country skiing, men's curling, and a bronze medal in women's downhill skiing.

I want to talk about Afton, Minnesota's own Jessie Diggins, who carried the Olympic torch for Team USA at the closing ceremony. As Senator KLOBUCHAR said, Jessie began skiing at 4 years old and started racing against high schoolers at age 11. She earned her spot on the Olympic cross-country team and was the only woman to compete in all six women's cross-country events—and compete she did.

Along with her teammate, Kikkan Randall, Jessie won the first Olympic Gold Medal ever for the United States in cross-country skiing—and in dramatic fashion. Jessie came from behind during the final stretch of the race, inching out her competitor as they crossed the finish line.

I am amazed, but not all that surprised, by the accomplishments of my fellow Minnesotans. I am so happy to be able to join Senator KLOBUCHAR in saying we are glad the whole world had the chance to witness what we see every day in our jobs as Senators from Minnesota—Minnesotans doing amazing things.

I yield the floor.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I know Minnesotans will look forward to Senator SMITH's actual first speech, but I think it is a tribute to our State that her first appearance on the Senate floor was about all of these Gold Medals in hockey and curling and skiing.

Thank you.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Terry A. Doughty, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, David Perdue, John Kennedy, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, Bill Cassidy, John Barrasso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Terry A. Doughty, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 45 Ex.]

YEAS—94

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

NAYS—2

Hirono Merkley

NOT VOTING—4

Cardin McCain
Flake Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 2.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Terry A. Doughty, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Ben Sasse, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran, John Kennedy, David Perdue, Tim Scott, Thom Tillis, Dean Heller, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, James M. Inhofe, Tom Cotton, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

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

NO UNCONSTITUTIONAL STRIKE AGAINST NORTH KOREA ACT

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to share my deep concern over what appears to be the Trump administration's intention to go to war with North Korea.

North Korea may have bent over backward to appear conciliatory during the recently concluded Winter Olympics in South Korea, but the Kim Jong

Un regime has not stopped its dangerous activities—far from it. North Korea is a serious and ever-worsening threat to its people, to our allies and partners in the region, and to the United States, but the responsible course of action is to use all tools of American statecraft to reduce those threats.

We have an obligation to American families, servicemembers, and our allies to say, unequivocally, that we did everything in our power to curb North Korea's dangerous behavior without resorting to armed conflict. Instead, I fear that the Trump administration is beating the drums of war.

While the North Korean regime was all smiles during the Olympics, its malign behavior continued. Engineers race to perfect a nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missile. North Korean laborers around the world—modern-day indentured servants—sent paychecks home to the regime, helping fund its illicit military programs. Illegal ship-to-ship transfers of refined petroleum products continued. North Korea's army of cyber warriors grew ever more capable. North Korean military officers reportedly continued to assist and empower Bashar al-Assad's chemical weapons program in Syria, and the Kim regime's thugs made no efforts to scale back rampant human rights abuses.

Many smiled as the North Korean regime won a gold medal in propaganda at the Olympics. All the while, it got ever closer to its ultimate goal of perfecting a nuclear weapon that could reach the United States of America. We missed an opportunity to engage in talks with North Korea, and we did that at our own peril.

While we must continue to ratchet up pressure on North Korea, other elements of President Trump's approach threaten to make an already bad situation even worse.

First, we are all too familiar with the President's reckless rhetoric. Promising "fire and fury" does not minimize tensions. Threatening to "totally destroy" North Korea only increases the chance of deadly miscalculation. Boasting about the size of a nuclear button only makes the United States less safe. How does Donald Trump think Kim Jong Un would react if he believed his rule were under immediate threat? Would Kim restrain himself?

Second, contradictory statements from the Trump administration cause confusion that dampens the prospect of a peaceful solution. Is the Trump administration open to talks with North Korea? We certainly should be. If we are, what are the preconditions, and should we even have any? We hear different thoughts on different days. President Trump routinely undercuts his Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson, and with it, our diplomatic high ground. Confusing our allies in South

Korea and Japan, whose assistance in helping resolve the North Korean crisis is indispensable, only serves to embolden Kim Jong Un, who seeks to drive a wedge between the United States and our allies. We saw this during the Olympics, and we cannot allow that effort to ever take hold.

Third, the Trump administration's recently released budget request for fiscal year 2019 would drastically cut State Department funding. Yet there is no explanation as to why the President believes that it is prudent to cut diplomatic resources, especially in the middle of a crisis. The State Department is already alarmingly understaffed to handle the significant and increasingly more potent threats from North Korea.

Just this week, we found out that the Special Representative for North Korea Policy, Ambassador Joseph Yun—the lead American negotiator with North Korea—is stepping down tomorrow. He is one of the key players in any strategy with Pyongyang. But wait—there is more. We still don't have a U.S. Ambassador to South Korea more than a year into the Trump administration. We still don't have a confirmed Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. We still don't have a special envoy for North Korean human rights issues. We still don't have a sanctions coordinator. It seems the only thing this administration has to show for its concern about North Korea is Donald Trump's Twitter account.

I sent a letter to Secretary Tillerson asking him to explain how the State Department is sufficiently staffed to execute a wide-ranging strategy of diplomatic engagement and pressure, but as I wait for his response, the talk of conflict persists and the drum beat of war grows louder.

Sadly, we have heard this before. In less than 3 weeks, we will mark the 15th anniversary of the U.S. invasion of Iraq. To be clear, the current situation we face with North Korea is not the same as the one we faced in the runup to the Iraq war in 2003, but, as Mark Twain once said, while history does not repeat itself, it does tend to rhyme. We should recognize the similarities and learn the appropriate lessons regarding the use of military force.

Unlike Iraq, North Korea has nearly completed development of long-range missiles, which will be capable of creating nuclear mushroom clouds in our cities. We all agree that we need to act to ensure that this never happens, but nowhere is there a convincing argument for military strikes. There might be a military option for the North Korean nuclear threat, but there is no military solution.

According to July 2017 polls, 76 percent of Americans are worried that the United States will become engaged in a major war in the next 4 years, and 86 percent of Americans believe the military should only be used as a last re-

sort. We should listen to the American people.

Congress must demand that the Trump administration exhaust all diplomatic and economic options in North Korea short of war. I am not the only one who thinks another Korean war would be horrific. Warnings about the consequences of conflict are coming from all corners, including from the senior-most national security and defense officials.

Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis said that conflict on the North Korean Peninsula would be "catastrophic."

Former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry said that a U.S. strike "could turn into a disastrous military operation" and that "a war in the Korean Peninsula that extends to Japan and that goes nuclear would be 10 times worse than the first Korean War."

Victor Cha, who was to be nominated as U.S. Ambassador to South Korea before being removed from contention, stated that "the answer is not, as some Trump administration officials have suggested, a preventive military strike."

Reports suggest that John Bolton, whom President Trump may be considering to replace H.R. McMaster as National Security Advisor, apparently "supports preventive war through a massive strike, if sanctions fail." He said that the United States would have to "simultaneously destroy all known North Korean ballistic missile sites, submarine bases, and artillery, mortar, and missile installments along the North's border with South Korea."

That doesn't include the sites we don't know about. In October, the Department of Defense stated that the "only way to locate and destroy with complete certainty all components of North Korea's nuclear weapons program is through a ground invasion."

Reports from a war game last week indicated that approximately 10,000 Americans could be wounded in combat in just the first few days of a new Korean war. Apparently GEN Mark Milley, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, stated that the "brutality" of conflict on the Korean Peninsula would "be beyond the experience of any living soldier."

Even before these comments, 74 percent of Americans were concerned about a "full-scale war with North Korea."

So we must ask some fundamental questions. On what criteria will the administration judge that all non-military options have been exhausted? Who will be the arbiter of that decision? Will the administration fulfill its constitutional obligation and come to Congress to ask for support? How will the Members of Congress respond to such a request?

It is because of these questions that I am here today. It is why I introduced the No Unconstitutional Strike

Against North Korea Act. This bill would prevent the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies from spending any money to carry out an attack, conventional or nuclear, on North Korea without congressional approval, because we must only use the U.S. military—the most powerful fighting force in the world—if it is absolutely necessary.

At the same time, I recognize that we must do more to stem the North Korea threat. That includes addressing actions by China, the primary enabler of three successful generations of North Korean dictators. We should seek China's partnership in this process, but we must not fear offending the Chinese Communist Party, nor fear China's reaction.

In the interest of our security and the interests of a peaceful resolution, we must, No. 1, cut off the flow of crude oil from China to North Korea—if we do not do this, then we are not going as far as we need to on a package of sanctions; No. 2, give the Kim regime a warning that we expect them to stop selling the slave labor of its people and, in fact, receiving the revenues from that slave labor in order to prop up their regime and to fund a ballistic missile and nuclear program; No. 3, eliminate North Korea's illicit drug trade; No. 4, halt the procurement of key rocket fuel chemicals; and No. 5, restrict its use of the internet to evade sanctions through theft of cryptocurrencies and the committing of other cyber crimes.

We must continue the pressure on North Korea, but it must be combined with simultaneous and direct engagement with North Korea. We have yet to use all of the sanctions that should be imposed upon the North Korean regime. We have a responsibility to ensure that we exhaust all sanctions, and that includes doing everything we can to shut down the flow of crude oil into North Korea, which props up the regime, props up the ballistic missile program, and props up their nuclear weapons program.

Talks with North Korea about these issues are not synonymous with concessions. Talks backed by targeted pressure and stronger alliances are the path pursued by countries that are strong, confident, and wise, while the drumbeat of war, on the other hand, is the sound of fear and insecurity.

We are talking today about sanctions on imported steel and aluminum that come into the United States of America, but we are looking at that as a trade issue. If we want to do something about trade that truly endangers our country, we should be looking at the trade between North Korea and China. We should be looking at the crude oil that continues to flow into North Korea. We should not be talking about a military option until we have exhausted our diplomatic and our eco-

nomic opportunities to bring North Korea to the table.

Without China's agreement on this, we will reach a debate on this floor talking about war with North Korea, but it will not be a debate that took place with the United States—the Trump administration—having exhausted all of the opportunities that a cutoff of crude oil would have and could have presented to bring North Korea to the table. It worked in 2006, it worked in 1994, and I expect, for the sake of the American people, that the President will try to make that work right now. He has not done that yet. This administration has not done that yet.

It is wrong to be hearing this talk about military possibilities and military options before we have exhausted the cutoff of oil, of slave labor, of drugs, of cryptocurrency. We have to do that first. We owe that to history so we are not judged to have rushed irrationally into a war with North Korea that could quickly spiral out of control.

Let's return to a United States of statecraft, allowing our diplomats to advance our interests using our economic tools, our economic strength, as a way of ensuring that we avoid a frivolous loss of life in our country and other countries because we did not pursue a course that would work.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 398, 399, 698, and 699.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Gregory Doud, of Kansas, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador; Jason Kearns, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring December 16, 2024; Dennis Shea, of Virginia, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Geneva Office), with the rank of Ambassador; and C.J. Mahoney, of Kansas, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Investment, Services, Labor, Environment, Africa, China, and the Western Hemisphere), with the rank of Ambassador.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Doud, Kearns, Shea, and Mahoney nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 700 through 709 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, all en bloc.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Lee H. Harvis

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael L. Ahmann
Col. Peter G. Bailey
Col. Malinda M. Beggs
Col. Eric L. Bratu
Col. Benjamin M. Cason
Col. Mark A. Chidley
Col. Troy T. Daniels
Col. Nicholas A. Gentile, Jr.
Col. Thomas F. Grabowski
Col. Andrew W. Love
Col. Richard R. Neely
Col. Russell L. Ponder
Col. Donna M. Prigmore
Col. Robert D. Reyner
Col. James A. Roberts
Col. Raymond S. Robinson, IV
Col. James P. Ryan
Col. Darrin E. Slaten
Col. Christopher L. Smith
Col. Jeffrey S. Smith
Col. Justin B. Smith
Col. Mark A. Weber
Col. Jeffrey L. Wilkinson

Col. John P. York

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Christopher R. Alderdice
Col. Robert S. Grant
Col. Paul N. Loiselle
Col. Wayne M. McCaughey
Col. David J. Mounkes

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Timothy L. Adams
Col. Mark A. Hashimoto
Col. Karl D. Pierson

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John J. DeGoos
Brig. Gen. Robert I. Miller
Brig. Gen. Lee E. Payne

IN THE ARMY

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Jeffrey P. Kramer

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Gordon D. Peters

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Brian B. Brown

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. John J. Allen

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Todd M. Lazaroski

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1235 AIR FORCE nominations (25) beginning PAUL OBI AMALIRI, and ending MEOSHIA A. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2017.

PN1502 AIR FORCE nominations (17) beginning CARL P. BHEND, and ending CHRISTOPHER M. WOLBERT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1503 AIR FORCE nominations (56) beginning STEVEN J. ACEVEDO, and ending HEATHER C. YUN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1504 AIR FORCE nominations (289) beginning NATALIYA A. ABLES, and ending MICHELLE L. ZIELINSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1505 AIR FORCE nominations (67) beginning GEORGE Z. ABERTH, and ending VERANIKA ZAKHARYEVA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1506 AIR FORCE nominations (121) beginning KEVIN D. ALFORD, and ending WINNIFRED M. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1507 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning ANN E. ALEXANDER, and ending PATRICK B. PARSONS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1557 AIR FORCE nomination of David J. Caswell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1558 AIR FORCE nomination of Bruce P. Heseltine, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1559 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL T. CAIN, and ending ILDA Y. ISAZA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1560 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning KERRY L. HIRZEL, and ending JOSHUA S. TRICE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1561 AIR FORCE nomination of Miguel J. Morales, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1562 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning JULIE A. BOWMAN, and ending LARRIN S. WAMPLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1599 AIR FORCE nominations (375) beginning MARC M. ADAIR, and ending JESSE B. ZYDALLIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

IN THE ARMY

PN1154 ARMY nomination of Devry C. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 16, 2017.

PN1508 ARMY nominations (90) beginning ANDREW A. ARNDT, and ending D013347, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1509 ARMY nomination of Tyler M. Abercrombie, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1510 ARMY nomination of Randolph S. Carpenter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1511 ARMY nomination of Angel Soto, which was received by the Senate and ap-

peared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1512 ARMY nominations (2) beginning MATTHEW C. DAWSON, and ending LEE C. NOVY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1565 ARMY nomination of Thomas A. Summers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1566 ARMY nomination of Christina M. Buchner, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1567 ARMY nomination of Marcia L. Lewis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1568 ARMY nomination of Jack E. Shields, III, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1569 ARMY nomination of Jerzy M. Matyszcuk, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1570 ARMY nominations (8) beginning ALECIA D. BIDDISON, and ending ROGER R. WOLD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1571 ARMY nominations (10) beginning JOSEPH W. BISHOP, and ending ROBERT T. UTLAUT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1572 ARMY nomination of Jennifer L. White, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1573 ARMY nomination of Patrick E. Mather, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1574 ARMY nominations (4) beginning LUIS G. FUCHU, and ending DEXTER C. NUNNALLY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1576 ARMY nomination of Olivia H. Ivey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1577 ARMY nomination of Han S. Kim, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1578 ARMY nomination of John E. Richardson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1579 ARMY nomination of Paul A. White, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1580 ARMY nominations (4) beginning ROBERT T. CARTER, JR., and ending CHARLES A. PHILLIPS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1602 ARMY nomination of Kyle R. Stiefel, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1603 ARMY nomination of Adam C. Miller, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1604 ARMY nomination of Mathew M. Condry, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1605 ARMY nominations (45) beginning DAVID A. AMAMOO, and ending D013799,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1606 ARMY nomination of Jason B. Yenrick, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1626 ARMY nomination of David R. Adams, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2018.

PN1627 ARMY nomination of Pankaj A. Ksheersagar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2018.

PN1628 ARMY nomination of Michael P. Sargent, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2018.

PN1630 ARMY nomination of Nicholas E. Hurd, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2018.

PN1631 ARMY nomination of Michael C. Agbay, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2018.

PN1632 ARMY nomination of Jay A. Iannacito, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2018.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1494 MARINE CORPS nomination of Lonnie M. McGhee, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 18, 2018.

PN1591 MARINE CORPS nominations (7) beginning MICHAEL E. FEUQUAY, and ending HEATH E. RUPPERT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1607 MARINE CORPS nominations (7) beginning SHAWN P. CHABOT, and ending RICARDO B. RIVERA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1608 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning ENRIQUE LUZ, JR., and ending JEREMY J. WILLOUGHBY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1609 MARINE CORPS nominations (4) beginning JEFFREY A. BRYANT, and ending JOE A. SAENZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1610 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning ANDREW E. CHEATUM, and ending JOSEPH M. DAVID, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1612 MARINE CORPS nominations (4) beginning BRIAN K. EVANS, and ending JEREMY F. ORTIZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1613 MARINE CORPS nominations (3) beginning DANIEL H. FLICK, and ending JESSE C. TALLMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1614 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning EZRA H. BARDO, and ending MICHAEL C. MEDLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1615 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning MATTHEW C. PAMPUSH, and ending STEPHEN T. SUTTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1616 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning ODIN PINEDA, and ending JAMES M. ROD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN1633 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning NATALIE E. MOORE, and ending BROOKE J. SPEERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2018.

IN THE NAVY

PN1246 NAVY nomination of Henry J. Kennedy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2017.

PN1302 NAVY nomination of John A. Mills, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of December 1, 2017.

PN1513 NAVY nomination of Eric C. Correll, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 2018.

PN1584 NAVY nomination of Jamal L. Headen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1585 NAVY nominations (44) beginning PATRICK P. ARRIGO, and ending OLIVER C. ZUFELT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1586 NAVY nomination of Jessica M. Ferraro, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1587 NAVY nomination of Vijay M. Ravindra, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

PN1589 NAVY nomination of Elisabeth S. Stephens, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2018.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which

have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 18-02, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Ukraine for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$47 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,
GREGORY M. KAUSNER
(For Charles W. Hooper, Lieutenant
General, USA, Director.)

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18-02

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Ukraine.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$29.5 million.
Other \$17.5 million.
Total \$47.0 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Two hundred ten (210) Javelin Missiles.
Thirty-seven (37) Javelin Command Launch Units (CLU) (includes two (2) CLUs to be used as spares).

Non-MDE: Also included are Basic Skill Trainers (BST); United States Government (USG) and contractor technical assistance, transportation, training and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (UP-B-UBT).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission. Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 1, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Ukraine—Javelin Missiles and Command Launch Units

The Government of Ukraine has requested to buy two hundred ten (210) Javelin Missiles and thirty-seven (37) Javelin Command Launch Units (CLUs) (includes two (2) Javelin CLUs to be used as spares). Also included are Basic Skill Trainers (BST); United States Government and contractor technical assistance, transportation, training and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated cost is not to exceed \$47 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of

Ukraine. The Javelin system will help Ukraine build its long-term defense capacity to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity in order to meet its national defense requirements. Ukraine will have no difficulty absorbing this system into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors will be Raytheon/Lockheed Martin Javelin Joint Venture of Orlando, Florida and Tucson, Arizona. However, these missiles are being provided from U.S. Army stocks and the CLUs will be obtained from on-hand Special Defense Acquisition Fund (SDAF)-purchased stocks. There are no known offset agreements proposed in conjunction with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require U.S. Government and/or contractor representatives to travel to Ukraine temporarily in order to conduct training.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18-02

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Javelin Weapon System is a medium-range, man portable, shoulder-launched, fire and forget, anti-tank system for infantry, scouts, and combat engineers. The system weighs 49.5 pounds and has a maximum range in excess of 2,500 meters. The system is highly lethal against tanks and other systems with conventional and reactive armors. The system possesses a secondary capability against bunkers.

2. Javelin's key technical feature is the use of fire-and-forget technology which allows the gunner to fire and immediately relocate or take cover. Additional special features are the top attack and/or direct fire modes, an advanced tandem warhead and imaging infrared seeker, target lock-on before launch, and soft launch from enclosures or covered fighting positions. The Javelin missile also has a minimum smoke motor thus decreasing its detection on the battlefield.

3. The Javelin Weapon System is comprised of two major tactical components, which are a reusable Command Launch Unit (CLU) and a round contained in a disposable launch tube assembly. The CLU incorporates an integrated day-night sight that provides a target engagement capability in adverse weather and countermeasure environments. The CLU may also be used in a stand-alone mode for battlefield surveillance and target detection. The CLU's thermal sight is a second generation Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) sensor. To facilitate initial loading and subsequent updating of software, all onboard missile software is uploaded via the CLU after mating and prior to launch.

4. The missile is autonomously guided to the target using an imaging infrared seeker and adaptive correlation tracking algorithms. This allows the gunner to take cover or reload and engage another target after firing a missile. The missile has an advanced tandem warhead and can be used in either the top attack or direct fire modes (for target undercover). An onboard flight computer guides the missile to the selected target.

5. The Javelin Missile System hardware and the documentation are UNCLASSIFIED. The missile software which resides in the CLU is considered SENSITIVE. The sensi-

tivity is primarily in the software programs which instruct the system how to operate in the presence of countermeasures. The overall hardware is also considered sensitive in that the infrared wavelengths could be useful in attempted countermeasure development.

6. If a technologically advanced adversary obtains knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

7. A determination has been made that Ukraine can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to further the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

8. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Ukraine.

REMEMBERING JOHN TUNNEY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a former Member of this Chamber, Senator John Tunney, whose seat I now hold.

Senator Tunney passed away on January 12 in Brentwood, CA, at the age of 83. His family and friends will gather on Monday to celebrate his life.

The son of a world heavyweight boxing champion, Senator Tunney was born in New York in 1934. After graduating from Yale in 1956, he went on to study law at the University of Virginia.

While attending law school, he was roommates with Senator Ted Kennedy, and the two became lifelong friends.

After graduating in 1959, he began his career in public service as a JAG lawyer in the Air Force. He was eventually stationed in California, where he settled after leaving the military.

He first ran for Congress in 1964, winning a House seat representing Riverside and Imperial Counties. After three terms in the House, when he was only 36 years old, John challenged Senator George Murphy in 1970.

It was highly contested election. Senator Murphy shared the ballot with his good friend, then-Governor Ronald Reagan, who was seeking reelection.

Despite the Governor's popularity, Senator Tunney was able to win and by a wider margin of victory than the Governor. That campaign would serve as the inspiration for Robert Redford's movie, "The Candidate."

Ever the statesmen, Senator Murphy went to Sacramento to meet with Governor Reagan immediately after the election. The two pledged to work together for the betterment of California.

That willingness to reach across the aisle allowed Senator Tunney to be an effective legislator during his career in the Senate.

A champion of civil rights and environmental causes, he passed several major bills, including the Noise Pollu-

tion Act in 1972 and an extension of the Voting Rights Act in 1975.

He also authored the landmark Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, commonly referred to as the Tunney Act. The antitrust bill gave the Justice Department oversight of corporate mergers and acquisitions.

Senator Tunney also played a key role in keeping the United States out of the Angolan civil war, pushing to end the Pentagon's covert operations there.

As a freshman Senator, he authored more than 38 bills, a record few of us here today could claim in our first term.

That success can be attributed in part to the talented staff he hired, including future Congresswoman Jane Harman and Hadley Roff, who later served on my own staff.

Despite his successful record, Senator Tunney lost his reelection bid to S.I. Hayakawa during the anti-incumbent wave that followed Watergate.

Upon leaving office, he continued to practice law, becoming a partner at Manatt, Phelps, Rothenberg & Tunney in Los Angeles.

He also served on the boards of several nonprofits, including Living With Wolves and UCLA's Hammer Museum.

After retiring, Senator Tunney spent most of his time in Idaho, enjoying poetry, reading, fishing, skiing, and hiking with his family.

Senator Tunney is survived by his second wife, Kathinka Osborne Tunney, his six children and stepchildren, and two grandsons.

After his defeat in 1976, Senator Tunney famously said, "When you get into public life, you've got to be prepared to take your knocks."

On behalf of all Californians, I am grateful he was willing to take those knocks and thankful for his life of public service.

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF KOSOVO INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish briefly to note that Saturday, February 17th, marked the 10th anniversary of the independence of Kosovo. I want to congratulate the people of Kosovo on reaching their aspirations for statehood 10 years ago and to support their current aspirations to be part of a democratic, integrated, and peaceful Europe. I urge the government and people of Kosovo to use this anniversary as an occasion to strengthen their commitments to democracy and human rights, to seek reconciliation with their neighbors, and to undertake and fully implement the reforms necessary to move forward in these areas.

In 1998, the situation in Kosovo was markedly different. Still a province of Serbia, with its autonomy unilaterally revoked and its ethnic Albanian majority harshly repressed, Kosovo erupted in conflict. After years of passive resistance to Serbian rule, the people of

Kosovo had enough and began to clamor for their rights. Early international efforts to restore peace were unsustainable, and with U.S. leadership, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, Alliance was compelled to intervene militarily the following year, placing Kosovo under the administration of the United Nations, UN, and opening the question of its status.

The violent chaos of 1998 and 1999—marked by horrific war crimes, massive displacement of populations, and ultimately the death of an estimated 12,000 or more people—made subsequent efforts to reach agreement on Kosovo's status a challenge, and only in February 2008 could Kosovo assert independent statehood based on a plan developed by the respected Finnish politician, Martti Ahtisaari.

This last decade has seen continued challenges as Kosovo has tried to achieve greater recognition of its independence abroad and to develop its democratic political institutions and economy at home. Perhaps the most important and positive development has been the direct dialogue since 2012 between Serbian and Kosovo officials in Brussels, under European Union, EU, auspices. These talks have sought to normalize relations between Belgrade and Pristina and to achieve practical progress that would improve the lives and protect the rights of the people in and from Kosovo. Some agreements have been reached, but implementation has been difficult. This work continues.

As a Member of Congress, both House and Senate, I have been a witness to Kosovo's history. As a member of the U.S. Helsinki Commission for more than two decades and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee since coming to this Chamber in 2007, I have visited Kosovo and participated in numerous hearings on developments there. I have met with its leaders, as well as those of Serbia and other neighbors, and engaged in critical debates on issues ranging from military intervention and peacekeeping operations to diplomatic recognition and bilateral support for the country's democratic and economic development.

As Kosovo moves into a second decade of statehood, I urge those countries that have not yet recognized its independence to do so now, particularly those in the European Union. Kosovo's independence is a reality, and full EU recognition will help pave the way to Kosovo's European integration as it continues to take the necessary steps to strengthen its democratic institutions, respect human rights, and adhere to the rule of law. Progress in these areas is desperately needed and something we should all want. Withholding recognition accomplishes nothing.

While I make this call urging Kosovo's recognition, I want also to

urge Kosovo's political leaders not to wait for outside incentives, but to see progress as in Kosovo's own interest and to make this progress now. Nothing will strengthen support for Kosovo and its integration into Europe in the years to come more than its efforts to take responsibility now for doing the right thing.

In this regard, I encourage the Kosovo Government to make clear its commitment to democracy. The political turmoil in the country has raised questions about the strength of this commitment.

I hope to see steps in Kosovo to boost respect for human and property rights of members of minority communities, whether Serb, Roma, Turk, Bosniak, or any of the others who live in Kosovo. This has been one area where progress has been sadly lacking with regard to what we would expect.

I also urge the Kosovo Government to make progress on justice for past atrocities by supporting the work of the special court established for that purpose and respecting its decisions and judgements. Upholding the rule of law for crimes that individuals in Kosovo have committed will boost Kosovo as a nation and contribute to a sustainable peace and prosperous future.

With its young and enthusiastic population, I personally have little to question about Kosovo's future being bright, but the job of Kosovo's leaders today is to erase all doubts at home and abroad through accelerated progress on the democratic and human rights values we all hold dear. By doing so, Kosovo will make an even stronger claim to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe—OSCE—NATO, and EU memberships it deserves in the years to come.

Let me conclude, by expressing my support for continued U.S. leadership in the Western Balkans, a leadership that ended a decade of regional conflict, helped bring Kosovo to where it is today, and can make a difference still. With Russian and other outside influences seeking to undermine the progress we have made, it is in our interest to engage more actively and offer a positive alternative to a difficult past. It is in our interest to see Kosovo and the entire region stable and secure, reconciled and integrated, and—above all—prosperous. Let this be a time where we not only celebrate the progress we have made in the past decade, but also commit to more rapid progress in the decade to come.

Congratulations, Kosovo, on your 10 years of independence. You can count on the continued support of your friends in the United States.

RECOGNIZING THE RAVALLI COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing

the Ravalli County Sheriff's Department and Sheriff Stephen Holton for their work to prevent an attack on the students and teachers of Darby School District.

Just last week, on the heels of 17 tragic murders in Parkland, FL, a Darby High School senior allegedly made threatening comments and social media posts directed at fellow students and faculty at Darby High School. After receiving information about the concerning threats, Sheriff Holton took action, and law enforcement arrested the student on felony charges.

While we will continue to investigate the tragedy in Florida and the performance of law enforcement in that incident, it is important that we commend students who speak up, school officials who respond, and those law enforcement officers who bravely act to keep our communities safe. The Darby students and school officials did the right thing.

Sheriff Holton and the quick response of students and school officials may have prevented a tragedy in Montana, and for that, we are very grateful.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING SOUTH GEORGIA

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, as the senior Senator from Georgia, it is my honor to pay tribute to South Georgia on its selection as a "2018 Great American Defense Community" by the Association of Defense Communities.

Since 1941, this region of my State has been the proud home of Moody Air Force Base and some of the best airmen in the world.

I congratulate the outstanding South Georgia Military Affairs Council, which is led by local chambers of commerce in Berrien, Cook, Lanier, and Lowndes Counties, and the many community members who work to support Moody Air Force Base. They take great pride in this installation, and they understand how important the brave men and women who are based there are to our national security and to America.

The Great American Defense Communities Program honoring these special volunteers recognizes the overall support that communities and regions in the U.S. provide to service members and military families to help ensure the highest quality of life possible. Selection for this honor is based on community building and integration, support and collaboration, educational and employment opportunities, and veteran and family support.

I have seen firsthand how strongly the airmen and families associated with Moody Air Force Base are supported and appreciated by the South Georgia community. It is much more than simply a place to live. For our

military members serving at Moody, their community is a place to call home. It is family.

Moody Air Force Base is the home to the 23rd Wing "Flying Tigers," which consists of the 23rd Fighter Group, the Air Force's largest A-10 fighter group, the 347th Rescue Group, and the Avon Park Air Force Range, among others. From close air support to combat search and rescue, the dedicated airmen of Moody Air Force Base play a critical role in our national defense and our ability to project power around the globe.

Throughout Georgia, we are fortunate to be home to welcoming communities for the servicemembers who are stationed at military bases across our State. South Georgia is a wonderful example of this spirit of service and patriotism. I congratulate this region and Moody Air Force Base on this distinct honor.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:14 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 535. An act to encourage visits between the United States and Taiwan at all levels, and for other purposes.

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

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

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

H.R. 1865. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-4470. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the President's fiscal year 2019 budget request; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-4471. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Admiral Michael S. Rogers, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4472. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2016 Inventory of Contracted Services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4473. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 28, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4474. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Streamlining the Office of Inspector General's Freedom of Information Act Regulations and Implementing FOIA Improvement Act of 2016" (RIN2508-AA15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 28, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4475. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "North Korea Sanctions Regulations" (31 CFR Part 510) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4476. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the President's fiscal year 2019 budget request; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-4477. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-4478. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Materials from Libya" (RIN1515-AE34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 28, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4479. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law,

the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 28, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4480. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Education Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2019 Annual Performance Plan, and Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2018-2022"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4481. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Education Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2019 Annual Performance Plan, and Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2018-2022"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4482. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Fiscal Year 2017 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Privacy Management Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4483. A communication from the Report to the Nation Delegation Director, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the organization's 2017 annual report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4484. A communication from the Senior Director of Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, Amtrak's fiscal year 2019 General and Legislative Annual Report and fiscal year 2019 grant request; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-174. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that provides the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and regional management councils additional tools to effectively and appropriately manage our nation's important saltwater recreational fisheries; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 118

Whereas, U.S. saltwater fisheries are among the world's largest and most sustainable, providing significant economic impact across the nation. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and regional management councils set catch limits, ensure compliance with fisheries regulations, and reduce unintended catches to provide continued economic and recreational opportunities; and

Whereas, Inaccurate and inconsistent data used to make decisions concerning saltwater fishing stocks, as well as a one-size-fits-all management approach, have led to curtailed recreational fishing opportunities, frustrating recreational anglers and adversely impacting Michigan companies that manufacture recreational fisheries products. Michigan is home to several boat and fishing tackle manufacturers who sell their products

nationwide. These companies employ thousands of skilled workers, having a substantial impact on Michigan's economy; and

Whereas, Improved data collection and implementing management tools more suitable for recreational fisheries will enhance public access to fish and continue to conserve our saltwater fisheries resources. Not only will recreational anglers benefit, but also thousands of fishing-related businesses that depend on reasonable angler access to healthy saltwater fisheries. The Modernizing Recreational Fisheries Management Act of 2017, S. 1520, would update federal fisheries management for recreational angling by allowing alternative management techniques, improve data collection, ensure periodic review of allocations in important mixed-use fisheries, and continue to rebuild overfished stocks, among other benefits, to anglers and the nation, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that provides the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and regional management councils additional tools to effectively and appropriately manage our nation's important saltwater recreational fisheries, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-175. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico requesting the United States Congress and the United States Department of Interior to take the necessary administrative and legislative actions in order to provide for the updating of the various topographic and hydrographic maps of our Island; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. CON. RES. 1

STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

The United States Geological Survey (hereinafter, the USGS) is a scientific organization that provides unbiased information on the health of our ecosystems and the environment; the natural hazards that threaten us; the natural resources, based on the impact of climate change and land use; and the core science systems that allow us to provide timely, relevant, and useful information.

As the Nation's largest water, earth, and biological science mapping agency, the USGS collects, monitors, analyzes, and provides scientific knowledge on the condition of the natural resources and any problems and issues related thereto. The agency's diverse scientific knowledge enables it to conduct large-scale multidisciplinary investigation, and to provide unbiased scientific information to resource managers, planners, and other customers. Likewise, the USGS works in conjunction with other federal agencies as well as the private sector through official memoranda of understanding and memoranda of agreement in order to fulfill the agency's scientific mission.

The services offered by the USGS are of utmost importance for Puerto Rico. The maps drawn by this entity are used for multiple purposes, such as the identification of drainage basins and the topography, land classification, localization, and the location of water resources, properties, delimitation, etc.

As a matter of fact, the USGS's plans are part of the requirements of the permit proc-

ess carried out by the government agencies of Puerto Rico. However, the aforementioned maps are not up to date and most of them date back to many decades. As expected, our Island and its topography have been altered in the last forty (40) or fifty (50) years; therefore, it is necessary to amend and update said maps.

The USGS keeps evolving and, in 2010, the agency made changes to its structure in order to focus on or pay special attention to natural hazards. For such reason, the importance of the accuracy in the records or documents that the agency provides must be recognized. Regarding the USGS's maps of our Island, it is essential that these maps are updated in order to avoid issues in future developments and make an orderly land planning feasible.

In view of these circumstances and through this Concurrent Resolution, this Legislative Assembly hereby requests the United States Congress and the pertinent federal agencies to provide for the updating of the various topographic and hydrographic maps of our Island.

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—To request the United States Congress and the United States Department of Interior to take the necessary administrative and legislative actions in order to provide for the updating of the various topographic and hydrographic maps of our Island.

Section 2.—It is hereby provided that a certification on this Concurrent Resolution shall be issued immediately to be delivered to the United States Congress and the United States Department of the Interior.

Section 3.—This Concurrent Resolution shall be translated into English to be delivered as provided in Section 2.

Section 4.—This Concurrent Resolution shall take effect immediately after its approval.

POM-176. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico memorializing the Assembly's opposition to H.R. 4202, the "Parity in Animal Cruelty Enforcement Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. CON. RES. 28

STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

The sport of cockfighting began in Puerto Rico in the 17th century, when it was officially established on April 5, 1770 by the decree of Spanish governor Don Miguel de Mueas. At that time, cockfighting was already a pastime in most European countries. It was so popular that, during the reign of King Henry VIII, cockfights were held in the Palace of Whitehall, in the courtyards and interiors of churches, and even in the British Parliament. Likewise, cockfights were so popular in France that they adopted the gamecock as their national symbol.

In the United States, some presidents were fans of the sport, among them, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Abraham Lincoln who was known as "Honest Abe" due to being a good pit judge. In fact, for many years, it was acceptable and encouraged in the United States for a gentleman to raise game fowls and be an expert at the sport.

Over the years, cockfight bans began appearing all across the Nation. In 1898, the sport was banned after Puerto Rico became a territory of the United States of America, but underground cockfights continued. However, as a result of the fight put up by the third President of the Senate of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Rafael Martínez-Nadal, who

was a fan of the sport and defended this Island tradition, then Governor of Puerto Rico, Robert Gore, repealed the ban and promulgated legislation which recognized cockfighting as a legitimate sport in the Island.

As a result of the above mentioned, the rule of law has recognized that the sport of cockfighting has been part of our culture and traditions. According to José S. Alegria, "the sport of cockfighting was a leveler that made a gentleman out of all those who visited the pits, regardless of their standing in society." This sport is known as the "gentlemen's sport," because the people who follow the same keep their word during the competitions, without the need for a contract or a similar document for such purposes.

Although this sport has millions of fans in dozens of countries around the world, Puerto Rico is still considered "the Mecca" of cockfighting. The sport is so well established that, unlike many other sports on the Island, cockfighting does not require subsidies from the Government of Puerto Rico. Moreover, it is estimated to generate over twenty-seven thousand (27,000) direct and indirect jobs. Likewise, this sport greatly impacts Puerto Rico's tourism because we receive visitors from Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and other countries who travel to the Island to partake in the sport of cockfighting.

Since its beginnings in Puerto Rico, the sport of cockfighting has faced great challenges and has overcome them. In 2007, the Federal Government passed the Animal Welfare Act[sic], Pub. Law 110-22 which classified as a felony the transport, sale, and purchase of tools and paraphernalia relating to this activity, among other things. At that time, the territories and places where cockfighting was legal were excluded from the application of the Act.

However, HR 4202 was introduced on November 1 of this year, jeopardizing the continuity of this sport in Puerto Rico. On this occasion, the express intent of the bill is to extend the total ban against animal fighting set forth in the "Animal Welfare Act" to the United States territories. Moreover, it prohibits the purchase, sale, or transportation of accessories to be used in cockfights, and even imposes penalties of imprisonment. The congress members who introduced this measure consider these types of fights animal cruelty.

It is worth noting that the sport of cockfighting in Puerto Rico is well regulated. For instance, safety measures are taken to guarantee that participating gamecocks wear the same spurs and are of the same age, weight, and bet. Furthermore, pit judges are empowered to stop the fight if they notice either excessive punishment or that a gamecock is not fit to continue fighting. Once the fight is over, both gamecocks are examined by specialized staff and treated accordingly for their prompt recovery. Hence, it is evident that our industry has taken measures to ensure the protection of gamecocks.

The enactment of HR 4202 shall threaten a century-old practice that is deeply rooted in our culture, history, and traditions. Moreover, said bill shall affect various components of our economy that provide services related to this sport, such as veterinarians, game fowl breeders, agricultural stores, and trophies and awards manufacturers, among others. For all of the foregoing, the Legislative Assembly is compelled to firmly and unequivocally reject the enactment of HR 4202, since it does not take into account the adverse effect that such bill shall have on Puerto Rico's economy and culture.

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—To express the firm and unequivocal repudiation and opposition of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico to HR 4202 of the United States House of Representatives that seeks to apply the “Animal Welfare Act” to United States territories and, consequently, prohibits cockfights in Puerto Rico.

Section 2.—A certified copy of this Concurrent Resolution translated into English shall be delivered to the members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress and to the President of the United States of America.

Section 3.—This Concurrent Resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

POM-177. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana urging the President of the United States and United States Congress to instruct the Environmental Protection Agency to remove Lake and Porter counties from the Chicago Nonattainment Area; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION FOUR

Whereas, The motor vehicle inspection and maintenance (I/M) programs in Lake and Porter counties were mandated by the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, based on Lake and Porter counties’ designation as “nonattainment”, along with northeast Illinois and southeast Wisconsin, under the one-hour ozone standard;

Whereas, According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), cars and trucks collectively are the single greatest contributor to ground-level ozone, the major component of smog;

Whereas, The purpose of an I/M program is to reduce ground-level ozone by ensuring that the emission control systems on vehicles are working correctly;

Whereas, Generally, only vehicles registered in Lake and Porter counties are subject to the I/M programs in Lake and Porter counties;

Whereas, Lake and Porter counties in northwest Indiana are intersected by Interstate Highway 80/90 and Interstate Highway 94, two of the most heavily traveled highways in the Midwest, and Lake County is also intersected by Interstate Highway 65, another heavily traveled highway, linking major southern cities with Indianapolis and Chicago;

Whereas, The citizens of Lake and Porter counties have been burdened with the cost of the testing and remediation required under the I/M program, even though thousands of out-of-state vehicles pass through these areas on a daily basis without the burden of submitting to the I/M program;

Whereas, Lake and Porter counties are linked to the Chicago Nonattainment Area based on violations in northeast Illinois and southeast Wisconsin;

Whereas, Under the standards promulgated in 2015 for ozone, nine monitors within the Chicago Nonattainment Area exceed the standard, but none of the monitors are located in Indiana; and

Whereas, Lake and Porter counties have the most stringent suite of control measures in the Midwest, and have consistently met EPA’s objectives; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:

Section 1. That the Indiana General Assembly urges the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Michael R. Pence, Vice President of the United States; and members of the

United States Congress from Indiana to instruct the Environmental Protection Agency to remove Lake and Porter counties from the Chicago Nonattainment Area, and thereby eliminate the requirements under which the motor vehicle inspection and maintenance programs in Lake and Porter counties are operated.

Section 2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Michael R. Pence, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable Joe Donnelly, the Honorable Todd Young, the Honorable Pete Visclosky, the Honorable Jackie Walorski, the Honorable Jim Banks, the Honorable Todd Rokita, the Honorable Susan Brooks, the Honorable Luke Messer, the Honorable Andre Carson, the Honorable Larry Bucshon, and the Honorable Trey Hollingsworth of the U.S. Congress; Scott Pruitt, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency; and Robert A. Kaplan, the Acting Regional Administrator for EPA Region 5 in Chicago.

POM-178. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California relative to the 45th anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 72

Whereas, January 22, 2018, marks the 45th anniversary of the United States Supreme Court’s landmark decision in Roe v. Wade, which affirmed that every woman has a fundamental right to control her own reproductive decisions and to decide whether to end or to continue pregnancy, and is an occasion deserving of acknowledgment; and

Whereas, Roe v. Wade has been the cornerstone of women’s ability to control their reproductive lives, allowing every woman in the United States the right to decide when, if, and with whom to have children, and how many children to have; and

Whereas, Women’s ability to control their reproductive lives has helped and facilitated their participation in the economic and social life of our nation; and

Whereas, Roe v. Wade has drastically reduced the maternal mortality rate for women terminating their pregnancies in the United States. In the years prior to the decision, illegal abortion accounted for approximately 17 percent of all reported deaths attributable to pregnancy and childbirth, and many women were severely injured as a result of “back alley” abortion procedures; and

Whereas, Interference with a woman’s right to choose causes women to be forced into illegal and dangerous abortions, as they often were in the United States before the Roe v. Wade decision. Many women are forced to make these decisions today in countries where abortion is illegal and unsafe. Each year between 4.7 percent to 13.2 percent of maternal deaths can be attributed to unsafe abortion. Many survivors of an illegal abortion suffer serious and often permanent injuries; and

Whereas, Roe v. Wade continues to protect the health and freedom of women throughout the United States; and

Whereas, The State of California stands in strong support of every woman’s fundamental right, as confirmed in Roe v. Wade, to make her own decisions regarding her pregnancy; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate urges the President of the United States and the United States Congress to express their support for a wom-

an’s fundamental right to control her own reproductive decisions, as well as their support for access to comprehensive reproductive health care, including the services provided by Planned Parenthood; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Billy J. Williams, of Oregon, to be United States Attorney for the District of Oregon for the term of four years.

Mark S. James, of Missouri, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Missouri for the term of four years.

Daniel C. Mosteller, of South Dakota, to be United States Marshal for the District of South Dakota for the term of four years.

Jesse Seroyer, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Alabama for the term of four years.

By Mr. BURR for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

*Isabel Marie Keenan Patelunas, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of the Treasury.

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2477. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to modify the exception to the work requirement; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the deduction for advertising and promotional expenses for prescription drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2479. A bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to address deferred maintenance at agricultural research facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2480. A bill to prohibit agreements between employers that directly restrict the current or future employment of any employee; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2481. A bill to increase the penalties for fentanyl trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2482. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require the Attorney General to establish a section within the Department of Justice with responsibility for the enforcement of laws against suspected operatives or agents of foreign governments, to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2483. A bill to provide greater access to higher education for America's students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2484. A bill to enhance Social Security benefits for children, divorced spouses, and widows and widowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 2485. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide payment of Medal of Honor special pension under such title to the surviving spouse of a deceased Medal of Honor recipient, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2486. A bill to repeal the Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990 and amendments to that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2487. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide certain data on conservation practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2488. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to exclude the receipt of basic allowance for housing for members of the Armed Forces in determining eligibility for certain Federal benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 2489. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities for housing and buildings on adequate farms, to establish a technical assistance program to improve access by Tribal entities to rural development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 419. A resolution designating the week of February 26 through March 4, 2018, as "National Eating Disorders Awareness Week" and supporting the goals and ideals of raising awareness and understanding of eating disorders; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 420. A resolution designating March 3, 2018, as "World Wildlife Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 421. A resolution condemning the horrific attack in Parkland, Florida, and expressing support and prayers for all those impacted by that tragedy; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 422. A resolution designating March 2, 2018, as "Read Across America Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 423. A resolution designating February 28, 2018, as "Rare Disease Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 422

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 422, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 1539

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1539, a bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence.

S. 1676

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to provide grants for access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1905

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1905, a bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services.

S. 2015

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 2105

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2105, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 2174

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2174, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the Veterans Crisis Line.

S. 2271

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2271, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

S. 2284

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2284, a bill to strengthen Buy American requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 2334

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2334, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide clarity with respect to, and to modernize, the licensing system for musical works under section 115 of that title, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of that title, and for other purposes.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2430

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2430, a bill to provide a permanent appropriation of funds for the payment of death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services in event of any period of lapsed appropriations.

S. 2458

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2458, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms and explosives and Federal firearms and explosives licenses and permits to known or suspected terrorists.

S.J. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2018, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 419—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 26 THROUGH MARCH 4, 2018, AS "NATIONAL EATING DISORDERS AWARENESS WEEK" AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF RAISING AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF EATING DISORDERS

Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 419

Whereas eating disorders affect 30,000,000 individuals in the United States at some point during their lifetimes;

Whereas eating disorders are caused by a complex interaction of genetic, biological, social, behavioral, and psychological factors;

Whereas eating disorders include anorexia nervosa, bulimia nervosa, binge eating disorder, avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder, and other feeding or eating disorders;

Whereas individuals with eating disorders have some of the highest mortality rates of all mental illnesses;

Whereas there is a high prevalence of eating disorders among members of the Armed Forces on active duty and veterans;

Whereas many health professionals receive limited or no formal training about eating disorders or the identification and treatment of eating disorders;

Whereas best practices for the treatment of an eating disorder includes the involvement of the patient, the family of the patient, and a comprehensive team of professionals such as social workers, mental health counselors, primary care practitioners, psychiatrists, psychologists, dietitians, and other specialty providers; and

Whereas more research on eating disorders is needed to inform evidence-based treatments, promote prevention efforts, facilitate early identification, and provide insight on

illness causation and the effects of eating disorders on minds and bodies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of February 26 through March 4, 2018, as "National Eating Disorders Awareness Week";

(2) supports the goals and ideals of a national week to raise public awareness and understanding of eating disorders and the millions of families in the United States affected by eating disorders;

(3) recognizes the need for treatment of individuals with eating disorders;

(4) acknowledges the need for further research on eating disorders; and

(5) encourages Federal, State, and local governments, and citizens of the United States—

(A) to support National Eating Disorders Awareness Week through programs and activities; and

(B) to promote public awareness of eating disorders.

SENATE RESOLUTION 420—DESIGNATING MARCH 3, 2018, AS "WORLD WILDLIFE DAY"

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

S. RES. 420

Whereas wildlife has provided numerous economic, environmental, social, and cultural benefits during the course of human history and wildlife conservation will secure those gifts for future generations;

Whereas plant and animal species play an important role in the stability of diverse ecosystems around the world and the conservation of that biodiversity is critical to maintain the delicate balance of nature and keep complex ecosystems thriving;

Whereas observation of wild plants and animals in their natural habitat provides individuals with a more enriching worldview and a greater appreciation of the wonders of the natural environment;

Whereas tens of millions of individuals in the United States strongly support the conservation of wildlife, both domestically and abroad, and wish to ensure the survival of species in the wild, such as rhinoceroses, tigers, elephants, pangolins, turtles, seahorses, sharks, ginseng, mahogany, and cacti;

Whereas the trafficking of wildlife, including timber and fish, comprises the fourth largest global illegal trade after narcotics, the counterfeiting of products and currency, and human trafficking and has become a major transnational organized crime with an estimated worth of as much as \$19,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas increased demand in Asia for high-value illegal wildlife products, particularly elephant ivory and rhinoceros horns, has triggered substantial and rapid increases in poaching of those species;

Whereas the trafficking of wildlife is a primary threat to many wildlife species, including elephants, rhinoceroses, tigers, pangolins, and sharks;

Whereas many different kinds of criminals, including some terrorist entities and rogue security personnel, often in collusion with corrupt government officials, are involved in wildlife poaching and the movement of ivory and rhinoceros horns across Africa;

Whereas wildlife poaching presents significant security and stability challenges for military and police forces in African nations

that are often threatened by heavily armed poachers and the criminal, extremist allies of those poachers;

Whereas wildlife poaching negatively impacts local communities that rely on natural resources for economic development, including through tourism;

Whereas penal and financial deterrents can improve the ability of governments to reduce poaching and trafficking and enhance the capabilities of those governments in managing resources;

Whereas assisting institutions in developing nations, including by providing material, training, legal, and diplomatic support, can reduce illegal wildlife trade;

Whereas wildlife provides a multitude of benefits to all nations and wildlife crime has wide-ranging economic, environmental, and social impacts;

Whereas the African Elephant Status Report 2016 issued by the International Union for Conservation of Nature revealed that the elephant population of Africa has recently seen a dramatic decline, mainly due to poaching during the 10 years preceding the issuance of the report, and the continental population is now thought to be 415,428;

Whereas the estimated African elephant population decreased by approximately 93,000 between 2006 and 2015, despite the inclusion of approximately 18,000 elephants that were previously uncounted, making the actual decline closer to 111,000;

Whereas, from 2007 to 2012, the number of elephants killed in Kenya increased by more than 800 percent, from 47 to 387 elephants killed;

Whereas, between 2002 and 2013, as a result of poaching, about 65 percent of the forest elephant population was killed and that species lost 30 percent of its geographical range;

Whereas World Wildlife Fund elephant surveys conducted between 2014 and 2016 and covering 6,000,000 hectares confirmed this catastrophic trend, documenting losses of 66 percent of the remaining elephants between 2008 and 2016, placing forest elephants on track for extinction in the next decade;

Whereas fewer than 50,000 wild Asian elephants remain and poaching of these populations is on the rise, with an average of 1 elephant poached every week in Burma, driven by demand for elephant skin products;

Whereas the number of rhinoceroses killed by poachers in South Africa—

(1) dramatically increased from 13 in 2007 to 1,215 in 2014, an increase of more than 9,000 percent; and

(2) was 1,028 in 2017;

Whereas the 3 species of Asian rhinoceroses also remain under constant threat of poaching, with a greater 1-horned rhinoceros poached in Kaziranga National Park in India as recently as January 2018;

Whereas pangolins are often referred to as the most trafficked mammal in the world;

Whereas all 8 pangolin species spanning Africa and Asia are faced with extinction because pangolin scales are sought after in the practice of traditional Chinese medicine and pangolin meat is considered a delicacy;

Whereas approximately 100,000,000 sharks are killed annually, often targeted solely for their fins, and unsustainable trade is the primary cause of serious population decline in several shark species, including scalloped hammerhead sharks, great hammerhead sharks, and oceanic whitetip sharks;

Whereas the vaquita porpoise of Mexico, with fewer than 30 individual porpoises remaining, is being driven to extinction through bycatch in gillnets set for the totoaba fish, the swim bladder of which feeds

a lucrative illegal trade through the United States to Asia;

Whereas tiger populations have plummeted by 95 percent over the last 100 years and African lion populations have declined by 40 percent over the last 20 years;

Whereas fewer than 4,000 tigers remain in the wild throughout all of Asia;

Whereas there are more than 7,000 tigers in farms in China, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam, which continues to stoke demand for illegal tiger products and contributes to 30 percent of illegal trading with respect to that animal;

Whereas the United States is developing and implementing measures to address the criminal, financial, security, and environmental aspects of wildlife trafficking;

Whereas Congress has allocated specific resources to combat wildlife trafficking and address the threats posed by poaching and the illegal wildlife trade;

Whereas Congress recently passed the Eliminate, Neutralize, and Disrupt Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2016 (16 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.) to strengthen the response of the United States to the global wildlife trafficking crisis;

Whereas, in December 2013, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed March 3 as World Wildlife Day to celebrate and raise awareness of the wild fauna and flora around the world;

Whereas March 3, 2018, represents the fifth annual celebration of World Wildlife Day;

Whereas, in 2018, the theme of World Wildlife Day is “Big cats: predators under threat”; and

Whereas, in 2018, World Wildlife Day commemorations will raise awareness about the plight of big cats and galvanize support for the many global and national actions that are underway to save those iconic species: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 3, 2018, as “World Wildlife Day”;

(2) supports raising awareness of the benefits that wildlife provides to people and the threats facing wildlife around the world;

(3) supports escalating the fight against wildlife crime, including wildlife trafficking;

(4) applauds the domestic and international efforts to escalate the fight against wildlife crime;

(5) commends the efforts of the United States to mobilize the entire Federal Government in a coordinated, efficient, and effective manner for dramatic progress in the fight against wildlife crime; and

(6) encourages continued cooperation between the United States, international partners, local communities, nonprofit organizations, private industry, and other partner organizations in an effort to conserve and celebrate wildlife, preserving this precious resource for future generations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 421—CONDEMNING THE HORRIFIC ATTACK IN PARKLAND, FLORIDA, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT AND PRAYERS FOR ALL THOSE IMPACTED BY THAT TRAGEDY

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER,

Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:.

S. RES. 421

Whereas on February 14, 2018, a mass shooting took place at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida;

Whereas the people of the United States mourn the 17 innocent lives that were lost at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in this unthinkable tragedy;

Whereas the people of the United States continue to pray for those who were wounded in the attack and continue to recover; and

Whereas the people of the United States are grateful for the quick action of first responders who cared for the injured: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, that took place on Wednesday, February 14, 2018;

(2) honors the memory of the victims that were killed;

(3) expresses hope for a full and speedy recovery and pledges continued support for people that were injured in the attack;

(4) offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to all of the students, teachers, administrators, and faculty of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, as well as the families, friends, and loved ones affected by the tragedy; and

(5) honors the selfless and dedicated service of—

(A) the teachers, school administrators, school support staff, medical professionals, and other individuals in the Broward County community;

(B) the emergency response teams and law enforcement officials who responded to the call of duty; and

(C) the law enforcement officials who continue to investigate the attack.

SENATE RESOLUTION 422—DESIGNATING MARCH 2, 2018, AS “READ ACROSS AMERICA DAY”

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 422

Whereas reading is a basic requirement for quality education and professional success and a source of pleasure throughout life;

Whereas the people of the United States must be able to read if the United States is to remain competitive in the global economy;

Whereas Congress has placed great emphasis on reading intervention and providing additional resources for reading assistance, including through the programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) and through annual appropriations for library and literacy programs; and

Whereas more than 50 national organizations concerned about reading and education have joined with the National Education Association to designate March 2, the anniversary of the birth of Theodor Geisel (commonly known as “Dr. Seuss”), as a day to celebrate reading: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2, 2018, as “Read Across America Day”;

(2) honors—

(A) all authors for their success in encouraging children to discover the joy of reading; and

(B) the 21st anniversary of Read Across America Day; and

(3) encourages—

(A) parents, educators, and communities to read with children for at least 30 minutes on Read Across America Day and promote a love of reading and opportunities for all children to see themselves reflected in literature in honor of the commitment of the Senate to building a country of readers; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe Read Across America Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 423—DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 28, 2018, AS “RARE DISEASE DAY”

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 423

Whereas a rare disease or disorder is one that affects a small number of patients, which in the United States is considered to be a population of less than 200,000 individuals;

Whereas, as of February 2018, nearly 7,000 rare diseases affect approximately 30,000,000 people in the United States and their families;

Whereas children with rare diseases account for about half of the population affected by rare diseases in the United States;

Whereas many rare diseases are serious and life-threatening and lack effective treatments;

Whereas, as a result of the Orphan Drug Act (Public Law 97-414; 96 Stat. 2049), important advances have been made in the research and treatment of rare diseases;

Whereas the Food and Drug Administration has made great strides in gathering patient perspectives to inform the drug review process as part of the Patient-Focused Drug Development program, an initiative that originated under the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (Public Law 112-144; 126 Stat. 993);

Whereas, although more than 600 drugs and biological products have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of rare diseases, millions of people in the United States have a rare disease for which there is no approved treatment;

Whereas lack of access to effective treatments and difficulty in obtaining reimbursement for life-altering, and even life-saving, treatments still remain significant challenges for people with rare diseases and their families;

Whereas rare diseases and conditions include aplastic anemia, porphyria, spina bifida, stiff person syndrome, Gaucher disease, diffuse pulmonary lymphangiomatosis, adrenoleukodystrophy, Noonan syndrome, Rett syndrome, Moebius syndrome, Castleman Disease, epidermolysis ichthyosis, and short bowel syndrome;

Whereas people with rare diseases experience challenges that include—

(1) difficulty in obtaining an accurate diagnosis;

(2) limited treatment options; and

(3) difficulty finding physicians or treatment centers with expertise in rare diseases;

Whereas the rare disease community gained important new tools during the 115th Congress with the enactment of the FDA Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-52; 131 Stat. 1005), which—

(1) advanced and facilitated the development and timely approval of drugs and biologics for rare diseases, including diseases affecting children;

(2) reauthorized user fees to help deliver safe and effective treatments to individuals with rare diseases;

(3) supported the utilization of real-world evidence;

(4) supported patient-focused drug development; and

(5) supported the National Evaluation System for Health Technology;

Whereas both the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health have established special offices to support and facilitate rare disease research and treatments;

Whereas the National Organization for Rare Disorders (referred to as “NORD” in this preamble), a nonprofit organization established in 1983 to provide services to and advocate on behalf of patients with rare diseases, remains a critical public voice for people with rare diseases;

Whereas 2018 marks the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Orphan Drug Act and the establishment of NORD;

Whereas NORD sponsors Rare Disease Day in the United States and partners with many other major rare disease organizations to increase public awareness of rare diseases;

Whereas Rare Disease Day is observed each year on the last day of February;

Whereas Rare Disease Day is a global event that was first observed in the United States on February 28, 2009, and observed in more than 94 countries in 2017; and

Whereas Rare Disease Day is expected to be observed globally for years to come, pro-

viding hope and information for rare disease patients around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates February 28, 2018, as “Rare Disease Day”;

(2) recognizes the importance of improving awareness and encouraging accurate and early diagnosis of rare diseases and disorders; and

(3) supports a national and global commitment to improving access to and developing new treatments, diagnostics, and cures for rare diseases and disorders.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Lieutenant General Paul M. Nakasone, USA, to be general and Director, National Security Agency/Chief, Central Security Service/Commander, United States Cyber Command, Department of Defense, and Brent K. Park, of Tennessee, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration, and Anne Marie White, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary (Environmental Management), both of the Department of Energy.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Semiannual monetary policy report to the Congress.”

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Implementation of Positive Train Control.”

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Administration’s Framework for Rebuilding Infrastructure in America.”

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Robert Frank Pence, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland, and Trevor D. Traina, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria, both of the Department of State, and Judy Lynn Shelton, of Virginia, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nomination: John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Joel M. Carson III, of New Mexico, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Colm F. Connolly, and Maryellen Noreika, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Delaware, William F. Jung, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Ryan T. Holte, of Ohio, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Jonathan F. Mitchell, of Washington, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, and Billy J. Williams, to be United States Attorney for the District of Oregon, Mark S. James, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Missouri, Daniel C. Mosteller, to be United States Marshal for the District of South Dakota, and Jesse Seroyer, Jr., to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Alabama, all of the Department of Justice.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed business meeting followed by a closed briefing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 1, 2018 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining Federal Managers’ Roles in Hiring.”

RURAL WIRELESS ACCESS ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 305, S. 1621.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1621) to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a methodology for the collection by the Commission of information about commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1621) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1621

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rural Wireless Access Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. METHODOLOGY FOR COLLECTION OF MOBILE SERVICE COVERAGE DATA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “commercial mobile data service” has the meaning given the term in section 6001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401);

(2) the term “commercial mobile service” has the meaning given the term in section 332(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(d));

(3) the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission;

(4) the term “coverage data” means, if commercial mobile service or commercial mobile data service is available, information about the service, which may include available speed tiers and performance characteristics; and

(5) the term “Universal Service program” means the universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254) and the regulations issued under that section.

(b) METHODOLOGY ESTABLISHED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to establish a methodology that shall apply to the collection of coverage data by the Commission for the purposes of—

- (1) the Universal Service program; or
- (2) any other similar program.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The methodology established under subsection (b) shall—

(1) contain standard definitions for different speed tiers, such as the 2G, 3G, 4G, and 4G LTE tiers;

(2) ensure that coverage data is collected in a consistent and robust way;

(3) improve the validity and reliability of coverage data; and

(4) increase the efficiency of coverage data collection.

PROVIDING FOR A CONSISTENT ELIGIBILITY DATE FOR PROVISION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEMORIAL HEADSTONES AND MARKERS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3656 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3656) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a consistent eligibility date for provision of Department of Veterans Affairs memorial headstones and markers for eligible spouses and dependent children of veterans whose remains are unavailable.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 3656) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROVIDING CERTAIN BURIAL BENEFITS FOR SPOUSES AND CHILDREN OF VETERANS WHO ARE BURIED IN TRIBAL CEMETERIES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2248 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2248) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain burial benefits for spouses and children of veterans who are buried in tribal cemeteries, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion

to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 2248) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2248

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

SECTION 1. ELIGIBILITY OF SPOUSES AND CHILDREN OF VETERANS BURIED IN TRIBAL CEMETERIES FOR CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BURIAL BENEFITS.

Section 2306 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by inserting “or a veterans’ cemetery owned by a tribal organization or on land owned by or held in trust for a tribal organization” after “State”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting “, a veterans’ cemetery of a tribal organization or on land owned by or held in trust for a tribal organization” after “owned by a State”;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(B) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “(1) The Secretary”;

(C) by striking “a national cemetery or in a veterans cemetery of a State or tribal organization for which the Department has provided a grant under section 2408 of this title” and inserting “a covered cemetery”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) The term ‘covered cemetery’ means any of the following:

“(A) A national cemetery.

“(B) A veterans’ cemetery of a State for which the Department has provided a grant under section 2408 of this title.

“(C) A veterans’ cemetery of a tribal organization or on land owned by or held in trust for a tribal organization for which the Department has provided a grant under subsection (f) of such section.”; and

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

“(i) In this section, the term ‘tribal organization’ has the meaning given such term in section 3765 of this title.”.

VETERANS CEMETERY BENEFIT CORRECTION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2372 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2372) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion

to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 2372) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2372

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans Cemetery Benefit Correction Act”.

SEC. 2. PROVISION OF OUTER BURIAL RECEPTACLES FOR REMAINS BURIED IN NATIONAL PARKS.

Section 2306(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “(A)” before “The Secretary of Veterans”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking “The Secretary of the Army” and inserting the following:

“(B) The Secretary of the Army”; and

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

“(C) The Secretary of the Interior shall provide an outer burial receptacle for each such a grave in an open national cemetery administered by the National Park Service.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “or in the Arlington National Cemetery” and inserting “, in the Arlington National Cemetery, or in a national cemetery administered by the National Park Service”; and

(B) by striking “or Secretary of the Army” and inserting “, the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of the Interior”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(B)(ii), by striking “or, with respect to Arlington National Cemetery, the Secretary of the Army” and inserting “or the Secretary of the Army with respect to Arlington National Cemetery or the Secretary of the Interior with respect to a national cemetery administered by the National Park Service”; and

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking “or, with respect to Arlington National Cemetery, the Secretary of the Army” and inserting “or the Secretary of the Army with respect to Arlington National Cemetery or the Secretary of the Interior with respect to a national cemetery administered by the National Park Service”.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 419, S. Res. 420, S. Res. 421, S. Res. 422, and S. Res. 423.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolutions en bloc.

The resolutions were agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preambles be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The preambles were agreed to. (The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, March 5; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Scholer nomination under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2018, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:58 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 5, 2018, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

HENRY E. HUDSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2021. VICE DABNEY LANGHORNE FRIEDRICH, TERM EXPIRED.

WILLIAM GRAHAM OTIS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2021. VICE PATTI B. SARIS, TERM EXPIRED.

WILLIAM H. PRYOR, JR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2023. (REAPPOINTMENT)

WILLIAM H. PRYOR, JR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE CHAIR OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION, VICE PATTI B. SARIS.

LUIS FELIPE RESTREPO, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2019. VICE KETANJI BROWN JACKSON, TERM EXPIRED.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination pursuant to the order of 06/28/1990 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*ANNE MARIE WHITE, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT).

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 2018:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

GREGORY DOUD, OF KANSAS, TO BE CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

JASON KEARNS, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2024.

THE JUDICIARY

A. MARVIN QUATTLEBAUM, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DENNIS SHEA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE (GENEVA OFFICE), WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

C. J. MAHONEY, OF KANSAS, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE (INVESTMENT, SERVICES, LABOR, ENVIRONMENT, AFRICA, CHINA, AND THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE), WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. LEE H. HARVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL L. AHMANN
COL. PETER G. BAILEY
COL. MALINDA M. BEGGS
COL. ERIC L. BRATU
COL. BENJAMIN M. CASON
COL. MARK A. CHIDLEY
COL. TROY T. DANIELS
COL. NICHOLAS A. GENTILE, JR.
COL. THOMAS F. GRABOWSKI
COL. ANDREW W. LOVE
COL. RICHARD R. NEELY
COL. RUSSELL L. PONDER
COL. DONNA M. PRIGMORE
COL. ROBERT D. REYNER
COL. JAMES A. ROBERTS
COL. RAYMOND S. ROBINSON IV
COL. JAMES P. RYAN
COL. DARRIN E. SLATEN
COL. CHRISTOPHER L. SMITH
COL. JEFFREY S. SMITH
COL. JUSTIN B. SMITH
COL. MARK A. WEBER
COL. JEFFREY L. WILKINSON
COL. JOHN P. YORK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTOPHER R. ALDERDICE
COL. ROBERT S. GRANT
COL. PAUL N. LOISELLE
COL. WAYNE M. MCCAUGHEY
COL. DAVID J. MOUNKES

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY L. ADAMS
COL. MARK A. HASHIMOTO
COL. KARL D. PIERSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN J. DEGOES

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT I. MILLER
BRIG. GEN. LEE E. PAYNE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY P. KRAMER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) GORDON D. PETERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. BRIAN B. BROWN

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN J. ALLEN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. TODD M. LAZAROSKI

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL OBI AMALIRI AND ENDING WITH MEOSHIA A. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 14, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARL P. BREND AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER M. WOLBERT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 19, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN J. ACEVEDO AND ENDING WITH HEATHER C. YUN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 19, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATALIYA A. ABLES AND ENDING WITH MICHELLE L. ZIELINSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 19, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE Z. ABERTH AND ENDING WITH VERANIKA ZAKHARYEVA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 19, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN D. ALFORD AND ENDING WITH WINNIFRED M. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 19, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANN E. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH PATRICK B. PARSONS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 19, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DAVID J. CASWELL, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF BRUCE P. HESELTINE, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL T. CAIN AND ENDING WITH ILDA Y. ISAZA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KERRY L. HIRZEL AND ENDING WITH JOSHUA S. TRICE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MIGUEL J. MORALES, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIE A. BOWMAN AND ENDING WITH LARRIN S. WAMPLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC M. ADAIR AND ENDING WITH JESSE B. ZYDALLIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF DEVRY C. ANDERSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW A. ARNDT AND ENDING WITH D013347, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 19, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TYLER M. ABERCROMBIE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RANDOLPH S. CARPENTER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ANGEL SOTO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW C. DAWSON AND ENDING WITH LEE C. NOVY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 19, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF THOMAS A. SUMMERS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTINA M. BUCHNER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARCIA L. LEWIS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JACK E. SHIELDS III, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JERZY M. MATYSZCZUK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALECIA D. BIDDISON AND ENDING WITH ROGER R. WOLD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH W. BISHOP AND ENDING WITH ROBERT T. UTLAUT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JENNIFER L. WHITE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PATRICK E. MATHER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LUIS G. FUCHU AND ENDING WITH DEXTER C. NUNNALLY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF OLIVIA H. IVEY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF HAN S. KIM, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN E. RICHARDSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PAUL A. WHITE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT T. CARTER, JR. AND ENDING WITH CHARLES A. PHILLIPS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KYLE R. STIEFEL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ADAM C. MILLER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MATHEW M. CONDRIY, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. AMAMOO AND ENDING WITH D013799, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JASON B. YENRICK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID R. ADDAMS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PANKAJ A. KSHEERSAGAR, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL P. SARGENT, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS E. HURD, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL C. AGBAY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAY A. IANNACITO, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF LONNIE M. MCGHEE, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. FEUQUAY AND ENDING WITH HEATH E. RUPPERT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHAWN P. CHABOT AND ENDING WITH RICARDO B. RIVERA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ENRIQUE LUZ, JR. AND ENDING WITH JEREMY J. WILLOUGHBY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY A. BRYANT AND ENDING WITH JOE A. SAENZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW E. CHEATUM AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH M. DAVID, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN K. EVANS AND ENDING WITH JEREMY F. ORTIZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL H. FLICK AND ENDING WITH JESSE C. TALLMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EZRA H. BARDO AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL C. MEDLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW C. PAMPUSH AND ENDING WITH STEPHEN T. SUTTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ODIN PINEDA AND ENDING WITH JAMES M. ROD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATALIE E. MOORE AND ENDING WITH BROOKE J. SPEERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 13, 2018.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF HENRY J. KENNEDY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.
NAVY NOMINATION OF JOHN A. MILLS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ERIC C. CORRELL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JAMAL L. HEADEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK P. ARRIGO AND ENDING WITH OLIVER C. ZUFELT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JESSICA M. FERRARO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF VIJAY M. RAVINDRA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ELISABETH S. STEPHENS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 1, 2018

The House met at 1:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 1, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY HARRIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Gene Hemrick, St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, on the east side of our U.S. Capitol stands a statue of peace that is a divine quality of Your love. We pray that You inspire the creativity of our Congress in pursuing peace in a world that is more hostile than nonviolent. May our Congress embrace Your wisdom for opening hearts in which reconciliation is preferred to strife; a time when lion and lamb will lie down together.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BUDD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 28, 2018, at 12:59 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 35. Appointments:
Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform.
Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans.
Public Interest Declassification Board.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 1, 2018, at 10:59 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. J. Res. 53.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 535.
That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1625.
That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 106.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 703 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 903), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Social Security Advisory Board for a term of 6 years:

Ms. Nancy Altman, Bethesda, Maryland

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Speaker and majority leader of the Senate, their joint appointment, pursuant to section 30442(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Pub. L. 115-123), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member to the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform as co-chair:

Mr. WOMACK, Arkansas

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SOLVENCY OF MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Speaker and majority leader of the Senate, their joint appointment, pursuant to section 30422(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Pub. L. 115-123), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Senator to the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans as co-chair:

Mr. HATCH, Utah

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MARCH 1, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to section 30442(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Pub. L. 115-123), I am pleased to announce the joint appointment, together with the Minority Leader of the Senate, of the Honorable NITA LOWEY of New York to serve as co-chair of the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform. Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 759, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 759

Resolved, That the House of Representatives offers its deep sympathies to the members of the family of the late Reverend Billy Graham.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the legacy of Reverend Billy Graham for his life-long commitment to preaching the Gospels, his fight for civil rights, his opposition to communism, and the spiritual guidance that he provided to millions of people in the United States and around the world.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it do so as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Billy Graham.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION
REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution honoring the life of William "Billy" F. Graham, Jr.; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 535. An act to encourage visits between the United States and Taiwan at all levels, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 28, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1725. To direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit certain reports relat-

ing to medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary.

H.R. 3122. To direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include on the internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs a warning regarding dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices targeting individuals who are eligible for increased pension on the basis of need for regular aid and attendance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4533. To designate the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Lexington VA Health Care System" and to make certain other designations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 759, the House adjourned until Monday, March 5, 2018, at noon for morning-hour debate, as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Billy Graham.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL SADLOSKY, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 23 AND JAN. 26, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Sadlosky	1/24	1/25	Djibouti		381.00		14,600.00				14,981.00
Committee total					381.00		14,600.00				14,981.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MR. DANIEL SADLOSKY, Feb. 12, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Chris Smith	11/18	11/23	Croatia	Kuna	838.00		3,640.46				4,478.46
Mark Milosch	10/10	10/14	Hungary	Forint	879.00		1,816.26				2,695.26
	11/18	11/23	Croatia	Kuna	838.00		3,640.46				4,478.46
Committee total					2,555.00		9,097.18				11,652.18

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Co-Chairman, Jan. 30, 2018.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4130. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Onions Grown in South Texas; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0040; SC17-959-1 FR] received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4131. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA): Guidance on Growers' Trust Protection Eligibility and Clarification of "Written Notification" [Document Number: AMS-FV-15-0045] (RIN: 0581-AD50) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4132. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2017-2018 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-16-0107; SC17-985-1A FR] received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4133. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Specialty Crops Program, Promotion and Economics Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Watermelon Research and Promotion Plan; Redistricting and Importer Representation [Document Number: AMS-SC-16-0097] received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4134. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0033; SC17-922-1 FR] received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4135. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methyl Bromide; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0447; FRL-9971-19] received February 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4136. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interpretation — Commission Statement and Guidance on Public Company Cybersecurity Disclosures [Release Nos.: 33-10459; 34-82746] received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4137. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Investment Company Liquidity Risk Management Programs; Commission Guidance for In-Kind ETFs [Release No.: IC-33010; File No.: S7-03-18] (RIN: 3235-AM26) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4138. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Prohibition of Children's Toys and Child Care Articles Containing Specified Phthalates; Revision of Determinations Regarding Certain Plastics [Docket No.: CPSC-2016-0017] received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4139. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Rule Part 225, Control of Emissions from Large Combustion Sources [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0397; FRL-9974-87-Region 5] received February 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4140. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Indiana NSR/PSD; Indiana PM2.5 NSR; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0805; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0567; FRL-9974-88-Region 5] received February 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4141. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Distillates (petroleum), Solvent-Dewaxed Heavy Paraffinic; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0179; FRL-9974-14] received February 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4142. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Quinalofop ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0360; FRL-9972-30] received February 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4143. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Redesignation of the Illinois Portion of the St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, Missouri-Illinois Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0277; FRL-9974-86-Region 5] received February 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4144. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 2011 Base Year Inventory for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Maryland Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Non-attainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0149; FRL-9974-98-Region 3] received February 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4145. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Approval of Texas Motor Vehicle Rule Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0077; FRL-9974-51-Region 6] received February 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4146. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0404; FRL-9974-67-Region 9] received February 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4147. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Section 112(l) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Perchloroethylene Air Emission Standards for Dry Cleaning Facilities; State of Vermont [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0343; A-1-FRL-9972-97-Region 1] received February 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4148. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Determination to Defer Sanctions; Bay Area Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0080; FRL-9974-97-Region 9] received February 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4149. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Titanium dioxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0257; FRL-9972-63] received February 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4150. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the semiannual report of disbursements for the operations of the Architect of the Capitol for the period of July 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1868a(a); Public Law 113-76, div. I, title I, Sec. 1301(a); (128 Stat. 428) (H. Doc. No. 115—97); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

4151. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Increased Assessment Rate for Processed Pears [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0045; SC17-927-1 FR] received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4152. A letter from the Manager, Species Assessment Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Texas Hornshell [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0077; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BB34) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4153. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Species Assessment Team, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Black Warrior Waterdog and Designation of Critical Habitat [Docket Nos.: FWS-R4-ES-2016-0029 and FWS-R4-ES-2016-0031; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BA78; RIN: 1018-BA79) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4154. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing *Oenothera avita* ssp. *eurekensis* from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants, and Reclassification of *Swallenia alexandrae* from Endangered to Threatened [Docket No.: FWS-

R8-ES-2013-0131; FXES11130900000-145-PF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-AW04) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4155. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Eastern Puma (=Cougar) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R5-ES-2015-0001; 50120-1113-000] (RIN: 1018-AY05) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4156. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for Four Body System Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2017-0055] (RIN: 0960-A117) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

(Omitted from the Record of February 27, 2018)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 146. A bill to take certain Federal lands in Tennessee into trust for the benefit of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5132. A bill to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5133. A bill to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BACON (for himself and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 5134. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to combat straw purchases of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 5135. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for additional grants for school secu-

rity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5136. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to eligible local educational agencies to encourage female students to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 5137. A bill to standardize and extend certain Buy America provisions; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KIND, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access to health care through modernized health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 5139. A bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 5140. A bill to make improvements to the Account For the State Response to the Opioid Abuse Crisis to improve tribal health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 5141. A bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize assistance for Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MESSER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 5142. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, to establish the style for amending laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MESSER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 5143. A bill to require all bills, resolutions, and other documents of Congress to be created, transmitted, and published in searchable electronic formats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUM (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 5144. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to report on compliance of contracting agencies with subcontracting plans and subcontracting goals under the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5145. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate tax preferences for foreign profits by repealing the reduced rate of tax on foreign-derived intangible income and global intangible low-taxed income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 5146. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to establish the American Technical Training Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 5147. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require voting systems used in elections for Federal office to produce a voter-verified paper ballot of each vote cast on the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 5148. A bill to release certain wilderness study areas in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 5149. A bill to provide that certain wilderness study areas in Montana have been adequately studied for wilderness designation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 5150. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to pay a Medicare part B rebate for certain drugs if the price of such drugs increases faster than inflation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 5151. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a grant program improving treatment for pregnant and postpartum women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 5152. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program for eligible nonprofit organizations to carry out positive psychology reconditioning

programs for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 5153. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing workforce training and education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. JONES, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. HUDSON):

H. Res. 759. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Reverend Billy Graham; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 760. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2018 as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POLIS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HURD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H. Res. 761. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

162. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, rel-

ative to Senate Resolution No. 118, to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that provides the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and regional management councils additional tools to effectively and appropriately manage our nation's important saltwater recreational fisheries; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

163. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 253, urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968 to protect the constitutional rights of medical cannabis users; which was referred jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey introduced a bill (H.R. 5154) for the relief of Osmark Juan Bruemmer Gonzalez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROYCE of California:

H.R. 5132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 5134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 5135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ."

The Necessary and Proper Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U. S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 5139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 5140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 5141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 5142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution states: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . ." It is both "necessary and proper [for Congress to make laws] for carrying into Execution" this Power (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18), including setting standards for the format and content of legislation proposed to be considered by Congress.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 5143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution states: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . ." It is both "necessary and proper [for Congress to make laws] for carrying into Execution" this Power (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18), including setting standards for documents produced by Congress.

By Mr. BLUM:

H.R. 5144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 5146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 5147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause) and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 5148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 5149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 5150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 5151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 5152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 5153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 35: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 99: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 530: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 559: Mr. FLORES and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 630: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 846: Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 914: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 930: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1026: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1078: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1100: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1120: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1267: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 1278: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1279: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1284: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1424: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1444: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1447: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1472: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1478: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1606: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1683: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1825: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 1910: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1972: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2024: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2059: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2220: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2327: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2428: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2472: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2513: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 2567: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2598: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DELANEY,

Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2687: Ms. DELAULO.

H.R. 2747: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2790: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 2851: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 2856: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 2899: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2991: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3034: Mr. COSTA, Mr. COLE, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BUCK, and Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 3197: Mr. TROTT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3497: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 3605: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 3613: Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3635: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 3642: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 3694: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 3699: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3742: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 3798: Mr. AMODEL.

H.R. 3875: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3987: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3988: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4045: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 4052: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 4099: Mr. MARINO and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 4142: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4143: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4186: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4223: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4240: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 4256: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4316: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 4392: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 4489: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 4536: Mr. HURD.

H.R. 4608: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 4612: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 4622: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 4635: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4664: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 4666: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 4671: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 4681: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 4682: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 4718: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 4724: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4733: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 4734: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 4747: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 4800: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 4811: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. COOK, Mr. FASO, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. HERRERA

BEUTLER, Mr. BACON, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COMER, and Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 4814: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 4854: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4858: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4888: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4909: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 4943: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 4949: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4954: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 5011: Mr. COOPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON

COLEMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VELA, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NADLER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CORREA, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HECK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 5057: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 5058: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 5062: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 5079: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 5087: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SABLÁN, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5105: Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 5113: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 5114: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 5116: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5122: Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.J. Res. 101: Mr. MEADOWS.

H. Con. Res. 10: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H. Res. 128: Mr. SIREN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 356: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. DOGETT.

H. Res. 367: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 401: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 740: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 743: Ms. LOFGREN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

82. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Senate of the Twentieth Northern Marianas Commonwealth Legislature, relative to Senate Resolution No. 20-21, strongly supporting the provisions of S. 2325 and H.R. 4869 and respectfully requests for the passage of S. 2325 and H.R. 4869 in the respective houses of the United States Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 6, February 26, 2018, by MR. THOMPSON of California on the bill (H.R. 4240), was signed by the following Members: Mr. Thompson of California, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Peters, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Sires, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Heck, Ms. Maxine Waters of California, Ms. Barragán, Mr. O'Halleran, Mr. Walz, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Pocan, Ms. DelBene, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mr. Sarbanes, Mrs. Murphy of Florida, Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Cohen, Ms. Pingree, Ms. Matsui, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Bera, Ms. Jayapal, Ms. Esty of Connecticut, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Lowenthal, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Keating, Ms. Tsongas, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Sherman, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Ruiz, Mrs. Demings, Mr. Kilmer, Miss Rice of New York, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. McEachin, Mr. Españillat, Mr. Khanna, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Ellison, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mrs. Dingell, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Soto, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Ms. Hanabusa, Mr. Huffman, Ms. Titus, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Evans, Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Capuano, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. DeSaulnier, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Takano, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Tonko, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Ms. Adams, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Lynch, Mr. McNerney, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Crist, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Grijalva, Mr.

Kennedy, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Deutch, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Vargas, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Lee, Mr. Hoyer, Ms. Meng, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Raskin, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Swalwell of California, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Kihuen, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Lipinski, Ms. Bass, Mr. Gomez, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Gallego, Ms. Moore, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Cárdenas, Ms. Pelosi, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Clay, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Levin, Mr. Higgins of New York, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Schrader, Mr. Polis, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, Mr. Rush, Mr. Foster, Mr. Loebsack, Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Welch, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Himes, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Carbajal, Ms. Shea-Porter, and Mr. Veasey.

Petition 7, February 27, 2018, by MR. CLYBURN on the bill (H.R. 3464), was signed by the following Members: Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Richmond, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Kildee, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Khanna, Mr. Lynch, Mr. McNerney, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Ms. Matsui, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Ellison, Mrs. Demings, Mr. Crist, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Deutch, Ms. Castor of Florida, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Ms. DelBene, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Vargas, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Beyer, Ms. Bonamici, Ms. Lee, Mr. Hoyer, Ms. Meng, Mr.

DeFazio, Mr. Soto, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Sarbanes, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Tonko, Ms. Velázquez, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Panetta, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Ms. Hanabusa, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Españillat, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Pocan, Ms. Adams, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Nadler, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Evans, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Kihuen, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Huffman, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. McEachin, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. Bass, Mr. Gomez, Ms. McCollum, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Sherman, Mrs. Dingell, Mrs. Murphy of Florida, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Gallego, Ms. Moore, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Cárdenas, Ms. Pelosi, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Clay, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Thompson of California, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Levin, Mr. Sires, Mr. Higgins of New York, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Polis, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Doggett, Ms. Eshoo, Ms. Esty of Connecticut, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cartwright, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, Mr. Rush, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Takano, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Foster, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Welch, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Peters, Ms. Barragán, Mr. Himes, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. Pascrell, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Heck, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Carbajal, Ms. Shea-Porter, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Kilmer, and Mr. Veasey.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING MS. JO ANN FLIRT

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life and legacy of Ms. Jo Ann Flirt. Jo Ann was a vibrant member of the Mobile community. To me, Jo Ann was a dear and trusted friend.

Jo Ann attended both undergraduate and graduate school at the University of Alabama, where she went on to teach journalism and public relations. Upon returning to Mobile, she was a founding member and former president of the Press Club of Mobile and a founding member of the Mississippi-Alabama chapter of the Public Relations Society of Alabama.

Jo Ann was known for her immeasurable work ethic. She started two businesses in Mobile, the Public Relations Counsel Inc., an advertising and public relations firm, and the Mobile Record, a daily legal publication with real estate and other civil business news. She also founded a group called Alabamians Behind Local Education with the purpose of peacefully integrating schools in Alabama.

Jo Ann was also a passionate advocate and champion for historic Blakeley State Park, where she served as director for almost fifteen years. It would not be a surprise to see Jo Ann out working on various projects at Blakeley, in addition to her administrative tasks. As a true testament to her character, Jo Ann was regularly called upon to serve in her community and was well known for her determined, caring spirit.

Sadly, Jo Ann passed away on February 2, 2018 at the age of 85. So, to her family and friends who will miss her dearly, I want to extend my deepest sympathies and condolences. May they take comfort in the warm memories of Jo Ann and the lasting impact she had on so many.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 26 and Tuesday, February 27, 2018, I was not present for recorded votes. I would have voted:

"YES" on roll call vote No. 81 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1222, as amended),

"YES" on roll call vote No. 82 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2422, as amended),

"NO" on roll call vote No. 83 (on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair),

"NO" on roll call vote No. 84 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 748),

"NO" on roll call vote No. 85 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 748),

"NO" on roll call vote No. 86 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 747),

"NO" on roll call vote No. 87 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 747),

"YES" on roll call vote No. 88 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 4296, with instructions),

"NO" on roll call vote No. 89 (on passage of H.R. 4296),

"NO" on roll call vote No. 90 (on agreeing to the Walters Amendment to H.R. 1865), and

"NO" on roll call vote No. 91 (on passage of H.R. 1865).

BILL LOPER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my close friend Bill Loper. My brother, sister and I grew up in one of the best neighborhoods a kid could ever grow up in. As youngsters we roamed from one house to another. No matter where we were, we knew we were under the watchful eyes of parents and adults who treated us like their own—the Wehdes, the Driftmiers, the Fisks, and especially, the Lopers. So, as I write this recognition and celebration of Bill's life, I cannot do it in isolation and think of Annie and the other families and my own mom and dad.

As close as we were to all of our neighbors, Bill and Annie and my mom and dad had something special. They all met at the University of Colorado just after WWII, and from that time on were the best of friends and partners. This was due, in no small part, to the kindred spirit that Bill and my dad shared and still share even with Bill's passing.

Dad and Bill were native Coloradans, Bill from Olathe and Dad from Denver. Bill followed in his big brother Bob's footsteps when he enrolled at CU after serving a hitch in the Navy at the end of WWII. My dad followed in his big brother Jack's footsteps, when he enrolled at Boulder. Both studied liberal arts, Dad—Political Science and Bill—Economics. They were friends, classmates and roommates. Both enjoyed politics and were left in their leanings. They were pretty rebellious too and despite Joe McCarthy's "Red Scare" of the late 40s and early 50s, they named their intramural softball team "The Social Science Reds." Bill excelled at everything while at CU, except spelling. According to my dad, Bill's friends had to help him correct his term papers so he could graduate.

After graduation, Bill announced he was moving to Alaska to find his fame and fortune,

and follow his brother who had moved up to the Northwest. Apparently he didn't find fame or fortune and wasn't too enamored with his brother, because he returned to Colorado shortly thereafter.

My dad, grandfather, Uncles Mike and Jack, and Aunt Ann knew Bill could build or fix just about anything and that whatever he worked at or worked on he would master. So, upon returning from Alaska, he joined them in business at Perlmutter & Sons Construction and Prestressed Concrete/Stanly Structures where he was the head of operations. As the head of operations, Bill learned and mastered new products and construction techniques for the next 50 years or so.

Bill, together with the others, helped build much of the West, whether it was roads, bridges, apartments, hotels, offices, warehouses or shopping centers. If there was a construction problem, Bill was the trouble shooter to figure out what went wrong and how to fix it. Bill helped build much of Vail and the Gore Valley, and even the precursor to the building hosting Bill's memorial, the Tivoli. He was also a risk taker, helping to stake and support young entrepreneurial developers and owners like Bob Lazier, the owner and proprietor of the Tivoli. Besides the Precast/Prestressed Concrete Business, Bill also headed up the Air Structure business which built big air bubble structures to cover virtually anything from tennis courts to football fields. He founded Cygnus with his friend and fishing buddy, Tom Obermeyer, which made the precast fascia and cladding for buildings all over the country.

But of greater importance to me, Cassie and Joe, was the way that Bill and Annie treated us, whether it was barbecues in their backyard on Upham Court (where the hamburgers were a little too rare) to badminton, or pool, or tennis or going to football games, or of course, skiing. We all spent countless hours together learning and playing and enjoying each other's company. One time, Bill agreed to teach me how to drive a stick shift over Loveland Pass just after I got my learner's permit. It was snowing and icy and I remember how scared I was; he must have been petrified, but he never showed it.

Annie taught all of us, including my mom and dad, how to ski. When Annie was teaching a class, Bill was always with us and his kids on the slopes. It didn't matter whether it was at Eldora, Winter Park, or Vail. We spent many nights and weekends bunking in the Loper's cabin in Fraser or their condo at the Villa Cortina in Vail.

Bill loved his sports, especially tennis, skiing, and squash. At one time he was one of the best squash players in Denver and was a regular at the downtown YMCA. He loved Bronco football and attended many games with Jerry Shpall and other Bronco fanatics.

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

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

Whatever Bill did, he did it to his best ability. One of the things he did best was to encourage people. He loved his children and grandchildren and encouraged them in every way possible. That encouragement and support led Amy, Steve, and Ted to take risks and accomplish things that most people fear to undertake, whether it's starting a business, moving overseas or telemarketing down the Minturn Mile.

Bill loved politics. He and my dad were Democratic precinct committeemen in Wheat Ridge and had all of us kids out walking precincts for our local candidates at a very early age. Bill participated in so many civic and charitable organizations that are too numerous to list. But suffice it to say, local PTA's, animal protection organizations, rotaries and industry groups benefitted from his leadership.

Bill had a wry sense of humor and could find something funny in just about everything and every situation (with the possible exception of the Trump Administration). He had many sayings but one that stands out for me is, "If you do somebody a favor, you can be sure they will remember it . . . the next time they need another favor." Despite the sardonic humor, you can bet that Bill did favors for just about everyone, whether it was teaching somebody like me to drive over an icy pass or helping a young ski bum build his first hotel.

I talked to Annie and Bill a couple of weeks before Bill passed away. As always, they both expressed interest in how I was doing, what it was like these days with Donald Trump in office and how my family was doing. Bill continued to encourage me to do my best for my constituents, no matter their means, and make sure that they had a voice in Washington. Bill was always concerned about the success of the little guy or the hardworking family down the street.

Bill was one of the nicest, smartest, most generous men I've ever known. In that regard, he and my dad were not only kindred spirits, but twin brothers. Bill was like a second dad to me, Cassie, and Joe, and he will be sorely missed. As my dad so succinctly put it, "Bill worked hard. He played hard. And he kept faith with himself." Bill lived a good life and was loved by anybody and everybody who knew him.

HONORING MR. MICHAEL MILONE

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend Michael Milone and recognize his longtime service as Cheshire Town Manager. Michael will retire this coming June, and the Cheshire Chamber of Commerce is honoring Michael at its awards dinner in my hometown of Cheshire, Connecticut for his service to our community over the past three decades.

A longtime Cheshire resident and public servant, Michael joined the town's government finance department thirty years ago, and his expertise in financial management has proven invaluable to our town and its elected leaders.

He stepped up to become Town Manager almost twenty years ago, and his long-term vision has supported Cheshire's success and ability to embrace the future. As a Town Councilor myself from 2005 to 2008, I had the pleasure of working closely with Michael, and I can testify to his dedication to the public, commitment to fiscal prudence, and knack for solving problems creatively.

Michael's leadership and accomplishments have not gone unnoticed in Cheshire—or outside our town. Money Magazine and Connecticut Magazine regularly laud Cheshire as one of America's best small towns. Although our state has faced its share of economic challenges, under Michael's commitment to fiscal responsibility, Cheshire has maintained a top credit rating from national rating agencies. Michael has also shared his time and expertise with the next generation of leaders as a lecturer at the University of New Haven. Michael's legacy for our town will live on well after his retirement, and his commitment to responsible leadership sets a tremendous example for our town's—not to mention our state's and country's—future leaders.

Mr. Speaker, Michael Milone has exemplified the best of what public servants bring to their roles. It is fitting and proper that we honor Michael here today, and I consider myself lucky to count Michael as a friend and mentor.

RECOGNIZING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF RON CARSON

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise, on behalf of Congressman MORGAN GRIFFITH and myself, to recognize the achievements of Ron Carson who has made the plight of tens of thousands of disabled coal miners a central part of his life's work. Through his decades of work directing three black lung clinics in Southwest Virginia, and tireless advocacy efforts across the coal fields of this country, he offered help and hope to miners whose lungs were irreversibly scarred with the scourge of black lung disease.

Ron was born in Pennington Gap, Virginia during segregation. He attended a one-room primary school on land that his great-great-grandmother, Rachael Scott, had donated in 1939 for education of black children in Lee County. Ron and his wife Jill, a Member of the Town Council in Pennington Gap, founded the Appalachian African American Cultural Center in that same brick school house, which now preserves the life stories, history, heritage, culture and events of African Americans in Southwest Virginia. Although segregated in housing and schools, African Americans found a measure of inclusion in Central Appalachia, where they were able to work free from the harsh conditions in the Deep South, and many received equal pay for their work mining coal.

Ron worked for Westmoreland Coal Co. in Appalachia, Virginia as did his stepfather. His grandfather and great-grandfather both worked for many years for Blue Diamond Coal in

Bonny Blue, Virginia. Ron later attended the Massachusetts School of Pharmacy, and in 1990 returned as an outreach worker in the black lung clinic operating out of the St. Charles Community Health Clinic. For the past 20 years he has served as the director of three black lung clinics which are now part of Stone Mountain Health Services. In addition to helping miners secure diagnostic tests, treatment and benefits counseling, Ron led an effort to develop what is now the largest program for non-lawyers to successfully advocate for black lung benefits before the U.S. Department of Labor.

There are very few attorneys who represent miners filing claims for black lung benefits. And, coal miners proceeding pro se are no match for the expert legal and medical resources that coal companies and insurers dedicate to each case. Ron and his team have worked to fill this void by providing training for clinics, doctors, lawyers and lay representatives in all 15 coal producing states. The lay advocates working for the Stone Mountain clinics have helped miners win over 2,000 black lung claims in the past 17 years.

In recent years, Ron documented how miners with progressive massive fibrosis (PMF), the most advanced form of black lung disease, have flooded the clinics in southwestern Virginia. Working with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), he recently co-authored an article in the Journal of the American Medical Association which verified an epidemic of this lethal form of the disease in Central Appalachia and helped to elevate national awareness. "Mining disasters get monuments, meanwhile black lung deaths get tombstones. And I've seen many a tombstone in the last 28 years from black lung," he noted.

At a roundtable Ron organized in Wise, Virginia, disabled miners, physicians and lawyers explained how the current black lung adjudication process keeps justice out of reach for far too many deserving miners and survivors.

Ron Carson has been accessible to Members of Congress and provided wise counsel, as well as compassionate and enduring service to his community. He has been recognized by the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) and his peers in the black lung community. On behalf of our colleagues in the House of Representatives, Congressman GRIFFITH and I extend our appreciation for Ron's service to those in need.

TRIBUTE TO ISABEL LATHRUM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Isabel Lathrum of Winterset, Iowa, on the very special occasion of her 102nd birthday on February 26, 2018.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Isabel's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones, and the internet. We have

fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism, and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Isabel has lived through nineteen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent Isabel in the United States Congress and I'm proud to recognize her today on this momentous occasion. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her and in wishing her nothing but continued happiness.

McLANE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud McLane for receiving the 2018 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales, or new capital investment to Commerce City. McLane started as a small retail grocer in 1894 and grew to a leading grocery, wholesaler and distributor in the 1970s and 1980s and to a worldwide logistics powerhouse in the 1990s. Today it is a global wholesale distributor of 35,000 products to over 50,000 businesses in the grocery, foodservice, convenience, mass merchandise, quick service restaurant, and drug store industries. In 2017, McLane completed a 226,000 square-foot facility along Tower Road creating 235 new jobs to Commerce City.

McLane is passionate about making a difference in the community. The company creates a diverse and inclusive workforce through their Hiring Our Heroes and Operation Network of Champions hiring initiatives. Employees also proudly support the Children's Miracle Network and the United Way.

I extend my deepest congratulations to McLane for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

RECOGNIZING THE PUBLIC
SERVICE OF RON CARSON

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise, on behalf of Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and myself, to recognize the achievements of Ron Carson who has made the plight of tens of thousands of disabled coal miners a central part of his life's work. Through his decades of work directing three black lung clinics in Southwest Virginia, and tireless advocacy efforts across the coal fields of this country, he offered help and hope to miners whose lungs were irreversibly scarred with the scourge of black lung disease.

Ron was born in Pennington Gap, Virginia during segregation. He attended a one-room

primary school on land that his great-great-grandmother, Rachael Scott, had donated in 1939 for education of black children in Lee County. Ron and his wife Jill, a Member of the Town Council in Pennington Gap, founded the Appalachian African American Cultural Center in that same brick school house, which now preserves the life stories, history, heritage, culture and events of African Americans in Southwest Virginia. Although segregated in housing and schools, African Americans found a measure of inclusion in Central Appalachia, where they were able to work free from the harsh conditions in the Deep South, and many received equal pay for their work mining coal.

Ron worked for Westmoreland Coal Co. in Appalachia, Virginia as did his stepfather. His grandfather and great-grandfather both worked for many years for Blue Diamond Coal in Bonny Blue, Virginia. Ron later attended the Massachusetts School of Pharmacy, and in 1990 returned as an outreach worker in the black lung clinic operating out of the St. Charles Community Health Clinic. For the past 20 years he has served as the director of three black lung clinics which are now part of Stone Mountain Health Services. In addition to helping miners secure diagnostic tests, treatment and benefits counseling, Ron led an effort to develop what is now the largest program for non-lawyers to successfully advocate for black lung benefits before the U.S. Department of Labor.

There are very few attorneys who represent miners filing claims for black lung benefits. And, coal miners proceedings pro se are no match for the expert legal and medical resources that coal companies and insurers dedicate to each case. Ron and his team have worked to fill this void by providing training for clinics, doctors, lawyers and lay representatives in all 15 coal producing states. The lay advocates working for the Stone Mountain clinics have helped miners win over 2,000 black lung claims in the past 17 years.

In recent years, Ron documented how miners with progressive massive fibrosis (PMF), the most advanced form of black lung disease, have flooded the clinics in southwestern Virginia. Working with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), he recently co-authored an article in the Journal of the American Medical Association which verified an epidemic of this lethal form of the disease in Central Appalachia and helped to elevate national awareness. "Mining disasters get monuments, meanwhile black lung deaths get tombstones. And I've seen many a tombstone in the last 28 years from black lung," he noted.

At a roundtable Ron organized in Wise, Virginia, disabled miners, physicians and lawyers explained how the current black lung adjudication process keeps justice out of reach for far too many deserving miners and survivors.

Ron Carson has been accessible to Members of Congress and provided wise counsel, as well as compassionate and enduring service to his community. He has been recognized by the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) and his peers in the black lung community. On behalf of our colleagues in the House of Representatives, Congressman SCOTT and I extend our appreciation for Ron's service to those in need.

HONORING MR. SHELDON DILL

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend Sheldon Dill, who the Cheshire Chamber of Commerce is celebrating upon his retirement at its awards dinner in my hometown of Cheshire, Connecticut. Sheldon has served as President of the Cheshire Chamber of Commerce for the past twelve years, and his leadership has proven invaluable through the challenges that our town, state, and nation have faced.

Sheldon has led an impressive career in public service. He served on the Cheshire Town Council, in fact, I took over his position on the Council in 2005, and his ability to work with members of both political parties earned him the respect both of his fellow councilmembers and of our entire town. Cheshire residents know Sheldon as a dedicated and creative problem solver who is always willing to advocate for our town.

As President of the Chamber of Commerce, Sheldon has been a strong advocate for Cheshire's small businesses and has worked to keep the American Dream a reality for families in our community. The past decade has seen big changes in Connecticut, but Sheldon has made sure Cheshire's businesses have a strong voice. He leaves behind a legacy of service to our town, and his commitment to Cheshire sets a high bar for the rest of us working in public service to meet. I wish him a restful—and much deserved—retirement full of time spent with his loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, Sheldon Dill has served the Cheshire community as an elected official, a volunteer, and an advocate for our business community. His leadership as President of the Cheshire Chamber of Commerce for the last twelve years has made our community stronger and better able to lead in the 21st Century. It is proper that we honor him here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 27, 2018, I regret not being present for two vote sessions. During both instances, I was with my constituents and the meeting extended longer than expected. It prevented me from making it to the House floor on time to submit the first vote in each series.

Had I been present, I would have voted in support of the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4296, Roll Call No. 88, and against the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, Roll Call No. 83.

SUTRAK

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sutrak for receiving the 2018 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales, or new capital investment to Commerce City. Sutrak is a manufacturer of HVAC systems for transit vehicles including bus, light rail, and automated people movers. Founded in the 1970s by Hugh Ferdows in Germany, Sutrak expanded into the United States and Colorado by the early 1980s.

With over 30 years of domestic production, Sutrak systems have been installed on virtually every major bus, light rail vehicle, and automatic people mover system manufacturer in the United States. Sutrak completed a major expansion in 2017, adding two new warehouse buildings and seven additional employees to the company's existing 70 employees.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sutrak for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the following Roll Call votes. I would like to reflect how I would have voted, had I been present.

Had I been present, I would have voted the following: "YEA" on Roll Call No. 81; "YEA" on Roll Call No. 82; "NAY" on Roll Call No. 83; "NAY" on Roll Call No. 84; "NAY" on Roll Call No. 85; "NAY" on Roll Call No. 86; "NAY" on Roll Call No. 87; "YEA" on Roll Call No. 88; "NAY" on Roll Call No. 89; "NAY" on Roll Call No. 90; and "YEA" on Roll Call No. 91.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 2018, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on Roll Call votes No. 83, No. 84, No. 85, No. 86, and No. 87.

GEORGE T. SANDERS COMPANY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud the George T. Sanders Company for receiving the 2018 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales, or new capital investment to Commerce City. The George T. Sanders Company is Colorado's largest independent distributor of plumbing and heating supplies and services the plumbing, heating, and HVAC trades as well as the general public and can accommodate plumbing and heating projects for residential dwellings or large commercial buildings. Last year, George T. Sanders Company built a new, 76,000 square-foot facility in Commerce City, which brought 25 new jobs to the city adding to their 16 existing locations throughout Colorado and in Wyoming.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the George T. Sanders Company for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE VICTIMS
OF THE SUMGAIT POGROMS**HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 30th Anniversary of the Sumgait pogroms, one of the most horrific attacks against the Armenian people committed at the hands of Azerbaijanis.

On February 27, 1988, up to 200 Armenian civilians living in the city of Sumgait in Azerbaijan were indiscriminately killed, raped, maimed, and even burned alive for no reason other than their ethnicity. This senseless violence was instigated by hostile, anti-Armenian rhetoric from Azerbaijani citizens and officials against these innocent individuals.

For three decades, Azerbaijan has taken steps to cover up these crimes against humanity and dismiss the atrocities at Sumgait. Even more disturbing is that perpetrators of these events and similar violent attacks have since been lauded as national heroes.

I condemn these horrific attacks. Tragically, the Azerbaijani government's approach toward the Armenian people has not changed much since these attacks were perpetrated. In 2018, we hear the same violent rhetoric and witness the intimidation tactics by the Azerbaijani government against the people of Nagorno Karabakh.

If we do not condemn crimes against humanity, we only strengthen the resolve of those seeking to perpetrate these crimes in the future. The Armenian people have known this for too long, as we prepare to commemorate the 103rd Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide in April.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Congressional Armenian Issues Cau-

cus to remember the victims of the pogroms at Sumgait and to condemn all acts of violence against people who are targeted simply because of their existence. I hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting violent rhetoric and intimidation by renewing our commitment to achieving a collective and lasting peace.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE JOHN HODGES
BENTLEY**HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and honor Judge John Hodges Bentley on the occasion of his retirement as Circuit Judge of the 25th Judicial Circuit of Alabama. I am proud to recognize Judge Bentley for his many years of public service on the bench and the practice of law. He is truly a man who embodies the American principles of hard work and devotion to one's community, state and nation.

Judge Bentley is a native of Kinston, North Carolina. After graduating from Grainger High School, he was appointed to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York where he graduated in 1972 and was commissioned into the infantry. While in the Army, Judge Bentley served five years on active duty commanding various infantry units on the East German-Czech Border during the Cold War. He finished out his active duty Army career as an instructor in the Leadership Department at Ft. Benning, Georgia.

Once out of the Army, Judge Bentley attended the Cumberland School of Law at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama, and graduated in 1980. He practiced law for twenty-two years in Birmingham and Hamilton, Alabama, many of those years serving as the City Attorney for the City of Hamilton. In 2002, he was appointed to the bench as Circuit Judge of the 25th Judicial Circuit serving Marion and Winston Counties. Judge Bentley served in this capacity until his retirement on January 15, 2018.

Judge Bentley is a member of the Hamilton First United Methodist Church and has served as both Lay Leader and Sunday School Teacher. Furthermore, he has served on the Board of Directors of the Alabama Emmaus Community. He is also one of the founders of the Weldy Home, an emergency shelter for abused, abandoned and neglected children.

He is married to Judy Sandlin Bentley, and they have two children, Carrie and Samuel, and four grandchildren, Lydia, William, Caroline and Jonathan.

Judge Bentley is very respected by the people of Marion and Winston Counties for his honesty and dedication, and I am proud to call him my friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to honor Judge John Hodges Bentley on his many accomplishments and for his enduring impact on his community, state and nation. I join his family, friends and colleagues in wishing him God's richest blessings as he enters the next chapter of his life in retirement.

CONGRATULATING IAN KUEHL,
STATE CHAMPION IN WRESTLING

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ian Kuehl, a student from Lena-Winslow High School, for earning the Class 1 A wrestling title for the Illinois State Championship in the 285lb weight class.

Ian Kuehl pinned his opponent in 3 minutes 25 seconds to claim his title as state champion, and I would like to recognize Ian for his tremendous accomplishment. Ian's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment that goes into being awarded such a title. Ian's title demonstrates the value of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Lena throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Ian Kuehl on his title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future.

CELEBRATING THE
CONTRIBUTIONS OF ARIZONA PBS

HON. RUBEN GALLEG0

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding contributions made by Arizona PBS and to celebrate its long history of service to the children of the City of Phoenix and the State of Arizona.

Arizona PBS is dedicated to supporting students, families and educators with content focused on national, common core and state standards.

Since 2010, the Arizona PBS Educational Outreach team has reached nearly 750,000 families and more than 60,000 teachers and teachers-in-training across the state through large-scale events and special community development workshops.

In addition, Arizona PBS provides educational assets through the Arizona PBS LearningMedia online portal in English, Spanish and Navajo, as well as professional development services to help guide individuals into careers in early childhood education.

I am especially grateful for PBS's efforts to help families from diverse backgrounds to prepare their children to enter kindergarten by providing free online apps and games as well as off-screen activities for early learning.

Last month, Arizona PBS launched a 24/7 children's channel, Arizona PBS KIDS, featuring an array of programming to help young children master important skills, ranging from reading and basic math and science to problem solving and emotional skills. This new channel is available over the air and online to educate, entertain and inspire children of all backgrounds across Arizona.

In closing, I want to recognize an event held in my district on February 17, 2018 in which PBS invited children and families to the heart of downtown to celebrate education, community and exploration.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to once again pay tribute to the outstanding work of Arizona PBS in helping to mold the young minds and future leaders of our great state.

L.G. EVERIST, INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud L.G. Everist, Inc. for receiving the 2018 Commerce City Business of the Year Award.

The Business of the Year Award is given to a Commerce City company with a pioneer spirit that has shown a history of leadership within its industry and the community. L.G. Everist has demonstrated longevity and sustained growth within the Commerce City community for over 26 years and just celebrated its 140th year in business. This family owned company provides construction aggregates, transload/bulk services, dimensional stone, decorative stone, rail services, and water storage. The business has spanned five generations of owners and has employed other several multi-generation families.

In 2016, L.G. Everist expanded its facility and is now well-positioned to accommodate the next phase of growth to meet the growing needs for transloading bulk construction products across the Denver metro region. L.G. Everist values every opportunity to contribute to its community through economic development and enhancing the lives of employees, families, and the community as a whole.

I extend my deepest congratulations to L.G. Everist, Inc. for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

HONORING MARK VAN EYCK

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Mark Van Eyck. Mark is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 522, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Mark has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Mark has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Mark has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Mark remodeled a youth area at his church, Harmony Vineyard, in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Mark for his accomplishments

with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF FRANCISCO CHARGUALAF
MENO

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Francisco C. Meno. Francisco was a proud son of Guam, faithful public servant, and a dear friend. He was born on November 28, 1939 to Felipe Q. and Fidela Chargualaf Meno, and he passed away on February 6, 2018 at the age of 78.

Francisco graduated from George Washington High School and went on to marry the love of his life, Rosa Rivera Meno. Together with Rosa, Francisco cared for his children and provided for his family. He was a member of Guam's greatest generation who survived the occupation of Guam during World War II. Francisco went on to serve our local community as a fire fighter with the Guam Fire Department. He was fondly known as "Chief," served in the Guam Fire Department for thirty years, retiring in 1988 as the department's Fire Chief.

In addition to his career as a fire fighter, Francisco was a skilled carpenter, mason, and fisherman. He was recognized by the Guam Council on the Arts and Humanities Agency as a Master of Chamorro Tradition as a "Master Kakahat Sagualle" or "Master Hut Builder." Francisco's huts were a part of many special celebrations throughout the island. He also graciously passed on his knowledge of hut building to all those who were willing to learn. Francisco was a firm believer of the need to pass down the traditions and culture of the Chamorro people. He also gave his time and talent to build many things for his village parish of St. Joseph Catholic Church in Inarajan.

Francisco's true passion in life was fishing. Francisco was known as a skilled fisherman and always shared his catch with family and friends. His involvement in village events and service in public safety were testaments of his leadership and commitment to the community of Guam.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of Francisco C. Meno, and my thoughts and prayers are with his family, loved ones and friends. I join the people of Guam in celebrating his life and remembering his many contributions to our island and his village of Inarajan. I extend my condolences to his wife Rosa, their children Frank, Joseph, Rosanne, Kurt, Brian, Dorinda, Melanie, Roderick, Vanessa, and numerous grandchildren and great-grandchildren. He will be deeply missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam.

RECOGNIZING MS. KRISTY BAXTER
FOR HER INTERNSHIP WITH THE
UNI-CAPITOL WASHINGTON IN-
TERNSHIP PROGRAMME

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional young Australian who is currently interning in my Washington D.C. office. Kristy Baxter came to our office as part of the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme (UCWIP) and has been a valuable contributor to our efforts on behalf of New York's Tenth Congressional District.

UCWIP has worked with congressional offices to foster strong ties and understanding between the United States and Australian governments by bringing the best and the brightest from top Australian universities to intern on Capitol Hill. I am proud to have personally hosted 14 Australians since 2003—each bringing their own unique outlooks on policy and desire to contribute.

Kristy, a student from Deakin University, studying a Bachelor of International Studies, has interned in our office since January and has quickly proved herself to be a highly valuable member of our team. Over the past weeks, it has been a pleasure to see her swiftly develop into an increasingly confident and pro-active individual. Her innate curiosity to learn, matched with her willingness to work hard, saw her tasked with researching Medicare and the healthcare industry, tax havens and financial secrecy as well as attending foreign affairs briefings on difficulties with post-conflict transition in Colombia and the involvement of the U.S. intelligence community in Sudan. Kristy is an exceptionally calm and affable presence in the office and encounters everyone she meets with respect. Through hard work, dedication and ability to learn from those around her, Kristy became a tremendous asset to our office and the Tenth Congressional District.

My team has learned a great deal about the current political situation in Australia as Kristy's fascination with America continues to grow. She is an absolute pleasure to have in the office and I offer her my thanks for a job well done. I wish her the best of luck in all of her future endeavors.

BASF CORPORATION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud BASF Corporation for receiving the 2018 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales, or new capital investment to Commerce City. BASF currently employs 17,500 people across North America and 114,000 worldwide, and operates across five

segments—Chemicals, Performance Products, Functional Materials & Solutions, Agricultural Solutions and Oil and Gas. These segments create chemistry for a sustainable future in nearly all sectors and almost every country in the world. In Commerce City, BASF Corporation's local focus is in the area of construction chemicals. The company operates out of a 150,000 square-foot facility with almost 150 employees including the addition of 30 new employees in 2017.

BASF is extremely involved in the community where their employees engage in BASF Kids Lab, Site Safety Day, Boy & Girl Scouts, and Engineer's Without Borders.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the BASF for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

HONORING IAN McDONALD

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ian McDonald. Ian is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 255, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ian has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Ian has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Ian has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Ian built and delivered a dozen wooden duck houses to the Missouri Department of conservation for distribution and installation on both public and private waters in western Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Ian for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

**RECOGNIZING MR. TRENTON
"TRENT" JEROME MCCLUSKEY**

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and honor Mr. Trenton "Trent" Jerome McCluskey on the occasion of his retirement as the Jail Administrator for Walker County, Alabama back on February 1, 2018. I am proud to recognize Mr. McCluskey for his many years of public service to our area. He is truly a man who embodies the American principles of hard work and devotion to one's community, state and nation.

Mr. Trent McCluskey is a native of Jasper, Alabama and a graduate of Walker High School. After graduating high school, he attended Walker State Technical College and

then earned his Bachelor of Arts degree from International Bible College in 1985. He received a Criminal Justice Certificate from the University of Alabama in 1997 and his Juris Doctorate from the Birmingham School of Law in 2000.

Trent began his career in corrections in 1991 working for the State of Alabama Department of Corrections. His career could have ended prematurely in 1993 when he was stabbed by an inmate and thrown from the second tier of the William E. Donaldson Correctional Facility. However, after an 18-month recovery period, he returned to work at the Walker County Jail in 1995. In 1999, one year after the completion of the new jail, he was named as the Jail Administrator where he served until January, 2018. As Administrator, he supervised the daily operations including up to 290 inmates, 43 full-time employees and a \$2.5 million dollar budget.

Trent was also very active in his community and received a certificate of appreciation in 1997 from the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. He was also named Volunteer of the Year in 1994 from the Daybreak Spousal Abuse Shelter and received their Community Service Award in 1996. He was very active in the Jasper Chapter of the Lions Club International, serving as president from 2001 to 2002, Zone Chairman for District 34-L from 2002 to 2003 and District Governor for District 34-L from 2004 to 2005.

Trent has one daughter, Terina Michelle Preston, and four grandchildren, Peyton, Conner, Grayson and Ryland. He is highly respected by the people of Walker County for his honesty, hard work and dedication, and I am proud to have had the opportunity to work with him over the years.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to recognize and honor Trenton "Trent" Jerome McCluskey on his many accomplishments and for his enduring impact on his community. I join his family, friends and colleagues in wishing him God's richest blessings in the next chapter of his life in retirement.

**RECOGNIZING JUDY BLAND FOR
OUTSTANDING SERVICE**

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Judy Bland and her selfless contributions to the residents of Kane County, Illinois. For nearly 20 years, Ms. Bland has worked as a Victim Advocate for the Kane County State's Attorney's office.

In 1996, Ms. Bland joined the office as an intern and soon after was offered a full-time position as Administrative Assistant. Less than two years later, she began working as a Victim Advocate and was recently named as the Director of the Victims' Rights Unit. Early in her career, she was asked to advocate for a mother whose 20-month-old daughter was a murder victim. Ms. Bland was there every step of the way and her persistence encouraged the mother to seek her own career as a paralegal.

When the death sentence of Luther Casteel, who killed two and wounded 16 in Elgin, Illinois in 2001 was commuted, Ms. Bland personally called the families of the victims and survivors informing them of what the Governor's action meant. From Ms. Bland's perspective, everyone who witnessed the shooting deserved a phone call. Ms. Bland helped coordinate crisis and grief counselors in the aftermath of the Northern Illinois University attack that killed five and wounded 17. Name a major crime or crisis in the last two decades and it is likely Ms. Bland helped people deal with the aftermath through her comfort, advocacy, and good counsel. It's not an easy nor a glamorous job, but the important work that Ms. Bland has done has changed the lives of people when they were in the greatest need of support.

Mr. Speaker, and distinguished colleagues; please join me in recognizing and thanking Ms. Judy Bland for her selfless contributions to the residents of Kane County, Illinois and her excellent example of public service.

GALLERY ON THE GO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Gallery on The Go, Inc. for receiving the 2018 Commerce City Entrepreneurial Spirit Award.

The Entrepreneurial Spirit Award recognizes a company or entrepreneur that demonstrates a pioneering spirit and development of a business start-up, new product development, or a company/product with growth in new markets. In October 2011, Maria Borrego, a Commerce City resident and Adams City High School graduate, co-founded the mobile painting planning party, Gallery on The Go. She was joined by Mandy Thomas in 2014 and today are a staff of four full-time and two part time employees. They have now expanded to over 160 Independent Gallery Guides in 30 states, serving over 35,000 painters in 2017.

In addition to expanding across the country, Gallery on The Go is also committed to giving back to the community. They have given over \$105,000 in donations, fundraising painting parties, and free events to benefit a variety of non-profits within the Commerce City community.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Gallery On The Go, Inc. for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

ZIMBABWE AFTER MUGABE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we held a hearing on Zimbabwe. The hearing has been a long time in the making—for some 37 years since the birth of the modern nation of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe

dominated the political landscape of this resource rich and promising country, first as Prime Minister, then as President, always as Strongman. It was a 37-year rule which, sadly, betrayed the post-colonial aspirations of freedom, one which was marked by misrule, mismanagement and mistreatment of Mugabe's fellow citizens.

For many Zimbabweans, and for many years, envisioning a "Zimbabwe after Mugabe" was considered a fool's errand. Elections—some more flawed than others—had come and gone, opportunities for reform fallen by the wayside, and through it all the domineering presence of one man haunted the dreams of his countrymen.

Then, in a matter of weeks, culminating last November, the landscape changed. The once-invincible ruler in October 2017 set into motion a series of events which left him not only ousted from the Zimbabwe National Union-Patriotic Front party, or ZANU-PF, but pushed off his presidential perch.

The drama began in earnest when Mugabe sought to prop up his wife Grace's standing as his designated successor by ousting one of his two Vice Presidents, Emmerson Mnangagwa, presumably to elevate his wife to the position, while simultaneously moving against Mnangagwa's allies in the government and in ZANU-PF, promoting a younger generation aligned with Grace.

Mnangagwa was part of an older faction in ZANU-PF, the generation that fought for liberation, with roots and strong connections in the military. As Rhodesian Bush War veterans and political survivors, Mnangagwa and his comrades could draw upon a reservoir of experience and cunning; they were not to be so easily pushed aside.

So while Mugabe sought to tighten the reigns of control in favor of his wife and her allies, the other Vice President and head of the Zimbabwe Defense Force, Constantino Chiwenga, made a bold statement on November 13, saying in "matters of protecting our revolution, the military will not hesitate to step in." This was declared "treasonous," but before Chiwenga himself could be arrested, the Zimbabwe Defense Forces did in fact step in and confined the long-serving President to his quarters while taking control of key points around the country.

What followed were spontaneous popular demonstrations against Robert Mugabe, indicating that a spell had been broken. ZANU-PF convened a meeting which declared Mnangagwa to be interim leader of the party, and in the face of impeachment proceedings against Mugabe, the 93-year-old President reluctantly stepped down, allowing Mnangagwa to assume the vacancy. This series of actions preserved a veneer of constitutional process, such that neither our country nor the African Union would label the events that took place a "coup;" indeed, if it were a coup, it was a popularly supported one, and one which subsequently received High Court ratification.

So where does that leave us? Who is Emmerson Mnangagwa, the man who was sworn in as Zimbabwe's President on November 21?

Critics call him "the Crocodile," and recall his role as Mugabe's right-hand man and confidant, including during the brutal period in the

early 1980s, when in the newly independent nation Mugabe waged an internal campaign of repression against fellow revolutionary leader Joshua Nkomo, killing thousands of ethnic minority Ndebele followers of Nkomo. During this time, Mugabe was assisted by military advisors from East Germany and North Korea, and by his Minister of State Security, one Emmerson Mnangagwa.

Others, more charitably, admit that Mnangagwa was indeed once the Crocodile, but maintain that he has changed, undergoing a religious conversion to Evangelical Christianity. Indeed, his rhetoric since ascending to power has been reassuring, stating that he will restore democracy, rule of law, economic prosperity and trade while addressing endemic corruption. On the issue of land tenure, he said he would end the seizures of property that Mugabe had used to punish enemies and reward cronies.

So we stand at a crossroads, perhaps facing a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity where Zimbabwe can chart a new course. Yet one cannot be Pollyanna, nor disregard the wise words of Pete Townshend, who once sang "Meet the new Boss, same as the old Boss . . . We won't get fooled again."

On the issue of land seizures, for example, one notes that the newly-retired general and, as of December 28, 2017, the new Vice President, Constantino Chiwenga—who issued the "treasonous" challenge that led to Mugabe's ouster—is alleged to be a beneficiary of Mugabe's past largess with other people's land.

Indeed, as we attempt to read the tea leaves and discern what the entrails portend, we will be assisted by a stellar panel. While the State Department is unable to send a witness due to the immediacy of issues concerning the budget and Secretary Tillerson's impending trip to Africa, we have with us a former Ambassador of the United States to Zimbabwe as well as one of the key implementers of our democracy promotion policy in Zimbabwe. We also have two Zimbabweans with us, who are extremely versed and involved in contemporary events in the country.

Yesterday's hearing looked at the prospects for true democratic and governance reform, as well as the potential restoration of rule of law.

We truly hope that the arrival of a new government signals an opportunity for establishing a mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and Zimbabwe, and that as the near future unfolds, events will allow us to re-evaluate some of the sanctions that were imposed during the Mugabe years.

16TH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL TEACHERS AWARDS

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 2018

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of outstanding public school teachers in Florida's 16th Congressional District.

I was once told that children are 25 percent of the population, but they are 100 percent of the future.

And it's true. The education of a child is an investment, not only in that student, but in the future of our country.

Therefore, I established the Congressional Teacher Awards to honor educators for their ability to teach and inspire students.

An independent panel has chosen the following teachers from Manatee, Sarasota, and Hillsborough counties for Florida's 16th District 2018 Congressional Teacher Award for their accomplishments as educators:

Ms. Michelle Brewster for her accomplishments as a sixth grade Math teacher at Eisenhower Middle School.

Ms. Karen Lewellen, for her accomplishments as a Math teacher at State College of Florida Collegiate School.

Ms. Carrie Ling, for her accomplishments as a Math and Science teacher at Braden River Elementary School.

Mr. Nelson Lopez for his accomplishments as an ELA and Journalism teacher Palmetto High School.

Ms. Barb Rannigan, for her accomplishments as a third grade teacher at Alta Vista Elementary School.

Ms. Es Swihart for her accomplishments as an English teacher at Riverview High School.

Dr. Terri St. John for her accomplishments as an English teacher at Sarasota High School.

Ms. Deborah Walker, for her accomplishments as a sixth grade Science teacher at Sarasota Military Academy Prep.

On behalf of the people of Florida's 16th District I congratulate each of these outstanding teachers and offer my sincere appreciation for their service and dedication.

SENATE—Monday, March 5, 2018

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, the sovereign Lord of nations, empower our lawmakers to be as faithful to others as You have been to them. May they be willing to show patience in dealing with the shortcomings of others in the same way that You have shown them mercy and long-suffering. Lord, help them to seek to respect the beliefs and ideas of others, being tolerant even to those with whom they may disagree. Give them the wisdom to refuse to do to others what they would not want done to themselves.

Lord, we commit this day to You, totally desiring to work for Your glory.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The majority leader is recognized.

CONGRATULATING KENTUCKY COLLEGE BASKETBALL TEAMS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there is a simple reason nearly every Kentuckian looks forward to March—college basketball. I would like to take a moment to recognize several teams that are already making the State proud by winning their conference tournaments.

This weekend, the women of the University of Louisville won their first-ever ACC tournament title. Finishing the regular season with a record of 29 to 2, the Cardinals are currently ranked third in the Nation. Led by ACC Coach of the Year Jeff Walz and ACC Player of the Year Asia Durr, these talented women are looking to add yet another title.

So are the Murray State Racers. Its men's team won the Ohio Valley Conference championship and earned its first NCAA tournament appearance since 2012. It will look to build on the longest winning streak in the Nation.

Also in Louisville, the Bellarmine Knights men's team earned its second straight conference championship and a two-seed in the NCAA Division II tournament.

At Thomas More College, both the men's and women's teams are celebrating conference championships which earned them spots in the NCAA Division III tournaments.

Lindsey Wilson College won its conference title and is headed back to the NAIA Division I tournament for the first time since advancing to the Fab Four in 2013.

The Union College men's team clinched its fifth consecutive conference title. The Kentucky Christian Lady Knights took home the Mideast Region title as well.

I congratulate all of these conference-winning Kentucky teams, their coaches, and, of course, their dedicated fans.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, we will vote on the nominations of three more talented individuals today whom the President has asked to serve as Federal district judges: Karen Scholer for the Northern District of Texas, Tilman Self for the Middle District of Georgia, and Terry Doughty for the Western District of Louisiana. These are three excellent nominees, and I encourage all of our colleagues to vote in support of each of them.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, it has been 73 days since President Trump signed historic tax reform into law.

It feels as though it has been longer than that because, practically every day, another major national employer announces a new commitment to invest in American workers because of tax reform. Every day, we hear about more local businesses realizing new savings and putting it toward equipment, expansion, and employees. Every day, we hear about how bonuses, rising wages, expanded benefits, and lower taxes are giving middle-class families a whole lot more breathing room. Yet, every day, we are reminded that some of our friends across the aisle are still desperately trying to minimize this good news. Democratic leaders have tried to say that these new jobs, raises, bonuses, and business expansions amount to no more than "crumbs."

I leave the final verdict to the hard-working families across the country,

including the many Kentuckians from whom I hear. In the meantime, the economic data are painting quite an optimistic picture.

Last week, the Labor Department announced that weekly jobless claims had reached a 48-year low. Let me repeat that. Fewer Americans are filing for unemployment today than at any time since 1969. The labor market is tightening; employers are competing for talent; and workers and their families are coming out on top.

In January, Americans' real disposable income rose more quickly than it had since April of 2015. That is the biggest jump in spending money available to American families, accounting for tax rates and inflation, in nearly 3 years. That is more money to save for a home purchase or a college fund. It is more to save for retirement or to spend on a family vacation. U.S. consumer confidence is higher today than it has been since the year 2000, and, last week, news broke that U.S. manufacturing is expanding at its fastest pace since 2004.

Look, it is not complicated. The bill passed by the Republicans in Congress last year was designed with a very simple philosophy in mind: that when we put more of Americans' hard-earned money back in their own pockets, they will know what best to do with it, that when we level the playing field and take weight off the shoulders of small businesses, they will help their communities thrive, and that when we welcome investment from entrepreneurs and job creators, instead of discouraging it, the economy will respond in kind.

The idea was simple enough, but as we are already seeing, because the Republicans in Congress and the President were able to overcome lockstep partisan opposition on the other side and get tax reform across the finish line, that simple idea is having an extraordinary impact.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Karen Gren Scholer, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is the day—March 5—the deadline imposed by President Trump on those who are being protected and allowed to stay in the United States under the DACA Program.

It was last September 5 when President Trump's Attorney General held a press conference and said: That is it. The protection that is currently given to 780,000 young people in America to allow them to stay in this country and pursue their dreams will end on March 5 of 2018—today—780,000 who were brought to the United States as infants, toddlers, children, and teenagers, who have lived their lives in this country, who have gone to school, who have never had a serious run-in with the law, who have gone through criminal background checks, come up with \$500 filing fees, and who were given permission under an Executive order by President Obama to legally stay in this country for 2 years at a time. During that period, they would not be deported, and they would be allowed to work.

Who are these young people? They are known as the Dreamers, although President Trump hates that term. They are known as the Dreamers because they represent young people who went to school in America, stood up in their classroom every day and pledged allegiance to that flag. This is the only country they have ever known. This was to be the country of their future, but at some point in their lives, a member of their family sat down and said: We have to have a serious conversation. You see, we never filed the papers when we brought you to this country as an infant, and right now you are undocumented in the United States of America.

What that means is that any minute, there could be a knock on the door and you and perhaps your entire family would be asked to leave. I introduced a bill called the DREAM Act 17 years ago. Senator HATCH was my cosponsor when I introduced it. The purpose of the DREAM Act was to say to these

young people: We will give you a chance. Though you are illegal in the eyes of the law in the United States—undocumented—we will give you a chance to earn your way to legal status, give you a chance someday to be a citizen of the United States. It will not be easy. There is no helping hand for you. If you want to go to college, there will be no Federal assistance for you. You are going to have to make it on your own. You will have to work and work harder than perhaps the person sitting next to you at their desk in high school. See if you can do it. If you can, we will give you your chance.

That is what the DREAM Act said. It passed with a majority vote in the Senate many times, but it never quite made it to 60 votes, which it needs to become the law of the land.

President Obama, when he was a Senator in this Chamber, was my colleague from Illinois. He cosponsored the DREAM Act with me. So the time came when he was elected President, and I wrote him a letter. Dick Lugar, Republican of Indiana, joined me in that letter. He supported the DREAM Act when he served in the Senate. We wrote to President Obama and said: Can you do anything to give these young people a chance, to spare them from deportation? He worked on it for 1 year. Then President Obama came up with something called DACA, a program by Executive order that gave these young people their chance—780,000 of them went through the background check, paid their filing fee, and proved they were eligible.

They were spared for 2 years at a time and allowed to stay in this country. During the course of the campaign, President Trump said many strong words about immigration. We remember them well—it is hard to forget—the words about the wall, words about Mexican rapists, on and on, but he seemed to have a soft spot in his heart for these kids. Many times he would say: We have to give them a chance. They are different.

The very first time I met President Donald Trump was minutes after he had been sworn in. It was at a luncheon here in the Capitol.

I went up to him and said: Congratulations. I want to thank you for the kind words you said about the Dreamers and those protected by DACA.

He said: DICK, don't worry about those kids. We are going to take care of those kids.

That is what President Trump said on January 20, 2017. I brought it up to him several times too. It is an issue that is important to me, but, more importantly, it is an issue that is critical to the future of these young people.

Then, what happened on September 5 of last year, just 9 months after the President was sworn in? His Attorney General held a press conference and said: That is the end of the protection

for these young people. As of March 5, 2018, no protection.

Then he challenged Congress. He said: Pass a law. Do what you are supposed to do here in the House and Senate. Pass a law that will protect these young people.

A number of us took up the President's challenge. We had a bipartisan effort, six of us—three Democrats and three Republicans—and we worked through some really hard issues on immigration and on these young people. I want to salute my colleagues who were part of that: LINDSEY GRAHAM, Republican of South Carolina; JEFF FLAKE, a Republican of Arizona; CORY GARDNER, a Republican of Colorado; joined with myself and MICHAEL BENNET, a Democrat of Colorado; BOB MENENDEZ, a Democrat of New Jersey, and we put together an approach that gave these young people protection and a fighting chance to prove they deserve to stay in America.

We felt pretty good about it. The President called a meeting in the White House on January 9—I remember these dates. I will always remember them—with about 25 Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate. He held an open press conference for an hour, which is unusual and rarely done in the White House.

We talked about DACA and we talked about Dreamers and we talked about what was going to happen next, since the President had given us a deadline of today, March 5, to do something.

The President outlined what he wanted to see, and then he said in front of the television cameras: Send me the bill, and I will sign it. I will take the heat on this one. That was January 9. So a number of us, the six I mentioned earlier, came together immediately that same day and said: Let's finish this bill, and let's get it in his hands as quickly as possible.

By January 11, 2 days later, we were ready. We reached a compromise, and it truly was a compromise. Parts of it I didn't care for at all, but that is what we do around here if Democrats and Republicans are going to produce something that might become a law. We called the President. We met the President—Senator GRAHAM and I and a number of others, and he totally rejected what we had done. In fact, the President went on to reject five other bipartisan proposals to try to solve this problem.

This is the same President who said on January 9 of this year, "Send me a bill, and I will sign it," who turned down bipartisan option after bipartisan option. He just said no.

We had a vote on the floor of the Senate. It has been about 3 weeks ago now. It was a vote on four different proposals to deal with this challenge. Not one of those proposals received 60 votes.

The one I had hoped for, a bill with a version of the Dream Act, was put together by Senator COONS and Senator MCCAIN and brought to the floor. I remember it had 52 votes. It needed 60 votes. It fell short. The bipartisan compromise led by Senator ROUNDS and Senator KING with the President's opposition ended up with 54 votes—6 votes short of what it needed to pass. Then the President's own immigration proposal came up here on the floor of the Senate. Now, there are 49 Democrats and 51 Republicans in the Senate. The President's proposal came up and got 39 votes—60 votes in opposition. It was a rejection by his own party and the Democrats in the Senate.

So here we are on March 5. The deadline is here. No bill has passed the Senate. The House will not even consider the measure—will not take up any version of the measure. What is at stake? There are 780,000 young people protected by DACA, which officially, by President Trump's order, ends today.

They have one ray of hope, perhaps two. Two courts have said they are going to suspend this abolition of DACA until we hear the arguments of the President's authority in the Constitution. So there is a temporary—and I underline temporary—injunction in place while these cases are pending, but I can tell you as a Member of the Senate and as a lawyer, no one—no one—can predict how long that protection will last. Is it a matter of days or weeks or months, at best?

That is what these young people live with, this uncertainty.

This humanitarian crisis in this country—and I call it that—was created by President Trump on September 5. He has failed to agree to six different bipartisan proposals to solve the problem he created, and now these lives hang in the balance.

Well, who are they? Who are these young people?

I was with one of them earlier today. Her name is Ana Flores. Ana grew up in Aurora, IL, and went to the public schools there. She is a very bright young woman who was brought to the United States at the age of 5 from Mexico by her parents. She is undocumented in America and lives under the protection of DACA.

What did she do with her life?

She went to the Illinois Institute of Technology, one of the best in the Nation, and she won a civil engineering degree there. Clark Dietz is an engineering firm in Illinois that stepped up and said: We want that bright young woman on our staff as an engineer, and they hired her.

I met her for the first time today. She is a wonderful person. She struggled against the odds all of her life. She is protected by DACA, a program that officially, under President Trump's edict, ends today.

Will Illinois be a better State, Chicago be a better city, the United States be a better nation with this young lady and her engineering talents at work for us? Of course, there is no question about it. Why in the world would we ever want to deport someone who has gone through our educational system and excelled like this young lady?

She is not the only one, by any means. This is a photo of Elizabeth Vilchis. She is the 109th Dreamer whom I have spoken about on the floor of the U.S. Senate. She was brought to the United States at the age of 7. She grew up in Yonkers, NY. As a child, she heard about STEM subjects—science, technology, engineering, and math. She decided to make that her life's work. She excelled in math and science and decided she would be part of the future of this country and took on these important subjects. She said: "From that point forward I made pursuing a career in STEM my responsibility, as an American."

During high school, Elizabeth was a member of the Honor Society, the Key Club, the Architecture, Construction and Engineering Program. She was editor of the yearbook and also played on the volleyball team. She graduated high school with an Advanced Regents diploma.

She was then accepted into the Honors College at City University, New York City College.

Remember, these Dreamers—these undocumented students—don't qualify for Federal assistance to go to school as most kids do. They have to find another way to work and save their money or take private loans.

She received a Community Service Award from the School of Engineering 4 years in a row for her work organizing engineering education programs for low-income students. She received a Student Leader Award for her work with an engineering student association. She was named Volunteer of the Year 4 years in a row for managing the Manhattan robotics competition.

I have seen those robotics competitions. A lot of young people in high school do some amazing things in these competitions, and it launches a career and a life in the STEM subjects.

Elizabeth graduated with a double major in mechanical engineering and political science. She worked as an engineer for Samsung for 2 years. Then she founded a nonprofit organization focused on creating funding opportunities for early stage technology startups. Today, Elizabeth's nonprofit has over 700 members. To date, they have raised over \$8 million to grow their companies.

She wrote me a letter and Elizabeth said:

To me DACA is my opportunity to give back to the United States and my family the way I dreamed of since I was 10 years old. It's the ability to help solve the STEM talent

shortage after 15 years of preparing for it and being told it was impossible. It's the power to say "No" to going back to the shadows and "Yes" to serving as a role model for young girls across the country who aspire to be engineers and entrepreneurs.

People like Elizabeth are the reason why more than 400 business leaders signed a letter to Congress urging us to pass the bipartisan Dream Act.

The letter says:

Dreamers are vital to the future of our companies and our economy. With them, we grow and create jobs. They are part of why we will continue to have global competitive advantage.

It would be a personal tragedy for us to deport Elizabeth Vilchis, but the decision of President Trump to abolish the program that protects her, sadly, makes that a possibility. If this injunction by the court is lifted, at that moment, there could be a knock on her door—or perhaps on the door of the company that hires her or her engineering firm—and she could be told that her time is up. Under President Trump, she has to leave the United States of America.

President Trump created this crisis. Instead of working toward a solution, he has rejected every bipartisan effort that has been sent his way to save the Dreamers.

What will happen next? Do we have to stand by and watch as these families are divided, as talented young people like Elizabeth and Ana are deported? Is that what we are all about? Is that what the President meant when he told me "We'll take care of those kids"? That is what it has come down to.

It is a sad reality that all across America, hundreds of thousands of these young people now live in fear of deportation. They should be living, as Elizabeth said, outside the shadows and as part of America and its future. What can we do about it? I am at a loss.

Unless and until this President accepts the responsibility to help us solve the problem he created, I am afraid we will never be able to rally the necessary Republican votes to make this a reality. It is up to President Trump.

In the part of the world that I come from in the Middle West, there is a saying that I am going to clean up a little bit, and it goes something like this: Any old mule can kick down a barn door, but it takes a carpenter to build one. This President has kicked down DACA, kicked it down to the dirt, and this is the day—the deadline that he set. The question is, Does he have the will or the heart to rebuild it?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII and the order of March 1, the confirmation vote on the Doughty nomination occur following

the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2155, with all other provisions of the previous order in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Between objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I enjoyed listening to the minority whip, and I don't believe the President is as heartless as he is indicating, but the President does want the American laws to be observed. There are ways of getting that done, and I think he is doing some of that to see that it is done. I happen to empathize very much with Senator DURBIN from Illinois and have long been a supporter of the Dreamers.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 2495 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it is nice to hear my colleague's words. I would also want to mention a few things about the same issue.

Mr. President, it has been nearly 3 weeks since the shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL. Still, unfortunately, the majority leader hasn't committed to any floor time for the debate on the issue of gun safety—no time to debate universal background checks, a policy that over 90 percent of Americans support, including the vast majority of gun owners; no time to debate protective orders to allow law enforcement to temporarily disarm individuals who have shown credible signs of being a harm to themselves or others, especially relevant after Parkland; no time to at least have a debate on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines on the floor of the Senate.

The kids who survived that horrific shooting are speaking up and speaking out and are demanding that we address this issue head-on. I believe they are moving the conscience of the Nation. I met with them. They are fine young men and women. Instead of just cursing the darkness after what they went through with the losses of friends and colleagues they suffered, they are trying to light a candle, urging us to debate and do something real. Yet, the majority leader is moving to a banking bill today with no promise of time to consider a package of commonsense gun safety measures.

We need to debate them on the floor. We can't just try to do one little bill by UC with no debate or put it into some other big bill. This needs a national debate. This issue is consuming America, and for the Senate to turn its back and do nothing, or to try to just slip some minor measure through, doesn't work.

Last week, America watched President Trump whipsaw on gun safety

issues in a matter of days. All of America felt pretty good when the President met with a bipartisan group. He seemed to be open to tackling gun safety in a bipartisan way in a nationally televised meeting. Then, the next day, he met with the NRA behind closed doors and seems to once again have backed off.

It is a show we have seen before, and it is getting old. Too many times we have watched the President say the right things when the cameras are on but refuse to follow through the moment they are switched off—oftentimes doing a 180-degree reversal of his position.

On the issue of gun safety, just like the issue of immigration, we could find a bipartisan consensus. It is very possible, but it requires the President to show some leadership, some follow-through, and some consistency. Otherwise, Congress will do what it has done after every mass shooting for the past decade—nothing.

Those brave, young students will be here in a few weeks, having watched Congress do nothing again. What a black mark that will be—lowering the even low ratings of this body.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. President, on to another matter, the Republican tax bill. Over and over, we have heard the Republican mantra that their tax bill was aimed at giving working Americans a boost. Yet every analysis showed that when you looked at the actual policy, the lion's share of the tax cuts are going to corporations and the richest 1 percent. According to one study, 83 percent of the benefits from the Republican tax bill go to the top 1 percent of earners.

Don't worry, our Republican friends say, that money will trickle down to workers, but trickle-down economics has never worked. It has failed time and again. Most of our Republican colleagues are even afraid to admit that the majority of the tax cuts go to the very wealthy. They simply say it is helping working people, but their mechanism of trickle-down is something they will not utter in public.

Instead of giving workers major wage increases, hiring new workers, or investing in new equipment and research, the most popular use of the savings from the tax bill for corporations is corporate share buybacks. That is from the big corporations. Already, big corporations have announced more than \$200 billion in share buybacks this year. We just started March, and already, corporations are on pace to spend over \$1 trillion this year buying back their own stock.

The problem here is, share buybacks don't really help workers. They don't really help grow the economy. They are a quick way for a big corporation to take more of their stock off the market, raising the value of the shares. Who benefits? Well, corporate execu-

tives who own lots of these shares and wealthy shareholders who hold the vast preponderance of the shares.

As one economist told Bloomberg, "You're not going to get the macro-economic benefit the administration thought it was going to get from its tax cuts. It's going to go to the areas that don't stimulate growth," namely, buybacks, dividends. An analysis by Just Capital, which the New York Times called "one of the most detailed accountings to date" of how companies are spending the windfall from tax reform, finds that "just 6% of capital allocated so far is going to [employees], while 58% is going to shareholders in the form of dividends, share buy-backs, or retained earnings." That is 6 percent for the workers and nearly 60 percent to share buybacks and other corporate benefits.

Today, the Joint Economic Committee, led by our wonderful ranking member, Senator HEINRICH, pointed out that if you distributed the savings that went to just one big company—Berkshire Hathaway, which gained \$29 billion as a result of the tax bill—you could give a \$1,000 bonus to 29 million Americans.

This is amazing. That is the equivalent of every employee in Arizona, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia combined from just one company's worth of savings. The public is beginning to realize what is going on here. They see they are putting their children and grandchildren into deep debt, not to benefit themselves, the workers, preponderantly, but to benefit corporate leadership, owners of shares—the vast preponderance of whom are in the top 10 percent of American wealth.

Corporations are not putting the vast preponderance of the money where they should be—raising the salaries of workers or increasing productivity of the company by investing in new machinery and new techniques. No; it is that quick hit, the stock buyback.

It goes to show how beneficial tax reform could have been if it were aimed at the middle class and those struggling to reach it. Instead, the Republicans made a conscious effort to give corporations and the wealthiest Americans the bulk of the tax cuts and promised it would trickle down to everyone else. Unfortunately, past is prologue, and corporate America will invest in what is best for corporate America, while working America is getting left behind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this week, we will be voting on an important piece of bipartisan legislation that recently passed out of the Senate

Banking Committee, led by our colleague, Chairman MIKE CRAPO.

The bill is called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. The purpose of the bill is to rightsize the onerous regulations that are currently imposed on community and independent banks and that stifle their ability to loan money to people who need access to credit in order to start a business or to grow a small business.

Under the current law famously known as Dodd-Frank, these smaller banks are often treated just like the largest banks and financial institutions in our economy. That doesn't make any sense at all. Main Street, we need to remind some of our colleagues, is not Wall Street.

The bill would make changes to reflect that important distinction. I can't tell you how many of my small bankers in Texas have told me they had to hire additional personnel, not to make more loans, just to comply with the onerous overregulation coming out of Washington, DC.

Unfortunately, we lost over 2,000 banks nationwide since the end of 2010. Two thousand banks have gone out of business, either as a result of a merger with a larger bank that could sustain the additional cost of complying with these regulations or those that have just given up and said: We can't cut it because of the costs, and we are hanging up our spurs. In Texas, 165 bank charters have vanished during that same timeframe—a 26-percent reduction. Like I said, some of the decline is due to mergers with larger banks, but there have also been a number of bank failures.

We all heard about too big to fail, but some institutions were deemed essentially too small to save. They were the ones left behind and forgotten under Dodd-Frank. Because of the regulatory burdens, some small banks said enough is enough and opted to get out of the lending business altogether. You know who ends up paying the price and who ends up getting hurt? It is the married couple who wants to borrow money to buy their first home or, as I said earlier, a business that wants to expand and hire more people. Those are the people who ultimately get hurt.

In this bill we are considering this week, we are trying to change that situation. No less than former Congressman Barney Frank—the Democratic author of the original law—has emphasized the point that we need now to remember: The bill we are voting on keeps in place rules and regulations that were imposed on large Wall Street banks after the financial crisis. In other words, the big banks on Wall Street were the ones that helped contribute to the financial crisis, and they are the ones that will continue to be regulated under Dodd-Frank, but the community and regional banks that

were, in essence, the collateral damage to the great recession of 2008, following the big financial crisis, will finally see some needed and welcomed relief. Rigorous stress testing of large financial institutions will continue. Congressman Frank has said it would be “wholly inaccurate” to claim otherwise.

So when some try to distort the bill's purpose and the provisions in the days ahead, I think it is important to keep that in mind and don't buy what they are selling. This bill will mostly, as I said, affect smaller community banks, which clearly don't fall under the same category as the titans of global finance.

Last year, the Banking Committee solicited input from a broad array of stakeholders. The committee's idea was to say: Hey, all of you out there who greatly suffered under Dodd-Frank, how can we reduce the burdens you face? Those are the kind of questions all of us need to be asking back in our States.

After extensive negotiations at all levels, and after hearing not just from financial entities great and small but also from consumer groups, the result is the bipartisan legislation we will soon consider on the Senate floor.

The bill was formally introduced by a group of 10 Democrats and 10 Republicans. You don't get much more bipartisan than that. I know the Senator from Idaho, the chairman of the committee, has had productive discussions as well with my friend and fellow Texan Chairman HENSARLING on the House side, who heads up the House Financial Services Committee.

While the new provisions will help community banks, credit unions, as well as midsized and regional banks, they will also ensure that key consumer protections remain in place. Some of these protections will even increase for consumers who have fallen on hard financial times or who are victims of fraud. Veterans and seniors particularly will benefit.

Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell has agreed that this common-sense bill will provide significant regulatory relief, and his predecessor, Janet Yellen, said it was a move in a good direction.

While I would like to go further and provide additional relief from Dodd-Frank, we should nonetheless pass as much as we can and help America's local lenders build small businesses and strengthen our local communities.

Let's get this bill—which is supported by a variety of stakeholders, including the Texas Independent Bankers Association—across the finish line this week.

I wish to especially congratulate and thank our colleague from Idaho for all of his hard work, and I hope that all of us can emulate that hard work on a bipartisan basis to get this bill across the Senate floor and ultimately to the President for his signature.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, I would like to shift gears for a moment and discuss a matter that my friends back home in Texas are talking about a lot, and that is the benefits of tax reform.

I happened to walk out here just as the Democratic leader, the Senator from New York, was saying that tax reform is not working. Well, I note that his message seems to be a little out of sync with the news, which in part reported today that the number of Americans applying for unemployment benefits is at its lowest level in more than 49 years. In other words, our economy is finally growing again, and it is working again for the people who needed the jobs and needed the income that are provided by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Sometimes I wonder whether our Democratic friends, who took great political risk by voting uniformly to a person to oppose the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, are worried not that it will not work but that it will work and they will be proved completely wrong in anticipating what the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will be. In particular, Ms. PELOSI, the minority leader of the House, said that these were crumbs—crumbs. Well, I think she will be proved wrong, and that will be to the great benefit of all of the people of America.

So everyone remembers, this was not an easy lift. We passed the first tax reform in more than 30 years. The immediate consequences of the bill have been transformative. In other words, we just did this in December, but we have already seen encouraging signs.

My constituents in Texas know as well as anyone—just ask a man by the name of Scott McDonald, who called my office last week. Scott owns a residential roofing company in Burleson, which is near Dallas. It is called F-Wave, and its mission is to “create the best [roofing] shingle the world has ever seen. Period.” That is Scott's dream. Do you know what Scott told us over the phone? He said that his 47 employees are really feeling the positive impact in their paychecks. He said: “There are a lot of happy people around here.”

People are happy because of the reduced tax rates. Now that the IRS has updated its withholding tables, in February people saw the first boost in their take-home pay they have seen in a long, long time.

Scott also said that the positive climate has created a lot of incentive for his company to invest and grow. If you think about it, looking at what has happened in the stock market and, more importantly, what it has done to 401(k)s and pension plans and people's savings, there is a lot of enthusiasm and newfound confidence in the American economy, and that is an unequivocally good thing. Scott sees that in his place of business. He said that it has

created a lot of incentive for his company to invest and grow, and that is good for the people who will benefit from those jobs. He is looking to hand out bonuses when the company's fiscal year ends at the end of this month, and he is hoping that a new facility his company is building will create jobs for as many as 500 people. You heard me right earlier. He said 47 people work there now, and he is hoping that this new facility will create jobs for as many as 500 people.

Scott, we appreciate your story, and we are glad you took the time to share it.

Back home in Texas, we are trying to keep track of all the tax reform successes, but there are so many, sometimes it is hard to keep up.

In West Texas, El Paso Electric has just announced that homeowners will get new refunds on their electric bills due to the lower tax rate. Seniors, people on fixed incomes, will actually see their utility bills go down because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. What great news.

In Helotes, which is right outside of San Antonio, my friend, Representative WILL HURD, who represents that area, tells us that Jeff and Mary Marsh, the owners of two coffee shops, are particularly thrilled. They are passing along the tax savings directly to their staff of 11 employees in the form of increased hourly wages, benefits packages, and bonus programs. They hope to upgrade their systems and equipment and expand with new locations too.

Stories like these sure don't sound like "Armageddon." That is the term House Minority Leader PELOSI used to describe the tax reforms last year, in addition to calling them "crumbs." She called them "Armageddon" and "crumbs." Well, I am not sure how those two go together, but she and other Democrats did their dead-level best to scare the living daylights out of the American people and to tell them that this would not work and that it would actually hurt them.

I heard the Democratic leader, my friend from New York, Senator SCHUMER, out here talking about how money that is being brought back from overseas isn't being invested properly here in the United States, as if it were the government's money. The whole point is that this is not the government's money, this is money earned by the people and the businesses that take the risks and that we need to succeed so that our country will succeed and we will continue to grow so that the American dream can remain alive.

It is almost as if they think that any money saved as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is somehow stolen from the clutches of the Federal Government that knows how to spend that money better than they do. Well, I certainly have a different view.

I guess, though, our Democratic colleagues were not totally off base in mentioning Armageddon because the tax cuts did spell doom for progressive rationales and excuses for not cutting taxes and making our system more competitive globally. It really was Armageddon when you consider what it did to their outrageous arguments.

Our reforms have exploded the notion that the only way government can ensure prosperity is with higher taxes. Again, it is based on this crazy idea that the money you earn is not really yours to keep, it is the Federal Government's, and the government will only let you keep a certain amount of it, and that when we cut taxes, it actually somehow is not money that is yours in the first place. It seems like it is completely reverse logic.

The bill's well-documented effects have killed the ludicrous claims we heard before Christmas that Americans who faced stagnant wages for years wouldn't really benefit from the raises or that companies are incapable or unwilling to actually give those raises or invest in their businesses and create new jobs. I wonder what the critics have to say about all this now. They have mostly been quiet since the good news started rolling in—although I guess, listening to my friend from New York, they have not given up entirely.

I wonder what they have to say to organizations like the Health Care Service Corporation, which operates Blue Cross Blue Shield in my State. Thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, it has announced a \$1.5 billion initiative to make health insurance more affordable. This \$1.5 billion initiative to make health insurance more affordable comes as more good news to men and women like those in my State who have struggled to pay for healthcare.

I wonder what the naysayers have to say to this one lady in particular. I am thinking about somebody from Lewisville, TX. She recently contacted me and preferred not to be identified. Originally in my remarks, I was going to mention her name, but out of respect for her privacy, let me just tell her story and leave her name out of it. She had surgery a while back and had to borrow money up front to pay for it. On top of her student loans, this stressed her out. She was pretty anxious. She was wondering: How am I going to pay these bills? Well, in her note that she sent to my office, she said that she is extremely grateful for the reduced taxes because now she brings home an additional \$125 in each paycheck—\$125. That \$125 helps her pay the bills she was so worried about.

I hope our friends across the aisle who opposed this bill uniformly—every single one of them voted against it—I hope they will listen not to our claims but, rather, to the evidence and realize that this \$125 to this woman from Lewisville, TX, is not crumbs; it is the

difference between living in fear that she will not be able to meet her obligations and living in peace knowing that she is going to be able to meet those responsibilities. Her story is America's story, too, and it is a snapshot of what is occurring in the economy.

Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell said last week that "some of the headwinds the U.S. economy faced in previous years have [now] turned into tailwinds." The economy continues to pick up steam.

I have already mentioned that the number of people making unemployment claims is at its lowest level in the last 49 years, but when you look at consumer confidence, when you look at the stock market, when you look at businesses willing to invest in new plants and equipment and you see the benefits of employers competing for labor—you know, one of the benefits of seeing unemployment so low and the economy growing again is that employers are going to have to start bidding up for the workers they need in order to do the job. What that means is that wages, which have been stagnant for so many years, are now going to grow again. So in addition to the lower rates, people will have more take-home pay. They are going to see more take-home pay in addition because of the increased wages they are going to be able to demand for their hard work.

These are great and positive signs, but we have to keep telling the good stories because they so often get drowned out by the scare tactics and the hyperbole that comes from those who seem to be afraid—not that this will not work but, rather, that it will work and they will be proved terribly wrong.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FLORIDA HURRICANE DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, it has been almost 6 months since Hurricane Irma struck Florida. It has been about a month since we passed the most recent disaster supplemental appropriations bill, which finally included the money for Florida's fisheries, citrus growers, and communities across the State that we have been fighting for since day one, since the storm passed.

Today, I spoke to the Secretary of Commerce, Wilbur Ross, and I asked him to immediately release this critical funding to help the people of our State. Florida's fishermen are still waiting for their help too.

Hurricane Irma caused extensive damage to vessels, facilities, docks,

equipment, and gear, especially in the Keys. Many in the spiny lobster industry lost all of their traps. The disaster supplemental appropriations gave NOAA \$200 million for Federal fishery disasters like the one that Secretary Ross declared for Florida. Where is the money?

Let's talk about the broader impact to the oceans. Did you know that Florida's coral reef tract is the third largest barrier reef in the world? It is a reef that starts south of Key West and goes all the way up the coast, almost all the way to Fort Pierce. The coral supports the spiny lobsters and the stone crabs, which are served in restaurants around the country. This industry is important to Florida's economy.

Hurricane Irma tossed all manner of debris around. Monroe County has already spent almost \$20 million to remove over 2 million cubic yards of waste—roofs, appliances, bicycles, trailer homes, and boats. The debris was also swept into the water, which is threatening the corals, and into the canals, where it blocks transportation.

I want you to take a look at this picture. This is one of the canals in the Keys. Look at what is sitting in the canal—a whole mobile home that was lifted up from the mobile home park on this side of the canal. There it is, in the water.

Take a look at this. Do you see what is in the canal? Do you see out here? That is the ocean. This canal is coming right in. What happens is that eventually some of the debris goes into the Atlantic. It gets near the reef. Some of it submerges. The wave action is sending it back and forth.

You can imagine any one of those pieces of debris knocking constantly into delicate coral that is already diseased, that is already overheated because the rising temperature of the water. You can imagine what is happening. Whether it is a mobile home sitting in the canal or whether it is all of this junk that is sitting in the canal and that eventually goes out, this is what we need help with.

It has been over a month since we passed the disaster supplemental appropriations bill. Why isn't the money flowing? That is what I called the Secretary of Commerce about this morning. I told him: Mr. Secretary, my request is very, very simple. Just get the money out. The money is appropriated. It is there.

I said: Mr. Secretary, will you please crack the whip on NOAA so that you can get this money out and we can get this place cleaned up, as well as protect those coral reefs from the damage they have already undergone?

Then I said: What happened in this storm is, whether for lobster or stone crab, the traps were all swept away. The poor fishermen don't have any traps. They need help too. That is what this disaster appropriations bill is for.

Mr. Secretary, you have to crack the whip to get them going.

Unfortunately, this is not the only issue we are facing. Florida's citrus industry suffered over \$760 million in losses from the storm. Why? Because the trees were full of fruit that was going to be picked within just a few weeks. Along came the storm; the winds were severe. In Southwest Florida, some of the citrus crops were 100 percent lost. In fact, the winds were so high that they ended up uprooting citrus trees. Further north, in Central Florida, the groves there lost 50 to 60 percent of their crops.

The citrus industry cannot survive those kinds of losses, and that is why we have a disaster appropriations bill. There were losses of over \$760 million from the storm. The rest of Florida's agriculture took a big hit, too, with an estimated \$2.5 billion in total damages.

In February, we finally came through with \$3.8 billion for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Of that money, \$2.6 billion was supposed to go directly to farmers and ranchers. It is March, and those folks haven't seen a dime.

After I talked to the Secretary of Commerce, Wilbur Ross, I put in a call to the Secretary of Agriculture. I have called several times today. I have yet to connect with him. If any of his staff are listening, there is a bottleneck at the USDA that is preventing this money from going to the families who desperately need it. I will continue to call Secretary Perdue to ask him to do what I asked Secretary Wilbur Ross to do: Crack the whip on his organization to get the money flowing. That is why we passed supplemental emergency appropriations. Now the Federal agencies need to get the money out the door.

This is so frustrating because the administration knew that Congress was discussing a disaster supplemental bill when Hurricane Harvey hit Texas in August. Then Irma hit, and then Maria hit.

Six months later, most of the Federal agencies are just starting to dust off their pencils and figure out how they are going to allocate the funding. What is wrong with you? People are hurting. They are going bankrupt. You have to get that money out.

Can you imagine how you would feel if your family's entire citrus crop had been wiped out and you had been holding your breath waiting for disaster assistance funding, which finally came over a month ago, and then you were told by the folks at the USDA that you were going to have to wait for several more months until USDA figures out how to get you the money? It is no wonder that people are fed up with bureaucracy.

Additionally, many of our cities and counties have yet to see any reimbursements from FEMA for Hurricane Irma. In fact, many have yet to be fully reimbursed for Hurricane Mat-

thew, which struck almost 2 years ago. Unbelievably, all those counties that were devastated had paid for the debris removal. The State of Florida missed the deadline—didn't turn it in on time. Of course, what we had to do to cover the State of Florida's mistake was to plead with FEMA: Forget the mistake; it is the local counties and cities that need the money.

Not getting the money out is totally unacceptable. While we are still waiting for reimbursements from these storms, how can we expect these local governments to prepare for the 2018 hurricane season that will start in just a few months, right around the corner?

Let me say it again. This is unacceptable for the slow-walking—the foot-dragging—that is going on in getting the money out the door. I am going to keep pounding on this until the folks in Florida start getting the help they need and deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, since I see no other Senator who seeks recognition, I thought I would take the occasion to bring the Senate up to date on what is happening down in Florida in the aftermath of 17 people being gunned down at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

As we know, we have seen those students speak out with a boldness and clarity that is rarely seen, and they are not being intimidated at all as to what needs to be done. As a matter of fact, in the aftermath of the shooting—and while some of the funerals have still been going on—since our Florida State Legislature is in session, over the course of 2 weeks, the students have gone to the capital city of Tallahassee and have held individual meetings with State legislators. They have held a rally outside of the capital and insisted that maybe—just maybe—this might be a time that the State legislature should confront this issue head-on: that, in fact, there was something to the fact that a weapon that was originally developed for the military, an AR-15—the semiautomatic version of a military weapon—could do such damage and quickly go about killing so many people. It was 17 in the case of the high school.

Just 2 years earlier, it was 49 people in Orlando at the Pulse nightclub. In between, we saw several mass killings with high-powered, military-style assault rifles in Texas, as well as 59 people being gunned down in Las Vegas.

Last week, I talked about the assault weapon, and I have since had, over the weekend, constituents in Florida ask me to come back and speak on the floor of the Senate about the difference in the damage—the mayhem, the carnage, the slaughter—that occurs as a result of an assault rifle as compared

to a handgun. You don't have to take it from this Senator. You can talk to the trauma surgeons. You can talk to the radiologist in the trauma center. As a matter of fact, several articles in the past week have been written in various publications in Florida and in the national press, along with there being photographs to show the difference. Let me paraphrase the words of one of the trauma surgeons in Broward County who attended to some of the victims.

He cited that on any normal night, particularly on a weekend, they have to treat gunshots. If that gunshot is from a handgun—say, a .22 pistol or, say, a .9 millimeter pistol—the bullet will enter the victim, and unless that bullet goes to a critical organ, such as the heart or, for example, to the blood supply going into the liver, that bullet will continue through. If it comes out the other side, it will come out with a hole that is the same size as when it penetrated the body in the first place. It is not so with a bullet from an assault rifle because those weapons, which are developed for the military, are clearly for killing.

The bullet, first of all, comes out at three times the speed—three times the velocity. Therefore, when it hits its target, it hits with three times the energy. Often, the bullet is designed so that when it hits the target, it will tumble and just tear through and destroy any flesh in its path, including bone and organs.

The trauma center's radiologist explains that if a handgun's bullet, such as a .9 millimeter, goes through the liver, they can usually save the patient's life. They point out that of almost all handgun wounds, they can save the life unless the bullet hits a major artery or organ, like the heart, or a major blood supply. It is not so with the bullet from an assault weapon. The bullet enters at three times the velocity, with three times the energy. It starts tumbling, ripping away flesh. If it goes, for example, to a kidney or to the liver, it pulverizes that organ and comes out the other side of the victim with a hole as large as an orange.

That is the difference between a handgun wound and a wound from a high-velocity assault rifle, whether it is a semiautomatic or whether it is an automatic. It was made automatic, with what we saw in Las Vegas, with the bump stocks. He made a semiautomatic, which was legal to purchase, into an automatic rifle. It is because of that carnage that one has to ask oneself: Would any American citizen want to have those kinds of assault rifles loose on the streets for people who want to use them for dastardly purposes? I think the answer is no.

This Senator grew up on a ranch. I have hunted all of my life. I still hunt with my son, but an AR-15 is not for hunting; it is for killing. It is an under-

standing of the difference of these weapons that is causing the American people to gradually understand that these kinds of weapons have no place on the streets of America.

One can imagine the SWAT team. Had they been there while the shooter had still been inside and had they entered that school and tried to find the killer and known that what they were going to come up against was an AR-15 instead of a handgun, that would have been a terrible thing. One can imagine, if there had happened to be an armed guard with a pistol and he had gone after the shooter but the shooter had had an AR-15, that would not have been a fair firefight. With a pistol against an AR-15, one can imagine who is going to win that fight.

These are the questions that the American people need to have answered as we go through these discussions about what to do. Thus, when these students all gather in Washington and in 100 cities around this country on March 24—a Saturday—and start marching in untold numbers, they are going to be asking: Isn't enough enough? Haven't we come to the point at which we ought to reexamine that the Second Amendment protects the right to bear arms but if these are the arms we want borne on our streets?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The Senator from Georgia.

NOMINATION OF TILMAN SELF

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise out of a great sense of pride to exercise one of my responsibilities in the U.S. Senate to speak on behalf of Tripp Self, a judge from the Georgia courts, who has been nominated to become a judge for the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Georgia. The vote will take place not too long from now, and I encourage every Senator to cast his vote for Judge Self. He is the whole package.

He has a wonderful wife and family and four great children. He worked in the private sector for years and accomplished many things in the private sector. He went to the University of Georgia School of Law and graduated cum laude and summa cum laude from The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina, and went on to have a distinguished private career. He then served as a superior court judge on the Macon Judicial Circuit for the State of Georgia. In that job with the superior court, he did something that I am very close to. He is an entrepreneur because he started the Veterans Treatment Court for the Middle District of Georgia and for that judicial circuit.

The Veterans Treatment Court, as all of you know, is a court that is formed to help veterans who stray from the law or who have difficulties when they come home either because of PTSD or TBI. It helps them with the struggles of battle that they have had and with

whatever problems they may have had from representing us on the battlefield. They trip and they fall, and they need somebody to help get them up. We want to make them do the right thing but also help them get themselves brushed off, look forward to careers, and help them get that step forward. We do that with teenagers with what are called CASAs, Court Appointed Special Advocates. We turn people around who otherwise might go to jail—young kids. The Veterans Treatment Court takes those who have risked paying the ultimate sacrifice—that of their lives for you and for me and for everybody else—who might have fallen off just a little bit. When we get them back into the judicial system, we get them straightened out, and we move them forward so they have better lives and rewarding careers of their own—thanking them for all of the things they have done for us as veterans.

As the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate and as one who recognizes the value of the court system for all of the things it does to administer justice, I am particularly proud to have a judge who has used his entrepreneurial skills to deal with a problem our society has in the legal sense and in the court sense and to see to it that our veterans are getting the help they need and that our communities are getting the representation they need.

I am also a football fan. I know calling football games is tough, just as making judicial decisions is tough. Tripp Self officiates NCAA football in the Southern Conference. Two years ago, he was selected to do the 2017 FCS national championship game, which is a testament to his ability to call balls and strikes on the field.

He is a pretty good shot too. He is a turkey hunter and likes to turkey hunt and likes the outdoors.

Most importantly, he loves the United States of America. He respects and loves the law for what it does. We are a nation of laws and not of men. He does everything in his capacity as an individual and as one on the bench to see to it that our country is a better country and our State is a better State—the State I represent, Georgia.

When each Senator turns to vote in a few minutes on the confirmations of the three judges that will come before us today, when it comes to Judge Tripp Self, of Georgia, may each cast a vote proudly for someone who is a legal entrepreneur for veterans, one who has served with distinction in the State as a private sector practicing attorney and on the bench already, and one who will serve the United States of America very well in the years to come.

I commend him and his family for being willing to take on this responsibility, and I thank the President of the United States for the wisdom to make this appointment.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SUL-LIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Ex.]

YEAS—95

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

NOT VOTING—5

Cruz	McCain	Sullivan
Heitkamp	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tilman Eugene Self III, of

Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Self nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SUL-LIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Ex.]

YEAS—85

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

NAYS—11

Blumenthal	Markey	Sanders
Booker	Menendez	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Peters	

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Murkowski
McCain	Sullivan

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from Tennessee.

RETIREMENT OF THAD COCHRAN

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, late this afternoon, Senator THAD

COCHRAN, the senior Senator from Mississippi, announced he will be retiring from the Senate on April 1. He said his health had become an ongoing concern.

I saw a steady stream of Senators visiting with Senator COCHRAN today expressing their best wishes to him and for good reason: Senator COCHRAN is a gentleman, first of all; he is a skilled legislator, second of all. He has earned the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle through his chairmanship of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the one-time chairman of the Senate Republican conference, and back in Mississippi, he was a pioneer in the development of that State's two-party system in the Republican Party.

He and Trent Lott were both elected to Congress in 1972, in the Nixon sweep. Then, THAD COCHRAN became the first statewide-elected Republican in Mississippi since Reconstruction, in 1978, when he was elected to the U.S. Senate. He has been here ever since.

He is a close friend. I admire him greatly. We will miss him greatly, but I especially admire his service and wanted to say that before I made other remarks.

TARIFFS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, 16 years ago President George W. Bush announced that tariffs would be imposed on steel imports from several countries. The goal was to help protect the domestic steel industry. It was a good goal by a well-intentioned President whom I supported, but it backfired.

Last week President Trump announced that he intends to impose new tariffs on imports of steel and aluminum for the same reasons. It is a good goal by a well-intentioned President, but I am afraid it will backfire, just as it did for President Bush 16 years ago.

Here is the problem: Tariffs are big taxes, and they are big taxes that raise consumer prices. These new tariffs may temporarily save a few jobs in plants that produce steel and aluminum, but they will destroy many more jobs in auto plants that use steel and aluminum.

This is especially bad news for Tennesseans because one-third of our State's manufacturing jobs are auto jobs, with more than 900 plants in 87 of our 95 counties. Anything that threatens to destroy or damage auto jobs is of grave concern to Tennesseans. It will now be cheaper for some Tennessee auto parts suppliers to move outside the United States, buy steel and aluminum there, and then ship finished parts back to this country.

These new tariffs will hurt more than U.S. auto manufacturers. The President indicated this morning that a final decision hasn't been made. I hope that before he makes a final decision,

he will take into consideration the choices that companies such as Electrolux are making, which demonstrate that broad tariffs are bad for American workers and will cost Americans jobs, not just auto jobs.

Here is one example of the damage the proposed steel tariff would do in Tennessee to a home appliance manufacturer that uses 100 percent American steel. Immediately after the tariff was announced last week, Electrolux—Europe's largest home appliance manufacturer—announced that it was putting on hold a \$250 million expansion in Springfield, TN, just outside of Nashville. Electrolux has made multiple investments in Tennessee, with plants in Memphis, as well as Springfield. Electrolux employs more than 1,000 Tennesseans.

The company said: “Unfortunately, this decision gives foreign appliance manufacturers a cost advantage that is hard to compete against.” Note that Electrolux says that it gives foreign manufacturers an advantage. Electrolux buys all of the carbon steel it uses in its Tennessee plants from American steel mills. Let me say that again. Electrolux, which employees 1,000 people in Tennessee making home appliances, buys all of the carbon steel it uses in Tennessee plants from American steel mills. Yet it has put its expansion on hold because it believes the tariff will make it difficult for Tennessee plants to compete with plants overseas. Why? Because the new tariff is expected to cause American steel mills to raise their prices to match the newer, higher price of imported steel. The result of the tariff, therefore, will be higher costs for Electrolux and fewer jobs in Springfield, TN, making home appliances with 100 percent American steel. Instead, there will be more jobs overseas making home appliances with 100 percent foreign steel.

The new U.S. tariffs on imported steel will raise the price of all steel sold in our country, so appliance manufacturers with plants in the United States will have a hard time competing with plants outside of our country.

We should learn the lesson from 2002 when President Bush imposed similar tariffs—again, a good goal, a well-intentioned President, but it backfired. According to one widely cited independent study, the tariffs raised consumer prices and “[m]ore American workers lost their jobs in 2002 to higher steel prices than the total number employed by the U.S. steel industry itself.” President Bush's tariffs also led to retaliation, as other countries threatened to impose new tariffs on American exports, which would have cost even more U.S. jobs.

On Friday, the Wall Street Journal editorial board reminded readers: “Steel using industries in the U.S. employ some 6.5 million Americans, while steel makers employ about 140,000,

Transportation industries, including aircraft and autos, account for about 40% of domestic steel consumption, followed by packaging with 20% and building construction with 15%. All will have to pay higher prices, making them less competitive globally and in the U.S.”

That was the Wall Street Journal.

The backlash to the 2002 tariffs was so strong that President Bush terminated them early.

I want to give President Trump credit for listening. He invited a number of us who disagree with his advisers on trade to the White House. He has listened carefully. So far, we haven't persuaded him. I hope we still can. I thank him for listening. I hope he will continue to listen.

It is unusual to have a lesson in American history so much like the action he is proposing to take that was not good for the country no matter how well-intentioned the President was or how good an idea it seemed.

Since history can often serve as a guide, I refer my colleagues to two addresses I delivered on the U.S. Senate floor on September 2, 2003, and November 11, 2003, summarizing the disastrous effect President Bush's proposed steel tariffs had on U.S. jobs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Wall Street Journal's March 2 editorial on tariffs.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Updated March 1, 2018]

TRUMP'S TARIFF FOLLY
(By the Editorial Board)

Donald Trump made the biggest policy blunder of his Presidency Thursday by announcing that next week he'll impose tariffs of 25% on imported steel and 10% on aluminum. This tax increase will punish American workers, invite retaliation that will harm U.S. exports, divide his political coalition at home, anger allies abroad, and undermine his tax and regulatory reforms. The Dow Jones Industrial Average fell 1.7% on the news, as investors absorbed the self-inflicted folly.

Mr. Trump has spent a year trying to lift the economy from its Obama doldrums, with considerable success. Annual GDP growth has averaged 3% in the past nine months if you adjust for temporary factors, and on Tuesday the ISM manufacturing index for February came in at a gaudy 60.8. American factories are humming, and consumer and business confidence are soaring.

Apparently Mr. Trump can't stand all this winning. His tariffs will benefit a handful of companies, at least for a while, but they will harm many more. “We have with us the biggest steel companies in the United States. They used to be a lot bigger, but they're going to be a lot bigger again,” Mr. Trump declared in a meeting Thursday at the White House with steel and aluminum executives.

No, they won't. The immediate impact will be to make the U.S. an island of high-priced steel and aluminum. The U.S. companies will raise their prices to nearly match the tariffs

while snatching some market share. The additional profits will flow to executives in higher bonuses and shareholders, at least until the higher prices hurt their steel- and aluminum-using customers. Then U.S. steel and aluminum makers will be hurt as well.

Mr. Trump seems not to understand that steel-using industries in the U.S. employ some 6.5 million Americans, while steel makers employ about 140,000. Transportation industries, including aircraft and autos, account for about 40% of domestic steel consumption, followed by packaging with 20% and building construction with 15%. All will have to pay higher prices, making them less competitive globally and in the U.S.

Instead of importing steel to make goods in America, many companies will simply import the finished product made from cheaper steel or aluminum abroad. Mr. Trump fancies himself the savior of the U.S. auto industry, but he might note that Ford Motor shares fell 3% Thursday and GM's fell 4%. U.S. Steel gained 5.8%. Mr. Trump has handed a giant gift to foreign car makers, which will now have a cost advantage over Detroit. How do you think that will play in Michigan in 2020? The National Retail Federation called the tariffs a “tax on American families,” who will pay higher prices for canned goods and even beer in aluminum cans. Another name for this is the Trump voter tax.

The economic damage will quickly compound because other countries can and will retaliate against U.S. exports. Not steel, but against farm goods, Harley-Davidson motorcycles, Cummins engines, John Deere tractors, and much more. Foreign countries are canny enough to know how to impose maximum political pain on Republican Senators and Congressmen in an election year by targeting exports from their states and districts. Has anyone at the White House political shop thought this through?

Then there's the diplomatic damage, made worse by Mr. Trump's use of Section 232 to claim a threat to national security. In the process Mr. Trump is declaring a unilateral exception to U.S. trade agreements that other countries won't forget and will surely emulate.

The national security threat from foreign steel is preposterous because China supplies only 2.2% of U.S. imports and Russia 8.7%. But the tariffs will whack that menace to world peace known as Canada, which supplies 16%. South Korea, which Mr. Trump needs for his strategy against North Korea, supplies 10%, Brazil 13% and Mexico 9%.

Oh, and Canada buys more American steel than any other country, accounting for 50% of U.S. steel exports. Mr. Trump is punishing our most important trading partner in the middle of a NAFTA renegotiation that he claims will result in a much better deal. Instead he is taking a machete to America's trade credibility. Why should Canada believe a word he says?

Mr. Trump announced his intentions Thursday, so there's still time to reconsider. GOP Senators Orrin Hatch (Utah) and Ben Sasse (Nebraska) spoke up loudly against the tariffs, but a larger business and labor chorus is required. Mr. Trump is a bona fide protectionist so he won't be dissuaded by arguments about comparative advantage. But perhaps he will heed the message from the falling stock market, and from the harm he will do to the economy, his voters, and his Presidency.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

SYRIAN CIVIL WAR

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today as Syria is about to enter its eighth year of conflict. We have witnessed 7 years of displacement and violence, 7 years of war crimes, and 7 years of Bashar al-Assad's illegitimate grasp on power. To say that it is past time for Assad to go or that it is past time for the conflict to be resolved dramatically underestimates the horrible suffering and destruction the people of Syria have experienced. In these 7 years, almost 500,000 Syrians have been killed and more than 12 million have been displaced from their homes.

This conflict has disproportionately affected children, as all conflicts do. According to Save the Children, inside Syria, 7.5 million children have lived their whole lives knowing nothing but war. Emotional and psychological stress has manifested itself physically; Syrian children now face an increase in heart disease, diabetes, and depression. These children are growing up in refugee camps, with no end in sight. This means the loss of their childhood and of educational opportunities. I don't exaggerate when I say that because of this war, an entire generation of Syrians will be both displaced and disaffected in an already volatile region. Ignoring these children ensures decades of instability to come.

In Eastern Ghouta this past week, we saw the most recent example of the brutality of the Assad regime, aided and abetted by Russia and Iran. While only just now making headlines, Eastern Ghouta has been held under siege by the Syrian Government since 2013. This neighborhood, which had supposedly been designated as a deescalation zone, has been bombarded by Syrian Government forces armed with Russian weapons. In just a few days, 500 civilians have been killed, and that number is growing.

Years after the international community reached a consensus that Assad had lost his legitimacy as the leader of Syria, he not only remains in power but is more secure than ever. The United States has not only failed to exert moral leadership in the face of Syrian suffering but has also failed to show strategic leadership in the face of a tangible threat to U.S. national security.

I have long called on both the Obama and Trump administrations, warning that U.S. interests were not being represented in Syrian negotiations, but this has never been more clearly illustrated than in November of this past year, November of 2017, when a picture circulated of Presidents Ruhani, Putin,

and Erdogan shaking hands in Russia after a round of negotiations to determine a potential resolution of the Syrian conflict.

I have to ask, is it now U.S. policy to let these three dictate policy in the Middle East—Ruhani, Putin, and Erdogan? The United States was not there, nor were our European allies. The United States is failing our own interests by ceding leadership in Syria to Iran and Russia, whose national security interests often directly contradict our own.

What do these bullying regimes want from Syria?

Let's start with Iran. Iran sees Syria as an investment in its political infrastructure and its campaign for regional hegemony. It is their "land bridge" from Tehran to Beirut, a weapons pipeline, a training camp for Hezbollah. It is a practice ground for a future war with Israel.

What about the Russians? The Russian Government, led by Mr. Putin, has made clear that they believe all Syrian territory must return to the Assad regime and to the Assad regime's control before political reforms can be considered. Putin seeks a solution that shows that he is the arbiter of events in the Middle East. Lately, foreign leaders—including Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel, President Ruhani, and King Salman of Saudi Arabia—fly to Moscow instead of Washington. They see a Russia that seeks to write the rules of international order and an America that sits back, too enmeshed in our own political strife to lead.

This is not the America that I know and that most Americans know. The America I know does not believe that where you are born should dictate where you live or die or if you spend your childhood in a refugee camp. The America I know does not stand by while enemy nations threaten to expand their spheres of influence. The America I know sees the complexity of our own foreign involvements, understanding, for instance, that ISIS cannot be fully defeated without considering the context of the Syrian civil war. The America I know supports its allies, like Israel, that share a chaotic border with a nation at war with itself.

In 1963, President John F. Kennedy spoke at the Fort Worth, TX, Chamber of Commerce on the challenges posed by the Soviet regime.

He said:

This country, which desires only to be free, which desires to be secure, which desired to live at peace for 18 years under three different administrations, has borne more than its share of the burden, has stood watch for more than its number of years. I don't think we are fatigued or tired. We would like to live as we once lived. But history will not permit it. . . . The balance of power is still on the side of freedom. We are still the keystone in the arch of freedom, and I think we will continue to do as we have done in our past, our duty.

So said President Kennedy. He spoke to the paradox of our country then and now, what we continue to face. If we are to remain the keystone in the arch of freedom, we cannot become fatigued by the responsibility to fight tyranny.

These are the very issues that should receive public debate as part of the congressional consideration of a new authorization for the use of military force, known by the acronym AUMF. We undermine our own credibility when we continue to send our men and women into conflicts that Congress has not authorized. Secretary Tillerson, our Secretary of State, has indicated that he sees a need for a long-term U.S. military presence in Syria; yet many of us believe that there is no purely military solution to this conflict. Where is the strategy? we ask. I would like to see the administration put forward a plan that encompasses all components of this conflict—military, political, and humanitarian.

When we ask our men and women in uniform to put their lives on the line to protect our homeland and fight terrorism, we need to be willing to back them up by doing our jobs here in Washington. Just consider Pennsylvania. Pennsylvanians have made a substantial sacrifice in the past 17 years of war as 288 of our brave servicemembers have been killed in action in those 17 years and as almost 2,000 have been wounded in action in Afghanistan and Iraq.

We owe it to these men and women to have a robust, bipartisan debate about this strategy and a vote on an AUMF. We should also vote on legislation to cut off financing for ISIS or any other terrorist organization in the world. I have a bipartisan bill, the Stop Terrorists Operational Resources and Money Act, the so-called STORM Act, with Senator ISAKSON. I have a bill, as well, with Senator RUBIO, the Preventing Destabilization of Iraq and Syria Act, to promote humanitarian aid and sanction the Russian and Iranian actors who are destabilizing this region—all of the components of a comprehensive strategy.

Let's have a serious debate on this critical national security issue. We are not always faced with situations in which our moral obligation and our strategic priorities lead to the same conclusion, but this is one of those rare moments.

May it be said of us years from now, just as President Kennedy said, that we do our duty to continue to be the keystone in the arch of freedom, including helping the Syrian people, especially her children, be free of Assad's brutality and bombing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, Executive Calendar No. 397.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey Gerrish, of Maryland, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and Industrial Competitiveness), with the rank of Ambassador.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

NORTHERN KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY'S FOUNDERS DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my privilege to highlight the 50th anniversary of the founding of Northern Kentucky University, NKU. I am proud to join with NKU's more than 14,000 students, its faculty and staff, and its supporters in marking the history of the institution.

As northern Kentucky was previously the only region in the State without a traditional public university, many students lacked the opportunity to attend a local 4-year institution of higher education that students in other regions of Kentucky enjoyed. In response, a bipartisan group of State legislators from the region worked with Kentucky Governor Louie B. Nunn to establish a new school in 1968. Originally named Northern Kentucky State

College, the school proved to be an attractive option for local students from the region. Less than a decade later, as the campus continued to expand its programs and services to accommodate a growing student population, the school became a university, changing its name to Northern Kentucky University, NKU. Since that time, NKU has continued to thrive, adding more undergraduate, graduate, and even doctoral programs, which have attracted a broader base of students to the university. These advancements, coupled with the region's population growth and economic development, have been an immense benefit to Northern Kentucky.

NKU has also expanded athletic opportunities for its students and has built a number of strong teams. Having dominated NCAA Division II play with two women's basketball national championships and one men's soccer national championship, the Norse recently transitioned into NCAA Division I. With this new reclassification, the Norse teams have continued to excel. Winning the Horizon League tournament last year, the men's basketball team earned their first trip to the NCAA Division I tournament. This year, the team's hard work earned their title as the Horizon League's regular season champions. In addition, the Norse have many other impressive teams and dedicated fans.

On its golden anniversary, NKU has so much to be proud of. Under the leadership of Interim President Gerard St. Amand, the school continues to grow in both size and prominence. It has matured into a comprehensive university that delivers innovative, student-centered education and engages in impactful scholarly and creative endeavors, all of which empower its graduates to have fulfilling careers and meaningful lives.

With successful alumni who have entered a wide range of careers, from government leaders to entrepreneurs, to artists, and to coaches, NKU has helped more than 60,000 students achieve their dreams. For a half century, NKU has had a tremendous impact on the economic, civic, and social vitality of the region, and all Kentuckians are benefiting from having such an outstanding higher education institution in our Commonwealth. I would like to congratulate the entire Northern Kentucky University community on reaching this Founders Day milestone, and I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in recognizing its accomplishments.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30

calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-79, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$45 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREGORY M. KAUSNER,
(For Charles W. Hooper, Lieutenant
General, USA, Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-79

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Japan

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$40 million.
Other \$5 million.
Total \$45 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Twenty-four (24) MK 15 Phalanx Close-in Weapon System (CIWS) Block IB Baseline 1 to MK 15 Phalanx Block IB Baseline 2 Conversion Kits.

Non-MDE: Also included is support equipment, spare parts, publications, software and associated support, and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (JA-P-NBE).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 2, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Japan—MK 15 Phalanx Close-in Weapon System (CIWS) Block IB Baseline 2 Conversion Kits

The Government of Japan has requested to buy twenty-four (24) MK 15 Phalanx Close-in

Weapon System (CIWS) Block IB Baseline 1 to MK 15 Phalanx Block IB Baseline 2 conversion kits. Also included is support equipment, spare parts, publications, software and associated support, and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated total case value is \$45 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a major ally that has been, and continues to be, a force for political stability and economic progress in the Asia-Pacific region.

The proposed sale will improve Japan's capability in current and future defensive efforts. Japan will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, AZ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the permanent assignment of additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives in Japan.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-79

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The CIWS Block IB Baseline 2 represents an increase in threat acquisition and fire-power accuracy over previous Block 1 Baseline configurations. The Baseline 2 variant includes a radar improvement upgrade and an electro-optical sensor to improve weapon system performance against low-observable, sea-skimming threats, and provides improved capability to concentrate hard-kill ordnance in a tighter pattern on the threat. The CIWS mount and spare hardware are UNCLASSIFIED. The radar improvement/upgrade is the most sensitive portion of the Baseline 2 configuration.

2. The CIWS Block IB Baseline 2 systems and upgrade kits will result in the transfer of a highly accurate close-in engagement technology and ship self-defense capability. The equipment, hardware, and the majority of documentation are UNCLASSIFIED. The embedded software and operational performance are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The seeker/electro-optical control section and the target detector are UNCLASSIFIED, but contain a sensitive state-of-the-art technology. Technical Manuals used to support the operation and provisioning of organizational-level maintenance are CONFIDENTIAL. The technical and operational data identified above is classified to protect vulnerabilities, design and performance parameters, and similar critical information.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of specific hardware, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that Japan can provide substantially the same degree of protection for sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sustainment program is necessary

to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Japan.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CAITLIN "KATIE" BRAND AND RECOGNIZING UCWIP

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme, UCWIP. Our Nation has benefited from the service of outstanding Australian college students who participate in internships throughout the U.S. Congress through this program.

The program provides students with the opportunity to obtain considerable experience through their congressional internships, while also making available other educational experiences throughout their time in the U.S. Uni-Capitol Washington Programme interns have helped me serve Idaho constituents, and I am grateful for their efforts and dedication.

Caitlin "Katie" Brand, a UCWIP participant, joined my staff as an intern this semester. Katie is studying a double bachelor of commerce, accounting, and law with a diploma of languages, Mandarin, at Monash University. Upon completion of her degree, Katie intends to pursue a career in either the international relations, finance, or banking fields. Katie has been a pleasure to have on my staff and quickly adapted to her role and responsibilities in the office. Her eager and intelligent demeanor have allowed Katie to put forth her best work in helping to advance crucial work for Idahoans. I commend the level of professionalism Katie exhibits in every office interaction. She has shared with us some of the political and cultural differences between the U.S. and Australia, and it has been a great learning experience for both Katie and the staff.

"Being part of the UCWIP program and working in Senator Mike Crapo's office was an invaluable experience," Katie has said about her experiences in Washington. "The opportunity has afforded me unparalleled insight into the world's foremost legislative body and enriched my professional development, including opportunities beyond what I imagined, such as attending the State of the Union as the Senator's guest. I want to wholeheartedly thank Senator Crapo and the staff in Senator Crapo's office who have made my internship so enjoyable and educational."

Eric Federer, UCWIP's director and founder, has successfully focused his Capitol Hill and Australia experiences to provide this valuable educational exchange opportunity that benefits Australian students and congressional offices. His dedication to advancing this learning experience is remarkable.

I have been honored to have worked with the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme for several years. The program is shaping young leaders who are helping to deepen understanding between our two nations while providing outstanding constituent support. I commend Katie Brand, Eric Federer, and the other Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme participants and interns for their achievements and wish them continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO IRMA CLOUGH

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize the very special occasion of the 100th birthday of Mrs. Irma Clough, which occurred on February 19, 2018. Born in 1918, Irma has lived in Bath, NH, for the majority of her life.

Irma's friends describe her as an independent spirit with a great sense of humor. She loves wildlife, playing cards and dominos, and keeping up with basketball games. As a young woman, she cleaned people's houses to help support her family. While working as a cook at the Village Bath School, Irma was well known for her baking skills.

Irma is a dedicated member of the Bath Congregational Church where she has sung in the choir and served as the church treasurer. Twenty-three years ago, Irma started the annual Fall Foliage Festival in her town. She has also been a member of Pine Grove Grange for over 85 years and continues to serve as their treasurer.

Irma and her husband, Edwin Clough, who passed away in 1993, were married for 45 years. Together they raised three children, and now, Irma has 8 grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren.

I hope everyone joins me in wishing an accomplished and well-loved Granite Stater, Irma Clough, a very happy 100th birthday.●

TRIBUTE TO KATERI CALLAHAN

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I want to recognize the leadership of Kateri Callahan, who has served as president of the Alliance to Save Energy since 2004. As the honorary chair of the alliance, I have been a firsthand witness to many of Kateri's most recent accomplishments. Before Kateri starts the next chapter of her career, I want take this opportunity to look back upon her 14 years with the alliance and thank her for her contributions to Federal energy-efficiency policy.

In 1977, Senators Charles Percy and Hubert Humphrey—a Republican from Illinois and a Democrat from Minnesota—founded the alliance as the leading energy-efficiency coalition of businesses, governments, environmental groups, and consumer advocates. The goal of the Alliance from

the start has been simple: "Use less and do more." In the wake of the oil embargoes and energy shortages of the 1970s, that message resonated loud and clear, and it still does.

Energy efficiency saves money, improves national security, reduces pollution, encourages innovation, boosts U.S. competitiveness, and creates jobs. Without the economywide improvements in energy efficiency made since 1973, it is estimated that today's economy would require 60 percent more energy than we consume now. In fact, savings from energy-efficiency improvements over the last 40 years have reduced our national energy bill by an estimated \$800 billion, all while growing and expanding our economy.

Since its establishment, the alliance has taken great care to cultivate and maintain bipartisan support for policies supporting energy efficiency. While doing so, the organization has been led by a distinguished group of energy efficiency thought-leaders and advocates like Kateri.

For my colleagues who have not met Kateri, you need to know she is persistent and tenacious. Once she gets ahold of something, believe me she never lets go and sees it through to the end. I am thankful for Kateri's leadership, and on behalf of my House and Senate colleagues who are also part of the alliance, I am thankful for the coalition's support for my proposals over the years.

Highlights abound during Kateri's tenure at the alliance. She was a key negotiator on many of the most impactful energy-efficiency provisions of the 2005 and 2007 energy bills that passed Congress with strong bipartisan support and were signed into law by President George W. Bush. She helped ensure that the 2009 stimulus package provided significant investments in energy efficiency and encouraged states to adopt updated building energy codes. In 2015, she stood with me and my colleagues, Senator ROB PORTMAN and Representatives DAVID MCKINLEY and PETER WELCH, as President Barack Obama signed our bipartisan and bicameral bill, the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act, which was the first significant energy-efficiency legislation to pass Congress in nearly a decade.

In addition to her work in Washington, Kateri has spurred initiatives to connect directly with energy consumers and educate the public about the economic and environmental opportunities of energy efficiency. She produced a series of award-winning consumer education campaigns, including the Power is in Your Hands, Energy Hog, DriveSmarter, LUMEN, and Six Degrees of Energy Efficiency. She also led the establishment of the Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance to ensure that American families and businesses in the southeastern States have the knowledge, resources, and opportunities to optimize energy use.

The alliance's reach does not stop at our borders. Under the leadership of Kateri, the alliance created the European Alliance to Save Energy and established EE Global, the world's premier gathering of energy-efficiency leaders to discuss new ideas and chart new paths to do more by using less.

Serving 14 years as president of an organization like the alliance is its own commendable accomplishment, but Kateri has had a more profound and positive impact on Federal energy-efficiency policy than can be counted just in years. I congratulate Kateri and express sincere thanks for her support over the years. I wish her the best in her future pursuits and good health and good luck.

Thank you.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 30422(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker and Majority Leader of the Senate jointly appoints the following Senator to the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans as co-chair: Mr. HATCH of Utah.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 30442(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker and Majority Leader of the Senate jointly appoints the following Member to the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform as co-chair: Mr. WOMACK of Arkansas.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 30442(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123) the Minority Leader of the House and Minority Leader of the Senate jointly appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform as co-chair: Mrs. NITA LOWEY of New York.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 703 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 903), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker re-appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Social Security Advisory Board for a term of 6 years: Ms. Nancy Altman of Bethesda, Maryland.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 2490. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2491. A bill to permit voluntary economic activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2492. A bill to provide for the reporting to State and local law enforcement authorities of cases in which the national instant criminal background check system indicates that a firearm has been sought to be acquired by a prohibited person, so that authorities may pursue criminal charges under State law, and to ensure that the Department of Justice reports to Congress on prosecutions secured against prohibited persons who attempt to acquire a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 2493. A bill to clarify the congressional intent behind the requirements relating to immediate suspension orders and corrective action plans under the Controlled Substances Act that were added by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2494. A bill to provide standards for short-term limited duration health insurance policies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. JONES, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2495. A bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 2496. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish Small Business Health Accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 2497. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2498. A bill to reduce identity fraud; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to allow for expedited approval of generic prescription drugs and temporary importation of prescription drugs in the case of non-competitive drug markets and drug shortages.

S. 224

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 224, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 266

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

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, *supra*.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 363

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 363, a bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require as-

sistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 898

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 898, a bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence.

S. 1685

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1685, a bill to require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to establish procedures for considering certain credit scores in making a determination whether to purchase a residential mortgage, and for other purposes.

S. 1746

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1746, a bill to require the Congressional Budget Office to make publicly available the fiscal and mathematical models, data, and other details of computations used in cost analysis and scoring.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1945, a bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

S. 2038

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2038, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of herbicide exposure for certain veterans who served in Korea, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator

from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS *Indianapolis*, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2295

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2295, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.0 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 2319

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2319, a bill to empower States to manage the development and production of oil and gas on available Federal land, and for other purposes.

S. 2324

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2324, a bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes.

S. 2335

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2335, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for recreation services on lands managed by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not

Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2383

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2383, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve law enforcement access to data stored across borders, and for other purposes.

S. 2393

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2393, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide Federal protection to the digital audio transmission of a sound recording fixed before February 15, 1972, and for other purposes.

S. 2416

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2416, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 37, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services for certain benefits.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2427

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 2427, a bill to establish a task force to identify countervailable subsidies and dumping.

S. 2456

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2456, a bill to reauthorize and expand the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016.

S. 2457

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2457, a bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for military families.

S. 2458

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2458, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms and explosives and Federal firearms and explosives licenses and permits to known or suspected terrorists.

S. 2478

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2478, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the deduction for advertising and promotional expenses for prescription drugs.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2018, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. JONES, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2495. A bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, 1 week ago today I stood here and urged my colleagues on both the left and the right to lay aside their differences and work together to prevent future tragedies like that in Parkland, FL.

It has been nearly 3 weeks since the murder of 17 students and staff at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. While time will continue to march on, our resolve to do something about school violence must grow only stronger.

Over the past 3 weeks my colleagues have put forth a number of legislative proposals. Some are recycled versions of earlier proposals, while others propose creative new ideas. Some enjoy broad bipartisan support, while others

have not been widely embraced. We have seen much discussion and debate but little legislative progress. To break the impasse, we must unite on the issues where we agree.

Let today be the day that we come together to take a meaningful step toward legislation that has the potential to prevent school gun violence, save lives, and restore the sense of peace and security that all children should enjoy when they walk through the doors of their respective schools.

Today I come together with my partners on both sides of the aisle to introduce the Students, Teachers, and Officers Preventing School Violence Act, or STOP School Violence Act. As I outlined on the Senate floor last week, the bill will make Department of Justice grants available to fund four initiatives. Last week I outlined those four initiatives, and today I would like to describe them in even greater detail.

First, the bill will provide grants to be used for evidence-based training to prevent student violence against others and self, including training for local law enforcement officers, school personnel, and students.

One kind of training this bill would fund could prevent many incidents of school violence. Over the last 25 years, research has revealed that in 7 out of 10 acts of gun violence, a friend or someone else was told that an act of violence would be committed before it happened. In one study, it was reported that in four out of five school shootings, the attacker had told people of his plans ahead of time.

We must ensure that everyone in the school ecosystem is educated to recognize the signs of a potential threat and likewise—students, teachers, and administrators—take action and follow up when they see warning signs. By building a culture in which students and teachers understand the importance of reporting possible threats of violence, this bill will save lives and help keep our communities safe.

Second, the bill will fund evidence-based technology and equipment to improve school security and prevent school violence.

After the shooting at Columbine High School nearly 19 years ago, I authored legislation that made Department of Justice grant funds available for metal detectors, locks, lighting, and other deterrent measures. The Secure Our Schools Program, which ran from 2002 through 2011, was the only Federal school safety program that exclusively provided direct funding for the purchase and implementation of security technologies to improve school safety. The legislation I am introducing today will reauthorize and build on that program to provide funding for proven school security infrastructure improvements consistent with schools' individualized needs and industry best practices. While we certainly don't

need to turn our schools into fortresses, we must do more to protect our children from harm.

Third, the bill will provide funding for the development and operation of evidence-based school threat assessment and crisis intervention teams, which may include evidence-based training for school officials in responding to mental health crises. These multidisciplinary teams—based on existing staff of school personnel, administrators, law enforcement, and mental health professionals—can implement proven, evidence-based approaches like the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines. These guidelines, which have been documented to be effective in field tests and controlled studies, provide schools with a safe, structured, and efficient way to respond to student threats of violence. Used at thousands of schools across the country, these are the types of proactive, preventive solutions that should be available for all schools.

Fourth, the bill will authorize funding for continued coordination with local law enforcement.

These four initiatives do not operate in isolation but together are a comprehensive approach to improving school security and reducing student violence. Training students and teachers to identify and report warning signs is critical to stopping acts of school violence before they happen.

As we saw in Parkland, having folks identify warning signs is not enough. There must be a process for acting on this information when it is brought to the attention of school administrators or law enforcement officials. The school threat assessment and crisis intervention teams that could be funded through this bill will ensure that schools have an effective procedure for evaluating and responding to potential threats of school violence.

Unfortunately, no amount of prevention will ever be able to stop every act of school violence before it happens. For those hopefully rare instances where we cannot intervene ahead of time, this bill ensures that funding is available to assist schools with commonsense security infrastructure improvements to harden schools and make it more difficult for attackers to succeed. Through each step of this process, local law enforcement has an important role to play in partnering with school personnel to prevent and respond to incidents of school violence.

States are already taking the lead in these areas to ensure that our schools are safe and secure. Last week I highlighted the Safe Utah smartphone app, a statewide service that provides real-time crisis intervention to youth through texting and a confidential tip program. Since the app was unveiled in 2016, 86 planned school attacks have been stopped. Utah and other States across the country are rolling out prov-

en solutions that prevent and reduce student violence.

We must respect the leading role of the States in this space, and we must do what we can to ensure that proven, evidence-based solutions are available to protect all students nationwide. The STOP School Violence Act will complement and magnify those efforts at the State and local level. With a requirement that States and localities contribute to the cost of these programs, my bill will authorize \$75 million in fiscal year 2018 and \$100 million each year for the following 10 years. In total, that is more than \$1 billion to secure our schools and train our students, teachers, and law enforcement.

Many of my colleagues have called for reforms and restrictions related to firearms—something this bill does not address. Those are important discussions, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on these and other issues. In the meantime, we need to work with what we have, and what we have in the STOP School Violence Act is good, commonsense legislation that can save hundreds of lives. I will not pretend that my bill is a catch-all solution to the problem of school violence. It is not, but it is a start. Indeed, this bipartisan proposal is the catalyst to a critical conversation that will take place in the weeks and months to come.

For far too long, we have allowed politics to get in the way of real reform. For far too long, we have been holed up in our partisan foxholes, ducking the difficult issues of the day in hopes that the problem of school violence would solve itself. For far too long, we have clung to our rhetorical weapons, but now is the time to lay those weapons aside. Now is the time to reconcile our differences for the good of our Nation and for the good of our children. As I said last week, now is not the time for argument but for action.

Rather than letting the perfect be the enemy of the good, I implore my friends on both sides of the aisle to come together for the safety of our children. Rather than resorting to recycled talking points, I ask my colleagues to heed minority leader SCHUMER's call to "pass real legislation that makes a difference." I thought that was a good statement.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the singularity of the opportunity we have in front of us. My bill represents a respite from the anger and acrimony that far too often pervade our politics. It is a symbol of the great good we can accomplish when we come together in common cause. Already, dozens of my colleagues from both the left and the right have signed on to support this bill. The STOP Act is just the start we need to prevent violence in our schools, so let's come together to get this done, and I hope we can.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 6; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2155 with the time until the cloture vote equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that following disposition of the Doughty nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2155; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, leader remarks, and the Doughty confirmation vote count postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator CASEY.

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION BY SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I restate my support for the investigations by Robert Mueller into Russia's election interference, as well as to condemn the partisan attacks on the independent investigation being led by Robert Mueller, who has been an honorable public servant over many decades.

In 2016, our Nation came under attack by a hostile foreign power. Everyone knows that now. Our election process—the bedrock of our system of government—was targeted by Russian agents. They used a variety of measures to pursue their goals. The intelligence community's unclassified report concluded:

We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election. Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.

That is from the unclassified report of our intelligence community.

These brazen and illegal actions have already resulted in the indictments of 13 Russian individuals and three Russian companies as part of Special Counsel Mueller's investigation.

Russia may not have used traditional military force against us, but the actions they took present just as serious a threat to our national security. Make no mistake, when a foreign adversary targets an American election, it has targeted America, itself. Yet the President, whose own campaign is being examined as part of the Russia investigation, has refused to enforce sanctions against Russia. He has refused to fight back against Putin and his regime, despite there being clear evidence that they attacked us. The President's failure to take action against Russia underscores the urgent need for Special Counsel Mueller's independent investigation to continue unfettered.

In this investigation, Mr. Mueller has already amassed enough evidence to have a grand jury indict Russian operatives and high-ranking members of the Trump campaign, including former Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort and deputy campaign manager Rick Gates. Other Trump advisers, like Mr. Papadopoulos and Michael Flynn, have pled guilty to Federal crimes.

Unfortunately, as this evidence has come forward, unwarranted, dangerous, and partisan attacks on Mr. Mueller's investigation and on Mr. Mueller, himself, have accelerated; yet a brief glance at Mr. Mueller's lifetime of service reflects his commitment to serving the American people with honor, integrity, and courage that, I think, is unmatched by anyone I know in Washington. Here are a couple of examples.

As a young man, Mr. Mueller served with distinction in the Vietnam war and was awarded a Bronze Star, two Navy Commendation Medals, the Purple Heart, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry for his leadership and exemplary service.

Mr. Mueller received the Bronze Star for his "heroic achievement" after leading his fellow marines through an 8-hour battle, where, under enemy fire, "Second Lieutenant Mueller fearlessly moved from one position to another, directing the accurate counterfire of his men and shouting words of encouragement to them. . . . [H]e then skillfully supervised the evacuation of casualties from the hazardous fire area." After that battle, he was promoted to first lieutenant.

Just 4 months later, he sustained a bullet wound when he responded to an ambush by enemy forces on marines who were in his command. For his heroic response, Mr. Mueller received the Navy Commendation Medal with a citation praising him for rushing to save his fellow marines while "completely disregarding his own safety."

I will give a recitation of some of the record that Special Counsel Mueller developed long before he was named to this position. I was going through his actions as a marine in combat, and I have a few more parts of his record to review.

Mr. Mueller not only fought courageously on the battlefield, but upon returning home earned his law degree. He continued serving his country throughout his legal career.

After serving in U.S. attorney's offices in both Boston and San Francisco for over a decade, he later served at the Justice Department leading the Criminal Division of the Justice Department under President George H.W. Bush. There he oversaw cases ranging from the prosecution of the Panamanian dictator, Manuel Noriega, to the Lockerbie bombing.

In 1995, Mr. Mueller left a high-paying position in the private sector to join the DC U.S. attorney's office—in this case, the Homicide Division—working to hold violent offenders accountable for their crimes.

Three years later, he became a U.S. attorney himself, serving again in San Francisco and earning a reputation as a dogged and fair prosecutor committed to enforcing the rule of law.

In 2001, Mr. Mueller was nominated by a second Republican President, President George W. Bush, to be the Director of the FBI. He was then confirmed unanimously by this body. His tenure at the FBI included leading the response to the September 11 attacks, spearheading the Bureau's efforts to combat cyber crime, which has been widely praised. In fact, in 2011, when his 10-year term was scheduled to end, we in the Senate voted 100 to 0 to extend his term as FBI Director through 2013, another 10 years.

Though our political system has become more polarized, each time Mr. Mueller has been named or nominated for a new position, he has received unqualified praise from people across the political spectrum and rightly so.

With Mr. Mueller's record as a war hero, a dedicated public servant, and an expert in law enforcement, it is hard to imagine anyone better suited to lead the investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 election. There is no one in Washington, DC, or, frankly, in all of America better prepared to do this job.

Serious congressional oversight of executive branch operations is always appropriate. However, the reckless partisan attacks on Mr. Mueller's investigation and on Mr. Mueller himself are not the same as congressional oversight. Such attacks have made us less safe as a nation. The political smears like those we have seen undermine our rule of law and strike at the heart of our democracy. They are a disservice to the brave men and women in law enforcement who put their lives on the line to keep all of us safe.

As Members of the U.S. Congress, we have a duty to uphold the rule of law and the principles of fairness and independence that American democracy is built upon.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to defend the integrity of Mr. Mueller's investigation and reject the politically motivated attempts to discredit the investigation and its underlying conclusions. I call on the House and Senate majority to give us a vote on legislation to protect Special Counsel Mueller's independence and ensure that he can continue his investigation free from interference.

To ensure the integrity of our elections and our democracy, we must make sure we never allow a hostile foreign power to interfere in our electoral process again, and to do that we must allow the special counsel to get to the bottom of what Russia did in 2016 and whether it was aided by American individuals. That is what the whole investigation is about—those two parts.

History, of course, will be our judge. We will be judged about how we handled this crisis. We know that in 1787, when the Constitutional Convention had just adjourned, Benjamin Franklin was asked what kind of government the Convention had chosen for our young nation. He responded that the Convention has given us "[a] Republic, if you can keep it."

Democratic principles are only as strong as those elected to uphold them. I hope my colleagues will stand together and stand strong to preserve the rule of law and the institutions of this Republic we have been given, and we must "keep it," as Franklin said.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:17 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5, 2018:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JEFFREY GERRISH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE (ASIA, EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST, AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS), WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

THE JUDICIARY

KAREN GREN SCHOLER, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

TILMAN EUGENE SELF III, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 5, 2018

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY K. WEBER, SR. to act as speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

AMERICAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to progress on a critical nationwide initiative: American energy independence. Energy is a bedrock industry of the American economic machine. Energy fosters innovation and has seen substantial leaps in efficiency, which have led to a dramatic expansion in scale.

To highlight the important progress our oil and gas producers have achieved, we need to look no further than my home State of Kansas, even just to think back to my childhood being raised up in Butler County, Kansas, which, during World War I, was the world's largest producer of oil.

Kansas has long been known for our production in agriculture and aviation. It is the spirit of innovation that has pushed Kansans to utilize their vast and diverse energy opportunities. The Wheat State is, in fact, a top-10 State for crude oil production and has the Hugoton gas area, one of the top-pro-

ducing natural gas fields in the United States.

These factors give Kansas the opportunity to be a leader in the national effort to eliminate our dependence on foreign oil. In fact, American energy exports now compete with Middle East oil for buyers in Asia. Daily trading volumes of U.S. oil futures contracts have more than doubled in the past decade.

I was reminded of the size of the export opportunity this past week when I was in Mexico City in NAFTA discussions. With improved delivery systems and more efficient extraction methods, the United States is now exporting more than 1.7 million barrels of crude oil each day, with an increase of 11 percent expected by 2019. The economic impacts of increased United States output are encouraging to everyone in the industry who has fought through tough times with low crude oil prices.

This expansion has shaved our Nation's oil imports by 20 percent over the past decade and provided 21st century careers in rural communities. Since the 2008 peak, we have lowered consumer prices for domestic gasoline by 37 percent.

Just a few short years ago, no one would have imagined the United States could have increased production of oil and natural gas while still cutting greenhouse gas emissions, which are now near 25-year lows, yet we have. These advancements are evidence of the ingenuity of our producers. Further, they show that we have balanced energy production and environmental stewardship.

For the first time in generations, American energy policy is focusing on domestic production, global leadership, and economic opportunity. And that is something worth recognizing.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Brian Chrzastek, O.P., Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

All powerful and ever-living God, thankful for the peace and security of our Nation, won by the many sacrifices of those who have gone before us, we continue to seek Your aid, those who serve our country in this Congress and all who assist them.

We humbly ask that You strengthen them by Your grace. May they continue selflessly in the fulfillment of their duties. May they vigorously tend to the constituencies that they represent. May they be fair and attentive in their deliberations with their fellow representatives. And while mindful of particular interests, may they also seek to benefit all of this Nation and all of humanity itself.

May all of us ever strive to realize the good whose possibility You call on us to trust, in what we see before us today and what awaits us tomorrow.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

RECOGNIZING MADIGAN McGRATH

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent of mine from Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Her name is Madigan McGrath, an honor student who works two jobs, volunteers with the Big Brothers Big Sisters, takes three dance classes per week, has an active social life, and happens to have type 1 diabetes.

When Madigan was 13 years old, she was diagnosed with type I diabetes.

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

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

Madigan took it in stride, much quicker than expected. Before she even left the hospital, she asked if there was a brochure that she could give her friends to explain type 1 diabetes. Learning that one did not exist, Madigan made one herself.

Madigan takes every opportunity to educate others about this disease and has spread awareness of it. Through her fundraising, Madigan made a video about her illness and lifestyle. One of the quotes she used was: "Diabetes doesn't define me; I define diabetes."

She now wants to pursue a career in the medical field, specifically in pediatric endocrinology, so that she can help other kids with type 1 diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in thanking Madigan for her commitment to helping others with this disease and educating the community and the country about type 1 diabetes.

HONORING DEPUTY JACOB PICKETT

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Deputy Jacob Pickett of the Boone County Sheriff's Office, who paid the ultimate sacrifice and sacrificed his life on the job last Friday.

As Boone County Sheriff Mike Nielsen said about Jake, as those who are close to him called him: There will forever be a loss felt in our community for him. He was a warrior, and he died laying down his life for you. He will never be forgotten.

Last Friday morning, 34-year-old Boone County Sheriff's Deputy Jacob Pickett was attempting to arrest a person who had an outstanding warrant. As is so common, one department helped out another, and Deputy Pickett joined police officers from the Lebanon Police Department in pursuit. During that pursuit, he was fatally shot. Tragically, he will never return home to his loved ones and is leaving behind a wife, Jen, two very young children, and his beloved K-9 partner, a German Shepherd named Brick.

The last time a Boone County officer was killed in the line of duty was over 80 years ago, in 1935.

Deputy Pickett also served as a Tipton County Sheriff's Department deputy and served at the Marion County Jail, all counties I represent in the Fifth District of Indiana. He has led the Boone County Sheriff's Department K-9 Team for the last 2 years and worked with Brick around the clock. He was known by his childhood friend as a good guy all around who was kind, compassionate, and generous. He dedicated his life to serving others and continues to do so even now, as an organ donor.

As Sheriff Nielsen said, that thin blue line was crossed. I offer my deepest condolences to Deputy Pickett's family, to the Boone County Sheriff's Department and their friends, the men and women in law enforcement who mourn his loss and will cherish his memory forever.

FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a legal term called "fruit of the poisonous tree."

If the evidence, or tree, is tainted, then anything gained from the evidence, the fruit, is tainted as well.

A former FBI Director intentionally leaked questionable memos about President Trump, hoping it would lead to the appointment of a special prosecutor. It did. Since the evidence for a special prosecutor was tainted, the appointment of the special prosecutor was tainted, too. If the premise is faulty, the conclusion is faulty.

To continue the investigation is to violate a legal principle and dishonor our system of justice. The process is poisoned. The special prosecutor should cease and desist.

USS "CARL VINSON" MAKES A PORT CALL IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this week, the USS *Carl Vinson* arrives in Da Nang, Vietnam. This is the first visit of a U.S. aircraft carrier to Vietnam in four decades, and obviously for a very different purpose. Together, Vietnam and America are demonstrating the importance of open sea lanes for commerce, security, and regional development.

Arriving aboard the USS *Carl Vinson* is a young officer named Tower Cook. Tower is from Dallas, Texas, and the grandson of former U.S. Senator John G. Tower of Texas. Senator Tower was elected to the Senate in a 1961 special election and served the people of Texas for 24 years. He led the implementation of President Reagan's strategy of a larger, competitive, modern Navy, and it was an honor for me to work for him the final 2 years of his term in office.

President Reagan and Senator Tower's vision of the importance of the Navy is illustrated by this week's visit of the *Carl Vinson* to Vietnam. Senator Tower, also a master chief petty officer, is looking down from his heavenly perch with great pride in seeing his grandson, Tower Cook, and the success of the United States Navy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE VICKY HARTZLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable VICKY HARTZLER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with civil subpoenas for documents and deposition testimony, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoenas is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Sincerely,

VICKY HARTZLER,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 5, 2018, at 10:12 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1621.

That the Senate passed S. 2248.

That the Senate passed S. 2372.

That the Senate passed without an amendment H.R. 3656.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

MISSION VETERANS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1209) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 901 N. Francisco Avenue, Mission, Texas, as the "Mission Veterans Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1209

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

SECTION 1. MISSION VETERANS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 901 N. Francisco Avenue, Mission, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Mission Veterans Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Mission Veterans Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1209, introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Representative HENRY CUELLAR.

H.R. 1209 honors the veterans of Mission, Texas, for their service to this Nation, veterans like First Lieutenant Joaquin Castro.

Lieutenant Castro, born in Mission, Texas, served as a pilot in the Army Air Corps from 1941 until 1943, when he was declared missing in action.

For his service, Lieutenant Castro earned the National Defense Service Medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Air Medal with an Oak Leaf Cluster.

I look forward to hearing more about Lieutenant Castro and the veterans of Mission, Texas, from Mr. CUELLAR.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 1209, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 901 North Francisco Avenue, Mission, Texas, as the Mission Veterans Post Office Building.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) so that he may tell us more about the honorable veterans from Mission, Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for his leadership and for his work on this committee; and, also, my friend from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) for the work he does on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1209, which will rename a post office facility in my district at 901 North Francisco Avenue in Mission, Texas, as the Mission Veterans Post Office.

Across my district, fine men and women of all walks of life have honorably served our country, and it is critical that we honor their service and their dedication. Mission alone is home to over 2,000 veterans, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. Dedication to this post office to our veterans will serve as an enduring reminder of the sacrifices that our friends, neighbors, and families have made while serving their country. These individuals put country ahead of self, and I am proud to recognize them with the dedicating of this post office facility.

Today in particular, I want to acknowledge the sacrifice of Captain Joaquin Castro from Mission, Texas. Captain Castro joined the Army Air Corps in 1941 and served as a B-17 pilot in the Pacific theater. He was stationed at Hickam Field in Hawaii during the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, where his airfield was extensively damaged and suffered heavy casualties. However, Captain Castro would go on to serve several missions against enemy forces before being declared missing in action during a bombing mission.

He received the National Defense Service Medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Air Medal with an Oak Leaf Cluster. Captain Castro would eventually be honored with an elementary school named after him in his hometown in Mission, Texas. He was known to be a humble and diligent individual who served in a variety of jobs before joining the military. He was a janitor; he was a school bus driver; and he was a stenographer also.

We owe our freedom to veterans like Mr. Castro, which is why I am recognizing him with the dedication of this

post office, not only for his service but also that of the other veterans. He is just one example of many veterans who have made countless sacrifices for their country in the face of danger. The bravery and the commitment of our veterans to our Nation demonstrates what it really means to be an American, the essence of an American.

Mr. Speaker, I would also, at this time, take a moment to thank the veterans organizations throughout my district for their tireless work in providing the care that our veterans need. Let us remember and express our gratitude to these courageous people: the veterans, their families, as well as their caregivers.

In the words of President John F. Kennedy: A nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces but also by the men it honors, the men it remembers.

And, of course, we include women in that quote also.

This bill allows us to show our appreciation for the veterans of Mission, Texas, and to make sure that their sacrifice to our country is not forgotten.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge the passage of H.R. 1209, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1209.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANCE CORPORAL JORDAN S. BASTEAN POST OFFICE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2673) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the "Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2673

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

SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL JORDAN S. BASTEAN POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2673, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

H.R. 2673 names the post office at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, after Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean. Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean enlisted in the United States Marine Corps after graduating high school. He deployed to the Helmand province of Afghanistan, where, on October 23, 2011, he gave his life in service of our country.

H.R. 2673 pays tribute to Corporal Bastean's sacrifice. I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 2673, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) to tell us more about Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the great State of Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, which would designate the post office in Pekin, Illinois, as the Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office.

A 2010 graduate of Pekin Community High School, Jordan was a 4-year cadet in the Junior ROTC and was the captain of the air rifle team. As an avid hunter, an athlete, and a big fan of taking his dad's Jeep off-roading, he was the very definition of what it means to be a Midwesterner.

Just like a lot of young men and women from the heartland, Jordan believed in service, and he believed in being the best he could be. That is why he joined the Marines. And Lance Corporal Bastean's commitment to service was so infectious that his dad quit his job and followed him into the military.

But on October 23, 2011, during his first deployment to Afghanistan, Lance Corporal Bastean made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation in the Helmand province. Back home, Steve and Kathy Bastean lost their only child at the age of 19.

Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, when his family releases balloons at his grave site to mark what would have been only his 26th birthday, I hope they know that a grateful Nation mourns with them.

On behalf of the families of the 17th Congressional District of Illinois and from the entire United States, I want to offer my deepest condolences to the entire Bastean family, to all of Lance Corporal Bastean's friends, and to all of the brave men and women in uniform who fight for our freedom today.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge the passage of H.R. 2673, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2673.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUSKEGEE AIRMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4406) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the "Tuskegee Airman Post Office Building", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4406

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

SECTION 1. TUSKEGEE AIRMEN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4406, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

H.R. 4406 names the U.S. Post Office at 99 Macombs Place, New York, New York, after the Tuskegee Airmen. The Tuskegee Airmen were a squadron of skilled pilots in World War II who were the first African-American military aviators in the U.S. Armed Forces. This bill honors their skill and service to the Nation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4406, as amended, to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York City as the Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building.

As we know, the Tuskegee Airmen had an impeccable record of saving American lives during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) to tell us the history of the esteemed Tuskegee Airmen.

□ 1715

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LACY CLAY for yielding time, as well as Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS and Chairman TREY GOWDY for their support in bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4406, my bill to designate the post office located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building.

The Tuskegee Airmen hold a historic significance as the first Black military aviators to serve in the U.S. Army Air Corps during the peak of World War II. At the time, racial segregation remained in the U.S. Armed Forces as well as much of the country. These men were treated as second-class citizens, and much of the military establishment believed back then that Black soldiers were inferior to White soldiers. The Tuskegee Airmen proved them wrong.

Collectively, they earned more than 150 Distinguished Flying Crosses, and they flew missions in secondhand P-40

planes, which were slower and more difficult to maneuver. Yet, in their more than 200 escort missions, the Tuskegee Airmen had a better success rate than any other escort groups of the 15th Air Force.

The Tuskegee Airmen were active in fighting against Jim Crow laws in the South, and their success and bravery encouraged the eventual integration of the U.S. Armed Forces. Many of the men who served in this squadron dedicated their lives to fighting for racial equality and civil rights.

Among the Tuskegee Airmen was a 26-year-old second lieutenant of Dominican heritage named Esteban Hotesse. Mr. Hotesse immigrated to the United States through Ellis Island at the age of 4 with his mother. He went on to serve as a pilot for 3 years with the Tuskegee Airmen before being killed during a military exercise in 1945.

Naming this post office after the Tuskegee Airmen is a fitting tribute to honor their memory and contributions to this country. I am proud to have sponsored this bill and look forward to the Tuskegee Airmen's legacy living on in my district for many, many years to come.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for bringing up this bill.

The State of Alabama takes immense pride in the Tuskegee Airmen for their skill and courage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the gentleman from Missouri aware that I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I urge the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4406, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the "Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building."

H.R. 4406 is a fitting tribute to the African American men who fought heroically and against great odds and personal hardships, in World War II and is long overdue.

The 332nd Fighter Group and the 477th Bombardment Group of the United States Army Air Forces, which will be forever known as the "Tuskegee Airmen," were instrumental in the Allied Powers victory in World War II, and is by any standard American heroes.

For these reasons it is a fitting tribute that we honor these men by naming the Post Office at 99 Macombs Place, in Harlem, New York after them.

A few years ago about this time, I was honored to join my colleagues, Congressman JOHN LEWIS and Congressman CHARLES RAN-

GEL, a Korean War veteran, in paying tribute to surviving members of the Tuskegee Airmen and the 555th Parachute Infantry, the famed "Triple Nickels" at a moving ceremony sponsored by the U.S. Army commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The success of the Tuskegee Airmen in escorting bombers during World War II—achieving one of the lowest loss records of all the escort fighter groups, and being in constant demand for their services by the allied bomber units—is a record unmatched by any other fighter group.

So impressive and astounding were the feats of the Tuskegee Airmen that in 1948, it helped persuade President Harry Truman to issue his famous Executive Order No. 9981, which directed equality of treatment and opportunity in all of the United States Armed Forces and led to the end of racial segregation in the U.S. military forces.

It is a source of enormous and enduring pride that my father-in-law, Phillip Ferguson Lee, was one of the Tuskegee Airmen.

Clearly, what began as an experiment to determine whether "colored" soldiers were capable of operating expensive and complex combat aircraft ended as an unqualified success based on the experience of the Tuskegee Airmen, whose record included 261 aircraft destroyed, 148 aircraft damaged, 15,553 combat sorties and 1,578 missions over Italy and North Africa.

These outstanding African American men defied all odds and became military pilots when the United States was still subject to Jim Crow Laws and the American military was still segregated.

Not only were these men exceptional soldiers who fearlessly defended this nation, but they were torchbearers who illuminated a path for countless African Americans to follow.

The Tuskegee Airmen proved that the antidote to racism is excellence in performance.

This bill would honor the unsung heroes of World War II who valiantly fought to defend this nation and pioneered a movement that led to the desegregation of the American military.

For these reasons, I am proud to support, H.R. 4406; and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this fitting tribute to American heroes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4406, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LANCE CORPORAL THOMAS E. RIVERS, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 4646) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the "Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4646

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

SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL THOMAS E. RIVERS, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, shall be known and designated as the "Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4646. This bill names the post office at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, after Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr.

Corporal Rivers was a resident of Hoover, Alabama, and a graduate of Briarwood Christian School.

Both of Rivers' grandfathers served in the military, and he desired to follow in their footsteps. Corporal Rivers wrote in a high school essay that he "wanted to be a marine since he was 10 years old," and that he believed "joining the Marines would be a good experience for him because it would teach him to rely on God to make it through."

Two weeks after graduating from high school, Thomas fulfilled his dream by joining the Marines. He was known by his fellow marines as a man of devout faith who was always looking for ways to serve his fellow marines.

In the early morning hours of April 28, 2010, while deployed in Helmand province, Afghanistan, Rivers ordered his men to take their positions. However, the marine assigned to stand watch was exhausted. As a patrol leader, Rivers was never required to stand

post, but Thomas had been reading in the Bible about how love isn't an emotion but is demonstrated in laying your life down for your friends. Rivers told the weary marine: "I'll stand post for you; you rest."

Tragically, while replacing the exhausted marine, Rivers activated an improvised explosive device. Rivers gave his life for his country and exemplified the attitude in John 15:13:

Greater love has no one than this, that he should lay down his life for his friends.

This bill pays tribute to Corporal Rivers' sacrifice. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4646, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building.

Born in Hoover, Alabama, Lance Corporal Thomas Rivers, Jr., held a deep love and dedication to both his faith and his country. Mr. Rivers dreamed of becoming a marine from a young age and enlisted following his graduation from Briarwood Christian School in 2007.

Tragically, on April 28, 2010, Lance Corporal Rivers was killed by an improvised explosive device while serving in Afghanistan. He was just 22 years old.

In order that they might honor and continue their son's love of country, Lance Corporal Rivers' parents now run a nonprofit organization that sends care packages to soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to commemorate Lance Corporal Thomas Rivers, Jr., and the ultimate sacrifice he made for the country he so loved.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 4646, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the comments from the gentleman from Missouri. I know the family does.

I knew Corporal Rivers. He attended the same high school as my children. I know his mom and dad very well. He is another example—as we have heard time and time again on this floor—of young men and women willing to sacrifice their lives not only for their country, but for their fellow soldiers and marines. It is an honor to stand here with my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) to urge passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the gentleman from Missouri aware that I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to urge the passage of this legislation for Lance Corporal Rivers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4646.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST SERGEANT P. ANDREW MCKENNA JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4685) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the "First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4685

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

SECTION 1. FIRST SERGEANT P. ANDREW MCKENNA JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, shall be known and designated as the "First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4685, introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative DAVID CICILLINE.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4685 names the U.S. Post Office at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, after U.S. Army First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna, Jr.

First Sergeant McKenna served 15 years in the Army, most recently as a Green Beret, and then as the first sergeant for the Special Operations Joint Task Forces—Afghanistan.

In August 2015, First Sergeant McKenna was killed in action while defending Camp Integrity in Kabul, Afghanistan, against insurgents. For his bravery and leadership during the attack, he was posthumously awarded the Silver Star.

This bill would honor his service to the Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4685.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) to tell us about the heroism of First Sergeant Andrew McKenna, Jr.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am honored to stand before you today to pay tribute to the life and service of a true American hero, First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna, by naming the Bristol Post Office in his honor.

A native of Bristol, Rhode Island, Sergeant McKenna dedicated 17 years of his life to serve and protect our country in the United States Army.

Born in 1980 to his mother, Carol, and father, Peter, Sergeant McKenna knew at the age of 5 years old that he wanted to be a soldier, and by the age of 7 that he wanted to serve the Nation as a Green Beret. His family and close childhood friends recall him wearing camouflage-patterned clothes almost every day.

Sergeant McKenna attended Mount Hope High School in Bristol, graduating in the spring of 1998. Upon graduation, he immediately enlisted in the Army as an infantryman.

After just 3 years, he went to selection for the Green Berets. He completed the grueling Special Forces Qualification Course in 2003, achieving his lifelong dream to be a part of the military's most elite.

Sergeant McKenna was then assigned to the First Battalion, 7th Special Forces Group. He went on to serve one tour of duty in Iraq and five more tours in Afghanistan.

During his first tour in Afghanistan, from 2004 to 2005, First Sergeant McKenna was awarded the Bronze Star with Valor for his tremendous courage under fierce enemy fire during a mission that resulted in the death of a senior Taliban official. He would then go on to earn 18 military awards, including the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Purple Heart, the Army Commendation Medal, and the Army Achievement Medal.

First Sergeant McKenna is remembered at each of his duty stations for his intense work ethic, strong attention to detail, commitment to excellence, quick sense of humor, and infectious smile. To this day, former team leaders and fellow servicemembers praise his motivation, leadership, and ability to bring out the best in the people around him.

Of the countless stories I could tell that exemplify these values in Sergeant McKenna, there is one that stands out.

In 2011, Master Sergeant Chris Corbin, a fellow Green Beret, was forced to undergo a double amputation on both legs after stepping on a hidden IED in Afghanistan. During a months-long recovery process at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, First Sergeant McKenna would make the 5-hour drive from Fort Bragg, located in North Carolina, to visit Master Sergeant Corbin, sometimes spending multiple days or even weeks at his bedside. Master Sergeant Corbin would later go on to credit Sergeant McKenna's reliability and motivation for getting him through his recovery.

This same selfless devotion to his fellow servicemembers was, of course, not a first for Sergeant McKenna, and it would not be his last in a decorated life that was ended far too soon.

He was stationed at Camp Integrity in Kabul, Afghanistan, in August of 2015 when Taliban soldiers exploded a car bomb outside the gates of the compound in the middle of the night. Four heavily armed insurgents opened fire on security contractors guarding the Special Forces complex, killing eight guards and breaching the facility. Sergeant McKenna was messaging with his mother at the time, and her last message to her son went unanswered.

After hearing an explosion and gunshots, he immediately grabbed his weapon and proceeded to engage the enemy alongside fellow Green Beret, Master Sergeant George Vera.

□ 1730

During the ensuing firefight, First Sergeant McKenna lost his life and Master Sergeant Vera suffered critical wounds to his spine, kidney, liver, and leg.

Their decision to charge into the fight without hesitation and regard for their own safety likely prevented the deaths of many, many soldiers stationed at that base.

First Sergeant McKenna's bravery and his ultimate sacrifice allowed supporting personnel to eliminate the Taliban attack and secure the complex.

First Sergeant McKenna was posthumously awarded the Silver Star for Valor in Combat, the Nation's third highest decoration for valor, for his courageous and lifesaving actions.

He was fearless. He was heroic. He represented the very highest examples

of service, duty, and sacrifice throughout his career and on this fateful day. However, in the words of his friend, Master Sergeant Corbin: "That's just Drew. There's dozens of times he's done stuff like that."

First Sergeant McKenna was laid to rest in St. Mary's Cemetery in Bristol next to his brother, Patrick, who passed away in 2005.

He is survived by his mother and father, whom I had the honor of hosting for President Obama's final State of the Union Address.

The First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna, Jr., Memorial Scholarship Fund, set up in his memory, awards \$6,000 in scholarships every year to Rhode Island high school students planning to attend college or serve in the Armed Forces.

Andrew McKenna was a true American hero who embodied the very best of Rhode Island values.

His patriotism, loyalty, and sense of shared purpose were reflections of his strong character and the values he learned growing up in Bristol.

I consider myself fortunate to have met First Sergeant McKenna in 2015 at the Bristol Fourth of July parade and for my continued relationship with his wonderful family.

I am proud to lead the effort here in Congress to honor First Sergeant McKenna's legacy that means so much to his family, his friends, the town of Bristol, and the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my gratitude to Chairman GOWDY and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their support of this bill, as well as my good friend and cosponsor of this bill, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their courtesy and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my good friend.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending my colleague from the First Congressional District of Rhode Island, Mr. CICILLINE, for sponsoring this bill in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Rhode Island hero and to support the designation of the United States Postal Service facility at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office.

First Sergeant McKenna had served with distinction for 17 years when he was killed on August 7, 2015, during an insurgent attack on Camp Integrity in Afghanistan.

That previous summer, I had the privilege of meeting First Sergeant McKenna at the Bristol Fourth of July parade.

Mr. Speaker, he was only 35 years old, and he died running toward incoming fire, saving the lives of his fellow soldiers.

A member of the 1st Battalion, 7th Special Forces Group out of Eglin Air Force Base, First Sergeant McKenna saw six deployments, five to Afghanistan and one to Iraq, and his extraordinary service was recognized throughout.

Among his many medals are five Bronze Stars, one of which was awarded with a valor device for his actions during a mission that resulted in the death of a senior Taliban commander.

Following First Sergeant McKenna's death, he was awarded a Purple Heart and Silver Star, decorations he richly deserved.

In my time as ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, I have heard the stories of many of our special operators and the heroic deeds they perform to keep us safe here at home. They are the consummate quiet professionals, never far from danger, yet shying away from the spotlight.

First Sergeant McKenna was "the best of us," his fellow Green Beret, Sergeant First Class Tim Kennedy, remarked.

He gave his life for his country, and naming the post office at 515 Hope Street in his honor is just a small way that we can thank him for his remarkable service and ensure that his memory lives on.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. CICILLINE, and our two Senators, JACK REED and SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, for coming together to offer this legislation.

First Sergeant McKenna has made his parents, Peter and Carol McKenna, his friends, the town of Bristol, and the entire State of Rhode Island extraordinarily proud.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring his courage, his service, and his sacrifice today.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge passage of H.R. 4685, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4685.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLICE OFFICER SCOTT BASHIOM
POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(S. 831) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Police Officer Scott Bashioum Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 831

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

SECTION 1. POLICE OFFICER SCOTT BASHIOUM POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the "Police Officer Scott Bashioum Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Police Officer Scott Bashioum Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 831, introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania, PAT TOOMEY.

The bill would name the U.S. Post Office at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, in honor of Police Officer Scott Bashioum.

Officer Bashioum served 29 years in the United States Air Force, retiring as a senior master sergeant.

During his service in the Air Force, Officer Bashioum served in the Persian Gulf war, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and was part of the recovery effort in the aftermath of Hurricane Wilma.

After retiring, Officer Bashioum became a police officer for the Canonsburg community.

On November 10, 2016, he was shot and killed while responding to a domestic violence call.

I thank Senator TOOMEY for introducing this bill to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Officer Bashioum.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to also join my colleagues in consideration of

S. 831, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the Police Officer Scott Bashioum Post Office Building.

Scott Leslie Bashioum was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and joined the U.S. Air Force in June of 1996, as a member of the 911th Airlift Wing's Civil Engineering Squadron. Scott served in both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Following 29 years of service in the Air Force, Senior Master Sergeant Bashioum became a full-time police officer in the Canonsburg community.

On November 10, 2016, Officer Bashioum was killed in service to his community while responding to a domestic violence call.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to commemorate the life of public service lived by Officer Scott Bashioum and honor his memory. I urge the passage of S. 831, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 831.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. NAVY SEAMAN DAKOTA KYLE RIGSBY POST OFFICE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3183) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3183

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

SECTION 1. U.S. NAVY SEAMAN DAKOTA KYLE RIGSBY POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3183, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia, Representative TOM GARRETT.

H.R. 3183 names the post office at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, after U.S. Navy Seaman Apprentice Dakota Kyle Rigsby.

Seaman Rigsby tragically lost his life on June 17, 2017, as the result of a naval accident while serving on the USS *Fitzgerald*.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) to hear more about Seaman Rigsby's life and service.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding and the gentleman from Missouri.

The Bible says: Greater love hath no man than this, to lay down his life for his brothers and sisters.

On September 12, 1997, a little boy was born to a hardworking couple and named Dakota Kyle Rigsby.

Dakota's father served in the military, and this would influence Dakota's decision to one day follow in his father's footsteps and also serve this great Nation.

Every young man and woman, and every parent who kisses a child goodbye, understands that the potential price for such a decision is to make the ultimate sacrifice for something that is bigger and greater than yourself, and on June 17, 2017, Dakota Kyle Rigsby did just that, along with six colleagues: Yeoman 3rd Class Shingo Alexander Douglass; Sonar Technician 3rd Class Ngoc Truong Huynh; Gunners Mate 2nd Class Noe Hernandez; Fire Controlman 2nd Class Carlos Victor Ganzon Sibayan; Personnel Specialist 1st Class Xavier Alec Martin; and Fire Controlman 1st Class Gary Leo Rehm, Jr.

I often joke that the United States is the worst country in the world except for all the others.

When a slave owner named Jefferson articulated an idea for the world that all people were created equal, it harkens to the preamble to the Constitution that gives us not a perfect union, but asks us to work towards a more perfect union, which means that there is always work to be done.

Mr. Speaker, this work is invariably done in most instances by women and

men whose names we will never know. So we carry this bill so that one of those heroes upon the backs of whom our Nation is built will be remembered, even if only in a small place in a small way, for sacrificing every single one of his tomorrows to help us continue to be free.

□ 1745

He joins the legion of Americans numbered in the millions who have given the ultimate sacrifice. We know the name of Abraham Lincoln. We know the name of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. We need to remember the names of people, heroes like Dakota Rigsby.

So this young man, devoted to service, demonstrated this from his time in high school as a volunteer firefighter to that eventful night when he executed his duties and went to bed for the day on the USS *Fitzgerald*.

I understand that there is a lot that we still need to do in this country, but please understand that we are where we are because better people than us have given all of their tomorrows for us to be here.

I would submit that when you hear that national anthem, while I would defend to my last breath your right not to stand, that you do stand. Stand up for Dakota Kyle Rigsby because, by God, he stood up for us.

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

I am pleased to join my friend from the great State of Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) in urging passage of H.R. 3183, the U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office.

The youngest servicemember killed in the collision on the USS *Fitzgerald*, Seaman Rigsby is remembered today by his family and friends for his sense of humor and true passion for public service.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor Seaman Rigsby's memory and service to his country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the gentleman from Alabama that I have no further speakers on this bill. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I have been very honored to join with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and my other colleagues to not only honor those named, but their families and colleagues, as well, and let them know that these heroes, their loved ones, will not be forgotten.

I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3183.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1119, SATISFYING ENERGY NEEDS AND SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1917, BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-586) on the resolution (H. Res. 762) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1119) to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1917) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3183, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 4406, by the yeas and nays.

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

U.S. NAVY SEAMAN DAKOTA KYLE RIGSBY POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3183) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—389

Abraham	Cohen	Gallego
Adams	Cole	Garamendi
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Aguilar	Collins (NY)	Gianforte
Allen	Comer	Gibbs
Amash	Comstock	Gohmert
Amodei	Conaway	Gomez
Arrington	Connolly	Gonzalez (TX)
Babin	Cook	Goodlatte
Bacon	Cooper	Gosar
Banks (IN)	Correa	Gotthelmer
Barletta	Costa	Gowdy
Barr	Costello (PA)	Granger
Barragán	Courtney	Graves (GA)
Barton	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Bass	Crist	Graves (MO)
Beatty	Crowley	Green, Al
Bera	Cuellar	Griffith
Bergman	Culberson	Grothman
Beyer	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Biggs	Curtis	Hanabusa
Bilirakis	Davidson	Handel
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Harper
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Hartzler
Blackburn	Delaney	Hastings
Blum	DeLauro	Heck
Blunt Rochester	DeBene	Hensarling
Bonamici	Demings	Herrera Beutler
Bost	Denham	Hice, Jody B.
Boyle, Brendan	Dent	Higgins (LA)
F.	DeSantis	Higgins (NY)
Brady (TX)	DeSaulnier	Hill
Brat	DesJarlais	Himes
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Dingell	Hollingsworth
Brooks (IN)	Doggett	Hoyer
Brown (MD)	Donovan	Hudson
Brownley (CA)	Doyle, Michael	Huffman
Buchanan	F.	Huizenga
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Bucshon	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Budd	Dunn	Hurd
Burgess	Ellison	Issa
Bustos	Emmer	Jayapal
Butterfield	Engel	Jeffries
Byrne	Eshoo	Jenkins (KS)
Calvert	Espallat	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Estes (KS)	Johnson (OH)
Carbajal	Esty (CT)	Johnson, Sam
Cárdenas	Evans	Jones
Carson (IN)	Farenthold	Jordan
Carter (GA)	Faso	Joyce (OH)
Cartwright	Ferguson	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Castro (TX)	Fleischmann	Keating
Chabot	Flores	Kelly (IL)
Cheney	Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)
Chu, Judy	Foster	Kelly (PA)
Ciциlline	Fox	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Kihuen
Clay	Fudge	Kildee
Cleaver	Gaetz	Kilmer
Coffman	Gallagher	King (IA)

King (NY) Murphy (FL)
 Kinzinger Nadler
 Knight Napolitano
 Krishnamoorthi Newhouse
 Kuster (NH) Noem
 Kustoff (TN) Norcross
 LaHood Norman
 LaMalfa Nunes
 Lamborn O'Halleran
 Lance O'Rourke
 Langevin Palazzo
 Larsen (WA) Pallone
 Larson (CT) Palmer
 Latta Panetta
 Lawrence Pascrell
 Lawson (FL) Paulsen
 Lee Payne
 Levin Pelosi
 Lewis (GA) Perry
 Lewis (MN) Peterson
 Lieu, Ted Pittenger
 Lipinski Pocan
 LoBiondo Poe (TX)
 Loeb sack Poliquin
 Lofgren Posey
 Long Price (NC)
 Loudermilk Quigley
 Love Raskin
 Lowenthal Ratcliffe
 Lowey Reed
 Lucas Reichert
 Luetkemeyer Rice (SC)
 Lujan Grisham, M. Richmond
 Luján, Ben Ray M. Roby
 Lynch Roe (TN)
 MacArthur Rogers (AL)
 Maloney Rogers (KY)
 Maloney, Carolyn B. Rokita
 Maloney, Sean Rooney, Francis
 Marino Rooney, Thomas J.
 Marshall Ros-Lehtinen
 Massie Roskam
 Mast Ross
 Matsui Rothfus
 McCarthy Rouzer
 McCaul Roybal-Allard
 McClintock Royce (CA)
 McCollum Ruiz
 McEachin Ruppertsberger
 McGovern Russell
 McHenry Rutherford
 McKinley Ryan (OH)
 McMorris Sánchez
 Rodgers Sanford
 McNerney Sarbanes
 McSally Scalise
 Meadows Schakowsky
 Meehan Schiff
 Meeks Schneider
 Meng Schrader
 Messer Schweikert
 Mitchell Scott (VA)
 Moolenaar Scott, Austin
 Mooney (WV) Scott, David
 Moulton Sensenbrenner
 Mullin Serrano

NOT VOTING—41

Black Gutiérrez
 Blumenauer Jackson Lee
 Brady (PA) Jenkins (WV)
 Carter (TX) Johnson (LA)
 Clyburn Johnson, E. B.
 Cramer Kind
 Cummings Labrador
 Davis, Danny Marchant
 DeFazio Moore
 Deutch Neal
 Duffy Nolan
 Gabbard Olson
 Green, Gene Pearce
 Grijalva Perlmutter

□ 1855

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUSKEGEE AIRMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4406) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the “Tuskegee Airman Post Office Building”, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—387

Abraham Coffman
 Adams Cohen
 Aderholt Cole
 Agular Collins (GA)
 Allen Collins (NY)
 Amash Comer
 Amodei Comstock
 Arrington Conaway
 Babin Connolly
 Bacon Cook
 Banks (IN) Cooper
 Barletta Correa
 Barr Costa
 Barragán Costello (PA)
 Barton Courtney
 Bass Crawford
 Beatty Crist
 Bera Crowley
 Bergman Cuellar
 Beyer Culberson
 Biggs Curbelo (FL)
 Bilirakis Curtis
 Bishop (GA) Davidson
 Bishop (MI) Davis (CA)
 Bishop (UT) Davis, Rodney
 Blackburn DeGette
 Blum Delaney
 Blunt Rochester DeLauro
 Bonamici DeBene
 Bost Demings
 Boyle, Brendan Denham
 F. Dent
 Brady (TX) DeSantis
 Brat DeSaunier
 Bridenstine DesJarlais
 Brooks (AL) Diaz-Balart
 Brooks (IN) Dingell
 Brown (MD) Doggett
 Brownley (CA) Donovan
 Buchanan Doyle, Michael
 Buck F.
 Bucshon Duncan (SC)
 Budd Duncan (TN)
 Burgess Dunn
 Bustos Ellison
 Butterfield Emmer
 Byrne Engel
 Calvert Eshoo
 Capuano Espallat
 Carabajal Estes (KS)
 Cárdenas Esty (CT)
 Carson (IN) Evans
 Carter (GA) Farenthold
 Cartwright Faso
 Castor (FL) Ferguson
 Castro (TX) Fitzpatrick
 Chabot Fleischmann
 Cheney Flores
 Chu, Judy Fortenberry
 Cicilline Foster
 Clark (MA) Foxx
 Clarke (NY) Frankel (FL)
 Clay Frelinghuysen
 Cleaver Fudge

Kilmer
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Knight
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Kustoff (TN)
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (MN)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham, M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Messer
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moulton
 Mullin

NOT VOTING—43

Black Issa
 Blumenauer Jackson Lee
 Brady (PA) Jenkins (WV)
 Carter (TX) Johnson (LA)
 Clyburn Johnson, E. B.
 Cramer Kind
 Cummings Labrador
 Davis, Danny Marchant
 DeFazio Moore
 Deutch Neal
 Duffy Nolan
 Gabbard Olson
 Green, Gene Pearce
 Grijalva Perlmutter

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the 'Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PINECREST, PALMETTO BAY, AND CUTLER BAY RELAY FOR LIFE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the upcoming 2018 Pinecrest, Palmetto Bay, and Cutler Bay Relay for Life.

On March 17, friends, families, neighbors, and community leaders from my congressional district will gather together to remember lost loved ones, to honor survivors, and to raise money for a cause that has affected too many in our community and around the Nation.

Sadly, in 2018 alone, over 1.7 million Americans will be diagnosed with cancer and more than 600,000 individuals will lose the battle against this dreadful disease.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, Relay for Life is such an important event to raise awareness and funds to help cancer patients and their families in my area of south Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the countless volunteers and local sponsors who are going to make this wonderful day possible, a day filled with activities, games, and fun.

Let us all join together to make a difference in the fight against cancer and make this year's Relay for Life the best one yet.

COMBATING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic events at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, leading American companies, including DICK'S Sporting Goods, Walmart, L.L.Bean, and Kroger, have taken a leadership role in combating gun violence.

Last week, all four companies announced that they would no longer sell guns to anyone under 21.

DICK'S Sporting Goods has demonstrated singular courage as the first company to establish a minimum age for gun sales and also by announcing that it would no longer sell assault-style rifles or high-capacity magazines.

When DICK'S announced these policies, it also challenged Congress to show the same commitment to commonsense gun reform. In his open letter, DICK'S Sporting Goods' CEO Ed

Stack implored Congress to ban assault weapons and high-capacity magazines, establish the age of 21 as the new minimum age to buy a firearm, and secure an effective universal background check system.

The American business community is already acting to combat gun violence. The private sector is ahead of us. Congress must follow suit.

PERMANENT STATUS FOR LIBERIANS IN DEFERRED ENFORCED DEPARTURE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my support as a cosponsor of the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act, which gives Liberians in deferred enforced departure permanent status.

Thousands of Liberians came to the United States to escape civil war, seeking a better life and a safer environment to raise their families. For the last 25 years, many have sought and realized the American Dream through hard work, drive, and determination. They have become small-business owners and leaders in our community. Minnesota is home to one of the largest Liberian communities in the United States, many of whom live in the western suburbs of the Twin Cities.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the distinct pleasure and honor of getting to know many members of the Liberian community personally. I have heard their stories, and I have seen their love for America firsthand. However, they are facing uncertainty today because their temporary period of protection is about to expire, so it is imperative that action be taken to ensure they are able to live here, work here, and continue to offer their contributions as important members of our community.

SUPPORTING DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago, the White House shamefully rescinded the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program without having legislation in place to protect Dreamers. That is just wrong.

The overwhelming majority of Americans support a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers, yet Republican leadership refuses to let Congress vote on a clean Dream Act.

A few months ago, after ending DACA, the President began rolling back immigration from Black and Latino countries he thinks are s—holes. After that, he went on a Twitter

rant to attack the Diversity Immigrant Visa program, which helps people from Africa immigrate lawfully to the United States.

Eliminating DACA without a plan for Dreamers is just another antiminority move. Removing the Diversity Immigrant Visa program is more of the same. The administration has shown itself to be hostile to people of color. Mr. Speaker, racism is not a good policy.

REMEMBERING OFFICER JUSTIN BILLA

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mobile Police Officer Justin Billa. Officer Billa was tragically shot and killed in the line of duty on February 20.

I am not sure my path ever crossed with Officer Billa, but it may have. We take for granted the work our police officers do on a daily basis.

Police officers hug their families good-bye and leave their home each day or night not knowing whether they will come home safe.

Each and every day, our law enforcement and first responders work to keep us safe and support our communities, but we far too often take their service for granted.

I can think of no better way to honor the life of Officer Billa than to encourage every American to take time to say "thank you" to your local police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Officer Billa's wife, Erin, and their young son, Taylor, take comfort in knowing that they are loved. Justin's service and sacrifice to Mobile, Alabama, and to the United States will never be forgotten.

□ 1915

YUCCA MOUNTAIN NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY IS AN UNWORKABLE PROJECT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I am here to once again remind my colleagues why the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository is an unworkable project. There are design flaws that the NRC's own analysis show lead to radioactive waste leaking into the water table, and transportation plans would ship more than 70,000 metric tons of nuclear waste by train and truck through 329 congressional districts for years to come past your homes, your businesses, your schools, and your churches.

Now some of my colleagues want to make this bad situation even worse by

busting the caps on the amount of allowable waste to be stored, increasing the danger and invalidating any existing studies.

If the proponents of Yucca Mountain and their industry donors are really serious about solving the problems of nuclear waste storage, they would follow the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendations and pass my consent-based bill rather than dumping nuclear waste into a State that does not produce it and does not want it.

Nevada is not a wasteland.

POSITIVE EFFECTS OF THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the positive effects the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is already having on individuals and businesses in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Two weeks ago, I traveled the First District and visited high school students, university students, senior citizens, small businesses, big businesses, and more to get their feedback on the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. The results from my trip and the benefits that the First District is already reaping were, frankly, astounding.

For example, Lee Container Company in Homerville said that the new tax law has allowed them to purchase at least three machines a year and to fully amortize them, allowing their company to grow at a substantial rate.

Businesses like Lee Container and the large number of individuals in Homerville that they employ are a reason it was so important to pass the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

With the new tax law, businesses can employ more people, increase salaries, invest in their business and communities, and help our economy to thrive.

OUR NATION IS IN THE GRIP OF A GUN VIOLENCE EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in the grip of a gun violence epidemic; yet, even in the face of national tragedy, Congress has failed again and again to act.

On January 10, 2018, a student in Denison, Texas, fired a weapon that belonged to an adviser, thinking it wasn't loaded. That same day, a middle school student in Maplewood, Minnesota, fatally injured himself with a gun in a school bathroom.

On January 23, 2018, a 15-year-old student in Benton, Kentucky, opened fire with a handgun, killing two people and injuring 18.

On February 14, Valentine's Day, 2018, a 19-year-old gunman killed 14 students and 3 faculty members at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, using a semiautomatic weapon.

Two months into 2018, its tragedies are too numerous to list.

For too long we have allowed NRA's gun industry lobbyists to pick and choose our guns laws.

I say: No more.

Students across America are demanding Congress enact commonsense gun violence prevention, including universal background checks, limits on high-capacity magazines, and a ban on the sale of assault weapons designed not for a hunting field, but for a battlefield.

We must not fail them again.

RECOGNIZING CLINTON COUNTY'S MISS TEEN UNITED STATES AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Haili Marie Frank from Mill Hall, Pennsylvania, who has been named Clinton County's Miss Teen United States Agriculture.

Haili is 16 years old and is the daughter of Eric and Clint Frank.

She is a 10th grader at the Sugar Valley Rural Charter School, where she is a member of the National Honor Society and an officer in the school's FFA chapter.

In 2017, Haili competed in the FFA Creed Speaking competition, placing first in the county and second in the region, which qualified her for the State competition, where she came in 10th.

Haili loves animals and is a member of two 4-H groups. Over the past 7 years, Haili has exhibited pigs, goats, lambs, chickens, and rabbits.

Haili is also an accomplished archer and shoots with one of her 4-H groups. Last August, she competed in the archery competition at State Days in Rock Run, Pennsylvania, and placed second in her age division.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly congratulate Haili on being an outstanding role model for her peers and a representative for agriculture in Pennsylvania.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that my colleagues plan to speak in favor of Yucca Mountain tonight and once again attempt to re-

vive the long-dead project that brings nuclear waste to my State of Nevada. They want to make Nevada's Fourth Congressional District, my home, my district, the dumping ground for the rest of the country's nuclear waste.

The Nevada delegation has raised a number of concerns about this project, including its location, which sits less than 100 miles northwest of Las Vegas.

Nevadans have strongly opposed the construction of this project.

As a State with no nuclear energy facilities, it is exceedingly unfair that Nevada is asked to serve as the dumping ground for the rest of the country's waste.

Rather than throw away millions more of taxpayer money to revive this shortsighted project, this funding could be better spent on infrastructure and job creation.

I will continue fighting tirelessly to ensure the Yucca Mountain project stays dead, and I urge my colleagues to join me in finding better ways to deal with the nuclear waste created in their States.

THE RUSSIAN BEAR IS HUNGRY FOR MOLDOVA, GEORGIA, AND UKRAINE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after the fall of the Soviet Union, the Russian bear started roaming Eastern Europe with its hungry appetite to gobble and dominate politics and the Governments of Moldova, Georgia, and Ukraine.

Each nation has had a portion of its sovereign territory occupied by the Napoleon of Siberia, Putin. His military is there, too.

I have been in each nation and talked to the speakers of each of the parliaments. Now the three countries are working together in a trilateral bond to thwart Russian interference and also improve their democratic processes.

For as it is written in Ecclesiastes: "A cord of three strands is not easily broken."

I also commend the Atlantic Council for their work with these nations in promoting democratic ideals, combating corruption, and increasing personal freedom.

The United States should encourage and support this trilateral union to prevent the hungry bear from eating up each nation and returning them to the old days of Russian oppression.

And that is just the way it is.

PI KAPPA ALPHA'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor tonight to recognize and honor my fraternity, Pi Kappa Alpha International Fraternity.

I came from Alpha Omicron Chapter in Georgetown, Texas, Southwestern University.

Pi Kappa Alpha is an international fraternity, a values-based men's fraternal organization with more than 225 chapters across the United States and Canada, approximately 16,000 undergraduate members, and over 290,000 lifetime members.

In 2018, Pi Kappa Alpha celebrates its 150th anniversary from its founding on March 1, 1868, at the University of Virginia, when six young men joined together and resolved to form a fraternity for the establishment of friendship on a firmer and more lasting basis.

Their commitment to the high ideals of scholarship, leadership, and gentlemanly behavior remains strong to this day, which is the reason why I not only pledged my support to the fraternity, but why I support them today.

APPOINTING JUDGES TO THE FISA COURT

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States should have the power to appoint judges to the FISA Court. This would lead to a more ideologically diverse court, more transparency in oversight, and better FISA outcomes.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't just my argument. It is the argument of the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and this is the gentleman from California making that very argument on Russia Today.

Here, YouTube has actually had to say:

Russia Today is funded in whole or in part by the Russian Government.

So my question is this, Mr. Speaker: If it is good enough for a bill to be filed by the gentleman from California in 2013, and if it is good enough to talk about it on Russia Today, why is it not good enough to give President Trump the very same powers that he wanted to give to President Obama?

That is my question. I am waiting for an answer.

FIXING OUR BROKEN NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by yielding to the chair-

man of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. WALDEN.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, my friend, Mr. SHIMKUS, who has worked tirelessly—not just this year, not just last year, but probably since the first year he came to Congress—to try and find a permanent solution to the storage of nuclear waste in America. He has been a tireless worker in this endeavor, a smart worker in this endeavor, and a successful, so far, worker in this endeavor, as this bill passed out of the committee 49-4.

I rise tonight to address this pressing national need, and that is the importance of fixing our broken nuclear waste management program.

It was more than 35 years ago that the United States Congress made a commitment to communities throughout our Nation which host spent nuclear fuel and nuclear waste. Congress, the Federal Government, agreed to assign the Department of Energy with the responsibility to permanently dispose of hazardous material, nuclear waste, by 1998.

There are many of those communities, like in the Tri-Cities in Washington State, co-located with the Department of Energy's Hanford site just up Columbia River, across the river from where I live and the people I represent. We have been DOE's partner to help win World War II at that site. It has maintained a nuclear weapon deterrent and powered our fleet of nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers.

Additionally, electricity consumers in many other communities have paid the Federal Government more than \$40 billion to develop, license, construct, and operate a nuclear waste repository. They have already paid \$40 billion to do this, and that was pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the law that Congress enacted. Yet rate payers have little to see for their investment because, I will call it political science, has deprived the public of the actual science to prove that nuclear waste can be safely and permanently disposed of.

As a consequence of this political interference, taxpayers and rate payers across the country are on the hook for DOE's inaction. The American people pay over \$2 million every day to temporarily store used fuel scattered throughout the United States. So it is up to us to fix this waste management program and stop this cost that will continue in perpetuity if we don't act.

Now, after hearing from dozens of expert witnesses over many years, the Energy and Commerce Committee developed and passed a bipartisan bill by a vote of 49-4. Mr. SHIMKUS led our effort in this measure.

This legislation makes targeted reforms to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to set the Federal Government up to finally, finally, keep its promise.

Nuclear waste challenges have vexed policymakers for generations.

We, this Congress, have the chance now in a bipartisan way to successfully build a durable solution. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve that goal, which brings about tonight's Special Order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to show something. This is a piece of glass. This is not actually nuclear waste. The Pacific Northwest National Lab, when I visited Hanford a little while back with Secretary Perry, gave me this because it is an example of what the liquid waste, the waste at Hanford, will end up being.

□ 1930

It will look like this in a big cylinder. It is glass. This is what would go to Hanford, and it would be stored safely when that occurs.

If we don't have a repository, these nuclear wastes, in their various forms, will sit around in various locations, not nearly as safe or secure as we can have with the kind of legislation fully enacted that Mr. SHIMKUS has led on. So I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for his leadership on this. And I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their encouragement, their participation, their counsel. We are going to get this thing done.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman, the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), who has actually been a pretty big leader in this issue because of Oak Ridge and the area that he represents.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be before the House of Representatives this evening, and I want to thank Chairman SHIMKUS.

When I came to Congress in 2011, I didn't know many people, and one night I had the privilege of meeting JOHN SHIMKUS from the great State of Illinois. I told him I was from Tennessee, and we started talking. And right away we talked about Yucca Mountain. We talked about nuclear waste, and I told him that I was going to be representing a very special place: Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

So let me start by thanking Chairman JOHN SHIMKUS. He has been the hero for the Yucca Mountain project. He has worked tirelessly. He has seen this through the courts. He has seen it through the House. He has worked so hard. I thank him for his efforts.

Oak Ridge, Tennessee, it is a beautiful place. I represent the Third District of Tennessee: Oak Ridge, where we had the Manhattan Project, where we won World War II; Oak Ridge, where we won the Cold War; Oak Ridge, where we have worked tirelessly to build our Nation's nuclear arsenal, and today we

are still advocating to do that, to keep America strong—great men and women.

But Oak Ridge, like many other places around the Nation—Savannah River, Portsmouth, Hanford—years ago, ladies and gentlemen, when we manufactured our nuclear weapons, we were not as safe and secure as we are today. There was an immediacy. There was a need during World War II to get the bomb built, and we did it in Oak Ridge, and it ended World War II.

But for years thereafter, we were not as safe at many of these venues. What does that mean? That means that legacy wastes were left in communities: sometimes in the soil, sometimes in the water, sometimes in facilities. And what that means is that the Federal Government has a duty to these communities to clean this waste up. And this waste has to go somewhere.

Now, Chairman SHIMKUS, and we have heard from Chairman WALDEN—for those of you who are listening tonight, they are authorizers. They authorize the law. I sit on the Appropriations Committee. That is the committee in Congress that authorizes the spending for this.

I am the chairman of the Nuclear Cleanup Caucus. That is how passionate I am about cleaning up nuclear waste not only in Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Savannah River; or Hanford, but all over these great United States, because we owe this to the American people.

The Federal Government caused this problem; the Federal Government needs to clean this up. It is the ultimate, I think, in environmental advocacy. This is something that Republicans and Democrats, Members of the House and Members of the Senate, usually agree upon; and we have worked together in this very important caucus.

Why is it important that we pass the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017? Because, first of all, we owe it to the American people. The Department of Energy does a good job in cleanup, but this will revise their programs. It will give what Congress should do, give direction to a Federal agency. So, as we advocate for dollars to clean up the nuclear waste, we need this key authorization bill to give it structure, to give it purpose.

So, in the end, Yucca is critically important—critically important. And I know the people in these affected communities want Yucca Mountain. That is the interesting thing about it. They want it because they realize it is critically important that we store the waste there; it is important for America; it is important for our environment; it is important to these communities; and it is long overdue.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to please work to support H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, and I thank Chairman SHIMKUS.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for his comments, and I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHIMKUS, as well, for continuing to bring light to the broken promise the Federal Government made to our communities.

The State of Minnesota is home to three nuclear reactors, two of which are at the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant in my district. Located directly adjacent to the Prairie Island Indian Reservation and the city of Red Wing, the plant has stored spent nuclear fuel on site since the 1970s. While this is done in a very safe and highly secure manner, storage in close proximity to large communities is simply not appropriate.

In 1982, Congress agreed and made it clear that they wanted the Federal Government to oversee and manage the storage of spent fuel. Congress did not want to put the burden and oversight of maintaining safe nuclear storage on our local communities. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act was adopted, and the Federal Government was tasked with creating a national Federal repository for used fuel.

The Federal Government began collecting taxes on all users of nuclear power. In the end, my constituents, businesses, and Americans throughout the country have paid roughly \$40 billion in taxes and interest.

In 1995, due to the inaction at the Federal level the plant in my district was forced to take matters into their own hands. While they continued to help fund a repository, they also invested in and began operating a dry cask storage area, a pad on site that could hold up to 48 casks of fuel.

Now, that should have been more than enough to cover their needs until the Federal Government finished their job. Today, Prairie Island is home to 40 casks, with 7 more expected to be filled by 2020.

Thirty-six years after the passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, we still have no repository. Prairie Island now has to go through the process of planning to expand their dry cask facilities in order to accommodate fuel they paid the Federal Government to dispose of.

So I strongly support the efforts of Chairman SHIMKUS, and that is why I cosponsored the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017. We owe it to our communities to follow through on our promise to provide a safe place for storage.

Meanwhile, it isn't just our local communities that are impacted by this inaction. When Congress passed a budget last year, I worked to point out that the Federal Government had assumed major liabilities associated with its failure to provide safe and environmentally friendly storage. The GAO recently reported that the Federal Gov-

ernment's environmental liability alone is nearly \$450 billion and growing.

At the same time, the funds collected from taxpayers to open a repository have begun being diverted to other payout settlements and judgments based on our broken promise. By the end of fiscal year 2016, \$6.1 billion had been paid out, with the Department of Energy estimating another \$25 billion to follow.

It is time to keep our promise. Our communities expect it, and the Federal Government cannot afford not to do so. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota and appreciate him spending this evening with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in support of America's nuclear energy industry. Today, America leads the world in nuclear energy production and technological advancement. However, the industry faces unique challenges that prevent us from reaching our full potential when it comes to nuclear energy.

So I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for hosting this Special Order which gives us a chance to shed light on some of these issues.

Over in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's Energy Subcommittee, we talk a lot about nuclear energy R&D as critical for the United States' national security and energy dominance. Through our numerous meetings over the course of several years, we have put forth multiple bills which will implement long-term R&D investments that will spur American competitiveness and keep us at the forefront of nuclear energy technology. We will need waste sites.

My bill, the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, actually provides important policy direction for the Department of Energy Office of Nuclear Energy. First, it provides DOE with statutory directions to leverage its supercomputing infrastructure for modeling and simulation capabilities to develop advanced fission and fusion reactors. Second, this legislation provides DOE with statutory direction to use its authority to enable the national labs to partner with the private sector to construct and operate reactor prototypes at DOE sites and to leverage expertise from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Because nuclear reactors are so expensive and so highly regulated, designing first-of-a-kind reactors requires a blend of creative freedom for engineers testing new designs but assurance of safety throughout that process. DOE sites, particularly the DOE

national laboratories, can provide a unique environment that safely allows for this kind of creative testing and development for advanced nuclear technology.

Finally, the bill lays out a clear timeline and statutory guidance for DOE to complete a research reactor that will allow for materials and fuels R&D to take place right here in the United States. Currently, this type of research, which requires access to fast neutrons, is only accessible for civilian use in Russia. While modeling and simulation can accelerate R&D, this research must ultimately be validated through a physical source. The versatile neutron source in this bill will enable this vital research.

Last month, my bill, which contains funding for this important research reactor, the Nuclear Energy Research Infrastructure Act, passed this House unanimously. While we at the Science Committee have been working hard on developing the infrastructure for nuclear research and development, I am thankful Mr. SHIMKUS is finding a long-term solution to our current challenges with spent nuclear waste. His bill takes an important step forward in authorizing private and interim storage of spent nuclear fuel, while still allowing the Federal Government to responsibly develop a permanent repository for spent nuclear fuel.

I applaud Mr. SHIMKUS and the Energy and Commerce Committee's bipartisan effort to find a productive, constructive answer to this pressing issue. Together, we will ensure that America's nuclear energy continues to lead the world.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, before I introduce the next speaker, I want to highlight that, in the days when people say we don't work together, there is no bipartisanship shown. I just want to remind folks that this bill came out of our committee 49-4. It has 108 cosponsors, many Democrats on there.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), a new Member of Congress who has been very active and whom I have been proud to get to know.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHIMKUS for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, Pacific Gas and Electric Company announced its decision not to relicense the two nuclear reactors at the Diablo Canyon Power Plant in San Luis Obispo County. The plant has been a key economic engine in my district, employing around 1,500 people and powering more than 1.7 million homes in central and northern California.

As our community works together to mitigate the economic impacts of this closure, I am committed to helping secure the central coast's dominance as a

hub for renewable energy development. That is why I am introducing legislation later this month that creates renewable energy incentives to offset the loss of jobs and revenue resulting from the Diablo Canyon closure.

In addition to economic stability, our community also needs certainty of responsible management and safe storage of nuclear waste after the plant's closure. The Diablo Canyon Power Plant was built against a seaside cliff near Avila Beach, where it was discovered that its reactors are in proximity to earthquake fault lines. Without a long-term solution, Diablo Canyon would become a de facto storage facility for radioactive nuclear waste and would hinder our ability to repurpose any of the scenic coastline where the power plant currently sits.

Currently, spent nuclear fuel sits across 39 States in 121 communities, including San Luis Obispo County.

□ 1945

We need a permanent geologic repository to store waste that will last far beyond our lifetimes. Congress must establish responsible interim storage solutions, while continuing to work towards establishing a safe and secure national repository for spent fuel.

H.R. 3053 is a good bipartisan solution to establish a process and outline next steps for interim and permanent storage solutions. With the impending decommissioning of Diablo Canyon, it is vital that we act to find a storage solution. I will continue to work to grow business in our area, remove spent fuel safely, and keep our communities safe and thriving as the Diablo Canyon decommissioning moves forward.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

So we have heard from Oregon, Tennessee, Minnesota, and then from California. Now I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act. Spent nuclear fuel currently sits in 121 communities across 39 States, simply because we lack a permanent geological repository to dispose of the waste. That is why I am proud to join my colleagues as a cosponsor of H.R. 3053, which would enact critical reforms to our nuclear waste management strategy.

Back home, in Georgia's 12th, we are leading the way in the expansion of our Nation's nuclear energy resources. My district is the proud home of every nuclear reactor in the State, with an additional two reactors under construction at Plant Vogtle. Nuclear energy is Georgia's most reliable power source and provides over 6,000 high-skilled jobs, many of which are filled by my

constituents in Georgia's 12th. But without a permanent solution, nuclear waste remains on those sites.

Now is the time for Congress to act on fulfilling our obligation to dispose of the spent nuclear fuel sitting in our States. I thank the Energy and Commerce Committee for passing this important legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments. I now yield to the gentleman from the State of California (Mr. MCNERNEY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a good friend, also.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for yielding. We work together on nuclear waste. I have been to the Yucca Mountain site, and I have seen the work that has gone on there.

But, first of all, I just want to say there are a lot of issues out there that we are dealing with here in Congress; so how important is nuclear waste? I mean, we have got the gun issue; we have climate change; we have the economy; we want to create jobs; trade. I mean, there are a lot of issues; so how important is nuclear waste? I mean, it has been festering for decades—for decades—so how urgent is it?

You know, we haven't had a major accident yet, but there are tens of thousands of tons of high-level nuclear waste sitting in relatively exposed conditions, so what could possibly go wrong? I mean, high-level nuclear waste is so radioactive that it emits heat. It emits an immense amount of heat. So we could—I will give you a couple of things that could go wrong.

The waste could be commandeered and then made into weapons. It doesn't have to be made into a nuclear fission bomb. It could be made into a dirty bomb. Just put a bunch of nuclear waste with explosive material in some city and that city would be uninhabitable for the rest of our lifetimes, for sure.

There also could be waste leakage. We have nuclear waste sitting on the banks of the Missouri River. We have nuclear waste, tons and tons of nuclear waste, high-level nuclear waste, sitting a quarter mile from the Columbia River, and this is pretty serious stuff. And my friend from Illinois, my colleague from Illinois, I am sure, will tell us about nuclear waste that is on the Great Lakes ready to go. So we have a problem. We have been pretty darn lucky so far.

You know, I worked as a graduate student. I was a graduate student in mathematics. I worked for an engineering professor to study the nuclear waste project at WIPP, a waste isolation pilot project near Carlsbad, New Mexico, and I can tell you the technical solutions are there. Nuclear waste can be safely engineered for tens

of thousands of years, as long as it needs to be stored. Transportation can be done safely. I have seen train cars that are designed to hold high-level nuclear waste slammed into concrete walls with no damage to the interior of the car.

This stuff can be done. It is not an engineering problem. I mean, the engineering and the geological solutions are there if we put our minds to making it happen. It can be done in engineering.

However, nuclear waste is a political problem, and it hasn't been managed so far. The politics of the Yucca Mountain waste project were very badly managed from the very beginning. A successful nuclear waste storage project will need complete transparency from the very beginning with the local community. There will always be some amount of opposition, but without local buy-in, the project is going to fail. Local buy-in is absolutely essential. This can be done if there is complete transparency, if the local people understand what the risks are and what the benefits are. This can be done.

Mr. Speaker, we need to devote the resources to finding a permanent solution to nuclear waste. Meanwhile, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017 is a step, a very important step in the right direction.

I want to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) who has worked on this tirelessly for year after year. I know that some people think that he has gone too far in Nevada, but, nonetheless, if we work together and can become transparent, maybe Nevada will never accept nuclear waste, but we have to find a permanent storage solution that can be done. This is a step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3053 and give this legislation fair and honest consideration.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his comments, and I will pull up a chart later on to show that the five surrounding counties have all passed resolutions in support of Yucca Mountain, and there are recent numbers from the northern part of the State that show a very positive movement as far as the acceptance, as long as we show there is a science. And now I will address that in a later discourse.

I want to thank my colleague for joining us. I now yield to the gentleman from the State of Georgia (Mr. CARTER), another member from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my good friend and chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment's legislation, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017.

This legislation is important, not only because of what it means for the

future of clean energy opportunities for this country, but also what this means for the safety of our communities. Nuclear energy has become a safe and effective way to generate large amounts of energy capability, while maintaining a source that doesn't produce greenhouse gas emissions.

We have come a long ways from Three Mile Island and the safety standards in place to ensure our communities and our grid aren't negatively impacted by nuclear energy. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act would finally put in place a permanent repository for the waste generated by energy production that powers millions of homes and businesses across the United States.

As of December, there were 61 nuclear power plants in the United States with 99 operating nuclear reactors. Those nuclear plants provide nearly 20 percent of the country's energy production capability. This is significant because these plants have continued to provide reliable flows of energy for decades, giving Americans a carbon-free source of energy to fuel their consumption.

But one thing hasn't been addressed: what to do with that spent fuel. We began a process in the 1980s to seek and construct a permanent repository for the Nation's spent fuel, eventually coming to Yucca Mountain in Nevada. This site was decided upon, due to its geological features, and extensively studied to ensure it could be done in a safe and effective manner.

Millions of dollars were spent studying and doing initial project development of the site, but it was eventually halted, and that progress was stalled. While this was going on, ratepayers in 39 States continued to pay towards the cleanup fund for a total of nearly \$40 billion. However, that money hasn't been able to be put towards a permanent repository due to resistance.

In Georgia, at Plant Vogtle, we are currently undergoing the only nuclear energy construction project in the country, in large part because of issues that have deterred companies from wanting to expand. That means that people are losing out on energy production, and it actually creates clean energy.

My good friend's legislation authorizes the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste to find a safe, permanent place in contrast to the temporary locations at each nuclear plant. It also authorizes a consolidated interim storage site to ensure there is an option available for the eventual transition.

This is something that needs to get done, and soon. Right now, spent fuel is sitting on site in either dry casks or spent fuel pools without an alternative. Now is the time for us to pass this bipartisan legislation and recognize that we have carbon-neutral energy sources

in place, and have for decades, but we need to get this across the finish line to support our communities and our country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act because it will give the United States the chance to, once again, be a global leader on our nuclear energy and to secure our communities. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for his comments, and now I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for his strong work, his positive statements, and his reaching out so that we could have a national solution to a national problem.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for yielding. Again, I am here tonight to join a bunch of my colleagues to speak in strong support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, which Mr. SHIMKUS has skillfully guided through the Energy and Commerce Committee, again, a 49-4 vote on a committee which basically is challenged, in many instances, with other issues from healthcare and energy policy, you name it.

It is really just an amazing accomplishment on his part dealing with one of the thorniest, toughest issues, which, again, has been out there for 30 years, which is, again, how we, as a nation, deal with the tons of nuclear waste that is now piled up and accumulating in over 100 communities around the country.

Again, I represent the Second District of Connecticut, the eastern half of the State, which has two operating nuclear facilities. One has been decommissioned, the old Connecticut Yankee facility, which sits very close to the Connecticut River. Again, it has been closed for over a decade. The plant itself has been cut up, dismantled. It is now pretty much, you know, just overgrown with vegetation. But still sitting there is dry cask nuclear spent fuel rods, which, again, are being patrolled every single day, literally, as we are here tonight, by heavily armed guards, which makes perfect sense, because, as has been said by other speakers, again, this is still very dangerous material, and again, very close to one of the largest bodies of waters in new England, the Connecticut River.

We also have the Dominion nuclear power plant in Waterford, Connecticut, which today is in full operation. Over 45 percent of the energy consumed in the State of Connecticut is generated at Dominion. It is about 15 percent of New England, because, again, it provides a supply for the rest of the region that is there, and again, this is a plant that goes back decades.

We are also the home of the Groton sub base, which is a base where, again, we have 15 attack subs that are deployed there. Again, the Groton sub

base was where the USS *Nautilus* was launched 62 years ago. Admiral Rickover, the father of the nuclear Navy, actually designed that first sub, which was christened by Mamie Eisenhower.

Again, that sub was built 5 years after the first lightbulb was powered by nuclear power as a nation; again, a pretty amazing accomplishment that Admiral Rickover was able to build and launch a nuclear submarine, something which the folks at the Navy at the time told him wouldn't happen for 75 years. Yet, today, the nuclear force, both in terms of submarines and carriers, are the backbone, again, of our away team, the U.S. Navy.

So, again, we have a lot of history and experience with the fact that we have got really smart capable people who do amazing things in terms of providing the energy needs but also the national security of this country. But, as has been said, again, a byproduct of that is that nuclear waste which we thought 30 years ago was going to be dealt with with the decision that Congress made to dispose of nuclear waste in a central facility in Nevada that, again, ratepayers have paid year in and year out, \$40 billion, as was mentioned earlier, but today is still immobilized.

So, again, Mr. SHIMKUS' effort, in terms of trying to not just restart the process but also to reform it, again, is such an extraordinary effort that really we, as a House, should really take advantage of and move on a bipartisan basis to enact.

□ 2000

This is not your father's Yucca Mountain bill that Mr. SHIMKUS got through. It made some changes for fairness in terms of ratepayers. It also created more transparency so that local stakeholders in Nevada will have an opportunity to really help make decisions and see and understand the technology that is being employed there.

It also set up an interim process, which, again, if it is over decades, which it is still going to take, that we can at least start moving material out from these over 100 sites situated all across the country, which is so important in terms of reducing costs and reducing national security risk.

His proposal, I think, deserves great support and, frankly, congratulations that he has been able to take this on.

I would note that the country of Finland has actually started to move forward with their own waste disposal site, the Onkalo Peninsula Depository, which a country that is very progressive in terms of a lot of its policies, but that have shown that the technology is there to safely deposit nuclear waste in a way that has real confidence and is moving forward. We should do it, too.

Again, H.R. 3053 is, I think, the roadmap for this country to deal with this problem in a way that is safe, is transparent, and will reduce costs for ratepayers all across the country.

I look forward to seeing a vote take place very soon on the floor of the House. And then, frankly, I look forward to a bill signing ceremony at the White House, where Mr. SHIMKUS should certainly take a front row seat for his great work.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks. I am glad he brought up the debate and the discussion on the nuclear Navy, because that is really a key part of this debate.

The nuclear-use fuel for our nuclear fleet is, by law, directed to be housed at Yucca Mountain.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, may I just make one last point to really underscore that?

Mr. Speaker, I am on the Armed Services Committee, and we are in the midst of moving forward with a 355-ship Navy.

If you look at the force architecture that is going to be in that growth, it is almost all concentrated in submarines and carriers. The fact of the matter is that the challenge of waste disposal for our national defense and national security is going to be with us for many, many years.

To comment again, the gentleman's proposal is a way for us to deal with that and strengthen our Navy and our national defense.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a colleague, a new member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, but no stranger to this issue and this debate.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order hour to talk about a very critical policy and issue for our country.

Mr. Speaker, nuclear energy is a critical component of the United States' energy matrix. It is no secret that I am passionate about energy independence and nuclear energy as an essential, emission-free, domestic source of electricity.

As we create nuclear energy, we also create nuclear waste. In my district, the Oconee Nuclear Station run by Duke Energy in Oconee County, South Carolina, has 40 years' worth of nuclear waste sitting at the site. Without a permanent geological repository, nuclear waste will continue to pile up at reactors in South Carolina and all across the Nation.

There is currently estimated to be about 4,500 tons of spent nuclear fuel in temporary storage in South Carolina from commercial reactors.

Furthermore, there are more than 10,000 tons of military and research nuclear waste at the Savannah River site, just outside my district.

Nuclear waste sits idle and is stored in dry casks and wet pools in 121 communities across 39 States. It is impera-

tive that we pass Chairman SHIMKUS' legislation, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act, to reform our country's nuclear waste policy and utilize Yucca Mountain as our main point of nuclear storage.

Having nuclear waste dispersed across the country and close to highly populated areas makes zero sense, and is an unnecessary and avoidable risk.

The depository at Yucca Mountain, after decades of research, has been independently verified to safely dispose of spent nuclear fuel for a million years. It is the law of the land. It is a perfect site for this.

We as a country need to embrace the law of the land. It is a long-term stable storage facility at Yucca Mountain in Nevada. After all the scientific research and money taken from ratepayers, it is time to move forward.

It is sad that this project has been mothballed because of politics and has been used as a political football at the expense of the American ratepayers.

What do I mean by American ratepayers paying for this?

U.S. ratepayers have already paid the Federal Government over \$40 billion to develop Yucca Mountain, and currently all U.S. taxpayers are paying over \$2 million a day because we have not yet fulfilled our legal obligations. Ratepayers are quite literally paying something for nothing.

Ratepayers in my State of South Carolina have already paid \$1.3 billion in fees, which were intended to pay for a functioning Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository. Ratepayers in other States which utilize nuclear commercial energy have paid billions more.

It is time to put politics aside. Authorize what Congress has already approved and paid for by Americans. Yucca Mountain should not have taken this long to become a reality; not after colossal amounts of money have been poured into this infrastructure project.

Members on both sides of the aisle, as you see tonight, are supportive of authorizing the use of Yucca Mountain through the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments. It voted out of the House Energy and Commerce Committee by a vote of 49-4. Let's not let the politics of a few get in the way of reforming our nuclear waste policy and ensuring Americans get what they have already paid billions into.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership, and I look forward to working with him to move this forward.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 20 minutes remaining.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I do that, Mr. Speaker, because we have had Members from Oregon—I am from Illinois—Tennessee, Minnesota, California, Georgia, South Carolina, Texas, Connecticut come down. Many, many Members from all over this country also wanted to join me here tonight, but they could not, so they will be submitting statements for the RECORD. I appreciate the Chair allowing us to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to highlight a few things and just follow up on some of my colleagues, who I really appreciate coming down and spending their time to talk about the importance of this issue.

This issue has national support, I think identified by the 49-4 vote out of the Energy and Commerce Committee. People are very diverse, from all over the country, on the Energy and Commerce Committee. I would encourage people to go to the Energy and Commerce Committee website and look at the members of that committee and how wide and how diverse we are. We are all united on this issue.

The national newsmakers and the recorders of what is going on are starting to take interest in solving this problem. We have a couple editorials and statements from some major papers and some smaller ones.

Here is The Washington Post: “Put Yucca Mountain to work. The Nation needs it.”

As was stated, the law was passed in 1982 and it was amended in 1987. Congressman DUNCAN said it right. This is the law of the land. For the last 8 to 10 years, we have been breaking the law by not moving forward. People have heard me say that numerous times before.

Here is The San Diego Union-Tribune: “Revival of Yucca Mountain nuclear waste project overdue.”

Well, it is 20 years. We should have been receiving spent nuclear fuel and defense waste 20 years ago. Now we are paying judgments because of our inability to comply with the law.

Wouldn't you like the government to do what it says it wants to do and then is planning to do it? And then shouldn't they do it?

Here is Aiken Standard: “Fed should proceed with Yucca Mountain.”

Here is the Reason: “Open the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository.”

Here is the Los Angeles Times and their statement on this issue: “The Federal Government needs to renew its efforts to bring the Yucca Mountain site into operation.”

There is a lot of support in California because they are closing nuclear power

plants and they have spent nuclear fuel on the beach, as Congressman CARBAJAL has said. He is talking about San Luis Obispo.

I think I will show a chart later on that shows San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, or SONGS, which is being decommissioned.

Here is the Chicago Tribune, from my State: “Yucca Mountain is the only viable alternative to the jury-rigged status quo. We hope the Trump administration and Congress will revive it because if they don't”—well, you can read it, right?

So let me give you an example. It was mentioned by one of my colleagues, and I will talk about Illinois for a little bit. Zion Nuclear Power Station is decommissioned. On the shore of Lake Michigan is spent nuclear fuel.

Part of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 2017 does a couple things. It makes sure the authorization language is in place so that we start moving forward on a final repository.

We have listened to my colleagues from around the country to say it is not going to move fast enough, even if you start it.

Can't we find some regional temporary locations.

Now, in the nuclear timeframe, “temporary” is about 40 years. That is temporary when you are talking about nuclear stuff. So we want to be able to consolidate.

What this shows is licensed and operating nuclear spent fuel storage installations. These are just locations where you have nuclear power. And you can see the red dots all over the place, and other nuclear registered locations.

I am not talking about the other issue, which is defense locations. That is why I am glad my colleague JOE COURTNEY came down to talk about Connecticut and the nuclear Navy.

A colleague that really wanted to be down here was DAN NEWHOUSE, who represents Hanford. Hanford is the epitome story of why we need to get our act together as a nation and fulfill our obligations to clean up these sites.

This is a defense site. We created waste in the production of our nuclear arsenal. Decades, stored in tanks, toxic sludge underneath the ground that needs to be glassified, as Chairman WALDEN mentioned. And where that glassified toxic sludge is supposed to go is underneath the mountain in a desert in Yucca Mountain.

So these are the different locations we have here across the country. As was stated tonight already, 39 States, 121 locations. Thirty-nine States, 121 locations.

So let me give you a few examples of what we are talking about.

My colleague JASON LEWIS was down here earlier, and he mentioned Prairie Island. These are old charts, but they are oldies but goodies because we

haven't done anything. I can go into the dustbin of history when I talk about this on the floor, and the only thing that has changed is there is more spent nuclear fuel on these sites.

So you have Prairie Island. You have waste stored aboveground in pools and in casts. You have, in the Mississippi floodplain, on the Mississippi River, 50 miles from Minneapolis-St. Paul versus Yucca Mountain.

Now, what do we have at Yucca Mountain?

Now, Yucca Mountain is where, by law, we are supposed to be receiving long-term repository.

I refer people, there is no nuclear waste on site. Here is the mountain in a desert. The waste will be stored 1,000 feet underground and 1,000 feet above the water table.

□ 2015

The Colorado River is the closest body of water 100 miles away. So that is the example. That is what we want to show to the American people.

Would you rather have nuclear waste or defense waste next to your major cities and by major bodies of water, or would you rather have them in a desert underneath a mountain?

I had a few Californians down here tonight. Why? Because they are decommissioning nuclear power plants. This is the one I visited just maybe 14 months ago. It is no longer an operating nuclear power station. They are decommissioning it. The waste will be stored onsite. It is the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. It is between L.A. and San Diego right on the Pacific Ocean. At this time, there are 2,300 waste rods onsite. That has probably increased by a number I don't know. Waste is stored aboveground. It is adjacent to the Pacific Ocean, and it is located 45 miles from San Diego, versus Yucca Mountain which is located here, which is a mountain in a desert. The waste would be 1,000 feet underground, and that is 1,000 feet above the water table.

So I have listened to my colleagues from Nevada. In fact, in this picture, this green area, these are all the counties around the Federal land site that have passed resolutions in support of moving forward.

Now, what do the Nevadans tell me? They want to make sure it is safe. How do you make it safe? You decide to adjudicate the science. We give Nevada, as per law, their last chance to question the science. That is what we are trying to do in the appropriation process is get the money to do the final adjudication so that the question can be answered. To my friends from the State of Nevada: Is a mountain in a desert a safe place to store the defense waste and spent fuel?

Now, the red part is Federal land. Yucca Mountain would be about right here, a little pinhole. That yellow

there is—when you hear people say local consensus, the yellow here is a local consensus from Sweden, and if you notice, it is smaller than the Federal land that we have. So I would argue the local consensus is the Federal Government since it is all that property. Now, why do we have all that property? Because Yucca Flat is there. Because we put nuclear fuel—nuclear waste, in some short and some shade, is already housed there. So, again, it is a great location.

I was given a pin tonight from Nye County, and it says, “Host of Yucca Mountain.” So with all due respect to my colleagues from the State of Nevada, when they say that everyone is against it, they are not talking to everyone in the State of Nevada. I have been to Las Vegas, I have been to Reno, and I have been to Pahrump, and there are people that—if proven safe.

So I would ask the Governor, allow us to have the litigation to fight the science. That is what he wants to prove, that is what we want to prove, and that is what we need to appropriate the money, get the final adjudication, and then I am convinced that our nuclear scientists, the studies, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that issued a safety and evaluation report will come out and say: You are not going to find a safer place on this planet; there is no more of a studied location on the planet than Yucca Mountain.

So, again, I want to thank my colleagues for coming down to do a couple things. First of all, we want to highlight to our leadership in this House and our appropriators that we need to get money into the final omnibus to do the adjudication to fight for the science, and we have to do that now—issue one.

Issue two, there is a bipartisan consensus, as proven by the 49–4 vote in the committee and by 108 cosponsors, and when we get the bill on the floor, a passage of a bill that we probably would project to get 300 votes out of 435.

So the nuclear era started in World War II. It was started to beat Hitler to make sure they didn't win World War II. Then we had the arms race with the Soviet Union. It has helped protect our freedom and liberty. There was a price to pay, environmental degradations across this country. We owe it to these communities and to ourselves to safely gather, store, and protect the environment and protect our citizens. We do that through the appropriation process. We do it by passing the Nuclear Waste Policy Act amendments of 2007.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank my friends from both sides of the aisle for coming down this night.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in 2002, after extensive research by the

Department of Energy (DOE), scientists concluded that Yucca Mountain met all the requirements to act as a repository for high level radioactive waste. After which, the DOE applied for the license from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to begin construction of the Yucca Mountain facility.

Unfortunately, due to political brinksmanship, those plans have stalled indefinitely, despite the fact that ratepayers have contributed nearly \$30 Billion to the nuclear waste fund, which is specifically designated to be used for Yucca Mountain.

The federal government and taxpayers have dedicated enormous resources to completing the nuclear storage facility at Yucca Mountain. However, the Obama Administration did everything in its power to stall the completion of the facility, holding up construction under political red tape—even though the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's own safety evaluation found it would not be a threat to the local population of Nevada as it would benefit all of America.

Thankfully, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017 will finally remove unnecessary burdens to make much needed improvements to our national nuclear waste strategy.

This legislation is especially important to the residents of South Carolina. South Carolina ratepayers have invested over \$1.3 billion into Yucca over the last 30 years—that's in addition to the billions of dollars collected from ratepayers across the country. During this time, states like South Carolina have remained de facto repositories for nuclear waste. The federal government should finish what they started and complete the Yucca Mountain license application.

Currently, SNF is stored in 121 different neighborhoods, across 39 states—all waiting to be moved to a permanent location. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act will address the concerns of communities across the country, in a cost-effective manner, and passed the Energy and Commerce Committee with bi-partisan support, 49 members voting in favor and only 4 against. I am grateful for the opportunity to support this legislation, and am hopeful that it will provide much needed clarification on the disposal of spent nuclear fuel.

I am grateful that text from my bill, the Sensible Nuclear Waste Disposition Act was included in this bill and thank Chairman JOHN SHIMKUS for his leadership.

SEPARATE AND UNEQUAL: RACISM AND POVERTY 50 YEARS AFTER THE KERNER REPORT

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor that I rise today to anchor the CBC Special Order. I would like to thank the CBC chairman, Chairman RICHMOND, for his leadership in this effort.

For the next 60 minutes, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus and the millions of constituents we represent.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about a topic that has affected this country and plagued us all. Over 50 years ago, in the middle of the Detroit riot, President Lyndon B. Johnson established the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, commonly known as the Kerner Commission. The goal of that Commission was to identify the underlying causes of the civil unrest in communities across the country.

This was a time of tremendous tension in our great Nation. Many Americans were confused about the root causes of the riots and the unsure path forward.

On February 29, 1968, following several field trips to troubled communities, the Commission released the Kerner Report, a 176-page report that examined cultural institutional racism, from segregated schools and housing discrimination to generational poverty and to limited economic opportunity.

The Commission largely held racism responsible for Black rioting and warned that our Nation is moving to two societies, one Black, one White—separate and unequal. The Commission called for bold policies to counter decades of political failure, such as investment in much-needed social services, housing, and education programs; and incentivizing diversity among law enforcement.

Sadly, President Johnson ignored the Kerner Report and rejected its recommendations. In the midst of that, we had the assassinations of several prominent Americans: President John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Dr. Martin Luther King.

Fifty years later, America has made some improvements, but African Americans continue to face some of the same issues discussed in the Kerner Report.

Since its release, Black American homeownership has been flat, and unemployment is still twice that of White Americans. The Black prison population has tripled here in America. It used to be two other countries, South Africa during the apartheid years and the former Soviet Union, had more people in prison. Now the United States has more people in prison than any nation in the world.

Black household wealth is less than one-fifth of the national average, and

almost 33 percent of Black children are growing up in poverty.

Recently, Fred Harris, the last living member of the Kerner Commission, issued a new report highlighting the persistent issues plaguing the Black community and calling on major investments in education, workforce development, and a living wage. This comes in stark contrast to the severe cuts proposed by President Trump in the fiscal year 2019 budget.

Today, in fact, I attended a meeting for the CEO Council for Growth at Drexel University. The council's mission is to lead our region forward by convening decisionmakers, taking action, and doing the things necessary to strengthen our regional economy.

With poverty at 26 percent in my district, I am committed to working with the CEOs present at today's meeting and others who are using creativity and innovation to help reduce poverty, combat hunger, and spur economic growth.

I also attended a discussion at Temple University in Philadelphia. Although the recently passed budget was by no means perfect, I firmly believe that our leadership and our actions matter.

So it was great to hear firsthand from professors at Temple University today about how the recent jolt in NIH funding will allow them to keep their research on the rise. If we want to continue moving the needle on poverty reduction, we must make it our priority to invest in all of our neighborhoods.

We are in the business of doing no harm. As elected officials, we are here to help move our neighborhoods forward, not backward, and we must continue to urgently press for commonsense economic solutions for Americans most in need.

I stand before you today to tell you just as I have always done before, we must continue to make ideas matter. We must push for commonsense solutions to help move us past the conditions that led to the Kerner Report.

Mr. Speaker, I have my colleague from California (Ms. LEE) here, who is someone whom I have watched and observed. As a matter of fact, she is the chair leading the effort from the Democratic perspective on attacking this issue of poverty. She has been in the forefront of this particular issue, and her voice is heard throughout this entire Nation, the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the 13th District.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Congressman DWIGHT EVANS for, once again, hosting this very important Special Order and for really continuing this fight for racial and economic justice both here in the House of Representatives but also in his congressional district. So I thank the gentleman very much for his tremendous leadership.

Fifty years ago at the height of the civil rights movement, violence erupted in cities across America. Over generations, systemic racism had produced what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., called a tale of two cities. One city was bright and full of opportunity for a select few, and another city was shrouded in darkness and locked in a never-ending cycle of poverty.

African Americans, suffocating under the pressure of institutional racism and discrimination, took to the streets.

After race riots erupted in Watts and Chicago; Newark, New Jersey; and Detroit, our government took notice. President Johnson convened the Kerner Commission, which Congressman EVANS laid out, which had three goals to investigate the root cause of the unrest.

Many activists and civil rights leaders were concerned that the Commission wouldn't reveal the true facts. But to our surprise—and I remember this very clearly—the report was brutally honest.

According to the report, White racism was responsible for the rising tensions and explosive violence ripping our Nation apart. So that should have been a wake-up call.

□ 2030

Racism had created two societies: one Black, one White, separate and unequal. The report identified the problem and proposed a series of targeted solutions that could right this terrible wrong.

According to the report, there were three options for our government:

One, do nothing, which would result in more riots and economic devastation and racial division in our country;

Two, we could make robust investments into African-American neighborhoods and schools;

Three, take racism and discrimination head-on, removing discriminatory barriers that lock African Americans into poverty and prevent them from accessing the basics and a basic standard of living.

Option three, of course, could have drastically changed the lives of millions of African Americans. Sadly, the Kerner Commission's report was largely ignored. Again, Congressman EVANS laid that out.

Instead of investing in education, employment opportunities, livable wages, raising incomes, and pathways out of poverty, this country, unfortunately, has allowed institutional racism to divide this Nation. Of course, we have made some progress, but this updated report clearly shows that is not nearly enough. We really are still a divided country. As a result, the findings of the 1968 Kerner Commission's report remain constant to this very day.

In 1968, almost half of all students of color, primarily African Americans, went to majority-White schools.

Today, that number has plummeted to 20 percent.

In 1968, the unemployment rate for African Americans was 6.7 percent. Today, 7.5 percent of African Americans are unemployed.

In 1968, African Americans were 5.4 times as likely as Whites to be in prison or in jail. Today, African Americans are 6.4 times as likely as Whites to be incarcerated.

Five decades have passed and economic inequality still prevents the African-American community from accessing the American Dream.

I represent the 13th Congressional District of California, which includes Alameda County. While some are witnessing and experiencing enormous wealth and economic growth in my district, 43 percent of African-American children in Oakland are living in poverty, 23.6 percent of African Americans in my district are locked in poverty, and the average income for African-American families in the San Francisco Bay Area is \$46,571 a year, compared to White families, who make more than \$109,000. That is in my district in the San Francisco Bay Area. This gap is one of the hugest gaps in the country. It is a total disgrace.

We should be leveling the economic playing field for African Americans across the Nation. Instead, we throw Black workers meager wages and apply trickle-down economics that only benefit the rich.

Our Federal Government should provide the impetus, incentive, and investment for good-paying jobs for African-American workers. Instead, this administration is attacking unions and produced a budget that guts job training programs and a tax law that makes it easier to ship jobs overseas.

We should be investing in affordable housing, which, yes, is a basic human right for everyone, including the African-American community. Instead, this administration is weakening fair housing laws and rationing off affordable housing funding.

The majority of this administration's proposed budget—the cuts, especially—will disproportionately negatively impact African Americans and people of color. This really is a twisted and sick reality that shouldn't be possible in the United States of America.

But members of the Congressional Black Caucus are here tonight to say that we continue to be determined to change this reality because, yes, Black lives do matter. We are here to tell the truth about what is dividing America: racism. It is manifest in many forms in our policy, in our budget, in our funding priorities, and in many, many ways.

In January, a group of nearly 100 religious leaders came together to issue a unity declaration on racism and poverty. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter, a document, entitled,

“Unity Declaration on Racism and Poverty,” and a document entitled, “Circle of Protection.”

UNITY DECLARATION ON RACISM AND POVERTY

As leaders from diverse families of U.S. Christianity, we are called by the Spirit to work together with new urgency against the resurgence of racism and the persistence of poverty in America. We see around us an increase of harmful attitudes and policies toward people of color and people in need. That painful reality and the current push for trillions of dollars in cuts to anti-poverty programs are bringing us together in a new way. While we have different positions on other questions, we are united on the gospel and biblical teaching on poverty and racism—feeling invited to do so by the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

WE BELIEVE THAT RACISM AND POVERTY ARE THEOLOGICAL ISSUES

The integral relationship between poverty and racism unifies us against both. They are both issues to which the gospel of Jesus Christ speaks—which also calls us to love our neighbors, without exceptions. Our unity on these issues is because they are theological issues for us, not merely political or partisan ones. These fundamentally biblical concerns challenge all of us and both of the major political parties.

Racism is a sin that goes back to the founding of our nation. At its root, racism is in conflict with the opening declaration in Genesis 1, that we are all made in the image and likeness of God. Racism literally throws away the biblical principle of *imago dei*—the image of God in all of us, with no exceptions. Racism is a sin against God and all of God's children. Therefore, the whole counsel of God calls us to preach against the sin of racism from all of our churches' pulpits and call for repentance.

The body of Christ is perhaps the most diverse racial community in the world. When people of color in the body of Christ suffer—while many white members of the body of Christ do not acknowledge their pain—we are violating the principle laid down in 1 Corinthians 12: that we are one body with many parts, who suffer with and honor one another. As Galatians instructs us, “there is no more Jew or Greek, bond or free, male or female, because we are all united as one in Christ” (3:28).

The historical sin of racism lingers on in America today, continuing and evolving in our social systems of economics and education, policing and criminal justice, housing and gentrification, voting rights and suppression, in our racial geography, and, painfully, in the continued segregation of our churches, which adds to our own complicity. Racism is more than individual behavior, language, and overt hostility toward particular people. Racism is systematic and structural in America and harms people of color in very specific, measurable, and tangible ways.

The failure to defend the lives and dignity of people living in poverty, by individuals or governments, is also a sin against God, with 2,000 verses in the Bible clearly outlining God's fundamental concern for people who are poor, vulnerable, and oppressed, instructing the people of God to protect and help them and holding political leaders responsible for them. Jesus says, in Matthew 25, that how we treat the “least of these” is how we treat Christ himself.

The world and our country have made progress against poverty in recent decades. It is possible to make further progress—per-

haps virtually end—hunger and extreme poverty in our time. We see the alleviation of material misery as an experience of God's loving presence in our own time, and believe that God wants us to seize this opportunity.

TO OUR CHURCHES: WHAT WE ARE DOING AND CAN DO

Most of our churches are active in helping people in need, struggling people within their congregations or in their communities. We need to do more, but many of our churches directly help millions of people every day. Local church leaders often work to bridge the racial divides in our communities, and many are searching for authentic and specific ways to address the rise of white supremacy.

Since the God of the Bible requires social justice and charity, our churches and many of our members also work to influence public policies. Christians have a wide array of political viewpoints. But a majority of the leaders of national church bodies have spoken out repeatedly against cuts to programs that provide help and opportunity to hungry and poor people in our country and around the world. We have also spoken out against renewed expressions of white racism, ethnic nationalism, and hateful attitudes toward people of color, immigrants, refugees, Jews, and Muslims. Many of us are active in support of immigration reform, criminal justice reform, and voting rights for all.

We are deeply troubled by the budget proposals coming from Congress and the president. They outline more than \$2 trillion of cuts in programs for hungry and poor people in our country and around the world. These cuts would hurt struggling people of all races, including millions of low- and middle-income people who need safety-net programs at some time in their lives. The hardest hit would be African American, Latino, and Native American communities, where the poverty rate is already high, and among people in the poorest countries in the world.

The threat over the coming year of this broad assault on anti-poverty programs that support families struggling to make ends meet is unifying us—bringing us together in a more vigorous, multiracial Christian movement to maintain a circle of protection around all people in poverty and God's children of color in particular, who are disproportionately impacted.

TO CONGRESS AND THE WHITE HOUSE: OUR UNITED APPEAL FOR HEALING AND REFORM IN OUR NATION'S POLITICS

We appeal to the president and Congress to work together for the common good. We especially call upon political leaders who are also people of faith to protect all the people in our country and world who are struggling with economic deprivation and frustration, hunger and poverty, disability and disadvantage—and racial bigotry that often contributes to inaction and hard-heartedness.

God's love for all people moves us to reach out to people and leaders all across the political spectrum. We respect and pray for all those who are in authority—that our nation and world “may lead a quiet and peaceable life” (1 Timothy 2:1-2). Conservative and liberal people, and those with differing political philosophies, may disagree on how to live up to our nation's ideals, but our loving God calls all of us to work together for liberty and justice for everyone.

We appeal to all people, especially Christians, to actively work against racism and poverty—in their personal and local engagement and as advocates for public policies that foster racial equity and healing, shared

prosperity, and peace in our country and worldwide. The spiritual power of a fresh, energetic, multiracial Christian movement against both racism and poverty is our prayer. So help us God.

SIGNATORIES

Rev. Eddy M. Alemán, Strategic Director of Leadership Development and Hispanic Ministries, Reformed Church in America

Rev. Dr. David Anderson, Founder/Senior Pastor, Bridgeway Community Church; President and CEO, BridgeLeader Network

Archbishop Vicken Aykazian, Diocesan Legate and Ecumenical Director, Armenian Orthodox Church

Bishop Carroll Baltimore, President and CEO, Global Alliance Interfaith Network

Dr. Jay Barnes, President, Bethel University

Bishop George E. Battle, Senior Bishop, AME Zion Church

Rev. David Beckmann, President, Bread for the World

Rev. Traci D. Blackmon, Executive Minister of Justice and Local Church Ministries, The United Church of Christ

Bishop Charles E. Blake, Presiding Bishop And Chief Apostle, Church of God in Christ

Rev. Samuel Borbon, Associate Missioner for Latino/Hispanic Ministry and Program Development, Episcopal Church USA

Rev. Dr. Peter Borgdorff, Executive Director Emeritus, Christian Reformed Church in North America

Carol Bremer-Bennett, Director, World Renew USA

Dr. Amos Brown, Chair, Social Justice Commission, National Baptist Convention USA, Inc.

Bishop Rosetta Bryson, Presiding Prelate, The Reconcile Group

Sister Simone Campbell, SSS, Executive Director, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice

Dr. Tony Campolo, Co-Founder, Red Letter Christians

Rev. Galen Carey, Vice President of Government Relations, National Association of Evangelicals

Mr. Patrick Carolan, Executive Director, Franciscan Action Network

Mr. John Carr, Director, Initiative on Catholic Social Thought and Public Life, Georgetown University

Dr. Iva Carruthers, General Secretary, Samuel DeWitt Proctor Conference

Dr. Fernando Cascante, Executive Director, AETH & The Justo Center

Rev. Noel Castellanos, President, CCDA

Rev. Walter Contreras, Vice President, NaLEC; Pasadena Presbyterian Church

Dr. Leslie Copeland-Tune, Director, Ecumenical Poverty Initiative

The Most Rev. Michael B. Curry, Presiding Bishop and Primate, The Episcopal Church

Rev. Joshua Dubois, Founder and CEO, Values Partnerships

Rev. José García, Senior Advisor for Prayer and Strategic Initiatives, Bread for the World

Mr. Vince Gonzales, Chair, Racial and Social Justice Task Force, Churches Uniting in Christ

Rev. Wesley Granberg-Michaelson, General Secretary Emeritus, Reformed Church in America; Chair of Board of Directors, Sojourners

The Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Atlanta

Dr. Jeffrey Haggray, Executive Director, American Baptist Home Mission Societies

Dr. Cynthia Hale, Founding Pastor, Ray of Hope Christian Church; Member, Disciples of Christ

Forest E. Harris, Sr., President, American Baptist College, Director of Black Church Studies, Vanderbilt University Divinity School

Dr. Frederick D. Haynes, III, Chairman, The Samuel DeWitt Proctor Conference
Richard B. Hays, George Washington Ivey Professor of New Testament, Duke Divinity School

Rev. Mitchell Hescocx, President and CEO, Evangelical Environmental Network

Dr. Roberto Hodgson, Director, Multicultural Ministries Church of the Nazarene

Dr. Shirley Hoogstra, President, Council of Christian Colleges & Universities

Rev. Teresa Hord-Owens, General Minister, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)

Dr. Joel C. Hunter, Faith Community Organizer; Chair, Central Florida Commission on Homelessness; Chair, Community Resource Network

Hyepin Im, President and CEO, Faith and Community Empowerment

Rev. Dr. Dale T. Irvin, President and Professor of World Christianity, New York Theological Seminary

Rev. John K. Jenkins, Pastor, First Baptist Church of Glenarden and Board Member, National Association of Evangelicals

Sister Carol Keehan, DC, President and CEO, Catholic Health Association of the United States

Eric LeCompte, Executive Director, Jubilee USA Network

Rev. Dr. Jo Anne Lyon, General Superintendent Emerita, The Wesleyan Church

Mr. John Lyon, President, World Hope International

Rev. Carlos Malavé, Executive Director, Christian Churches Together

Sister Donna Markham OP, PhD, President and CEO, Catholic Charities

Rev. Dr. Walter Arthur McCray, President, National Black Evangelical Association

Rev. John L. McCullough, President and CEO, Church World Service

Bishop Vashti McKenzie, 117th Elected and Consecrated Bishop, AME Church

Bishop Darin Moore, Presiding Prelate of the Mid-Atlantic Episcopal District, AME Zion Church

Rev. Dr. Otis Moss, Jr., Co-Convener National African American Clergy Network

Rev. F. Salvador Orellana, National Coordinator for Latino Ministries, Intercultural Ministries American Baptist Home Missions Society

Rev. Rubén N. Ortiz, Latino Field Coordinator, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

The Most Reverend Richard E. Pates, Roman Catholic Bishop of Des Moines

Rev. Dr. James C. Perkins, President, Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.

Rev. Daniel Prieto, M.A.R. Chairman, National Hispanic Commission; Missional Coach & Hispanic Multiplication Coordinator, Foursquare Church

Agustin Quiles, Orlando, Florida

Soong-Chan Rah, Professor of Church Growth and Evangelism, North Park Theological Seminary

Ms. Diane E. Randall, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation

Senior Bishop Lawrence Reddick, CEO, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church

Bishop Frank Madison Reid III, Presiding Bishop, AME Ecumenical & Urban Affairs

Dr. W. Franklin Richardson, Chairman, Conference of National Black Churches

Jose Luis (Pepe) Romero, Hispanic Affairs Specialist, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Andrew Ryskamp, Executive Director Emeritus, World Renew

Dr. Stephen Schneck, Director of the Institute for Policy Research & Catholic Studies, The Catholic University of America

Dr. Ronald Sider, President Emeritus, Evangelicals for Social Action

Rev. Arthur Simon, President Emeritus, Bread for the World

Dr. T. DeWitt Smith, Co-Convener, National African American Clergy Network

Rev. Eldridge Spearman, Pastor, Mt. Jezreel Baptist Church, National Baptist Convention, USA Inc.

Gregory E. Sterling, Henry L. Slack Dean and Lillian Claus Professor of New Testament, Yale Divinity School

Ervin R. Stutzman, Executive Director, Mennonite Church USA

Rev. Lori Tapia, National Pastor for Hispanic Ministries, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)

Rev. Adam Taylor, Executive Director, Sojourners

Dr. Steven Timmermans, Executive Director, Christian Reformed Church in North America

Bishop Joseph W. Walker, III, International Presiding Bishop, Full Gospel Baptist Church Fellowship International, Inc.

Rev. Jim Wallis, President and Founder, Sojourners

Colin P. Watson, Director of Ministries and Administration, Christian Reformed Church in North America

Dr. Barbara Williams-Skinner, Co-Convener, National African American Clergy Network; President, Skinner Leadership Institute

Rev. Jim Winkler, President and National Secretary, National Council of Churches

Bishop Jesse Yañez, Director, Church of God of the Prophecy N.A.

CIRCLE OF PROTECTION,
January 29, 2017

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As the president and Congress are preparing their plans for this year, almost 100 church leaders—from all the families of U.S. Christianity—are sharing a common “Unity Statement” on racism and poverty. As Christians, we are grounded in God’s love for all people, and we feel called to ask our churches and political leaders of both parties to work together to overcome racism and poverty which are theological, biblical, and gospel issues for us, not merely political or partisan ones.

This moment in time and the clear movement of the Spirit have brought diverse multi-racial church leaders together over the last several months for dinner conversations and times of prayer. Out of those moving times together, we developed a Unity Statement on Racism and Poverty. It has attracted many more racially and theologically diverse church leaders and is now embraced by the Circle of Protection, the broadest group of Christian leaders focused on poverty. The leaders who have signed this statement are from African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, Native American, Evangelical, Catholic, Pentecostal, and mainline Protestant churches; and many national faith-based organizations. We are all committed to help build a fresh, newly energetic, multi-racial Christian movement to make the integral connection between racism and poverty and seek the spiritual power to end both. We are also committed to working in alliance with other faith communities on the crucial intersection of racism and poverty as it is worked out in public policies. While the Circle of Protection is a Christian group, we believe this statement reflects the values and principles of people of diverse faiths.

We are purposefully sending you this statement before you go to your respective retreats. In addition to reading this statement thoughtfully, we ask for the following three things: first, we ask you to discuss this statement and the issues central to it—racism and poverty—at your retreats; second, we ask you to incorporate these concerns into your policy decisions and legislation in 2018 and beyond; third, we ask you to convene meetings with faith leaders in your communities to plan follow-up action on these issues in your states and districts. Racism and poverty are systemic issues that are central to the Bible and the teachings of Jesus. Therefore, they are critical to policy choices made by political leaders of faith and conscience. We will be following up with you directly to see how we can be helpful and useful to you as you consider these deeply biblical and theological issues.

We believe if we Christians from diverse backgrounds and traditions were known, not mostly for our divisions, but for our unity in a shared commitment to faithfully address both racism and poverty—together—it could be powerful force—both for our churches and the country. So help us God.

REV. JIM WALLIS,
President and Founder, Sojourners;

DR. BARBARA WILLIAMS-SKINNER,
Co-Convener, National African-American Clergy Network and President, Skinner Leadership Institute;

REV. DAVID BECKMANN,
President, Bread for the World;

REV. CARLOS MALAVÉ,
Executive Director, Christian Churches Together USA (in his personal capacity).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to share a passage from the unity statement that was developed. This was an ecumenical group of over 100 religious denominations: “Racism is more than individual behavior, language, and overt hostility toward particular people. Racism is systematic and structural in America and harms people of color in very specific, measurable, and tangible ways.”

Mr. Speaker, the Kerner report, unfortunately, was ignored, and 50 years later, we are still feeling and reaping the consequences. The difficult truth is that, until we address the impact of the middle passage and slavery of generations of African Americans and believe that truth and reconciliation must happen, 50 years from now, two cities will have destroyed the very fabric of our Nation.

As the unity declaration goes on to say: “Racism is a sin that goes back to the founding of our Nation.”

We know what is plaguing our society, and we know what to do about it. The time for talk is over. It is time we do what is right for all Americans. Yes, Black lives do matter.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentlewoman say, obviously, 1968, and we are now in 2018. I yield to the gentlewoman to tell me what she thinks,

in terms of the conditions in 1968, which were obviously the riots, to where we are in 2018. I know there has been some progress, but in terms of things moving back.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, in many communities, housing was segregated. We passed fair housing laws. Affordable housing now is out of reach for many African Americans. This administration is now gutting all of our fair housing programs, our public housing programs, our Section 8 programs.

The banks, of course, did target African-American communities for these subprime scam loans. Unfortunately, any equity that had been built in the homes that we purchased after 1968 is gone. So the wealth gap is huge. It is greater than what it was probably in 1968.

When you look at the number of African Americans who were unemployed in 1968, I believe it was a little over 5 percent. Now we are looking at 7 percent.

When you look at the incarceration rates for the war on drugs, the marijuana laws in this country, especially in the eighties and the impacts of that, we have so many of our young African-American men incarcerated for misdemeanor and felony charges for marijuana distribution and use. We are looking at mass incarceration that has taken place since 1968 of African-American young men and women.

So, yes, we have made a lot of progress. I stand here as the 100th Black Member of Congress. Mr. EVANS is here. We have a Congressional Black Caucus that has increased in size. We have many, many allies in our fight. But I think what we haven't addressed is the issue of racism and institutional racism, because it is so subconscious for so many people until many decisions are made which negatively impact the African-American community.

So from 1968 to now, we have made some progress. We have some great professionals, people doing wonderful things in our community. We have great leaders. We have great scientists, lawyers, doctors, teachers, firefighters, and workers. We have so many people who have been able to lift themselves into the middle class, but we have left so many behind.

That is the point, I think, that, while this new report shows that some of us have progressed, we didn't do what was necessary to bring everyone along with us, to lift everyone out of poverty in the Black community and provide for a level playing field for equality, for parity, and for a pathway into the American Dream.

That is really very sad and very shameful, but I have a lot of hope that our young people and that we here in the House and that the country really begin to understand that we have to address the root causes of what has happened in this country as it relates

to the middle passage and slavery, and to understand that what we see today in these respects that cause these economic and racial disparities go right back to the unfortunate, devastating, and horrific middle passage.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman to speak about the panel she is leading on poverty.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, we established the Whip's Task Force on Poverty, Inequality, and Opportunity. For so many years, I wanted to see our caucus talk about more issues relating to low-income and working people and people of color. I really appreciate our whip, STENY HOYER, and our leader, NANCY PELOSI, for rallying around this concept of looking around all these issues of poverty, inequality, and opportunity.

We put together this task force to begin to look at the policies that not only we need to support that are lifting people out of poverty, but what we need to do to fight against some of the policies and funding priorities that would lead more people into the ranks of the poor.

This task force now has over 100 people. We have meetings with experts, with organizations that are doing wonderful work throughout the country in communities of color and low-income communities and the Black communities, really demonstrating that there are some grassroots efforts and community efforts that, while here in Congress we haven't been able to change many policies, at the grassroots levels and the community level there are some wonderful people doing some great things to help lift people out of poverty and into the middle class.

So we try to highlight and showcase those organizations and individuals so that we can replicate them around the country, so that, until we can get the policies right, we can support those efforts that are taking place that are really doing a wonderful job.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), someone I had the pleasure of spending time with. We have a little running conversation with the Eagles playing in the Super Bowl. He has turned out to be a very good friend in spite of that.

He has traveled this Nation and been very thoughtful in his comments and the things he has said. He wanted to really weigh in on this subject. He has been in the forefront of economic opportunity, poverty reduction, racism, and income equality. He has been in there.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, even though the gentleman from Pennsylvania's football team, the Eagles, beat the Vikings pretty badly, I forgive him for that because at least they beat New England and Tom Brady.

Now, on to the serious business.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. EVANS, for hosting this Special Order talking about the Kerner Commission.

I was born and raised in the city of Detroit. I am honored to represent Minnesota. I am a Minnesotan and very proud of Minnesota, but I started life out in the city of Detroit.

I remember 1968. I was born in August of 1963. I distinctly remember the riots. As a small child, my father was a medical professional, and I remember him being gone for long hours, coming home extremely tired. I remember the earnest conversations my parents were having, talking about the riots.

I remember looking outside my door and seeing military-style vehicles driving by, which is something we didn't really see. I remember being afraid because we heard some noises, and my mother had me and my brothers get under the bed.

I had no idea, really, what was going on, but those memories for me are very vivid because, when you are a child and your parents are afraid, you can feel it. I don't think I will ever forget it.

As I got older, I wanted to know more about the causes of the riots, and I learned and read about the Kerner Commission. The Kerner Commission's report was designed to focus on all of the civil disturbances that had been happening in the United States, including the Detroit riot, which I was alive and have some memory of.

□ 2045

I think it is difficult for young people who want to understand the Kerner Commission report—a report that was prophetic, a report that was thorough and important, a report that was actually a pretty good piece of literature that had good recommendations that our country has never really taken seriously.

But to understand this report and to really delve into the roots of it, I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, to understand that, before 1968, before there ever was a Kerner Commission report, our country, the United States, was a slave-holding nation for about 250 years. If you mark African-American presence in the United States from 1619 and you say slavery officially ended in 1865, America, our country, the United States, was a slave-holding nation longer than it was not one—longer, actually longer. This country held men, women, and children in bondage in absolute absence of freedom for longer than it has not, which is particularly ironic, given that our country is dedicated to liberty and freedom.

Literally millions of Americans existed in a state of anti-freedom, which is slavery. We have yet to contemplate it.

I remember going to law school studying property and contracts. We never talked about America's greatest amount of property, which is human property. We never actually asked: What is the law about leasing on slaves? What is the law about property

ownership on slaves? What is this species of property?

We talked about real estate. We talked about other forms of property. We talked about intellectual property. But for many years of this Nation's history, the predominant form of property was human property in the United States, and we never stopped to even slow down.

I bet you there is not more than two or three law schools in the United States that take on this topic so that people can really understand the ground upon which we stand. We are in the U.S. Capitol, built by people who were not free. In this cathedral of freedom, the people who built it were not free for 250 years.

People stand by and say: Why don't you all get over that? You are always talking about that.

I say: Well, you all still celebrate the Fourth of July.

We are all proud on the Fourth of July that happened in 1776, but we are not supposed to talk about an institution that prevailed in the United States for most of its history.

And it wasn't quite over in 1865, was it?

No. In 1865, we passed the 13th Amendment banning involuntary servitude. We passed the 14th Amendment granting citizenship in, I think, 1868. In 1870, we passed the 15th Amendment granting Black men the right to vote.

This is essentially war measures. I am glad they exist, trust me. I am quite grateful they exist. But when you consider that over 200,000 Black soldiers took up arms to keep the Union—the Union—it was the very least that could happen that Black men would get to vote. Black women didn't get to vote.

But then after that, it is important, Mr. Speaker, to bear in mind another phenomenon took place. By 1877, the Tilden-Hayes compromise was effected, in which there was a dead heat political election. And the Republicans of that day, who, ironically, were the people who were against slavery at that time and against racism and bigotry, they said: We are tired of fighting about racism, slavery, and what is to happen with the Freedman. We will pull Union troops out of the South if you Democrats give us the election.

That allowed Rutherford B. Hayes to become President. Samuel Tilden did not become the President, but the Southerners, Democrats at that time, got what they wanted.

This phenomenon that occurred after that was the end of reconstruction. Lynching, slavery by another name, and true terrorism, under the auspices of the Ku Klux Klan, reined in America at this time. Pulaski, Tennessee, was the home of the Klan. But there were many other White supremacist groups that received the sanction of our government. In fact, one might even argue

that the whole government of the State of Indiana at one time was dominated by the Klan.

People interested in this phenomena can study a very important piece of film and book called "Slavery By Another Name," that talked about convict leasing. The 13th Amendment says that you cannot hold anybody in an involuntary servitude unless convicted of a crime.

That loophole allowed our country to use the criminal justice system to push Black men into it to take advantage of their labor through convict leasing. And even though the industry in Alabama of steelmaking really had not taken root during slavery, it did take root after slavery. The people who mined the iron ore and who worked in those mines were, essentially, in convict leasing.

Convict leasing prevailed in our country up until the 1930s and 1940s. In fact, cotton production dropped after the Civil War, but then went back up because of convict leasing because Black men and women were held in bondage through an unjust criminal justice system that forced them to work cotton up until mechanization made hand cotton picking not advantageous anymore. That, together with the sharecropping system, maintained that system.

We think about the Kerner Commission report, we think about the riots of 1968, 1965, and 1966, all of these things, Black rage exploding on the national scene, and people ask: What are they mad about?

Two hundred and fifty years of slavery and 100 years after Jim Crow after that might make you a little upset.

Black people never missed a war. African-American soldiers helped fight for the Union; African-American soldiers helped fight in Korea; the Spanish-American war. As a matter of fact, you can't name a military conflict that Black people didn't fight for this country and die for it. Yet, after the service, usually we came back to racism and discrimination.

There is a great movie out now called "Mudbound" about this very phenomena. If people want to learn more about this, they can look at this film "Mudbound" about a Black soldier who comes back, gets treated with human dignity in Europe, comes back to Mississippi, and then gets lynched.

This is our country. I am proud of my country and I love my country, but I am not blind to it.

The Kerner Commission tried to open our eyes and tell us what was really going on. One of the phenomena—and I would like to just note this—is that one of the many ways that racism manifested itself is through residential segregation. Blacks were not allowed to live in certain areas, work in certain areas, and, in 1903, the great Woodrow Wilson kicked Black people out of Fed-

eral employment. His reason was that we carry disease. This is in the modern era. Black people were relegated to living in certain neighborhoods. And, actually, when it was found to be illegal to say Blacks can't live in this neighborhood by the Supreme Court, then that is when redlining took hold.

Residential segregation was so effective, Mr. Speaker, for 50 years, that we now in America today—and I am talking about 2018—if you survey White Americans and you ask them, Have you had a significant and meaningful conversation in the last 6 months, who are those people and who are the top seven, 91 percent of White Americans will say that they haven't had a meaningful conversation with a person of color.

Residential segregation is so bad that we don't talk to each other. The result is no empathy—no sympathy; no empathy; no sense of, gee, that is really too bad.

People say: Well, they don't work hard. That is the problem.

Well, wait a minute. How could it be that the people who worked for 250 years for free don't work hard? How could it be that people who don't have any power are some big threat to be feared in this Nation when all we have done is serve it and build it?

At the end of the day, the Kerner Commission tried to highlight discrimination against African Americans in education, housing, and employment; tried to help the Nation understand why some African Americans get enraged about incidents of official violence; why we don't condone, nor even do we agree, with riots.

We cannot act like we don't understand them. Of course we understand them. Many of us have chosen that we are going to try to reform our country and help it reach its promise through our electoral system, through organizing, and activism. We are going to try to make America a stronger and better place by working within the systems that exist.

I am proud that I am one of those people. But I often have to find myself trying to convince people who don't agree with me that there are answers within the system that I am right and they are not, because they come with arguments sometimes based on the history.

The bottom line is the Kerner Commission report, 50 years ago today, we have made progress. There is no doubt about it. We don't have Jim Crow anymore. But we have also seen stagnation.

There is a new report by the Eisenhower Foundation, which shows that since the late 1960s, income inequality and the wealth gap have actually gotten wider. While high school and college graduation rates have improved for the Black community since the Kerner Commission report—thank goodness, and this is an important advance, and we are grateful for it—these

gains in access have not translated in economic vitality.

Black families have the highest student debt. Thirty-one percent of all Black families have college debt, compared to about 20 percent of White families. College debt is tough on families of any color, but African Americans, having a lower overall income and a much lower wealth, have to borrow more to seek out education, and that is limiting African-American opportunity.

More than 70 percent of White families own their own homes compared to less than half of Black and Hispanic families. Since 1968, White homeownership has steadily increased, but Black homeownership has not changed. In 1968, 41 percent of Black families owned their own home.

And what is the homeownership rate today?

Now it is 41.2.

Given what I shared with you earlier about residential segregation and about how Blacks and Whites and Latinos don't really interact nearly as much as they should, given the fact that we are all Americans, people may not understand why African-American economic progress has not been as swift as we might want it to be.

To that I say it is a matter of residential segregation and even current redlining. I recommend to people to read an important book called "Evicted" by Matthew Desmond, and also listen to a podcast called "Reveal" about redlining. This prospect of redlining is very important. "Reveal" looked at literally thousands and thousands of pieces of data from the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. They found that, in 61 metropolitan areas in the United States, there is substantial evidence of mortgage discrimination. That is African Americans, who got the same credit score, the same down payment as other people, who are denied loans.

Mr. Speaker, this even happens in neighborhoods where Black people are the majority.

People wonder: How is it that you have gentrification?

Well, the Black person with the downpayment and the 700 credit score gets told that they cannot have a loan; and the White person with the 500 or 600 credit score and a 3 percent downpayment gets told: Sure, have the loan.

It is happening every day.

Listen to the podcast "Reveal." You will see a woman who went through this herself. It left her not only without a house, but she had to have her partner, who is White and Asian mix, be the one who took out the mortgage because they wouldn't give her one.

I am saying that our country is truly a great nation, but to get to its true greatness, it has got to confront racial discrimination. I am not talking about prejudice. I am talking about racism.

What is the difference?

Prejudice means I don't like you because of your color, your race, and it is a personal thing. It is just I don't like you.

What I am talking about by racism is systematic denial of opportunity without regard to personality.

They didn't turn that Black woman down in that "Reveal" podcast because they didn't like her. They don't know her. They know she is Black, and that is all they need to know to turn her down.

This is what we have to confront as a country.

And as I close, Congressman EVANS, and as I get ready to take my seat, I just want to point out that, in 2016, White families had a median net worth of \$171,000 compared to \$17,000 for Blacks and \$20,000 for Latinos. Sixty percent of White families reported having retirement savings, which is double the rate for Black and Hispanic families.

We have to understand what Martin Luther King tried to teach us, and that is: What difference does it make if you can sit at a lunch counter if you cannot afford a hamburger?

□ 2100

The Kerner Commission tried to signal to us the way forward. In 2018, we still have the opportunity to take the lessons of it and to build a truly beloved society, as Martin Luther King tried to teach us, but it cannot just be platitudes and pretty talk. It has got to be real commitment, real money, and real investment in opportunity for all.

At the end of the day, in the United States, we say, as we say the Pledge of Allegiance, "liberty and justice for all." I say economic liberty and economic justice for all, and I say we will then see much more social inclusion, and we will live up to the recommendations of the Kerner Commission. We can't wait another 50 years.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I hope people heard him. I want to ask a couple things.

The goal of the Commission was to identify the underlying causes of the civil unrest in communities across the country, and obviously a lot has happened in that 50 years. Technology, trade policies, tax policies, education policies, all those types of things have occurred, and it is clear knowing—obviously, in 1968, they didn't know anything about the internet, trade policies, tax policies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman: Should there be another commission report? Should there be something that, in a sense, tries to update, in 2018, knowing the circumstances that we are in, and especially poverty has even grown more?

Mr. Speaker, I told you, in the district I am in, which has a lot of wealth

with major universities, there is 26 percent poverty. In 1968, there was a riot in the city of Philadelphia.

Now, we don't have riots, you know, fortunately, anymore today in communities, but do we have a form of quiet riot that is occurring in these communities, not physically the way they were, but in some way there is still this growing gap? So we know what the goal was.

Mr. ELLISON. Right.

Mr. EVANS. We know the goal was to identify the underlying causes of the civil unrest.

Mr. Speaker, what I hear Mr. ELLISON saying with that 250 years, the first time I ever heard that described that way, I would ask him to talk to us a little bit about here it is 2018, 50 years later, with all these things that have happened.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I think another Kerner Commission report is definitely appropriate. It is right. It is good. But I will say that the Eisenhower Foundation did a report that showed that, since the late 1960s, income inequality and the wealth gap have widened.

I really believe that what we really need to do is say to ourselves, as a nation, that we are going to actually live out the true meaning of our creed. At the end of the day, the problem is not intellectual; the problem is a matter of will.

Actually, we have real challenges in our Nation today because, I happen to believe, we have a President who is less willing to move progress forward than even other Republicans who have been in office.

We live in a time, now, where we have seen the rollback of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. We have seen the—right now, there is an attack on public employees in the Supreme Court. It feels like 1870.

You remember I was talking about the Civil War. Black soldiers entered the Civil War in 1863 after the Emancipation Proclamation; 200,000 fought in that Civil War. Black soldiers helped win the Civil War and maintained the Union. In fact, Lincoln himself said that, without Black soldiers, we might not have a Union.

We went through Reconstruction. Of course, Lincoln was killed in April of 1865, but by 1870, we began to roll back, we began to see the progress and the promise roll back.

It feels a little bit like that right now. It feels a little bit like that. But, you know, we are not going back to them bad old days. I want everyone to hear that African Americans, Latinos, women, the LGBT community, people of other religious groups, minority religions, we are not going to the back of the bus. It is just not going to happen.

Better to say, okay, instead of having one group in America be supreme

over everyone, what if that group were simply equal to everyone?

Some people in our country seem to believe that having 43 Presidents who are White men, you get one that is Black, and now, all of a sudden, oh, my God, the world is coming to an end. No, it isn't. Everything is fine. Everyone is fine. It just means that what we wrote on paper is actually getting reflected a little bit more in reality.

I think we need to make a firm commitment to end housing discrimination, a firm commitment to let the people vote, a firm commitment to stop giving tax breaks to the richest people and give the working and middle class a chance to earn a decent level of pay.

I think we need a Republican caucus who will help work with us to stop the carnage of guns on these streets and to allow people who have come here as children not to be thrown out of the country summarily. That is what we really need. But I am not getting the sense that they want to help out, so I am thinking we need to get elections that will get some people, Republican or Democrat, to come out here and do some good things for the American people—and not just the wealthiest, most privileged people.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, we have another person, who is a neighbor of mine and has been a very good friend, from the great State of New Jersey. We have got that Benjamin Franklin, Walt Whitman Bridge connection. He is a very good friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), from the 10th District of New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Keystone State for hosting tonight's Special Order hour. He has demonstrated great leadership during this time, and the issues that we are tackling during these Special Order hours are very important to this country as we move forward.

As has been stated today, it has been 50 years since the Kerner report warned us that the Nation was headed into a separate and unequal future. The Kerner report was supposed to be a wake-up call for the United States to break the cycle that kept African-Americans in poverty. It called for government to invest in job creation programs, to expand public housing, and to guarantee minimum family incomes. The Kerner report understood that such actions were necessary for the United States to confront its legacy of race and inequality.

Unfortunately, 50 years later, the same problems persist. The rate of child poverty in the United States today is greater than it was in 1968. The percent of Americans who live in the depths of poverty has grown as

well. Welfare reform has failed. African-American unemployment is still nearly double the rate of our White counterparts. Labor unions, once a great equalizer for workers, have shrunk, and inequality has grown.

Rich people in the United States are healthier than poor people. They live longer. They go to better schools, get better jobs, and generate more wealth. They are also more likely to be White than to be Black.

Our schools are more segregated than they were in the 1980s. Our prisons are darker. The Voting Rights Act, a landmark achievement of the civil rights movement, has been gutted.

These and other barriers to equality threaten our democracy.

The resegregation of our schools means that people of color and those who struggle with poverty are often forced to go to underfunded schools. Their education suffers. They aren't given adequate preparation for college or a trade school, and they ultimately make less money than their White counterparts.

A recent Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco study found that Black men and women earn persistently lower wages compared to their White counterparts, a gap that cannot be fully explained by differences in age, education, job type, or location.

So what can Congress do? We need to invest in housing programs that help desegregate communities once again. We need to make it easier for people of color to get federally backed loans to buy homes and finally do away with red lining.

We need to invest in public schools. We need to expand preschool education. We need to spend money on job training programs and public universities.

We need to increase the minimum wage, and we need to strengthen oversight of mortgage lenders.

We need to restore the Voting Rights Act, because people who cannot vote cannot lead.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I can, just follow up a little bit on the Voting Rights Act.

Obviously, that is the foundation of a democracy, and it is rather amazing to me that all of us in this Congress are elected by the people. I tell people the greatest title is citizen. It is not Congressman; it is not President; it is citizen.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to speak a little bit about what has that impact been about the Voting Rights Act, as he sees it today, and the fact that, for some reason, this Congress doesn't seem to understand that we still need the Voting Rights Act in 2018.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would say that, as we have all stated tonight, it apparently appears that we are going backwards in this country, and so why wouldn't the Voting Rights Act be

under attack? It was finally the opportunity for African-American citizens to be full citizens.

The only right you are born with in the United States of America is the right to vote as an American citizen. You are born with that right, and yet it is stripped away through the gutting of the Voting Rights Act.

So what does that say to people who fall under the Voting Rights Act? It says that you are not equal, that you don't deserve the same rights as other Americans, that somehow you are less than a first-class citizen in this country, yet you can go to war for us, you can do other things, contribute to this society, but not be able to vote. The three-fifths compromise, we can go all the way back to that and talk about the inequality.

So we need people of goodwill on both sides of the issue, on both sides of the aisle, to understand how equality is arrived at and come together and do the things that we need to do in order to make this a more perfect Union. I believe in that. I have not always seen it, but I believe that we need to continue to strive to make this a more perfect Union, to live out the mantra of this great Nation.

This is the greatest country in the world, no question about it, absolutely incredible, but let's live up to it. Let's really live up to what this Nation stands for, because you don't need people who are citizens here that don't believe in what you are saying.

Every day, we get up and we pledge allegiance to the flag like every other resident, every other citizen in this country, but every once in a while it fails us. We need to stay vigilant. We at the Congressional Black Caucus will be the voice and be vigilant on this floor in this House for people throughout this country who seem to be on the wrong side of this issue.

□ 2115

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, what others have heard this evening from the Congressional Black Caucus is sort of like a canary in the mine. The Kerner Report, when President Johnson established it 50 years ago, was an attempt to shine a light and to send a warning that we were two nations, one Black and one White. And for every Member who stood up here and spoke, they all talked about how proud they are, as Americans; and that we all recognize the beauty and the idea of America and what it has meant.

I come from the city of Philadelphia, where it all started. In those conversations, there is no question it started out as a very flawed document, where African Americans and women basically were left out of that discussion.

But as you think about what my good friend from Minnesota said as he laid out the historical aspect to where we are here in 2018 and the opportunity we have—because I do believe we have an opportunity, and I do believe it is not any more words on paper. It is not a report or anything. It is a question of what is in our hearts collectively.

I don't think this is a Democrat or Republican issue. I don't think this is a Black or White issue. I think this is an issue about inclusion and involvement. I think that when you go back to that report that talks about the underlying causes of the civil unrest in these communities across this country, I think that we all have an obligation to try to address those issues.

The issues are very fundamental. May you live in rural America, or urban America, or suburban America, you know, everybody needs quality healthcare. Everyone needs a job opportunity. Everyone needs a good, solid education. And those things we should not take lightly. All of those things, we all need.

So what we, as the Congressional Black Caucus, attempted to do is continue to raise the consciousness and to get people to understand that we still have a lot of work to do. This should not be taken lightly; that we all recognize that though, as Dr. King used to say, we have come over here on different boats, we are in the same boat now; and that boat is America; that boat is we are in a much more competitive world than in 1968. This is 1968. The world has radically changed.

The question is: Are we going to be in the forefront of the change, or are we going to be in the back of change?

I like to believe we should be in the forefront of change. I like to believe that we all understand, as a country, that it is in our collective interests to work together and to make a difference. I am not saying to you it will be easy. And it was not easy in 1968.

As I said, President Johnson was a Democrat, but he did not heed the report the way he should have probably heeded it. But it is no use talking about the past.

The question is: How do we deal with the future, and where do we go?

We should applaud him and others for at least having the discussion. We should not be fearful of discussion. We should all recognize that we have some challenges ahead for us in the 21st century.

Again, I will repeat myself. It will not be easy. It will take a lot of work, and it will take us confronting those issues that we face today. It is not easy, as we have debated the issue about healthcare or the issue about jobs or the issue about education. Everybody wants to work. Everybody wants a quality job and a quality opportunity. No one wants to sit on the sidelines.

So we have a chance today, in my view, to take advantage of the opportunities. I hope we will, Mr. Speaker. I believe that all members of the Congressional Black Caucus strongly feel that way. I thank the chairman of our caucus for initiating these efforts that we have been doing for this last year or so. I really appreciate that opportunity.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Kerner Report.

In 1968, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, known as the Kerner Commission, found that the civil unrest in the African American community was a result of white racism. From employment and housing discrimination to segregated and underfunded schools, racism was the root cause of systemic poverty plaguing African Americans.

In 1969, the theme for Delta Sigma Theta under the leadership of the late Frankie Muse Freeman was, "One Nation or Two?" As we continue to ask ourselves that same question 50 years later, it is clear that civil rights is still unfinished business.

According to 2016 Census data, 12.7 percent of Americans live in poverty. For African Americans, the poverty rate is nearly double the national rate at 22 percent. And 33 percent of African American children are growing up in poverty.

The persistent racial wealth divide and lack of economic progress among African Americans is cause for alarm.

The Black unemployment rate has risen to 7.7 percent and continues to be nearly double that of White workers. In 1968, it was 6.8 percent.

The median net worth for Black families is \$17,600, compared to \$171,000 for white families. When it comes to homeownership, 71 percent of White households are homeowners compared to 41 percent of Black households—practically the same as in 1968.

On the campaign trail, the President said inner cities were more dangerous than war zones and repeatedly asked the African American community, "What do you have to lose?"

Every day, the Trump Administration's economic policies make clear what African Americans and communities of color have to lose: economic opportunity and upward mobility.

The President's lopsided tax cut added at least \$1.5 trillion to the national deficit with likely offsets to earned benefits and social safety net programs many families depend on like Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and SNAP.

The President's budget would reduce funding for SNAP by \$213 billion over the next 10 years and force 16 million households to survive on so-called "Harvest Boxes" that will cost more than they save in dollars and human capital. These proposed "ration boxes" are demeaning to families: shelf stable milk, ready to eat cereals, canned meat, fruits and vegetables, peanut butter and pasta. Is this what we have come to? This is the same Republican Party who told us that we couldn't provide our children healthy meals in schools.

While roughly 1 in 6 Black households spend more than 50 percent of their income

on housing, the President's budget eliminates the National Housing Trust Fund and U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, the legal aid program which helps families avoid unwarranted evictions, the Community Development Block Grant program, and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program.

Republicans in Congress and this Administration have chosen to rob the American people of resources that could put people to work building infrastructure, improve public education, child care, and health care. Time and again, their proposals benefit the wealthy and hurt the working poor and communities of color.

It's no coincidence that the President wants to eliminate diversity visas and prevent immigrants from Africa and Asia from coming into this country. It's no coincidence that our fellow Americans in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are still suffering and can't get the resources needed to truly rebuild after Hurricane Irma and Hurricane Maria. Black and Brown people are not wanted. They need not apply here.

As we look ahead to the next fifty years, will this be one America or two? One Black and Brown, one White? One rich, one poor?

America will only be great if we ensure our policies create opportunities for all Americans and address the structural racism that preserves the racial wealth divide. If we don't direct needed resources to communities of highest need, they will never catch up.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman EVANS for anchoring this very important Special Order on the subject of the famous Kerner Commission Report and the persistence of economic inequality and poverty in America.

Together, we stand, firmly committed to combating poverty.

Poverty in America reaches into all regions of the country, urban and rural, and affects millions of persons of all races, ethnicities, creed, ages, and gender.

However, it seems that far too often, and for far too long, the African American community has been disproportionately disadvantaged.

Three years ago we marked the 50th anniversary of the Watts Rebellion in Los Angeles, which was followed in the succeeding two years by the long hot summers and outbreaks of civil unrest in Detroit, Newark, Washington, D.C., Baltimore, and Gary, Indiana.

The 1967 civil unrest and disturbances in Detroit and Newark prompted President Lyndon Johnson to establish the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, an 11-member commission, chaired by Illinois Governor Otto Kerner.

The mandate of the Kerner Commission was to identify the underlying cause of the civil unrest in communities across the country.

On February 29, 1968, following several field trips to troubled communities, the Commission released its 176-page report that examined cultural and institutional racism, from segregated schools and housing discrimination to generational poverty and limited economic opportunity.

The Kerner Report brought attention to the racial tension and divide that communities of color were facing nationwide.

It is important to recall two of the more important conclusions of the Kerner Report.

First, the Commission concluded that:

"Discrimination and segregation have long permeated much of American life; they now threaten the future of every American. This deepening racial division is not inevitable. The movement apart can be reversed. Choice is still possible. Our principal task is to define that choice and to press for a national resolution. To pursue our present course will involve the continuing polarization of the American community and, ultimately, the destruction of basic democratic values."

Second, the Commission concluded that:

"No American—white or black—can escape the consequences of the continuing social and economic decay of our major cities. Only a commitment to national action on an unprecedented scale can shape a future compatible with the historic ideals of American society."

The Kerner Commission called for bold policies to counter decades of political failure, such as investment in much-needed social services, housing, and education programs and incentivizing diversity among law enforcement.

In the wake of the upheaval, the Civil Rights Act of 1968 outlawing housing discrimination was signed into law.

Consequently, the past 50 years have seen the most progress towards equality than any point in our nation's history.

Over the last five decades, African Americans have seen substantial gains in high school completion rates.

High school graduation rates are up to 92.3 percent.

College graduation rates have also improved for African Americans.

Among 25–29-year-olds, less than one in 10 (9.1 percent) had a college degree in 1968, a figure that has climbed to almost one in four (22.8 percent) today.

Over the same period, however, college completion expanded for whites at a similar pace, rising from 16.2 percent in 1968 to 42.1 percent today, leaving the relative situation of African Americans basically unchanged: in 1968 African Americans were just over half (56.0 percent) as likely as whites to have a college degree, a situation that is essentially the same today (54.2 percent).

America has made some improvements, but African Americans continue to face some of the same obstacles identified in the Kerner Report.

The unemployment rate for African Americans in 2017 (the last full year of data) was 7.5 percent, 0.8 percentage points higher than it was in 1968 (6.7 percent).

The unemployment rate for whites was 3.8 percent in 2017 and 3.2 percent in 1968.

The unemployment data for these two years, almost 50 years apart, demonstrate a longstanding and unfortunate economic regularity: the unemployment rate for black workers is consistently about twice as high as it is for white workers.

Today, hourly wage black workers who could get jobs still only made 82.5 cents on every dollar earned by the typical white worker.

In, 1968, black infants were about 1.9 times as likely to die as white infants; today, the infant mortality rate is 2.3 times higher for African Americans.

On average, an African American born today can still expect to live about 3.5 fewer years than a white person born on the same day.

In 1968, African Americans were about 5.4 times as likely as whites to be in prison or jail; compared to today, African Americans are 6.4 times as likely as whites to be incarcerated, which is especially troubling given that whites are also much more likely to be incarcerated now than they were in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear the inequalities and disparities that ignited hundreds of American cities in the 1960s still exist and have not been eliminated over the last half-century.

Fifty years ago, the Kerner Commission proposed bold recommendations to address the issues of poverty and racism that plague the African-American community, including:

Investments in housing programs to combat de facto segregation in communities;

Investments in K–12 and higher education to provide equal access to quality education;

Investments in job training programs to ensure equal employment opportunities.

Unfortunately, those recommendations have not been fully heeded over the past half-century.

The time has come for Congress to rededicate itself to making bold investments necessary to eliminate economic inequality of opportunity in every corner of our great nation.

If these investments are not made, our nation will remain separate and unequal for another 50 years.

I urge my colleagues in Congress, and all Americans, to look at what unites us rather than what divides us.

We are linked by our compassion, and bound by the fundamental edict of the American Dream that says we will strive to provide our children with a better life than we had.

We can, and we must, find the common ground necessary to make this dream a reality for Americans of every race and creed, nationality and religion, gender and sexual orientation; indeed for every American wherever he or she may live in this great land regardless of what he or she looks like or who they may love.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, 1968 was a watershed year in our nation's history. That year saw the deadliest period of the Vietnam War and the peak of protests against that conflict. It saw the passage of the Fair Housing Act but the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy. 1968 saw President Johnson announce that he would not run for a second term and Richard Nixon elected to succeed him.

In the midst of that tumultuous year, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, known as the Kerner Commission, issued its report examining the cause of riots and unrest that had occurred in inner cities and communities of color around the country.

After visiting those cities, interviewing witnesses, and consulting with experts, the Kerner Commission submitted its findings to President Johnson. That groundbreaking report remains important five decades later, not only as an historical document, but also because it describes the same issues of race that we struggle with today and how we can overcome them.

The Kerner Commission's report identified twelve grievances that were shared in the communities of color where the unrest had taken place. Among these were lack of economic opportunity, discrimination in the administration of justice, and inadequacy of education, housing, and social welfare programs.

These same problems persist today.

Employment: In 2018, the unemployment rate for African-Americans is 7.7 percent, compared to just 4.1 percent overall, and black workers made 83 cents on the dollar compared to white workers.

Housing: only 41 percent of black households own their home, virtually the same as 1968, while over 70 percent of white families own their homes.

Education: schools are more segregated now than they were thirty years ago, and blacks are half as likely as whites to have a college degree.

Justice: blacks are incarcerated at a rate of 3.5 times higher than whites.

So we now find ourselves in the same situation as the one described in the Kerner report 50 years ago: "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal."

Fortunately, the Kerner report also described a path to reverse the trend of racial division. It called for "the realization of common opportunities for all within a single society" that requires "a commitment to national action—compassionate, massive and sustained, backed by the resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on this earth. From every American it will require new attitudes, new understanding, and, above all, new will."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus who embody the commitment to national action and the new will that the Kerner Commission called for 50 years ago.

HONORING PASTOR ED SEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 30 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Grace Baptist Church, in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, paid tribute to its pastor of the past 37 years, Ed Sears, and his wife, Linda. Pastor Sears is transitioning out of his role as senior pastor, and the members of the church, along with people from across the State, met to acknowledge the leadership and inspiration provided by Pastor Sears.

Pastor Sears is known as a servant of God who is held in high esteem by all who know him and his reputation. He is a person who made those around him feel loved. There is general agreement that the love that he shows others is a result of his commitment to and his relationship with Jesus Christ.

He has made a difference in the lives of thousands of others to whom he ministered whenever they were in need. He has been totally committed to his ministry and been a true role model for us all.

As he retires from a full-time ministry to face health challenges, we wish him well. We know that he will deal with these challenges in the same way he has lived his life thus far, with honor, integrity, strength, and faith that will inspire others.

May God continue to bless you, Pastor Sears.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical procedure.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and March 6 on account of representational duties in district relating to Hurricane Harvey recovery activities.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and March 6.

Mr. NEAL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1621. An act to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a methodology for the collection by the Commission of information about commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 2372. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; in addition, to the Committee on Natural Resources for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 5, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 535. To encourage visits between the United States and Taiwan at all levels, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4157. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army case number 17-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

4158. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General David G. Perkins, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4159. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — CPSC Acceptance of Third Party Laboratories: Revision to the Notice of Requirements for Prohibitions of Children's Toys and Child Care Articles Containing Specified Phthalates [Docket No.: CPSC-2017-0043] received February 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4160. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4161. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to the situation in Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, is to continue in effect beyond March 8, 2018, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—98); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4162. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions, is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2018, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—100); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4163. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine, that was declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, is to

continue in effect beyond March 6, 2018, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—99); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4164. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Services Surveys: BE-120 Benchmark Survey of Transactions in Selected Services and Intellectual Property With Foreign Persons (RIN: 0691-AA87) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4165. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List [Docket No.: 180112034-8034-01] (RIN: 0694-AH48) received February 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4166. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4167. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4168. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2017 Federal Information Security Modernization Act and Agency Privacy Management Report, pursuant to Public Law 113-283, 44 U.S.C. 3554(c); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4169. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting four notifications of nomination, action on nomination, change in previously submitted reported information, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4170. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4171. A letter from the Vice-Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2022, FY 2017 Annual Performance Report, and Annual Performance Plan for FY 2018 (Final) and FY 2019 (Proposed), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 306(a); Public Law 103-62, Sec. 3(a) (as amended by Public Law 111-352, Sec. 2); (124 Stat. 3866) and 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4172. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants;

Taxonomical Update for Orangutan [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2017-0081; 4500090024] (RIN: 1018-BC54) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4173. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2017-18 Season [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2016-0051; FF09M21200-178-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BB40) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4174. A letter from the Regulations Specialist, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska — 2017-18 and 2018-19 Subsistence Taking of Fish Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2015-0003; FXFR13350700640-167-FF07J00000; FBMS#4500096963] (RIN: 1018-BA76) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4175. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Listing the Oceanic Whitetip Shark as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act [Docket No.: 151110999-7999-03] (RIN: 0648-XE314) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4176. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — List of Fisheries for 2018 [Docket No.: 170303230-8047-02] (RIN: 0648-BG72) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4177. A letter from the Enforcement Specialist, Office of Law Enforcement, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Penalties; 2018 Inflation Adjustments for Civil Monetary Penalties [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-LE-2017-0097; FF09L00200-FX-LE18110900000] (RIN: 1018-BC05) received February 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4178. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Harmonization of Fire Protection Equipment Standards for Towing Vessels [Docket No.: USCG-2017-1060] (RIN: 1625-AC43) received February 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4179. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restriction

Imposed on Certain Archaeological Material from Belize [CBP Dec. 18-02] (RIN: 1515-AE37) received February 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4180. A letter from the Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report titled "Review of Medicare Administrative Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2016", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395kk-1(e)(2)(C)(ii); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1874A(e)(2)(C)(ii) (as amended by Public Law 108-173, Sec. 912(a)); (117 Stat. 2388); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4242. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a permanent VA Care in the Community Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. CHENEY: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 762. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1119) to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1917) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule (Rept. 115-586). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2823 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 5155. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to improve affordability of, undo sabotage with respect to, and increase access to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 5156. A bill to protect publicly owned trees from unnecessary destruction, maiming, or alteration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 5157. A bill to ensure that certain incidents involving a covered employee that are reported to the title IX coordinator at an eligible institution of higher education have been reviewed by the president of the institution and not less than 1 additional member of the institution's board of trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 5158. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to request nominations for and make determinations regarding roads to be designated under the national scenic byways program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 5159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the refined coal production tax credit and modify the qualifying advanced coal project credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 5160. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of cancer care planning and coordination under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself,

Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 5161. A bill to require the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to submit to Congress an annual report on the effects of gun violence on public health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN,

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 5162. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to remove the exclusion of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms from the definition of consumer product in order to permit the issuance of safety standards for such articles by the Consumer Product Safety Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 5163. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale or other disposition of a firearm to, and the possession, shipment, transportation, or receipt of a firearm by, certain classes of high-risk individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5164. A bill to expand economic opportunities, improve community policing, and promote common-sense gun violence prevention in underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Ways and Means, Small Business, Oversight and Government Reform, Agriculture, Rules, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 5165. A bill to prohibit entities from requiring individuals to submit to arbitration for disputes arising from a security breach, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 5166. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to review and potentially revise its standards for safeguarding customer information to ensure that such standards require certain consumer reporting agencies and service providers of such agencies to maintain sufficient safeguards against cyber attacks and related threats, to provide for additional authority to enforce such standards with respect to such agencies and providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 5167. A bill to provide for the termination of residential or motor vehicle leases

and telephone service contracts for Foreign Service officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 5168. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to establish seaweed as a high-priority research and extension area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 5169. A bill to amend the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act to prioritize research on sensor and imager technology in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 5170. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to reauthorize and reform the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. BACON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. KIHUEN):

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution recognizing and supporting the efforts of the United Bid Committee to bring the 2026 Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup competition to Canada, Mexico, and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 763. A resolution calling upon the leadership of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to dismantle its labor camp system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 5155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Subsection 18: the "Necessary and Proper" clause

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:

H.R. 5157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 5159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 3

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 3

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 3

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 3

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 5165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 5166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 5168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 5169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 5170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 57: Mr. SOTO and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 103: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 130: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 131: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 173: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. AMODEI, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 303: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 501: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 553: Mr. HILL.

- H.R. 559: Mrs. HANDEL.
H.R. 613: Mr. MACARTHUR and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 630: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 644: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 681: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 812: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 820: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 846: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 878: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 911: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 936: Mr. KING of Iowa and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 947: Mr. NEAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 949: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 959: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1017: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1027: Mr. FASO.
H.R. 1044: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1079: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1118: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1150: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1223: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1243: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1267: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 1276: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1330: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 1439: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1444: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1472: Ms. TITUS and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1475: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1478: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BASS, Mr. VELA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1494: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1530: Mr. CRIST and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1553: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1562: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1596: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1612: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KIHUEN, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1661: Ms. TITUS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1683: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1692: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1739: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1772: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1832: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1876: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 1902: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1969: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1982: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1993: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2004: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2077: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2276: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2293: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2319: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 2380: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2392: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2421: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2436: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2439: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2472: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2477: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 2583: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 2625: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2670: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2740: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 2801: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2832: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2903: Ms. ROSEN and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2999: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 3030: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 3079: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3087: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3091: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3174: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 3282: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3409: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3431: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3444: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3464: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SOTO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KIHUEN, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 3528: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 3545: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 3558: Mr. FASO and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 3637: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3642: Mr. HIMES and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3654: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3694: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3712: Mr. HARPER and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3887: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3976: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 3987: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3988: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3994: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MENG, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3999: Mr. KATKO and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 4025: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4052: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 4057: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4058: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 4101: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4107: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4137: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 4142: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4143: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4152: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4153: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4207: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4223: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4229: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 4240: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4245: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4260: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4267: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4268: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4275: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 4287: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4290: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4311: Ms. CHENEY and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4314: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4316: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4403: Mr. BOST and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4471: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4489: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4548: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 4556: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4565: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 4638: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4655: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4677: Ms. ROSEN, Mr. NORMAN, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4702: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4706: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 4721: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4732: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4751: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4837: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4846: Mr. PETERSON and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 4850: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 4851: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4854: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 4856: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4909: Mr. MAST, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HECK, Mr. COMER, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 4929: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4932: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4934: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4943: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 4949: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 4953: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4973: Mr. SOTO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4986: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 4997: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 5001: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5006: Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 5009: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 5028: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5041: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 5071: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 5080: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 5090: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5095: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5104: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 5105: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 5122: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 31: Mrs. TORRES.
H.J. Res. 61: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.J. Res. 130: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. LATTA.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H. Res. 31: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H. Res. 257: Mr. MARSHALL.
H. Res. 307: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H. Res. 720: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H. Res. 730: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. KIND.
H. Res. 731: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 732: Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 740: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 746: Ms. ROSEN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DONALD W. LEMKA

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the life and service of Supervisory Special Agent Donald W. Lemka (Don) who passed away at the young age of 41 late last year after a valiant battle with cancer. He is survived by his wife, Tracey, and daughter, Madison Bridges.

Don served his country in the U.S. Marine Corps where his assignments included work on Marine One as Crew Chief and at three U.S. embassies. He then continued his service to our country as a special agent at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Don's first office assignment was at the San Antonio Field Office's Resident Agency in Austin, Texas, where he worked until 2015.

Given the confidential nature of his work, many of his accomplishments cannot be made public. The people of South and Central Texas are more secure today because of honorable Americans like Don who protect them from global and domestic threats they are often not aware of. We owe Don a debt of gratitude for a life well lived in service to his country.

RECOGNIZING THE 83RD ANNUAL FLORIDA STRAWBERRY FESTIVAL

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 83rd Annual Florida Strawberry Festival in Plant City, Florida, an important celebration in my district.

Plant City, Florida, is recognized as the Winter Strawberry Capital of the World, and the state of Florida is the second largest strawberry producing state in the United States, with more than 10,000 acres of strawberries planted annually.

The Florida Strawberry Festival serves to bring the community together to celebrate the agricultural and historical legacy of the Florida strawberry. The festival is scheduled to take place over eleven days this year, and has provided family-friendly fun since 1930 and welcomes over 500,000 visitors from across the country to enjoy musical concerts, agricultural exhibits, parades, youth developmental programs, other forms of entertainment, and delicious strawberry treats.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize this treasured community tradition that has brought together countless participants, volunteers, and sponsors. I thank all of those who

have given their time and resources to make the Florida Strawberry Festival such a cherished tradition in our community.

OATH OF CITIZENSHIP ON MARCH 9, 2018

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate twenty-five individuals who will take their oaths of citizenship on March 9, 2018. This memorable occasion will be held at the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. Oath ceremonies are a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On March 9, 2018, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Domingo Virruete, Bernadette Augustynski, Haroldas Vysniauskas, Jose Otoniel Campos, Maria Georgina Rivera, Jorge Robles, Humberto Morales Jr., Ernestina Caro, Omar Awad Sobih, Maria Francisca Aguliar, Katie Rizhkov, Haneen Mohammad Al-Zeer, Rania Shwqi Abudayyeh, Christine Nasr Mousa, Tannya Marisa Viramontes, Paul Alejandro Beltran, Jimmy Trang, Lissette Jesus Sayan Thompson, George Gonzalez, Luis Alberto Salazar, Ana M. Ramirez, Hina Naz Chaudhry, Beth Wanjiru Kavolu, Said Saad, and Karoline R. Stiglich.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country “. . . of the people, by the people, and for the people.” They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals who will be-

come citizens of the United States of America on March 9, 2018. They, too, are American citizens, guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

RECOGNIZING NACDS RXIMPACT DAY

HON. MARKWAYNE MULLIN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Tenth Annual NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill. This is a special day where we will have the chance to recognize pharmacy's many contributions to the American health care system.

Organized by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores (NACDS) for the past decade, this event will take place March 7–8, 2018. This year alone, more than 400 individuals from the pharmacy community—including practicing pharmacists, pharmacy school faculty and students, state pharmacy association representatives and pharmacy company leaders—will visit us here on Capitol Hill. Advocates from all 50 states will share their views with us about the importance of supporting their access agenda—legislative priorities that will ensure that our constituents will continue to have access to more than 40,000 community and neighborhood pharmacies across the country and be better able to utilize pharmacists to improve health care quality while reducing the cost of care.

Patients have always relied on their local pharmacist to meet their health care needs and we as policymakers know our local pharmacists to be important community leaders. They are trusted, highly accessible health care providers deeply committed to providing high quality, convenient, and efficient health care services.

As demand for health care services continues to grow, pharmacists have expanded their role in health care delivery, partnering with physicians, nurses and other health care providers to meet their patients' needs. Innovative services provided by pharmacists do even more to improve overall patient health and wellness.

Pharmacists are highly valued by those that rely on them most—those in rural and underserved areas, as well as older Americans, and those struggling to manage chronic diseases. Pharmacy services improve patients' quality of life as well as health care affordability. By helping patients take their medications effectively and providing preventive services, pharmacists help avoid more costly forms of care. Pharmacists also help patients identify strategies to save money, such as through better

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

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

understanding of their pharmacy benefits, using generic medications, and obtaining 90-day supplies of prescription drugs from local pharmacies.

Pharmacists are the nation's most accessible health care providers. In many communities, especially in rural areas, the local pharmacist is a patient's most direct link to health care. Utilizing their specialized education, pharmacists play a major role in medication therapy management, disease-state management, immunizations, health care screenings, and other health care services designed to improve patient health and reduce overall health care costs. Pharmacists are also expanding their role into new models of care based on quality of services and outcomes, such as accountable care organizations (ACOs) and medical homes.

The pharmacy advocates of NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill will be promoting an access agenda. They know that we face difficult debates about the future of health care and the pharmacy community wishes to work with us to help in the effort to develop comprehensive and consistent approaches to public policy that put pharmacy's value to work for patients and payers. They understand well that the issues we are debating today are highly connected and vital to pharmacy, to all of health care, and to society as a whole.

I believe Congress should look at every opportunity to make sure that pharmacists are allowed to utilize their training to the fullest to provide the services that can improve care, increase access and lower costs. In recognition of the Tenth Annual NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill, I would like to congratulate pharmacy leaders, pharmacists, students, and the entire pharmacy community represented by NACDS, for their contributions to the health and wellness of the American people.

IN HONOR OF LOGAN GROSZ AND SEAMUS CASEY'S SELECTION AS WYOMING'S TOP YOUTH VOLUNTEERS, AND SADIE HOGAN AND MICKAYLA VANNATTER AS DISTINGUISHED FINALISTS BY THE PRUDENTIAL SPIRIT OF COMMUNITY AWARDS

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Logan Grosz and Seamus Casey for being honored as Wyoming's top youth volunteers by the Prudential Spirit of Community Awards, and Sadie Hogan and Mickayla Vannatter for being recognized as Distinguished Finalists.

The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards is a nationwide program that recognizes four middle level and high school students from each state for their outstanding volunteerism. Each year, two students are selected as the State Honorees, and two as Distinguished Finalists. This year's honored students are committed to service and to going above and beyond for their communities.

Logan Grosz was selected as the High School State Honoree for Wyoming for his

dedication to supporting the Children's Hospital Colorado. As a patient and its Champion for the State of Wyoming, he organizes and runs fundraisers that have raised over \$7,500 for the hospital and its other patients.

Seamus Casey is this year's Middle Level State Honoree for his support of the Folds of Honor Foundation. Last summer, he designed and completed his own triathlon, raising \$10,000 for the Foundation's scholarships for family members of fallen or disabled servicemen.

Sadie Hogan was recognized as a Distinguished Finalist for her leadership in a project that compiled and distributed sacks of food and toiletries to homeless members of her community.

Mickayla Vannatter was recognized as a Distinguished Finalist for her program that encourages children at her school to choose inclusion over bullying.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Logan, Seamus, Sadie, and Mickayla. They have set excellent examples for their friends and families, and I appreciate all they do to support the great state of Wyoming and our great country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARCUS RASKIN

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of a strong voice in the progressive movement, and a great mentor and friend, Marcus Raskin. Marcus' exceptional work as a national security staffer, political theorist, and progressive thought leader has deeply shaped our nation's consciousness about war, economic inequality, and civil rights.

Born in 1934 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Marcus initially pursued a career as a pianist, before changing direction and studying law and policy at the University of Chicago. After attaining his law degree, Marcus moved to Washington D.C. and became a staffer for Representatives Robert W. Kastenmeier & James Roosevelt.

He quickly distinguished himself as a leading voice of liberal thought, and was hired as staff on the National Security Council by President Kennedy's National Security Advisor, McGeorge Bundy. He also later served in the Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget), and the Presidential Panel on Education.

Following his service in the Kennedy Administration, Raskin formed the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) along with Richard Barnet. As a progressive policy think-tank, IPS was the first of its kind. To this day, the institute remains committed to economic and racial justice, climate justice, peace and foreign policy, community engagement, and leadership development.

Marcus also played a pivotal role in the release of the Pentagon Papers during the Nixon Administration. His criticisms of the Vietnam War and American military policy led to

Daniel Ellsberg noticing Marcus and relying on his help to get the leaked documents to reporters at the New York Times. This initiated a watershed moment in our country's history about the need for transparency and accountability in government.

I first met Marcus Raskin, during the mid-1970's, while I worked on Capitol Hill for Congressman Ron Dellums, and I am grateful to him for his wise counsel over the years. Marcus was one of the first to congratulate me on my election to Congress, and acted as a reassuring confidant as I considered my vote against the overly broad 2001 authorization to use military force.

Marcus Raskin passed on December 24, 2017, and is survived by his wife, Lynn, and his children Erika, Eden, Noah, and my colleague in Congress—JAMIE.

Today, on behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, it is my honor to commend Marcus Raskin for his moral leadership and to thank him for his mentorship. I cherish my time serving alongside his son, Representative JAMIE RASKIN of Maryland's 8th Congressional District and wish my sincere condolences to the rest of his surviving family.

THE INVALUABLE HELP OF ANDY IGREJAS IN STRENGTHENING THE LAUTENBERG TSCA REFORM ACT

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding contributions Andy Igrejas has made in improving the lives of the American people through his tireless advocacy and expertise in reducing public exposure to harmful chemicals.

A native of Bloomfield, New Jersey and a proud graduate of Rutgers College, Andy has worked on environmental health and government reform issues in New Jersey, California, and Washington, D.C. over his decades of service.

Every day, we see the steps the Environmental Protection Agency is taking to implement the Lautenberg TSCA Reform law passed in 2016. While that implementation is so far not living up to the letter of the law, we will continue to work to hold the EPA accountable for meeting its essential duty under the law: removing toxic chemicals from commerce and from our homes.

We are only able to do this because of important changes that were made in the Lautenberg Act as it went through Congress—changes that came about because of Andy's tireless work and dedication as Executive Director of the Safer Chemicals Healthy Families Coalition.

The work to reform the Toxic Substances Control Act began in earnest in 2009, when the major stakeholders published principles for reform. It was that year that Andy organized the Safer Chemicals, Healthy Families coalition to create a unified voice for health, environmental, and labor organizations interested in advancing chemical policy reform.

With Andy as its director, the coalition has grown to include 450 organizations and small businesses from across the country and across the political spectrum. By unifying these groups, Andy made their voices stronger, strong enough to stand up to extraordinary expenditures from industry interests.

Andy's work also kept the interest in TSCA reform alive when negotiating a deal seemed impossible. Andy's appreciation for the role of entrepreneurship and the private sector in creating positive social change led to the coalition's decision to launch Mind the Store, an initiative challenging the nation's largest retailers to restrict hazardous chemicals in their supply chains. It was that effort at the retail level, along with legislative efforts in the states, which kept industry at the table pursuing a comprehensive federal program.

I want to thank Andy for his bold thinking, tireless efforts, and strategic counsel to me and my staff, without which many of the public health and environmental improvements in the Lautenberg TSCA reform law would not have been possible.

SPECIAL OLYMPIAN, "BEEBO"

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once Brendan West picked up a basketball, he was never able to put it down. Nicknamed "Beebo," Brendan is a 22 year old Special Olympian from Houston, Texas, who has become an aficionado of the game of basketball.

Beebo has Roberts Syndrome, a genetic disorder that delays the growth of limbs and facial features. He was born without arms, so naturally he learned to do everything with his feet. His father, Ray, and his mother, Ann, adopted Beebo when he was 6 weeks old. Doctors told his parents he wouldn't be able to do anything other than eat and go to the bathroom. His diagnosis didn't keep Beebo down for long, continuing to defy the odds.

Just about anytime and anywhere, you can find a smile on Beebo's face and a basketball between his feet. Beebo first learned how to play basketball when he was in Jr. High. With just his feet, he is able to dribble and shoot the ball with deadly accuracy. His basketball skills have earned him multiple titles and propelled him forward as an award winning Special Olympian. Beebo was even honored with an honorary ESPY, the Excellence in Sports Performance Yearly Award, last year. The basketball star has shot hoops with NBA player James Harden and even played with the world-renowned Harlem Globetrotters. Beebo is not only an amazing basketball player, but also an exceptional bowler and tennis player, winning gold medals in both events.

Perhaps the most shining quality Beebo exudes is his personality. When you step onto a basketball court, you can hear Beebo's laugh echoing from every corner. His enthusiasm for the game of basketball and life is infectious, and he inspires everyone around him.

I am honored to be able to spread the inspiring story of Beebo. His resiliency, deter-

mination, and grit all are to be admired and something we should all seek in our lives.

He is the perfect embodiment of what it means to be a Special Olympian and Houstonian. Keep playing basketball, Beebo, we will all be cheering him on.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on Monday February 26 and Tuesday February 27, 2018. I had intended to vote "yes" on Roll Call vote 81, "yes" on vote 82, "no" on vote 83, "no" on vote 84, "no" on vote 85, "no" on vote 86, "no" on vote 87, "yes" on vote 88, "no" on vote 89, "yes" on vote 90, and "yes" on vote 91.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to an excused absence on February 14, 2018, I was unable to vote on Roll Call Vote Nos. 72 through 78. Had I been present I would have voted in the following matter:

On Roll Call Vote No. 72 on ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 736 I intended to vote NAY.

On Roll Call Vote No. 73 on Agreeing to the Resolution for H. Res. 736 I intended to vote NAY.

On Roll Call Vote No. 74 on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H.R. 3542, Hamas Human Shields Prevention Act, as amended, I intended to vote YEA.

On Roll Call Vote No. 75 on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 129, Calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States, I intended to vote YEA.

On Roll Call Vote No. 76 on Motion to Re-commit with Instructions H.R. 3978, TRID Improvement Act, I intended to vote YEA.

On Roll Call Vote No. 77 on Passage of H.R. 3978, TRID Improvement Act, I intended to vote NAY.

On Roll Call Vote No. 78 on Passage of H.R. 3299, Protecting Consumers Access to Credit Act of 2017, I intended to vote NAY.

IN HONOR OF HOWARD AND JOAN KUNESH'S 71ST WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Howard and

Joan Kunesh on the celebration of their 71st Wedding Anniversary.

This significant benchmark is a symbol of their commitment to each other and to their family. I am happy to join their friends and family in extending my best to them on this special occasion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Howard and Joan on the celebration of their 71st Wedding Anniversary. I wish them the best today and for many more blessed years to come.

PI KAPPA ALPHA 150TH ANNIVERSARY RECOGNITION

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and to recognize the Pi Kappa Alpha International Fraternity—a values-based men's fraternal organization with more than 225 chapters in the United States and Canada, approximately 16,000 undergraduate members, and over 290,000 lifetime members. In 2018, Pi Kappa Alpha celebrated the 150th anniversary of its founding on March 1, 1868 at the University of Virginia when six young men joined together and resolved to form a fraternity for the establishment of friendship on a firmer and more lasting basis. Their commitment to high ideals of scholarship, leadership and gentlemanly behavior remain strong to this day.

In 1868 there were 38 states. Pi Kappa Alpha predates two rows of stars on the American Flag. The nation of Canada, home to several Pi Kappa Alpha chapters, was founded one year earlier in 1867. The first organized baseball and football games were played in 1869. Coca-Cola was founded in 1886 and basketball was first played in 1891.

Pi Kappa Alpha has persevered and grown through world wars, generational and cultural changes, depressions, recessions, and other challenges on college campuses that have at times threatened its existence. Its members have explored space, served as leaders of business and industry, filled the ranks of public servants in the arenas of education, government and the military; authored books; performed on athletic fields and entertainment venues.

Throughout its history Pi Kappa Alpha has answered the call to arms to preserve and protect the United States of America and its friends and allies. More than 600 Pi Kappa Alphas are recognized as Gold Star Heroes, making the ultimate sacrifice in conflicts dating back to the Spanish American War and including the War on Terror today.

Pi Kappa Alpha has prepared nearly 300,000 men to lead on their campuses and in their homes, communities, and businesses. It has endured and it thrives today because valuing friendship, showing love for your fellow man and defending the truth of its ideals are timeless, lifelong virtues.

Nearly 16,000 PIKE student members are impacting and influencing their campuses and communities today, serving as leaders in student government, Interfraternity councils,

sports teams and student organizations. Collectively, PIKE chapters annually perform over 360,000 hours of community service and donate more than \$3.6 million to philanthropy.

These student leaders are supported by 2,500 men (and women) who volunteer to serve on advisory boards and house corporations. Over 150 alumni associations ensure that the admonition, "Once a Pike, Always a Pike," remains true, inspiring the lifetime fraternal experience for its members.

Pi Kappa Alpha seeks to enrich the undergraduate experience and the quality of its volunteer support through a comprehensive, industry-leading educational program that incorporates all aspects of the Fraternity including scholastic performance, personal development, leadership training, innovative learning, community engagement, campus involvement and participation.

Today, in its 150th year, Pi Kappa Alpha calls upon its members to live anew its legacy, to reflect on the principles of its Founders and to commit to a strong future for its great brotherhood. As a proud member of the Pi Kappa Alpha International Fraternity, I would like to congratulate the fraternity on its 150 years of success.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHIEF THOMAS J. MORAN OF THE BUFFALO POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the exemplary life and career of Thomas J. Moran, Chief of the "A" District of the Buffalo Police Department, who passed away on March 1st of this year. Chief Moran was 49 years old.

Chief Moran first joined the Buffalo Police Department on February 4, 1994 at age 25, a recent graduate of the State University of New York at Brockport.

In May of 2006, he received the Edward H. Butler Award for Heroism for having successfully disrupted an armed robbery of a retail store in the Ferry-Fillmore district where he had been stationed.

After performing admirably in various roles as a Police Officer for eighteen years, he was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant in April of 2012, and again promoted to Chief in June of 2013.

As Chief of the "A" District covering South Buffalo and the adjacent neighborhoods, he was known for his responsiveness and engagement with community stakeholders, for his clear leadership and helpful mentorship of the officers under his command, and for his dedication and commitment to the citizens of the City of Buffalo, to the Buffalo Police Department, and to the principles of law and order.

Like so many in my community, I am grateful to have known Chief Moran and to have called him a friend. I shall remain grateful for his leadership, and his work to serve and protect the people of South Buffalo and the entire City of Buffalo.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join with me and with Members of the House to express our deepest condolences to his wife, Kelly, to his daughters Ava and Lia, and to the entire family of the late Chief Tom Moran, and join me in recognizing his many years of dedicated public service.

HONORING DEBBIE DAVIS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Debbie Davis, editor and assistant publisher of The Davis Enterprise, for her service to the Davis community and to congratulate her on her retirement.

For over 38 years, Ms. Davis has helped unite and inform the Davis community through her work at The Davis Enterprise. Her work expertise has earned her a reputation as a respected journalist, and there is no doubt in my mind that her legacy will leave a lasting impact on the Davis community.

The breadth of Ms. Davis' accomplishments is in itself an achievement, and some of her most notable milestones include developing the 2017 centennial magazine that celebrated the businesses and leaders that built the Davis community, the "Those Who Make Memories" book, and over 10,700 editions of The Davis Enterprise.

I speak on behalf of the entire Davis community when I say thank you to Debbie Davis for her generous service to our community. I wish her the best as she enjoys her well-deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Votes Nos. 83, 84, 85, 86 and 87 I am not recorded because I was not present in the House for that vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner.

On Roll Call No. 83, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call No. 84, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call No. 85, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call No. 86, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call No. 87, I would have voted YEA.

RUSSELL N. COLLINS, JR.

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of the late Russell

N. Collins, Jr., of Palmyra, New Jersey, for his service to our nation.

Russell N. Collins Jr. was born in Camden, New Jersey in 1925. He attended Woodrow Wilson High School where he was a gifted drum player in the school band. Upon learning of the surprise attack on the American naval base at Pearl Harbor, Mr. Collins enlisted into the United States Navy and proudly served his country during World War II as an original crew member of the USS *New Jersey* (BB-62), from 1943 to 1946.

After the war, Mr. Collins returned home to New Jersey and married his high school sweetheart, Helen S. Collins. They were married more than fifty years until Mrs. Collins' passing in 2004.

Later in life, Mr. Collins would return to the Battleship *New Jersey*, where he served as a volunteer and valued member of the floating Museum and Memorial along the Camden, New Jersey waterfront.

Mr. Collins is remembered by those close to him as having a hearty laugh, a gentle grin and was adept at storytelling. He was a Mason, a Shriner and an Odd Fellow, and was never seen without his USS *New Jersey* hat.

On December 21, 2017, Mr. Collins passed away at the age of 92. He was the last museum volunteer who served as a U.S. Navy sailor on the Battleship during World War II. Mr. Collins' life was a rich collection of love, friendship, loyalty, bravery, and heroism.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Russell N. Collins, Jr. was a true American hero. I ask you to join me in celebrating this patriot and his selfless sacrifices on behalf of our grateful nation.

IN HONOR OF JIM AND JEAN LAKE'S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Jim and Jean Lake on the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary.

This significant benchmark is a symbol of their commitment to each other and to their family. I am happy to join their friends and family in extending my best to them on this special occasion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Jim and Jean on the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary. I wish them the best today and for many more blessed years to come.

RETIREMENT RECOGNITION FOR DIANE DZURISIN

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a tireless and visionary veteran and federal employee for her work to protect and improve the lives of her fellow citizens.

Diane Dzurisin is retiring after seventeen years with the VA, two decades in the military, and six years of long-term care nursing. It has been said that if you choose work that you love, then you never have to work another day. I suspect that has been the case for Diane during her impressive career. When my constituent services staff has needed guidance to resolve the most challenging VA cases, she has never failed to ensure that each veteran's concerns were appropriately and expeditiously addressed. Her awareness of and sensitivity to the unique challenges of adjudicating claims following military sexual trauma has lifted the burdens and changed the lives of countless veterans.

People like Diane Dzurisin never really retire—they reinvent. On behalf of a grateful nation, I want to thank her for her service, honor her for her dedication to veterans, and wish her all the best as she embarks on this new journey.

HONORING ELAINE BROWN ON HER
75TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 75th birthday of Elaine Brown, a community leader, civil rights activist, and advocate for the underrepresented.

Elaine Brown was born on March 2, 1943, in North Philadelphia, an area affected by significant poverty and racial segregation. She was raised by her mother, Dorothy Clark, who worked to support her and instilled in her a love of music. Starting with classical piano lessons, Elaine grew as a songwriter and eventually moved to Los Angeles to pursue music as a career.

In LA, she engaged with the civil rights movement, and after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., Brown was motivated to join the Black Panther Party. As a party member, she helped establish the groundbreaking Free Breakfast for Children Program, Free Busing to Prisons Program, and Free Legal Aid Program.

In 1968, Brown was commissioned by David Hilliard, the Party Chief of Staff, to record the album "Seize the Time," which includes the anthem of the Black Panther Party. The Party's co-founder, Huey P. Newton, later commissioned her to record a second album, "Until We're Free", to promote the party's message, "All Power to the People."

In August of 1974, Elaine Brown took over as the chair of the Black Panther Party—the first and only woman to lead the revolutionary organization. Under her leadership, the party focused on electoral politics and community service. In 1977, she managed Lionel Wilson's victorious campaign to become Oakland's first black mayor. That same year, I was proud to work on her trailblazing campaign for the Oakland City Council.

After leaving the party in 1977, she wrote her memoir "A Taste of Power: A Black Woman's Story" in 1982 and returned to her work on the struggle of black liberation and prison

reform. In 1996, Brown moved to Atlanta, Georgia, and founded Fields of Flowers, Inc., a non-profit committed to providing educational opportunities for impoverished African American children.

Elaine also founded Mothers Advocating Juvenile Justice and the Michael Lewis Legal Defense Committee, where she spent nearly two decades supporting the legal appeal of Michael "Little B" Lewis, who was wrongly accused of murder and tried as an adult at 13. Elaine wrote *The Condemnation of Little B*, exposing racism that affects millions of poor African Americans and the barbarity of trying children as adults. In 2003, Brown co-founded the National Alliance for Radical Prison Reform and has continued her advocacy by frequently lecturing at colleges and universities throughout the country.

Elaine continues to co-author many books and serves in leadership roles for various committees, and is the CEO of a non-profit organization, Oakland & The World Enterprises, Inc. which is dedicated to launching and sustaining for-profit businesses for cooperative-ownership by the formerly incarcerated and those facing monumental social barriers.

On a personal note, Elaine has been a "comrade" and friend since the early 1970's, whose friendship, intellect, and life's work I deeply appreciate and admire.

Today, on behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, it is my honor to celebrate Elaine Brown and her accomplishments, advocacy and contributions for the underrepresented. Her work toward the empowerment of women and minorities, especially African Americans, is a true inspiration to many.

WHY WE CAN WAIT NO LONGER
AND THE FIERCE URGENCY TO
ENACT NOW RESPONSIBLE GUN
VIOLENCE PREVENTION LEGIS-
LATION AFTER PARKLAND,
FLORIDA MASS SHOOTING

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to act without delay and pass legislation to prevent gun violence and mass casualties from shootings.

The community of Parkland, Florida—along with the rest of the country—is still reeling from the horrific tragedy that took place at the Marjorie Stoneman Douglass High School on Valentine's Day, February 14, 2018.

Our hearts still ache with sadness and disbelief for the families and loved ones of the 17 students—sons and daughters, brothers and sisters—who lost their lives in this senseless, horrific act of domestic terrorism.

It is safe to say that America is sick and tired of being sick and tired of gun violence.

That is why we must act now to stop gun violence, protect citizens, and save lives.

Here are the top 6 actions the President and the Congress can and must take now to protect our communities:

Require universal background checks to keep guns out of dangerous hands;

Extend the waiting period to purchase or transfer dangerous weapons like the AR-15 pending completion of background checks to 7 days;

Raise the minimum age to purchase or transfer dangerous weapons like the AR-15, high-capacity magazines, ammunitions, and silencers from 18 to 21 years of age;

Ban military-style assault weapons;

Limit high-capacity magazines; and

Increase access to mental health services.

We can take action without infringing on the 2nd Amendment rights of Americans.

We need to make it harder for criminals to obtain guns by strengthening the background check system.

We need to ensure that mental health professionals know their options for reporting threats of violence—even as we acknowledge that someone with a mental illness is far more likely to be the victim of a violent crime than the perpetrator.

We must also make safe gun storage a priority.

As the founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, a senior Member of the Judiciary Committee, and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I have listened far too often to the testimony of individuals who have survived tragedies or lost loved ones as a result of gun violence.

In the words of President Obama after the 2013 Sandy Hook Elementary shooting, "We're going to have to come together and take meaningful action to prevent more tragedies like this, regardless of the politics."

While it is certainly true that violent crime and homicide rates in this country have been declining in recent years, they are still far above those in other industrialized nations.

There exists a culture of violence in America; a subculture that with today's technologically advanced weaponry is far more dangerous to public safety than ever before.

At no point in our nation's history has a single human been more capable of inflicting massive death and misery, and our society is producing more individuals who seek to employ such means to carry out their ill intentions.

Far too often, the tool of choice for would-be killers are military-style assault weapons with high-capacity magazines.

Every day, on average, 92 Americans are victims of gun violence, resulting in more than 33,000 deaths annually.

In raising this issue, we recognize and respect other cultures that exist in America; law-abiding citizens who are responsible in their ownership of firearms.

Many of these citizens are responsible with respect to the lethal capacity of their firearms, opting not to obtain assault weapons or to equip assault weapons with 30, 50, 75, or 100-round magazines.

Here is what I think the Congress can and must do to reduce gun violence without abridging the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Americans.

Extend the waiting period to purchase or transfer dangerous weapons like the AR-15 pending completion of background checks to 7 days.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 4268, the "Gun Safety, Not Sorry Act."

Raise the minimum age to purchase or transfer dangerous weapons like the AR-15, high-capacity magazines, ammunitions, and silencers from 18 to 21 years of age.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 5088, the "No Mass Atrocities with Guns Act" ("No MAGA Act").

Reinstate and strengthen the federal ban on assault weapons.

I am an original co-sponsor of H.R. 3947, legislation that will reinstate the assault weapons ban that has been introduced by my colleague, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Reinstate a federal ban on bump stocks and high-capacity magazines holding more than ten rounds and allowing a shooter to inflict mass damage in a short period of time without reloading will save lives.

I will soon be introducing the "Stop Abuse, Violence, and Ending Lives Act of 2018," legislation to ban the sale and possession of bump stocks.

Require a background check for every gun sale, while respecting reasonable exceptions for cases such as gifts between family members and temporary loans for sporting purposes.

I am an original co-sponsor of H.R. 4240, the "Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2017," legislation that requires universal background checks and closes the gun show loophole that has been introduced by my colleague, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON of California.

It is estimated that four out of ten gun buyers do not go through a background check when purchasing a firearm because federal law only requires these checks when someone buys a gun from a federally licensed dealer.

That would be like allowing four out of ten people to choose if they would like to go through airport security.

This loophole allows felons, domestic abusers, and those prohibited because of mental illness to easily bypass the criminal background check system and buy firearms at gun shows, through private sellers, over the internet or out of the trunks of cars.

Strengthen the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) database to ensure it is up to date by requiring federal and state agencies to transfer important records to the database expeditiously since without the information, the reliability of a background check is questionable.

Pass legislation aimed specifically at cracking down on illegal gun trafficking and straw-purchasing which often puts guns in the hands of people who are prohibited from having them.

Straw-purchasing is when a prohibited buyer has someone with no criminal history walk into a gun store, pass a background check and purchase a gun with the purpose of giving it to the prohibited buyer.

Restore funding for public safety and law enforcement initiatives aimed at reducing gun violence.

Congress should fund law enforcement's efforts to reduce gun violence, while supporting federal research into causes of gun violence.

There is no reason the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) or the National Institute of Health (NIH) should be prohibited from researching the causes of gun violence.

That is why I have co-sponsored H.R. 1832, legislation that authorizes the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

I have also co-sponsored H.R. 1478, the Gun Violence Research Act, which repeals the provision that in practice prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from sponsoring research on gun violence.

And there is no reason for the restrictions federal law places on our law enforcement officers' ability to track and combat the spread of illegal guns.

Close the holes in our mental-health system and make sure that care is available for those who need it.

Congress must improve prevention, early intervention, and treatment of mental illness while working to eliminate the stigma associated with mental illness.

Access to mental health services should be improved, the shortage of mental health professionals should be addressed, and funding should be made available for those programs that have proven to be effective.

That is why I have co-sponsored H.R. 1982, the "Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act," legislation that authorizes the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Social Security Administration to: (1) increase access to mental health care treatment and services, and (2) promote reporting of mental health information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Help local communities get unwanted and illegal guns out of the hands of those who should not have them.

Congress should help support and develop local programs that get unwanted guns off our streets, such as gun buy-back programs that proved so effective in Australia.

Finally, we must address our culture's glorification of violence seen and heard through our movie screens, television shows, music and video games.

Congress should fund scientific research on the relationship between popular culture and gun violence, while ensuring that parents have access to the information they need to make informed decisions about what their families watch, listen to, and play.

Here is what I think neither the President, the Congress, nor state and local governments should not do to reduce gun violence.

We should not arm teachers because they are not trained to handle weapons; this is not what they signed up for.

We must not surrender to NRA even though the gun lobby has long enjoyed tremendous influence over congressional Republicans and some Democrats.

Persons who live in fear of gun violence and mass shootings at schools, theaters, places of worship and work, and public spaces are not afraid of the NRA.

What they are afraid of is an AR-15 in the hands of a mentally unstable person.

Americans are a can-do people; we do not bemoan our problems and accept terrible outcomes.

We act to solve them.

We have made our cars and trucks and roads safer and reduced traffic fatalities.

We have virtually eradicated polio, small pox, and other debilitating and life-threatening diseases.

We respond immediately to natural disasters caused by hurricanes, earthquakes, tornados, floods, and man-made disasters caused by acts of terrorism.

When it comes to reducing or preventing gun violence, we must summon that same spirit of American resolve and know-how and get the job done.

We can do it; after all, we are Americans.

IN HONOR OF TASHA MCKELVEY
FOR EARNING THE SPAATZ
AWARD AND RANK OF CADET
COLONEL IN THE CIVIL AIR PA-
TROL

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cadet Colonel Tasha McKelvey on earning the Spaatz award and the rank of cadet colonel in the Civil Air Patrol.

The Spaatz Award is the highest cadet honor in the Civil Air Patrol, given to less than one percent of all cadets. It acknowledges those who have demonstrated excellent leadership, character, fitness, and aerospace knowledge in the CAP Cadet Program. During her time in the Wyoming Wing of the CAP, Ms. McKelvey has done just that. Among her peers, she is a leader and source of inspiration for inspiration during trying times. Her determination and grit also resulted in her passing the Spaatz exam on her first try, a rarity across the nation.

Ms. McKelvey is the first female and the sixth cadet within the Wyoming Wing to receive the Spaatz Award. I thank her for her commitment to serve our great nation. Her bravery, sacrifice, and resolve are truly admirable. Ms. McKelvey has set an excellent example to her family, friends, and peers.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Cadet Colonel Tasha McKelvey on receiving the Civil Air Patrol's highest cadet honor, the Spaatz Award and the rank of cadet colonel. She and her family deserve to be extremely proud.

COMMEMORATING THE 165TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF STEINWAY & SONS

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 165th anniversary of a Queens treasure, and one of the world's most iconic brands—Steinway & Sons.

Steinway makes world-renowned pianos, distinguished for their grandness and masterful craftsmanship. Each piano consists of more than 12,000 individual parts, and is said to have its own musical character as unique as the individual who plays it. These magnificent

works of art, I am proud to say, are made in my district.

The Steinway legacy dates back to 1853, when Heinrich Engelhard Steinway founded Steinway & Sons in New York, a few years after emigrating from Germany. The high quality and meticulous craftsmanship of Steinway's pianos led to rapid growth for the business and the opening of a factory in Queens. Along with the factory, the Steinway family established a company town, Steinway Village, which spurred development in the neighborhoods that are today known as Astoria and Long Island City in Queens, and they spread their family values of investing in community. The philanthropic work of the Steinway family endures today throughout Queens and New York City.

That same factory, which first opened in the early 1870s, continues to operate today. The historic factory has been producing the world's finest pianos, virtually uninterrupted, for more than 145 years. Today, the factory employs over 300 union craftspeople, and many more people in management, administrative and sales roles in New York and throughout America. Steinway & Sons is an American success story, integral not only to the history of the borough of Queens and New York City, but also to the cultural story of the United States of America. It is a jewel that elevates American craftsmanship and innovation throughout the world.

As a lifelong musician and a son of Queens, it is with great pride that I celebrate the 165th anniversary of the world's number one piano, New York's very own Steinway & Sons.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN
PALLONE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I rise today to congratulate my brother, Long Branch Councilman John Pallone, on his selection as the Amerigo Vespucci Society Man of the Year. I joined the Amerigo Vespucci Society on March 3, 2018 at their 125th dinner gala to celebrate John and recognize his outstanding work.

Born and raised in Long Branch, New Jersey, John is a lifelong resident of the city and an active member of the community. Currently serving as Council President, John was first elected to the city council in 1990 and then ran successfully again for a council seat in 2010 where he has served ever since. In this capacity, John has made the safety and well-being of Long Branch residents a priority and continues to focus on the redevelopment of the city, serving as a board member of the Urban Enterprise Zone.

In addition to his work as a public servant, John is the Vice President of the Long Branch Free Public Library Board of Trustees, a member of the Amerigo Vespucci Society and a parishioner of Holy Trinity Church.

John is the owner of Video Life Productions, a successful video production company that he established in 1982. He and his wife

Svetlana are the proud parents of John Thomas.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating John Pallone on his recognition as Man of the Year by the Amerigo Vespucci Society. He is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

SPRINGFIELD CLINIC LEADS
ILLINOIS IN OPENNOTES

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to recognize the Springfield Clinic, one of the first multi-specialty clinics in downstate Illinois. With more than 400 physicians and advanced practitioners practicing in 80 medical specialties and sub-specialties, Springfield Clinic now proudly stands as one of Illinois' largest private multi-specialty clinics and serves nearly one million patients throughout the central Illinois region.

In 2010, as part of their "leading the way" initiative, all Springfield Clinic offices began working with the OpenNotes movement. This put them among the nation's leaders in integration of electronic health record technology, which enables clinicians to share their visit notes with patients through fully transparent medical records. This secure system encourages patients to become active participants in their health care by providing a convenient way to access and manage personal medical records, communicate directly with medical professionals, schedule appointments and prescriptions, receive email and text reminders for preventive care and upcoming appointments, and pay bills online.

This dynamic state-of-the-art system provides Springfield Clinic the necessary tools to expand patient services. However, we cannot hope to automate and streamline provider workflow unless more patients sign up for and participate in these portals. I'm proud to represent Springfield Clinic, which is on the forefront of this innovative approach to the doctor-patient relationship. Nineteen million patients are already taking advantage of their new ability to access medical information online through OpenNotes, and my hope is that this number only continues to grow both in my district and across the country. More and more medical professionals and citizens should take advantage of this patient-centered program so we can focus on what matters most—patient care.

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING
CASEY JESZENKA

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Casey Jeszenka for his service to the people of Guam. Casey made Guam his home and joined the Pacific

Islands Small Business Development Center in 2000. He has served as the director of the Pacific Islands Small Business Development Center Network for the last 16 years and will retire on March 2, 2018. Throughout his tenure, Casey has been an invaluable advocate and resource for many in our community in Guam to develop successful businesses and contribute to the local economy. I have worked closely with Casey throughout my time in Congress, and he has been a trusted advisor in the development of small businesses on Guam.

As the Network Director, Casey has been responsible for the overall management and implementation of the service functions associated with the University of Guam Pacific Islands Small Business Development Center Network (PISBDCN). His leadership at PISBDCN was instrumental to assisting clients and providing information, resources, education, technical support, and professional counseling and consultant services to local entrepreneurs and business owners. Casey worked closely with both the public and private sectors and a system of island sub-centers, overseeing their organization, program implementation, management and evaluation processes in order to further develop and enhance a comprehensive network on Guam and throughout Micronesia. Casey nurtured partnerships between PISBDCN, and the Guam Small Business Administration (SBA), the Guam Economic Development Authority (GEDA), and the University of Guam College of Agriculture's Extension Programs to make the programs of the Pacific Islands Small Business Development successful.

Prior to serving as Network Director, Casey served as Special Projects Director and Counselor from 2000 to 2002 for the Pacific Islands Small Business Development Center. Casey was responsible for planning, directing and organizing the establishment and operations of new and established Small Business Development Center (SBDC) Subcenter and Satellite programs throughout the network. He provided training to new SBDC Subcenter and Satellite personnel in accordance with the PISBDCN Standard Operating Procedures. Casey, additionally directed and supervised the SBDC Subcenter and Satellite counseling services and training programs, and trained SBDC personnel to handle these duties. He assisted in the development and tracking of goals in line with the PISBDCN mission, strategic plan and directives. also provided a comprehensive range of small business based assistance to established and prospective small business owners and other qualified clients including one-to-one client counseling. Casey implemented SBDC orientation and training sessions and developed and implemented new workshops.

In addition to his roles with the Pacific Islands Small Business Development Center, Casey has also been actively involved as a member of the Pacific Asia Travel Association Micronesia Chapter's Executive Committee, a member of the Pacific Asia Travel Association Micronesia Chapter's Education Committee, as secretary of the Pacific Islands Small Business Development Center Network's Advisory Board, and as a member of the Guam Chamber of Commerce Small Business Committee.

Casey has worked diligently throughout his 18 years of service on Guam. He will be missed as a valued member of the Pacific Islands Small Business Development Center, but through his leadership and guidance, he has positioned the PISBDN to continue its exceptional service to the people of Guam. I extend my sincere congratulations to Casey, and I join the people of Guam in commending him for his service and thanking him for his many contributions to our island community.

RECOGNIZING THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER AND STAFF FOR SURPASSING 20 MILLION VISITORS TO THE CVC

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the staff of the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center (CVC) and recognize the CVC for surpassing its twenty-millionth visitor.

On December 2, 2008, the CVC opened to the public for the first time. By May of the following year, the CVC welcomed its one millionth visitor. During this past December, after just nine years in operation, the CVC welcomed its 20 millionth visitor.

Since its opening, the CVC has been guided by four primary goals to better serve the U.S. Congress: Security, Visitor Education, Visitor Comfort, and Functional Improvements to the U.S. Capitol.

Today, which traditionally marks the beginning of the Spring tourist season, the CVC provides a secure public environment to welcome and assist a large number of visitors. The CVC creates and presents informative programs on the workings and history of the Congress, the legislative process, and the art and architecture of the Capitol to millions of visitors each year, all while providing the amenities, comfort, convenience, and accessibility for visitors appropriate to one of the nation's most visited tourist destinations.

The CVC team welcomed 2.4 million visitors in 2017, the highest single-year total since the facility opened. Even more remarkable is that almost half of those visitors came during the Spring season between the months of March and June. As we are about to begin a new Spring tourist season, I am reminded of just how important the CVC is as we welcome our constituents to Washington, D.C.

Behind the scenes, the CVC provides modern, efficient facilities for the operational functions of the Capitol, as well as provides important work space for both the House and Senate, and improves connectivity between the Capitol and the Library of Congress.

While the CVC does provide world-class tours for over two million visitors each year, its service to Congress doesn't stop there. The CVC team has also supported more than 7,000 congressional events in CVC meeting spaces as well as welcoming and assisting guests at Congressional Gold Medal Ceremonies, commemoration ceremonies, annual Memorial Day and Capitol Fourth Concerts, and presidential inaugurations, among many other events.

Also, in support of Congress, the CVC team has developed training programs for congressional staff to learn about the history of the Capitol and Congress and the artwork that represents their story. Critical safety and emergency evacuation procedures are key elements of this program. To date, more than 31,000 interns and other staff have participated in the training program, enhancing their ability to deliver high-quality tours to constituents.

The majority of visitors to the CVC are our constituents, and based on independent surveys, 93 percent of visitors to the Capitol said their expectations were met or exceeded and that they were likely to recommend taking a Capitol Tour to their friends. These numbers reflect the passion and knowledge the Visitor Center's team brings to the Capitol each day, as well as their commitment to inform, involve, and inspire every visitor.

The CVC will celebrate its 10th anniversary on December 2, 2018. As the CVC embarks on its second decade serving as the front door to the Capitol and the Congress, I wish to recognize the hard-working CVC staff that remain committed to providing world-class services to our visitors, our constituents, and those of us who work in the Capitol each day.

TERRY VAUGHN, A HURRICANE HARVEY HERO

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute another of our Harvey Heroes. I want to recognize Terry Vaughn, district manager of pharmacy and retail operations for 14 Walgreens stores in the Lake Houston area where I live. As Hurricane Harvey hovered over the Houston area dropping up to 50 inches of rain in some parts, Terry and his Walgreens partners were watching and waiting like most Houstonians. In the wake of the storm, all but one of Terry's stores closed due to damage or impassable roads. The only store the Walgreens team could get to was the location on West Lake Houston Parkway and FM 1960—in my neighborhood of Atascocita.

Terry lives one mile from the store. As the San Jacinto River rose and Lake Houston came out of its banks, a fellow team member's house was flooding so quickly she and her family of six had nowhere to turn. They walked through water to the Atascocita Walgreens where Terry and other volunteers met them with kayaks and transported them to Terry's home where Mitzi, his bride of 19 years, and their two boys provided the food and shelter the family so badly needed.

The forecasts said this storm would be here for days. Since he could get to the store, Terry decided to open up the Atascocita location. Terry, three other managers, and Walgreens team members who couldn't make it to their own stores but still wanted to help, kept our Atascocita location's doors open through shortages of power and shortages of patience. The one thing they didn't have a shortage of

was dedication to their community. Terry would wake up each morning, check the water level of Lake Houston to make sure it wasn't coming closer into his own home, then report for service.

Mr. Speaker, during Harvey, Terry's store was the only continually operating Walgreens this side of the Gulf of Mexico. He partnered with the City of Humble to deliver life-saving medications to evacuees at the city's emergency shelter at the Humble Civic Center. He immunized 40 local first responders to protect them from the flood borne diseases of tetanus and Hepatitis A; then took his immunizations on the road setting up first responder clinics at fire and police stations. Terry and his team immunized more than 1,000 people in two days.

Virtually all Lake Houston-area grocery stores were closed due to the flooding. The stores were filled with water. Distribution trucks could not get to the area. As the storm damage continued, Terry led a team of Walgreens managers who with their own trucks (Texas trucks with plenty of lift to get through those waters, Mr. Speaker) went to 13 other Walgreens and gathered household supplies, diapers, baby formula, and medical supplies to distribute at the operational Atascocita location.

For days Terry kept answering the calls and kept serving. One of those calls was from United Airlines who had personnel and displaced passengers stuck at George Bush Intercontinental Airport. Terry and his Walgreens team fulfilled an order of more than \$30,000 in supplies and delivered it straight to the tarmac. Was there a bright spot in all this for Terry? He told me, "Seeing people come together and my team working non-stop without breaks—with their own families going through the worst times—we showed up to help our community and put our own issues aside."

Mr. Speaker, those who know Terry know he has a servant's heart. He is active with the Lake Houston Chamber of Commerce, Boy Scouts, and Humble Area Assistance Ministries. Terry started with Walgreens as a cashier more than 21 years ago. He has performed every job in the store and worked his way up to be a district manager. On August 18 as Hurricane Harvey ravaged and flooded our area, he was called upon to once again do every job. And he did. And he makes us proud to be Texans.

IN MEMORY OF WALTER J. BUCKERT, JR.

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, sadly, Walter J. Buckert, Jr., a proven champion for military service-members and their devoted families, passed away last week. He will always be cherished for championing benefits for our military and providing extraordinary jobs for military family members. The Office of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina was fortunate to have as staff members two of his talented granddaughters,

Elizabeth Grayson and Katherine Grayson, who he influenced for extraordinary service on behalf of constituents. I include in the RECORD the following thoughtful obituary:

Walter J. Buckert, Jr., age 85, passed away peacefully on Sunday, February 25th at Inova Fairfax Hospital in Virginia.

Walter was born on February 24th, 1933, in Rochester NY, to Walt and Marge Buckert. In 1955, Walter graduated from Georgetown University with a BA in Business. He joined the General Electric Company's Corporate Financial Program where he was assigned to the Federal Government Department of Electronics Division. From there, he was promoted to General Electric's Lighting Business Group, its highest division by revenue at that time. He took on increasing roles of responsibility with each transfer accepting positions in New York, Cleveland and Richmond. His final assignment from General Electric, before his retirement in 1995, was as Manager of U.S. Government Sales and Marketing for all lighting products for government use and resale to military personnel. In that role, Walter grew government sales and created a division highly valued to this day. After 47 years with General Electric, Walter joined Webco General Partnership in 1996 as Director of Government and Industry Affairs. A strong advocate for military personnel and their families, he was awarded the American Logistics Association Lifetime Achievement Award, The Department of the Army Outstanding Civil Service medal for his service, and The Exchange.

Walter is survived by his beautiful wife of 55 years, Mary Sutton Buckert and loving daughter, Laurie Grayson; son-in-law, Bill Grayson; and granddaughters Katherine, Elizabeth, and Caroline Grayson who fondly referred to their grandfather by his childhood nickname, Buddy. He is also survived by his older sister, Joanne McDermott, and too many nieces and nephews on both sides of the family to count but to whom he held much love and respect.

Walter will be remembered for his loyalty, hard work, and dedication to others. He was a true blooded, American patriot who never took his freedom for granted. He was a humble, stoic man, with strong convictions and beliefs, but underneath it all was a childlike spirit. Walter was a loving and devoted husband, father, grandfather, uncle, brother and friend, he will forever be missed.

IN HONOR OF CHIC AND BILLIE RAWLINGS' 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Chic and Billie Rawlings on the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary.

This significant benchmark is a symbol of their commitment to each other and to their family. I am happy to join their friends and family in extending my best to them on this special occasion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Chic and Billie on the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary. I wish them the best today and for many more blessed years to come.

ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUMGAI POGROMS

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the pogrom against the Armenian residents of the town of Sumgait, Azerbaijan. On February 27, 1988, and for three days following, Azerbaijani mobs assaulted and killed Armenians. The violence left hundreds of Armenian civilians dead and injured, women and girls were raped, and some victims were burned alive. Thousands were forced to flee their homes, leaving behind their belonging.

The pogroms came about as the result of years of vicious, racist anti-Armenian propaganda by Azerbaijani authorities, dehumanizing Armenians. Azerbaijan authorities made little effort to punish those responsible, instead attempting to cover up the atrocities in Sumgait to this day, and denying the government role in instigating the killings. Indeed, even today, racist propaganda against Armenia and Armenians is prevalent in Azerbaijan.

The assault on ethnic Armenian civilians in Sumgait helped touch off what would become a direct conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan which took thousands of lives and displaced millions more. The anniversary of Sumgait is a reminder of the consequences when aggression and hatred grow unchecked.

Mr. Speaker, this April we will mark the 103rd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, an event the Turkish government, Azerbaijan's closest ally, goes to great lengths to deny. We must not let such crimes against humanity go unrecognized, whether they occurred yesterday or 30 years ago or 100 years ago. Today, let us pause to remember the victims of the atrocities of the Sumgait pogroms. Mr. Speaker, it is our moral obligation to condemn crimes of hatred and to remember the victims, in hope that history will not be repeated.

IN RECOGNITION OF RODNEY T. MITCHELL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rodney Mitchell, associate dean of students at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas. He tragically passed away February 26, following almost 30 years of affiliation to UNT first as a student and then as a cherished staff member.

Rodney was a UNT alumnus who earned his BA in Applied Arts and Sciences in 1996 and his MPA in 1999. A proud member of the Mean Green family, he was a life member of the UNT Alumni Association, a Mean Green football season ticket holder, and supporter of various student programs with his gifts to the university. The Residence Hall Association created the "Rodney T. Mitchell Advocate of the Year" award in honor of his service and

leadership as the College Inn Hall Director and Residence Hall Association President.

After working for the City of Denton as the Assistant to the City Manager, he returned to UNT as a member of staff in 2001. He served as assistant director for academic development—Upward Bound program and as director of TRIO Upward Bound and student support services before becoming associate dean of students in 2013.

Throughout his time at UNT, it was clear that Rodney had an enormous heart for students. He assisted students through the SOS (Seeking Options and Solutions) Program, opened and grew the UNT Food Pantry, and oversaw various intervention programs to support student success. He made a significant impact as a part of the University and community he loved, touching thousands of lives as a generous, caring servant.

It was at UNT that Rodney met his wife Melanie. Together they served for many years at the Denton Church of Christ at Welch Street on the UNT campus and at the Singing Oaks Church of Christ.

Rodney was a kind and generous man, and the world is a lesser place with his departure. His servant heart is a shining example as we seek to treat others as we want to be treated. He is survived by Melanie, a current UNT employee, and his 13-year-old son, Hayden.

On behalf of the 26th Congressional District, I wish to extend condolences to Melanie, Hayden, Rodney's mother Joyce Mitchell, his father Marvel Mitchell, his brother Zachary Mackey and many other family members, as well as the entire UNT and Denton communities. Rodney will be remembered and loved forever by his family and a multitude of friends. I am grateful for the legacy he has left for the UNT and our North Texas community.

IN HONOR OF DAVID AND LINDALU BARBER'S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50th wedding anniversary of David and Lindalu Barber on February 3, 2018.

David Barber and Lindalu Thompson were married on February 3, 1968 at Wilson Chapel United Methodist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. They are both life-long residents of Jefferson County.

David spent his professional career as a prosecutor, serving Jefferson County as a Deputy District Attorney, and as District Attorney, for a total of 35 years. He concurrently served in the United States Army Reserve for a period of 37 years, retiring in 2005 as a Colonel.

Lindalu's chief occupation was that of mother and homemaker to their three children: Joel Barber (Mindy), Julie Barber Hanner and Jenny Lou Barber Grindle (Chris). They are grandparents to Drew Grindle, Catherine Grindle, John Lewis Barber, Lawson Barber, Fischer Barber, Mary Evelyn Grindle and David Grindle.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 50th wedding anniversary of David and Lindalu Barber.

IN HONOR OF THE 50TH WEDDING
ANNIVERSARY OF RONNIE AND
RHONDA BROOKS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50th wedding anniversary of Ronnie and Rhonda Brooks on August 10, 2018.

Ronnie and Rhonda met on June 9, 1968 and were married that same year.

Ronnie graduated from MacArthur Technical College and joined the Navy. He was assigned to a brand new Naval Boot Camp Facility in Orlando, Florida.

Rhonda Fore Brooks graduated in May of 1968 from Kinston High School in Kinston, Alabama. She had just moved back from Tacoma, Washington, where her father was stationed in the Air Force.

Their first child, Scotty Zane, was born in the Great Lakes Naval Training Center on Mother's Day, May 11, 1969. Their second child, Sandra Elaine, was born on February 1, 1972, in Charleston, South Carolina, where Ronnie was stationed on the USS *Howard W. Gilmore* AS-16.

Ronnie graduated from Troy State University in 1977 and the University of Alabama in 1982. He taught and was principal at Coosa Christian Elementary School in Gadsden, Alabama. Rhonda went to MacArthur Technical School.

In 1984, they moved to Piedmont, Alabama. Ronnie was Human Resources Manager for SCT Yarns, Inc. and Rhonda went to Jacksonville State University. They again moved to Opp, in 1991 and Ronnie became Personnel and Safety Manager with Opp & Micolis Mills and Rhonda owned the Opp Christian Bookstore for the next 10 years before moving to Phenix City, Alabama, as part of Ronnie's job promotion.

Their children are married now: Scotty married Tammy Bryan and Sandie married James Manscill, Jr. They have four grandchildren: Justin Brooks (married to Anna Frederick), Hannah Brooks, Erika Manscill and Danielle Manscill.

Being retired now, Ronnie and Rhonda are still active in the community, active members of Epworth United Methodist Church and members of the International Gideon's Association in the Russell County Camp. They both give the success of their marriage and family to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 50th wedding anniversary of Ronnie and Rhonda Brooks.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all

meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 6, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 7

Time to be announced

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider the nominations of John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, Frank T. Brogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, and Mark Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Institute of Education Science, both of the Department of Education, Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and other pending nominations.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine security clearance reform.

SD-106

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To continue a business meeting to consider H.R. 2825, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John B. Nalbandian, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kari A. Dooley, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Dominic W. Lanza, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, Jill Aiko Otake, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii, and Joseph H. Hunt, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

SD-G50

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine Department of Defense audit and business operations reform at the Pentagon.

SD-608

1 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine stopping senior scams.

SD-562

2 p.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President.

SH-216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Joseph E. Macmanus, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Marie Royce, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary (Educational and Cultural Affairs), Robin S. Bernstein, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, and Edward Charles Prado, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Argentine Republic, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts

To hold hearings to examine small business bankruptcy, focusing on assessing the system.

SD-226

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States European Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider S. 79, to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to identify security vulnerabilities of certain entities in the energy sector, S. 186, to amend the Federal Power Act to provide that any inaction by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that allows a rate change to go into effect shall be treated as an order by the Commission for purposes of rehearing and court review, S. 1059, to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 relating to the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado, S. 1160, to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area, S. 1181, to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, S. 1260 and H.R. 2615, bills to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign

Wars, S. 1335 and H.R. 2888, bills to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, S. 1336, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, S. 1337, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to make certain strategic energy infrastructure projects eligible for certain loan guarantees, S. 1446 and H.R. 1135, bills to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program, S. 1457, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out demonstration projects relating to advanced nuclear reactor technologies to support domestic energy needs, S. 1563, to authorize the Office of Fossil Energy to develop advanced separation technologies for the extraction and recovery of rare earth elements and minerals from coal and coal byproducts, S. 1602, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Finger Lakes National Heritage Area, S. 1692, to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, S. 1799, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to facilitate the commercialization of energy and related technologies developed at Department of Energy facilities with promising commercial potential, S. 1860 and H.R. 1109, bills to amend section 203 of the Federal Power Act, S. 1981, to amend

the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, S. 2213 and H.R. 4300, bills to authorize Pacific Historic Parks to establish a commemorative display to honor members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Pacific Theater of World War II, S. 2325, to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, H.R. 589, to establish Department of Energy policy for science and energy research and development programs, and reform National Laboratory management and technology transfer programs, H.R. 648, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend the Definite Plan Report for the Seidskadee Project to enable the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir, H.R. 1397, to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, H.R. 1404, to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and H.R. 1500, to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park".

SD-366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight

To hold hearings to examine S. 2421, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and

Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

SD-406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the opioid crisis, focusing on leadership and innovation in the states.

SD-430

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing regarding certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Personnel

To hold hearings to examine domestic violence and child abuse in the military.

SD-G50

MARCH 14

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine opioids in Indian country.

SD-628

SENATE—Tuesday, March 6, 2018

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O God, You are our refuge. Give us wisdom to live so we never disgrace Your Name. Provide our lawmakers with power and insight to accomplish Your will on Earth as they look to You for help. Please become for them their shade by day and defense by night. As they acknowledge that You alone are the source of their strength, surround them with the shield of Your favor, and direct their steps.

Lord, we also ask You to bring a spiritual awakening to our Nation and world, prompting people to experience the transformative power of Your mercy and grace. Arise, O God, and defend Your purposes in these grand and challenging times.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2155, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

RETIREMENT OF THAD COCHRAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate learned that its quiet persuader will be leaving us after a long and distinguished career. Senator THAD COCHRAN's retirement will mark the end of a tenure defined by steady, honorable leadership.

Since the day he arrived in this Chamber, THAD's focus has been squarely on serving the people of Mississippi with integrity. For nearly four decades, he has done exactly that, and he has earned the admiration and gratitude of countless friends and colleagues along the way.

Those of us here today are proud to have had the privilege of working with Senator COCHRAN. His expertise as chairman of the Appropriations Committee will be sorely missed. So too will be the collegiality, warmth, and grace that is so characteristic of the senior Senator from Mississippi.

But the Senate's loss is THAD's family's gain. As we say our farewells over the next few weeks, I know all of our colleagues will join me in wishing him every happiness in his next chapter.

Mr. President, on another matter, the Senate will vote today to begin consideration of S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

This bill recognizes a simple truth: Small community banks and Main Street credit unions are not the same as the multitrillion-dollar banks on

Wall Street. It is a simple enough observation, I might add, but, at present, our laws fail to account for it.

Since Washington imposed the Dodd-Frank financial regulations back in 2010, small-scale lenders have been subjected to a litany of new regulatory, compliance, and examiner demands that were designed with the country's largest banks in mind. Dodd-Frank's enormous regulatory burden has been inefficient and unhelpful for financial institutions of all sizes, but it has hit Main Street lenders especially hard.

Many small banks have had to hire additional staff and expend additional resources solely to deal with the staggering compliance burden. According to a survey conducted last year, community bank compliance costs have risen to an average of 24 percent of net income. Let me say that again. Community bank compliance costs have risen to an average of 24 percent of net income.

This regulatory burden crowds out the capital that is available to American families and small businesses, especially in rural communities. According to researchers at the Harvard Kennedy School, community banks provide over 50 percent of all small business loans and nearly 80 percent of agricultural loans. In Kentucky, for example, there are more than 100 community banks and more than 20 credit unions. Many of them are the only financial institutions that are present in rural and underserved communities.

But while Dodd-Frank supposedly took aim at too big to fail, in the first 4 years after it passed, the share of U.S. deposits in small banks shrunk by nearly a quarter. Deposits in small banks shrunk by a quarter in the first 4 years of Dodd-Frank. That means less access to capital for young couples who are looking to purchase their first home, less credit for aspiring small business owners who need help in turning dreams into reality, and fewer options for farmers and ranchers who are hoping to expand.

The bill before us this week will continue to unwind the damage caused by an administration and Democrat-run Congress that kept its foot firmly on the brake of the American economy. This is a modest but critical bill. By streamlining regulations, it will bring relief to the small financial institutions that have been hurt by Dodd-Frank's one-size-fits-all approach.

In a certain respect, this bill is a perfect complement to tax reform—further expanding opportunities for American families, communities, and small businesses. It is the product of years of

work and a robust committee process. It is also a truly bipartisan bill, co-sponsored by an equal number of Republicans and Democrats or Independents. Senators had and still have a wide diversity of views on Dodd-Frank, but there is a widening agreement that we should not continue allowing this unintended consequence to wreak havoc on community banks and small credit unions. I hope that soon we can turn that consensus into law.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on one final matter, every day we hear more ways that tax reform is immediately helping American workers, job creators, and middle-class families across our country, but this generational reform was not designed to be a flash in the pan. We are already seeing ways it will continue to benefit hard-working Americans even decades down the road.

Along with bonuses and wage increases, many of the 400-plus companies that have announced enhanced employee benefits are also significantly expanding their contributions to workers' retirement savings accounts.

In recent years, tight budgets have forced too many families to forgo investing for the future in order to cover today's expenses. Recent estimates suggest that two-thirds of Americans do not contribute to a 401(k). A lack of retirement savings can seem like an abstract concept for young workers, but for some senior citizens, it becomes a harsh reality. While the poverty rate for Americans under 65 has decreased since 2015, it has increased among those 65 and older.

Tax reform is already helping remedy a part of the problem. Many companies and small businesses alike have announced plans to reinvest tax reform savings in their employees' retirement accounts. Cigna is adding \$30 million to its employee 401(k) program. Aflac is doubling its 401(k) match for its 10,000 employees. In Kentucky, workers will benefit from increased or accelerated retirement contributions by major employers such as UPS, Brown-Forman, Anthem, and FedEx.

As employers of all sizes continue following suit, more American families will have more flexibility as they plan for the future. At the same time, of course, lower tax rates are increasing take-home pay, making it a little easier to cover today's expenses. More money in workers' pockets for today and more money in their retirement plans for tomorrow—all thanks to tax reform.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, ever since President Trump signed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act on December 22, we have seen how one law can literally transform the economic landscape across the country. The New York Times has reported that there is a wave of optimism surging among job creators.

Let me just footnote that the New York Times was certainly a skeptic as to what the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act would be, but they now report that a wave of optimism is surging among job creators.

Since January 2017, 2.3 million jobs have been added in the United States, and unemployment is at a 17-year low. U.S. weekly jobless claims are at their lowest since 1969. Many people who thought that stagnant growth and flat wages were the new normal have been surprised—and maybe a better word is “gratified”—to see what the impact of this policy has been on their take-home pay, on their confidence in their future, and on investments and new jobs. It is pretty exciting. In 2017, average unemployment rates decreased in 32 States according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. President, 186,000 manufacturing jobs have been added over the last 12 months. I know the President and all of us are concerned about manufacturing moving offshore because the cost of doing business in some places around the world is much lower than it is in the United States, but we should all be excited about the fact that 186,000 manufacturing jobs have been added in the last 12 months.

As I mentioned, consumer confidence is now at its highest level since November 2000, and real disposable incomes have seen their biggest gain since April 2015.

According to a National Federation of Independent Business survey, more small businesses than ever now believe it is a good time to expand. This is a very important part of the equation, and I will say more about small businesses in just a moment.

In Texas, where I am from, a survey of Houston businesses found that 2 out of 3 companies there will increase hiring and wages, while nearly 9 out of 10 said they expected to see an increase in their revenue. The head economist of the bank that conducted the survey didn't waste any words, saying that “something real is happening in the economy.” I agree. The positive gains from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act are real and undeniable.

Recently, my office heard from one of my constituents by the name of Judy Patton. Judy lives in Cleburne, TX, which is roughly an hour from Dallas, down U.S. Highway 67. Judy owns a plumbing company called P&P. She

said that her plumbing company will be giving both raises and bonuses to all of its employees this year because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and she just wanted to let us know that she appreciates what we are doing.

Well, all of us who have the honor of representing constituents here in the Senate hear from our constituents from time to time, and they don't always give us an “attaboy” or words of encouragement. Frequently they say “Can't you all do better?” or “You have done this, and I don't like that much.” So it is nice to hear from people like Judy the encouragement that she has given us for the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I can say, for my part, to Judy that we are thrilled you decided to pay the savings forward to other folks in the Cleburne area. Plumbers are a good example of the untold stories on tax reform.

Here in Washington, we are not always conscious of the ripple effect—the way in which the changes we have enacted affect small businesses and individual lives. Judy reminds us of the positive impacts that are felt all over. It is not just the big players, the Fortune 500 companies with thousands of employees and operations around the world; it is small businesses like P&P in Cleburne, too, that are busy helping out those small communities and making lives better. Those examples are just as important as those in the Fortune 500.

FIX NICS BILL

Mr. President, another issue I will continue to be focused on concerns a bill that I cosponsored with the junior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY, called Fix NICS. The President, when we were over at the White House last week, said: Well, maybe you need a better name for the bill. I had to explain that NICS was the National Instant Criminal Background Check System and that we believed it was broken and needed to be fixed; hence the name “Fix NICS.” But I take the President's point—maybe we ought to do a better job branding what it is we are selling here, and what we are selling is something vitally important that will save lives.

The Fix NICS bill will fix holes in the background check system that is utilized when firearms are purchased by individuals in the United States. As we know, when you go buy a gun at a gun store, there is a background check that has to be conducted. That is current law. When federally licensed firearm dealers like McBride's Guns, Inc., in Austin, TX, that I patronize—when you go in to buy a new shotgun to go bird hunting or something like that, they will run a background check. Of course they ask you to answer the questions, but the problem we discovered in Sutherland Springs is that not everybody is performing their responsibility and uploading the information that would

show that people who are purchasing guns are lying on their background check and are legally disqualified from purchasing those firearms.

For many, the aftereffects of the shooting last month at Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL, still resonate—I know that is true for all of us—and the pain and frustration aren't going away. I always worry, though, after one of these events occurs, that given the relentless carpet-bombing of news and other information that we all sustain here in Washington, in the Nation's Capital, it is too easy to begin to lose sight of our objective to make things different and to improve outcomes when it comes to terrible events like this. Sometimes we get distracted and we move on to other topics, but we can't allow ourselves to do that. We have heard from Stoneman Douglas students themselves who are angry and deserve to be so.

Last week, the junior Senator from Florida, Mr. RUBIO, and I met with Andrew Pollack, the father of a victim who lost her life at Stoneman Douglas. Mr. Pollack's daughter isn't coming back, sadly, but the least we can do is to prevent others like her from losing their lives in similar incidents in the future.

I wanted to tell Andrew that steps have already been taken, and I wanted to say: This will not happen again. Your daughter and other future victims have pushed us, finally, to change.

But I couldn't do that, not with a straight face, and I still can't. Here we are almost a week after the meeting and we have taken zero steps forward, even though the Fix NICS bill is now cosponsored by 50 Senators on a bipartisan basis. The majority leader, a Republican, and the minority leader, a Democrat, are cosponsors of the bill. Senator MURPHY from Connecticut and Senator CORNYN from Texas—we are the principal cosponsors of the bill. We agree about very little in other areas of public policy, but we agree in this case that this is simply too important of an issue and that we really need to demonstrate our competence and to try to regain the public's confidence in our ability to actually function in a way that will save lives in the future.

Well, unfortunately, much like the DACA debate, people want to make this bill a Christmas tree, trying to decorate it with other legislative ornaments that look nice to their political base but stand no chance of passing this body or the House. I think we have to call that what it is—political posturing. It is not about getting a result. It is not about passing a bill that will actually improve the background check system to prevent people like the shooter at Sutherland Springs, for example, from actually purchasing a firearm by lying on the background check.

Thankfully, Andrew Pollack sees all this with clear eyes. He has said to me

and Senator RUBIO that we need to focus on what is achievable. He, himself, is focused on school safety, and I certainly support that.

I know my colleague Senator HATCH has introduced a bill that is bipartisan and widely supported by all sides, which I support.

Another reform that is achievable today, if we were allowed to vote on it, is Fix NICS—to fix our broken background check system. We should start with what is achievable and what will actually save lives, and that describes the Fix NICS bill. It will help prevent dangerous individuals with criminal convictions and history of mental illness from buying firearms. This bill could easily pass the Senate. It has already passed the House. The President would sign it, as he told me when he called me last Thursday night. He said he supports the Fix NICS bill. There are other things he would like to do. There are other suggestions people have made, but we need to do what is achievable, and we need to do that as soon as we possibly can.

Several publications have endorsed the Fix NICS bill, saying it is a commonsense proposal that is a “test of [Democrats'] sincerity.” Do our colleagues really want to work together to prevent further shootings at churches and schools? Voting on this bill would be one way to do it.

The New York Times calls Fix NICS a “rare piece of gun legislation that has no meaningful opposition and that has bipartisan support.” That is one of the most maddening things about working here in Washington, DC—when there are bills that have no meaningful opposition and have bipartisan support and they still don't go anywhere.

The Dallas Morning News said the bill “keeps deadly weapons away from people already prohibited from owning them.” The San Antonio Express News calls Fix NICS a “relatively easy place to start.” That would be wonderful if it were true in the Senate. The Express News calls the bill “narrow” and “necessary.”

I am not suggesting it is a panacea, but why don't we want to take the first step in the direction of passing legislation, which essentially enforces existing law and one that will save lives?

If the shooter at Sutherland Springs had run into the FBI background check system in the Air Force, in that case, and they uploaded his felony conviction as well as his conviction for domestic violence, where he fractured the skull of his infant stepson—if they had uploaded that information into the background check system, he would not have been able to legally purchase a firearm, but he did purchase those firearms, and he used them to walk around a little Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs one Sunday morning when people were worshiping inside. He didn't go inside at first. He shot

through the wall. It wasn't a stone building. It wasn't a brick building. It was made out of wood. It was a simple little Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs. People were gathered to worship, and 26 of them were gunned down. He walked into the church, after he shot dozens of rounds through the building, and he went inside and shot them and killed them—26 people. There were 20 more wounded. Fortunately, they did not die from their wounds.

I believe, with all my heart, that those 26 people would be alive today if we made sure our broken background check system worked by enforcing current law and passing a bill like Fix NICS. I believe that would have saved their lives, and it would have stopped the change that the 20 who were wounded are now going to experience as a result of their life-altering injuries.

I told myself, at that time, I am not going to come back to that small community and look those families in the face unless I have done everything humanly possible to change the outcome in the future. How can any of us, in good conscience, look our constituents in the face, those who lose their loved ones to incidents like this—how can we look them in the face, in good conscience, and say we have done our duty, when we failed to act where we could on an achievable bill, with no opposition and broad bipartisan support?

The Waco Tribune says: “Second Amendment advocates who regularly stress the need to enforce existing gun laws rather than forging new laws should welcome” the bill. This bill is supported by the whole political spectrum when it comes to guns and the Second Amendment, from the NRA to people who say, well, they really have reservations about law-abiding citizens owning guns even for their own defense or for recreation or hunting purposes. The whole political spectrum agrees this is a commonsense, achievable bill, and so do 49 colleagues in the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats.

I have said it before, but I am here to say it again: Let's pass Fix NICS now. Andrew Pollack and the rest of the Nation are waiting for a sign that we are serious about preventing wanton acts of violence that should not and cannot continue.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, when the Republican majority forced through a \$1.5 trillion tax cut to big corporations and the richest Americans, a big question was, What will those companies do with the money? Roughly, \$1 trillion of that \$1.5 trillion was aimed at the biggest corporations.

Republicans promised that corporations would reinvest the savings from the tax bill, stimulating jobs and economic growth. We Democrats warned that corporations would do what is best for themselves, not necessarily what is best for workers or the economy. There is often a dichotomy, as we have learned over the years.

It has been only a few months since the Republican tax cut was signed into law, and while a few corporations here and there announced annual bonuses with a whole lot of hoopla from the President and the Republicans, we don't hear a peep now that they have been announcing an avalanche of corporate stock buybacks—an absolute bonanza for corporate leaders and for wealthy shareholders. Over \$200 billion in corporate buybacks have been announced since January, putting corporations on pace to spend over \$1 trillion this year buying back their own stock.

This morning, the oil and gas giant Chevron announced it expects to restart its share repurchasing program since halting it in 2015. Why? Because they just reaped \$2 billion in savings from the Republican tax bill. Chevron told the Houston Chronicle last week it is planning no major changes or benefits given to its workers. Let me repeat that. Chevron is planning no major benefits to its workers but huge stock buybacks. Is that what America wants? No, but that is what is happening, as we predicted, with this tax bill.

The Chevron example is not alone, unfortunately, my fellow Americans. An analysis by Just Capital found that 6 percent of the savings companies received from the tax bill are going to employees, while 58 percent are going to shareholders in the form of dividends, share buybacks, and retained earnings. The problem is, buybacks don't really help workers or average Americans. They don't really grow the economy. In fact, the money corporations spend on buybacks crowds out investment in the things that do help workers and help our economy—research, development, new equipment, new hires, better pay for employees. But those benefits are in the long term. The corporate CEOs, the boards, the leaders of the corporations—the big ones—get an immediate benefit when they buy back stock. The stock goes up, the shareholders are happy, but workers and America get no benefit.

What buybacks accomplish is the funneling of even more money to corporate executives and wealthy share-

holders. Buybacks don't help the American workers. They don't grow the economy. By taking stock off the market, corporations inflate the value of their stockholdings.

Who holds all this stock? Not average Americans. The richest 10 percent of America owns 80 percent of the stock. That is including pension funds and everything else. When corporations goose their stock, those benefits go to a tiny piece of the pie—the upper crust.

(Mr. CRAPO assumed the Chair.)

This is the legacy of the tax bill: further benefits to the wealthy, incentives to raise corporate pay and stocks, and no real help—minimal real help for workers. Just as Democrats predicted, the Republican bill has unleashed a tsunami of corporate backslapping, while working Americans get left behind.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, yesterday Washington became the first State to institute its own net neutrality requirements after the Republican-led FCC voted to repeal net neutrality in December, helping the big ISPs and hurting the average consumer. That is typical of what the Senate on the Republican side and what our President have been doing. Over half of the States have similar legislation pending in their legislatures. The States are rightly concerned about what the end of net neutrality may mean for their residents.

When the Republican-led FCC repealed net neutrality, they handed the large internet service providers—your cable company—all the cards. They said: Do what you will with the internet. ISPs could charge consumers more for faster service or start segmenting the internet into packages, forcing consumers to purchase faster times for their favorite websites. Big companies could pay to get faster internet service, while startups, small businesses, and average Americans are left in the slow lane. High-demand websites that offer streaming television, sports, and movies could be slower if you don't pay up. Public schools that don't pay for premium service could be put at a significant disadvantage. In rural America, where there is less competition, ISPs will wield even greater power to raise the price on consumers without fear of losing business.

An internet without net neutrality is a tale of two internets where the best internet goes to the highest bidder, those with the money, and everyone else loses.

Democrats want to keep the internet free and open, like our highways, accessible and affordable to all Americans regardless of your ability to pay, where you live, or the size of your business, no slow lanes, no paying for internet packages, like cable, no one set of rules for big corporations and another for everyone else. Every American

should be able to affordably and easily access the internet. That is what Democrats believe.

I am glad Washington State has already taken action to reinstitute net neutrality, but we need to do it across the country. Democrats have put together a CRA that would undo the FCC's decision and put net neutrality back on the books. As you know, Mr. President, we will be able to bring that to the floor. Every Democrat has signed on, but only one Republican has—SUSAN COLLINS. I say to the other 50 Republicans who are in this Chamber: Whose side are you on? Whose side are you on—the big cable providers or the average consumer who depends on the internet? This vote will determine that.

I urge all Americans—particularly our younger people—to contact their Senators and demand that they sign up to save the internet.

One final point. President Trump campaigned as a populist, but what he and our Republican colleagues have been doing over and over again—whether it is what they tried to do on healthcare, whether it is the tax bill, net neutrality, or anything else—they want to help the wealthiest and the most powerful. They are the ones who backed them and funded their campaigns. That is wrong. That is not what America wants.

The only good news I can see out of this is that Americans are realizing this. Over 70 percent of people believe that Donald Trump favors the wealthy over the middle class, despite how he campaigns and despite his occasional rhetoric and tweets. They are realizing that the Republican Party seems to favor them. It is just that the Democrats, whether we had the Presidency or the majority in the House or the Senate, were able to block these things until now. Now the wealthy and powerful are getting far too much, and I believe my Republican colleagues will reap the whirlwind.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, and to urge my colleagues to support its passage.

In just a few minutes, we will have the first vote to vote on cloture to bring this bill to the floor, cloture on the motion to proceed—a very critical vote. Again, I encourage all of my colleagues to support bringing this bill forward to the floor for a full debate and vote.

First, let me thank each of the cosponsors of this bill, including the many members of the Banking Committee, for their interest and involvement in the many discussions, hearings, personal negotiations, and conversations we have had to get to this

point. Originally introduced by 10 Republicans and 10 Democrats, this package of commonsense reforms now has 26 Senate cosponsors, including 16 members of the Banking Committee.

Community banks and credit unions across the country have long struggled to keep up with ever-increasing regulatory compliance and examiner demands coming out of Washington. In local economies, this places a strain on small businesses looking to open or to grow.

In fact, when the Dodd-Frank legislation was initially proposed and we were debating it on the floor of this Senate, I held a news conference in Idaho, on Main Street in one of our cities. I said that this bill was not targeted at Wall Street, as it was being marketed; instead, it was being targeted at Main Street—our small financial institutions and communities. That has turned out to be exactly the case. Since the passage of Dodd-Frank, our big banks have profited wonderfully, but our small banks, our small financial institutions—credit unions and community banks—have suffered terribly.

S. 2155 is aimed at right-sizing the regulation for financial institutions, primarily community banks and credit unions, which makes it easier for consumers to get mortgages or obtain credit. It also increases important consumer protections for veterans, senior citizens, victims of fraud, and those who fall on tough financial times.

Congress has held numerous hearings in prior years exploring many of these issues, and the product before us today is the result of a years-long process and careful vetting.

This bill has received widespread support from commentators, regulators, businesses, and institutions representing millions of hard-working Americans and consumers, including over 10,000 community bankers, more than 100 million credit union consumer members, and thousands of small business owners and entrepreneurs, among others.

The reforms in this bipartisan bill help tailor the current regulatory landscape, while ensuring safety and soundness and relieving the burden on American businesses that are unfairly being treated like the largest companies in our economy.

The passage of this legislation holds real promise for local economies across America, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to have been here today to offer strong bipartisan support for a bill that would help with rules and regulations for the smallest banks and credit unions in the country. There is a real effort on the part of a lot of us to come to an agreement particularly aimed at those banks, the community banks and the regional banks. I have three. Senator PORTMAN's and my State is the only State in the country that has three regional banks, the banks that have \$50 billion, \$100 billion, \$150 billion—Huntington, KeyCorp, and Fifth Third.

Unfortunately, this bill started off that way, but it has become something else, and the something else is that this bill seems to me and many others to be more concerned with the largest banks and Wall Street than it does with community banks.

There are lots of things that can come out of this bill. The bill gives regulators way too much flexibility—regulators such as Mulvaney, Otting, Quarles, and others. It vests more power in FSOC—something that the Republicans didn't want to do until they got regulators like Mnuchin, Mulvaney, and people like that who are much more likely to side with Wall Street. The White House is increasingly looking like a retreat for Wall Street executives, and these are the people who are going to be doing the regulation of this bill.

Republicans and Democrats alike who believe in the need for regulation are concerned about this bill or are opposed to this bill, people like Dan Tarullo, who used to be a member of the Board of Governors at the Federal Reserve in charge of regulation; Paul Volcker, a Federal Reserve Chair who was selected by a Republican and a Democratic President; Sarah Bloom Raskin; Gary Gensler; Tom Hoenig, a Republican; Sheila Bair, President Bush's nominee at the FDIC; Phil Angelides, who did a good analysis of what actually happened 10 years ago when Wall Street almost collapsed our economy.

This body seems to have experienced sort of a collective amnesia. Take a look at what happened to the economy 10 years ago, and today we are giving relief to many of the largest banks in this country, relief that these things on the stress test—a weaker stress test, a less regular stress test, will mean many of the larger banks simply will not be under the intense examination that we have done in the past. What does that mean? What that means is those banks are more likely to jeopardize the safety and soundness of the banking system. Again, we know what happened 10 years ago when we had to bail them out.

There is a Washington Post article that came out today. The headline is "Senate banking bill likely to boost

chances of bank bailouts, CBO says." The CBO says that the Senate banking bill is likely to boost chances of bank bailouts. Why would we do that when banks are doing very well? Banks of all sizes are very profitable these days. We just did a tax bill that gives the largest banks—the financial services industry overall but especially the Wall Street banks—huge tax breaks. So we are going to pass a bill that the Congressional Budget Office—a neutral scorer here, the referee—the Congressional Budget Office says that this will cost taxpayers \$671 million, and it will increase the chances of a bailout. Why would we pass a bill to give the banks breaks and then give them \$671 million of taxpayer dollars? I just don't understand why we as a Senate would want to do such a thing.

Nobody in Ohio, except for some bank executives, are clamoring for this bill. Nobody is saying: Oh, we have to deregulate the banks. We have to help the biggest banks. We have to help these banks that drove us into the ditch 10 years ago. It simply doesn't make sense.

I ask for a "no" vote on the motion to proceed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY).

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Ben Sasse, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran, John Kennedy, David Perdue, Tim Scott, Thom Tillis, Dean Heller, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, James M. Inhofe, Tom Cotton, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Carper	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Shaheen
Coons	Jones	Shelby
Corker	Kaine	Stabenow
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	King	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	
Flake	Nelson	

NAYS—32

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Blumenthal	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 32.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Terry A. Doughty, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Doughty nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Ex.]

YEAS—98

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

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session and consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2155.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, sometimes—not always—but sometimes Congress operates under the principle that anything worth doing is worth overdoing, and that, to some extent, is what happened with Dodd-Frank.

It has been almost 8 years since Dodd-Frank took effect, and in that time, well over 1,700 community banks have consolidated, merged, or shut their doors forever. We are going backward. That is an average of one every 3 days.

I was reading this morning that in the last 3 years, only 13 new banks have been formed in America. That is not 13 per year, that is 13 total. Before Dodd-Frank, we averaged about 100 a year. Across America, banks of all sizes have closed more than 10,000 branches. Acknowledging the damage Dodd-Frank has wrought for our local econo-

mies is long overdue, and it is high time we did something about it.

In my State of Louisiana, out-of-control compliance costs have led to banks boarding up their windows. That means, at this point in time, in at least 15 communities in my State, folks do not have access to a bank or to a credit union. For Louisianians living in these banking deserts, getting a check or a savings account may be little more than a pipedream.

I am not suggesting to you that everything in Dodd-Frank was misguided. I think we had a handful of institutions that precipitated, in part, the meltdown in 2008, and Dodd-Frank regulates those institutions, but not every financial institution, particularly a community bank and a small credit union, should be lumped in with the larger financial institutions.

To return to my point, even the ordinary act of cashing a paycheck—something that goes sight unseen for most Americans—is next to impossible without paying high fees at the convenience store, a pawn shop, or a payday lender. Because of the shrinkage in the banking community in Louisiana, every day, ordinary Louisianians are being told to participate in the economy, manage their finances, save for their kids' future, and plan for their retirements when, thanks to Dodd-Frank and its overregulation of medium-sized and community banks and credit unions, too many Louisianians don't even have a bank branch in their community.

I think it is time to swing the pendulum back toward simple, sensible regulations. We have legislation that will be on the floor this week in the Senate that will do that. It is called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. I call it the Dodd-Frank fix bill or the Dodd-Frank reform bill. It doesn't destroy Dodd-Frank. It doesn't eliminate it entirely. It just brings some common sense to the legislation. I think it is a vital step in the right direction. Dodd-Frank, to some extent, particularly for medium-sized and smaller financial institutions, was like using a sledgehammer to kill a gnat. All our reform bill does is suggest that we ought to try using a flyswatter instead of a sledgehammer.

The changes made in our bill will not mean the banks that are given relief will go unregulated—far from it. They will still be heavily regulated. They just will not be overly regulated as a result of the Dodd-Frank bill.

Everybody in America knows that community banks and credit unions, which I refer to as relationship bankers, played no role—none, zero, zilch—in the 2008 financial crisis. When former Chair of the Federal Reserve Yellen testified during her term in office before the Banking Committee, I asked her point-blank: Chairwoman

Yellen, what did the community banks do wrong to contribute to the economic meltdown in 2008, and she responded: Nothing.

The businesses of these small institutions revolve around lending. I am talking about community banks and credit unions. They lend to farms, mom-and-pop businesses, and homeowners. They are not hedge fund managers. They are not playing the margins. Yet the small banks are the ones that are suffocating under the weight of Dodd-Frank's 20,000 pages of regulations. Let me say that again. Dodd-Frank is about a 900-page bill, and it has 20,000 pages of regulations.

Ultimately, our communities pay the price for the costs that have been imposed upon small- and medium-sized banks to comply with Dodd-Frank, when these banks did nothing wrong in 2008.

Studies show that when a bank branch shuts its doors, on average, the number of small business loans made in that community falls by 3 percent, and that has certainly been the case in Louisiana. The experts say the neighborhoods can take more than 8 years to recover. You multiply that by 10,000 branches that have closed across this country, and the figure is breathtaking. It doesn't take an economist to see that the ultimate cost of Dodd-Frank on our communities in Louisiana, in Texas, and elsewhere has been job losses and economic decline.

Fortunately, I think we can start to see a light at the end of the tunnel—at least if our Dodd-Frank reform bill passes. Dodd-Frank, as you know, said that all banks are created with equal risks and should be subject to the same regulations. From the largest bank to the smallest bank, they all create equal risk for the American financial system, and they should be subject to the same regulations. Whoever came up with that rule must have parachuted in from another planet.

I am cosponsoring the Dodd-Frank reform bill because I believe an international bank—and I think common sense tells us this—with \$50 billion in assets poses a different risk to our economy than a community bank in Bossier City with 30 employees. The Dodd-Frank reform bill acknowledges that banks come in all different shapes and sizes and purposes, and it treats them accordingly.

We have had 8 years under Dodd-Frank to see what this level of government regulation means for our economy, and it is time to find some balance. Dodd-Frank's purpose was to prevent another financial crisis. Yet, in practice, banks across this country are now able to offer fewer products, fewer services, and fewer loans at much, much higher prices as a result of overregulation by Dodd-Frank. If we want to get our economy back on track for working and middle-class Americans, it has to stop.

I have been working closely with my colleague Senator SCHATZ on a bipartisan amendment to our Dodd-Frank reform legislation to protect consumers. Americans shouldn't have to spend months fighting to correct inaccurate information on their credit report when they didn't consent to have it collected in the first place. They shouldn't be penalized because a credit reporting agency, such as Equifax, can't keep their data safe.

Our proposal would require that the Big Three credit reporting agencies work together to create an online portal that gives consumers access to their credit reports and their credit scores. This website would allow folks to see what information has been collected about them, see who has viewed their credit report and why, and opt out of having their information packaged and sold to third parties. It would make it simple for people to dispute inaccuracies on their credit reports. In short, it would give consumers control over their financial information once again.

I respectfully urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this necessary amendment.

To conclude, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act—the Dodd-Frank reform bill that I have been talking about—will help promote stability in our financial markets. It will protect American consumers, and it will give breathing room to some of our smaller banks and to our credit unions. It will ensure that consumers and small businesses continue to have access to mortgage credit and to capital. I respectfully submit that it will help ensure that our relationship bankers—95 percent of the bankers in America, the ones on whose back this country was built—can afford to keep their doors open and continue lending to the middle-class drivers of our economy.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 7 minutes.

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

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the steady stream of good news for American workers continues. Just take a look at the headlines:

"Craft brewers putting tax savings toward expansions and new jobs." That is one headline.

"Grocery chain investing in employees and brand after tax reform."

"Quad/Graphics to give \$22 million in stock to employees."

"Entergy Arkansas files plan to pass corporate tax cuts to customers."

"Taco John's International Inc. Shares Tax Reform Benefits With Employees And Surrounding Communities."

"Largest Health Insurer in New Jersey Says It Will Use Tax Refunds for Members."

"Tax reform payday: Kid's clothing giant Carter's giving bonuses, boosting retirement funds."

"Tax reform positive for farmers, ranchers."

"Express scripts giving employee bonuses averaging \$1,200 following impact from tax law."

"Franklin Savings Bank to Give Employees \$1,000 Bonus; Cites New Tax Reform."

"Sprouts plans to invest tax reform savings in employee programs."

"First Horizon announces minimum pay level increase."

"NC Blue Cross: Tax cut will hold down rate increases, workers to get \$1,000 bonuses."

"Hormel to give employees stock shares, increase wages."

I could keep reading. These are all headlines—headlines from the past 2 weeks that have come from news organizations around the country, highlighting the ways in which tax reform is benefiting American workers.

Businesses large and small are seeing the benefits of tax reform, and they are passing them on. More than 400 companies, and counting, have announced good news for American workers, from wage increases to increased retirement benefits. Utility companies in at least 39 States are passing tax savings on to consumers.

CNBC reports that small business confidence has hit a record high in 2018, driven by small business owners' optimism about the new tax law. In other words, tax reform is working exactly the way it was supposed to. It is putting more money into Americans' pockets and giving them access to new jobs, higher wages, and increased opportunity.

I don't need to tell anyone that Americans had a tough time during the last administration or that our economy had stagnated. All you have to do is look at the numbers. A chief priority of the Republican majority of this Congress has been turning things around for American families, and that is why we took up tax reform.

The Tax Code might not be the first thing people think of when they think of economic prosperity, but it actually plays a key role in determining the success of individual families and of our economy as a whole.

The more money the Federal Government takes from you in taxes, the less money you have to save or pay bills or buy a house or repair your car. The

more money a business has to give to the Federal Government, the less money it has to grow the business and invest in its workers. If businesses are struggling to grow and succeed, that is a big problem for American workers.

In order for American workers to thrive, American businesses have to thrive. It is pretty hard for a small business to hire a new worker or to raise wages if the owner can barely pay the tax bill.

It is unlikely that an American company is going to have a lot of spare cash for investing in its workforce if it is struggling to compete with foreign companies that are paying far less in taxes. And it is unlikely that America's global companies are going to focus on reinvesting in the United States if they face a tax penalty for bringing foreign earnings back home.

When it came time to draft a tax reform bill, Republicans knew that the bill had to do two things. First, it had to lower the tax burden on American families and put more money in Americans' pockets right away, and it had to create the kind of economy that would give American families access to security and prosperity for the long term.

To achieve the first goal, we lowered tax rates across the board for American families. We nearly doubled the standard deduction, and we doubled the child tax credit.

To meet the second goal, we lowered our Nation's massive corporate tax rate, which, until January 1, was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. We lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We expanded the ability of business owners to recover investments they make in their businesses, which will free up cash so that they can reinvest in their operations and their workers. We brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century by replacing our outdated worldwide system with a modernized territorial tax system so that American businesses are not operating at a disadvantage next to their foreign counterparts. It is working.

In less than 3 months, we have seen lower tax burdens for American families, pay increases, bonuses, new jobs, increased investment in the American economy, better employee benefits, and other kinds of benefits, such as lower utility bills. All of that means more money in Americans' pockets. It means more money to put toward a child's education, more money to save for a house or a car, and more money to save for retirement.

Tax reform is accomplishing our goal of making life better for American families, and the benefits have just begun.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:43 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, 10 years ago almost to the day, this country was on the verge of a financial crisis that would wreck the lives of millions of families. The experts—let's say the so-called experts—had their heads in the sand. They shrugged off the warnings. They told the public everything was fine.

Jim Cramer was telling hard-working Americans to invest their money in Bear Stearns. Maybe younger Members of the Senate don't really remember what Bear Stearns was. Jim Cramer said: "I'm not giving up on the thing."

Bank of America was putting the finishing touches on its plan to buy the subprime lender Countrywide, which they called "the best domestic mortgage platform."

Hank Paulson, the last Treasury Secretary who got plucked from Goldman Sachs—we have had at least one since—downplayed homeowners' pain. He said: "You know, the stock market goes up and down every day more than the entire value of the subprime mortgages in the country."

Meanwhile, advocates in communities—the people who were actually dealing with the consequences of the crisis—were sounding the alarm. The fair lending group Greenlining began meeting with Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan at least once a year, starting in 1999—1999—to warn about predatory mortgage lending. Attorneys general from across the country started to caution about troubling trends.

In Cleveland, which is in the Presiding Officer's home State, we saw home prices climb 66 percent in 10 years, with the housing market juiced by "flipping on mega-steroids," according to a government panel that investigated the crisis. City officials in Cleveland began to hear reports that predatory home refinances were being pushed on buyers regardless of whether they could afford to repay the loans. Those refinances mean fees to bankers.

Foreclosures began to shoot up in Cuyahoga County—5,900 foreclosure filings in 2000, and by 2007, 15,000. My wife and I live in ZIP Code 44105, which includes Slavic Village in Cleveland, OH. In the first half of 2007, that ZIP Code had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States of America.

The city of Cleveland went to the Fed and asked it to use its authority to restrain subprime lending. The Fed did nothing. The people in charge in Washington were too certain, too detached, and perhaps too comfortable to listen to the warnings from Ohioans and from people across the country.

We saw what happened. All of these people who had the hubris to say that the economy could keep growing and keep growing and keep growing while the middle class was being looted—those people, thank you very much, weathered the crisis just fine. No one with a cable show had their home foreclosed on. Nobody on Wall Street who tanked the economy went to jail. In fact, many of these same people now have fancy jobs in fancy buildings and dress in fancy clothes and have fancy titles and work on Wall Street and in the White House. But in ZIP Codes like 44105, in Slavic Village and Cleveland, OH, and places like it across the country, parents were sitting down at kitchen tables to have painful conversations with their children.

Think about what this means. You lose your job, or you can't keep up with your mortgage payment. The husband, the wife, two teenage children. You have a family pet, a dog. You realize you are falling further and further behind. You are still working and you are still trying, but things aren't going well. The first thing you do—your dog has to go to the vet. You can't pay for that. You simply don't have the money. You take the dog to the shelter. You do what a lot of families in Cleveland unfortunately do; you just try to give your dog away or do something.

You then face your children. You say to your children: We are going to lose our home. We are going to have to move. We don't know where we are going to move yet. We don't know which school district. We don't know where your friends will be because we are going to have to move.

I don't think people around here really think much about what foreclosures mean to families. Remember what I said—5,900 foreclosures in Cuyahoga County in 2000 and 15,000 by 2007. Hundreds of those were in ZIP Code 44105. Think what that does to those families. My colleagues, when we vote today and tomorrow and Thursday on whether we are going to pass this giveaway bill to Wall Street, just think about that.

The CEOs and the boards at the banks and people in Washington who are supposed to be watching failed these Americans. That is why Congress, including some Republicans, did something about it 10 years ago, something to stop this from ever happening again. We passed a law. We created important protections for the financial system, for taxpayers, for homeowners. We held banks and watchdogs accountable to prevent another crisis.

Fundamentally, we did it right a decade ago, but Wall Street never gives up that easily. They didn't like that bill. They opposed that bill—most of them. Big bank lobbyists, the same ones who were so sure the 2000s crisis wasn't going to happen, those who flippantly said that things are all right—remember what Hank Paulson said. Hank Paulson, the Bush Secretary of the Treasury, said: You know, the stock market goes up and down every day more than the entire value of subprime mortgages in the country. Well, Hank Paulson didn't pay much of a price. None of the regulators paid much of a price.

Ten years ago, we did it right. As I said, the big banks never gave up. Big bank lobbyists went to work.

Get this: The day the President signed the Dodd-Frank bill implementing these safety rules and regulations—implementing the consumer protections, making sure that the government was actually on the side of consumers and people paying their mortgage and homeowners—the same day President Obama put his “Barack Obama” signature on the Dodd-Frank law, the top financial services lobbyists in Washington said: Now it is half time. In other words, we may have lost the first half. They passed this bill. We didn't want it, but don't worry about us in the second half.

To these people, the economy is a game. They can't tell the difference between putting millions of Americans' lives and homes and savings at risk and a game of pickup basketball.

Piece by piece, Wall Street has gone to the agencies, they have gone to the courts, they have gone to Congress to dismantle the consumer protections we put in place. The drumbeat is constant. It is ongoing. It has been happening for 10 years. They always want a new exemption, they always want a weaker standard, they always want a new tax break, and do you know what? They can always find a whole lot of Senators and House Members who will write a letter to the Federal Reserve, who will make a call to the Office of Consumer Counsel, who will go at it and will attack in public the Consumer Bureau. They can always find Members in this body who are fueled by lots of Wall Street contributions and a lot of allies in New York. They can always find people to do their bidding. That is why you see this drum. That is how you hear this drumbeat. They want a new exemption, a new weaker standard, a new tax break.

The last year has been a really good time to be a bank lobbyist. After the crisis, we had created the Consumer Protection Bureau to represent the interests of regular Americans who have to fight with their bank or their credit card company. Now, in this administration, the Consumer Bureau, unbelievably so, is run by a guy who believes—

publicly said it—it shouldn't even exist. The Consumer Bureau's new protections are under attack.

One quick story. All Democrats, even some Republicans, agreed we should protect consumers' right to take their bank to court. What is more American than that; if you think your bank cheated you, that you should be able to go to court.

Bank lobbyists, with a lot of allies on this side of the aisle, convinced the Vice President of the United States to come to this very Senate Chamber late at night—late at night here, at 9 or 10, the public is not watching, but you can be damned sure the special interests are alive and well and watching in their offices and making calls and doing all that.

The Vice President of the United States came to this Senate Chamber to break a tie, to cast a tie-breaking vote to vote against hard-working American families. Instead of protecting these families, the Vice President and his allies in the Senate—they voted for Wells Fargo, they voted for Equifax, they voted for Citigroup. The rule is gone. That rule to ensure that consumers have their day in court if their bank cheated them, that rule is gone, piece by piece by piece.

The watchdogs who are supposed to be protecting Main Street all come to their jobs fresh from—surprise—Wall Street and K Street. The President's Cabinet looks like an executive retreat for Wall Street bankers. They have released blueprint after blueprint on how to dismantle all the rules put in place after the crisis, and they are putting their people in place to do it. They just rammed through Congress a bill to give Wall Street an enormous tax break that will cost American families \$1.5 trillion, but it gives big bank CEO's a huge raise.

That is 10,000 times more than what we spend at HUD every year to protect kids from toxic levels. Back to ZIP Code 44105, the health department of the city of Cleveland told me almost all those homes built before World War II, 99 percent of them have levels of toxic lead that will make children sick—99 percent of those homes. Yet we can do this big tax cut and not take care of those families.

Not long ago, another bank lobbyist told us their plan: We don't want a seat at the table, he said, we want the whole table—and they are about to get it under the bill the Senate will consider this week. Piece by piece, they tear these protections down. This bill gives them the whole table. It leaves nothing for working families.

If you thought the Secretary of HUD's \$31,000 he spent to buy that fancy table for his dining room—31,000 taxpayer dollars—if you thought that was a bad deal for taxpayers, wait until I tell you about the billions and billions of dollars at risk that are packed into this effort.

This bill puts Americans at risk of another bank bailout. The Congressional Budget Office, the independent, nonpartisan scorekeeper, confirmed yesterday that this bill would increase the probability of a big bank failure and a financial crisis. It will add \$671 million to the deficit. The Washington Post said: “Senate banking bill likely to boost chances of bank bailouts.”

It is bad enough we are going to pass—after banks have been so profitable the last decade, after they were bailed out by the public—thank you very much—they have had a really, pretty darned good decade. Then they got a big tax cut. Now they want this and a little cherry on top. First, they get this bill, which is about to pass—which will be really good for bankers—but then they get \$671 million extra from taxpayers. So, again, thank you very much, taxpayers, for taking care of the banks. So we are going to weaken the rules, and we will pay Wall Street for the privilege of doing it.

This bill weakens stress tests for all large banks, even Wall Street megabanks that are designated as global, systemically important banks—like JPMorgan Chase, \$2.5 trillion in assets. Now, 2.5 trillion is 2,500 billion, and a billion is a thousand million. So \$2.5 trillion—that is hard to calculate, but that is a lot of money. So JPMorgan Chase gets a break. They get their \$2.5 trillion in assets. Bank of America gets a break. They get \$2.3 trillion in assets. Wells Fargo, which can't stay out of trouble—every week there seems to be something new—\$1.9 trillion in assets. Citibank, \$1.9 trillion in assets. These banks—and the Wall Street Journal, hardly a paper hostile to business or a bank that is really always close to Wall Street. Wall Street Journal headline this morning: “[Wall Street] Banks Get a Big Win in Senate Rollback Bill.”

So don't let my colleagues—don't let anybody who supports this bill—tell you this is all for the community banks. The community banks get some things in this bill. I would love to support the community banks and make this a bill about community banks, about credit unions, even about the regional banks like the ones in my State that generally do the right thing—Huntington and Fifth Third and KeyBank. But this bill, this is the Wall Street Journal: “Big Banks Get a Big Win in Senate Rollback Bill.”

This is about those four banks I mentioned: JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Citigroup. These banks hold 51 percent—more than half—of all industry assets. They are a pretty darned big part of our economy, and we are doing things for them. As they are profitable, as their executives make maybe tens of millions of dollars, as they are doing stock buybacks to make even more millions of dollars, we are doing things for them. We are not

dealing with infrastructure, we are not dealing with the opioid crisis, we are doing nothing here about guns, but we have time to do a lot for America's largest banks. With this deregulation, these are banks whose collapse could cause ripples across the world.

Together, the country's biggest banks took \$239 billion in taxpayer bailouts. So without the rigorous annual stress test that we put in Dodd-Frank a decade ago and we are relaxing now, taxpayers could, once again, be on the hook if too-big-to-fail banks collapse, and we don't have the right tools in place to see it coming.

This is maybe even more unbelievable than the fact that this body has fallen all over itself to help the biggest banks. This bill also weakens the oversight for foreign megabanks operating in the United States—the same banks that repeatedly violate U.S. laws. Let's run through the rap sheets of some of these banks.

Deutsche Bank, a big German bank, manipulated the benchmark interest rates used to set mortgages. It is also known as the only large bank in the world that will finance the President's businesses.

Santander, a Spanish bank, illegally repossessed cars from members of the military who were serving our country overseas. So we are going to give a break to a Spanish bank that repossessed the cars of men and women at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and others when they were serving overseas. Santander repossessed their cars, a Spanish bank, and we are going to deregulate and make them more profitable with less accountability.

Barclays, a British bank, manipulated electric energy prices. If you live on the West Coast—I don't; my constituents weren't affected—but a whole lot of people were as they manipulated energy prices.

Credit Suisse and UBS, two Switzerland banks—one of them illegally did business with Iran. We have tried to tighten the sanctions on Iran to get Iran to behave better so they don't continue to harass—or worse—Israel and all the threats they make. We are going to help a bank that did business with Iran, and UBS sold toxic mortgage-backed securities.

It didn't have to be this way. I tried for months to work with the chairman of the committee—and I like Senator CRAPO a lot. We work together well. I tried for months to work in a common-sense package of reforms aimed at lifting up community banks and credit unions. That is what we ought to do. That is what we could do. That is what we still could do. These are the local financial institutions that fuel home ownership and small businesses. I know a lot of them. They come to see me when they are in Washington. I see them in their communities. I see them in Sycamore, Columbus, and Mansfield,

and all over the State. These are not the people who caused the meltdown 10 years ago. These are the ones who got dragged down when big banks crashed the economy. I support relief to those banks and regional banks that do things right and play by the rules. I want to do more to help average Americans who have to cope with unfair tricks and traps, but that is not what this bill does. That is how it started out. That is what Wall Street wants you to think; this is a bill for the community banks.

Don't forget, they said that about the tax cut bill: It is a tax cut for the middle class. Well, 81 percent of the benefits of the tax cut go to the richest 1 percent. So don't always believe what they say when they talk about this.

This was a false choice. Why should we have to roll back rules for the largest banks in Switzerland to help out community banks or credit unions in Ohio? Of course we shouldn't. It has been a false choice. We could pass a bill today that helps those local banks invest more in their communities while keeping in place strict rules for Wall Street megabanks, but Wall Street and Republicans don't want to do that. They want to use the little guys, the community banks we all want to help. They want to use the little guys to extract something for the big guys. It is the oldest trick in the book around here.

We are going to cut taxes for the middle class. Well, really we are kind of hoping we can give big tax breaks to the richest 1 percent. We are going to help the community banks, but really we are hoping—we know we are going to help Wall Street.

This city, Washington, this government, this Senate, this Senate Banking Committee are all suffering from collective amnesia. They just forgot what happened 10 years ago. Maybe it is convenient they don't want to remember what happened. Thankfully, the IMF, the International Monetary Fund—an agency of international financial experts—has done us a favor, to help jog memories. They have cataloged 300 years of history of bank deregulation efforts all across the globe. Do you know what they found? We deregulate, the economy explodes. We put in protections, the economy gets better. We deregulate again, the economy explodes. We put in protections, the economy gets better. We deregulate again—wash, rinse, repeat.

We can do better. We owe it to the people we serve to do better. The Senate owes it to 176,000 kids in Ohio and other kids across the country whose lives and education were disrupted by the foreclosure crisis. Think how many children lived in homes when their parents were foreclosed on or their parents were evicted, and everything in their lives turned upside down. We don't care about them. We are going to forget

about them, this collective amnesia. We are going to forget about them because we want to help the big banks get bigger and bigger and bigger. Is that what we are going to do? We owe it to the millions of people whose retirements were wiped out. Millions of Americans lost big chunks of their retirement, but we bailed out the big banks at the same time. We owe it to the students who graduated in the great recession and may have low earnings for the rest of their lives.

The watchdogs who understand these markets are trying to warn us. Paul Volcker, former Chair of the Federal Reserve, has cautioned us about this bill. He was the Fed Chair for a Democrat and a Republican President. Sheila Bair, who helped us put protections in place after the crisis, is a Republican warning us about this bill. Tom Hoenig, the current Vice Chair at the FDIC, selected to that position by Republicans, has told us this bill is harmful. Barney Frank, as in Dodd-Frank, has said he would vote no if he were here. Former member of the Federal Reserve Dan Tarullo, who used to do the bank regulation with the Federal Reserve, has outlined a long series of concerns. Sarah Bloom Raskin, Antonio Weiss, Gary Gensler, law professors, fair housing advocates, big bank experts, people who provide legal services across this country who deal with foreclosures and civil rights groups are telling us we can't go down that path again.

We know what happens next. It is hubris to think we can gut the rules on these banks again but avoid the next crisis. If you strip the rules away from the big banks and you turn your back as regulators on misfeasance and malfeasance, that collective amnesia—we are going to pay for it, and we know we are.

There are so many important things we should be doing here instead. We should be addressing the fact—and the Presiding Officer and I have been working on this bill—that workers and retirees in Ohio and across the country might have their pensions they have spent a lifetime earning slashed in half if Congress doesn't act. We can be doing that. We could be addressing the fact that 400,000 Ohioans pay more than half their income each month on rent to keep a roof over their head. We could be creating jobs. We could be attacking the opioid epidemic. We could be fighting against high drug prices. We could be investing in our crumbling roads and bridges. Instead, guess what. We are here helping the big banks. Everybody is willing to work full time to help Wall Street.

It is a question of whose side are we on? Are we on the side of megabank lobbyists or are we on the side of American taxpayers and homeowners and students and workers?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

PROTECT PUBLIC USE OF PUBLIC LANDS BILL

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, Montanans want to access and enjoy our State's public lands, and for a very good reason. Nothing beats our way of life in Montana—our hunting, fishing, hiking, biking, skiing, backpacking, climbing, all with a backdrop of breathtaking views and a very rich history of conservation. That is why Congressman GIANFORTE and I introduced the Protect Public Use of Public Lands Act.

Our bill protects our pristine natural resources while also ensuring that Montanans are able to recreate in U.S. Forest Service lands that are not wilderness, but they have been locked up in regulatory limbo for decades. Congressman GIANFORTE's second bill deals with similarly locked-up Bureau of Land Management lands.

Here is what the Protect Public Use of Public Lands Act does. It ensures public access to land within five wilderness study areas across Montana. They are also called WSAs. While there are thousands more acres of public land that are still in limbo, I put these five WSAs in my bill for two simple reasons. First, the Forest Service determined that these lands were not suitable for wilderness in their final plan. In fact, that was a charge given by Congress in 1977. They said: Go out and study these Forest Service lands and tell us which acres are suitable for wilderness and which are not.

The acreages I am proposing we should release are those that were deemed not suitable for wilderness in the final plan by the Forest Service.

Second, there is strong local support for unlocking these lands from the grassroots up, including the Montana State Legislature, countless local community members, and dozens of sportsmen, county commissioners, and wildlife groups, including the Western Montana Fish & Game Association and the Montana Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife.

Unlocking these lands from a WSA does not—does not—automatically authorize any particular use of the land. It simply opens up and allows for public conversation about how the lands should be used by setting up the planning process for public comment. In fact, protections like the 2001 roadless rule, the Endangered Species Act, and the existing forest and travel management plans remain intact. Do you know what this means? You can't construct a new road, and that would be kept after the release of the WSAs.

This has been a bottom-up approach from the get-go, and here is the bottom line. Montana's public lands are meant for everyone. They are meant for people who like to recreate in many different ways—for those who love to hike, of course, but also folks who

enjoy recreating with mountain bikes, hunting, snowmobiling, and riding ATVs.

Creating access to our public lands is critical to Montana's jobs and our \$7 billion outdoor economy. In fact, communities in Montana understand this is an important local economic driver that will strengthen local economies that depend on outdoor jobs. In fact, just recently, the Bureau of Economic Analysis agreed. They said that outdoor recreation generates \$373 billion of the GDP across our country, mostly from motorized vehicles, boating, fishing, hunting, and shooting. Our bill will help Montanans recreate with all of these uses by unlocking our public lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I am going to be joined today by some of my colleagues from the Banking Committee who are also supporters of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. We rise today to speak about this bipartisan legislation, which advanced out of the committee last year by a vote of 16 to 7, a bipartisan vote. The primary purpose of this legislation is to make targeted changes to simplify and improve the regulatory regime for community banks, credit unions, midsized banks, and regional banks to promote economic growth.

Many of us represent rural States where community banks and credit unions are the primary providers of credit and financial services. These institutions hold a competitive advantage over their larger counterparts, operating with a relationship-based knowledge of their customers and an understanding of their unique needs. They are decidedly disadvantaged when it comes to keeping up with the ever-increasing compliance and examiner demands coming out of Washington.

Our bill offers much needed reforms that will reduce unnecessary burdens on smaller financial institutions so that they can use more of their capital serving customers rather than complying with Federal regulations that were never intended for them. It also adds protections against fraud and identity theft for consumers, veterans, senior citizens, and others, as well as for those falling on hard financial times.

This bill is the product of robust, bipartisan negotiation. It was years in the making. It is the outgrowth of feedback and input garnered from a process we initiated in the Banking Committee across all stakeholders in America, as well as from previous meetings, briefings, and many conversations and negotiations among the members.

I see Senator HEITKAMP is here, and I am going to ask her to talk about this process, how we reached this point

today, and what it means for North Dakotans.

Senator HEITKAMP.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Thank you. I was going to say "Mr. Chairman," but I guess at this point he is just Senator CRAPO.

Mr. President, I want to take a moment and personally thank Senator CRAPO from Idaho for his incredible leadership. Frequently we are asked: What is wrong in the U.S. Senate? Why can't you seem to get anything done, even though there is common purpose; that is, to protect the American public, defend the American public, and help the American public be prosperous?

Frequently my response is that many times it is a lack of leadership. It is a lack of willingness to sit down, listen, and prepare a product that can get results. That hasn't been our problem with Senator CRAPO. He has been there personally every step along the way, not delegating to staff but working with us one on one—sometimes, maybe, four on one. He may feel a little bit ganged up on, but I think it was fair odds for him, I might say. I also know that this would not be here without the leadership of Senator CRAPO and the Banking Committee, a committee that historically has a reputation for being notoriously bipartisan. I want to extend my great appreciation for his work and for his willingness to listen and to work with all of us.

What are we celebrating today? We haven't quite gotten it over the finish line, but certainly the vote we just had a couple of hours ago, which was broad bipartisan support on a cloture vote, is not something we see very often in this body. I think what we have to say is that this bill is a piece of almost old-fashioned legislating. It is a prime example of how Senators can work together to effectively achieve a result and do it in a bipartisan way.

Despite the Washington gridlock of partisanship, a group of us on Banking wrote and introduced this bipartisan bill through a good-faith negotiation, which lasted literally years. I have been working on this since coming to the U.S. Senate and being assigned to the Banking Committee. In fact, I have been working on these reforms since 2013.

The bill didn't come together overnight. It was carefully crafted. It was done not just with these regulators in discussion but also the Obama-era regulators as well. We know that we have an opportunity to do something that no one thought was possible—take a piece of legislation that didn't come through in rule XIV, didn't come through in reconciliation. It came through in the traditional way, through a Banking Committee process where we sat—and I will again applaud the Chairman. No amendment was told it was out of order. No amendment wasn't given an opportunity to be

heard or voted on. In fact, we sat for 7 hours and voted on amendments and listened to debate on this bill. Those people who think it came quickly are wrong. This did not come quickly. It came over a long period of time, through extensive discussions.

I want to talk about why I care so much about this bill. When I was going around the State in 2012, talking to folks who had opinions about the Federal Government, one of the things I frequently heard from my small credit unions and my independent community bankers and my bankers—in North Dakota, independent community bankers frequently tend to be members of the North Dakota Bankers Association. They said one thing to me that really resonated, and that was: How is it that Dodd-Frank, which was supposed to deal with the largest lenders in this country, the largest institutions in this country—how is it that you have this Dodd-Frank bill that was supposed to stop too big to fail, and it has become too small to succeed? The compliance burdens are overwhelming. The confusion that we have about this—we wonder why all of this is on us when we weren't part of the problem. We are getting punished for being a financial institution and for no good reason, other than we are in a class that includes much bigger actors.

One of the things I would tell you is that this bill is critical to rural America. When you look at the challenges that rural America faces, access to capital has to be on top of the list. Plus, I think all of those who have been to a Class B basketball tournament or a Class B basketball game can look at the program, turn it over, and what they will see is sponsorship from their local lending institution; they will see a part of the community. Whether it is helping host fundraisers, whether it is being involved in cancer drives, that Main Street institution of the community bank is there every step of the way. We are seeing more and more those institutions being challenged by things such as overregulation.

I want to talk a little bit about my hometown bank, the first bank in which I had a checking account and a savings account. It is a little bit of a funny story. The statute of limitations has probably run, but back in the day, in every small town, there was illegal gambling. I know, people might be shocked.

My dad put my name in a raffle they were having. That night at the stag party, I won the raffle. It was \$30, which years ago was a lot of money. The first thing my dad did was take me to Lincoln State Bank to open a savings account. I put that \$30 into a savings account. That institution was there, and from there, we had our first checking account. From there, I knew that my dad had a relationship with his banker that would help him

through some tough times when he needed a little bit of extra cash and help him through times when he needed a car loan.

When we lose those local lenders, when we lose the ability of those local lenders to do business, that means the opportunity for relationship banking is gone. What do I mean by that? I have told this story many times in committee. You are the small town banker. A guy comes in, and maybe he has a shoebox full of receipts. He doesn't have a fancy cash flow statement. He doesn't have a fancy work plan. But you know that this guy has never not paid a bill. He owes nobody any money. That is part of his character—who he is. He never cheats anyone. He fixes the plumbing. He fixes the furnace, and it stays fixed. He doesn't ask for a lot in return, but maybe he needs a new piece of equipment. Maybe he needs a new car. He goes to the local lender. That may not pencil out. It may not be the best loan they are going to make, but it is who they are, and it is what they contribute to that institution.

They give that guy the loan, not based on any paperwork in that shoebox. They give that guy the loan based on who they know he is.

Then, there is the other guy in the small town who comes in. He may have a fancy cash flow statement, and he may have a wonderful statement of net worth that he can present to the bank.

Yet one thing the banker knows about him is that there may be some unpaid bills and that he may be the guy who takes out a loan but then wants to negotiate 80 cents on the dollar.

In America, we have to bring back relationship lending. You can say: Well, none of these regulations really apply to them. Why don't you talk to these folks who are in the banking world and realize that they have retracted from mortgage lending because they are fearful that they will do something wrong and will not be able to afford the fines that they may be assessed. They are fearful that they will not be able to contribute and be part of the community effort because we have overregulated the smallest institutions to the point at which they wonder if their children, who could inherit their institutions, really want to stay in business.

There will be a lot of discussion about this bill. There has been a lot of discussion already. The one thing I want to say is that we stand ready to defend any of these provisions.

Before I close and turn this over to the Senator from Georgia, I want to just say that one of the things we need to be very careful of here when we debate this bill is that we do not in any way misstate the effects of this bill, because that misstatement will become part of the public record. I am going to be very aggressive in making sure that

we push back against statements that I believe are false, statements that characterize this bill in a way that was not intended and that, in fact, is not part of the legislative language.

Mr. CRAPO. Before the Senator yields to the Senator from Georgia, may I make one comment?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Mr. CRAPO. I just want to express appreciation for the Senator's chart.

For those who cannot see the chart, this is a chart that the Senator from North Dakota has put up that shows the intersection of Main Street and relief for Main Street. The reason I mention this is that back when we were debating this regulatory system that was put into place that we are now trying to rightsize and correct, I had held a news conference on Main Street in Boise, ID. I had said: This legislation is being promoted as targeting Wall Street excesses, but the bulls-eye is on Main Street across this country, which is what we are trying to fix today.

So I just wanted to tell the Senator how much I love her chart.

Ms. HEITKAMP. The Senator from Idaho can borrow it at any time. I have no pride of authorship, and there is no copyright on here. He may pass it around.

Mr. CRAPO. I will take the Senator up on that.

I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator and am honored to follow my good friend from North Dakota.

It took courage for the Senator from North Dakota to be a leader on this issue in committee. The Banking Committee fought hard and long on this issue. I think there were 30 amendments that we discussed and voted on in coming to this bill that we are bringing forward today. The Senator from North Dakota was a shining star in that debate, one that reminded both sides of what was most important—the people back home. The Senator has reminded me today of something that I have come prepared to talk about but that, I think, warrants merit.

The Citizens State Bank was my hometown bank, and it has been bought and sold a few times. My father, who was a schoolteacher and a school superintendent, was actually on that board. It was my first exposure as to how banking worked. I remember going with my dad then, who was a schoolteacher and didn't make a lot of money but who wanted a loan to buy a car. At that time, I was a little older, but this was a 1954 Ford that my dad had been driving. I am not really that old, but it was an old car, and he wanted to buy a new car. I remember sitting off to the side and listening to the conversation.

When you talk about relationship lending, relationship lending could not go very long if that relationship lending didn't lead to a loan that got paid back. I knew the lending officer because he taught me in Sunday school.

We saw him every week in church. His children went to the school where my dad was the principal.

This is a different time today—I understand that—but the fact still remains that relationship lending, as the Senator from North Dakota just reminded us, should be at the core of what we consider here when we talk about this being a lending institution, making a transaction with an individual for him to then pay that loan back. That is what we tend to forget sometimes because of the debacle in 2008.

Since Dodd-Frank has become law, over 1,700 banks have been closed. Let me say that again. Since Dodd-Frank has become law, 1,700 banks have been shut down. Most of these are community banks and regional banks—entities that had nothing whatsoever to do with the financial situation in 2008. While some in this body may see that as encouraging signs that Big Government is now getting more control of the lending principal in the banking industry, I think they are misguided. I think they are overlooking the reality that these 1,700 banks aren't the massive big banks or the very few banks that had responsibility in the 2008 financial crisis. These are local banks, credit unions, regional banks—the banks supporting our Main Street, as the Senator from North Dakota just reminded us. They are providing small businesses with capital and sponsoring Little League Baseball games.

I grew up in Little League, as many Senators here did—and in softball leagues and so forth. Right there in center field was The Citizens State Bank sign, for, every year, they were involved in that effort in that community. Yet, for nearly 8 years, those same small town entities have been hammered by Big Government regulations that had been enacted by the Dodd-Frank Act. Credit unions, community banks, regional banks were simply not responsible for the financial crisis of 2008, period. None of the draconian rules put on them make them safer today than they were in 2007. These onerous rules have subjected these small lenders to the same regulation and compliance costs to which the major four or five banks are now being subjected. Overall, it is estimated that compliance costs for community banks have risen by at least 20 percent, but I think it is much higher than that.

I met with a regional bank just this morning from Georgia, and their compliance costs have gone up \$400 million because of Dodd-Frank. That is money that could be in the community in the form of loans; yet it is now coming in the form of higher compliance costs. Some of those are fines, by the way, coming from the Federal Government up here. That is another topic for another day that we don't address in this bill.

This is eating up those small banks' bottom lines and is discouraging some banks from offering some services to their communities—services that small businesses and Main Street rely on for capital every day as they try to grow. What happens when a bank grows? Lending grows. That means small businesses grow. What happens when small businesses grow? Jobs are created. Compliance costs run diametrically opposite to that dynamic and do not increase or lower the risk.

The CFPB's qualified mortgage rule is a perfect example. This rule has driven many community banks actually out of the mortgage lending business altogether. So, while it was intended to protect the consumer, yes, it protected the consumer all right. It protected him from being able to get a mortgage.

Government restrictions on reciprocal deposits are what is at topic here in this bill. Reciprocal deposits have created uncertainty around this critical lifeline for community banks and especially minority-owned banks that have specialized in serving customers with limited discretionary income and limited access to capital. Dodd-Frank is crippling the ability of community banks and regional banks to serve these communities.

We recently heard from one community bank in Georgia that has not even established a residential mortgage department to serve the community because of these draconian compliance regulations. Why isn't it doing this? It is simply because the Federal Government—the people in this room—decided a few years ago in the Dodd-Frank Act that they knew more about the free enterprise system, the capital formation dynamic, the relationship between a lending entity and a borrowing entity, and how all of that translates into jobs and economic growth. Because of that, we have ended up with this arcane Dodd-Frank rule that overregulates these small regional and community banks.

Look, we are not trying to blow up Dodd-Frank. Many of us have taken a big step back in terms of what we think we need to do in terms of growing the economy in order to accommodate this bill. I think there are some 14 cosponsors on the other side of the aisle, and I applaud them for the courage that it has taken to work with us to get to a bill on which we both give and take. In the Senate, the No. 1 criticism we get back home is: Why can't you guys work together to get anything done? Here is a shining example. If we can get it across the finish line here and get a vote on this, we may have a tremendous example that will have a dramatic impact on Main Street back home.

Small banks tend to spend too much time and resources dealing with the regulation and compliance costs that this Dodd-Frank law has created. Put

simply, Dodd-Frank is just another one-size-fits-all, Washington bureaucratic policy that hurts the very people it claims to champion—the middle class and the working poor and those communities that have the least access to capital to borrow. Fortunately, we have an opportunity to do something today to fix these problems.

The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act takes major steps to roll back Dodd-Frank's overreach. It will bring relief to the more than 5,000 community banks across the country. It will help free up capital for small businesses to invest in our economy and put people to work. It will help minority-owned banks, again, to provide a wider range of services.

In my State, the Citizens Trust Bank is a minority-owned bank in Atlanta. Why is that important? You may have heard of that bank. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a customer of the Citizens Trust Bank. Martin Luther King, Sr., served on its board. Many distinguished Atlantans and Georgians have been customers and members of the board of this auspicious bank in Georgia. Citizens Trust, though, has been forced to draw back its entire mortgage business because of the regulatory costs that have been imposed by Dodd-Frank. This is counterintuitive. Thanks to the action we are taking this week in the U.S. Senate, Citizens Trust will be able to grow its mortgage business again because of safe harbor provisions in this plan.

Citizens Trust is not alone. Carver Bank is a minority-owned bank that has been serving Savannah, GA, for 90 years. The restrictions and regulatory uncertainty on reciprocal deposits have limited its resources. This bill we are voting on this week will more than remove government restrictions on reciprocal deposits, meaning Carver Bank and Citizens Trust and many others will have additional lending capacity and lower compliance costs, which is another way to provide more capital to the community.

This bill was written by both Democrats and Republicans. It is a shining example of what people back home expect us to do up here—our job. No, it is not perfect from my perspective. It is not perfect from the Senator from North Dakota's perspective, but do you know what? Between us, there is common ground, and we have found it. This bill will bring relief to rural communities and help small businesses, which will, in turn, grow our economy—something that both sides want dearly. This bill also preserves and improves consumer credit protections.

A vote on this plan is a vote for Main Street growth, obviously. It is a vote for rural communities and small businesses. It is a vote for people who work with their local banks to secure capital so that they can keep building the American dream.

I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together in support of this bipartisan effort, and I encourage every Member of this body to think seriously about this and to support this bill in its final passage.

I thank the chairman of the Banking Committee, the Senator from Idaho. I cannot tell him how much I appreciate his leadership. This has been a yeoman's effort, and I am committed to seeing this through, across the finish line, and getting a vote on it this week. I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. CRAPO. I thank very much the Senator from Georgia.

I next ask Senator CORKER if he would like to weigh in and let us know his thoughts on this.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I will be very brief as I know numbers of people here would like to speak to this bill, which will be an accomplishment for us, and we greatly appreciate the Senator's leadership in making it happen.

I was here when Dodd-Frank was passed. I was on the Banking Committee at that time. I didn't support it. The reason I didn't support it is for the many reasons and the many things we are doing today to correct it.

Whenever regulation passes, it begins at the targeted group, which, in this case, was made up of the larger institutions in our country which failed. Then, over time, the regulatory processes seeped down to the smaller entities, the smaller banks, that were housed in the communities all across our respective States—the members of the Rotary Club, the Kiwanis Club, the Lions Clubs International, the Chamber of Commerce—the people who make things happen in our communities back home. We have ended up in a situation now in which our community banks and credit unions, which serve our communities and cause economic growth to occur, have these large back office operations that are spread over a smaller asset base. It has made them noncompetitive and has made it very difficult for them to do the jobs we all cherish that they do back home, which is to help to grow those economies. This bill is focused on them.

Senator TESTER, I know, has been focused on this for many years, but what we are doing here is giving relief to those institutions. It is about time. We have had enough time to see what needs to happen. This was done in a bipartisan way, for which I am thankful.

Mr. President, I would like to thank Senator CRAPO for his leadership here in working with people on both sides of the aisle to create a responsible bill that is not an overreach. Some of the provisions of Dodd-Frank, we all know, are good. Some of them are good, and we are leaving many of those in place. At the same time, what we are doing is taking a very constructive step to make sure that these smaller institu-

tions, which represent a very small amount of the assets in our Nation but have such outsized impact on the communities they are in, have the ability again to flourish and do the things that are necessary for our economies back home to grow.

I thank Senator CRAPO. I am proud to be a part of this and a cosponsor. I thank Senator CRAPO for letting us be a part of it, and I hope that collectively we will ensure that this is a very successful effort.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. HOEVEN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. CRAPO. I thank Senator CORKER. I appreciate that.

Next, I would like to turn to my colleague from the other side of the aisle—another colleague from the other side of the aisle, just showing the bipartisanship we have here on this bill—Senator TESTER from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I thank Chairman CRAPO. I want to associate myself with my good friend from Tennessee, Senator BOB CORKER. We always say “good friend,” but the truth is that Senator CORKER has truly been a good friend. We came to this body together, and he has exhibited uncommon common sense in this body time and again, and once again, he has today. I thank Senator CORKER for his remarks about this bill.

Mr. President, time and again over the past year, I have been here on the Senate floor raising my concerns about the direction this body is heading—secret backroom deals on the healthcare bill, a “take it or leave it” tax bill that was dropped on our desks literally hours before the vote, and the floor time that has been wasted to score political points. Quite frankly, this dysfunction has turned the world's most deliberative body into a shell of its former self.

Folks in Washington have shied away from the big debates and refused to tackle the tough issues that are facing hard-working Americans every day, but this week I am hopeful that can change.

Today we begin the debate on the bipartisan Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. This bill is the product of years of bipartisan negotiations, hearings, and compromises. Under the leadership of Chairman CRAPO and my good friends Senators HEITKAMP, DONNELLY, and WARNER, we have struck a bipartisan agreement that is needed to provide an economic boost for rural America. Folks from both parties put their differences aside. We negotiated from our points of agreement, and we emphasized common ground. We kept working toward our shared goal of strengthening America's economy by providing commonsense regulatory reform to small- and medium-sized banks, community banks, and credit unions.

During the committee process, this bill was marked up and debated for 7

hours. We voted on 36 amendments during an open amendment process. The chairman handled that committee process incredibly professionally.

Since this bill was introduced in the Banking Committee last year, it has been strengthened by Senators who are not on that committee, and it has been endorsed by regulators, veterans groups, and job creators from both parties. This bipartisan bill has support from folks of all walks of life and is cosponsored by more than a quarter of this body because they know that reform is desperately needed.

In my home State of Montana, prior to the financial crisis in 2008, there were 72 chartered banks. Today that number has dropped to 49. What we have seen in Montana is not unique throughout this country. Across rural America, bank consolidation is leaving communities underserved. Community banks and credit unions didn't cause the financial crisis back in 2008, but they have suffered under a one-size-fits-all set of regulations specifically designed to rein in the behavior on Wall Street. As a result of complying with these regulations, many of our community bankers are hanging up their hats, and our local banks are being swallowed up by bigger banks. Ultimately, they will be swallowed up by the folks on Wall Street.

Furthermore, when a community bank is bought out by a big bank, its business model changes and it is no longer tailored to fit that community. Despite being a small portion of the banking industry, community banks provide—listen to this—48 percent of the small business loans in this country, 15 percent of the residential mortgage lending, 43 percent of farmland and farm lending, and 34 percent of commercial real estate loans. These banks are designed and built to serve their communities.

Since the passage of Dodd-Frank, the number of banks in this country has declined by 14 percent, and in our State of Montana, with some quick math, it is closer to 30 percent. If you are a product of rural America like I am, you know full well the consequences when a bank leaves town. It is just a matter of time before that community shrivels up. Folks, something must be done.

Eight years ago, during the dark days of the financial crisis, I proudly supported Dodd-Frank. Dodd-Frank was needed to crack down on risky financial behavior. For the most part, Dodd-Frank has been successful, but, like all major bills, Dodd-Frank had some unintended consequences. Since its passage, small business lending has declined by 41 percent. That is why our bill is needed—to bring more capital to Main Streets across America and to protect community banks from further consolidation.

Our bill provides small and midsized banks and credit unions with more

flexibility to meet the unique needs of the communities they serve. It also provides our community banks with much needed regulatory relief and cuts the redtape to keep our local banks competitive. It includes critical consumer protection provisions to better protect our veterans, our seniors, and tenants. This bipartisan bill makes it easier for young families to purchase their first home. It helps family farmers and ranchers secure the capital they need to survive a tough year when Mother Nature doesn't cooperate. It helps small businesses and startups secure the funding they need to grow their businesses and create more jobs. It protects the small banks that serve as a cornerstone of rural communities from being eaten alive by the big boys on Wall Street.

In addition to banking reform, this bill strengthens the rights of consumers. It provides consumers with unlimited free credit freezes and unfreezes. It prevents mortgage companies from immediately kicking tenants out of their homes if a landlord is foreclosed on. It increases safeguards against fraud for veterans, Active-Duty servicemembers, seniors, and children.

Over the course of this debate, there are going to be some folks who come to this floor and peddle misinformation, so let me be clear about what this bill does not do. It does not roll back the regulations on Wall Street's fat cats. It does not make structural changes to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It does not weaken or repeal the Volcker rule for large banks. It does not change the way the Federal Reserve regulates foreign banks. It does not weaken efforts to combat lending discrimination.

I have already seen a lot of falsehoods about this bill claimed out there, so I hope this debate stays grounded in the facts, and the fact is that folks in rural America need this bill.

Take for instance the Community Bank in Polson, MT. Polson's population is 5,000, and that might be generous. The Community Bank had faithfully served this community for decades, but the regulations from Dodd-Frank were so burdensome on that small bank and so costly that it was forced to sell out to a larger bank.

But it is not just Polson. Here is what other folks in my State are saying about the bill. A small credit union in Billings, MT, said:

As a small credit union, we spend a ridiculous amount of time complying with complex rules and I am pleased to see a bill that would eliminate some of this red tape so I can focus my resources on serving members.

That was from Sydney El-Bakken, manager of Homestead Federal Credit Union in Billings, MT.

This is a quote from another bank in Jordan, MT:

Dodd-Frank has disproportionately affected small banks like mine who have lim-

ited staff and resources to comply with the regulations created by the bill. Prior to Dodd-Frank's passage, my bank was able to keep up with compliance regulations with one staff member. Now, in addition to our one staff person, we also have outside compliance consultants that cost us over \$23,000 last year alone.

I am going to get back to that figure in a second.

I have talked to many of my fellow bankers who decided to sell to, or merge with, another bank. Almost every one of them has told me that the regulatory burden was one of the main reasons for them to sell or merge.

The loss of small community banks is not good for our country, our consumers, or our economy. This bill provides many remedies to lessen the regulatory burden on small banks, which allow us to remain competitive, viable, and able to serve the needs of our communities.

The reason I bring up the \$23,000 is that there are some out there who may be listening and may say that \$23,000 is not even a rounding error in a lot of businesses. Rex Phipps is the CEO of Garfield County Bank in Jordan, MT. Their total assets are \$86 million. This is a small bank that is getting pounded and that this bill is going to help in a big, big way.

I am going to tell you, I could go on reading the words of community bankers and credit union leaders and businesses in Montana that support this bill, but the bottom line is this: Folks sent us to the Senate to do something to help out the folks we represent. For too long, this body has been dragged into the mud, and as a result, we have had partisan and zero-sum policies and zero-sum politics. Dysfunction has kept this Congress from doing its job, and part of that job is to fine-tune laws to ensure that regulation fits the risk.

Enough is enough already. We must do something. And I am proud to work with 13 Republicans, 12 Democrats, and 1 Independent who worked so hard to compromise on this bill that I think works very well for rural America. The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act is a jobs bill, and it is a much needed solution for the folks who power our local economies. I look forward to this week's debate.

It is encouraging to see that the Senate is back here doing the job we were sent here to do. It is encouraging that we have a bill here that has gone through the process to gather public input, gather bipartisan support, and it is now on the floor so that we can debate it. I look forward to that debate, and I hope that debate is based on the facts.

I want to say one more thing before I yield the floor. We would not be here today without Chairman CRAPO. Chairman CRAPO has done a fine job getting everybody's opinion, respecting everybody's opinion, and walking that line to allow for negotiations and having a good bill as the final product. I

don't know what is going to be in the final managers' package, but I hope it doesn't change this bill dramatically because I think this bill really fits the needs of our economy, especially in rural America right now.

With that, I would just say, look, we have some work to do. Hopefully we can do it in a timely fashion and get this bill off to the House. Hopefully the House doesn't screw it up and we can get it to the President's desk for his signature.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Montana, Senator TESTER. Earlier in my remarks, I said that this bill had been years in the making, and Senator TESTER is one of those who have been involved the entire time, helping us to get here, as are Senator DONNELLY from Indiana and Senator WARNER, who is here—he had to step out for just a second—and Senator HEITKAMP, who was here earlier.

I now want to turn to one of our colleagues on the Republican side, Senator MORAN from Kansas, who also is one of those who have been with us for years, working to make sure we get this critically needed legislation to the floor.

Senator MORAN.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for his kind remarks, and I join my colleagues in expressing our gratitude for his efforts to make certain we are here today. What a long time it has been to get us to this point.

This is important legislation, and we ought not suggest that because there is such bipartisan support, that this is a minor accomplishment. We come together, it seems, on the small things around here, but on the big things, it seems awfully impossible for us to bridge the gap. Therefore, to suggest that what we are doing here today is nothing important would be a total mistake, would be a fabrication of the facts.

If we are successful in passing this legislation and the House accepting it in a form that is acceptable to the Senate and having it signed by the President, this legislation will make a significant and tremendous difference in America and especially on Main Street, in farms and small businesses across the country.

A significant component of what I am about in my work in the Senate is trying to make certain that my colleagues from places that are not rural understand the rural nature of much of America and understand how we do business and how things get done.

As has been indicated by many of my colleagues, in smalltown America, nothing gets done without the support of your local financial institution. We earn a living in much of Kansas by small businesses—by farms and ranches—and in the absence of access

to credit, the ability for us to continue to earn a living in smalltown America disappears.

It was a sad day when the Banking Committee—now 3 years or so ago—passed Dodd-Frank reform legislation but did so with only Republican votes. The sadness is that we were unable to find common ground and make a difference in a piece of legislation that was passed in years gone by. We were unable to make the improvements that were necessary, the changes, the alterations that could make Dodd-Frank work for rural America, that could limit its scope to Wall Street, not Main Street.

I think when Dodd-Frank was passed and many of us voted against it, Republicans were saying: We are going to repeal Dodd-Frank. That caused many Democrats to say: We are not going to let you touch Dodd-Frank. So we have been at an impasse when Republicans and Democrats alike know that this legislation, Dodd-Frank, is causing serious harm to places across the country. But we have gone to our corners. We have argued for full repeal, and you have argued that we are not going to touch it. This is a good day in which we have decided that it is neither one of those extremes. It is the idea that we can find the solutions to problems that exist as a result of legislation that Congress approved.

This legislation is important, and it matters. It is important because it demonstrates that the Senate can function in its proper form, that we can accomplish good, commonsense things. It is also important because it will alter the landscape in the future for communities across Kansas and around the country.

In rural America, we need access to credit. It is too often that access to credit is only available from that smalltown lender—that local bank, that credit union—and they know the community and know their borrowers.

Earlier, one of my colleagues talked about relationship banking. It is the banking system that many of us grew up with, and it is the banking system that still works for us in smalltown America. In the absence of the reforms included in this legislation, the ability of many of my banks in Kansas to make home loans will continue to be absent.

For the years that I have been on the Banking Committee, I have questioned the examiners, the FDIC, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the State banking commissioners: What are you doing to make certain that the regulations don't put out of business the smalltown lenders who are so important to the communities that I represent?

It seems that we have gotten lip-service: We have a committee. We have a commission. We study these things. When you ask "What rule or regulation

have you eliminated?" there is never an answer that outlines that that has happened.

Today, we are altering the opportunity for the regulators to continue to overregulate financial institutions that are only important to the communities they serve, and if they have financial challenges, it does not create a threat to the rest of our banking system or to our country's economy and fiscal condition. Relationship banking matters.

Today we have a regulatory environment in which bankers are fearful of making a home loan to a citizen within their community. If somebody wants to buy a home or build a home, they are told by their local bank: We can't afford the cost associated with the regulations for making these loans. We can't afford the risk that if we make a technical error, the financial consequences to our bank will be so great, we will be out of the home loan business.

Who would ever expect to go to their hometown bank and discover they don't make home loans? And it is not because there is not the opportunity to make a loan that will be repaid—the bank will make money, and the borrower will get the benefit of the loan—it is because, upon a mistake, the regulations are so onerous and so expensive that the business decision is made not that this person is not creditworthy but that the risk associated with the regulations is so great that they can't make the loan.

We need more banks, more financial institutions making home loans in more communities so that more people in rural America can access the American dream. If we create a banking system in which the rules and regulations dictate that every "t" must be crossed and every "i" must be dotted, and it is like you have a computer program and plug in the numbers and make a decision whether that local banker can make a loan, rural America will no longer be here.

For much of the time I have served in Congress and tried to explain rural America to my colleagues, I have indicated that in communities that I represent, it is often true that economic development can be the difference between whether or not there is a grocery store in town. Most people in Washington, DC, don't understand the nature of that small town. Is there a hardware store? Can the newspaper continue to print newspapers and sell enough advertising and subscriptions to make ends meet? When you lose your grocery store, you begin to lose your home town.

What I have learned over time is that if only that local financial institution is making a loan, are we going to have a grocery store in our town? That local relationship lender knows their community, knows their borrowers, and knows whether they have the character to repay the loan.

I saw this happen recently, and we are experiencing this in Kansas again this month. Wildfires are consuming acres of land across rural Kansas. Our grasslands are burning. A year ago this month, nearly 80 percent of Clark County, KS, was consumed in a wildfire. It is a ranching community. Ashland, the county seat, has a population of 900. That is rural. That is the biggest town in the county. As a result of those fires, thousands of head of cattle were killed in the fire or had to be euthanized. As you would think, there was a terrible economic consequence to the community. You would wonder, how do we recover? One of the things you would think about is, well, I can go to my bank and borrow money to keep my farm or my cattle operation in business. But those cattlemen no longer had any collateral. There was no collateral. You could not tell your banker: I pledge my cattle to repay the loan. If I don't repay the loan, you get my cattle. The fire consumed their opportunity to rebuild.

The Presiding Officer is a member of the Agriculture Committee. He will be asked about the safety net that is in a farm bill, and that is important to us. But the safety net that many farmers and ranchers have in Kansas is the relationship they have with their banker, who makes a decision. It is not based upon a computer program or that every "t" is crossed and every "i" is dotted. That banker makes a decision based upon the character and the relationship and the history.

Many of our banks in Kansas are owned by families. They have been in the family for generations. The same is true of our farms and ranches. That relationship allows a banker to make a loan even when there is no cattle due to the result of a natural disaster. The collateral is gone, but the banker knows the family. He knows the history and knows whether this potential borrower has character. They know that if he or she makes a promise to repay, that he or she will.

All too often, those decisions have been taken away from those relationship lenders and reside here in Washington, DC, with a myriad of regulators who are telling our bankers through their examiners, through the examination process, this is a loan you can't make or this is a loan we will write for you.

Today, we make another step in the process toward returning the ability for smalltown America—its businesses, its farmers, and its ranchers—to have a future. This is important legislation that will make a significant difference in the future of communities and the people who live in rural America and in rural Kansas.

This is not about taking care of bankers. It is not about taking care of credit unions. It is about taking care of the people they serve, their borrowers,

and that means a bright future for the rest of rural America, for the other people who live in the communities, because access to credit determines whether there is a grocery store in town or whether a farmer or a rancher can borrow money to keep their business going, to keep their farm or ranch going.

This is a good day, and I commend my colleagues. It is a good day for the Senate, to see us working together, Republicans and Democrats, to reach a result that will make a difference. It is a good day for America. It is a good day for rural America. It is an opportunity for us to correct when we went too far following the financial collapse of 2008.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I appreciate my colleagues, especially the chairman, the Senator from Idaho, for his tremendous efforts in bringing us together and getting us to this point.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MORAN, for his kind comments and especially for so clearly explaining the true beneficiaries of this legislation.

There is a lot of talk about financial institutions and even small banks and credit unions, but the real beneficiaries are the borrowers. They are the small businesses and the individuals who live in small and rural communities across this country and, frankly, even in some of our larger communities across this country. I thank you for explaining that so well.

The first words in the name of this bill are the "Economic Growth," then "Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Bill."

I would like to turn to Senator DONNELLY from Indiana—another one of the giants in terms of sticking to it and helping us get this important legislation drafted and moved to the floor.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I want to thank Chairman CRAPO and my good friend from Kansas, whose statement is so similar to mine in many ways.

In rural Indiana—you talked about relationship banking. That is, in many ways, the heartbeat of a community. Our small businesses, our farms that are handed down from generation to generation—you find the grandsons of our farmers dealing with the grandsons of the person who developed the bank. It is a privilege to be part of this.

I thank the chairman of the Banking Committee, Senator CRAPO, for leading this debate and for his good-faith efforts to make this a bipartisan process.

As we debate the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, the Senate is on the verge of doing something significant. We are breaking through the gridlock on a bipartisan legislative package to reduce unnecessary regulatory burdens on Main Street banks and credit unions,

while also expanding protections for consumers, servicemembers, and veterans.

This is an example of what we can achieve when we work together. I am proud to have worked closely with my friend the chairman, Senator CRAPO, among others, to craft this bipartisan legislation that, as my friend Senator TESTER mentioned—13 Republicans, 12 Democrats, 1 Independent.

I have worked on this issue since I came to the Senate in 2013. This bill is the result of dozens of meetings, Banking Committee hearings, and a 7½-hour committee markup, where more than 100 amendments from both sides were filed, and 36 were considered and voted on. This bill is carefully written and narrowly tailored.

This commonsense legislation is intended to help Main Street community banks and local credit unions to focus more on traditional banking—our small businesses, our farms, our families—while maintaining the safety and soundness of our financial system.

In rural areas and in many towns across my beloved home State of Indiana, Main Street community banks and credit unions are the institutions that Hoosiers turn to—whether it is a family seeking a mortgage for their first home to make their dreams come true or an entrepreneur with a dream who is looking to start a small business, create more jobs, and make his or her community grow.

Unfortunately, the 103 community banks and 154 credit unions in Indiana have been unintentionally burdened by rules and regulations that were intended to hold Wall Street accountable, to make sure they would never damage our economy again. Since 2008, the number of small business loans is down 41 percent nationally. That is according to our Federal banking regulators.

This package includes a number of important new consumer protections as well, including for servicemembers, as I mentioned, for veterans, seniors, and tenants.

One provision is based on my bipartisan Protecting Veterans Credit Act. It ensures that veterans are not wrongly penalized when the Department of Veterans Affairs is late in paying a vet's medical bills.

In response to Equifax's massive data breach and other data breaches, for the first time, every American—let me repeat that—every American would be able to freeze and unfreeze their credit free of charge and set year-long fraud alerts.

This bill also provides free credit monitoring for all Active-Duty servicemembers.

This makes a big difference. It helps folks like Cpl Logan Hartz, a Hoosier, who serves proudly in the U.S. Marine Corps. He was training at Camp Lejeune when he learned his personal

information may have been compromised by Equifax. He said it was really stressful to try to figure out what to do and challenging to get his credit frozen. Corporal Hartz says the free credit monitoring in this bill would provide peace of mind to servicemembers like him whose first focus is on protecting our country.

I also want to highlight another provision I authored on manufactured housing, which serves as a vital source of affordable housing not only in Indiana but across our country, particularly in rural and underserved communities. This effort provides a narrow exemption to allow consumers to receive general financing information from a manufacturer, while creating new disclosures to prevent conflicts of interest and prohibiting retailers from directly advising consumers on financial transactions.

This legislation has broad bipartisan support, it maintains strong financial oversight, and it adds new consumer protections. It is reasonable, it is balanced, and it is the result of very thoughtful negotiation and hard work. I am very hopeful it will pass the Senate soon.

Again, I thank our chairman, Senator CRAPO, for his bipartisan work, for his willingness to be flexible, to stay with it when it looked so difficult to get done. As a result, there are families who are going to be in homes for the first time from loans they were able to get from a banker who knew them in town, who, when every computer program showed something different, they knew the family was worth investing in. That is what this bill is going to do.

I very much thank the chairman.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I very much thank Senator DONNELLY. I truly appreciate the Senator's solid, strong, and continued commitment to making this bill work, come to be a reality, and now helping to get it across the floor of the Senate. The Senator truly is appreciated.

Next, I turn to my good friend and another great colleague on the Democratic side of the aisle, Senator WARNER from Virginia, another one of those who has consistently been there for years working to help us get to these solutions and to get them right.

Senator WARNER.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished chair.

Mr. President, first of all, let me thank my good friend, the Senator Indiana, for his great work on this and actually getting rid of half of my speech. I think he started to go through, in very good detail, a number of the new consumer protections that are put into this legislation, and a lot of that is due to his good work.

The truth is, in a few days, we may actually do something that hasn't been seen in a really long time—the Senate producing a meaningful piece of legislation with a strong bipartisan coalition.

Now, neither side got everything they wanted. I compliment the chairman for his good work, but as my friend from Indiana—you should have seen the original list of wants of the Senator from Idaho. The truth is, we are only here because, at the end of the day, we all went back and recognized the people we work for—our constituents in our respective States and, for that matter, Americans at large—one, they want to see the Senate work; and, two, they want to see it work in a meaningful way to protect people's lives. What this legislation will do is, bottom line, make sure there is more access to capital on Main Street by cutting some of the excessive regulations on community banks and credit unions, as well as a number of the consumer protection items and others that have been put forward. It also provides some relief for regional banks and, as mentioned, major expansion of consumer protections.

Let me also step back. As somebody who got to the Senate right after the financial crisis, we all know the system needed stronger financial reform a decade ago, and I am very proud of the role I played, in some small way, on drafting Dodd-Frank. Title I and title II were areas that then-Chairman Dodd gave me a great deal of responsibility.

Let me be clear that I will do nothing and support no legislation that seriously undermines or cuts back on the provisions and the systemic protections that were put in place by title I and title II and, for that matter, for all of Dodd-Frank, but 8 years later—2 years it took us to do the bill—there is widespread agreement that some of the standards we set in Dodd-Frank needed time for review.

One of those was the standard we put in place at the \$50 billion threshold for enhanced prudential standards. We know, 8 years later, that number is just too low. There is a legitimate debate about where that standard should be reset, but recognizing that this standard was set 8 years ago at \$50 billion, if you just take inflation and growth in the economy, it would be dramatically different. That is a view shared by Federal Reserve Gov. Dan Tarullo, who is the architect of much of the legislation implementing Dodd-Frank. It is also the view of former Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen and current Reserve Chair Jay Powell.

The fact is, there is an awful lot of difference even between some of these regional banks and some of the largest six banks in our country. At this point, they still control about 60 percent of all total assets.

If we don't do this legislation, what we will see—and this is where, again, I have to disagree with some of my Democratic colleagues—is there will be more pressure on consolidation, not only for community banks and credit unions but, for that matter, more con-

solidation among regional banks, which will place more and more power in those largest of institutions, where I think we have pretty good protections and protections that we don't want back at all in this legislation, but I don't think we ought to encourage that greater consolidation. So, again, we focus not only on community banks and credit unions but also on some of these regional banks.

I want to make clear, what we have done is make no changes to the applicability of enhanced prudential standards for the big banks with assets above \$250 billion. These are both the largest and, in many ways, because of some of their products, the riskiest financial institutions, and the full set of postcrisis regulations should apply to them, but we have required the Fed to tailor those standards appropriately for banks with total assets between \$100 billion and \$250 billion. I want to highlight that the bill actually sets a very low bar for the Fed to apply enhanced standards to regional banks.

Under the bill, the Fed can apply enhanced prudential standards to a bank with assets larger than \$100 billion for financial stability reasons or to promote the safety and soundness of the bank—part of their traditional prudential regulations as they stand, but I don't think every enhanced prudential standard should apply to every bank with assets larger than \$100 billion. There is a broad agreement that standards should be tailored for this group.

Again, let me cite someone whom most of the folks on this side of the aisle, myself included, have a great deal of respect for: former Fed Chair Janet Yellen. She called this bill “a move in a direction that we think would be good.”

More recently, Chairman Powell testified that the Fed will implement standards over the next 18 months for banks with assets between \$100 billion and \$250 billion. Chairman Powell also testified that the regional banks will continue to be subject to the most important enhanced prudential standard: meaningful, strong, and frequent stress tests. Those are his words, not mine. He called himself a strong believer in stress testing. Again, let me say, so am I.

Critically, again, this bill does not change the existing requirement that the Fed conduct annual stress tests on banks with assets larger than \$250 billion. I know I am getting into a lot of details, but details in banking regulations are important. Again, unfortunately, I don't think some of my colleagues who are in opposition to the bill are setting out what this bill truly does or doesn't do.

Again, let me point out another thing on stress tests. The bill also does not alter the comprehensive capital analysis and review or what banking regulators call the CCAR process. The

Fed capital planning process is actually not part of Dodd-Frank, but it is another core pillar of the Fed's supervisory regime. We believe it should continue to apply as much as it does today.

So for banks within this \$100 billion to \$250 billion range, you have not only CCAR, but you have the chairman himself saying he will put in place—some-what similar to the existing DFAST stress test—meaningful, strong, and frequent stress tests. As has been mentioned as well, banks with assets above \$250 billion should expect to have the annual stress test.

Let me touch on another subject, foreign banks. Another thing this bill does not do is change the enhanced prudential standards applied to the largest foreign banks' U.S. operations. This gets pretty technical, but I think for the record it is important that it is reflected.

All foreign G-SIBs that have total consolidated assets greater than \$250 billion have enhanced prudential standards, and those enhanced prudential standards will continue to apply to these largest and systemic important foreign banks, and the Fed will continue to have the authority to apply these enhanced prudential standards on foreign banks with total consolidated assets of more than \$100 billion.

So a large foreign bank—let's say Deutsche Bank, for example, that had problems recently—that may have only \$100 billion or less than \$250 billion of American assets, but the fact that their consolidated balance sheet has greater than \$250 billion will mean that the Fed will continue to enhance the full G-SIB regulation.

Again, let's move to Chairman Powell. He was approved by 84 Senators to this post—40 Democrats. He made clear in his Banking Committee testimony that the Fed requires establishment of intermediate holding companies by certain foreign banking organizations independently of Dodd-Frank. Chair Powell made clear that nothing in this bill requires any change to the IHC requirement. This is by design, as we believe the IHC requirement is an important innovation that greatly helps international holding companies. For those keeping track of these comments, it is an important innovation that greatly helps the Federal Reserve supervise and apply enhanced prudential standards to the U.S. operations of foreign banks.

As explained by the Federal Reserve in its final rule, in applying enhanced prudential standards to foreign banking organizations, there were unique financial stability issues associated with some of the large foreign banks' operations in the United States during the crisis.

We remember that it was some of the foreign banks and operations in the United States that were part of causing

the crisis back in 2008, and those enhanced standards need to stay in place.

In that final rule and in other rules implementing prudential requirements for the intermediate holding companies of foreign banks, the Federal Reserve has distinguished between which standards should apply to U.S. banks and the IHCs of foreign banks and how they should apply it.

The Federal Reserve remains fully capable of assessing the unique risks associated with large foreign banks' U.S. operations and applying appropriate enhanced prudential standards on these institutions and their IHCs, giving due regard to the principle of competitive equality, while remaining focused on the mandate under this bill and under section 165 of Dodd-Frank to protect financial stability and safety and soundness.

This is the final point I want to make. I also want to make clear that my support for section 402 in this bill—again, which deals with a technical issue but a very important issue, the supplemental leverage issue, which excludes deposits from the calculation of supplemental leverage ratio for custody banks—this exclusion for custody banks, those assets deposited within a central bank, such as the Fed, while we are carving out this one exclusion, it does not mean that I support removing other assets from the calculation of that leverage ratio.

Again, there is widespread agreement from former Governor Tarullo to current Chair Powell that the leverage ratio should not be the binding capital constraint on custody banks because of a unique business model that relies on less risky business.

When the leverage ratio is the binding constraint on a business, it encourages actually riskier activity and rewards making bets that tend to decrease, rather than increase, safety and soundness. That gives the wrong incentive. This bill will fix the narrow problem that exists for custody banks and goes no further.

I personally say that I would have no support for any movement further than what is narrowly carved out in this bill.

I know my friend the Senator from Vermont is here, and he will have a different opinion on some of these issues, but I want to again thank Senator CRAPO. As well, I do hope we will have a chance to enter into further colloquy on this debate and to further make clear for the record both his and my support for strong capital, that our system is stronger and, particularly for the largest institutions, that nothing we are doing will reverse keeping American banks the strongest in the world.

I know there are strong opinions on the other side. I look forward to the continued debate. I look forward to a managers' package that I believe will

actually continue to expand certain areas around consumer protections and other areas where there is broad-based general agreement. I look forward to the conclusion of this debate and an amendment process that again allows other issues to be vetted.

With that, I thank the chairman, and I look forward to further discussions.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I thank Senator WARNER, my good friend and colleague from Virginia. I see that Senator SANDERS from Vermont is here and the time has arrived for his time on the floor.

I will just conclude by saying that I agree with Senator WARNER. We both support strong capital standards for our banks. I have a pretty solid, long speech on that that I was going to give if there was time. I will give it later.

I agree with Senator WARNER that one thing we need to make clear is that the foreign banks with \$250 billion in global consolidated assets will continue and still be subject to enhanced standards. Our bill does nothing to change that.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I could ask the Senator a question—we may come back for a more formal colloquy at some point. We are working on some additional language to further reinforce this point.

I thank the chairman for his good work on this bill. I am thankful for the fact that the legislative RECORD will reflect at least this short conversation and other speeches and conversations which recognize that a consolidated balance sheet of foreign banks, if they only have \$100 billion in assets in the United States but \$1 trillion in total assets, will still be subject to the enhanced prudential standards.

Again, I thank the chairman and look forward to continued debate.

Mr. CRAPO. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I get around my own State of Vermont a lot. In fact, I get around the country a lot. I hear from a lot of people and I talk to a lot of people about what is on their minds.

Needless to say, in these very complicated and difficult times, there is a lot the American people are concerned about. They are concerned about gun violence, and they want strong legislation to be passed as soon as possible to protect their kids and the American people.

Overwhelmingly, they want legislation—over 80 percent of the American people in poll after poll—want legislation to protect the 1.8 million young people who are eligible for the DACA Program. That is what people talk about.

People talk about the high cost of healthcare, and they talk about the

fact that they cannot afford prescription drugs because the drug companies are ripping us off every single day.

They talk about climate change and their fear about what kind of planet we are going to be leaving our kids and our grandchildren if we don't transform our energy system away from fossil fuel.

The people I talk to in Vermont and throughout the country talk about our crumbling infrastructure.

They talk about the need for decent-paying jobs.

They talk about the high cost of a college education. I just talked to a teacher the other day in Wisconsin. She had tears in our eyes because she cannot afford to send her own daughter to college. I talk, every day it seems, to people who graduate from college, \$30,000, \$50,000, \$100,000 in debt, and they wonder how that debt will impact the rest of their lives.

I talk to people in Vermont and around the country about the childcare crisis that we have and about the lack of affordable housing and about a million other issues that are on the minds of people in Arizona, in Vermont, and all across this country.

But I can honestly say that I have not heard one person come up to me and say: Bernie, we have to deregulate 25 of the largest banks in this country with cumulative assets of \$3.5 trillion. No one has ever come up to me and said that is a major priority for the American people. No one has ever suggested to me that instead of talking this week about and moving forward on gun safety legislation or the DACA issue or the high cost of prescription drugs, we should be here on the floor of the U.S. Senate talking about the needs of some of the largest banks in this country. But that is precisely what the Senate will be discussing this week and probably next week as well.

If you want to know why the American people, in very, very strong numbers, hold the U.S. Congress in contempt, it is precisely because we have a Republican leadership that does exactly the opposite of what the American people want. And it is not just not dealing with the DACA issue or dealing with the gun violence issue. Over the last year, despite the overwhelming objections of the American people, Republican leadership tried to throw some 32 million Americans off of health insurance. Thank God we were able to beat that back.

At a time of massive income and wealth inequality, the American people do not believe that the Koch brothers and other billionaires should receive massive tax breaks. That is exactly what the Republican leadership provided.

And on and on it goes.

The needs of the middle class and working families are ignored while the needs of the wealthy and powerful, including Wall Street, are addressed.

Today, my Republican colleagues, along with some Democrats, tell us that what we should be doing right now is spending our time on deregulating some of the largest banks in America. How absurd is that? Not gun violence, not the DACA crisis, not the high cost of prescription drugs, not 30 million people without health insurance, but deregulating some of the largest banks in America.

Are our memories so short that we learned nothing from the 2008 Wall Street crash? Have we learned nothing from the savings and loan disaster of the early 1990s or the thievery of Wells Fargo over the last couple of years or the dishonesty of Equifax or the accounting fraud at Enron and Arthur Anderson or the failure of long-term capital management or the billions of dollars in fines that financial institution after financial institution has paid out for illegal or deceptive activities?

Just 10 years ago, as a result of the greed and the recklessness and the illegal behavior on Wall Street, this country was plunged into the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. The official unemployment rate shot up to 10 percent and the real unemployment rate jumped to over 17 percent. At the height of the financial crisis, more than 27 million Americans were unemployed, underemployed, or stopped working altogether because they could not find employment.

Fifteen million families, as a result of that financial crisis, lost their homes to foreclosure as more and more people could not afford to pay their mortgages. Thousands of Americans set up tent cities in Sacramento, Fresno, Tampa Bay, and Reno because they had no place left to live.

As a result of the illegal behavior of Wall Street, American households lost over \$13 trillion in savings, which shattered retirement dreams, wiped out life savings, and made it impossible for parents to send their kids to college. That is what Wall Street did 10 years ago. Against my strong opposition then, Congress and the Federal Reserve provided the largest taxpayer bailout in the history of the world to these huge banks because they were too big to fail.

But now, 10 years later, hoping that we forget all about that, these large financial institutions are back again. How pathetic is that? Just yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office told us that the legislation we are debating today will “increase the likelihood that a large financial firm with assets of between \$100 billion and \$250 billion would fail.” That is from the CBO.

In other words, this legislation makes it more likely that we will see another financial crisis and makes it more likely that there will be another huge taxpayer bailout and massive dislocation of our economy.

Under this bill, large banks with assets of up to \$250 billion will no longer

have to submit comprehensive plans on winding down if they fail. They will no longer have to hold sufficient capital in case their loans go bad. And they may never have to undergo a stress test to find out if they are adequately prepared to withstand an economic downturn.

Further, this legislation makes it easier for financial institutions to offer bogus subprime mortgages that caused so many Americans to suffer during the 2008 financial crisis.

This legislation makes it easier for large banks to steer African Americans, Hispanics, and the elderly into mortgages with high interest rates and hidden fees.

This legislation deregulates foreign banks like Deutsche Bank—a bank that in January of 2017 agreed to a \$7.2 billion settlement for selling toxic mortgages during the financial crisis.

This legislation guts the Volker rule, allowing banks all over this country to gamble with the bank deposits of their customers on risky derivative schemes that were at the heart of the financial meltdown.

Let us be very clear. The major banks that we are deregulating in this bill were forced to pay over \$49 billion in fines for a wide variety of fraudulent and deceptive activity. These very same banks received a taxpayer bailout of \$47 billion from the Treasury and trillions in financial assistance from the Federal Reserve. Many of these banks, it should be pointed out, like Wall Street in general, have enjoyed record-breaking profits over the last 2 years. They are not coming here because they are losing money. Over the last 2 years, most of these banks have done very, very well.

So how does it happen that Congress finds itself worrying about the needs of huge financial institutions but ignores the concerns of ordinary Americans? The answer, as I think most Americans understand, has everything to do with following the money. Follow the money.

Since the 1990s, the financial sector has given more than \$3.2 billion in campaign contributions and last year alone spent over \$200 million on lobbying. If you want to hear about the corruption of the American political system, here it is. Since the 1990s, the financial sector has given more than \$3.2 billion in campaign contributions and last year alone spent over \$200 million on lobbying. That is why Congress will be spending day after day trying to make life easier for these large financial institutions, while at the same time ignoring the needs of working families.

No, we can't get a bill on the floor of the Senate that will lower the cost of prescription drugs. We can't do that. The American people overwhelmingly want us to act on gun violence. We can't do that. We are not able to pro-

tect the 1.8 million young people who are eligible for the DACA Program. We can't do that. But we can spend a week or two worrying about the needs of some of the largest financial institutions in this country. And that is why the American people are disgusted with what goes on in Washington, DC.

I have a radical idea, and that is that maybe—just maybe—instead of listening to the lobbyists here in DC, maybe we should listen to the American people, who believe that we should strengthen, not weaken, Wall Street regulations.

Believe it or not—of course we are not going to hear any discussion of this at all—believe it or not, the four largest banks in America are, on average, 80 percent bigger today than they were before we bailed them out because they were too big to fail. Incredibly, the six largest banks in America—this is wealth. This is power. This is who owns America. The six largest banks in America have over \$10 trillion in assets—six banks, \$10 trillion—equivalent to 54 percent of the GDP of this Nation. The six largest banks hold more than half of all credit card debt, control over 90 percent of all bank derivatives, underwrite a third of all mortgages, and control over 40 percent of all bank deposits. If any of these financial institutions were to get into financial trouble again, there is no doubt in my mind that once again the taxpayers of this country would be asked to bail them out—except this time, the bailout might be even larger than it was in 2008.

Now is not the time to be talking about deregulating large financial institutions—quite the contrary. If a financial institution is too big to fail, in my view, it is too big to exist. Now is the time to take on the greed and power of Wall Street and break up the largest financial institutions in this country, and I will be introducing an amendment to this bill to do just that.

I understand fully, as the American people do, the power of Wall Street and the huge amounts of money they spend on campaign contributions and lobbying. That should not, however, intimidate us. Now is the time for us to have the courage to stand up to these very wealthy and powerful institutions, defeat this legislation, and support the needs of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

SCHOOL SAFETY AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, later this week Senators Blunt, Cassidy, Collins, Roberts, and Young will join me in introducing the School Safety and Mental Health Services Improvement Act.

Three weeks ago, 14 high school students, a teacher, a coach, and an athletic director were killed at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL. As the authorities tried

to get to the bottom of exactly what happened in the shooting, many of us in local, state, and federal government have been looking at what can be done to help keep students safe at school. We can't stand still and do nothing while our children are being killed.

I am the chairman of the Senate Health and Education Committee and sponsor, with Senator MURRAY, of the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, which reauthorized the law overseeing kindergarten, elementary, and secondary education. I also sponsored with Senator MURRAY the 21st Century Cures Act of 2016, which made the first major mental health reforms in a decade, focusing the federal government's efforts on early intervention.

The bill I am introducing this week with several of my colleagues will help States use every federal dollar available to them to keep their schools safer from violence and have the mental health services they need. This is complementary to a bill Senator HATCH introduced this week that addresses programs in the Judiciary Committee to improve school safety and stop school violence.

There are 100,000 public schools in the United States, and most of the responsibility for making them safer for children lies with the State and local governments and families and communities that provide 90 percent of school funding. But the Federal Government can and should help create an environment where communities, school boards, and States can create safer schools.

Under this bill, the Federal Government can help in the following four ways:

No. 1, allow schools to use title II funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to hire more counselors.

About a fifth of all children age 9 to 17 have "a diagnosable mental or addictive disorder that causes at least minimal impairment." In the 2014-to-2015 school year, there was a counselor-to-student ratio of 482 to 1, while the American School Counselor Association recommends a counselor-to-student ratio of 250 to 1. This bill would help schools make up that difference.

No. 2, make it clear that schools can use federal funding they are already receiving through titles II and IV under the Every Student Succeeds Act to improve the professional development of school counselors and to improve the school safety infrastructure, including installing new alarm systems, improving entrances and exits of schools, installing security cameras, and other infrastructure upgrades.

No. 3, our bill renews and updates a law to expand a successful program that helped to train education personnel and ensure children have the services they need after a violent incident. This program was piloted after

the shooting in Newtown, CT, and has shown to be effective.

No. 4, create an interagency task force led by the Secretary of Education, with the Departments of Health and Human Services, Justice, Homeland Security, Interior, and Defense, to make recommendations—not mandates; recommendations—on best practices, policies, and procedures to improve school safety and school safety infrastructure.

This bill would encourage and reinforce for Tennessee and for all other States that Federal dollars may be used to hire more counselors, psychologists, and other mental health professionals at schools; to build safety infrastructure—such as securing doors, automatic locks, and smart entrances—to prevent intruders; and to develop mental health programs to identify children who might be dangerous to other children.

While most of the responsibility for improving the safety of our schools and the environment or climate of our schools rests with local and State officials, the federal government has a role to play.

In conclusion, in addition to the policies in this bill that I described, I support President Trump's directive to the Department of Justice to craft regulations to ban so-called "bump stocks," which have the effect of making a semiautomatic firearm function more like an automatic firearm.

I, along with 49 other Senators, have cosponsored bipartisan legislation to have more effective background checks. This legislation, sponsored by Senator MURPHY and Senator CORNYN, would ensure that Federal agencies and States get information about individuals who should be prohibited from buying a gun through the National Instant Background Check System.

I hope my colleagues will cosponsor and support our legislation to help States use every Federal resource available to them to keep their schools safer from violence and have the mental health services they need.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, this week we are considering a bill to roll back the rules on some of the biggest banks in the country. Over the course of this week, I am going to be spending a lot of time on the Senate floor talking about the problems with this bill and how it threatens working families and American taxpayers, but I want to start by looking back to 2008 and the reason we have these rules in the first place.

Ten years ago next week, Americans started holding our breaths. For years, financial institutions had been riding high, selling dangerous products to consumers, and making risky bets. All the while, Washington looked the other

way, cozying up to big banks, loosening rules left and right, and shrugging off rules they couldn't get rid of. And no wonder—the revolving door was spinning like crazy. Bank officials became regulators and then went back to the banks, getting richer and richer. Bank profits were sky high and getting higher.

But business built on scams and hype can't grow forever. Ten years ago this month, Bear Stearns, an 85-year-old institution on Wall Street, went belly up because of \$46 billion in scam mortgages and other questionable investments on its books. The failure gave the rest of the world a glimpse of Wall Street's addiction to risky bets. The disease spread. It turned out that a lot of other banks had invested heavily in scam mortgages too. Investors panicked, sending the markets into a nose-dive.

When the American economy fell off a cliff in 2008, American families got crushed. Almost 9 million people lost their jobs. Workers lost \$2.6 trillion from their retirement accounts—about 25 percent of their savings for someone who had been working for 20 years. In 2008 alone, foreclosures spiked 81 percent, and 3.1 million notices went out to homeowners across the country telling them they would lose their homes. In a single year, 1 out of 54 homes in the United States was in foreclosure.

Behind those enormous numbers were real people and real families whose lives were shaken up and turned upside down, little kids who worried about where they were going to live, and bigger kids who worried about whether they would lose their chance to go to college.

I know that feeling. I lived in Oklahoma City, and my folks had picked out our house because it was right inside the boundary line of what my mother believed was the best school district in the county. Our lives seemed to be on track right up until the day my daddy had a heart attack, and then it all started sliding sideways. He was out of work for a very long time.

My mother usually picked me up from school in our bronze, two-toned station wagon, and one day she showed up driving the old, off-white Studebaker that daddy had been driving back and forth to work. As I climbed into the car, I asked where our station wagon was.

It is gone.

Gone where?

Gone.

I just kept pushing. My mother was staring straight ahead, fingers tight on the steering wheel, and after one more "Where?" from me, she answered in a low voice: We couldn't pay. They took it.

The house was next in line. My family was right on the brink of foreclosure when my mom put on her best dress, walked into the Sears, and landed a minimum-wage job. But that feeling—the feeling of being on the brink,

the feeling of no security, nothing under your feet—is a feeling no family in this country should have, especially not have it because Congress decided it was OK to let the big banks gamble with the economy again. Yet here we are, on the verge of making the same mistake Congress has made so many times before.

The banks don't want you to know what is in this bill because if you did know, you would fight back. It was written by Senators in back rooms and jammed through the Banking Committee, where its authors voted down every single amendment, every single idea to make the bill even one smidgen better or protect consumers just one tiny bit more. They voted against every amendment, even if they agreed with it, because Republicans and Democrats had locked arms to do the bidding of the big banks.

There is a lot of dangerous stuff in this bill. Today I want to focus on the harm it will do to America's consumers, but I will start with what is not in the bill because what is not in the bill should make Congress ashamed. Strong consumer protections—that is what is not in this bill. Banks get their wish list, but consumers get next to nothing. This bill is called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, but in all 148 pages, there are only a few watered-down provisions to help consumers.

Equifax loses data for nearly half of all adults in America, lies about it, and this Congress, these Senators, still can't manage to pass a bill with some teeth in it to hold the company accountable. That says it all.

This bill was written by big banks to help big banks. It is not a bill to help American families who are still getting cheated by the companies that make huge profits off them.

What is actually in this bill? Start with the first part of the bill, section 101, "Improving Consumer Access to Mortgage Credit." When you get a mortgage, usually your lender spends some time combing through your financial records to make sure you can repay the loan. That is good. American families don't want to take out loans they can't afford, and banks don't want to make loans that can't be repaid.

Before the financial crisis, that whole process went haywire. Lenders were making crazy loans with balloon payments and exotic features that consumers didn't understand. Lenders didn't care if their customers could repay. Why? Because they got their fees up front and then sold the loans to distant investors, and the original lender was long gone before the homeowner got in trouble. But the families were stuck. Eventually, the payments skyrocketed, and homeowners who couldn't keep up defaulted and lost their homes.

After the crisis, Congress changed the rules. They told lenders that they had to start underwriting their loans again to protect consumers and the economy. But that takes time and money, so Congress told the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to write a rule that says that there is no need to investigate if the lender knows that it is issuing a super-safe, boring, plain-vanilla loan. OK. That sounds reasonable. But section 101 of this bill is not reasonable. It takes the CFPB rule and stretches it in all directions, tearing open big, dangerous loopholes. This bill that is on the floor says: Banks, have some fun out there. It says: Bring back the greatest hits of the financial crisis housing scams. Scoop up profits on the front end, and leave families holding the bag on the back end.

I understand breaks for banks that make straightforward loans, but these loans in this bill are too risky and they come at a bad time. Rising interest rates mean that exotic products like adjustable rate mortgages are starting to make a comeback. Bank lobbyists are dragging us back to the bad old days when banks had free reign to scam their customers.

Here is another section. Section 104 makes it harder to enforce anti-discrimination laws by telling loads of institutions that they don't have to comply with a law called the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, or HMDA. HMDA requires most financial institutions to tell the public and the CFPB who they are lending to and at what rates and what terms. Regulators and law enforcement then use that data to make sure that American families don't have a harder time getting one of those loans because of who they are or where they come from.

This bill takes a sledgehammer to HMDA by exempting 85 percent of banks from reporting HMDA data. If this bill passes, there will be entire communities in America where there will be no data whatsoever, which means there will be no ability to monitor whether people are getting cheated because of their race or their gender.

Once again, this couldn't come at a worse time. Lending discrimination is real. A new, comprehensive report that looked at housing markets all across the country just came out from the Center for Investigative Reporting and Reveal, and its findings should make us all sick to our stomachs.

In 2015 and 2016, nearly two-thirds of mortgage lenders denied loans to people of color at higher rates than for White people. According to Reveal, in the Washington metro area, "in 2016, Native American applicants were 2.3 times as likely to be denied a conventional home mortgage as white applicants. For black applicants, it was 2.2 times as likely. For Latino applicants, it was 1.9 times as likely. For Asian applicants, it was 1.6 times as likely."

The Reveal report showed that this problem happens in giant banks and also in small banks.

Here is the thing: None of that analysis—none of it—would have been possible without HMDA data from big institutions and small ones. Without the data, we would all be sitting in the dark, wondering if maybe some mortgage lenders discriminated against African Americans or women or Native Americans, but we wouldn't have any way to know. That means we wouldn't have any way to change it if it was happening. Gutting HMDA allows us—actually forces us—to look the other way when discrimination happens, and that is disgraceful.

There is one more section in this bill that really hurts consumers; that is, section 107, "Protecting Access to Manufactured Homes." Eighteen million Americans live in manufactured homes. Many are low-income, elderly, or disabled. It is a good option for many Americans, especially in rural areas, but it is very important to make sure buyers don't get scammed.

Under today's law, mortgage lenders cannot steer a borrower toward a higher cost loan so the lender can get a kickback. That is the law today but not if this bill passes. Instead, the rules for mobile home lenders will be weaker rules, and that means it will be much easier to cheat buyers of mobile homes.

Congress imposed strict requirements on loan originators because Congress knew most of us don't buy a lot of homes in our lifetime, and we rely on the people helping us through the process to tell it straight. Owners of mobile homes deserve the same protection as people who buy brick-and-mortar homes. They need that protection.

Abusive lending practices are rampant in the manufactured housing industry. In 2015, the Seattle Times wrote about Kirk and Patricia Ackley in Ephrata, WA. Kirk worked construction, and Patricia worked at Walmart. They had already bought the foundation for their new mobile home when they sat down to close on their mortgage. What happened at closing? Surprise. The interest rate was higher than they had been told, and the payments were larger than they could afford. The mortgage broker then convinced them to go ahead and sign up anyway, promising that they could refinance that loan later on.

You can probably guess the end of the story. The Ackleys signed, the lender wouldn't refinance, they lost all the money they had put in up front, and they lost their home. It turns out that the homebuilder, the dealer, and the mortgage lender—all three of them—were owned by one company, Clayton Homes. All the incentives were to push the Ackleys into a loan they couldn't afford because Clayton got the purchase price, the commissions, and the fees, and they got the mobile home

back again. No one was looking out for the Ackleys.

The backers of this bill say that this provision will help small lenders, but the truth is that manufactured home lending is mostly done by giant lenders like Clayton. In fact, in 2013, Clayton alone—one company—provided 39 percent of mobile home loans. Savings from rolling back these consumer protections would go right out of the pockets of working families like the Ackleys and right into the pockets of dealers like Clayton.

The Ackleys' story is not unique. I wish it were. These same problems happen all over the country, and they are exacerbated by the special characteristics of mobile homes. The lifespan of a manufactured home is shorter than a traditional home. That means the purchaser may not be able to take out equity by reselling it.

A woman from Oklahoma told the CFPB:

I was given a loan for a single width mobile home through [a mortgage company]. They switched it to Green Tree and next to Ditech. The home started deteriorating in 10 years and is now unsafe to live in, as I have had electrical problems and many of the pipes are broken where the bathtub and faucets in the master bathroom are not functioning. The floor under the shower has completely caved in, windows are crooked and allow flies to get into the house in warm weather. Most of the floors have buckled under the legs of furniture, and the rain has caused the areas around the windows to buckle. Walls are little more than cardboard. I believe the flooring is waferboard and unfit for floor foundation.

When I tried to trade this [model], the dealer [] told me he couldn't because the house is worth much less than what I owe and that this sounded like a Predatory Mortgage Loan. He said that mobile homes do not have 30 year mortgages because they don't last that long. He said my loan should have been a 15 year loan at the most. Also, right before Ditech took the predatory loan over, they added about {\$100.00} to my monthly payments, which went from {\$360.00} to {\$460.00} a month. Ditech claims the {\$100.00} is for insurance; however, as of yet they have repaired nothing, although I have made several claims.

I was also told I should complain because when they put the mobile home on my property, they did not put it on a cement foundation and instead put it on the ground, which has caused the home to sink.

This bill is designed to make it easier for the lender/dealer to squeeze people like this woman from Oklahoma.

This bill is a punch in the gut to American consumers. If it passes, it will be harder to police banks that sell abusive mortgages, harder to police lenders who discriminate against their customers, and harder to police giant monopolies that build, sell, and offer financing to mobile home buyers. Only a bunch of bank lobbyists and their friends in Washington would call this a consumer protection bill.

American families weren't in the back room when this bill was written. They don't have millions of dollars in

campaign cash to get Senators' attention. They don't keep an army of lobbyists on their payroll. No. American families are busy going to work, helping the kids with homework, and trying to catch up on a thousand things. They are trying to pay off student loans or maybe save a little for their own kids to go to college. Some are trying to put aside a few bucks for a mortgage so they can buy a home. They trust us to stand up for them and make sure they have a fair shot at home ownership, at the American dream. They trust us to make sure we are not turning over the keys to our economy to the same people who crashed it 10 years ago and ran over a bunch of American families on the way.

I know we are outnumbered, but this fight isn't over. Make no mistake—I am going to do whatever I can to convince enough other Senators that this is a bad deal for American families and a dangerous one. I will push and I will tug and I will talk to anyone who will listen about how this bill will hurt the people we were sent here to represent. And maybe, just maybe, for once, the Senate will start listening to voters instead of donors.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1551

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I have been in Congress now for about 18 years—12 years in the House and now 6 in the Senate. It is an honor of a lifetime, obviously, to represent Arizona here.

After being here so long, I have to say I get a little defensive when I hear somebody say that Congress is incapable of solving big problems. Yet it is a hard point to argue after watching the Senate squander the best opportunity we have had in a long time to pass legislation to protect young immigrants who are impacted by an uncertain future of the DACA Program and to strengthen security along the border. Somehow, despite sweeping public support for both of these items, we have been incapable of finding a compromise that can garner the support of 60 Senators. To say this has been a disappointment would be an understatement.

I do appreciate Majority Leader MCCONNELL's attempt to facilitate an open debate. I truly believe he wanted this process to provide the necessary dialogue so as to deliver an effective bipartisan solution. I am certainly not alone in my efforts to forge genuine

consensus on these subjects. There are a lot of Senators on both sides of the aisle who want to fix this problem. Unfortunately, as too often happens, the siren call of politics brought too many of us back into partisan trenches and blocked any hope of real results.

There are teachers and students and members of the military who are DACA recipients. They are friends and colleagues who represent the very best ideas of America. They are hard workers and productive members of their families and communities. They don't have the luxury of being able to admit defeat and move on to the next topic.

Likewise, those of us from border States, like Arizona, know that law enforcement officers who are tasked with patrolling the borders and protecting our neighborhoods just can't give up and go home. We have neighbors and family members who simply cannot shrug off failure and accept the status quo when it comes to securing the border.

That is why I have introduced legislation to extend DACA protections for 3 years and to provide 3 years of increased funding for border security. I am the first to admit that this is far from a perfect solution, but it does provide a temporary fix to these crucial problems. It begins the process of improving border security, and it ensures that DACA recipients will not lose protections and be left to face potential deportation.

We in Congress have too regularly confused action with results and have been entirely too comfortable with ignoring problems when they seem too difficult to actually solve. To put it as bluntly as possible, this is not something we can ignore any longer.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP for joining me as a cosponsor on this bill and for illustrating that the drive to get something done on these issues is a bipartisan effort. She has been a trusted partner on border security and sensible immigration reform measures.

We may not be able to deliver a permanent solution to these problems, but we cannot completely abdicate the responsibility of Congress to solve them. There are many people whose lives and well-being depend on our ability to deliver meaningful results here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 300, H.R. 1551. I further ask that the Flake substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object. There is no question that I want to see legislative

solutions here, and I am actually glad to stand with my colleague from Arizona to talk about how we get a solution on this issue.

As we have seen from Congress, especially over the last 20 years, the challenge has been, if Congress does a temporary patch once, it will do it 20 times again. My concern is for the 7,500 DACA kids who are in my State of Oklahoma. They are looking for an actual solution. They want a sense of permanence. Their status has been in limbo since 2012. The question is, Can we actually resolve this for them?

I have put forward a presentation—Senator FLAKE has been passionate about this as well—for those individuals to actually end up toward naturalization, not to have a temporary patch of just being in limbo status again. It would be to work them through a process to get them in a line in which they actually end up in naturalization at the end of it. At the same time, there would be border security and some other things that we think would be connected to it. I would like to see us work through this process to actually get to a resolution. A couple of Federal courts have pushed back on the administration and have bought Congress a little more time to be able to resolve this issue. I would like for us to use the better wisdom of that to actually get to a solution during this time period.

The goal is: How do we get this resolved?

I am pleased to say the President has moved a long way on this issue. The President has laid out naturalization for 1.8 million people, has dealt with border security, and has engaged in a conversation to actually get it resolved. We had a completely failed effort a couple of weeks ago with four different proposals coming up, with all four of them getting bipartisan support, but with all four of them failing. I would love to see us get on any one of them and start amending it.

The Senator from Arizona and I have already had conversations about changes that I would like to see even in some of the bills that I supported, but the way to resolve that is get on one of them. Let's actually start amending one, and at the end of it, let's let this body work its will. The frustration I have had with this body in these 3 short years that I have been here is, most of the time, we fail to even debate an issue. When it requires 60 votes to even open debate on something, we just, simply, start the process, never get 60, never debate it, never resolve it. Then this body just moves on to another topic.

I commend my colleague from Arizona for reminding this body again that we have an unanswered issue still sitting out there that needs to be resolved. I agree with him completely on that one. Let's get on it. Let's resolve

it long term, and let's provide a sense of permanency to this solution, not another temporary patch that will end up being the same temporary patch we will do 3 years from now, 3 years after that, and 3 years after that.

May I remind our body that we are on our fourth continuing resolution just this year. We need to resolve this and take the moment to be able to do that.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2579

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify his request so that the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2579. I further ask that the pending amendments be withdrawn with the exception of the Grassley amendment No. 1959. Finally, I ask that the Grassley amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to modify his request?

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me just say that we had a debate for a week, and I commend the Senator from Oklahoma for his hard work on this topic and constructive contribution during that entire time. We considered several proposals, one of which was this proposal, the Grassley amendment. It did get bipartisan support, but it still fell well short of the goal. I think there were 39 votes in favor. We had bipartisan support for a countermeasure that I supported, but we failed to get the 60 votes as well. We got only 54.

I would love to get a permanent solution. I have been working my entire 18 years in this body to try to get comprehensive immigration reform through. The problem is what has been proposed as an amendment here is, for all intents and purposes, comprehensive immigration reform, which, in moving ahead, would make changes to the legal immigration structure. That is, simply, too much to bite off at this time.

As much as I don't like to do it, I am offering something that is a stopgap, but at least it is for 3 years. At least it will give 3 years to those who are affected and give us in Congress some time to actually come to a solution. What we cannot do is force these kids through more uncertainty. I would love to get to a permanent solution. That is what I have tried to do for a number of years here. I know the Senator from Oklahoma has, as well, but we just cannot do it right now.

I prefer to simply go with the 3 for 3 amendment for which I am asking 3 years of extended protections on DACA in exchange for 3 years of border security funding at the President's request for this year. I think that is a realistic proposal for which we can get bipar-

tisan support here and in the House. I believe the White House can support it as well. So I object to a modification of the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. LANKFORD. I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, since the tragedy 3 weeks ago tomorrow in Parkland, FL, we have all, as a nation, had a conversation about how did this happen, why did it happen, and what can we do to make sure something like this never happens again. As part of that conversation, we have spent a significant amount of time talking to all sorts of different groups and individuals—from students and teachers impacted by this to experts across the country, to other communities that have put in place policies to address this. We have learned a lot about not just this particular incident but some of the dangers around the country.

It is interesting, just in the last couple of weeks since it happened, you have seen a significant increase in the number of potential shooters who have been reported to law enforcement and people who have been arrested. I think one of the lessons from this terrible tragedy is, we live in a day and age when someone who is out there talking about hurting people has to be taken seriously. We can no longer afford to be a country in which people make these sorts of threats, and they are taken lightly.

Based on all of this information we have gathered, last week I came to the floor and announced a number of initiatives that I hope the Senate will move forward on to make sure these things never happen again. It is important to begin by recognizing that those of us who serve here are in the business of passing laws and making public policy. Making public policy isn't just about coming up with the best idea you can come up with, but it is also about coming up with the best idea you can come up with that actually has a chance of being implemented into law. What that means is, in order to get something done, we need 60 votes in the Senate on virtually any issue, we need a majority of the votes in the House, and we need a White House that is willing to sign it. If those three things don't happen, you do not have a law.

So what we spent time trying to do is identify what can we get 60 votes for in the Senate, can pass in the House, and be signed by the President that will make a difference. That has been our criteria. That does not mean there are not other important issues that deserve to be debated—and they will continue to be debated—but it means what

can we pass quickly and put in place because, unlike tax policy or some of the other issues we talk about here, there is a time urgency related to this. The time urgency is that it is fair to say there is a high probability that somewhere in America today there is someone like the killer in Parkland who has ideas about doing something similar, and we do not have the luxury of waiting until November or waiting until next year before we act, especially if there are things we agree on.

Something remarkable happened over the weekend. Almost all of the 17 families impacted by this horrifying event came together and spent a significant amount of time meeting and talking because they wanted to issue a joint statement as families. It was difficult because these families and some of the people in these families have very different views on a number of issues, including on the Second Amendment, but the one thing they all agreed on is, our schools should be safe places and that when we drop our children at school in the morning, they should be safe, and no one should be worried there is a possibility their children may not come home that afternoon because someone walked into the school and took their life.

I would say that is not just true of these 17 families; I think that is true of the country. No matter where you are on the issues regarding the Second Amendment—how much or how little you believe our laws should govern and regulate the sale of guns and what type of guns should be sold—I cannot imagine there is anyone in this country in their right mind who does not believe our schools should be safe. I also do not believe there is anyone in this country in their right mind who would disagree, if we have the opportunity to identify someone before they act, we should act against them and stop them. Because there is such broad consensus on those issues, those are the first steps I believe we should try to take.

Now, sometimes when you describe it that way, people think, “Well, that is all you are going to do or that is all you want to talk about,” and that is not true. That can’t be true because these Second Amendment issues preexist Parkland. We have debated them in the past, and we will continue to debate them in the future. They often find their ways into court. So those issues aren’t going anywhere, and they will continue to be here for us to debate and act on, if the body so chooses.

The issue that I am afraid will go away, the issue I am afraid may be forgotten in a number of weeks is the fact that, in this case, there was the chance to stop the shooter before he acted. There were clear signs. It is one of the things you see in every single one of these events. It isn’t like from one moment to the next they woke up one

morning in a bad mood and did these sorts of things. They had been showing signs, for a significant period of time, in case after case after case. If we know this, should we not then create systems in this country to identify people before they act and stop them?

On that point, I believe there is broad consensus, and on that point is where I think we should start. Let’s act. If there is a law we can pass or a program we can put in place to prevent one of these things from happening, let’s do it. Obviously, we may part ways on different views on the other parts of this, but at least, for now, we are together to get these things done. This is the commonsense way forward. This is the way people operate in real life.

In real life, if you and another group of people agree on something, you do the thing you agree on first, you get that out of the way, and then you have the debate and the vote on the things you may not have a consensus on. We have a chance to do some things, and they are meaningful.

The first is a bill Senator HATCH introduced yesterday. We joined him, along with a broad bipartisan coalition, on the STOP School Violence Act. Senator HATCH’s bill is a bill that was innovated by Sandy Hook Promise. It is their No. 1 legislative priority right now, and it is a bill I cannot imagine having a single “no” vote in the U.S. Senate. What the bill does is it basically creates a Federal grant program through the Department of Justice for States and through the States’ local communities to create risk assessment programs—in essence, to have programs in place to train teachers, administrators, and students to identify the warning signs of someone who may hurt themselves or may hurt other people. It also sets up a task force in each one of these school districts to monitor these students, to identify them collectively. For example, if it had existed in Broward County or something like it that was effective, you can only imagine a room where the sheriff’s office and the school and the Department of Children and Families and potentially even the FBI were all there comparing notes. If those entities had been together in one room comparing notes, the sheriff’s office would have said we have been to his house 40 times for all sorts of things. The school would have said we had to kick him out, and we had to do all kinds of things because he had fights, he was violent, and made threats. The FBI would say someone actually called our hotline and said this guy was going to shoot up a school. I cannot imagine, through that collaboration, there would not have been action or, at least, the opportunity for action. It didn’t happen that way, and we have a chance now to change that.

By the way, I saw last week where it was described by some media outlets as

a modest bill. This is not modest. Just because it is not controversial doesn’t make it modest. Preventing an attack, identifying an attacker, and stopping them before they act is the best thing we could possibly do.

Hopefully, the STOP School Violence Act is something we will be able to move on fairly quickly. The House announced earlier today that they will be taking that bill up next week on the floor, and I hope we will move quickly to pass Senator HATCH’s bill that has already over 20 other Senators involved in it.

Another bill that has been filed that we have joined with as well, with Senators TOOMEY and COONS, is “Lie and Try.” Another problem we have identified in the broader scheme of things is that local law enforcement may not always have sufficient information to investigate individuals who try to buy a firearm, knowing that they are prohibited from doing so. Under our current law, when a person fails an FBI background check, some State law enforcement authorities are not even made aware of the failed background check. Individuals who are willing to lie and try to buy a gun in these situations could very well be very dangerous, and laws are only as good as our willingness and our ability to enforce them. We have to crack down on this. If someone who is ineligible to buy a firearm is trying to buy a firearm, shouldn’t law enforcement already, at least, know that—because they may be able to take that piece of information and put it together with other pieces of information to realize this is someone we need to be looking at because they might be up to something.

I hope we can pass that. Again, I cannot imagine anyone not being in favor of it. This law would require Federal authorities to alert State law enforcement within 24 hours when someone who is prohibited from buying a firearm lies and tries to do so.

The third thing I hope we will look at—and we are working on the language now to address this—is the PROMISE Initiative in schools. As I already said, improving our prevention and information sharing systems as the first two pieces of legislation would do is the best thing we can do to stop school shootings before they happen, but these systems will not work if the clearest warning signs of school shootings—suspicious and violent misbehavior at the school—are not reported in the appropriate places in the first place. Anything blocking this flow of information is very dangerous, and it is a risk to our children. For this reason, a directive to schools issued by the Federal Government during the previous administration deserves for us to look at it again.

In 2014, the Department of Education, working with the Department of Justice, issued guidance which used the

threat of reduced Federal funding to encourage schools to alter how and which misconduct at school is reported to law enforcement. Now, the goal of this directive was to reduce the school-to-prison pipeline, to reduce suspensions and expulsions, to prevent racially biased discipline. These are laudable goals, which I share and support, but we have to balance that with some common sense. The failure to report violent misbehavior from students—like the shooter in Parkland—to law enforcement can end up having some very serious repercussions as we saw. So no matter how laudable this goal is, it is not worth risking the safety of our children or losing the public's trust and the trust of our parents about sending their kids to school. This directive needs to be refined. It has to allow for schools and law enforcement to communicate, when warranted, for the safety of the student and the community, and furthermore we need clear pathways of intervention and repercussions that need to be established and followed so local education agencies and law enforcement are effectively able to work together to either navigate students back onto the correct path, properly identify and address red flags that can lead to severe consequences or prevent a student from being lost in the system altogether.

Yesterday, I wrote to the Department of Education and the Department of Justice, and I asked them to immediately revise this directive from 2014, and any associated guidance, to make sure that schools are appropriately reporting violence and dangerous actions to local law enforcement.

In addition to asking them to do that, proactively, I will also be introducing legislation to make sure that the Federal Government does not fail our children in this way.

Finally, I believe the Parkland shooting has identified an area of law that can be improved to reduce gun violence of all kinds, particularly school shootings. Amidst the many systems that we have in place, law enforcement often lacks a flexible tool that they can use to prevent the sale or the possession of guns to someone who should not have them, based on their behavior and the behavior that they have exhibited around those who know them best.

There has to be a way to identify and prevent circumstances like what occurred in Parkland, while also preserving the Second Amendment constitutional right of law-abiding Americans and the right to due process. That is why we are working to try to figure out a way to encourage States to enact policies like the gun violence restraining order, so State and local law enforcement and families who have identified someone who is at risk of either taking their own life or hurting other people could petition a court to obtain a court order that allows law enforce-

ment temporarily to stop that person either from buying a gun or from possessing that gun and the ammunition. This would put power back in the hands of people who see something, not just to say something, but they have the opportunity to do something about it.

We continue to work on what the right formulation of that is. The most effective implementation is at the State level. We are trying to figure it out with our colleagues. There are different ideas floating around about the right way to structure it.

It has to have strong due process. You don't want this used to abuse people. You don't want courts to misuse it or have it being used for false claims, but we need to have a tool at our disposal. If the schools and local law enforcement, and others, identify someone who poses a threat but has yet to commit a crime, there has to be a tool available to stop them from buying guns or using the ones they already have.

The State of Florida is probably going to be passing, either today or tomorrow, a law that puts that in State law. Other States like Indiana and California have one as well. What can we do at the Federal level to incentivize more States to do this and have these tools? That is what we are working on.

Hopefully, we will have the resolution on a bill that doesn't just work, but that can pass. We can all file the perfect bill in our own minds, but if it doesn't have 60 votes, it is nothing but a piece of paper. That is why we need to work toward that.

I want to conclude by mentioning one of the students, Kyle Kashuv, who is a junior at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. Like many students at that school, he is motivated to advocate for changes in our laws to prevent something like what happened in his school from ever happening again. In his advocacy, he wants to make sure that the Second Amendment is protected. His No. 1 concern is to make sure that the rights of innocent Americans aren't infringed upon.

His opinion on this issue might be different from some of his other classmates, but that doesn't change their shared goal, which is to stop this from happening to anyone ever again. Although their opinions may vary, he and his classmates still go to school together and still root for the same sports teams at their school. They take the same classes with the same teachers, and they still faced the same danger on February 14. As they lift their voices in political discourse to advocate for change, they have differences. They have differences on some issues, but they share a common goal, to keep themselves and students like them safe.

I think we can learn something from this example—from them and from

their parents. The lessons learned from Parkland are that changes can be made. Some of them I just mentioned action on would immediately reduce the chances of school shootings but would not infringe upon the Second Amendment rights of all Americans.

The Members elected to the Senate, like the students at Parkland, have a wide array of opinions on many of these issues, but I think we all share a common goal. We all agree that our schools should be safe. So I am here to urge my colleagues to remember that we have to share a country, no matter what our views may be on any political issue. We have to find a way not just to live together but to thrive as a nation. We have to find a way to keep our children safe. If we keep that in mind, I am sure we can work together to create real, enduring consensus on solutions, on things we agree on that will stop these from happening again.

We can have respectful and productive debates on the issues upon which our Nation and this body are still divided, but let us first come together and do the things we agree on. Then we will have the time to argue and debate and solve the things we may not agree on. This is the opportunity before us, and we should not let it pass us by.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I will be joined by a series of my colleagues who are coming to the floor this afternoon to talk about the November 2018 elections coming up and the steps we need to take to make sure that the Russian influence effort that bedeviled our 2016 election is not replicated in the 2018 election.

I guess the first question to answer is, Is this a realistic prospect? Is this something we should concern ourselves with—that the Russians would come back again in 2018 and try to meddle in our elections?

Everyone in the Trump administration who has been asked about this, perhaps outside of the Oval Office itself, has said: Yes, absolutely. They are coming. The Director of the CIA, the Director of National Intelligence, the head of the FBI, the Attorney General, the Department of Justice—there is no contest. There is no disagreement. There is no doubt, even among the President's senior national security and law enforcement team that they are coming back, that they are going to do this again. That leads us to the question of what we are doing about it.

It seems that the silence from the Oval Office on this subject is deafening. The White House doesn't ever want to talk about doing anything about this. To the extent that we get signals from tweets and things like that, they are usually nonfactual and highly politicized challenges to the basic facts that

all of the President's senior Cabinet staff seem to agree with.

I don't know why they haven't sorted out why the President says one thing and all of his Cabinet officials say something else, but that is for them. What is for us is to review this in Congress, to do oversight, and to do what legislation might be necessary to raise our defenses to make sure that we can effectively counter what we have been warned is coming at us.

We have no proposal from the administration. One would think with something like this, where we have an election that has been attacked by a hostile foreign country—one would think that would be the kind of thing that would bring our country together and would get the President's attention. He swore an oath to protect and defend the Constitution, and last I heard, the elections are a part of our Constitution. Yet there is nothing—crickets.

Where is the proposal? Where are the congressional hearings on our proposals? Where are the markups? Where are the bills? We are seeing an extraordinary lack of interest and initiative in something about which we have been very forcefully warned.

The failure at the White House is very profound. Over and over again, we have heard senior Trump officials say that they have not been instructed by the President to take this seriously. My senior colleague, Senator JACK REED, asked Director Chris Wray of the FBI about whether the FBI had taken specific actions to confront and blunt Russian influence and disinformation activities. On February 13, in the Senate Intelligence Committee, he said, "not as specifically directed by the President, no."

To read the transcript more completely, Senator REED asked:

So let me begin with Mr. Wray and say, has the President directed you and your agency to take specific actions to confront and blunt Russian influence activities that are ongoing?

Wray: We're taking a lot of specific efforts to blunt Russian . . .

Reed: . . . directed by the President?

Wray: Not—not as specifically directed by the President, no.

Similarly, 2 weeks later, February 27, in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the NSA's Director, ADM Mike Rogers, said that he had not been granted the authority nor directed specifically by the President to take action to disrupt Russian election hacking operations.

Again, Senator REED asked:

So, you would need, basically, to be directed by the President, through the Secretary of Defense, to get—

Rogers interrupts:

Yes, sir, as I—I mentioned that in my statement.

Reed: Have you been directed to do so, given the strategic threat that faces the United States and the significant consequences you recognize already?

Rogers: No, I have not.

There is a lot of room for improvement here. You can also add to this list the failures of activity at the State Department, which was allocated \$120 million to counter foreign efforts to meddle in elections to sow distrust in democracy. According to the March 4 story in the New York Times:

Not one of the 23 analysts working in the department's Global Engagement Center—which has been tasked with countering Moscow's disinformation campaign—speaks Russian, and a department hiring freeze has hindered efforts to recruit the computer experts needed to track the Russian efforts.

So when Congress provides \$120 million to the State Department to take steps to protect against Russian election interference, what we get back is that none of that money gets spent, and a hiring freeze prevents the people with the necessary qualifications from even coming in to do the job. That is not taking the problem seriously—not at the FBI, not at the NSA, and not at the State Department.

As far as I can tell, there actually is no formal executive branch inter-agency process that is designed to examine what the Russians did and put together legislative recommendations for Congress to follow up on. In national security matters, that is the President's role; that is the executive branch's role. We have the authority to make the laws, but because they are doing the day-to-day work, we count on the executive branch to put the proposals together for us. And again, there is nothing.

There is one thing that we did do. We wanted to send a strong signal to Vladimir Putin that there was a price to be paid for this kind of misbehavior—manipulating our elections. We voted, virtually unanimously, in this Chamber, 98 to 2. I don't know the numbers on the House side, but it was equally virtually unanimous on the House side.

It was 98 to 2 here in the Senate. We passed tough sanctions to hit Vladimir Putin where it hurts, which is right in the oligarchs. That is what he cares about, the oligarchs who support him, the oligarchs whose corrupt enterprises he has corruptly engaged with. That whole racketeering enterprise that runs the Russian Government is what the sanctions would go after.

Well, the administration has refused to implement them. The State Department has said that they are not needed. Not needed? We are hearing from all of the Trump administration's own senior executive agencies that they are going to come and do this again in 2018. How are they not needed if this is no deterrence for what they did in 2016? It would be one thing to say they are not needed if the evidence was: OK, they got the message. They are not going to do this again. We are fine in 2018.

But that is not what Trump's own Cabinet officials and national intel-

ligence leaders are telling us. They are telling us that they are needed because they are coming at us again. So this added bit of deterrence would be very important.

When it came to something as simple as putting together the list of targeted oligarchs to put maximum pressure on President Putin, they didn't even put a list together on their own; they went to Forbes magazine and took the list out of a public magazine. That doesn't look like a serious or conscientious effort.

So right up and down the administration, you see failure to take this seriously traceable directly to the White House, and that is very, very regrettable.

The other thing that we don't know is what the White House has been up to with respect to Congress. There was a lot of talk early on about how we needed to have an independent committee to take a look at this, to be independent, to put together a package of reforms, observations, and recommendations, and we have had no support for doing that. What we were told was: Don't worry. Work through the committees.

Well, the committees aren't doing much, to tell you the truth. It is like the gavels are made out of foam rubber around here. We could do a lot better, and there is no independent commission.

It raises the question, what was the role of the White House? What was the role of the President in stopping an independent commission? How active were they in doing that? Those are questions that need answers, but obviously, if there aren't serious investigative processes going on in our committees, it is hard to get those answers.

Here is another question: What was the role of the White House in coordinating or colluding with the House Intelligence Committee—with Representative Nunez and/or his staff—in preparation for the so-called Nunez memo?

We have learned a lot about that memo since it came out. We have learned that it was essentially phony. It had a couple of basic accusations. One was that the FBI had misled the FISA Court. They were misled that one of the sources that supported the affidavit that got the FISA warrant for the surveillance of Carter Page—that one of those sources had been in touch with or had been funded by a political campaign; that this was a phony effort cooked up on behalf of the Clinton campaign and run before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

Well, as it turns out, the FISA application stated specifically the FBI's speculation that the source, Steele, had been hired to "find information that could be used to discredit Candidate #1's campaign"—Trump's campaign. As somebody who has pursued affidavits for search warrants and for

surveillance warrants before, I can tell you that it is common and standard FBI and Department of Justice practice to leave out unnecessary names. So the fact that Mrs. Clinton wasn't mentioned is perfectly consistent with longstanding Department practice.

The other thing that it omitted was that the Steele information was actually corroborating information for a lot of other information that had begun this investigation beforehand. So the theory that this all depended on this particular source and that this source had an undisclosed relationship with a political opponent was simply baloney. The fact is that that was disclosed in the warrant, and there were additional sources.

That leaves me with the question of why. Why would a legislative committee apparently deliberately put together a report that contained misleading or false statements but tried to create an erroneous or false impression about something that had taken place? Well, did the White House have any connections in that process? That is the question we are entitled answers to. If this was just a botched job by a partisan crew in a legislative committee, that is one set of problems. If this is the Congress of the United States taking its oversight authority and handing it over to the executive branch of government, handing it over to White House operatives when the White House itself is the subject of the inquiry, that is a very different problem. And we are owed an answer as to what the communications were between the White House, the Trump legal team, and the staff of the House Intelligence Committee that prepared the Nunez report.

I have been joined by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, so I will leave my remarks there.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. President.

We are here at a critical time for our democracy because our country is under attack. In fact, we are here because Russia is attacking our democracy as part of a campaign of informational warfare. That term is not mine; it is Russia's. It is quoted in an indictment that was handed down by the special counsel less than a month ago against 13 individuals and 3 entities. That document is absolutely stunning. It is chilling in its detail and breadth and in its revelations about the apparatus and personnel, the skills and expertise that Russia methodically and relentlessly brought to bear in the 2016 election, in its attack on our democracy.

That attack began in 2014. It was not a few hackers in the basement of some Moscow apartment; it was literally thousands of people, divided into dif-

ferent departments with different skills, pursuing disinformation, cyber attack, misinformation, and propaganda directed at undermining our democracy and, in fact, our election.

Let's remember, constitutionally, elections are foundational to our democracy, and Russia sought not just to sow discord and dissension but to affect the outcome. According to the indictment, its effort to affect the outcome was to assist then-Candidate Donald Trump and to disparage and damage Hillary Clinton. We will never know how much it affected the outcome, but it certainly impacted the views and the votes of some people in the United States of America.

That attack is now continuing. Our intelligence community is unanimous in the view that Russia interfered in our last election and that this effort is continuing. Indeed, all of the intelligence community that has come before the Armed Services Committee in the last 2 weeks has been unanimous that Russia is continuing its attack.

In his testimony, Admiral Rogers is very clear that they will continue that attack because they are paying no price for it. The cost to them is minimal, if any, and the benefit is highly asymmetrical. In other words, they pay very, very little to undermine our democracy, and they see a lot of return. That is because this country is doing little or nothing—or I should say more accurately that this administration is doing absolutely nothing to make Russia pay a price. In effect, that is the testimony from representatives of the intelligence community, including, most recently today, the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, and GEN Robert Ashley.

When I asked what was being done to deter, counter, or retaliate against the Russians, Director Coats said, in effect, that it is everyone's responsibility, which means, in effect, it is no one's responsibility; that it was the whole of government responding, which means no single agency, and there is no plan and no action underway. There is at most perhaps some kind of study of what should be done.

But the denial of meddling is really the reason why nothing has been done and why no action is underway, and that denial comes from one person—the President of the United States. He has refused to acknowledge that the Russians interfered on the scale and scope that they did, and that denial or refusal to acknowledge is itself a tremendous boon to the Russians continuing to attack our democracy.

As recently as this afternoon, at his press conference with the Swedish Prime Minister, the President said, in effect, that perhaps Russia might have meddled, other countries might have meddled, and other individuals might have meddled, but he has refused to acknowledge the extent and the depth

and breadth of past and continuing Russian interference in our democracy.

Make no mistake—others of us on both sides of the aisle have said that the Russians will escalate in the sophistication of their attacks, in the depth of their interference, in the types of tools used through cyber and social media and platforms that are now being developed. They will use American voices. There will no longer be the broken English, no longer be the payment in rubles. They will become evermore astute and adroit in their attack on our democracy.

So the question is, Why? Why has the President declined to acknowledge this attack—a continuing assault on our democratic institutions, particularly on our elections, which are foundational to our democracy? Some have put it this way: What do the Russians have on him? But my view is that we need to look back at the knowledge that the Trump campaign had of that attack in 2016 as it was proceeding.

To take one example, the stolen or hacked emails. Clearly, Trump campaign contacts with WikiLeaks and Russia show that the campaign knew about those stolen or hacked emails, which were then used to attack the Clinton campaign. If those members of the Trump campaign knew about it—those in responsible positions—the question is, How could the President not have known?

In April of 2016, George Papadopoulos, a member of the Trump foreign policy team for at least a substantial period of time, was eager to communicate with senior staff of the Trump campaign that he knew the Russians had hacked emails and that those emails could help the Trump campaign. He was anxious to ingratiate himself with his connections to make himself more valuable in their eyes. So he boasted, in effect, about his contacts with Russians and with Russian officials. Papadopoulos was already working overtime to ingratiate himself with the Trump campaign leadership, and he certainly was not likely to keep valuable information about stolen emails possessed by the Russians to himself.

Remember, when the Trump campaign—specifically Donald Trump, Jr.—was offered dirt on Hillary Clinton, he replied: "I love it." From everything we know about Donald Trump, Jr.'s relationship to his father, he is unlikely to have kept that information to himself.

George Papadopoulos is one of several Trump associates who seemed to know that Russia was trying to help the Trump campaign win the 2016 election. Donald Trump, Jr., again, was in contact with WikiLeaks beginning in September of 2016, and we know this communication continued at least through July of 2017. We know that Donald Trump, Jr., turned over these

messages to investigators. When Trump, Jr., received the first message from WikiLeaks, he emailed other senior officers within the Trump campaign. Those officers included Steve Bannon, Kellyanne Conway, Brad Parscale, and Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner. How could that information and other similar communications not have been transmitted to Donald Trump himself?

Donald Trump, Jr., received an email in which Rob Goldstone offered to provide the Trump campaign with some official documents from Russia that would supposedly incriminate Hillary Clinton. We know now that Donald Trump, Jr., jumped at the chance to receive this information, responding with the famous: "If it's what you say, I love it." That, then, led to the meeting involving Trump, Jr., Jared Kushner, and Paul Manafort at Trump Tower.

There is more here that raises the likelihood of collusion. There is a credible case of obstruction of justice against the President of the United States. There is a solid factual basis to believe that the Trump campaign not only knew but encouraged and cooperated and even colluded with the Russians in this effort. If motive is necessary for the Trump campaign to have done this kind of collusion—certainly it is in the prospect of impacting the outcome. If motive is necessary for President Trump now refusing to acknowledge Russian meddling during the election campaign and now continuing meddling, it is collusion as well.

So we are in a dangerous time because, in fact, Russia will continue to interfere and undermine our democracy if it pays no price for it. The only way to make sure Russia will pay a price to counter, deter, or retaliate is for the President of the United States to demonstrate leadership and to put aside whatever concern about legitimacy there may be. No one is relitigating the 2016 election as to what the outcome was, in fact. We have a President in office, but that President now must act to protect our democracy and our elections going forward from this day into the future.

Thank you.

I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Connecticut as well as our colleague from Rhode Island for calling us together on the Senate floor today to discuss a timely and important topic.

We know that Vladimir Putin and Russia attacked America's democracy in 2016, and it is clear Vladimir Putin will try again. CIA Director Pompeo recently said he had "every expectation" that Russia would try to influence our 2018 election. We have been warned.

We can expect Russia to continue to use the tactics they have used before

and to come up with new ones. We can expect them to hack and leak sensitive information. We can expect these Russians to use social media and propaganda to spread false information. We see it almost every week. We can expect them to try to hack into State election systems and more.

I was home over the weekend in Springfield, IL—of course, the State capital—and ran into a fellow who works for the State Board of Elections. We talked for a few minutes about the experience we had in our State in the last election cycle when the Russians hacked into the computer network of the Illinois State Board of Elections. We were the only State, of those that were hacked, to come forward and identify the culprit. It was Russia. We also came forward and notified hundreds of thousands of our voters that their identity—at least in terms of the State election agency is concerned—had been compromised by the Russians. We were open about it.

I asked the individual what was being done for the next election cycle. He said we have patched the problem that gave the Russians entry into the system in 2016, and we spent over \$100,000 as a State to put in new security, new cyber protections. We are taking it seriously in Illinois because we know what the Russians tried to do to us. We don't believe they changed a vote or changed a ballot, but we are not sure they will not try in the future.

That is the reality of what we face in Illinois, and that is the reality of what America faces.

Just last week, NSA and U.S. Cyber Command head ADM Mike Rogers bluntly acknowledged what most of us already know; that President Trump is doing nothing—nothing—to protect Illinois or any other State against Russia's ongoing and future attacks on our election process. In fact, President Trump reportedly refuses to even talk about the issue.

Admiral Rogers told the Armed Services Committee that Vladimir Putin has paid "little price" for his previous and ongoing attacks and, therefore, hasn't been stopped. Incredibly, the admiral said President Trump has not granted him any new authorities to strike at Russian cyber operations.

Can anyone here imagine what President Ronald Reagan would have said at the stunning abdication of responsibility in addressing this Russian threat to America?

In the face of this fundamental threat of Russian attack on our democracy, we should have spent the last year coming together, on a bipartisan basis, establishing a sound national defense when it comes to the exercise of our democracy. We should be working—Republicans and Democrats together—to hold anyone accountable who participated in this Russian effort. We should be strengthening our laws

against foreign election interference—a responsibility of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has never even taken up that issue—and we should punish and deter Russia and other nations from ever attacking our Democratic process again.

Instead, we have seen the Trump administration consistently refuse to hold the Russians accountable for their election interference or impose meaningful sanctions. President Trump has even gone out of his way to invite top Russian officials to the Oval Office and to call Russia's election interference a "hoax." Despite the fact that all of our intelligence agencies say he is wrong, President Trump calls Russia election interference a hoax.

So what are Republicans in Congress doing about this? With a few exceptions like Senator JOHN MCCAIN, they have mostly tried to change the subject. In fact, instead of trying to get a full accounting of what Russia did to us, Republicans have focused far more on scrutinizing and criticizing anyone who suggests that the Russians interfered.

We need to take a step back and remember what this is all about; specifically, that a foreign adversary of the United States interfered in America's election. They continue to use weaponized cyber campaigns against us and our allies, and most in the majority party of Congress and the President seem not to care at all.

How have we let it get to this point? Have we forgotten our obligation to our Constitution and to this country? For those who watched the devastating two-part episode of the PBS documentary "Frontline" last year entitled "Putin's Revenge," there was a deeply telling moment.

Months before the 2016 election, our Nation's top intelligence officials came and told key congressional leaders about Russia's efforts. These intelligence officials were deeply concerned about what Russia was trying to do to the 2016 election. President Obama had wanted a bipartisan message condemning Putin for his efforts so as to avoid any hint of partisanship as we approached the election and so we could put a common face on this common view of unity on this effort.

What was the response of the Republican Party leadership after hearing this bombshell revelation by our intelligence agencies, this threat from Vladimir Putin, which actually goes to the heart of our democracy—the election process? The response of the Republican leader was: No thanks. We don't want to get involved. And they didn't.

Is there anybody in the Senate—anybody who took the oath to protect the Nation against enemies, foreign and domestic—who thinks that any of us, regardless of political party, should get help from a foreign adversary to be elected?

Yet here we are, with aggressive efforts to discredit investigations into this threat, with a White House that ignores Russian sanctions, with the majority party blocking legislation that offers aid to States that request it to secure our election systems, with the failure of this Congress or this White House to do anything to protect against the next such threat, and all the while, Russia continues to conduct disinformation campaigns right under our noses.

On February 14, the tragedy in Parkland, FL, invited comments of those who wanted more gun safety and those who opposed it. When we traced the source of many of the comments, we found out they were Russians—Russians preaching to the United States on both sides of the issue, trying to rile us up at this moment of great human tragedy. That is now commonplace.

We need to wake up. Russian cyber campaigns were pushing for the release of the discredited Nunes memo from the House of Representatives. They have tried to undermine the FBI's credibility. They are at work every single day trying to undermine our democracy. Russian cyber campaigns have attacked even Republican Senators who have been critical of President Trump.

So I say to my Republican friends that not one of us is immune from these threats, and it is long overdue that we put Nation before party in this extremely important matter. The next time it might be China or North Korea taking different sides or pushing a different agenda when it comes to the American political process, but, of course, it doesn't matter whom a foreign adversary is trying to help. An attack on any American political party or Democratic institution by any Nation is an attack on all of us—at least it should be.

This can't be tolerated. We don't want to make America great by letting foreign powers undermine it.

So I ask my Republican friends; in fact, I invite them: Join us to get to the bottom of this. Let's pass legislation together that helps request these States secure their election systems. Let's pass legislation together that forces the administrations—this one and future administrations—to protect our national infrastructure against these cyber threats. Let's work together on a bipartisan basis to ensure that Russia and others are genuinely deterred from such actions. Let's use sanctions when necessary, and other measures, and let's work together to denounce the Russian disinformation campaign regardless of who it might help on any given day.

We have a lot of work to do, and we are only months away from this November election. In just 6 months or so, there will be early voting in this election. Are the Russians going to get to

vote? Maybe not directly, but indirectly? Will they be able to invade America's political machinery, election machinery? Will they make a difference in this next election campaign? Shame on us if we can't answer those questions, and shame on us if we do nothing to stop them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I am stunned by President Trump's willful paralysis when it comes to holding Russia accountable on threats made crystal clear by our intelligence community.

Indeed, it has been more than a year since 17 U.S. intelligence agencies issued their report on how the Kremlin sought to “blend covert intelligence operations—such as cyber activity—with overt efforts by Russian Government agencies, state-funded media, third-party intermediaries, and paid social media users, or ‘trolls’” in order to undermine our 2016 elections.

Today, even the administration's own national security strategy warns that Russia will continue to challenge American power, influence, and security interests, at home and abroad. These threats are precisely why Congress imposed a mandate on President Trump to act. Yet, time and again, this President has refused to hold Russia accountable and refuses to take steps to defend our democracy and our national security. It is alarming, it is reckless, and it is absolutely unacceptable, and, to be honest, I also find it baffling. Here is why.

Pick any policy issue. Chances are, since taking office, President Trump has changed his mind about it at least once. Last week he changed his positions on gun safety so many times in 24 hours, it could make your head spin. A few weeks before that, he rejected a bipartisan deal to protect Dreamers that met the very specifications he outlined to my colleagues and me just days before. Throughout the past year, the President's remarks with respect to NATO's Article 5, the alliance's bedrock principle that guarantees mutual defense, have been wholly inconsistent.

But there is one thing that President Trump has shown rock-solid consistency on since taking office, and that is his shameful embrace of Russian President Vladimir Putin and his refusal to protect American democratic institutions.

President Trump's embrace of Putin has put a straitjacket on U.S. policy toward Russia. In many ways, we are more vulnerable today than we were in 2016. Think about it. Mr. Putin made a serious gamble when he decided to interfere in our election—a gamble that would normally draw the ire of any American President, regardless of their political party. But, as we know, nothing about this administration is

normal, and the truth is that we are in far greater peril today because Mr. Putin knows that he has a friend in the White House—a friend who won't do anything to stop him from interfering in our democracy, nor those of our allies; a friend who won't even issue a statement condemning Putin's nuclear sabre rattling last week when he proudly showed a video simulating a nuclear attack on Florida.

It is time for the President to recognize that Mr. Putin's intentions are not up for debate. From the spread of extremist propaganda across Europe, to Russia's continued attack on Ukrainian sovereignty, to the latest revelations made public by Special Counsel Mueller's investigation, the Kremlin is orchestrating a systematic and ongoing campaign to undermine the democracies at the heart of the post-World War II international order.

Consider President Trump's response to the revelations made public by Special Counsel Mueller when he indicted 13 Russians for interfering in our democracy 3 weeks ago. The special counsel's findings left many Americans shocked by Russia's outstanding, sophisticated effort to defraud American voters, stoke division on Facebook, and sow doubt in our electoral process in 2016. Yet President Trump's only response to these stunning revelations of foreign interference—nothing. Nothing. Not a word from the President beyond a victorious tweet once again proclaiming no collusion.

At every turn, President Trump has dismissed the significance of Russia's interference in our elections, and his willful paralysis on Russia is in full display through the White House's refusal to impose sanctions under CAATSA, as well as the unacceptable delays in establishing a strategy for countering the Kremlin's propaganda and disinformation.

Let's remember why Congress passed CAATSA in the first place, why the Senate voted 98 to 2 and the House of Representatives voted 419 to 3 despite overwhelming opposition from the Trump administration. We voted to hold Russia accountable for its assault on our democracy, and we voted to increase pressure on the Kremlin to stop its illegal war against our friends in Ukraine and its aiding and abetting of war crimes in Syria. But apparently President Trump fails to see that these are real threats from a real foreign adversary—real threats that undermine the integrity of our elections and therefore the security of our country; real threats from a brutal leader who seeks the erosion of Western democracy as a strategic imperative for Russia's future.

We saw it in March of 2014, when Russia authorized the use of military force to illegally occupy Crimea, blatantly violating the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people—violence that continues in eastern Ukraine to this day.

We saw it in 2016, when the Kremlin's disinformation campaign targeted American voters on Facebook. We see it today, as Russia continues to spread propaganda throughout Western Europe. Meanwhile, in the Middle East, Russia continues to prop up Assad's brutal dictatorship, dropping bombs on hospitals, homes, and humanitarian aid convoys working to help the Syrian people under siege.

This President's schoolyard swagger stops cold when it comes to confronting the world's biggest bully: Vladimir Putin. It has been 7 months—7 months—since Congress passed the CAATSA sanctions law. While the administration has upheld some sanctions imposed by Obama-era Executive orders, it is appalling to see this White House refuse to implement sanctions that Congress made mandatory—mandatory. Let me say that again: provisions that were made mandatory.

So let me tell you what I have learned about CAATSA's implementation in the recent briefings I have received as the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee and membership on the Banking Committee.

President Trump has imposed no sanctions in response to Russia's cyber aggression, as required by section 224. President Trump has imposed no sanctions related to Russian crude oil products, as required by section 225. President Trump has imposed no sanctions on serious human rights abusers in the Russian Federation, as required by section 228. President Trump has imposed no sanctions on those facilitating the transfer of assets owned by the Russian people to oligarchs, handpicked by Putin, as required under section 233. President Trump has imposed no sanctions punishing Russia for its transfer of arms to Syria, as required under section 234. I could go on, but you get the picture.

The Trump administration has refused to implement the law despite the overwhelming, bipartisan will of Congress—a Congress that decided to put “shall” in that legislation versus “may,” which made it mandatory. The Constitution made Congress a coequal branch of government for a reason, and I take very seriously our responsibility to hold the executive branch accountable.

Given what we know about Russia's interference in European elections over the last year alone, I am especially disappointed in the White House's failure to implement sanctions under section 224. That section targets anyone knowingly undermining the cyber security of an individual or a democratic institution on behalf of the Russian Government. I find it hard to believe this administration has yet to identify one single sanctionable offense, but in case they need some tips, here are two they can look into.

In November, Spain's Government discovered Russian state-sponsored groups using social media to spread disinformation and influence political events in Catalonia. Just last week, the German Government pointed to a massive cyber hack against its foreign ministry, allegedly carried out by a Russian state-sponsored group called Snake.

Meanwhile, our intelligence leaders, including many who were appointed by President Trump himself, have testified that Russia continues to interfere here in the United States and looks forward to doing so during the midterm elections.

I have cosponsored a resolution calling upon President Trump to implement these sanctions, and while we shouldn't have to pass a resolution calling on the administration to enforce the law we passed, which was mandatory, we clearly do. Fortunately, we will have the opportunity to do so next week when the Foreign Relations Committee meets to mark up legislation, and I urge the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to take up this important resolution.

Let's remember that Congress also gave the administration additional tools to thwart Russia's disinformation campaigns—an essential priority if we want to protect the integrity of our democracy. Yet it seems that Russia's disinformation campaigns continue to sow chaos online unabated.

Every day that ticks by is one that the Russian Government continues to sharpen its tools and go on the attack. Every day that ticks by, the Russian Government has further encroached on sovereign democracies. We saw it most recently when Russian trolls amplified rightwing hysteria over Congressman DEVIN NUNES' memo with the Twitter hashtag #releasethememo. According to Politico, “Russian bots and their American allies gamed social media to put a flawed intelligence document atop the political agenda.”

Just this week, the New York Times reported on an “American strategic void” in response to Russian threats, highlighting the administration's inability to spend even one dollar—even one dollar—of the \$120 million that Congress authorized over a year ago to counter the Kremlin's information warfare.

The Defense Department last week transferred \$40 million—a third of what was authorized—to the State Department's Global Engagement Center, although not a penny's worth of action has been taken. Why the ridiculous delay? Why not the full amount?

Any responsible President would be vigorously working to protect Americans from foreign interference aimed at undermining our democracy. Any responsible President would have communicated to the American people the seriousness of the threat and rallied

our citizens to respond with classic American resilience and courage. Any responsible President would have worked with Congress on a robust strategy and secured funding for it, and once he got the resources, any responsible President would have moved swiftly to spend them, to empower all the relevant security agencies to mobilize a collective effort to protect the integrity of our democracy. We don't have a responsible President. We have a President asleep at the wheel or maybe even too scared to get into the car at all.

We cannot afford further delays that only cede more ground to Putin on the battlefield of information. Our Global Engagement Center must immediately put these funds to use blunting the effects of Russian Government disinformation. Most urgently, we need the Trump administration to finally develop a comprehensive strategy to shore up American democracy against Russian malign influence and implementing it without delay.

I will close with this. Every day that ticks by, the Russian Government burrows deeper into our society, cultivating extremists and sowing discord. Consider Alexander Torshin. NPR reported that for 6 years, he traveled to the United States to deepen his friendships with the NRA, one of the most active groups in our country. Mr. Torshin cultivated its leadership, meeting with them in Moscow, and now the FBI is reportedly investigating whether he funneled money through the NRA to support Trump's campaign. It is disturbing to think the NRA is so eager to cultivate ties with Putin's inner circle. As we all know, this organization's efforts has left our country a more dangerous place, from our schools to our movie theaters, to our concerts, to our churches.

The American people overwhelmingly want Congress to uphold its solemn responsibility to keep our families safe. Yet the NRA's opposition to commonsense gun safety laws have made this Congress more dysfunctional and less responsive to the needs of our citizens. That, to me, sounds right in line with Kremlin policy.

More than anything, I hope President Trump and our Secretary of State will start treating this threat with the seriousness it deserves. They should appreciate the level of careful planning, resources, and energy the Russian Government invests into destabilizing American democracy. It is time to protect the integrity of our elections and secure our democracy against the cyber threats of the 21st century, whether they come in the form of election machine tampering or paid propaganda on social media or targeted hacks on public officials.

In the meantime, President Trump's inaction speaks louder than his words. His willful paralysis only serves to embolden our adversaries and weaken

democratic institutions at home and abroad. That simply cannot stand, and it cannot stand with the silence we hear from too many of our colleagues on this issue. We need to speak up. We need to act. We need to make sure the law we pass gets enforced. Otherwise, we neuter the very essence of this institution.

With that, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as I was walking into the Chamber tonight, the press outside was telling me that they had just been told—and I hope to hear otherwise tomorrow—that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, on which the distinguished Presiding Officer and I both serve, would not be holding any public hearings on the financial issues so central to holding the President of the United States accountable.

What I am going to describe for a few minutes is how the executive branch, particularly officials such as Secretary Mnuchin, are ducking these issues, and now it appears the President's Republican allies on the Hill are ducking the issues as well.

I especially believe it is a great mistake for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, on which the distinguished Presiding Officer and I both serve, to fail to follow up on the follow-the-money questions. Following the money, as the Presiding Officer knows, is counterintelligence 101. Right at the heart of our duties on the Intelligence Committee is our mandate to vigorously pursue issues relating to counterintelligence. The reason that is so extraordinarily important, it is money that is one of the best and easiest tools to compromise people, to take advantage of counterintelligence measures that, for example, would compromise American public officials.

I believe it is a great mistake for the executive branch, particularly Treasury Secretary Mnuchin—and as the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, we have jurisdiction over his agency—and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to just punt on these issues that are central to the question tonight, that Senator WHITEHOUSE deserves great credit in terms of pursuing, which is holding the President accountable.

The public, in particular, deserves the full story about financial entanglements between Russia and the President and his associates. Obviously, the American people are constantly reading stories in the press about these connections. The special counsel's indictments of the Trump campaign manager, Paul Manafort, and the campaign aide, Richard Gates, contained voluminous information about money laundering and tax evasion intended to hide money from pro-Russian Ukrainian entities.

The distinguished Presiding Officer and I know a bit about money laundering because we have introduced bipartisan legislation to deal with shell companies and money laundering. It is clear that this is a serious matter because when you are talking about money laundering and tax evasion, particularly as it relates to national security and American sovereignty, it has great implications.

Donald Trump and his administration have consistently tried to prevent the American people from seeing not only his finances but the activities of Russian oligarchs. The President's allies, both here in the Senate and elsewhere in Washington, are just going along with it. Americans need to see both sides of this. They need to understand the corruption in both Russia and in the United States in order to determine how they may be connected.

That is why the Congress required the administration to provide—and I want to emphasize this—a public report on the Russian oligarchs, their relationship with President Putin, and indications of corruption. Secretary Mnuchin released nothing other than a list of rich Russians taken from public sources.

I have wanted to know if the intelligence community had warned the Secretary of Treasury against releasing what they saw as sensitive sources or methods. When I asked the leaders of the intelligence community whether they had weighed in, they all said no. What you have, in effect, is a whitewashing of the responsibilities of the Secretary of Treasury, possibly the White House, and possibly senior Republicans in the Congress on this issue.

I then asked Secretary Mnuchin why the Russian oligarch report was covered up. I have gotten no answer to that either. This is just part of the stonewalling that is preventing the public and the Congress from following the money. In addition, I have inquired of Secretary Mnuchin about Treasury documents associated with a suspicious real estate transaction in which a Russian oligarch bought an estate in Florida from Donald Trump for more than twice what the President paid for it. I have gotten no response from the Secretary on this matter either.

What you have is a period of time—and I just speak from popular news accounts—when President Trump bought this property, essentially did nothing with it. It was at a time when it was very hard in our country to get access to money, and the President sold it to a Russian oligarch for tens of millions of dollars beyond what he paid for it.

I was particularly concerned when I read the press accounts of Florida newspapers with accountants and lawyers and others in the Palm Beach area saying they thought this transaction smelled. They thought it was suspicious. They thought it was question-

able. They couldn't see why anybody would pay that amount on top of the purchase price without there being some more sinister kind of motive.

In addition to getting no response from Secretary Mnuchin on that, I have also written to Secretary Mnuchin about press reports regarding connections between the National Rifle Association and yet another Russian oligarch. I wanted to know if there were records held by the Department of the Treasury that would shine a light on these reported connections.

As the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, we have jurisdiction over the Department of the Treasury and the work done by the Secretary and his associates. You would think that just as a matter of courtesy Secretary Mnuchin would respond. We have received no response on that matter as well.

I intend to pursue this matter until we get some answers. If the President, his associates, or powerful political entities, like the NRA, have been corrupted by Russian money, the Congress and the public need the full story. There needs to be open hearings, and they need to be in the Senate Intelligence Committee.

The President's associates have not been shy about releasing their side of the story, and they ought to face questions from Members of Congress. Secretary Mnuchin needs to testify about whether the Department of the Treasury knows about these financial entanglements.

I would like to close simply by saying that these questions of following the money, which I have made my top priority since the period in which the Intelligence Committee began to dig into these issues, are central to holding the President accountable. The executive branch and their allies in the Congress simply cannot justify ducking these questions, as apparently the press is about to report on the basis of conversations I had walking into the Chamber.

The American people deserve to know the extent to which Russian money has corrupted their leaders and their democracy. It is long past time to open this up and, for the sake of American national security and sovereignty, get this information out. I intend, as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee and a member of the Intelligence Committee, to stay with it, the issue of how this administration and its financial entanglements may have affected policies important to all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise tonight to join my colleagues in speaking to the need to immediately respond to Russian interference. I would like to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for bringing us together.

This evening, many of my colleagues have spoken about how Russian aggression affects Americans and our allies across the world. Some have discussed the need for sanctions to deter Russia and the fact that the administration has not yet imposed sanctions, the same sanctions that were passed by the Senate 98 to 2 and 419 to 3 in the House of Representatives. Those were the additional sanctions that were directly related to the interference in the elections and what we saw take place over the last year. They sit dormant.

Others have talked about the importance of Special Counsel Mueller's investigation and the fact that it must move forward without interference from the White House. Nearly a dozen Senators have come to the floor to highlight the need to stand up to Russia. I am here to talk about the critical need to safeguard the most fundamental part of our democracy—the U.S. elections.

Today, I heard the Prime Minister of Sweden address our Nation. When standing next to the President, he was asked a question about this, and he put it simply. He said that in their country, they believe that the people, the citizens of their country, should be the ones who make the decisions about their elections, that they are the ones who should be able to vote, that they are the ones who should be able to have their own opinions not be influenced by foreign countries acting as if they are people in their country.

It is the Presiding Officer who made the statement that I have quoted so many times—that in the last election, it was one candidate and one party, and in the next election, it could be the other candidate and the other party. We do not come here in a partisan way. We come here because the clock is ticking.

Today marks an important day in the 2018 election cycle. Texas is holding the first State primary, and others begin in the coming weeks, including in Illinois. Illinois was one of 21 States that the Russians attempted to hack into—Illinois, where they actually hacked into their voter data, which is the personal information about their voters. Those elections are coming. We are glad that we have a decentralized system so that they have different systems. It is easier to hack into one centralized system. It also means that they have many things to choose from, and we have 40 States that haven't updated their equipment in over 10 years. We have 10 States that don't even have backup paper ballots, and we sit here doing nothing when the solution is right in front of us.

Over the course of the last year, I have come to the floor a number of times to urge this body to take immediate action to beef up our election cybersecurity. There is no longer any doubt that our elections have been and

will continue to be a target for foreign adversaries. Intelligence reports make it clear that Russia used covert cyber attacks, espionage, and harmful propaganda to attack our political system.

I mentioned the attempts on 21 State election systems. Do you know when the real election—the general election—is? It is 245 days away, with primaries beginning today. We have not imposed the sanctions—the administration hasn't—despite this body's taking firm action that we wanted to see these sanctions imposed.

We have had six security heads from this administration—not from the Obama administration; they already spoke out on this. The head of the CIA, the Director of National Intelligence, and the head of the FBI have all testified before U.S. Senate committees that, in fact, this is happening now. It was Director Coats, who was once a Senator here, who said that, in fact, he believes the Russians are getting bolder. These are not the words of Obama's security people. These are the words of Trump's security people.

Last week, NSA Director Rogers said this about Russia: "They haven't paid a price at least that is sufficient to get them to change their behavior."

Earlier this year, CIA Director Pompeo said that he has seen no signs that Russia has decreased its activity and that Russia is currently working to disrupt the upcoming 2018 elections.

It is the policy of the United States of America to defend against and respond to threats to our Nation. This is a cyber attack. It is not with bullets, and it is not with tanks. It is not with aircraft, but it is an attack. It is, simply, using the computer system. In every briefing that I have gone to, this is always listed as one of the major ways in which foreign adversaries are going to attack our Nation—they are going to use the internet. Here we have it happening right here on our very democracy, itself.

In order to protect our election system, we need to do three key things.

First, we must give State and local officials the tools and resources they need to prevent hacks and safeguard election infrastructure from foreign interference. They need those resources now, not after the election, not after the primaries. Today, more than 40 States, as I mentioned, rely on electronic voting systems that are at least 10 years old. Do you think the Russians don't know that? Do you think I am giving away some state secret here? Of course they know that.

Ten years ago, on February 6, 2008, it was Super Tuesday for the 2008 Presidential election. A lot has changed in the last 10 years but not our voting equipment. It has remained the same. That is why I am leading bipartisan legislation with Senator LANKFORD. This is a bipartisan effort. We also appreciate our cosponsors Senators HAR-

RIS, GRAHAM, COLLINS, and HEINRICH. We call this bill the Secure Elections Act. It would provide \$386 million in grant funding for States to secure their elections systems. It is paid for. We found a pay-for.

We have a similar bill that is led by Congressman MEADOWS in the House—the head of the Freedom Caucus—because they understand that freedom is not cheap, that to guarantee freedom, you must have a secure democracy, and \$386 million is just 3 percent of the cost of one aircraft carrier.

I think most Americans would agree that, as we see more and more sophisticated types of warfare happening, to not even pay attention to helping the States fund this election equipment that has been woefully underfunded is a huge mistake.

The second thing that we need to do—by the way we can do this now. We can do this in the omnibus bill. The second thing we need to do is improve information sharing so that local election officials know when they are attacked and how to respond. It took the Federal Government nearly a year to notify these 21 States that were targeted by Russian-backed hackers. That cannot happen again.

Finally, we need a reliable backup system. I am talking about paper backup ballots—the old-fashioned way. There are 10 States that don't have them.

The integrity of our election system is the cornerstone of our democracy. Americans have fought and died for our democracy since our country was founded, and we must guarantee that democracy continues.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DANA MARSHALL-BERNSTEIN

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I honor the life and memory of Dana Marshall-Bernstein and express my deepest condolences to her parents, family, and friends.

Dana was diagnosed as a young child with Crohn's disease, which she succumbed to at age 28, but Dana did not allow her disease to define her and instead will be remembered for her infallible spirit, perseverance, strength, and

courage. Through her large collection of hats and artistic spirit, Dana brought joy to so many. She was a light in the lives around her, as a "spiritual warrior," giving hope and support through her work with the southwest chapter of the Crohn's and Colitis Foundation.

Dana lived life to the fullest—skiing, playing piano, creating art, and singing every chance she got. Dana's intelligence, brilliance, amazing sense of humor and wit, loving compassionate heart, and all-around remarkable soul will always be in the hearts and minds of her loving family and in those who had the fortune of knowing her.●

250TH ANNIVERSARY OF SANFORD, MAINE

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the city of Sanford, ME, on their 250th anniversary. As a southern Maine community, Sanford's residents have access to the countryside and a downtown area, while also being close to Maine's coastal communities. Sanford prides itself on being a business friendly community, and the economic growth council has promoted a plan for the future of business which includes greater development and revitalization of the city.

On February 27, Sanford began their year of celebration with a kick-off event in Central Park where residents had the opportunity to ice skate, drink hot chocolate, enjoy music performed by the high school chorus, and end the night with a fireworks show. The city has a year to celebrate this milestone and will do so through events focusing on community engagement and promotion of local business.

In 1661, William Phillips purchased land from two Native American leaders which would be called Phillipstown. The land was first inhabited in 1739, and in 1768, the residents of Phillipstown received town status. The Governor of Massachusetts chose the name for the new town, as Maine was a province of Massachusetts at the time. The name "Sanford" was chosen in honor of Peleg Sanford, the stepson of William Phillips, who served as Governor of Rhode Island. In Sanford, work in sawmills saw growth in the early 19th century, followed by development in agriculture and textiles. The establishment of Goodall Mills in the late 1860s attracted skilled workers from Canada and Europe. Looking forward to present day, Sanford achieved city status in January of 2013, making it the newest city in the State of Maine. Today Sanford is home to 21,000 residents that span residential areas and woodlands, including access to three different trail ways. In addition to enjoying the nature surrounding Sanford, the parks and recreation department also hosts a variety of events that meet the interests of all generations,

including line-dancing, pickleball games, activities at the YMCA, and an annual Winterfest.

For its 250th anniversary, Sanford is celebrating this milestone with the design of a new anniversary logo, the creation of a commemorative coin, and a communitywide promotion to support businesses in the city. With a history dating back to as early as 1661, the residents of Sanford have worked to develop and improve their community over time. This year the city will see the opening of a new combined high school and technical center designed to prepare students with the skills needed for the 21st century in area industries; the launch of a 50 MW solar array at the Seacoast Regional Airport which will be the largest solar project in Maine and the largest solar array on any airport in the United States; and the construction of SanfordNet Fiber, a 45-mile dark fiber extension to Maine's 3 Ring Binder high-speed internet system.

I would like to congratulate and celebrate with the citizens of Sanford on its 250th anniversary. I wish the city continued success and look forward to seeing the celebration of this milestone throughout the year.●

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS FRYE

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a prominent Civil War historian, whose work spans the globe as a lecturer, guide, and preservationist. Dennis Frye is the chief historian at Harpers Ferry National Park in my home State of West Virginia.

Born out of the fiery turmoil of the Civil War, the Mountain State was founded by courageous patriots who were willing to risk their lives and fortunes in a united pursuit of justice and freedom for all. As West Virginians, we take great pride in our history, and it is so important to instill this commitment to our values in the next generation. That is Dennis's legacy.

As a preservationist, Dennis is a co-founder and first president of the Save Historic Antietam Foundation and is also a cofounder and former president of the Civil War Trust. His lifetime achievements in the Civil War history community have earned him numerous awards and recognitions, including the Shelby Foote Award by the Civil War Trust and the Nevins-Freeman Award by the Civil War Roundtable of Chicago—the first and oldest Civil War roundtable.

Dennis has authored nearly 100 articles and 10 books and also helped produce the Emmy Award-winning television features about the Battle of Antietam, abolitionist John Brown, and Maryland during the Civil War. He has been published in countless prestigious Civil War magazines, including Civil War Times Illustrated, America's

Civil War, Blue & Gray Magazine, North and South Magazine, and Hallowed Ground and has been featured as a guest contributor to the Washington Post. His book, "Harpers Ferry Under Fire," received the national book of the year award from the Association of Partners for Public Lands. "September Suspense: Lincoln's Union in Peril" was awarded the 2012 Laney Book Prize for distinguished scholarship and writing on the military and political history of the Civil War.

Dennis is a highly sought after tour guide, having worked with the Smithsonian, National Geographic, and numerous colleges and universities. He has a remarkable gift for storytelling and has certainly made history a favorite subject for countless students.

West Virginia is great because our people are great—Mountaineers who will always be free. In fact, when visitors come to West Virginia, I jump at the chance to tell them about our wonderful State. We have more veterans per capita than most any State in the Nation. We have fought in more wars, shed more blood, and lost more lives for the cause of freedom than most any State. We have always done the heavy lifting and never complained. We have mined the coal and forged the steel that built the guns, ships, and factories that have protected and continue to protect our country. I am so deeply proud of what our citizens have accomplished and what they will continue to accomplish in the days and years ahead.

Dennis has been a vital part of keeping the legacy of our State alive and inspiring the next generation to research, learn, and appreciate what makes West Virginia so special.

While he is retiring and everyone is sure to miss his strong leadership, Dennis's unwavering dedication passion for his work will leave a lasting legacy with the countless lives he has touched. I am sincerely grateful for his remarkable work and for showcasing our beautiful State to the rest of the Nation. I am deeply honored to wish good health and much happiness to Dennis and his family in the days and years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO EVERETT LEE

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the legacy of a trail-blazing musician and conductor from beautiful Wheeling, WV: Everett Lee.

Everett has not only been witness to changes in the classical music industry in the last century, but he has been an integral part of the change as well. His story began while working at a hotel in Cleveland, OH, where he met the Cleveland Orchestra music director, Artur Rodzinski. The director, having already heard of Everett's remarkable talent, invited him to attend concerts

on Saturdays. Rodzinski was a mentor to Everett and inspired him to continue his violin training and eventually enroll at the Cleveland Institute of Music.

Everett enlisted in the military of June 1943, serving as an aviation cadet at the Tuskegee Army Air Field. Following an injury in the military, Everett made his way to New York to serve in the orchestra for Broadway's "Carmen Jones," a reimagining of Bizet's opera with an all African-American cast. One evening, the conductor was unable to attend a performance, and Everett stepped up to fill the role, a move that launched his talent and professionalism into the spotlight.

In 1945, Everett served as the music director of "On the Town," a groundbreaking show for having an integrated cast. Still, despite his success, Everett faced adversity and was once advised against auditioning for a seat in the New York Philharmonic. Many thought the South would not yet embrace him either. His response was to aim even higher and pursue an even more challenging career path as a conductor. In 1947, he founded the Cosmopolitan Symphony, which became famous for its inclusion of all ethnicities and backgrounds.

In time, Everett was invited by national and international symphonies to conduct, including the Louisville Symphony, which in 1953 made Everett the first African-American to lead a major symphony orchestra in the U.S. South. He went on to break even more barriers and rise above any challenge that came his way. Conducting an acclaimed New York City Opera production of "La Traviata" in 1955 made him the first African-American to conduct a professional grand opera in the United States.

Deciding that he would find better opportunities outside of America, Everett and his family moved to Germany in 1957. He held the position as chief conductor of the Norrköping Symphony Orchestra in Sweden for a decade. In 1976, he conducted the New York Philharmonic for the first time. It was a concert in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which was particularly fitting; both men held the ideal that they could embody the change they wanted to see in the world and created opportunities for those who wanted to follow in their footsteps.

Time and time again, sheer talent and strength of character have transcended societal obstacles. It is because of individuals such as Everett Lee that countless musicians, regardless of their background or ethnicity, have pursued their dreams.

On his 100th birthday, the Mayor of Wheeling designated August 31 as "Everett Lee Day" so we could all celebrate his extraordinary talent and strength of character. We are truly blessed to have such an international

treasure as a part of our West Virginia family. Again, it is a great honor and privilege to recognize his many accomplishments, and I wish him and his family the very best.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:16 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 831. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Police Officer Scott Bashium Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1209. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 901 N. Francisco Avenue, Mission, Texas, as the "Mission Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 2673. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the "Lance Corporal Jordan S. Basteau Post Office".

H.R. 3183. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office".

H.R. 4406. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the "Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building".

H.R. 4646. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the "Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 4685. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the "First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office".

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3656. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a consistent eligibility date for provision of Department of Veterans Affairs memorial headstones and markers for eligible spouses and dependent children of veterans whose remains are unavailable.

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

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1209. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 901 N. Francisco Avenue, Mission, Texas, as the "Mission Veterans Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2673. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the "Lance Corporal Jordan S. Basteau Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3183. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4406. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the "Tuskegee Airman Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4646. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the "Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4685. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the "First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-4485. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Sean B. MacFarland, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4486. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the continuation of the national emergency originally declared in executive order 13288 on March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4487. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency originally declared in Executive Order 13692 on March 8, 2015, with respect to Venezuela; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4488. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency originally declared in Executive Order 13660 on March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4489. A communication from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Annual Stress Test—Technical and Conforming Changes" (RIN1557-AE28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4490. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Health Insurance Providers Fee" (RIN1545-BM52) (TD 9830) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4491. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Presence of Certain Individuals in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or the United States Virgin Islands Under Section 937(a) Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria" (Notice 2018-19) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4492. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, five (5) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 1, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4493. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Secretary's Final Supplemental Priorities and Definitions for Discretionary Grant Programs" (RIN1894-AA09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4494. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 1, 2018; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-4495. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Department of Justice Freedom of Information Act 2017 Litigation and Compliance Report", the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for all federal agencies' Freedom of Information Act reports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4496. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0075) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4497. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0024) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4498. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0029) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4499. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0069) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4500. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0030) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4501. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0070) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4502. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0713) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4503. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0076) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4504. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0707) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4505. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0630) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4506. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0901) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4507. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0811) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4508. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Millersburg, OH and Coshocton, OH" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0342) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4509. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fort Scott, KS and Phillipsburg, KS" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0523) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4510. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Spanish Fork, UT" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0897) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4511. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Johnson City, TN" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0279) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4512. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Class E Airspace; Pulaski, WI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0818)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4513. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Cape Girardeau, MO; St. Louis, MO; and Macon, MO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9559)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4514. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0658)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4515. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rosemont Aerospace, Inc. Pilot Probes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6616)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4516. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Stemme AG Gliders" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0952)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4517. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0066)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4518. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Aeroclubul Romaniei Gliders" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1068)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4519. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0694)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4520. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turboprop Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0943)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4521. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; 328 Support Services GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by AvCraft Aerospace GmbH; Fairchild Dornier GmbH; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH) Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0026)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4522. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with BRP-Rotax GmbH & Co KG 912 A Series Engine" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1078)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4523. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0068)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4524. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Western United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0344)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4525. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; North Central United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1082)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4526. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (71); Amdt. No. 3785" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4527. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard

Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (3); Amdt. No. 3786" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4528. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 141, Minimum Sound Requirements for Hybrid and Electric Vehicles" (RIN2127-AL84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Paul M. Nakasone, to be General.

*Brent K. Park, of Tennessee, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration.

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 2499. A bill to require the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority to establish a relief fund to provide investors with the full value of unpaid arbitration awards issued against brokerage firms or brokers regulated by the Authority; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2500. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the vehicles, weaponry, and ammunition to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2501. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the establishment of a Ski Area Fee Retention Account; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2502. A bill to address gun violence, improve the availability of records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check

System, address mental illness in the criminal justice system, and end straw purchases and trafficking of illegal firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2503. A bill to establish Department of Energy policy for science and energy research and development programs, and reform National Laboratory management and technology transfer programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 2504. A bill to provide for continuing cooperation between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Israel Space Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2505. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that workers and communities that are responsible for record corporate profits benefit from the wealth that those workers and communities help to create, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. Res. 424. A resolution honoring the 25th anniversary of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for nonpreemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 266

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

S. 407

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

S. 517

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 517, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid vapor pressure limitations under such Act.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1539

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence.

S. 1600

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1600, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and to provide for Social Security benefit protection.

S. 1667

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1667, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for consumers against excessive, unjustified, or unfairly discriminatory increases in premium rates.

S. 1676

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Min-

nesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to provide grants for access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1697, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens and United States Citizens.

S. 1911

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1911, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 2009

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2009, a bill to require a background check for every firearm sale.

S. 2047

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2047, a bill to restrict the use of funds for kinetic military operations in North Korea.

S. 2095

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2095, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2147

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2147, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2268

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2268, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modify certain provisions relating to the capital financing of historically Black colleges and universities.

S. 2271

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2271, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

S. 2286

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2286, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to provide greater protection and services for Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes.

S. 2289

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2289, a bill to create an Office of Cybersecurity at the Federal Trade Commission for supervision of data security at consumer reporting agencies, to require the promulgation of regulations establishing standards for effective cybersecurity at consumer reporting agencies, to impose penalties on credit reporting agencies for cybersecurity breaches that put sensitive consumer data at risk, and for other purposes.

S. 2334

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2334, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide clarity with respect to, and to modernize, the licensing system for musical works under section 115 of that title, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of that title, and for other purposes.

S. 2343

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2343, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force for meeting the connectivity and technology needs of precision agriculture in the United States.

S. 2360

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, a bill to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes.

S. 2381

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2381, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to require that broadband conduits be installed as a part of certain highway construction projects, and for other purposes.

S. 2383

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2383, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve law enforcement access to data stored across borders, and for other purposes.

S. 2467

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2467, a bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to obtain a statue of Shirley Chisholm for placement in the United States Capitol.

S. 2490

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2490, a bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures.

S. 2494

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2494, a bill to provide standards for short-term limited duration health insurance policies.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit

societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2018, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

S. RES. 402

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 402, a resolution calling upon the President to exercise relevant mandatory sanctions authorities under the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act in response to the Government of the Russian Federation's continued aggression in Ukraine and illegal occupation of Crimea and assault on democratic institutions around the world, including through cyber attacks.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 424—HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE PROGRAM

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 424

Whereas the National Guard Youth Challenge Program (referred to in this preamble as the "Youth Challenge Program") is celebrating 25 years of providing successful and free alternative education and structured discipline to at-risk youth between the ages of 16 and 18;

Whereas the Youth Challenge Program was born from the visionary concept of using a "whole person" intervention model to combat the effects of gangs, violence, high rates of school dropout, and drug abuse on a generation of youth;

Whereas the Youth Challenge Program is a federally and State-funded program that offers a unique opportunity for at-risk youth to change course at a critical time in life;

Whereas the multiphased Youth Challenge Program uses quasi-military discipline and training, coupled with educational instruction, learning, and mentorship, to promote the character development and resilience of at-risk youth;

Whereas one phase of the Youth Challenge Program is a 5-month residential program that focuses on the following 8 core components: life-coping skills, leadership and followership, service to community, job skills, academic excellence, responsible citizenship, health and hygiene, and physical fitness;

Whereas another phase of the Youth Challenge Program is a 12-month mentoring phase that builds on the 8 core components to help shape youth into productive citizens ready for societal success;

Whereas the Youth Challenge Program offers more than 10,000 cadets annually an opportunity to succeed outside of a traditional high school environment;

Whereas there are currently 40 Youth Challenge programs operating in 28 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia;

Whereas more than 160,000 cadets have graduated from the Youth Challenge Program;

Whereas more than 110,000 academic credentials have been awarded under the Youth Challenge Program; and

Whereas graduates of the Youth Challenge Program have improved physically and mentally and are poised to become assets to the communities of the graduates and to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that the National Guard Youth Challenge Program has been successfully helping at-risk youth for 25 years;

(2) commends the accomplishments of all of the graduates of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to support—

(A) the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; and

(B) the critical mission of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program to help and develop the character of at-risk youth in the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2045. Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COCHRAN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2046. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2047. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2048. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2049. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2050. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2051. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2052. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2053. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2054. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment in-

tended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2055. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2056. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2057. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2058. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2059. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2060. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2061. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2062. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2063. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2064. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2065. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2066. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2067. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2068. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2069. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2070. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2045. Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COCHRAN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TREATMENT OF CERTAIN NON-SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENTS IN THE CAPITAL OF UNCONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828), as amended by section 403(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) TREATMENT OF NONSIGNIFICANT INVESTMENTS IN THE CAPITAL OF UNCONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—For purposes of the final rules titled ‘Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule’ (78 Fed. Reg. 62018; published Oct. 11, 2013 and 79 Fed. Reg. 20754; published April 14, 2014) and any other regulation which incorporates a definition of the term ‘nonsignificant investments in the capital of unconsolidated financial institutions’, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall provide that investments in trust preferred securities (pooled and individual instruments) by a depository institution with assets of less than \$15,000,000,000 as of July 21, 2010, or a depository institution holding company with assets of less than \$15,000,000,000 as of July 21, 2010, shall not be subject to deduction from the regulatory capital of such depository institution or depository institution holding company or any depository institution holding company of such an institution, provided such investments were held prior to July 21, 2010.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO BASEL III CAPITAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than the end of the 3-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall amend the final rules titled “Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule” (78 Fed. Reg. 62018; published Oct. 11, 2013 and 79 Fed. Reg. 20754; published April 14, 2014) to implement the amendments made by this Act.

SA 2046. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under subsection (b) of such section

714 within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the audit required pursuant to subsection (a) is completed, the Comptroller General—

(A) shall submit to Congress a report on such audit; and

(B) shall make such report available to the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other Member of Congress who requests the report.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

(c) **REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.**—Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence.

(d) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “or (f)” each place such term appears;

(B) in subsection (e), by striking “the third undesignated paragraph of section 13” and inserting “section 13(3)”; and

(C) by striking subsection (f).

(2) **FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.**—Subsection (s) (relating to “Federal Reserve Transparency and Release of Information”) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “has the same meaning as in section 714(f)(1)(A) of title 31, United States Code” and inserting “means a program or facility, including any special purpose vehicle or other entity established by or on behalf of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or a Federal reserve bank, authorized by the Board of Governors under section 13(3), that is not subject to audit under section 714(e) of title 31, United States Code”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking “or in section 714(f)(3)(C) of title 31, United States Code, the information described in paragraph (1) and information concerning the transactions described in section 714(f) of such title,” and inserting “the information described in paragraph (1)”; and

(C) in paragraph (7), by striking “and section 13(3)(C), section 714(f)(3)(C) of title 31, United States Code, and” and inserting “, section 13(3)(C), and”.

SA 2047. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . RATE OF PAY FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1013(a)(2) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010

(12 U.S.C. 5493(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) **COMPENSATION.**—The rates of basic pay for all employees of the Bureau shall be set and adjusted by the Director in accordance with the General Schedule set forth in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to service by an employee of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection following the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2048. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. ____ . GAO REPORT ON PUERTO RICO FORECLOSURES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on foreclosures in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, including—

(1) the rate of foreclosures in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria

(2) the rate of return for housing developers in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(3) the rate of delinquency in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(4) the rate of homeownership in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(5) the rate of defaults on federally insured mortgages in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria; and

(6) policy recommendations to address adverse impacts of Hurricane Maria on the rates of foreclosure, delinquency, homeownership, and default rates in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SA 2049. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 504. REPORT ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN REAL ESTATE IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on foreign investment in real estate in the United States that includes the following:

(1) For each of the 30 years preceding such date of enactment, an estimate of the following:

(A) The total amount of foreign investment in real estate in the United States.

(B) The amount of investment described in subparagraph (A), disaggregated by—

(i) each of the 10 foreign countries from which the most such investment originates;

(ii) each covered foreign country; and
(iii) investment by public and private entities.

(C) The total amount of foreign investment in real estate in the United States in the 20 metropolitan statistical areas with the most such investment.

(D) The amount of investment described in subparagraph (C), disaggregated by—

(i) each of the metropolitan statistical areas described in that subparagraph;

(ii) each covered foreign country; and

(iii) investment by public and private entities.

(E) The total amount of foreign investment in real estate in the United States in the 10 States with the most such investment.

(F) The amount of investment described in subparagraph (E), disaggregated by—

(i) each of the States described in that subparagraph;

(ii) each covered foreign country; and

(iii) investment by public and private entities.

(2) An estimate of the percentage of the average home price in the metropolitan statistical areas described in paragraph (1)(C) attributable to foreign investment in real estate.

(3) An estimate of the percentage of the average home price in the States described in paragraph (1)(E) attributable to foreign investment in real estate.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) **COVERED COUNTRY.**—The term “covered country” means—

(A) Argentina;

(B) Brazil;

(C) Canada;

(D) Colombia;

(E) Germany;

(F) Japan;

(G) Norway;

(H) the People's Republic of China;

(I) Singapore;

(J) South Korea;

(K) Switzerland;

(L) the United Arab Emirates; and

(M) Venezuela.

(3) **METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA.**—The term “metropolitan statistical area” has the meaning given that term by the Office of Management and Budget.

SA 2050. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STANDARDS FOR PHYSICAL CONDITION AND MANAGEMENT OF HOUSING RECEIVING ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) is amended by inserting after subsection (v) the following:

“(w) **STANDARDS FOR PHYSICAL CONDITION AND MANAGEMENT OF HOUSING RECEIVING ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS.**—

“(1) STANDARDS FOR PHYSICAL CONDITION AND MANAGEMENT OF HOUSING.—Any entity receiving assistance payments under this section shall maintain decent, safe, and sanitary conditions, as determined by the Secretary, for any structure covered under a housing assistance payment contract.

“(2) SURVEY OF TENANTS.—The Secretary shall develop a process by which a Performance-Based Contract Administrator shall, on a semiannual basis, conduct a survey of the tenants of each structure covered under a housing assistance payment contract for the purpose of identifying consistent or persistent problems with the physical condition of the structure or performance of the manager of the structure.

“(3) REMEDIATION.—A structure covered under a housing assistance payment contract shall be referred to the Secretary for remediation if a Performance-Based Contract Administrator identifies a consistent or persistent problem with the structure or the management of the structure based on—

“(A) a survey conducted under paragraph (2); or

“(B) any other observation made by the Performance-Based Contract Administrator during the normal course of business.

“(4) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO UPHOLD STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may impose a penalty on any owner of a structure covered under a housing assistance payment contract if the Secretary finds that the structure or manager of the structure—

“(i) did not satisfactorily meet the requirements under paragraph (1); or

“(ii) is repeatedly referred to the Secretary for remediation by a Performance Based Contract Administrator through the process established under paragraph (3).

“(B) AMOUNT.—A penalty imposed under subparagraph (A) shall be in an amount equal to not less than 1 percent of the annual budget authority the owner is allocated under a housing assistance payment contract.

“(C) USE OF AMOUNTS.—Any amounts collected under this paragraph shall be used solely for the purpose of supporting safe and sanitary conditions at applicable structures or for tenant relocation, as designated by the Secretary, with priority given to the tenants of the structure that led to the penalty.

“(5) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection shall not apply to any property assisted under subsection (o).”.

(b) ISSUANCE OF REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) examines the adequacy of capital reserves for each structure covered under a housing assistance payment contract under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f);

(2) examines the use of funds derived from a housing assistance payment contract for purposes unrelated to the maintenance and capitalization of the structure covered under the contract; and

(3) includes any administrative or legislative recommendations to further improve the living conditions at those structures.

SA 2051. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL CONTRACTS IN EVENT OF DATA BREACH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No entity that has been subject to a data breach impacting over 10,000,000 individuals may be awarded any Federal contract until the Federal Trade Commission certifies, after appropriate consultation with the entity, that the issues or failures to adequately protect consumer data that led to the breach have been adequately resolved.

(b) POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective December 31, 2018, no entity shall be eligible to be awarded any Federal contract unless they have a policy in place to notify consumers within 30 days of being subject to a data breach.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall promulgate regulations that carry out this subsection.

SA 2052. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REQUIREMENT TO INVESTIGATE SIGNIFICANT VIOLATIONS AND DATA BREACHES.

In the case of a potential violation of laws or regulations within its jurisdiction known to affect or reasonably believed to affect at least 1,000,000 consumers, or a data breach known to affect or reasonably believed to affect at least 1,000,000 consumers, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall investigate the incident and promptly submit to Congress a report detailing why the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection did or did not assess fines and penalties or take other corrective actions. Such report shall be posted contemporaneously on the website of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection at a location that is conspicuous and available to the public.

SA 2053. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ INCREASED CIVIL PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN FALSE CERTIFICATIONS TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS REGARDING HOME LOANS TO BE GUARANTEED OR INSURED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 3737. Civil penalties for lenders making false certifications regarding home loans

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3802 of title 31, any lender who knowingly and willfully makes a false certification

under section 36.4340(k)(2) of title 38, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulation, shall be liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty equal to four times the amount of the Secretary's loss on the loan involved or another appropriate amount, not to exceed \$50,000, whichever is greater.

“(b) PATTERN OR PRACTICE.—(1) In any case in which a lender described in paragraph (2) makes a false certification under section 36.4340(k)(2) of title 38, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulation, that is a part of a pattern or practice of knowingly and willfully making false certifications under such section that has had an effect on 500 or more veterans, the lender shall be liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty equal to \$1,000,000 per veteran affected in addition to any amounts the lender may be liable for under subsection (a).

“(2) A lender described in this paragraph is a lender which has been identified as a global systematically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulation, or subject to a determination under section 113 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5323).

“(c) ADDITIONAL REMEDIES.—Any assessment under this section may be in addition to other remedies available to the Secretary.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3736 the following new item:

“3737. Civil penalties for lenders making false certifications regarding home loans.”.

SA 2054. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 303(a)(2)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), insert “under section 502 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6802)” after “shall not be liable”.

In section 303(a)(2)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), insert “under section 502 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6802)” after “shall not be liable”.

SA 2055. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401(a)(1), strike subparagraph (B) and insert the following:

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “the applicable threshold”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

SA 2056. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer

protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 401, add the following:

(g) TARP FUNDS.—Any financial institution that received more than \$1,000,000,000 from any funds made available under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5201 et seq.) shall be subject to the provisions amended by this section in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2057. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . USE OF CREDIT CHECKS PROHIBITED FOR EMPLOYMENT PURPOSES.

(a) PROHIBITION FOR EMPLOYMENT AND ADVERSE ACTION.—Section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(B), by inserting “within the restrictions set forth in subsection (b)” after “purposes”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (g) as subsections (c) through (h), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) USE OF CERTAIN CONSUMER REPORT PROHIBITED FOR EMPLOYMENT PURPOSES OR ADVERSE ACTION.—

“(1) GENERAL PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a person, including a prospective employer or current employer, may not use a consumer report or investigative consumer report, or cause a consumer report or investigative consumer report to be procured, with respect to any consumer where any information contained in the report bears on the creditworthiness, credit standing, or credit capacity of the consumer—

“(A) for employment purposes; or

“(B) for making an adverse action, as described in section 603(k)(1)(B)(ii).

“(2) SOURCE OF CONSUMER REPORT IRRELEVANT.—The prohibition described in paragraph (1) shall apply even if the consumer consents or otherwise authorizes the procurement or use of a consumer report for employment purposes or in connection with an adverse action with respect to the consumer.

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—Notwithstanding the prohibitions set forth in this subsection, and consistent with the other sections of this Act, an employer may use a consumer report with respect to a consumer in the following situations:

“(A) When the consumer applies for, or currently holds, employment that requires national security clearance.

“(B) When otherwise required by law.

“(4) EFFECT ON DISCLOSURE AND NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The exceptions described in paragraph (3) shall have no effect upon the other requirements of this Act, including requirements in regards to disclosure and notification to a consumer when permissibly using a consumer report for employment purposes or for making an adverse action against the consumer.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND CROSS REFERENCES.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act

(15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is further amended as follows:

(1) In section 603 (15 U.S.C. 1681a)—

(A) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “604(g)(3)” and inserting “604(h)(3)”; and

(B) in subsection (o), by striking “A” and inserting “Subject to the restrictions set forth in subsection 604(b), a”.

(2) In section 604 (15 U.S.C. 1681b)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (d)”; and

(B) in subsection (c), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2) of this section—

(i) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “and subject to the restrictions set forth in subsection (b)” after “subparagraph (B)”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting “and subject to the restrictions set forth in subsection (b)” after “subparagraph (B)”; and

(C) in subsection (d)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2) of this section, by striking “subsection (e)” each place that term appears and inserting “subsection (f)”; and

(D) in subsection (f), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2) of this section—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (c)(1)(B)” and inserting “subsection (d)(1)(B)”; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “subsection (c)(1)(B)” and inserting “subsection (d)(1)(B)”; and

(3) In section 607(e)(3)(A) (15 U.S.C. 1681e(e)(3)(A)), by striking “604(b)(4)(E)(i)” and inserting “604(c)(4)(E)(i)”.

(4) In section 609(a)(3)(C) (15 U.S.C. 1681g(a)(3)(C))—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “604(b)(4)(E)(i)” and inserting “604(c)(4)(E)(i)”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “604(b)(4)(A)” and inserting “604(c)(4)(A)”.

(5) In section 613(b) (15 U.S.C. 1681k(b)), by striking section “604(b)(4)(A)” and inserting “section 604(c)(4)(A)”.

(6) In section 615(d) (15 U.S.C. 1681m(d))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 604(c)(1)(B)” and inserting “section 604(d)(1)(B)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “section 604(e)” and inserting “section 604(f)”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “section 604(e)” and inserting “section 604(f)”.

SA 2058. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 401, add the following:

(g) RESTRICTION ON CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “covered bank holding company” means a bank holding company that—

(A) on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, was subject to the prudential standards under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365); and

(B) on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is no longer subject to the prudential standards described in subparagraph (A).

(2) RESTRICTION.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date on which a covered bank holding company is no longer subject to the prudential standards described in paragraph (1)(A), a covered bank holding company may not merge with or acquire another bank holding company.

SA 2059. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . PREDISPUTE ARBITRATION.

Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) PREDISPUTE AGREEMENTS AND WAIVERS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOAN.—The term ‘postsecondary education loan’—

“(I) means a loan that is—

“(aa) made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 1087a et seq., 1087aa et seq.); or

“(bb) issued or made by a postsecondary education lender and is—

“(AA) extended to a borrower with the expectation that the amounts extended will be used in whole or in part to pay postsecondary education expenses; or

“(BB) extended for the purpose of refinancing or consolidating 1 or more loans described in item (aa) or (bb);

“(II) includes a private education loan; and

“(III) does not include a loan—

“(aa) made under an open-end credit plan; or

“(bb) that is secured by real property.

“(ii) STUDENT LOAN SERVICER.—The term ‘student loan servicer’—

“(I) means a person who performs student loan servicing;

“(II) includes a person performing student loan servicing for a postsecondary education loan on behalf of an institution of higher education or the Secretary of Education under a contract or other agreement;

“(III) does not include the Secretary of Education to the extent the Secretary directly performs student loan servicing for a postsecondary education loan; and

“(IV) does not include an institution of higher education, to the extent that the institution directly performs student loan servicing for a Federal Perkins Loan made by the institution.

“(B) NO WAIVER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A borrower may not waive any right or remedy relating to a private education loan that is available to the borrower against a private educational lender, postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer before the dispute as to which the right or remedy relates arises.

“(ii) NO FORCE OR EFFECT.—Any waiver described in clause (i) agreed to before, on, or after the date of enactment of this paragraph shall not be enforceable and shall have no force or effect.

“(C) PREDISPUTE ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS.—An agreement entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this paragraph to arbitrate a dispute relating to a private education loan that had not arisen at the time the agreement was entered shall not be enforceable and shall have no force or effect.”.

SA 2060. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer

protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401, add at the end the following:
(g) PROHIBITION ON STOCK BUYBACKS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the terms “bank holding company” and “nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors” have the meanings given the terms in section 102(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5311(a)); and

(B) the term “covered entity” means a bank holding company or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors that is not subject to prudential standards under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) because of the amendments made by this section.

(2) PROHIBITION.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, no covered entity may buy back the stock of that covered entity.

SA 2061. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 401, add the following:

() OUTSOURCING OF JOBS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any financial institution that has outsourced more than 50 jobs in any given year during the 5-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act shall be subject to the provisions amended by this section in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) STUDY AND RULEMAKING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall publish a list of financial institutions that have outsourced more than 50 jobs in any given year during the 5-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2062. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. REVENUE SHARING AND DISCLOSURE OF AFFILIATION.

Chapter 2 of title I of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1631 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 140B. PREVENTING UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE MARKETING OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PRODUCTS AND SERVICES TO STUDENTS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AFFILIATE.—The term ‘affiliate’ means any person that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with another person.

“(2) AFFILIATED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘affiliated’, when used with respect to a consumer financial product or service and an institution of higher education, means an association between such institution and product or service resulting from—

“(i) the name, emblem, mascot, or logo of the institution being used with respect to such product or service; or

“(ii) some other word, picture, or symbol readily identified with the institution in the marketing of the consumer financial product or service in any way that implies that the institution endorses the consumer financial product or service.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to deem an association between an institution of higher education and a consumer financial product or service to be affiliated if such association is solely based on an advertisement by a financial institution that is delivered to a wide and general audience consisting of more than enrolled students at the institution of higher education.

“(3) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE.—The term ‘consumer financial product or service’ has the meaning given the term in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

“(4) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘financial institution’ means—

“(A) any person that engages in offering or providing a consumer financial product or service; and

“(B) any affiliate of such person described in subparagraph (A) if such affiliate acts as a service provider to such person.

“(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

“(6) PERSON.—The term ‘person’ means an individual, partnership, company, corporation, association (incorporated or unincorporated), trust, estate, cooperative organization, or other entity.

“(7) REVENUE-SHARING ARRANGEMENT.—The term ‘revenue-sharing arrangement’—

“(A) means an arrangement between an institution of higher education and a financial institution under which—

“(i) a financial institution provides or issues a consumer financial product or service to college students attending the institution of higher education;

“(ii) the institution of higher education recommends, promotes, sponsors, or otherwise endorses the financial institution, or the consumer financial products or services offered by the financial institution; and

“(iii) the financial institution pays a fee or provides other material benefits, including revenue or profit sharing, to the institution of higher education, or to an officer, employee, or agent of the institution of higher education, in connection with the consumer financial products and services provided to college students attending the institution of higher education; and

“(B) does not include an arrangement solely based on a financial institution paying a fair market price to an institution of higher education for the institution of higher education to advertise or market the financial institution to the general public.

“(8) SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ‘service provider’—

“(A) means any person that provides a material service to another person in connection with the offering or provision by such other person of a consumer financial product or service, including a person that—

“(i) participates in designing, operating, or maintaining the consumer financial product or service; or

“(ii) processes transactions relating to the consumer financial product or service (other than unknowingly or incidentally transmit-

ting or processing financial data in a manner that such data is undifferentiated from other types of data of the same form as the person transmits or processes); and

“(B) does not include a person solely by virtue of such person offering or providing to another person—

“(i) a support service of a type provided to businesses generally or a similar ministerial service; or

“(ii) time or space for an advertisement for a consumer financial product or service through print, newspaper, or electronic media.

“(b) DISCLOSURE OF AFFILIATION.—

“(1) REPORTS BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, each financial institution shall submit a report to the Bureau containing the terms and conditions of all business, marketing, and promotional agreements that the financial institution has with any institution of higher education, or an alumni organization or foundation that is an affiliate of or related to an institution of higher education, relating to any consumer financial product or service offered to college students at institutions of higher education.

“(B) DETAILS OF REPORT.—The information required to be reported by a financial institution under subparagraph (A) includes—

“(i) any memorandum of understanding between or among the financial institution and an institution of higher education, alumni association, or foundation that directly or indirectly relates to any aspect of an agreement referred to in subparagraph (A) or controls or directs any obligations or distribution of benefits between or among the entities; and

“(ii) the number and dollar amount outstanding of consumer financial products or services accounts covered by any such agreement that were originated during the period covered by the report, and the total number and dollar amount of consumer financial products or services accounts covered by the agreement that were outstanding at the end of such period.

“(C) AGGREGATION BY INSTITUTION.—The information required to be reported under subparagraph (A) shall be aggregated with respect to each institution of higher education or alumni organization or foundation that is an affiliate of or related to the institution of higher education.

“(2) REPORTS BY BUREAU.—The Bureau shall submit to Congress, and make available to the public, an annual report that lists the information submitted to the Bureau under paragraph (1).

“(3) ELECTRONIC DISCLOSURES.—

“(A) POSTING AGREEMENTS.—Each financial institution shall establish and maintain an Internet site on which the financial institution shall post the written agreement between the financial institution and the institution of higher education for each affiliated consumer financial product or service.

“(B) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION TO PROVIDE CONTRACTS TO THE BUREAU.—Each financial institution shall provide to the Bureau, in electronic format, the written agreements that it publishes on its Internet site pursuant to this paragraph.

“(C) RECORD REPOSITORY.—The Bureau shall establish and maintain on its publicly available Internet site a central repository of the agreements received from financial institutions pursuant to this paragraph, and such agreements shall be easily accessible and retrievable by the public.

“(D) EXCEPTION.—This paragraph shall not apply to individually negotiated changes to contractual terms, such as individually modified workouts or renegotiations of amounts owed by an institution of higher education.

“(c) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PRODUCTS OR SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.—A financial institution or service provider that offers a consumer financial product or service that is affiliated with an institution of higher education shall—

“(1) work with the institution of higher education to obtain a student’s consent to offer a consumer financial product or service before a consumer financial product or service is provided to the student;

“(2) ensure that any personally identifiable information about a student that is received by the financial institution or service provider—

“(A) is used solely for activities in the written agreement between the financial institution and the institution of higher education for each affiliated consumer financial product or service; and

“(B) is not shared with any other affiliate, person, or entity except for the purpose described in subparagraph (A);

“(3) inform the student of the terms and conditions of the consumer financial product or service, before the student uses the consumer financial product or service;

“(4) not charge the student any cost for using the consumer financial product or service for any purpose, including when the student conducts point-of-sale transactions, a balance inquiry, or withdrawal of funds; and

“(5) ensure that—

“(A) consumer financial product or service is not marketed or portrayed as, or converted into, a credit card; and

“(B) no credit is extended or associated with the consumer financial product or service, and no fee is charged to the student for any transaction or withdrawal.

“(d) PROHIBITION OF REVENUE-SHARING ARRANGEMENT.—A financial institution that offers a consumer financial product or service that is affiliated with an institution of higher education may not enter into a revenue-sharing arrangement with the institution of higher education.

“(e) STUDENT’S BEST FINANCIAL INTEREST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution or service provider that offers a consumer financial product or service that is affiliated with an institution of higher education shall ensure that the terms and conditions of all agreements that the financial institution has with any institution of higher education, or an alumni organization or foundation that is an affiliate of or related to an institution of higher education, relating to any consumer financial product or service offered to college students at institutions of higher education are consistent with the best financial interests of the students using the consumer financial product or service, as described in paragraph (2).

“(2) STUDENT’S BEST INTEREST.—A financial institution or service provider shall be considered to meet the requirement described in paragraph (1) if that financial institution—

“(A) ensures that all agreements that the financial institution has with any institution of higher education relating to any consumer financial product or service offered to college students enrolled at institutions of higher education—

“(i) make provisions for termination of the arrangement by the institution of higher

education based on complaints received from students enrolled at the institution; and

“(ii) do not require students enrolled at the institution of higher education to use consumer financial products or services offered by the financial institution in order to receive Federal student aid financial assistance funding authorized by title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965;

“(B) ensures that requirements of this section are met.

“(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a financial institution from establishing a consumer product or service affiliated with an institution of higher education if—

“(1) the consumer product or service will—

“(A) assist college students in reducing costs or fees associated with the use of consumer financial products or services;

“(B) increase consumer choice; and

“(C) enhance consumer protections; and

“(2) the financial institution is in compliance with the requirements of this Act.”.

SA 2063. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401, add at the end the following:

(g) APPLICATION.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the terms “bank holding company” and “nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors” have the meanings given the terms in section 102(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5311(a)); and

(B) the term “covered entity” means a bank holding company or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors—

(i) that would not be subject to prudential standards under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) because of the amendments made by this section; and

(ii) on which the Attorney General, or the head of any other Federal agency, has imposed more than \$10,000,000 in fines during the 10-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall not apply with respect to a covered entity.

SA 2064. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401, add at the end the following:

(g) APPLICATION.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the terms “bank holding company” and “nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors” have the meanings given the terms in section 102(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5311(a)); and

(B) the term “covered entity” means a bank holding company or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors—

(i) that is not subject to prudential standards under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) because of the amendments made by this section; and

(ii)(I) that is subject to a consent decree or a deferred prosecution agreement; or

(II) with respect to which a monitor has been appointed pursuant to a settlement with the Federal Government or a State agency.

(2) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall not apply with respect to a covered entity.

SA 2065. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—DATA BREACH PREVENTION AND COMPENSATION

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Data Breach Prevention and Compensation Act of 2018”.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CAREER APPOINTEE.—The term “career appointee” has the meaning given the term in section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) COVERED BREACH.—The term “covered breach” means any instance in which at least 1 piece of personally identifying information is exposed or is reasonably likely to have been exposed to an unauthorized party.

(4) COVERED CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY.—The term “covered consumer reporting agency” means—

(A) a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)); or

(B) a consumer reporting agency that earns not less than \$7,000,000 in annual revenue from the sales of consumer reports.

(5) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Cybersecurity.

(6) DETAIL.—The term “detail” means a temporary assignment of an employee to a different position for a specified period, with the employee returning to his or her regular duties at the end of the detail.

(7) PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.—The term “personally identifying information” means—

(A) a Social Security number;

(B) a driver’s license number;

(C) a passport number;

(D) an alien registration number or other government-issued unique identification number;

(E) unique biometric data, such as faceprint, fingerprint, voice print, iris image, or other unique physical representations;

(F) an individual’s first and last name or first initial and last name in combination with any information that relates to the individual’s past, present, or future physical or mental health or condition, or to the provision of health care to or diagnosis of the individual;

(G)(i) a financial account number, debit card number, or credit card number of the consumer; or

(ii) any passcode required to access an account described in clause (i); and

(H) such additional information, as determined by the Director.

SEC. 603. CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS AND FTC AUTHORITY.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Commission an Office of Cybersecurity, which shall be headed by a Director, who shall be a career appointee.

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Office of Cybersecurity—

(1) shall—

(A) supervise covered consumer reporting agencies with respect to data security;

(B) promulgate regulations for effective data security for covered consumer reporting agencies, including regulations that require covered consumer reporting agencies to—

(i) provide the Commission with descriptions of technical and organizational security measures, including—

(I) system and network security measures, including—

(aa) asset management, including—

(AA) an inventory of authorized and unauthorized devices;

(BB) an inventory of authorized and unauthorized software, including application whitelisting; and

(CC) secure configurations for hardware and software;

(bb) network management and monitoring, including—

(AA) mapped data flows, including functional mission mapping;

(BB) maintenance, monitoring, and analysis of audit logs;

(CC) network segmentation; and

(DD) local and remote access privileges, defined and managed; and

(cc) application management, including—

(AA) continuous vulnerability assessment and remediation;

(BB) server application hardening;

(CC) vulnerability handling such as coordinated vulnerability disclosure policy; and

(DD) patch management, including at, or near, real-time dashboards of patch implementation across network hosts; and

(II) data security, including—

(aa) data-centric security mechanisms such as format-preserving encryption, cryptographic data-splitting, and data-tagging and lineage;

(bb) encryption for data at rest;

(cc) encryption for data in transit;

(dd) systemwide data minimization evaluations and policies; and

(ee) data recovery capability; and

(ii) create and maintain documentation demonstrating that the covered consumer reporting agency is employing reasonable technical measures and corporate governance processes for continuous monitoring of data, intrusion detection, and continuous evaluation and timely patching of vulnerabilities;

(C) annually examine the data security measures of covered consumer reporting agencies for compliance with the standards promulgated under subparagraph (B);

(D) investigate any covered consumer reporting agency if the Office has reason to suspect a potential covered breach or non-compliance with the standards promulgated under subparagraph (B);

(E) after consultation with members of the technical and academic communities, develop a rigorous, repeatable methodology for evaluating, testing, and measuring effective data security practices of covered consumer reporting agencies, that employs forms of static and dynamic software analysis and penetration testing;

(F) submit to Congress an annual report on the findings on any investigation under subparagraph (C);

(G) determine whether covered consumer reporting agencies are complying with the regulations promulgated under subparagraph (B); and

(H) coordinate with the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center of the Department of Homeland Security; and

(2) may—

(A) investigate any breach to determine if the covered consumer reporting agency was in compliance with the regulations promulgated under paragraph (1)(B); and

(B) if the Commission has reason to believe that any covered consumer reporting agency is violating, or is about to violate, a regulation promulgated under paragraph (1)(B), bring a suit in a district court of the United States to enjoin any such act or practice.

(c) **STAFF.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint such personnel, including computer security researchers and practitioners with technical expertise in computer science, engineering, and cybersecurity, as the Director determines are necessary to carry out the duties of the Office.

(2) **DETAILS.**—An employee of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, or the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center of the Department of Homeland Security may be detailed to the Office, without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

SEC. 604. NOTIFICATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 10 days after a covered breach, the covered consumer reporting agency that was subject to the covered breach shall notify the Commission of the covered breach.

(b) **PENALTY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the event of a covered breach, the Commission shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission receives notification of the covered breach, commence a civil action to recover a civil penalty in a district court of the United States against the covered consumer reporting agency that was subject to the covered breach.

(2) **DETERMINING PENALTY AMOUNT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in determining the amount of a civil penalty under paragraph (1), the court shall impose a civil penalty on a covered consumer reporting agency of—

(i) \$100 for each consumer whose first and last name, or first initial and last name, and at least 1 item of personally identifying information was compromised; and

(ii) an additional \$50 for each additional item of personally identifying information compromised for each consumer.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), a court may not impose a civil penalty under this subsection in an amount greater than 50 percent of the gross revenue of the covered consumer reporting agency for the previous fiscal year before the date on which the covered consumer reporting agency became aware of the covered breach.

(ii) **PENALTY DOUBLED.**—A court shall impose a civil penalty on a covered consumer reporting agency double the penalty described in subparagraph (A), but not greater than 75 percent of the gross revenue of the

covered consumer reporting agency for the previous fiscal year before the date on which the covered consumer reporting agency became aware of the covered breach if—

(I) the covered consumer reporting agency fails to notify the Commission of a covered breach before the deadline established under subsection (a); or

(II) the covered consumer reporting agency violates any regulation promulgated under section 603(b)(1)(C).

(3) **PROCEEDS OF THE PENALTIES.**—Of the penalties assessed under this subsection—

(A) 50 percent shall be used for cybersecurity research and inspections by the Office of Cybersecurity; and

(B) 50 percent shall be used by the Commission to be divided fairly among consumers affected by the covered breach.

(4) **NO PREEMPTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall preclude an action by a consumer under State or other Federal law.

(c) **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.**—The Commission may bring suit in a district court of the United States or in the United States court of any Territory to enjoin a covered consumer reporting agency to implement or correct a particular security measure in order to promote effective security.

SEC. 605. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to carry out this title, to remain available until expended.

SA 2066. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS FOR SETTLEMENTS OF DISPUTES REGARDING SEXUAL ABUSE AND CERTAIN TYPES OF HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION.

Section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) **DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES REGARDING SETTLEMENTS OF DISPUTES RELATING TO SEXUAL ABUSE AND CERTAIN TYPES OF HARASSMENT OR DISCRIMINATION.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘covered discrimination’ means—

“(i) discrimination described in any of clauses (i) through (vi) of subparagraph (B); or

“(ii)(I) a violation of section 704(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-3(a)) that is related to discrimination described in subparagraph (B)(i) or (B)(vi)(I);

“(II) a violation of section 4(d) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 623(d)) that is related to discrimination described in subparagraph (B)(ii);

“(III) a violation of subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12203) that is related to discrimination described in subparagraph (B)(iii);

“(IV) a violation of section 207(f) of the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 2000ff-6(f)) that is related to discrimination described in subparagraph (B)(iv);

“(V) a violation of section 4311(b) of title 38, United States Code, that is related to discrimination described in subparagraph (B)(v); and

“(VI) a violation of section 40002(b)(13)(A) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(13)(A)) that—

“(aa) may cover retaliation described in a provision specified in any of subclauses (I) through (V); and

“(bb) is related to discrimination described in subparagraph (B)(vi)(II);

“(B) the term ‘covered harassment’ means harassment that is—

“(i) discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.);

“(ii) discrimination because of age under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 et seq.);

“(iii) discrimination on the basis of disability under—

“(I) title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111 et seq.); or

“(II) section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791);

“(iv) discrimination because of genetic information under title II of the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 2000ff et seq.);

“(v) discrimination on the basis of status concerning service in a uniformed service under section 4311(a) of title 38, United States Code; or

“(vi) discrimination because of sexual orientation or gender identity under—

“(I) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.); or

“(II) section 40002(b)(13)(A) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(13)(A));

“(C) the term ‘covered issuer’ means an issuer that is required to file Form 10-K;

“(D) the term ‘Form 10-K’ means the form described in section 249.310 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection;

“(E) the term ‘gender identity’ means the gender-related identity, appearance, mannerisms, or other gender-related characteristics of an individual, regardless of the designated sex of the individual at birth;

“(F) the term ‘settlement’ means any commitment or agreement—

“(i) without regard to whether the commitment or agreement, as applicable, is in writing; and

“(ii) under which an issuer directly or indirectly—

“(I) provides to an individual compensation or other consideration because of an allegation that the individual has been a victim of covered harassment, covered discrimination, or sexual abuse; or

“(II) establishes conditions that affect the terms of the employment, including by terminating the employment, of the individual with the issuer—

“(aa) because of the experience of the individual with, or the participation of the individual in, an alleged act of covered harassment, covered discrimination, or sexual abuse; and

“(bb) in exchange for which the individual agrees or commits not to—

“(AA) bring legal, administrative, or any other type of action against the issuer; or

“(BB) publicly disclose, for a period of time of any length, any portion of the alleged act described in item (aa) on which the commitment or agreement, as applicable, is based;

“(G) the term ‘sexual abuse’ means any type of sexual contact or behavior that oc-

curs without the explicit consent of the recipient, including forced sexual intercourse, forcible sodomy, child molestation, incest, fondling, and attempted rape; and

“(H) the term ‘sexual orientation’ means homosexuality, heterosexuality, or bisexuality.

“(2) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this subsection, each covered issuer shall disclose annually on Form 10-K, to shareholders of the covered issuer, and to the public—

“(i) with respect to the previous year—

“(I) the total number of settlements entered into by the covered issuer, a subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer, or a corporate executive of the covered issuer that relate to any alleged act of sexual abuse, covered harassment, or covered discrimination that—

“(aa) occurred in the workplace of the covered issuer or a subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer; or

“(bb) involves the behavior of an employee of the covered issuer, or a subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer, toward another such employee, without regard to whether that behavior occurred in the workplace of the covered issuer or the subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor, as applicable;

“(II) the total dollar amount paid with respect to the settlements described in subclause (I);

“(III) the total number of settlements entered into by the covered issuer, a subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer, or a corporate executive of the covered issuer that relate to any alleged act of sexual abuse, covered harassment, or covered discrimination that—

“(aa) was committed by a corporate executive of—

“(AA) the covered issuer; or

“(BB) a subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer; and

“(bb)(AA) occurred in the workplace of the covered issuer or a subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer, as applicable; or

“(BB) involved the behavior of a corporate executive described in item (aa) toward another employee of the covered issuer or a subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer, as applicable, without regard to whether that behavior occurred in the workplace of the covered issuer or a subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer;

“(IV) the total dollar amount with respect to the settlements described in subclause (III); and

“(V) the average length of time required for the covered issuer to resolve a complaint relating to covered discrimination, covered harassment, or sexual abuse; and

“(ii) as of the date on which the disclosure is made, the total number of complaints relating to covered discrimination, covered harassment, and sexual abuse that the covered issuer is working to resolve through—

“(I) processes that are internal to the covered issuer; and

“(II) litigation.

“(B) CATEGORIES.—Subject to subparagraph (C), in each disclosure required under subparagraph (A), a covered issuer shall report the total number of settlements in subclauses (I) and (III) of subparagraph (A)(i) and the total dollar amounts in subclauses (II) and (IV) of subparagraph (A)(i) in the aggregate and list each such settlement by any

of the following categories that apply to the settlement:

“(i) Settlements relating to sexual abuse, covered discrimination, or covered harassment because of sex.

“(ii) Settlements relating to covered discrimination or covered harassment because of race, color, or national origin.

“(iii) Settlements relating to covered discrimination or covered harassment because of religion.

“(iv) Settlements relating to covered discrimination or covered harassment because of age.

“(v) Settlements relating to covered discrimination or covered harassment on the basis of disability.

“(vi) Settlements relating to covered discrimination or covered harassment because of genetic information.

“(vii) Settlements relating to covered discrimination or covered harassment on the basis of status concerning service in a uniformed service.

“(viii) Settlements relating to covered discrimination or covered harassment because of sexual orientation or gender identity.

“(C) PROHIBITIONS ON CERTAIN DISCLOSURES.—

“(i) PROHIBITION ON DISCLOSURES BY COVERED ISSUERS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A covered issuer may not—

“(aa) in any disclosure made under subparagraph (A), or in any other public disclosure, disclose the name of a victim of an alleged act of sexual abuse, covered harassment, or covered discrimination on which a settlement or complaint, as applicable, described in subparagraph (A) is based; or

“(bb) under subparagraph (B), categorize a settlement described in subclause (I) or (III) of subparagraph (A)(i) if the victim of the alleged act of sexual abuse, covered harassment, or covered discrimination on which the settlement is based objects to that categorization.

“(II) INDICATION OF OBJECTION.—A covered issuer shall indicate in any disclosure made under subparagraph (A) whether any objection has been made under subclause (I)(bb) of this clause.

“(ii) PROHIBITION ON DISCLOSURES BY THE COMMISSION.—The Commission may not disclose the name of a victim of an alleged act of sexual abuse, covered harassment, or covered discrimination on which a settlement or complaint, as applicable, described in subparagraph (A) is based.

“(D) PREVENTION OF SEXUAL ABUSE, COVERED HARASSMENT, AND COVERED DISCRIMINATION.—In each disclosure required under subparagraph (A), the covered issuer making the disclosure shall include a description of the measures taken by the covered issuer and any subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer to prevent employees of the covered issuer and any subsidiary, contractor, or subcontractor of the covered issuer from committing or engaging in sexual abuse, covered harassment, or covered discrimination.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—The Commission may promulgate such regulations as the Commission considers necessary to implement the requirements under paragraph (2).”.

SA 2067. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other

purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 301 and insert the following:
SEC. 301. PROTECTING CONSUMERS' CREDIT.

(a) **DEFINITION OF CREDIT FREEZE.**—Section 603(q) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(q)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **CREDIT FREEZE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘credit freeze’ means a restriction placed at the request of a consumer or a personal representative of the consumer, on the consumer report of the consumer, that prohibits a consumer reporting agency from releasing the consumer report for a purpose relating to the extension of credit without the express authorization of the consumer.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—A credit freeze shall not apply to the use of a consumer report by any of the following:

“(i) A person, or the subsidiary, affiliate, agent, subcontractor, or assignee of the person, with whom the consumer has, or prior to assignment had, an account, contract, or debtor-creditor relationship for the purposes of reviewing the active account or collecting the financial obligation owed on the account, contract, or debt.

“(ii) A person, or the subsidiary, affiliate, agent, subcontractor, or assignee of the person, to whom access has been granted pursuant to a request by the consumer described under section 605A(1)(B), for purposes of facilitating the extension of credit or other permissible use.

“(iii) Any person acting pursuant to a court order, warrant, or subpoena.

“(iv) A Federal, State, or local government, or an agent or assignee thereof.

“(v) Any person for the sole purpose of providing a credit monitoring or identity theft protection service to which the consumer has subscribed.

“(vi) Any person for the purpose of providing a consumer with a copy of the consumer report or credit score of the consumer upon request by the consumer.

“(vii) Any person or entity for insurance purposes, including use in setting or adjusting a rate, adjusting a claim, or underwriting.

“(viii) Any person acting pursuant to an authorization from a consumer to use their consumer report for employment purposes.”.

(b) **ENHANCEMENT OF FRAUD ALERT PROTECTIONS.**—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “ONE-CALL” and inserting “ONE-YEAR”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “INITIAL ALERTS” and inserting “IN GENERAL”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or harmed by the unauthorized disclosure of the financial or personally identifiable information of the consumer,” after “identity theft,”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “90 days” and inserting “1 year”;

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by inserting “1-year” before “fraud alert”;

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) upon the expiration of the 1-year period described in subparagraph (A) or a subsequent 1-year period, and in response to a direct request by the consumer or such rep-

resentative, continue the fraud alert for an additional period of 1 year if the information asserted in this paragraph remains applicable.”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “1-year” before “fraud alert”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “any request described in subparagraph (A)” and inserting “the consumer reporting agency includes the 1-year fraud alert in the file of the consumer”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “EXTENDED” and inserting “SEVEN-YEAR”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “5-year period beginning on the date of such request” and inserting “the 7-year period described in subparagraph (A)”;

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking “extended” and inserting “7-year”;

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) upon the expiration of the 7-year period described in subparagraph (A) or a subsequent 7-year period, and in response to a direct request by the consumer or such representative, continue the fraud alert for an additional period of 7 years if the consumer or such representative submits an updated identity theft report.”; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) disclose to the consumer that the consumer may request a free copy of the file of the consumer pursuant to section 612(d) during each 12-month period beginning on the date on which the 7-year fraud alert was included in the file and ending on the date of the last day that the 7-year fraud alert applies to the file of the consumer; and”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking “Upon the direct request” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the direct request”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **ACCESS TO FREE REPORTS.**—If a consumer reporting agency includes an active duty alert in the file of an active duty military consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall—

“(A) disclose to the active duty military consumer that the active duty military consumer may request a free copy of the file of the active duty military consumer pursuant to section 612(d), during each 12-month period beginning on the date on which the active duty military alert is requested and ending on the date of the last day that the active duty alert applies to the file of the active duty military consumer; and

“(B) not later than 3 business days after the date on which the active duty military consumer makes a request described in subparagraph (A), provide to the active duty military consumer all disclosures required to be made under section 609, without charge to the active duty military consumer.”;

(4) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) **PROCEDURES.**—Each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall

establish and make available to the public on the Internet website of the consumer reporting agency policies and procedures to comply with this section, including policies and procedures—

“(1) that inform consumers of the availability of 1-year fraud alerts, 7-year fraud alerts, active duty alerts, and credit freezes, as applicable;

“(2) that allow consumers to request 1-year fraud alerts, 7-year fraud alerts, and active duty alerts, as applicable, and to place, temporarily lift, or fully remove a credit freeze in a simple and easy manner; and

“(3) for asserting in good faith a suspicion that the consumer has been or is about to become a victim of identity theft, fraud, or a related crime, or harmed by the unauthorized disclosure of the financial or personally identifiable information of the consumer, for a consumer seeking a 1-year fraud alert or credit freeze.”;

(5) in subsection (e), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “1-year or 7-year” before “fraud alert”;

(6) in subsection (f), by striking “or active duty alert” and inserting “active duty alert, or credit freeze, as applicable.”;

(7) in subsection (g)—

(A) by inserting “or has been harmed by the unauthorized disclosure of the financial or personally identifiable information of the consumer,” after “identity theft,”; and

(B) by inserting “or credit freezes” after “request alerts”;

(8) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “INITIAL” and inserting “1-YEAR”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “initial” and inserting “1-year”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “an initial” and inserting “a 1-year”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “EXTENDED” and inserting “7-YEAR”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “extended” and inserting “7-year”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “an extended” and inserting “a 7-year”.

(c) **PROVIDING FREE ACCESS TO CREDIT FREEZES.**—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **CREDIT FREEZES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the direct request of a consumer, or an individual acting on behalf of or as a personal representative of a consumer, a consumer reporting agency that maintains a file on the consumer and has received appropriate proof of the identity of the requester (as described in section 1022.123 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto) shall—

“(A)(i) not later than 1 business day after receiving the request sent by postal mail, toll-free telephone, or secure electronic means as established by the agency, place a credit freeze on the file of the consumer;

“(ii) not later than 5 business days after placing a credit freeze described in clause (i), provide the consumer with written confirmation of the credit freeze and a unique personal identification number or password (other than the social security number of the consumer) for use to authorize the release of the file of the consumer for a specific period of time; and

“(iii) disclose all relevant information to the consumer relating to the procedures for temporarily lifting and fully removing a credit freeze, including a statement about the maximum amount of time given to an agency to conduct those actions;

“(B) if the consumer provides a correct personal identification number or password, temporarily lift an existing credit freeze from the file of the consumer for a period of time specified by the consumer for a specific user or category of users, as determined by the consumer—

“(i) not later than 1 business day after receiving the request by postal mail; or

“(ii) not later than 15 minutes after receiving the request by toll-free telephone number or secure electronic means established by the agency, if the request is received during regular business hours, except if the ability of the consumer reporting agency to temporarily lift the credit freeze is prevented by—

“(I) an act of God, including earthquakes, hurricanes, storms, or similar natural disaster or phenomenon, or fire;

“(II) unauthorized or illegal acts by a third party including terrorism, sabotage, riot, vandalism, labor strikes or disputes disrupting operations, or a similar occurrence;

“(III) an operational interruption, including electrical failure, unanticipated delay in equipment or replacement part delivery, computer hardware or software failures inhibiting response time, or a similar disruption;

“(IV) governmental action, including emergency orders or regulations, judicial or law enforcement action, or a similar directive;

“(V) regularly scheduled maintenance or updates to the systems of the consumer reporting agency occurring outside of normal business hours; or

“(VI) commercially reasonable maintenance of, or repair to, the systems of the consumer reporting agency that is unexpected or unscheduled; or

“(C) if the consumer provides a correct personal identification number or password, fully remove an existing credit freeze from the file of the consumer not later than 21 business days after receiving the request by postal mail, toll-free telephone, or secure electronic means established by the consumer reporting agency.

“(2) NO FEE.—A consumer reporting agency may not charge a consumer a fee to place, temporarily lift, or fully remove a credit freeze.

“(3) EXCLUSION FROM THIRD-PARTY LISTS.—During the period beginning on the date on which a consumer or a representative of the consumer requests to place a credit freeze and ending the date on which the consumer or representative requests to fully remove a credit freeze, a consumer reporting agency shall exclude the consumer from any list of consumers prepared by the consumer reporting agency and provided to any third party to offer credit or insurance to the consumer as part of a transaction that was not initiated by the consumer, unless the consumer or that representative requests that the exclusion be rescinded before end of the period.”.

(d) ADDITIONAL FREE CONSUMER REPORT.—Section 612 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or subsection (h)” after “through (d)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) FREE DISCLOSURES IN CONNECTION WITH CREDIT FREEZE.—In addition to the free annual disclosure required under subsection (a)(1)(A), each consumer reporting agency that maintains a file on a consumer who requests a credit freeze under section 605A(i) shall make all disclosures pursuant to sec-

tion 609 once during any 12-month period without charge to the consumer if the consumer makes a request under section 609.”.

(e) REFUNDS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “consumer”, “consumer reporting agency”, and “credit freeze” have the meanings given those terms in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a), as amended by subsection (a).

(2) REFUNDS.—With respect to any consumer who requested a credit freeze from a consumer reporting agency during the period beginning on September 7, 2017, and ending on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, the consumer reporting agency—

(A) shall issue a refund to the consumer for any fees charged to the consumer relating to the request for a credit freeze; and

(B) may not impose a fee on the consumer to temporarily lift or fully remove the credit freeze.

SA 2068. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. 308. IMPROVED CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) DISCHARGE OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS IN THE EVENT OF DEATH OR DISABILITY OF THE BORROWER.—Each private education loan shall include terms that provide that the liability to repay the loan shall be cancelled—

“(A) upon the death of the borrower;

“(B) if the borrower becomes permanently and totally disabled, as determined under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 437(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a)) and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Education under that section; and

“(C) if the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of Defense determines that the borrower is unemployable due to a service-connected condition or disability, in accordance with the requirements of section 437(a)(2) of that Act and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Education under that section.

“(13) TRANSFER OF SERVICING.—

“(A) DISCLOSURE TO APPLICANT RELATING TO TRANSFER OF SERVICING.—A private education lender shall disclose to each person who applies for a private education loan, at the time of application for the private education loan, whether there may be a transfer of servicing of the private education loan at any time during which the private education loan is outstanding.

“(B) NOTICE BY TRANSFEROR SERVICER AT TIME OF TRANSFER OF SERVICING.—

“(i) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—A transferor servicing shall notify the borrower under a private education loan, in writing, of any transfer of student loan servicing for the private education loan (with respect to which such notice is made).

“(ii) TIME OF NOTICE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subclause (II), the notice required under clause (i) shall be made to the borrower not less than 15 days before the effective date of transfer of the student loan servicing of the private education loan.

“(II) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS.—The notice required under clause (i) shall be made to the borrower not more than 30 days after the effective date of transfer of the student loan servicing of the borrower’s private education loan if the transfer of student loan servicing is preceded by—

“(aa) termination of the contract for student loan servicing of the private education loan for cause;

“(bb) commencement of bankruptcy proceedings of the transferor servicing; or

“(cc) any other situation in which the Bureau determines that such exception is warranted.

“(C) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—The notice required under subparagraph (B) shall—

“(i) be made in writing and, if the transferor servicing has an email address for the borrower, by email; and

“(ii) include—

“(I) the effective date of the transfer;

“(II) the name, address, website, and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of the transferee servicing;

“(III) a toll-free or collect-call telephone number for an individual employed by the transferor servicing, or the office or department of, the transferor servicing that can be contacted by the borrower to answer inquiries relating to the transfer of servicing;

“(IV) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number for an individual employed by the transferee servicing, or the office or department of, the transferee servicing that can be contacted by the borrower to answer inquiries relating to the transfer of servicing;

“(V) the date on which the transferor servicing will cease to accept payments relating to the borrower’s private education loan and the date on which the transferee servicing will begin to accept such payments;

“(VI) a statement that the transfer of student loan servicing of the private education loan does not affect any term or condition of the private education loan other than terms directly related to the student loan servicing of the private education loan;

“(VII) a statement disclosing—

“(aa) whether borrower authorization for recurring electronic funds transfers will be transferred to the transferee servicing; and

“(bb) if any such recurring electronic funds transfers cannot be transferred, information as to how the borrower may establish new recurring electronic funds transfers in connection with transfer of servicing to the transferee servicing;

“(VIII) a statement disclosing—

“(aa) the application of all payments and charges relating to the borrower’s private education loan as of the effective date of the transfer, including—

“(AA) the date the last payment of the borrower was received;

“(BB) the date the last late fee, arrearages, or other charge was applied; and

“(CC) the amount of the last payment allocated to principal, interest, and other charges;

“(bb) the status of the borrower’s private education loan as of the effective date of the transfer, including whether the loan is in default;

“(cc) whether any application for an alternative repayment arrangement submitted by the borrower is pending; and

“(dd) an itemization and explanation for all arrearages claimed to be due as of the effective date of the transfer;

“(IX) a detailed description of any benefit, alternative repayment arrangement, or other term or condition arranged between

the transferor servicer and the borrower that is not included in the terms of the promissory note;

“(X) a detailed description of any item identified under subclause (VIII) that will cease to apply upon transfer, including an explanation; and

“(XI) information on how to file a complaint with the Bureau.

“(D) NOTICE BY TRANSFEREE SERVICER AT TIME OF TRANSFER OF SERVICING.—

“(i) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—A transferee servicer shall notify the borrower under a private education loan, in writing, of any transfer of servicing of the private education loan.

“(ii) TIME OF NOTICE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), the notice required under clause (i) shall be made to the borrower not more than 15 days after the effective date of transfer of the student loan servicing of the borrower's private education loan.

“(II) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS.—The notice required under clause (i) shall be made to the borrower not more than 30 days after the effective date of transfer of the student loan servicing of the student loan servicing of borrower's private education loan if the transfer of servicing is preceded by—

“(aa) termination of the contract for student loan servicing the private education loan for cause;

“(bb) commencement of bankruptcy proceedings of the transferor servicer; or

“(cc) any other situation in which the Bureau determines that such exception is warranted.

“(E) METHOD OF NOTIFICATION.—The notification required under this subsection shall be provided in writing.

“(F) TREATMENT OF LOAN PAYMENTS DURING TRANSFER PERIOD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—During the 60-day period beginning on the effective date of transfer relating to a borrower's private education loan, a late fee may not be imposed on the borrower with respect to any payment on the private education loan, and no such payment may be treated as late for any other purposes, if the payment is received by the transferor servicer (rather than the transferee servicer who should properly receive payment) before the due date applicable to such payment.

“(ii) NOTICE.—To the maximum extent practicable, a transferor servicer shall notify a borrower, both in writing and by telephone, regarding any payment received by the transferor servicer (rather than the transferee servicer who should properly receive payment).

“(G) ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—A transferee servicer shall make available to a borrower whose student loan servicing is transferred to the transferee servicer a simple, online process through which the borrower may transfer to the transferee servicer any existing authority for an electronic fund transfer that the borrower had provided to the transferor servicer.

“(14) PAYMENTS AND FEES.—

“(A) PROHIBITION ON RECOMMENDING DEFAULT.—A loan holder or student loan servicer may not recommend or encourage default or delinquency on an existing private education loan prior to and in connection with the process of qualifying for or enrolling in an alternative repayment arrangement, including the origination of a new private education loan that refinances all or any portion of such existing loan or debt.

“(B) LATE FEES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A late fee may not be charged to a borrower under a private education loan under any of the following circumstances, either individually or in combination:

“(I) On a per-loan basis when a borrower has multiple private education loans in a billing group.

“(II) In an amount greater than 4 percent of the amount of the payment past due.

“(III) Before the end of the 15-day period beginning on the date the payment is due.

“(IV) More than once with respect to a single late payment.

“(V) The borrower fails to make a singular, non successive regularly-scheduled payment on the private education loan.

“(ii) COORDINATION WITH SUBSEQUENT LATE FEES.—No late fee may be charged to a borrower under a private education loan relating to an insufficient payment if the payment is made on or before the due date of the payment, or within any applicable grace period for the payment, if the insufficiency is attributable only to a late fee relating to an earlier payment, and the payment is otherwise a full payment for the applicable period.

“(15) MODIFICATION AND DEFERRAL FEES PROHIBITED.—A loan holder or student loan servicer may not charge a borrower any fee to modify, renew, extend, or amend a private education loan, or to defer any payment due under the terms of a private education loan.”

(b) PROHIBITION OF ACCELERATION OF PAYMENTS ON PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a private education loan (as defined in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)) executed after the date of enactment of this Act may not include a provision that permits the loan holder or student loan servicer to accelerate, in whole or in part, payments on the private education loan.

(2) ACCELERATION CAUSED BY A PAYMENT DEFAULT.—A private education loan may include a provision that permits acceleration of the loan in cases of payment default.

SA 2069. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “21st Century Glass-Steagall Act of 2017”.

SEC. 602. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) in response to a financial crisis and the ensuing Great Depression, Congress enacted the Banking Act of 1933, known as the “Glass-Steagall Act”, to prohibit commercial banks from offering investment banking and insurance services;

(2) a series of deregulatory decisions by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, in addition to decisions by Federal courts, permitted commercial banks to engage in an increasing number of risky financial activities that had previously been restricted under the Glass-Steagall Act, and also vastly expanded the meaning of the “business of banking” and “closely related activities” in banking law;

(3) in 1999, Congress enacted the “Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act”, which repealed the Glass-Steagall Act separation between commercial and investment banking and allowed for complex cross-subsidies and interconnections between commercial and investment banks;

(4) former Kansas City Federal Reserve President Thomas Hoenig observed that “with the elimination of Glass-Steagall, the largest institutions with the greatest ability to leverage their balance sheets increased their risk profile by getting into trading, market making, and hedge fund activities, adding ever greater complexity to their balance sheets.”;

(5) the Financial Crisis Inquiry Report issued by the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission concluded that, in the years between the passage of the Gramm-Leach Bliley Act and the global financial crisis, “regulation and supervision of traditional banking had been weakened significantly, allowing commercial banks and thrifts to operate with fewer constraints and to engage in a wider range of financial activities, including activities in the shadow banking system.”. The Commission also concluded that “[t]his deregulation made the financial system especially vulnerable to the financial crisis and exacerbated its effects.”;

(6) a report by the Financial Stability Oversight Council pursuant to section 123 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5333) states that increased complexity and diversity of financial activities at financial institutions may “shift institutions towards more risk-taking, increase the level of interconnectedness among financial firms, and therefore may increase systemic default risk. These potential costs may be exacerbated in cases where the market perceives diverse and complex financial institutions as ‘too big to fail,’ which may lead to excessive risk taking and concerns about moral hazard.”;

(7) the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations report, “Wall Street and the Financial Crisis: Anatomy of a Financial Collapse”, states that repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act “made it more difficult for regulators to distinguish between activities intended to benefit customers versus the financial institution itself. The expanded set of financial services investment banks were allowed to offer also contributed to the multiple and significant conflicts of interest that arose between some investment banks and their clients during the financial crisis.”;

(8) the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations report, “JPMorgan Chase Whale Trades: A Case History of Derivatives Risks and Abuses”, describes how traders at JPMorgan Chase made risky bets using excess deposits that were partly insured by the Federal Government;

(9) in Europe, the Vickers Independent Commission on Banking (for the United Kingdom) and the Liikanen Report (for the Euro area) have both found that there is no inherent reason to bundle “retail banking” with “investment banking” or other forms of relatively high risk securities trading, and European countries are set on a path of separating various activities that are currently bundled together in the business of banking;

(10) private sector actors prefer having access to underpriced public sector insurance, whether explicit (for insured deposits) or implicit (for “too big to fail” financial institutions), to subsidize dangerous levels of risk-

taking, which, from a broader social perspective, is not an advantageous arrangement; and

(11) the financial crisis, and the regulatory response to the crisis, has led to more mergers between financial institutions, creating greater financial sector consolidation and increasing the dominance of a few large, complex financial institutions that are generally considered to be “too big to fail”, and therefore are perceived by the markets as having an implicit guarantee from the Federal Government to bail them out in the event of their failure.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting the ability of banks to engage in activities other than socially valuable core banking activities;

(2) to protect taxpayers and reduce moral hazard by removing explicit and implicit government guarantees for high-risk activities outside of the core business of banking; and

(3) to eliminate any conflict of interest that arises from banks engaging in activities from which their profits are earned at the expense of their customers or clients.

SEC. 603. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “bank holding company” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841); and

(2) the terms “insurance company”, “insured depository institution”, “securities entity”, and “swaps entity” have the meanings given those terms in section 18(s)(6)(D) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as added by section 604(a) of this title.

SEC. 604. SAFE AND SOUND BANKING.

(a) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—Section 18(s) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(s)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) LIMITATIONS ON BANKING AFFILIATIONS.—

“(A) PROHIBITION ON AFFILIATIONS WITH NONDEPOSITORY ENTITIES.—An insured depository institution may not—

“(i) be or become an affiliate of any insurance company, securities entity, or swaps entity;

“(ii) be in common ownership or control with any insurance company, securities entity, or swaps entity; or

“(iii) engage in any activity that would cause the insured depository institution to qualify as an insurance company, securities entity, or swaps entity.

“(B) INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE TO SERVE ON BOARDS OF DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An individual who is an officer, director, partner, or employee of any securities entity, insurance company, or swaps entity may not serve at the same time as an officer, director, employee, or other institution-affiliated party of any insured depository institution.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i) shall not apply with respect to service by any individual which is otherwise prohibited under clause (i), if the appropriate Federal banking agency determines, by regulation with respect to a limited number of cases, that service by such an individual as an officer, director, employee, or other institution-affiliated party of an insured depository institution would not unduly influence—

“(I) the investment policies of the depository institution; or

“(II) the advice that the institution provides to customers.

“(iii) TERMINATION OF SERVICE.—Subject to a determination under clause (i), any individual described in clause (i) who, as of the date of enactment of the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act of 2017, is serving as an officer, director, employee, or other institution-affiliated party of any insured depository institution shall terminate such service as soon as is practicable after such date of enactment, and in no event, later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on that date of enactment.

“(C) TERMINATION OF EXISTING AFFILIATIONS AND ACTIVITIES.—

“(i) ORDERLY TERMINATION OF EXISTING AFFILIATIONS AND ACTIVITIES.—Any affiliation, common ownership or control, or activity of an insured depository institution with any securities entity, insurance company, swaps entity, or any other person, as of the date of enactment of the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act of 2017, which is prohibited under subparagraph (A) shall be terminated as soon as is practicable, and in no event later than the end of the 5-year period beginning on that date of enactment.

“(ii) EARLY TERMINATION.—The appropriate Federal banking agency, at any time after opportunity for hearing, may order termination of an affiliation, common ownership or control, or activity prohibited by clause (i) before the end of the 5-year period described in clause (i), if the agency determines that such action—

“(I) is necessary to prevent undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interest, or unsound banking practices; and

“(II) is in the public interest.

“(iii) EXTENSION.—Subject to a determination under clause (ii), an appropriate Federal banking agency may extend the 5-year period described in clause (i) as to any particular insured depository institution for not more than an additional 6 months at a time, if—

“(I) the agency certifies that such extension would promote the public interest and would not pose a significant threat to the stability of the banking system or financial markets in the United States; and

“(II) such extension, in the aggregate, does not exceed 1 year for any single insured depository institution.

“(iv) REQUIREMENTS FOR ENTITIES RECEIVING AN EXTENSION.—Upon receipt of an extension under clause (iii), the insured depository institution shall notify shareholders of the insured depository institution and the general public that it has failed to comply with the requirements of clause (i).

“(D) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the following definitions shall apply:

“(i) INSURANCE COMPANY.—The term ‘insurance company’ has the meaning given the term in section 2(q) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841(q)).

“(ii) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘insured depository institution’—

“(I) has the meaning given the term in section 3(c)(2); and

“(II) does not include a savings association controlled by a savings and loan holding company, as described in section 10(c)(9)(C) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(c)(9)(C)).

“(iii) SECURITIES ENTITY.—The term ‘securities entity’—

“(I) includes any entity engaged in—

“(aa) the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution of stocks, bonds, debentures, notes, or other securities;

“(bb) market making;

“(cc) activities of a broker or dealer, as those terms are defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a));

“(dd) activities of a futures commission merchant;

“(ee) activities of an investment adviser or investment company, as those terms are defined in section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)) and section 3(a)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(a)(1)), respectively; or

“(ff) hedge fund or private equity investments in the securities of either privately or publicly held companies; and

“(II) does not include a bank that, pursuant to its authorized trust and fiduciary activities—

“(aa) purchases and sells investments for the account of its customers; or

“(bb) provides financial or investment advice to its customers.

“(iv) SWAPS ENTITY.—The term ‘swaps entity’ means any swap dealer, security-based swap dealer, major swap participant, or major security-based swap participant, that is registered under—

“(I) the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); or

“(II) the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.).”

(b) LIMITATION ON BANKING ACTIVITIES.—Section 21 of the Banking Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 378) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) BUSINESS OF RECEIVING DEPOSITS.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘business of receiving deposits’ includes the establishment and maintenance of any transaction account (as defined in section 19(b)(1)(C) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(1)(C))).”

(c) PERMITTED ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL BANKS.—The paragraph designated as “Seventh” of section 24 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) is amended to read as follows:

“Seventh. (A) To exercise by its board of directors or duly authorized officers or agents, subject to law, all such powers as are necessary to carry on the business of banking.

“(B) As used in this paragraph, the term ‘business of banking’ shall be limited to the following core banking services:

“(i) RECEIVING DEPOSITS.—A national banking association may engage in the business of receiving deposits.

“(ii) EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT.—A national banking association may—

“(I) extend credit to individuals, businesses, not for profit organizations, and other entities;

“(II) discount and negotiate promissory notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and other evidences of debt; and

“(III) loan money on personal security.

“(iii) PAYMENT SYSTEMS.—A national banking association may participate in payment systems, defined as instruments, banking procedures, and interbank funds transfer systems that ensure the circulation of money.

“(iv) COIN AND BULLION.—A national banking association may buy, sell, and exchange coin and bullion.

“(v) INVESTMENTS IN SECURITIES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A national banking association may invest in investment securities, defined as marketable obligations evidencing indebtedness of any person, copartnership, association, or corporation in the form of bonds, notes, or debentures (commonly known as ‘investment securities’), obligations of the Federal Government, or any State or subdivision thereof, and includes

the definition of 'investment securities', as may be jointly prescribed by regulation by—

“(aa) the Comptroller of the Currency;

“(bb) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and

“(cc) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

“(II) LIMITATIONS.—The business of dealing in securities and stock by the association shall be limited to—

“(aa) purchasing and selling such securities and stock without recourse, solely upon the order, and for the account of, customers, and in no case for its own account, and the association shall not underwrite any issue of securities or stock; and

“(bb) purchasing for its own account investment securities under such limitations and restrictions as the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may jointly prescribe, by regulation.

“(III) PROHIBITION ON AMOUNT OF INVESTMENT.—In no event shall the total amount of the investment securities of any single obligor or maker, held by the association for its own account, exceed 10 percent of its capital stock actually paid in and unimpaired and 10 percent of its unimpaired surplus fund, except that such limitation shall not require any association to dispose of any securities lawfully held by it on August 23, 1935.

“(C) PROHIBITION AGAINST TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING STRUCTURED OR SYNTHETIC PRODUCTS.—A national banking association may not—

“(i) invest in a structured or synthetic product, a financial instrument in which a return is calculated based on the value of, or by reference to the performance of, a security, commodity, swap, other asset, or an entity, or any index or basket composed of securities, commodities, swaps, other assets, or entities, other than customarily determined interest rates; or

“(ii) otherwise engage in the business of receiving deposits or extending credit for transactions involving structured or synthetic products.”

(d) PERMITTED ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—Section 5(c)(1) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (Q); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (R) through (U) as subparagraphs (Q) through (T), respectively.

(e) CLOSELY RELATED ACTIVITIES.—Section 4(c) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “had been determined” and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: “are so closely related to banking so as to be a proper incident thereto, as provided under this paragraph or any rule or regulation issued by the Board under this paragraph, provided that for purposes of this paragraph, closely related shall not be considered to include—

“(A) serving as an investment adviser (as defined in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a))) to an investment company registered under that Act, including sponsoring, organizing, and managing a closed-end investment company;

“(B) agency transactional services for customer investments, except that this subparagraph may not be construed as prohibiting purchases and sales of investments for the account of customers conducted by a bank (or subsidiary thereof) pursuant to the bank's trust and fiduciary powers;

“(C) investment transactions as principal, except for activities specifically allowed by paragraph (14); and

“(D) management consulting and counseling activities;”

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking “or” at the end;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (14) as paragraph (15); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) purchasing, as an end user, any swap, to the extent that—

“(A) the purchase of any such swap occurs contemporaneously with the underlying hedged item or hedged transaction;

“(B) there is formal documentation identifying the hedging relationship with particularity at the inception of the hedge; and

“(C) the swap is being used to hedge against exposure to—

“(i) changes in the value of an individual recognized asset or liability or an identified portion thereof that is attributable to a particular risk;

“(ii) changes in interest rates; or

“(iii) changes in the value of currency; or”.

(f) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—Section 4(a) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “, or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the “requirements of this Act.” and inserting “requirements of this Act; or”; and

(3) by inserting before the undesignated matter following paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) with the exception of the activities permitted under subsection (c), engage in the business of a ‘securities entity’ or a ‘swaps entity’, as those terms are defined in section 18(s)(6)(D) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(s)(6)(D)), including dealing or making markets in securities, repurchase agreements, exchange traded and over-the-counter swaps, as defined by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, or structured or synthetic products, as defined in the paragraph designated as ‘Seventh’ of section 24 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24), or any other over-the-counter securities, swaps, contracts, or any other agreement that derives its value from, or takes on the form of, such securities, derivatives, or contracts;

“(4) engage in proprietary trading, as provided by section 13, or any rule or regulation under that section;

“(5) own, sponsor, or invest in a hedge fund, or private equity fund, or any other fund, as provided by section 13, or any rule or regulation under that section, or any other fund that exhibits the characteristics of a fund that takes on proprietary trading activities or positions;

“(6) hold ineligible securities or derivatives;

“(7) engage in market-making; or

“(8) engage in prime brokerage activities.”

(g) ANTI-EVASION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any attempt to structure any contract, investment, instrument, or product in such a manner that the purpose or effect of such contract, investment, instrument, or product is to evade or attempt to evade the prohibitions described in section 18(s)(6) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(s)(6)), section 21(c) of the Banking Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 378(c)), the paragraph designated as “Seventh” of section 24 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24), section 5(c)(1) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)(1)), or section 4(a) of the

Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(a)), as added or amended by this section, shall be considered a violation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.), the Banking Act of 1933 (Public Law 73-66; 48 Stat. 162), section 24 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24), the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.), and the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 et seq.), respectively.

(2) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a Federal agency has reasonable cause to believe that an insured depository institution, securities entity, swaps entity, insurance company, bank holding company, or other entity over which that Federal agency has regulatory authority has made an investment or engaged in an activity in a manner that functions as an evasion of the prohibitions described in paragraph (1) (including through an abuse of any permitted activity) or otherwise violates such prohibitions, the Federal agency shall—

(i) order, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, the entity to terminate the activity and, as relevant, dispose of the investment;

(ii) order, after the procedures described in clause (i), the entity to pay a penalty equal to 10 percent of the entity's net profits, averaged over the previous 3 years, into the Treasury of the United States; and

(iii) initiate proceedings described in section 8(e) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(e)) for individuals involved in evading the prohibitions described in paragraph (1).

(B) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the inherent authority of any Federal agency or State regulatory authority to further restrict any investments or activities under otherwise applicable provisions of law.

(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, each Federal agency having regulatory authority over any entity described in paragraph (2)(A) shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and make available to the public a report, which shall identify—

(i) the number and character of any activities that took place in the preceding year that function as an evasion of the prohibitions described in paragraph (1);

(ii) the names of the particular entities engaged in those activities; and

(iii) the actions of the Federal agency taken under paragraph (2).

(h) ATTESTATION.—Section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843), as amended by section 604(a)(1) of this title, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) ATTESTATION.—Executives of any bank holding company or its affiliate shall attest in writing, under penalty of perjury, that the bank holding company or affiliate is not engaged in any activity that is prohibited under subsection (a), except to the extent that such activity is permitted under subsection (c).”

SEC. 605. REPEAL OF GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT PROVISIONS.

(a) TERMINATION OF FINANCIAL HOLDING COMPANY DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843) is amended by striking subsections (k), (l), (m), (n), and (o).

(2) TRANSITION.—

(A) ORDERLY TERMINATION OF EXISTING AFFILIATION.—In the case of a bank holding company which, pursuant to the amendments made by paragraph (1), is no longer authorized to control or be affiliated with any entity that was permissible for a financial holding company on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, any affiliation, ownership or control, or activity by the bank holding company that is not permitted for a bank holding company shall be terminated as soon as is practicable, and in no event later than the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EARLY TERMINATION.—The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (in this section referred to as the “Board”), after opportunity for hearing, at any time, may terminate an affiliation prohibited by subparagraph (A) before the end of the 5-year period described in subparagraph (A) if the Board determines that such action—

(i) is necessary to prevent undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interest, or unsound banking practices; and

(ii) is in the public interest.

(C) EXTENSION.—Subject to a determination under subparagraph (B), the Board may extend the 5-year period described in subparagraph (A), as to any particular bank holding company, for not more than an additional 6 months at a time, if—

(i) the Board certifies that such extension would promote the public interest and would not pose a significant risk to the stability of the banking system or financial markets of the United States; and

(ii) such extension, in the aggregate, does not exceed 1 year for any single bank holding company.

(D) REQUIREMENTS FOR ENTITIES RECEIVING AN EXTENSION.—Upon receipt of an extension under subparagraph (C), a bank holding company shall notify the shareholders of the bank holding company and the general public that the bank holding company has failed to comply with the requirements of subparagraph (A).

(b) FINANCIAL SUBSIDIARIES OF NATIONAL BANKS DISALLOWED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5136A of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24a) is repealed.

(2) TRANSITION.—

(A) ORDERLY TERMINATION OF EXISTING AFFILIATION.—In the case of a national bank which, pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1), is no longer authorized to control or be affiliated with a financial subsidiary as of the date of enactment of this Act, such affiliation, ownership or control, or activity shall be terminated as soon as is practicable, and in no event later than the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EARLY TERMINATION.—The Comptroller of the Currency (in this section referred to as the “Comptroller”), after opportunity for hearing, at any time, may terminate an affiliation prohibited by subparagraph (A) before the end of the 5-year period described in subparagraph (A) if the Comptroller determines, having due regard for the purposes of this title, that such action—

(i) is necessary to prevent undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interest, or unsound banking practices; and

(ii) is in the public interest.

(C) EXTENSION.—Subject to a determination under subparagraph (B), the Comptroller may extend the 5-year period de-

scribed in subparagraph (A) as to any particular national bank for not more than an additional 6 months at a time, if—

(i) the Comptroller certifies that such extension would promote the public interest and would not pose a significant risk to the stability of the banking system or financial markets of the United States; and

(ii) such extension, in the aggregate, does not exceed 1 year for any single national bank.

(D) REQUIREMENTS FOR ENTITIES RECEIVING AN EXTENSION.—Upon receipt of an extension under subparagraph (C), a national bank shall notify the shareholders of the national bank and the general public that the national bank has failed to comply with the requirements described in subparagraph (A).

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter one of title LXII of the Revised Statutes is amended by striking the item relating to section 5136A.

(c) REPEAL OF PROVISION RELATING TO FOREIGN BANKS FILING AS FINANCIAL HOLDING COMPANIES.—Section 8(c) of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3106(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 606. REPEAL OF BANKRUPTCY PROVISIONS.

Title 11, United States Code, is amended by repealing sections 555, 559, 560, and 562.

SEC. 607. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956.—The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2 (12 U.S.C. 1841)—

(A) by striking subsection (p); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (q) as subsection (p); and

(2) in section 5 (12 U.S.C. 1844)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking the last sentence;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking paragraphs (3), (4), and (5); and

(C) by striking subsection (g).

(b) BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1970.—Section 106(a) of the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1971(a)) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) CLAYTON ACT.—Section 7A(c) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “, except that” and all that follows and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking “, except that” and all that follows and inserting a semicolon.

(d) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.—The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1a(21)(G) (7 U.S.C. 1a(21)(G)), by striking “(as defined in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956)”;

(2) in section 2(c)(2)(B)(i)(II)(dd) (7 U.S.C. 2(c)(2)(B)(i)(II)(dd)), by striking “(as defined in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956)”;

(3) in section 2(h)(7)(C)(i)(VIII) (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(C)(i)(VIII)), by striking “, as defined in section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956”;

(e) COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1977.—Section 804 of the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2903) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(f) DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT.—Section 201(a)(11)(B) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5381(a)(11)(B)) is amended by striking

“for purposes of section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(k))” each place that term appears.

(g) FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 8(b)(3) (12 U.S.C. 1818(b)(3)), by striking “section 50” and inserting “section 48”;

(2) in section 18(u)(1)(B) (12 U.S.C. 1828(u)(1)(B)), by striking “or section 45 of this Act”;

(3) by striking sections 45 and 46 (12 U.S.C. 1831v and 1831w); and

(4) by redesignating sections 47 through 50 as sections 45 through 48, respectively.

(h) FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—The Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 221 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the 20th undesignated paragraph of section 9 (12 U.S.C. 335), by striking the last sentence; and

(2) in section 23A (12 U.S.C. 371c)—

(A) in subsection (b)(11), by striking “subparagraph (H) or (I) of section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 or”;

(B) by striking subsection (e); and

(C) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(i) FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010.—The Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 113(c)(5) (12 U.S.C. 5323(c)(5)), by striking “(as defined in section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956)”;

(2) in section 163 (12 U.S.C. 5363)—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “(a)” and all that follows through “For purposes” and inserting “For purposes”;

(3) in section 167(b) (12 U.S.C. 5367(b)), by striking “under section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956” each place that term appears; and

(4) in section 171(b) (12 U.S.C. 5371(b))—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively.

(j) GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT.—The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Public Law 106-102; 113 Stat. 1338) is amended—

(1) by striking section 115 (12 U.S.C. 1820a);

(2) in section 307(f) (15 U.S.C. 6715(f)), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) BOARD.—The term ‘Board’ has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).”;

(3) in section 505(c) (15 U.S.C. 6805(c))—

(A) by striking “section 47(g)(2)(B)(iii) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act” and inserting “section 45(g)(2)(B)(iii) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act”; and

(B) by striking “section 47(a)” and inserting “section 45(a)”;

(4) in section 509(3)(A) (15 U.S.C. 6809(3)(A)), by striking “as described in section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956”.

(k) HOME OWNERS’ LOAN ACT.—Section 10(c) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (H); and

(2) in paragraph (9)(A), by striking “permitted” and all that follows and inserting “permitted under paragraph (1)(C) or (2) of this subsection.”;

(l) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Section 864(f)(4)(C)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “(within the meaning of section 2(p) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841(p)))”.

(m) PAYMENT, CLEARING, AND SETTLEMENT SUPERVISION ACT OF 2010.—Section 803(5)(A)

of the Payment, Clearing, and Settlement Supervision Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5462(5)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (viii), by adding “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (ix), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking clause (x).

(n) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(a)(4)(B)(vi)(II) (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(4)(B)(vi)(II)), by striking “other than” and all that follows and inserting “other than a registered broker or dealer.”; and

(2) in section 3C(g)(3)(A) (15 U.S.C. 78c-3(g)(3)(A))—

(A) in clause (vi), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (vii), by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (viii).

(o) TITLE 11.—Title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 101—

(A) in paragraph (25)(E), by striking “, measured in accordance with section 562”;

(B) in paragraph (47)(A)(v), by striking “, measured in accordance with section 562 of this title”; and

(C) in paragraph (53B)(A)(vi), by striking “, measured in accordance with section 562”;

(2) in section 103(a), by striking “555 through 557, and 559 through 562” and inserting “556, 557, and 561”;

(3) in section 362(b)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “555 or” each place that term appears;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking “(as defined in section 559)” each place that term appears;

(C) in paragraph (17), by striking “(as defined in section 560)” each place that term appears; and

(D) in paragraph (27), by striking “(as defined in section 555, 556, 559, or 560)” each place that term appears and inserting “(as defined in section 556)”;

(4) in section 502(g)—

(A) by striking “(1)” before “A claim”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(5) in section 553—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), by striking “555, 556, 559, 560, or 561” and inserting “556 or 561”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “555, 556, 559, 560, or 561” and inserting “556 or 561”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “555, 556, 559, 560, 561” and inserting “556, 561”;

(6) in section 561(b)(1), by striking “555, 556, 559, or 560” and inserting “556”;

(7) in section 741(7)(A)(xi), by striking “, measured in accordance with section 562”;

(8) in section 761(4)(J), by striking “, measured in accordance with section 562”;

(9) in section 901(a), by striking “555, 556, 557, 559, 560, 561, 562” and inserting “556, 557, 561”.

SA 2070. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 308. IMPROVED CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR STUDENT LOAN SERVICING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 6—POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS

“Sec.

“188. Definitions.

“189. Servicing of postsecondary education loans.

“190. Payments and fees.

“191. Authority of Bureau.

“192. State laws unaffected; inconsistent Federal and State provisions.

“§ 188. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) ALTERNATIVE REPAYMENT ARRANGEMENT.—The term ‘alternative repayment arrangement’ means an agreed upon arrangement between a loan holder (or, for a Federal Direct Loan or a Federal Perkins Loan, the Secretary of Education or the institution of higher education that made such loan, respectively) or student loan servicer and a borrower—

“(A) that is different than the terms under an existing postsecondary education loan; and

“(B) pursuant to which remittance of a monthly payment—

“(i) satisfies the terms of the postsecondary education loan; or

“(ii) is not required for a period of 1 or more months in order to satisfy the terms of the postsecondary education loan.

“(2) BILLING GROUP.—The term ‘billing group’ means a postsecondary education loan account that—

“(A) is serviced by a student loan servicer; and

“(B) includes 2 or more postsecondary education loans that are in repayment status.

“(3) BUREAU.—The term ‘Bureau’ means the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

“(4) EFFECTIVE DATE OF TRANSFER.—The term ‘effective date of transfer’ means the date on which the first payment is due to a transferee servicer from a borrower under a postsecondary education loan.

“(5) FEDERAL DIRECT LOAN.—The term ‘Federal Direct Loan’ means a loan made under part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq.).

“(6) FEDERAL PERKINS LOAN.—The term ‘Federal Perkins Loan’ means a loan made under part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087aa et seq.).

“(7) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

“(8) LATE FEE.—The term ‘late fee’ means a late fee, penalty, or adjustment to principal, imposed because of a late payment or delinquency by the borrower under a postsecondary education loan.

“(9) LOAN HOLDER.—The term ‘loan holder’ means a person who owns the title to or promissory note for a postsecondary education loan (except for a Federal Direct Loan or a Federal Perkins Loan).

“(10) OPEN END CREDIT PLAN.—The term ‘open end credit plan’ has the meaning given that term in section 103.

“(11) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION EXPENSE.—The term ‘postsecondary education expense’ means any expense that is included as part of the cost of attendance (as that term is defined in section 472 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 10871l)) of a student.

“(12) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LENDER.—The term ‘postsecondary education lender’—

“(A) means —

“(i) a financial institution, as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813) that solicits, makes, or extends postsecondary education loans;

“(ii) a Federal credit union, as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752) that solicits, makes, or extends postsecondary education loans; and

“(iii) any other person engaged in the business of soliciting, making, or extending postsecondary education loans; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) the Secretary of Education; or

“(ii) an institution of higher education with respect to any Federal Perkins Loan made by the institution.

“(13) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOAN.—The term ‘postsecondary education loan’—

“(A) means a loan that is—

“(i) made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 1087a et seq., 1087aa et seq.); or

“(ii) issued or made by a postsecondary education lender and is—

“(I) extended to a borrower with the expectation that the amounts extended will be used in whole or in part to pay postsecondary education expenses; or

“(II) extended for the purpose of refinancing or consolidating 1 or more loans described in subclause (I) or clause (i);

“(B) includes a private education loan; and

“(C) does not include a loan—

“(i) made under an open-end credit plan; or

“(ii) that is secured by real property.

“(14) PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—The term ‘private education loan’ has the meaning given the term in section 140(a).

“(15) QUALIFIED WRITTEN REQUEST.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ‘qualified written request’ means a written correspondence of a borrower (other than notice on a payment medium supplied by the student loan servicer) transmitted by mail, facsimile, or electronically through an email address or website designated by the student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers that—

“(i) includes, or otherwise enables the student loan servicer to identify, the name and account of the borrower; and

“(ii) includes, to the extent applicable—

“(I) sufficient detail regarding the information sought by the borrower; or

“(II) a statement of the reasons for the belief of the borrower that there is an error regarding the account of the borrower.

“(B) CORRESPONDENCE DELIVERED TO OTHER ADDRESSES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A written correspondence of a borrower is a qualified written request if the written correspondence—

“(I) meets the requirements under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A); and

“(II) is transmitted to and received by a student loan servicer at a mailing address, facsimile number, email address, or website address other than the address or number designated by that student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers.

“(ii) DUTY TO TRANSFER.—A student loan servicer shall, within a reasonable period of time, transfer a written correspondence of a borrower received by the student loan servicer at a mailing address, facsimile number, email address, or website address other than the address or number designated by

that student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers to the correct address or appropriate office or other unit of the student loan servicer.

“(iii) DATE OF RECEIPT.—A written correspondence of a borrower transferred in accordance with clause (ii) shall be deemed to be received by the student loan servicer on the date on which the written correspondence is transferred to the correct address or appropriate office or other unit of the student loan servicer.

“(16) STUDENT LOAN SERVICER.—The term ‘student loan servicer’—

“(A) means a person who performs student loan servicing;

“(B) includes a person performing student loan servicing for a postsecondary education loan on behalf of an institution of higher education or the Secretary of Education under a contract or other agreement;

“(C) does not include the Secretary of Education to the extent the Secretary directly performs student loan servicing for a postsecondary education loan; and

“(D) does not include an institution of higher education, to the extent that the institution directly performs student loan servicing for a Federal Perkins Loan made by the institution.

“(17) STUDENT LOAN SERVICING.—The term ‘student loan servicing’ includes any of the following activities:

“(A) Receiving any scheduled periodic payments from a borrower under a postsecondary education loan (or notification of such payments).

“(B) Applying payments described in subparagraph (A) to an account of the borrower pursuant to the terms of the postsecondary education loan or of the contract governing the servicing of the postsecondary education loan.

“(C) During a period in which no payment is required on the postsecondary education loan—

“(i) maintaining account records for the postsecondary education loan; and

“(ii) communicating with the borrower on behalf of the loan holder or, with respect to a Federal Direct Loan or Federal Perkins Loan, the Secretary of Education or the institution of higher education that made the loan, respectively.

“(D) Interacting with a borrower to facilitate the activities described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), including activities to help prevent default by the borrower of the obligations arising from the postsecondary education loan.

“(18) TRANSFER OF SERVICING.—The term ‘transfer of servicing’ means the assignment, sale, or transfer of any student loan servicing of a postsecondary education loan from a transferor servicer to a transferee servicer.

“(19) TRANSFEREE SERVICER.—The term ‘transferee servicer’ means the person to whom any student loan servicing of a postsecondary education loan is assigned, sold, or transferred.

“(20) TRANSFEROR SERVICER.—The term ‘transferor servicer’ means the person who assigns, sells, or transfers any student loan servicing of a postsecondary education loan to another person.

“§ 189. Servicing of postsecondary education loans

“(a) STUDENT LOAN SERVICER REQUIREMENTS.—A student loan servicer may not—

“(1) charge a fee for responding to a qualified written request under this chapter;

“(2) fail to take timely action to respond to a qualified written request from a borrower to correct an error relating to an allo-

cation of payment or the payoff amount of the postsecondary education loan;

“(3) fail to take reasonable steps to avail the borrower of all possible alternative repayment arrangements to avoid default;

“(4) fail to perform the obligations required under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

“(5) fail to respond within 10 business days to a request from a borrower to provide the name, address, and other relevant contact information of the loan holder of the borrower’s postsecondary education loan or, for a Federal Direct Loan or a Federal Perkins Loan, the Secretary of Education or the institution of higher education who made the loan, respectively;

“(6) fail to comply with any applicable requirement of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.);

“(7) fail to comply with any other obligation that the Bureau, by regulation, has determined to be appropriate to carry out the consumer protection purposes of this chapter; or

“(8) fail to perform other standard servicer’s duties.

“(b) BORROWER INQUIRIES.—

“(1) DUTY OF STUDENT LOAN SERVICERS TO RESPOND TO BORROWER INQUIRIES.—

“(A) NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF REQUEST.—If a borrower under a postsecondary education loan submits a qualified written request to the student loan servicer for information relating to the student loan servicing of the postsecondary education loan, the student loan servicer shall provide a written response acknowledging receipt of the qualified written request within 5 business days unless any action requested by the borrower is taken within such period.

“(B) ACTION WITH RESPECT TO INQUIRY.—Not later than 30 business days after the receipt from any borrower of any qualified written request under subparagraph (A) and, if applicable, before taking any action with respect to the qualified written request of the borrower, the student loan servicer shall—

“(i) make appropriate corrections in the account of the borrower, including the crediting of any late fees, and transmit to the borrower a written notification of such correction (which shall include the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of a representative of the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower);

“(ii) after conducting an investigation, provide the borrower with a written explanation or clarification that includes—

“(I) to the extent applicable, a statement of the reasons for which the student loan servicer believes the account of the borrower is correct as determined by the student loan servicer; and

“(II) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of an individual employed by, or the office or department of, the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower; or

“(iii) after conducting an investigation, provide the borrower with a written explanation or clarification that includes—

“(I) information requested by the borrower or an explanation of why the information requested is unavailable or cannot be obtained by the student loan servicer; and

“(II) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of an individual employed by, or the office or department of, the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower.

“(C) LIMITED EXTENSION OF RESPONSE TIME.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—There may be 1 extension of the 30-day period described in subpara-

graph (B) of not more than 15 days if, before the end of such 30-day period, the student loan servicer notifies the borrower of the extension and the reasons for the delay in responding.

“(ii) REPORTS TO BUREAU.—Each student loan servicer shall, on an annual basis, report to the Bureau the aggregate number of extensions sought by the student loan servicer under clause (i).

“(2) PROTECTION OF CREDIT INFORMATION.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date on which a student loan servicer receives a qualified written request from a borrower relating to a dispute regarding payments by the borrower, a student loan servicer may not provide negative credit information to any consumer reporting agency (as defined in section 603 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a)) relating to the subject of the qualified written request or to such period, including any information relating to a late payment or payment owed by the borrower on the borrower’s postsecondary education loan.

“(3) HIGH-TOUCH STUDENT LOAN SERVICING.—A student loan servicer shall designate an office or other unit of the student loan servicer to act as a point of contact regarding postsecondary education loans for borrowers considered to be at risk of default, including—

“(A) any borrower who requests information related to options to reduce or suspend his or her monthly payment, or otherwise indicates that he or she is experiencing or is about to experience financial hardship or distress;

“(B) any borrower who becomes 60 calendar days delinquent on any loan;

“(C) any borrower who has not completed the program of study for which the borrower received the loan;

“(D) any borrower who is enrolled in discretionary forbearance for more than 9 months of the previous 12 months;

“(E) any borrower who has rehabilitated or consolidated one or more student loans out of default within the prior 12 months;

“(F) a borrower under a private education loan who is seeking to modify the terms of the repayment of the postsecondary education loan because of hardship; and

“(G) any borrower or segment of borrowers determined by the Director of the Bureau to be at risk of default.

“(c) LIAISON FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

“(2) DESIGNATION.—A student loan servicer shall designate 1 or more employees to act as a liaison for members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and spouses and dependents of a member of the Armed Forces or a veteran, who shall be—

“(A) responsible for answering inquiries relating to postsecondary education loans from members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and spouses and dependents of a member of the Armed Forces or a veteran; and

“(B) specially trained on the benefits available to members of the Armed Forces and veterans under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal and State laws relating to postsecondary education loans.

“(3) TOLL FREE NUMBER.—A student loan servicer shall establish and maintain a toll-free telephone number that—

“(A) may be used by a member of the Armed Forces, veteran, or spouse or dependent of a member of the Armed Forces or a

veteran to connect directly to the liaison designated under paragraph (2); and

“(B) shall be listed on the primary Internet website of the student loan servicer and on monthly billing statements.

“§ 190. Payments and fees

“(a) PROHIBITION ON RECOMMENDING DEFAULT.—A loan holder or student loan servicer may not recommend or encourage default or delinquency on an existing postsecondary education loan prior to and in connection with the process of qualifying for or enrolling in an alternative repayment arrangement, including the origination of a new postsecondary education loan that refinances all or any portion of such existing loan or debt.

“(b) LATE FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A late fee may not be charged to a borrower under a postsecondary education loan under any of the following circumstances, either individually or in combination:

“(A) On a per-loan basis when a borrower has multiple postsecondary education loans in a billing group.

“(B) In an amount greater than 4 percent of the amount of the payment past due.

“(C) Before the end of the 15-day period beginning on the date the payment is due.

“(D) More than once with respect to a single late payment.

“(E) The borrower fails to make a singular, non successive regularly-scheduled payment on the postsecondary education loan.

“(2) COORDINATION WITH SUBSEQUENT LATE FEES.—No late fee may be charged to a borrower under a postsecondary education loan relating to an insufficient payment if the payment is made on or before the due date of the payment, or within any applicable grace period for the payment, if the insufficiency is attributable only to a late fee relating to an earlier payment, and the payment is otherwise a full payment for the applicable period.

“(c) PAYOFF STATEMENT.—

“(1) FEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) or (D), a loan holder or student loan servicer may not charge a fee for informing or transmitting to a borrower or a person authorized by the borrower the balance due to pay off the outstanding balance on a postsecondary education loan.

“(B) TRANSACTION FEE.—If a loan holder or student loan servicer provides the information described in subparagraph (A) by facsimile transmission or courier service, the loan holder or student loan servicer may charge a processing fee to cover the cost of such transmission or service in an amount that is not more than a comparable fee imposed for similar services provided in connection with consumer credit transactions.

“(C) FEE DISCLOSURE.—A loan holder or student loan servicer shall disclose to the borrower that payoff balances are available for free pursuant to subparagraph (A) before charging a transaction fee under subparagraph (B).

“(D) MULTIPLE REQUESTS.—If a loan holder or student loan servicer has provided the information described in subparagraph (A) without charge, other than the transaction fee permitted under subparagraph (B), on 4 or more occasions during a calendar year, the loan holder or student loan servicer may thereafter charge a reasonable fee for providing such information during the remainder of the calendar year.

“(2) PROMPT DELIVERY.—A loan holder or a student loan servicer that has received a request by a borrower or a person authorized

by a borrower for the information described in paragraph (1)(A) shall provide such information to the borrower or person authorized by the borrower not later than 5 business days after receiving such request.

“(d) INTEREST RATE AND TERM CHANGES FOR CERTAIN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(1) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a student loan servicer shall provide written notice to a borrower of any material change in the terms of the postsecondary education loan, including an increase in the interest rate, not later than 45 days before the effective date of the change or increase.

“(B) MATERIAL CHANGES IN TERMS.—The Bureau shall, by regulation, establish guidelines for determining which changes in terms are material under subparagraph (A).

“(2) LIMITS ON INTEREST RATE AND FEE INCREASES APPLICABLE TO OUTSTANDING BALANCE.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a loan holder or student loan servicer may not increase the interest rate or other fee applicable to an outstanding balance on a postsecondary education loan.

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—The requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to—

“(A) an increase in any applicable variable interest rate incorporated in the terms of a postsecondary education loan that provides for changes in the interest rate according to operation of an index that is not under the control of the loan holder or student loan servicer and is published for viewing by the general public;

“(B) an increase in interest rate due to the completion of a workout or temporary hardship arrangement by the borrower or the failure of the borrower to comply with the terms of a workout or temporary hardship arrangement if—

“(i) the interest rate applicable to a category of transactions following any such increase does not exceed the rate or fee that applied to that category of transactions prior to commencement of the arrangement; and

“(ii) the loan holder or student loan servicer has provided the borrower, prior to the commencement of such arrangement, with clear and conspicuous disclosure of the terms of the arrangement (including any increases due to such completion or failure); and

“(C) an increase in interest rate due to a provision included within the terms of a postsecondary education loan that provides for a lower interest rate based on the borrower's agreement to a prearranged plan that authorizes recurring electronic funds transfers if—

“(i) the borrower withdraws the borrower's authorization of the prearranged recurring electronic funds transfer plan; and

“(ii) after withdrawal of the borrower's authorization and prior to increasing the interest rate, the loan holder or student loan servicer has provided the borrower with clear and conspicuous disclosure of the impending change in borrower's interest rate and a reasonable opportunity to reauthorize the prearranged electronic funds transfers plan.

“(e) PROMPT AND FAIR CREDITING OF PAYMENTS.—

“(1) PROMPT CREDITING.—Payments received from a borrower under a postsecondary education loan by the student loan servicer shall be posted promptly to the account of the borrower as specified in regulations of the Bureau. Such regulations shall prevent a fee from being imposed on any bor-

rower if the student loan servicer has received the borrower's payment in readily identifiable form, by 5:00 p.m. on the date on which such payment is due, in the amount, manner, and location specified by the student loan servicer.

“(2) APPLICATION OF PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) TREATMENTS OF PREPAYMENTS.—A student loan servicer that services a billing group of a borrower shall, upon receipt of a payment from the borrower, apply amounts in excess of the monthly payment amount first to the principal of the postsecondary education loan bearing the highest interest rate, and then to each successive principal balance bearing the next highest interest rate until the payment is exhausted, unless otherwise specified in writing by the borrower.

“(ii) TREATMENT OF UNDERPAYMENTS.—

“(I) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, the Bureau shall issue regulations establishing the manner in which a student loan servicer shall apply amounts less than the total payment due during the billing cycle.

“(II) CONSIDERATIONS.—In issuing the regulations required under subclause (I), the Bureau shall consider—

“(aa) the impact of the regulations on—

“(AA) outstanding debt of borrowers and the imposition of late fees;

“(BB) credit ratings of borrowers; and

“(CC) continued availability of alternative repayment arrangements; and

“(bb) any other factors the Bureau determines are appropriate.

“(B) CHANGES BY STUDENT LOAN SERVICER.—

If a student loan servicer makes a material change in the mailing address, office, or procedures for handling borrower payments, and such change causes a material delay in the crediting of a payment made during the 60-day period following the date on which such change took effect, the student loan servicer may not impose any late fee for a late payment on the postsecondary education loan to which such payment was credited.

“(f) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PREPAYMENTS.—

“(1) ADVANCEMENT OF DATE DUE.—A student loan servicer may advance the date due of the next regularly scheduled installment payment of a postsecondary education loan upon remittance of a prepayment by the borrower, if—

“(A) the borrower's payment is sufficient to satisfy at least 1 additional installment payment;

“(B) the number of billing cycles for which the date due is advanced is equal to total number of installment payments satisfied by the prepayment; and

“(C) upon receipt by the student loan servicer, the prepayment is applied—

“(i) to the principal balance of the postsecondary education loan; or

“(ii) if the student loan servicer services a billing group of a borrower, to the principal balance of the postsecondary education loan with the highest interest rate in such billing group.

“(2) BORROWER RIGHTS.—A student loan servicer shall provide a clear, understandable and transparent means, including through submission of an online form, for the borrower to elect to—

“(A) instruct the servicer not to advance the date due of future installment payments as described in paragraph (1); and

“(B) voluntarily make payments in excess of the borrower’s regularly scheduled installment payment amount on a periodic basis via recurring electronic funds transfers or other automatic payment arrangement.

“(g) **TIMING OF PAYMENTS.**—A student loan servicer may not treat a payment on a postsecondary education loan as late for any purpose unless the student loan servicer has adopted reasonable procedures designed to ensure that each billing statement required under subsection (j)(1) is mailed or delivered to the consumer not later than 21 days before the payment due date.

“(h) **OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.**—

“(1) **STATEMENT REQUIRED WITH EACH BILLING CYCLE.**—A student loan servicer for each borrower’s account that is being serviced by that student loan servicer and that includes a postsecondary education loan shall transmit to the borrower, for each billing cycle at the end of which there is an outstanding balance in that account, a statement that includes—

“(A) the outstanding balance in the account at the beginning of the billing cycle;

“(B) the total amount credited to the account during the billing cycle;

“(C) the amount of any fee added to the account during the billing cycle, itemized to show the amounts, if any, due to the application of an increased interest rate, and the amount, if any, imposed as a minimum or fixed charge;

“(D) the balance on which the fee described in subparagraph (C) was computed and a statement of how the balance was determined;

“(E) whether the balance described in subparagraph (D) was determined without first deducting all payments and other credits during the billing cycle, and the amount of any such payments and credits;

“(F) the outstanding balance in the account at the end of the billing cycle;

“(G) the date by which, or the period within which, payment must be made to avoid late fees, if any;

“(H) the address of the student loan servicer to which the borrower may direct billing inquiries;

“(I) the amount of any payments or other credits during the billing cycle that was applied to pay down principal, and the amount applied to interest;

“(J) in the case of a billing group, the allocation of any payments or other credits during the billing cycle to each of the postsecondary education loans in the billing group;

“(K) information on how to file a complaint with the Bureau and with the ombudsman designated pursuant to section 1035 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5535); and

“(L) any other information determined by the Bureau, which may include information in the Bureau’s Student Loan Payback Playbook.

“(2) **PAYMENT DEADLINES AND PENALTIES.**—

“(A) **DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENT DEADLINES.**—In the case of a postsecondary education loan account under which a late fee or charge may be imposed due to the failure of the borrower to make payment on or before the due date for such payment, the billing statement required under paragraph (1) with respect to the account shall include, in a conspicuous location on the billing statement, the date on which the payment is due or, if different, the date on which a late fee will be charged, together with the amount of the late fee to be imposed if payment is made after that date.

“(B) **PAYMENTS AT LOCAL BRANCHES.**—If the loan holder, in the case of a postsecondary education loan account referred to in subparagraph (A), is a financial institution that maintains a branch or office at which payments on any such account are accepted from the borrower in person, the date on which the borrower makes a payment on the account at such branch or office shall be considered to be the date on which the payment is made for purposes of determining whether a late fee may be imposed due to the failure of the borrower to make payment on or before the due date for such payment.

“(1) **CORRECTIONS AND UNINTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS.**—A loan holder or student loan servicer who, when acting in good faith, fails to comply with any requirement under this section will be deemed to have not violated such requirement if the loan holder or student loan servicer establishes that—

“(1) not later than 30 days after the date of execution of the postsecondary education loan and prior to the institution of any action under subtitle E of title X of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5561 et seq.)—

“(A) the borrower is notified of or discovers the compliance failure;

“(B) appropriate restitution to the borrower is made; and

“(C) necessary adjustments are made to the postsecondary education loan that are necessary to bring the postsecondary education loan into compliance with the requirements of this section; or

“(2) not later than 60 days after the loan holder or student loan servicer discovers or is notified of an unintentional violation or bona fide error and prior to the institution of any action under subtitle E of title X of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5561 et seq.)—

“(A) the borrower is notified of the compliance failure;

“(B) appropriate restitution to the borrower is made; and

“(C) necessary adjustments are made to the postsecondary education loan that are necessary to bring the postsecondary education loan into compliance with the requirements of this section.

“(j) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR FEDERAL POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supercede any reporting or disclosure requirement required for a postsecondary education loan that is made, issued, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), if such reporting requirement does not directly conflict with the requirements of this section.

“§ 191. Authority of Bureau

“(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Bureau is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations, make such interpretations, and grant such reasonable exemptions, in accordance with, and as may be necessary to achieve the purposes of, this chapter.

“(b) **DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Bureau shall issue regulations requiring disclosures to borrowers that clearly and conspicuously inform borrowers of the protections afforded to them under this chapter and under other provisions relating to postsecondary education loans. The Bureau shall consider whether special disclosures are required to accommodate the unique needs of borrowers who are members of the Armed Forces or veterans.

“(2) **REGULATIONS REQUIRED.**—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) ensure that a borrower is made aware of—

“(i) all repayment options available to the borrower, including the availability of refinancing products, and the effect of each repayment option on the total amount owed under, total cost of, and time to repay the postsecondary education loan;

“(ii) the risks and costs associated with default; and

“(iii) the eligibility of certain borrowers for discharge of certain postsecondary education loans; and

“(B) require provision of information about how a borrower can file a complaint with the Bureau relating to an alleged violation of this chapter.

“(3) **TIMING OF DISCLOSURES.**—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall specify the timing of the disclosures described in paragraph (2)(A). Such timing may include—

“(A) before the first payment is due under the postsecondary education loan; or

“(B) when the borrower—

“(i) first exhibits difficulty in making payments under the postsecondary education loan;

“(ii) is 30 days delinquent under the postsecondary education loan;

“(iii) is 60 days delinquent under the postsecondary education loan;

“(iv) notifies the student loan servicer of the intent of the borrower to forbear or defer payment under the postsecondary education loan;

“(v) inquires about or requests the refinancing or consolidation of the postsecondary education loan; or

“(vi) informs the student loan servicer, or a postsecondary education lender acting on behalf of the borrower informs the student loan servicer, that the borrower will be refinancing or consolidating the loan.

“(c) **UNFAIR, DECEPTIVE, AND ABUSIVE ACTS OR LENDING PRACTICES.**—The Bureau, by regulation or order, shall prohibit acts or practices in connection with—

“(1) a postsecondary education loan that the Bureau finds to be unfair, deceptive, or designed to evade the provisions of this chapter; or

“(2) the refinancing of a postsecondary education loan, including facilitation of refinancing or enrollment in an alternative repayment arrangement, that the Bureau finds to be associated with abusive lending practices, or that are otherwise not in the interest of the borrower.

“(d) **CONSULTATION WITH SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.**—In order to avoid duplication, to the extent practicable, the Bureau, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, may consider obligations of student loan servicers under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“§ 192. State laws unaffected; inconsistent Federal and State provisions

“Nothing in this chapter shall annul, alter, or affect, or exempt any person subject to the provisions of this chapter from complying with the laws of any State with respect to student loan servicing practices, fees on postsecondary education loans, or other requirements relating to postsecondary education loans, except to the extent that those laws are inconsistent with any provision of this chapter, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency. The Bureau is authorized to determine whether such inconsistencies exist. The Bureau may not determine that any State law is inconsistent with any provision of this chapter if the Bureau determines that such law gives greater protection to the consumer. In making these

determinations the Bureau shall consult with the appropriate Federal agencies.”.

(b) EXEMPTED TRANSACTIONS.—Section 104 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1603) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “This title” and inserting “(A) IN GENERAL.—This title”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall prevent or be construed to prevent the provisions of chapter 6 from applying to any postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer (as those terms are defined in section 188).”.

(c) CIVIL LIABILITY.—Section 130 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1640) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and any postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer (as such terms are defined in section 188) who fails to comply with any requirement imposed under chapter 6 with respect to any person” before “is liable to such person”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “; or (iv)” and inserting “, or (iv)”;

(II) by inserting “, or (v) in the case of a postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer (as such terms are defined in section 188) who fails to comply with any requirement imposed under chapter 6, not less than \$400 or greater than \$4,000” before the semicolon; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer” after “creditor” each place it appears; and

(C) in the matter following paragraph (4)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by inserting “, postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer” after “creditor” each place it appears; and

(II) by striking “creditor’s failure” and inserting “failure by the creditor, postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer”;

(ii) in the fourth sentence, by inserting “other than the disclosures required under section 128(e)(12),” after “referred to in section 128,”; and

(iii) in the fifth sentence, by inserting “, postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer” after “creditor”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “creditor or assignee” each place it appears and inserting “creditor, assignee, postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the second sentence, by inserting “or chapter 6” after “section 129, 129B, or 129C”; and

(B) in the fourth sentence, by inserting “or chapter 6” after “or 129H”; and

(4) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking “creditor or assignee” and inserting “creditor, assignee, postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer”; and

(B) by striking “creditor’s or assignee’s liability” and inserting “liability of the creditor, assignee, postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH, intend to object to proceeding to the nomina-

tion of Howard C. Nielson, Jr., of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, dated March 6, 2018.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of James Reilly, of Colorado, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Protecting E-Commerce Consumers and from Counterfeits.”

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a joint hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOW

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 6, 2018 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Reilly Steel, a fellow with the Banking Committee, be granted floor privileges during the pendency of S. 2155.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ari Rabin-Havt be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BLUMENTHAL’s legislative fellow Mary Miller Flowers be granted floor privileges until the end of June 2018.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 7; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2155.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator PORTMAN and our Democratic colleagues.

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

The Senator from Florida.

RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I join our colleagues who have spoken about the concern of the Russian cyber attacks on this country.

Every day that passes, we gather new information about how Russia, at Vladimir Putin’s direction, has gone about interfering by committing cyber attacks on this country, not only in its stealing names and personal information but now in its interfering in our elections.

In a long indictment, Special Counsel Robert Mueller spelled out how the so-called Internet Research Agency—a front in Russia—created fake accounts on social media and other internet platforms. It spread divisive content, and it even organized political rallies in the United States with the help of unwitting Americans—all backed by one of Putin’s cronies through a so-called catering company. This indictment tells a pretty remarkable and alarming story, and if you are still not sure what this was all about, just read the Internet Research Agency’s own words: “information warfare against the United States of America.” That says it all.

I know there has been a lot of discussion about Russian interference in our elections, and there should be. We have to get to the bottom of this. It is coming fast and furious, and it is going to be happening in the elections this year. We know what Russia did in the last election. Just as the CIA Director and the Director of National Intelligence told us, we know, in their words, that Russia will do it again. The more we learn, though, the more it becomes clear that we are not doing enough to protect ourselves from further attacks.

This is not a partisan issue; it is an attack on the very foundation of our democracy. At a time when it is getting harder and harder to come together as a country—when polarization is so rampant, when excessive partisanship is so evident—what Russia is doing is particularly sinister. It is trying to exacerbate our divisions and undermine Americans' faith in their institutions.

Months away from an election, the question is, What are we going to do about it? We are just days away from an election in Texas and about 8 months away from the November general election. What are we going to do? One thing we ought to do is to start defending ourselves.

Last month, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and I wrote to the Secretary of Defense and urged him to use our cyber forces—U.S. Cyber Command, which is the one instructed with protecting us—to disrupt Russian cyber operations that target our elections. We urged the Secretary of Defense to implement the recommendations of the Department's own task force to deter these cyber operations. Those were the recommendations of the Department of Defense's own task force.

Just a few days ago, four-star Admiral Rogers, commander of Cyber Command, told our Armed Services Committee that he had still not been directed to counter these cyber operations and that he needed approval from the White House. The White House, unbelievably, hasn't authorized him to act.

Until the Trump administration starts cracking down on Russia, Vladimir Putin is going to continue to get away with his cyber attacks on our elections and all of his other cyber attacks on our country. Admiral Rogers also told the committee that Russia has not paid a sufficient enough price for what it has done to us to get it to change its behavior.

This is the kind of thing—defending the Nation—for which our cyber forces were created. This Senator is the ranking member of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I can tell you that our cyber forces are growing, and they are getting better and better, but they are only good if they are put to work and given the task of defending us.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter that several of us sent to the Secretary of Defense be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, February 6, 2018.

Hon. JAMES N. MATTIS,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MATTIS: The Government of Russia, at President Vladimir Putin's direction, conducted an extensive campaign to influence our elections in 2016. The Russian campaign—a mix of covert intelligence operations, disinformation, and propaganda spread through traditional and social media—represents a serious and unprecedented attack on American democracy.

While the Obama Administration imposed targeted sanctions on Russia in response to the attack, just last week, the Trump Administration elected not to impose further sanctions. Yet, Russia's influence activities continue in the United States and elsewhere, according to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. As the 2018 midterm elections are now only months away, there is no time to lose in countering Russian influence through multiple means.

Because Russian influence is conducted largely through cyberspace, National Mission Teams (NMTs), part of the U.S. Cyber Command's Cyber Mission Force, should be ordered to prepare to engage Russian cyber operators and disrupt their activities as they conduct clandestine influence operations against our forthcoming elections. The mission of these forces is to defend the Nation, including critical infrastructure like our election systems, from foreign attack and we urge the Department of Defense to consider employing them as soon as possible.

Additionally, we urge you to implement the recommendations of the Department's own Defense Science Board's Task Force on Cyber Deterrence. The Task Force's report outlined a strategy to deter further Russian attacks on our democracy by threatening those things that our adversaries hold most dear through tailored campaigns of both cyber and information operations. To my knowledge, the Department has yet to implement these critical recommendations.

Defending our democracy must rank among the most important responsibilities of our government, including our military cyber forces. We are grateful for your continued service to the country and appreciate your prompt attention to this most pressing threat.

Sincerely,

BILL NELSON.
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL.
JEANNE SHAHEEN.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to say that all of us have to get to work—the White House, our cyber forces, and the whole of government. When it comes to defending our democracy, many of us have taken up arms, many of us have worn the uniform of this country to defend it, many of us, in civilian performance of the duties of this government, have likewise performed duties to defend this Nation. We now have to defend this Nation against cyber attacks, and more immediately we have to de-

fend against the cyber attacks to undo and undermine our democratic institutions by attacking our elections.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Ohio.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise tonight to talk about the bipartisan legislation that is before the body. It is an opportunity that provides significant needed regulatory relief, primarily to smaller financial institutions like community banks and credit unions.

The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act will modernize the Federal Dodd-Frank regulations to ensure that small- and medium-sized banks, as well as credit unions, can lower their compliance costs, which will mean more loans to small businesses and better deals for their customers.

For years, Dodd-Frank has hurt these smaller community banks and credit unions that have been caught up in this broader effort to rein in a select few larger financial institutions—primarily financial institutions on Wall Street. In effect, these smaller banks were caught in the web.

Last week, I met with some of Ohio's community banks. I meet with them regularly, and they tell me these stories. Their view, of course, is these Dodd-Frank rules targeted at the big banks are actually hurting the little guys. Over the past several years, they have told me story after story about how their compliance costs have increased. A small bank will say they used to have one person doing compliance, but now they have three people doing compliance, and those costs get passed along to their consumers. They also say, with the redtape and regulations and rules they live under, it makes it harder for them to lend to small businesses, which is one of the problems we have today in our economy. As the economy is beginning to grow, we need to ensure that startups and people who are interested in taking a risk and may not have a lot of business experience are able to get that loan to get started.

What has happened is, there has been a consolidation of these community banks because of these costs. In fact, they say one community bank is becoming insolvent every day in this country because of these big compliance costs, but others are consolidating into larger banks. That may be fine in some cases, but I like these community banks.

I like the fact that these community banks are close to the people in the neighborhood, and they know the businesses that are coming to them for

loans. Again, it is easier for small businesses to get loans when you actually have a banking relationship. They also are very involved in our communities.

So these community banks, which are really the backbone of America's financial sector, are what this bill is primarily about. The bill on the floor this week makes it easier for them to extend credit, loans, mortgages, and provide other products and services to working families in Ohio and around the country.

The legislation does more than that though. It also focuses on the regional banks in Ohio. These are banks that were not part of the financial crisis. They had nothing to do with it, but despite that, they have been required to live under the onerous systemically important financial institution rules and regulations or the SIFI designation. It has caused higher compliance costs for them. Again, it has hurt lending to Ohio businesses.

In Ohio, we happened to have three very big employers in the State that are regional banks—Fifth Third Bank, Huntington Bank, and KeyBank. They are all examples of well-capitalized Ohio regional banks that will benefit from this legislation, and the benefit will go to their thousands of employees, but it will also go to their many thousands of customers.

This legislation also increases important consumer protections for veterans, senior citizens, victims of fraud, and those who have fallen on tough financial times.

Another thing I like about the legislation that is particularly important to me is it includes a specific piece of legislation I authored to make it easier for a group called Habitat for Humanity to carry out their mission of providing safe and affordable housing to those in need. Habitat is a great organization. I volunteer at Habitat regularly. I see firsthand the great work they are doing back in my home State of Ohio.

My legislation is called the Housing Opportunity Made Easier Act or HOME Act, and it simply ensures that Habitat affiliates and other organizations—nonprofits—can receive donated appraisals of the homes they build. This is a really important issue for Habitat because Dodd-Frank disallows this donated appraisal, and the affiliates have traditionally accepted the donations. That has allowed them to have lower costs. When they have to pay the appraisal fees, it increases the cost of the homes to the families that are so badly in need of affordable housing. So getting rid of this redtape is something that should be bipartisan and even non-partisan. It has been tough for us to get this legislation moving because people have wanted to block anything that has to do with Dodd-Frank, but this obviously, I hope, was inadvertent. So in this legislation we have the ability

for Habitat and other nonprofits to take advantage of these donated appraisals. Getting rid of that redtape is going to help create more affordable housing for families in need.

I want to thank Chairman CRAPO for including that legislation. I also want to congratulate him and his colleagues on the Banking Committee for their bipartisan work on this legislation, dealing with the very real problem we have, which is the burdens, the redtape, the compliance costs, and coming up with a balanced product that can be supported on both sides of the aisle, get through the House, get through the Senate, get to the President for signature, and begin to improve this economy even more.

TAX REFORM

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, on another economic issue, I want to talk for a minute about the good news coming out of my State of Ohio with regard to the tax reform legislation. In just the past few weeks, I have visited eight separate businesses across the State talking about this issue, asking them what has been the impact of the tax reform bill, what are they doing with their savings.

There are three of these I want to talk about tonight, briefly. One is a small auto parts manufacturing business in Zanesville, OH. They have three auto parts stores. One is a multinational credit card processing company headquartered in Cincinnati, OH, and one is a premier medical center in Cleveland, OH. They are very different businesses in different sectors of our economy, but all are benefiting from the tax legislation.

GKM is the small auto parts store in Zanesville. They are reinstating healthcare benefits to their employees directly as a result of this tax reform bill. Under the Affordable Care Act, the company's healthcare costs increased dramatically—like so many other businesses—by double digits every year. They had a 22-percent increase in their costs in 2016, and the company went to its employees and said: We simply cannot afford to pay for this 22-percent increase on top of other double-digit increases. We don't know what to do. We are going to have to have you go out on your own and find healthcare, including in the exchanges.

Now, with the money GKM Auto Parts is saving as the result of this tax reform, all of their full-time employees are once again able to get healthcare through the company, and they are very grateful, having talked to some of the employees who had to go out to the exchanges, while others chose to pay the penalty. They are really happy to have their healthcare back.

These kinds of real, tangible benefits are exactly what we intended to accomplish in developing tax reform, but

businesses small and large are benefiting from these pro-growth changes to the Tax Code.

The second company I want to talk about is a big C corporation—Worldpay, Inc. It is the largest credit card processing company in the world now by volume. It has about 2,000 employees in Ohio at their headquarters. I recently went to their headquarters to talk about what they were doing, and when I was there, they announced cash bonuses of \$1,000 and up to \$2,000 for all of their hourly employees, higher wages for their frontline positions, an increased 401(k) match, greater company investment in employee wellness and recognition programs, and significantly more charitable giving. As Worldpay's executive chair said, tax reform is "ensuring Ohio companies like Worldpay can remain competitive and recruit the region's top talent."

They merged recently with a foreign company. Thank goodness they stayed in Ohio, but now they are rewarded for that because, although they were punished for being a U.S. company before, now with our Tax Code changes in place, they are actually benefiting from being an American company, where it is more beneficial to make the investment here rather than, in their case, in the United Kingdom.

A more competitive business tax code, an international tax code that encourages investments in this country rather than overseas, and incentives like immediate expensing that is in the Tax Code now are helping to create jobs in my home State of Ohio. It is helping Worldpay continue to be an American company and to be strong. It also is helping foreign direct investment in my home State because companies that are not American companies but foreign companies invested in Ohio are more likely to increase that investment rather than an investment somewhere else in the world because of the tax reform legislation. Immediate expensing and lower tax rates, this all helps to create good American jobs.

The most recent Federal jobs report shows strong job gains and the fastest wage growth since 2009. According to a recent National Federation of Independent Business survey, the NFIB, which represents a lot of small businesses in Ohio, 32 percent of their companies now say they are going to expand. By the way, that is the highest level in the survey's history, and it is the highest level of optimism also in their survey about the future among these small businesses. A lot of that is from the increased opportunity and the optimism that comes from this tax reform legislation.

One website I saw here in Washington tells us that across the country more than 400 businesses have now announced bonuses, higher wages, increased benefits, or a combination of these things as the result of the tax reform law. Four hundred is impressive,

but I have to tell you it is a lot more businesses than that. I have been to small business roundtable discussions and individual businesses over the past several weeks in Ohio and talked to over two dozen individual companies—none of whom are on the list of 400 because they are not big companies that made a big public announcement—but every single one of them are taking this tax reform and the benefits they are getting from that, and they are re-investing it into their people, their workers, their company's plant, equipment, technology, making their workers more productive. So 400 is impressive, but I know it is much larger than that. Thousands of businesses are taking advantage of this and therefore their employers are and therefore you are seeing this increased optimism.

The final example I want to talk about is one that has to do with our communities. I recently visited the University Hospital Rainbow Center for Women and Children in Cleveland, OH—a really impressive new facility they are building. This is a new \$26 million medical facility, and I learned during this visit that it was the new markets tax credit that was key to making this project possible. New markets is a tax incentive to spur economic growth and community redevelopment projects, and it helps to spur private investment, as it did in this case. In this Cleveland case, it spawned significant private investment from foundations and from individuals. This is something that has worked in the cities I represent in Ohio. We fought to preserve the new markets tax credit in the Senate version of the tax legislation, and the final agreement that became law has the new markets tax credit made permanent. That is critical for economic development opportunities like this new university hospital medical center I talked about.

So these benefits from tax reform are not abstract. They are very real. They are extra money in your paycheck, they are more affordable healthcare coverage, they are increased investments in emerging communities, and much more.

As the good news continues to roll in from tax reform, I will keep traveling Ohio, meeting with businesses, families, and workers to discuss ways tax reform can help them achieve a better economic future. A brighter future is really what our tax reform and tax cut legislation was all about.

SESTA

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, finally, I want to talk about something else we were working on in Congress to create a brighter future for many Americans. I am talking about our efforts to provide justice for victims of sex trafficking and to hold accountable those online entities, those websites

that knowingly facilitate these evil crimes. I am talking about this because, although this week we are focused on these reforms to Dodd-Frank to help our smaller banks make the economy stronger and help individuals and small companies, next week we hope to take up this issue of sex trafficking.

We are closer than ever to getting this legislation passed, and just recently we had some good news in our bipartisan effort. The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA, a bill I introduced with 24 Senators back in August, is gaining momentum in Congress. Last week, the House of Representatives actually offered the SESTA legislation as an amendment on the floor to a broader bill, and it passed by an overwhelming vote—over 300 votes. Just a couple of days later, the White House expressed their support for this legislation.

It is now the Senate's turn to act on this critically important issue, and Leader MCCONNELL—the leadership in the Senate—again has made a commitment to me and my colleagues that we will hold a vote on this sex trafficking legislation, the SESTA legislation, in the next couple of weeks. We now have 67 Senate cosponsors for SESTA. That is not typical around here.

It is a majority of Democrats; it is a majority of Republicans—two-thirds of the Senators in this body. By the way, this is a diverse group with wide-ranging political and ideological backgrounds. They have all signed on to this legislation because they want to be part of the solution. It is a common-sense solution to what is unfortunately a growing problem here in our country and in every State represented here in this body.

Unbelievably, sex trafficking is actually increasing in this country right now. In this century, in this country, sex trafficking is actually increasing. How can that be? What the experts tell us is that it is because of the online presence of these evil websites that are selling women and children online. The ruthless efficiency of social media—of the online presence of these websites—is what is causing this increase.

Victims of sex trafficking in Ohio have told me, as I have met with them: Rob, this has moved from the street corner to the smartphone. One website called backpage.com is the industry leader in online sex trafficking. They are involved in nearly 75 percent of all child trafficking reports that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children receives from the public. Seventy-five percent of the reports that this great organization receives to try to stop sex trafficking relate to this one site.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations here in the Senate, which I chair, conducted an 18-month investigation into this issue. We looked at

what the online presence was and why it was happening. We learned, of course, that backpage.com was by far the biggest problem. We found that backpage not only had the vast majority of the commercial sex traffic on their site, but they had knowingly facilitated and assisted criminal sex trafficking and covered up evidence of those crimes in order to increase their own profits.

For years, unbelievably, we have allowed them to get away with it. I think that is a stain on our national character. I think we need to address it, particularly because we have the opportunity here in the Senate to change a Federal law to help stop this.

Courts have consistently ruled that backpage.com and these other websites are protected by a Federal law—a law that we passed over two decades ago—called the Communications Decency Act that protects these websites from liability for crimes users commit through their site, no matter how complicit they are in those crimes. It was certainly not the intent of Congress to permit this, but that is how the courts have interpreted it.

Prosecutors and courts from across the country, including 50 State attorneys general, have called on Congress to fix this injustice. In one of the most direct calls that I have seen, a Sacramento judge last year dropped pimping charges against backpage.com, stating: "If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking." In other words, this judge is saying that there is now an immunity—a protection under Federal law—that allows these people, even when they are knowingly involved with sex trafficking, to continue to do what they are doing.

Our legislation makes two very simple changes to the Federal law that currently protects websites like backpage in an effort to restore justice.

First, SESTA says that if you are violating a Federal law, the Federal law on trafficking—and that is a law that was in existence long before we started this investigation. It is a law that is well established. If you are violating the Federal law on trafficking, assisting, supporting, or facilitating sex trafficking, and if you are doing it knowingly, which is a very high standard to prove, then you can be held liable and held to account. Again, this is very narrowly targeted legislation to deal with this specific problem.

Second, the legislation will allow State attorneys general—who cannot now but would be able under this legislation—to prosecute websites that violate Federal sex trafficking laws. It is very important because that is where you are going to see most of the action—at the State level, the State prosecutors.

We have tailored this legislation narrowly to ensure no threat to the freedom of the internet but ensure we are getting at this problem and actually dealing with immunity in Federal law.

Sex trafficking survivors, their families, and anti-trafficking advocates have shown great courage by sharing their tragic stories and personal accounts of injustice at the hands of online sex traffickers as we worked with them to develop this narrowly crafted legislation.

In testimony before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and in testimony before the Commerce Committee—which unanimously endorsed this legislation—we heard from victims and their families. We heard from moms who told us about their teenage daughters having been trafficked online.

One mom talked about her daughter who, at 14, was trafficked. She had been missing for 10 weeks. She finally found a photograph of her daughter on backpage. She called and said: I found my daughter. She is on your website. Thank you for taking her off your website. She is 14 years old.

The person at the other end of the line from backpage said: Did you pay for the ad?

The mom said: No, I didn't pay for the ad. That is my daughter.

They said: Then we can't take down the ad.

That is who these people are.

They have shown great courage by coming forward with their stories. Now it is our turn to show courage by coming together and voting on this bill, sending it to the President's desk, and fixing this problem, fixing the Federal law to allow justice for the trafficking victims and to finally hold accountable those who knowingly facilitate these crimes.

We have an opportunity to do something important here to create a better, safer, and more just society. I am hopeful that next week we will have that legislation before this body. We will have the debate. We will pass the legislation and begin to provide these victims of trafficking the justice they deserve and, most importantly, stop women and children from being exploited online.

Thank you, Mr. President.
I yield back my time.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:06 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

LISA PORTER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PATRICK FUCHS, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

MICHELLE A. SCHULTZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JAMES EDWARD CAMPOS, OF NEVADA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MINORITY ECONOMIC IMPACT, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE LADORIS GUESS HARRIS.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PETER C. WRIGHT, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE MATHY STANISLAUS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

MICHAEL J. DESMOND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND AN ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, VICE WILLIAM J. WILKINS.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

JON PARRISH PEEDE, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE WILLIAM D. ADAMS.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS AT THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 9333(C) AND 9336(B):

To be colonel

ARTHUR W. PRIMAS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GREGORY J. PAYNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL J. PATTERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRAD R. MATHERNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JONATHAN A. MORRIS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

ERIC T. ASHLEY
BRENT W. CLARK
KEN JO
ROBERT KEELER
NAM K. KIM
BENJAMIN R. METHVIN
DALE A. NICHOLS
DAVID OLSON
KARL RICHARDS
MICHAEL J. RYHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

GILBERT AIDINIAN
ROGER A. ANDERSON
THOMAS J. BACKENSON
KIMBERLY R. BARRETT
TYSON E. BECKER
RONALD D. BEESLEY
PHILIP J. BERRAN
WILLIAM F. BIMSON
JAMES B. BRANCH
JAMES M. BROWN
KEVIN L. BUFORD
JASON B. CABOOT

MICKEY S. CHO
PATRICK J. CONTINO
CORD W. CUNNINGHAM
KARLA L. DAVIS
DAVID H. DENNISON
JEANNE C. DILLON
CRAIG P. DOBSON
JOSEPH G. DOUGHERTY
JEREMY V. EDWARDS
THOMAS E. ELLWOOD
MATTHEW V. FARGO
ROBERT G. FOWERS
DUNCAN A. GILLIES II
BABETTE GLISTERCARLSON
THOMAS J. HAIR
BRIAN T. HALL
DAWN M. HAROLD
DAVID P. HARPER
TYLER E. HARRIS
WAYNE J. HARSHA
JASON S. HAWLEY
GARTH S. HERBERT
MATTHEW H. HOEFER
AARON B. HOLLEY
NELSON HOWARD
PAULA J. JACKSON
MARK L. JACQUES
JEFFERSON W. JEX
DAVID E. JOHNSON
RYAN J. KENEALLY
EUGENE H. KIM
WON I. KIM
JACQUELINE N. KING
JUDY KOVELL
DAVID G. LAWTON
LLEWELLYN V. LEE
DOWNING LU
RODD E. MARCUM
JENNIFER W. MBUTHIA
THANE MCCANN
MICHAEL Y. MCCOWN
SCOTT T. MCNEAR
STEVE B. MIN
CRISTIN A. MOUNT
JEANNIE M. MUIR
LAUREL A. NEFF
DANA R. NGUYEN
CHARLES D. NOBLE
PETER D. OCONNOR
STEPHEN W. OLSON
JEREMY C. PAMPLIN
IOANNIS B. PAPADOPOULOS
DINA S. PAREKH
PARESH R. PATEL
BENJAMIN K. POTTER
NICOLE C. POWELL-DUNFORD
GORDON K. RAINEY
ROSEANNE A. RESSNER
PEACHES A. RICHARDS
ERIC A. ROBERGE
JEFFERSON R. ROBERTS
DAVID RUFFIN
KEVIN E. SCHLEGEL
MICHELE A. SOLTIS
MARK E. STACKLE
NEIL R. STOCKMASTER
ABRAHAM W. SUHR
TIMOTHY L. SWITAJ
NATHAN TAGG
WILLIAM THOMAS
CHRISTOPHER TROLLMAN
DAVID C. VANECHO
PETER H. VANGEERTRYDEN
LUTHER WIEST
HARRY J. WRIGHT
BELINDA J. YAUGER
D011955

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

HAYLEY R. ASHBAUGH
PEGGY I. BAIN
CHAD E. BROWN
CRAIG M. CALKINS
AMI D. CAMPBELL
ANDREW J. CHAMBERS
JAMES S. CORRIGAN
JENNIFER D. CWIKLA
LINDSEY S. DAY
HANNAH S. DOLLAR
NATALIE A. ERKER
BRIAN D. FARR
DANIEL K. FINNEGAN
KIMBERLY M. FOX
CASSANDRA M. FRAMSTAD
JEREMY L. GALLMAN
AMBRE N. GEJER
JANAS L. GRAY
ERIN C. HENNESSEY
AIMEE M. HUNTER
ASHLEY M. HYDRICK
DAVID A. JOHNSTON
AMORY L. KOCH
KELLY M. MALLETT
BRITTANY M. MARBLE
JACOB G. MARCEK
BRET A. MILLER
LYNN J. MILLER
JESSICA A. PERPICH

LAUREN M. SEAL
TERESA M. VAUGHN
WHITNEY E. VICKERY
SARAH T. WATKINS
HEATHER L. WEAVER
JORDAN N. YOLLES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JEFFREY A. ANDERSON
JOSEPH R. BONGIORNO
ALLEN R. BYRNE
PATRICK R. CASEY
ROBYN L. CHALUPA
DONALD W. CHASE
WILLIAM R. CONKRIGHT
CARLY R. COOPER
ROMMEL B. DAFFON
PATRICK T. DEPRIEST
ROBERT C. DICHIERA
ADRIAN DONIAS
ABE R. DUMMAR
BRIAN G. GOMEZ
JOSEPH N. GOMEZ
CHARISSE L. GONZALEZ
SETH GRUBBS
JAMES R. GRUENEWALD
DANNY L. HARRIS
JEFFERY L. HEILESON
GARY L. HELTON
ALLISON F. HOWELL
STEVEN D. HURTLE, JR.
ADAM R. IRBY
MACKENZIE J. JONES
ANNA L. KAUS
CHRISTINA M. KOREERAT
NICHOLAS R. KOREERAT
KURT D. KRESTA
FRANCES P. LANG
JOSEPH M. LANG
DEANA M. LAWRENCE
KAREN M. LONG
NICOLE T. LOPEZ
PRESTON E. LOPEZ
JOHN B. LOSCH
MAYA L. LOWELL
MARK R. MATEJA
KEVIN E. MAYBERRY
TAMARA J. MAYBERRY
SHANE D. McDONALD
ROBERT M. MEADOWS
ROBERT B. MILLER
BRIAN J. MIMS
JACOB A. NAYLOR
LARISSA R. PARSEK
ANTHONY K. RAKOFISKY
CLAY T. RANGLES
CHRISTOPHER P. ROGERS
CHRISTOPHER R. SMITH
JEFFERY G. TAYLOR
JON M. THIBODEAU
CHARLES A. TRINGO
SHAVANA TURAY
VERN WAGNER
ANGELA R. WESTON
MELISSA D. WILKES
JEFFREY A. WITTKOPP
LYDIA A. ZELLERS
D012178
D012189
D012878

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

AHMAD B. ALEXANDER
MONICA I. ALLEN
JAMIE R. ARRUIZA
ERICA V. ATKISSON
BRIAN V. BAGGETT
VIRGINIA B. BAILEY
ROBERT L. BAKER
BRUCE W. BARNES
MATTHEW L. BARRETT
DAVID M. BARRY
NATHANIEL D. BASTIAN
LEBARON D. BATES
RICHARD H. BENSON
ANDREW J. BODWELL
STEPHEN T. BONNEY
DANIEL M. BOUDREAUX
AMY L. BREGUET
LACHARLES M. BROWN
MEREDITH A. BROWN
JENNA M. BURNESKIS
CLINTON J. BURROUGHS
CARLOS O. BUSTAMANTE
ELISA MARIE K. CALACE
VERN E. CAMPIGOTTO, JR.
JOSE A. CAPELLAN
KEYIA N. CARLTON
JOSHUA M. CARMEN
JINO I. CARO
MAXWELL G. CARROLL
WILLIAM A. CEBALLOS
MICHAEL C. CHASE

JAMES E. CHRISTENSEN
ERIKA CHU
JAE H. CHUNG
AMANDA A. CLINE
MATTHEW A. COOLEY
ADAM D. COOPER
MICHAEL L. COOPER
GARION E. DAVENPORT
DANIEL C. DAVIS
SEAN T. DAVIS
DAVID W. DRAPER
ASHLEY H. FAIR
KENT A. FISHER
ALEXANDER F. FLYNN
DEREK K. FOLK
ALHAJI FONAH
JAMES S. FOX
MIGUEL A. FRAGUEIRO
GREG A. FULLER
JORDAN T. GARRETT
LOTISHA E. GARVIN
DANIEL M. GAZZANO
JESSICA L. GIDWANI
JINA A. GILMORE
RAQUEL L. GIUNTA
BRIAN J. GOMES
FABIA M. GOMEZSALAS
KENNETH R. GONZALES
BRADLEY J. GREGORY
HELEN L. HAMPTON
JESSIE G. HART
JOHN HENIGER
FRANCIS J. HEREL III
ROBERT N. HJULER
THOMAS J. HOLMES
HEATHER L. HOLUB
TIMOTHY J. HOPPER
THOMAS J. HORAL
CHIH C. HUANG
ERIKA G. HUERTA
MATTHEW S. JEWETT
ANTHONY L. JOHN II
JEFF A. JOHNSON
WAYNE D. JOHNSON
JOSHUA I. JONES
TREVOR P. JOSEPH
SEUNGHONG KANG
NADIA T. KENDALLDIAZ
SHAWN A. KIRBY
MELISSA A. KOTTKE
NICHOLAS C. KUCAN, SR.
JENNIFER S. KUNTZ
JOSHUA D. KUPER
MARCUS H. LAI
LAKESHA L. LEE
ERICA J. LINDROTH
DAVID M. MARSHALL
MATTHEW N. MASCITELLI
RANDAL MAURER
MATTHEW P. MCCREERY
SEAN A. MCFARLING
MARK J. MEDLEY II
LAKISHA S. MERCER
TERRY L. MERCIER
JONATHAN D. METCALF
RICHARD H. MILLER
CLINT H. MITCHELL
ZACHARY R. MITCHELL
ANDREA MOUNTNEY
JANESSA R. MOYER
ERIC M. NEUTKENS
LAURA M. NEWELL
TIFFANY T. NGUYEN
TOSHA M. NICHOLS
LINDSEY E. NIELSEN
RONALD E. NIXON, JR.
JENNIFER M. NOETZEL
SAMUEL P. OCHINANG
RALPH M. ODOM
AZUWUIKE N. OHUKA
JEB S. ORR
ELBERT T. OSBORNE, JR.
EDWARD K. OSEI
GLORIA I. OSORIOGIRAUD
KIRSTEN B. OUMETTE
JAMES J. PAK
JUSTIN C. PAO
CHOICEY L. PELLERIN
HALI J. PICCIANO
DENISE L. QUINTANA
DREW D. REINBOLDWASSON
ROSALINDA C. REYES
BRANDON C. RITCHEY
YASHEBA M. ROBINSON
GILBERTO RODRIGUEZ
ROBERT E. ROSENBERG
PRESTON D. ROY
SHARLEEN M. RUPP
RENATA M. RUSSO
TOMMY W. SANDMEL
DAWN E. SERVIDIO
ERNEST A. SEVERE
ROBYN M. SHARIER
ERICKA SHELDON
VERONICA C. SIMMONS
JOSHUA T. SINGLETON
LEONARD D. SKIPPER
LOUISA M. SLAYDEN
MATTHEW D. SLYKHUIS
JASON R. SMEDBERG
AMBER L. SMITH
CARL D. SMITH

MARIETTA M. SQUIRE
ISAAC A. STEPHEN
ALLISON S. STERNBERG
MATTHEW B. STOKLEY
MICHAEL E. SUDWEEKS
RAJINDER N. SUMAIR
LAUREN N. TEAL
LUIS A. TEJADA
NICHOLAS K. TONEY
TAMARA K. TRAN
NICHOLAS M. TRICHE
TOAN M. TRINH
CAROLYN D. TYSON
REMINGTON W. VANDERGRIF
CASSANDRA O. WEBB
RHONDA M. WELLS
TRAVIS E. WHITESIDE
KENNETH S. WILDER
CHARLES R. WILLIAMS
GLENNDALE L. WILLIAMS
JONATHAN W. WILLIAMS
WILLIAM J. WILTBANK
MEAGAN L. WISNIEWSKI
MICHAEL B. WRIGHT
RONALD O. YOUNG, JR.
STEVEN D. ZUMBRUN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

ASHLEY K. AITON
JACQUELINE K. ALLEN
CYNTHIA A. ANDERSON
DEANNA R. ANDREWS
KEREN E. ANDUJAR
JESSICA M. ARNOLD
LEROY A. BARBOUR
MARIE A. BAUTISTA
LANCE M. BELL
MARKO PAULO M. BENITO
MARQUS O. BERRY
MOLLY M. BLACK
ERICA L. BLOCK
MELISSA A. BOETIG
TANYA L. BOLDEN
SARAH E. BOLIN
DAVID G. BOWEN
MYLINH P. BRUHN
MARCUS R. BURGESS
LINDSAY J. BURGNER
KATRINA D. BURRUS
RUBY L. CANNON
IVONNE E. CARTAGENA
ANTHONY L. CARTHON
MARIACRISTINA CARUSO
JESSICA M. CASSIDY
KIRT D. CLINE
LUANE D. COVINGTON
LUTISHA T. CRAWFORD
SHAYNA L. DEBARROS
JARRETT M. EDWARDS
SUIN C. ELLISON
GLORIA J. ERNEST
JENNIFER ESPARZA
MATTHEW M. FANNING
DANIEL J. FEDDERSON
ALVIN G. FERRER
CLIFF FONTANEZ
GHARIWAYNE A. FORNILLOS
STEPHANIE FOSCANTEBOWLING
PAMELA L. FRANCIS
MAYA A. FRAZIER
MICHELLE L. FREDACH
KIMBERLY A. GENKOV
STACIE M. GIBSON
JOHN M. GILLESPIE
MARSHALL P. GLENISTER
MARIA L. GONZALEZ
TRAVIS J. GRAHAM
MICHELLE L. GRANT
ERIC S. GRAYBILL
JASMIN A. GREGORY
SAMANTHA M. HANSON
STEPHEN C. HARMON
JESSE M. HARTMANN
KRISTINA M. HERRIOTT
ELIZABETH HICKSON
LESLEY A. HUCKABY
ANDREA R. HUDSON
RENATA K. HUNLEY
JEFFERSON U. HUNTER
SUWAIBA IBRAHIM
PAULA JABBOUR
GILBERT C. JARAMILLO
MONIQUE JEANBAPTISTE
MARLIN L. JOLLY
CHANEL D. JONES
MATTHEW A. KALIS
BENJAMIN M. KAUFMAN
WILLIAM KELLY
STEPHANIE K. KESSINGER
JANETTE J. KIM
SUSAN KING
ELAINE B. KIRISH
ALBERT R. KNIGHT
LORI S. KUPT
CHRISTIE M. LANG
RACHEL H. LAROSE
MARIA A. LIGHTFOOT
MEGAN E. LUCCIOLA

BECKY LUX
AIMEE A. MACK
SCOTT A. MADDOX
TODD B. MALONE
MARIMON I. MASKELL
PATRICIA MAUVAIS
TIERRA L. MCDEARMON
CODY J. MCDONALD
MARCUS L. MCGEE
TAMELA J. MCGRAWSCHENCK
PAUL D. MCLEMORE
JOSE E. MENDOZA
JOSEPH A. MICHNA
JASON MILLER
JENNIFER A. MILLER
BRENDA F. MITCHELL
SUNNIE R. MURRAY
LAURA M. OGLE
JOEL J. OSTERHOUT
WINCESS PAPIUS
ALEX J. PASSMORE
ELZONA M. PATTERSON
NAJUMA A. PEMBERTON
DONALD W. PITCOCK
JEFFREY C. RANSOM
LUCAS R. REAVIS
ASHLEA RICHMOND
YADIRA RODRIGUEZ
KENNETH J. ROMITO
JASON F. RYNCARZ
SABAS SALGADO
DALE R. SCOTT, JR.
LISA M. SHROPSHIRE
JENNIFER L. SIEGERT
JESSIE M. SMITH
MICHAEL D. SMITHERS
RYAN L. STAAB
SERENA K. STAPLES
JUSTIN R. STEPHENS
CYNTHIA L. STYNER
ANGELA SUMMERS
ELIZABETH A. SZAKEL
LISA TAYLOR
SAMUEL G. TEAGUE
PAUL B. TENPENNY
JUSTIN T. TETREAU
GERALDINE M. WATERS
LAURENCE B. WEBB
BRETT S. WEIR

MYRA D. WHITE
ANNETTE E. WICKETT
ANGELA N. WILHOIT
FELICIA M. WILLIAMS
TERESA A. WILLIAMS
EDWARD L. WITHERS
KEVIN M. WOODSON
TRACY L. ZINN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

WILSON R. RAMOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CURTIS D. BOWE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CARL E. FOSTER III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL A. FOWLES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ANDREW K. SINDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

D013264
D013298

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER F. RUDER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRIAN P. WALSH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JUSTIN M. ADCOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DANIEL A. WARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ROBERT M. HESS

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 6, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

TERRY A. DOUGHTY, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 6, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARPER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 6, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGG HARPER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

SECURING THE FUTURE OF DREAMERS

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the deadline for the U.S. Congress to secure the futures of hundreds of thousands of Dreamers. Our constituents, who grew up in the United States, have been here at least 10 years, but do not have permanent legal immigration status and, therefore, are deportable, vulnerable, and exploitable.

And guess what? The cynics were right, and Congress has taken no action. There have been a few attempts, but the reality is that Congress has not passed a bill, and the opportunities for us to pass a bill are dwindling.

How did we get here? How is it that we always end up here when it comes to immigration?

Well, it has been a failure of both parties to act, to compromise, and to legislate. But let's be honest, the President doesn't want these immigrants in this country, and Republicans in Congress only want to do what the Presi-

dent wants them to do because they fear his tweets and the effect it might have on their voters in November.

The President said he loved Dreamers. Remember? He wanted to preserve DACA and treat them "with heart." He said he wanted to give a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers, and he told a group of lawmakers on national television that he would take the political heat and sign whatever bipartisan approach they were able to come up with, but he was lying, again.

Just like his conversations with lawmakers on guns after the massacre in Florida—also with the television cameras rolling—what the President says in public, what he does behind closed doors, what he tweets, and what he thinks from moment to moment do not seem to be connected in any logical way.

And when the cameras are turned off, the radical rightwing whispers their orders in the President's ear, and he falls right in line—whether it is with gun manufacturers or the anti-immigration nativists.

And when you cannot trust the President to have a stable opinion for more than 2, maybe 3, hours, it makes it hard for Republicans to figure out what will please him and make him happy from moment to moment.

Bipartisan proposals that could have passed the House and the Senate were brought to him and he rejected them, saying that he wanted to eliminate various types of legal immigration avenues used by people, especially people of color and people from the developing world. Without these massive cuts to legal immigration, the President just wasn't interested.

And we offered him money for his silly, mindless, stupid, dimwitted, racist wall, but he rejected that, too.

In the end, this is not about Dreamers, it is not about the wall, it is not about border security. Do you know what it is about? It is about a deeply held core belief of the President, and many of his advisers, that there are just too many people of color coming legally to the United States. There are too many family members of immigrants, unless those immigrants are members of Trump's own family.

It is clear that the President doesn't want immigrants who look like the diverse and colorful fabric of the world. And he doesn't want Dreamers who were raised in the U.S. alongside of our own children, who reflect the diversity of America.

Now, to be fair, some of my Democratic colleagues are just as happy

about the injunctions in the Federal courts that are keeping the Trump deportation machine from fully engaging and going after Dreamers. Lawmakers—both Democrats and Republicans—don't need much encouragement sometimes to just kick the can down the road.

But let's not kid ourselves. Relying on the courts to save Dreamers is a cop-out, and a lot of people are left out if they do not already have DACA. And for the ones who can renew their status, we may be back here in a few days or weeks trying to prevent the deportation of Dreamers and lots of other immigrants if the courts change course, which they may.

So I will not let my colleagues in either party rest.

For now, every person who has DACA should renew their DACA as quickly as possible for whatever time they have left. I say run, don't walk, to renew.

I have been here long enough to know that even when faced with an issue on which 80 percent of the American people agree—whether it is sensible gun control or preventing the deportation of children raised in America—it is the 20 percent of the American people who Republicans are listening to, and playing to, and tweeting to, and playing nice-nice with the White House to appease.

And the rest of us, what do we get? Nothing—on immigrants, on guns, on climate change, on healthcare, or on taxes—unless we, as voters, simply reshuffle the deck.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

BORIS NEMTSOV

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last week sadly marked the third anniversary of the murder of the Russian human rights activist Boris Nemtsov.

On February 27, 2015, Boris was assassinated while crossing a bridge near the Kremlin in Moscow, shot in the back in the most cowardly manner. Boris' murder was no doubt directed by Putin, because Boris had actively organized rallies against the regime and even had the courage to report in detail on corruption in the Putin regime. His death was a great loss for the people of Russia who are fighting for a free and Democratic society.

I was lucky enough to have known Boris and met with him several times over the years. I had the great privilege to work with him on getting the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act passed into law in 2012. In fact, I met with Boris right after the House passed that bill.

That day, Boris told me something that resonated with me, Mr. Speaker. He told me that Putin had made stopping the Magnitsky Act his utmost priority.

Though that resonated with me, it did not surprise me, because I was born in communist Cuba, and I was forced to flee my homeland with my family to get away from the Castro regime. And I know that Castro would have had the same reaction as Putin, because thugs fear the people who are brave enough to challenge their authoritarian rule.

That is why Putin feared Magnitsky; that is why Putin feared Boris; and that is why Putin fears my friend and close friend of Boris' Vladimir Kara-Murza, who the Putin regime has tried to kill on two occasions, both by poisoning.

Vladimir has bravely picked up the mantle from Boris, and he carries out his mission of speaking the truth about the Putin regime and calling attention to the human rights abuses in Russia. He has carried on the legacy and brought Boris' message to the world. And through Vladimir's efforts, the legacy has been memorialized right here in Washington, D.C.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I attended the unveiling of the naming of the plaza right in front of the Russian Embassy after Boris. Boris personified the fight for human rights in Russia.

And now, in front of the Russian Embassy in Washington, D.C., 3 years after Boris was murdered, he is now memorialized as a symbol—a symbol signifying that one person or one idea can be more powerful and more threatening to a corrupt regime than even the biggest army.

That plaza also serves as a symbol for the future because one day Putin will be gone and Boris' dream will become a reality. When that day comes, the diplomats who come to the United States, representing a free and democratic Russia, will be able to look out the windows of their embassy beaming with pride at what Boris' sacrifice helped them realize.

And they will honor Boris' legacy and everyone else who told the truth about the regime of Putin and who gave everything for a free and democratic Russia, where human rights and the rule of law are respected, not feared. I hope that day is soon upon us, Mr. Speaker.

PASSING A STRONG, BIPARTISAN FARM BILL

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the challenges that we face, not only in my constituency as it relates to California agriculture, but a host of other issues as well.

We are in the process of trying to reauthorize the farm bill, something we do every 4 years. It used to be—and we hope it will continue this year—one of the more bipartisan efforts we are engaged in.

I represent not only the heartland of the San Joaquin Valley, but third-generation farmer.

Last week—as I do every weekend when I go home—I was walking the rows of the almond trees on my ranch outside of Fresno, California. They are beautiful. They are in full bloom this time of year. There is not a time, though, in the year, in the San Joaquin Valley, where the incredible bounty of the 300 crops that we grow are not on display because they are always out there.

The blossoms in the spring grow into the almonds, walnuts, and pistachios until late summer. Tomatoes are harvested in August and September, followed by cotton in October and November. The dairymen and dairy processors work every day because those cows have to be milked every day year-round to produce the finest quality milk, cheese, and butter.

As I walked through my orchard, I remembered the countless stories and insights by my fellow California farmers, ranchers, dairymen and -women shared with me over the past year, and I think about my father, who farmed all of his life, and my grandfather.

In anticipation of the 2018 farm bill, I have held round tables and listening sessions, attended agriculture town-halls, and met with our farmers and farm workers, who, every day, work so hard to put those food products on America's dinner table.

I have done this to hear firsthand the concerns and priorities of our local producers, farm workers, and nutrition organizations regarding our Nation's food supply.

I have also had numerous meetings with key agriculture and trade officials, including Agriculture Secretary Perdue, who has been out to California a number of times.

And as we in Congress move together with farm bill negotiations, we must maintain strong support for the cultivation and production of fresh fruits and vegetables, which are the foundation of a healthy diet. California produces over half of the Nation's fruits and vegetables. It is truly amazing. Three hundred crops.

We must also make sure that we do not abandon our Nation's most vulnerable through inhumane cuts to the nutrition programs that provide a steady source of food to our Nation's food supply. We are talking about our safety net, we are talking about the SNAP

program, and we are talking about Women, Infants, and Children. This has been part of the glue on a bipartisan basis that has kept Democrats and Republicans together in the reauthorization of the farm bill.

But we must have a safety net for those who are most unfortunate in our society. We should work to expand foreign markets for our products and to incentivize sound conservation practices and research. Research is very important to ensure the sustainability. Sustainability is critical—and continued growth of American agriculture.

We have the opportunity with the farm bill to address the crippling agriculture labor crisis afflicting our farms, and it must be addressed as we look at a broken immigration system that not only impacts our Dreamers—the DACA program—but a reliable supply of farm labor.

These are all among the issues that we must address to ensure that our Nation's food supply is reliable, because, guess what, it is a national security issue. People don't look at it that way. People go into the grocery store and they think: Well, what is the problem; grocery stores have all the food in the world. They go to the restaurants, and they have all the food that you need.

But the food doesn't go to the grocery store or to those restaurants without it being grown by America's men and women who labor—less than 3 percent of the Nation's population—to produce the finest, highest quality, greatest yield, most nutritious food anywhere in the world, every night on America's dinner table.

That is why we must come together—Democrats and Republicans—to improve our Nation's food supply by passing a strong, bipartisan farm bill.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, otherwise known as VAWRA.

Protecting the Violence Against Women Act is one of our top priorities in the Victims' Rights Caucus, a bipartisan House caucus that Congressman TED POE and I organized some 10 years ago.

□ 1015

The law seeks to both prevent violence in our communities and provides services to survivors of violence, in part, by encouraging collaboration among local law enforcement, traditional personnel, and the private sector organizations, NGOs. In my district, these organizations collaborate, and they have been vital in helping survivors of violence.

We must have numerous organizations working tirelessly together to support the victims of crime. In my district, they include the Marjaree

Mason Center, Central California Legal Services, Choice Women Empowerment, Centro La Familia, and Valley Crisis Center. This is critical to end violence not only in our valley, but in our Nation, and that is why we must come together to end this violence, to ensure that the survivors have access to services for essential recovery.

We cannot stop, and we must end this horrendous violence once and for all. That is why we must support the Violence Against Women Act.

CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF ALTON, ILLINOIS

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the city of Alton, Illinois. Alton was selected from hundreds of cities nationwide to be featured on the reality TV show "Small Business Revolution—Main Street." The city will also receive a \$500,000 investment for its small businesses.

Alton has a rich history. It is home to historic buildings, and has a deep manufacturing heritage. It was the site of one of the Lincoln-Douglas debates, a route on the Underground Railroad, and home to blues musician Miles Davis and history's tallest man, 8-foot-11-inch Robert Wadlow.

These days, Alton is undergoing a small business revolution, from a self-pour craft beer taproom to a post office converted into a small business hub. And new businesses are popping up all over. It is an exciting time for the Alton community, and they can't wait to show the Nation southern Illinois' spirit of innovation.

RECOGNIZING THE DETERMINATION OF ROWDY LOYD

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the determination of a young man from my hometown of Murphysboro, Illinois.

Rowdy Loyd has cerebral palsy and a nerve disorder, but that has not stopped him from trying out for the Murphysboro Red Devils basketball team year after year. While he hasn't made the official roster, he serves as team manager. Going to every game all through his high school career, and every practice, Rowdy had a constant presence with the team, coaches, and our community.

Last month, Rowdy finally got the chance to see game time. Rowdy scored 10 points on the night, including a buzzer-beating 3-point shot. In Rowdy's own words:

I got a whole lot of school behind my back, and my family. I've got a lot of people that support me. So it was awesome to know that they all came to the game to watch me play.

Rowdy, we are all proud of you.

WISHING A HAPPY ANNIVERSARY TO TRACY BOST

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, if I could, to take a moment. I would

like to read a part of a particular proverb, Proverbs 31:10-31:

An excellent wife, who can find? She is more precious than jewels.

The heart of her husband trusts in her, and he will have no lack of gain.

She does him good and not harm in all the days of her life.

She seeks wool and flax and works with willing hands.

She is like merchant ships; she brings her food from afar.

She rises while it is yet night and provides food for her household and portions for her maidens.

She considers a field and buys it, and from the fruit of her hands she plants the vineyards.

She dresses herself with strength and makes her arms strong.

She perceives that the merchandise is profitable, and her lamp does not go out at night.

She puts her hands to the distaff and her hands to the spindle.

She opens her hand to the poor and reaches out her hands to the needy.

She is not afraid of snow, for all her household is clothed with scarlet.

She makes bed coverings for herself. Her clothing is fine linen and purple.

Her husband is known in the gates when he sits among the elders of the land.

She makes linen garments and sells them. She delivers sash to the merchants.

Strength and dignity are her clothing, and she laughs at time to come.

She opens her mouth in wisdom, and the teaching of kindness is on her tongue.

She looks well to the ways of her household and does not eat the bread of idleness.

Her children rise up and call her blessed.

Her husband also, and he praises her: Many women have done excellently, but you surpass them all.

Charm is deceitful and beauty is vain, but a woman who fears the Lord is to be praised.

Give her the fruit of her hands, and let her works praise her in the gates.

Mr. Speaker, many may ask why I would read such a Scripture this day on the floor. Well, because 38 years ago, tomorrow, I married a beautiful young woman who has grown to become the very woman described in this Scripture. She is very beautiful and very charming, but most of all, she is virtuous.

With that, I want to wish her an early happy anniversary. I love you, Tracy.

IN DEFENSE OF DREAMERS AND THOSE WHO BROUGHT THEM HERE

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise today in defense of Dreamers and those who brought them here. I rise in defense of them, Mr. Speaker, because, quite frankly, there was a desire for persons to come here. There was a desire for them to come and to work, and to work at wages that some considered subpar, a desire for them to work under conditions that were not the best. There was a desire for them to come, and they came.

I rise in defense of them because, Mr. Speaker, we are complicit in this behavior. We were complicit because we knew they were coming, and we wanted them to come.

I rise in defense of them because I don't believe that a country as great as the United States of America can ask young people to accept a pathway to citizenship but not give it to the people who brought them here: their parents, in most cases, but, in a good many cases, other persons who cared for them.

To ask these young people to sell out their parents, to borrow a term that we use, is more than a great nation should ask of young people; to say to them, "You can stay, but your parents may have to go," what kind of country are we if we demand this of young people who came with people whom we wanted to come, who have done us no harm, who have worked hard in our kitchens, who have worked hard cleaning our homes, who have worked hard tending our fields, who worked hard bringing in the fruits of the labor that they brought to this country?

What kind of country says, "You are going to go back," after many years of being here, and send the young people back to places of which they know very little?

Mr. Jose Escobar is a case in point. He was sent back to San Salvador. He hadn't been there in many, many years. He came here around 15 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for this country to take the affirmative action to correct what will be an injustice if we pursue the path that the President would have us pursue. Now is the time for us to make sure that every person is receiving the kind of liberty and justice for all that we extol in the Pledge of Allegiance. Now is the time for us to make sure that all of these young people are given the opportunity to succeed on their merits or fail on their demerits in the country that they know as home.

Mr. Speaker, we are a great country. A great country does not do what the President is proposing, and I will not stand with the President on this. I stand and defend the Dreamers and the people who brought them here: in most cases, their parents. This is what a great nation ought to do.

I know that there may be people who differ, but when you are standing on right, you don't worry about those who differ. This is the right thing for the United States of America to do.

CONGRATULATING SCHRACK FARMS ON ITS 2018 INNOVATIVE DAIRY FARMER OF THE YEAR AWARD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Schrack Farm Resources of Loganton, Pennsylvania, for being named the 2018 Innovative Dairy Farmer of the Year.

The national award celebrates U.S. dairy producers that apply creativity, excellence, and forward thinking to achieve greater on-farm productivity and improved milk marketing. The award is presented annually by the International Dairy Foods Association and Dairy Herd Management magazine.

Mr. Speaker, Schrack Farm Resources has a rich history in Clinton County. Located in the heart of farm country, Schrack Farms is operated by Jim and Lisa Harbach and Kevin Schrack. Lisa and Kevin are siblings. They run the farm with the help of their children and grandchildren, who now represent the 11th-generation farmers of the land. Yes, that is right; Schrack Farm Resources has been in operation since 1773, 3 years before the Declaration of Independence was even issued. They have 22 full-time employees and some part-time help as well. The owners said it is teamwork that makes it possible for them to receive this award.

It is especially meaningful to see a Pennsylvania farm with such a long history of good stewardship being named the leading innovator, nationwide, for dairy farming. Today, Schrack Farms is managing an 1,100-head dairy herd while advocating for no-till farming and maintaining soil health and promoting awareness of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Its farming practices truly focus on conservation. Schrack Farms also was an early adopter of renewable energy technology and installed one of the first methane digesters in Pennsylvania. Now the farm generates revenue by selling power back to the grid and reduces electricity costs for the farm.

Schrack Farms is a model operation that is at the forefront of modern-day farming practices. Their operation effectively demonstrates that investment in environmentally friendly practices can lower costs, provide new revenue streams, and offer greater efficiencies on the farm.

They also educate local legislators and the general public about their operation's positive economic and environmental benefits. Jim Harbach said the farm's practices and beliefs go well beyond the borders of farming. Family members and farm staff are involved in associations and organizations that promote dairy farming and its environmental impacts. He has traveled across the country speaking about the practices that they use right there in Loganton, Pennsylvania.

Schrack Farms accepted the award earlier this year at Dairy Forum 2018 in Palm Desert, California. Pennsylvania's Secretary of Agriculture Russell

Redding nominated the farm for the award, and I was pleased to add supporting comments to the nomination.

Mr. Speaker, I am most proud of Schrack Farms and the entire family for being a leader in dairy farming not only in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but nationwide. I wholeheartedly congratulate Jim, Lisa, Kevin, and their families and employees on this outstanding achievement.

COMMEMORATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S REEMERGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Representative JACKIE WALORSKI, as co-chairs of the Polish Caucus.

This year, we commemorate the 100th anniversary of Poland's reemergence as a European nation in 1918. As grateful Polish Americans, we join together on a bipartisan basis to acknowledge this historic achievement of freedom's advance.

The reality is history has been brutal to Poland. In the late 1700s, Poland was erased from the map of Europe for 123 years by three adjacent predatory empires because it passed a constitution inspired by ours, which included a separation of powers.

Poland became the first nation in Europe to abolish serfdom by the Polaniec Manifesto on May 7, 1794. Then, in 1918, following World War I, with the support of President Woodrow Wilson, Poland was restored to the map of Europe and resumed its torturous climb to freedom.

□ 1030

But then, in 1939, World War II began. As Poland was invaded, first by Nazi Germany, and then 3 weeks later by Communist Russia, Poland suffered an unimaginable loss of 20 percent of its population that perished during World War II, the most of any nation in that war.

Of the 14 million civilians killed by Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, over 6 million were killed in Poland; 3 million Jews and 3 million Christians, as well as Roma and Sinti, the disabled, homosexuals, and other innocents.

Poland never surrendered. There never was a collaborationist Polish Government. Establishing a free government in exile, Polish armies fought on every front in Europe, including alongside American soldiers at Normandy.

Despite the Nazi and Soviet campaign to wipe out Poland's most educated and accomplished and, indeed, Poland's history, Poland resisted at home with the largest underground resistance movement in Europe. Poland

never surrendered, nor did it ever surrender to Nazi nor Communist, murderous ideology.

At Katyn, Communist Russia, with bullets to the back of their heads, killed over 12,000 Polish leaders from its military, civil society, their educational community, and their religious leadership.

1945 brought allied liberation to a war-torn Europe, but not to Poland, which fell under the Soviet yoke, repressed, and blocked from its own identity, indeed, even denied a true representation of its wartime history of heroism, tragedy, and terror.

But in 1989, after 43 years of increasing resistance to occupation inside Poland, its fierce love of liberty spilled over into successful resistance and massive electoral victory won by Solidarnosc, the labor movement that yielded ultimate liberty for Poland. This was the first wave of major popular and anti-Communist opposition across the Soviet bloc that resulted in the Berlin Wall's collapse in 1989, the wall that divided liberty from tyranny and, ultimately, communism's demise.

Poland has accomplished much in the generation of freedom that followed. She has achieved a steady economic growth in each year since its return to freedom, the most robust of any nation in Europe. Yet, the millions of souls who perished in Poland across every faith, confession, and ethnic origin, most remain unknown to history. Our globe is still weighed down with the collective sense of unresolved grief and the lack of historical truth that humanity must address.

For the millions who perished, this anniversary year of Poland's rebirth should be an occasion to uplift that historical truth to heal, not divide. As we speak, vicious Russian aggression aims to destabilize Europe and our precious transatlantic and NATO alliance, essential to liberty. Free nations, including Poland and her critics, should use this moment to recommit to liberty and rule of law, setting aside language and gestures that inflame divisions across Europe.

Now is a time for unity, not division. Now is a time for restraint, not antagonism. Now is the time for reasoned dialogue, not media taunts. And let me commend the Polish-Israeli Reconciliation Commission for its reasoned progress and recent statement.

Now is the time for diplomatic excellence and military readiness, not provocative gestures, legislative or otherwise. Now is the time for robust archival restoration so the full truth of millions who perished can be known and recorded forever. Now is the time to strengthen freedom's umbrella, not weaken it.

May I extend all congratulations and blessings to Poland on its 100th anniversary of reborn nationhood.

CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KEVIN LEZYNSKI

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was fortunate to meet an impressive young man, Kevin Lezynski, and celebrate with him as he earned the rank of Eagle Scout.

Kevin, of Harleysville, Pennsylvania, is a senior at Souderton Area High School. He is involved in the community as a member of the Unified Special Olympics and the regular Special Olympics, where he competes in soccer, swimming, bocce, baseball, and track and field. He is the manager of the school lacrosse team; he is involved in this year's musical; and he was voted homecoming king.

As an Eagle Scout in Troop 91, Kevin earned 36 merit badges and led a group of 38 others in building a gazebo on the high school grounds in just 2 days. Students and teachers now use the space to learn and socialize.

Kevin is a shining example of commitment to community service and what you can accomplish when you put your mind toward a goal.

Congratulations, Kevin, on earning this well-deserved rank of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTINE GUNSIOROWSKI, ALLI CURRO, AND KIM MCCLEARY FOR FOUNDED THE TYPE ONE PARENT PROJECT FOUNDATION

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christine Gunsiorowski, Alli Curro, and Kim McCleary for their work in the community combating type 1 diabetes.

After all three women had a child diagnosed with diabetes in 2014, they began raising money to find a cure. In 2016, they took their efforts even further, starting the Type One Parent Project Foundation focused on providing support and guidance for families in my district in Bucks and Montgomery Counties, as well as raising general awareness about type 1 diabetes.

This year, this organization will continue to expand its efforts, increasing the number and range of speakers at their meetings, creating a mentoring program where older kids can mentor younger children about the effects of type 1 diabetes. They will, in the coming months, award several scholarships to local families so that kids can attend the American Diabetes Association's Camp Freedom, a week-long overnight camp for kids with diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Christine, Alli, and Kim for all the work they are doing to keep kids safe and help kids in our community and educate our community about children facing this challenge.

DEMOCRATS HAVE A BETTER PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the reckless, regressive, and reprehensible Republican budget cuts funding for Social Security, cuts Medicare, cuts Medicaid. The Republican budget cuts funding for Meals on Wheels, cuts funding for school violence prevention programs. It even cuts funding for the Special Olympics.

Who does that?

The Republican budget seeks to balance itself on the backs of working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, rural America, and the safety of our children. It is an abdication of responsibility. It is a dereliction of duty. It is a stunning act of legislative malpractice. The reckless Republican budget is a raw deal for the American people.

Democrats have a better deal focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future for the American people. Democrats have a better deal focused on higher pay, lower costs, and providing the American people with the tools to succeed in a 21st century economy. Democrats have a better deal focused on improving the quality of life of everyday Americans.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

The Prophet Isaiah, in the first chapter, begins his message with these words: "Hear, O heavens, and listen, O Earth, for the Lord speaks." All the heavens and all the Earth cannot grasp or contain Your Word, O Lord. Once spoken and unleashed upon the world, Your Word catapults imaginings to their heights and penetrates everything to its depths. May our hearing turn to listening and our listening make us so attentive that it leads to new understanding and new ways of acting.

Your Word provokes Isaiah to cry out to the people: If only we were free enough to be raised up by its power or strong enough to be embraced by its full passion. Then we, like Isaiah, would be able to hear in our broadcast news the voice of violence coming from our own children, and we would lament as a nation searching for prophetic vision until we and our ways of acting change.

We pray for this vision now, and may all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DEUTCH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THOSE KILLED OR WOUNDED IN SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in honor of those who have been killed or wounded in service to our country and all those who serve and their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING RICHARDSON POLICE OFFICER DAVID SHERRARD

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Richardson Police Officer David Sherrard.

Last month, Sherrard and other officers responded to a domestic disturbance, where Sherrard was shot and later succumbed to his wound.

Mr. Speaker, David Sherrard served with the Richardson Police Department for 13 years. He was known for his

generosity and bravery, but above all, he was known for his faith in God, which he shared with others.

Sherrard was the first Richardson police officer to die in the line of duty. His death is a great loss. His wife and daughters remain in my thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the service and sacrifice of David Sherrard, a true hometown hero.

WILLIE O'REE SHOULD BE INDUCTED INTO THE HOCKEY HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 60 years ago, Willie O'Ree broke the color barrier in professional hockey, all while overcoming racial slurs, doubt, and blindness in his right eye.

Often referred to as the Jackie Robinson of hockey, Willie has been a trusted champion for diversity, a proponent of inclusion, and an inspiration for so many young players both off and on the ice.

Each February, we celebrate Black History Month as well as Hockey is for Everyone Month, and no one embodies both of those tributes as profoundly as living legend Willie O'Ree.

He is as humble as he is inspiring, often reminding fans that he only played in the NHL for 45 games, and while that may be true, he changed the game forever.

There are few players worthier of being inducted into the Hockey Hall of Fame, and it is long overdue that Willie's name be added to that list.

As the Hockey Hall of Fame continues to accept and review nominee submissions before the March 15 deadline, I want to remind everyone of the countless ways Willie strengthened and supported this sport.

I thank him for his continued efforts to increase access for all people of all backgrounds to get out on the ice and play the greatest game.

UNLOCKING MONTANA'S PUBLIC LANDS TO INCREASE PUBLIC ACCESS

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to Washington inactivity that has locked up hundreds of thousands of acres of Montana public lands.

In the 1970s, Congress designated over 1 million acres of Montana as wilderness study areas. The U.S. Forest Service and BLM were charged with determining whether to include them in the

National Wilderness Preservation System.

By the early 1980s, the Forest Service and BLM had made their recommendations, but Congress did not act. Now, nearly 40 years later, Congress still hasn't acted, and those study areas are still locked up.

Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced the Unlocking Public Lands Act and the Protect Public Use of Public Lands Act. These bills will release nearly 700,000 acres of lands found to be not suitable for wilderness designation and return them to Forest Service and BLM management.

County commissioners, State legislators, and impacted communities support this overdue action.

Congress is about 40 years late in unlocking Montana's public lands and increasing public access to them. It is time to finish the job.

THE NATION WILL NOT FORGET PARKLAND

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, it has been just 20 days since the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida; but when you spend those days going to funerals and memorial services and vigils, and when you spend those days meeting with grieving parents who don't know what life is without their loved one, and when you spend those days demanding that this House take action, it feels a lot longer.

Life moves on, new headlines fight to push our pain aside.

One Parkland student, starting her first full week back at Marjory Stoneman Douglas since the shooting, said this on Twitter: "There are no media trucks in sight. Don't forget about Parkland."

Mr. Speaker, the fight is not over. Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot and will not just move on from this tragedy.

The Nation will not forget Parkland, because this time, we join with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas students in declaring: "Never again."

RECOGNIZING OUR NORTH COUNTRY OLYMPIANS

(Ms. STEFANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the hard work and dedication of our north country Olympians, who made history at the 2018 Winter Games in Pyeongchang.

The United States women's bobsled team, trained in Lake Placid in my district, finished strong with an incredible silver medal win.

We are also incredibly excited for Saranac Lake's very own Chris Mazdzer, who made Olympic history this year, taking home Team USA's first ever medal in men's singles luge.

Chris trained tirelessly at the Olympic Training Center in Lake Placid, and I know he has inspired the next generation of New York-21 athletes from across our region.

Mr. Speaker, the north country has been buzzing with excitement since the Winter Games began, and seeing Chris on the podium was an incredible moment for us all.

Congratulations to Chris and to all our Olympians, who showed the world just what the north country has to offer.

GREAT LAKES WEEK

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week is Great Lakes Week.

As a Michigander, I am proud of the fact that Republicans and Democrats in Congress continue to work together to highlight the importance of our shared water resources and to protect the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes generate billions of dollars in economic activity and provide drinking water to 40 million people. We have to do everything we can to protect them from harm.

Unfortunately, President Trump recently unveiled his proposed budget, which cuts funding to the Great Lakes by 90 percent. An important restoration initiative that has succeeded and has had bipartisan support, the President nearly eliminates.

Protecting our Great Lakes has never been a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans have come together before to restore funding cuts that were proposed by President Trump. I am confident that we will come together again.

This Great Lakes Week, as every week, I stand up for the Great Lakes and those who depend upon them. They are a critical water resource that must be protected.

RECOGNIZING ALBERTO CARVALHO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alberto Carvalho, the superintendent of Miami-Dade County Public Schools, the Nation's fourth largest school system, with more than 500,000 students.

For the past decade, Alberto has worked tirelessly on behalf of students and educators throughout my congressional district. His efforts have propelled Miami-Dade public schools into

a position of national prominence, and it is now one of the Nation's highest performing urban school systems.

Recently, Mr. Carvalho was offered the opportunity of a lifetime to run the largest school system in the country, and that is chancellor of New York City schools, but he showed his dedication and commitment to south Florida's students and teachers when he decided to stay in Miami-Dade. As a former Florida certified teacher, I am so glad that he is staying to continue leading Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our grateful community and countless individuals who have been positively impacted by Alberto Carvalho's unwavering dedication, I want to say: Thank you, "friend," "amigo." Please stay.

WE SHOULD NOT ROLL BACK FLIGHT SAFETY LAWS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago, Continental Flight 3407 crashed in western New York, killing all aboard and one on the ground.

The National Transportation Safety Board found that the cause of the crash was pilot error and poor training.

Prior to the enactment of flight safety laws, there were two levels of safety: one more stringent for the commercial carriers that we are all familiar with, and one considerably less stringent for the ones that we are less aware of. There were two levels of safety.

Now there is only one because of the courageous work of the families of the survivors who came to Congress and helped Congress enact very strict safety regulations. We have not had a commercial crash that ended up in fatalities since that time.

It is important that we not roll back these safety standards, as they are based on the National Transportation Safety Board's findings and the work of this Congress.

LIMIT SCOPE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the special counsel investigation has pushed way beyond its authorized purpose.

Recent reports indicate that individuals have been questioned about President Trump's business activities prior to his entering the 2016 campaign. The private interests of Trump family members also are being probed.

These lines of investigation clearly violate the scope of the special counsel,

which is limited to: "... any links and/or coordination between the Russian Government and individuals associated with the campaign..."

In the interest of justice, the investigation must be limited. The Deputy Attorney General should do so immediately to ensure a fair process.

A rogue investigation should not be allowed to continue.

□ 1215

FLORIDA HOUSE PASSES GUN SAFETY BILL

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, MARCO RUBIO's Florida State Senate got shocked enough by the Parkland shooting to pass a token gun safety bill. The Florida House has yet to act. Whatever Florida does, RUBIO's token gun bill in Washington is belied by his pending bill to eliminate virtually all of the District of Columbia's gun safety laws. Worse, RUBIO has put his D.C. bill in the Congress to raise his NRA rating for the last two Congresses. It did raise his NRA rating from B plus to A.

I have managed to save D.C.'s gun safety laws, but RUBIO's shamefully token responses in the Senate to the Parkland tragedy will be seen as one more act of hypocrisy until he stops meddling in the District of Columbia's affairs and withdraws his D.C. gun bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIANFORTE). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward Members of the Senate.

THE ALAMO—MARCH 6, 1836

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours it was cold, damp, and dark in the old, beat-up Spanish mission.

It was the Alamo.

It was March 6, 1836.

It was a battle for Texas independence.

The volunteers were from most of the States and several foreign countries, including Mexico.

The small band of 186 Texans and Tejanos, led by defiant Colonel William Barrett Travis, had already repelled two attempts by Dictator Santa Anna and his army of thousands to take the garrison.

But on this morning, after a fierce battle, the enemy overwhelmed the volunteers and killed them all. Survivors were murdered.

However, Travis wrote in a letter on March 3 that "a victory by the enemy will cost Santa Anna more than defeat."

He was right. The enemy losses were staggering.

The Alamo volunteers gave General Sam Houston time to organize another army. So, on April 21, Houston and his troops vanquished and routed the enemy and secured Texas independence.

Then Texas was a republic for 9 years.

Independence was successful because the valiant, relentless Alamo defenders believed death was preferable to tyranny. Today we honor their sacrifice on the altar of liberty.

And that is just the way it is.

TRADE AND TARIFFS

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, last week I was invited to the White House to meet with President Trump and his advisers to discuss trade and the renegotiation of NAFTA. My district is the eighth largest agriculture district in the country. For districts like mine, free trade is crucial to ensuring that there are new markets for our farmers and manufacturing to sell their products and goods. That is why I urged the President to maintain and strengthen our existing trade agreements, including NAFTA, not withdraw or create new barriers to free trade.

The American economy is currently booming, thanks to once-in-a-lifetime tax reform, with disposable income seeing its highest jump since 2015. We should be working to build upon this success, not instituting protectionist tariffs that could start a trade war. In the end, the cost of tariffs are passed on to consumers and act like a new form of taxation, which could undo much of the gains we have seen since tax reform.

I urge the President and his team to reconsider the blanket tariffs discussed last week, and instead focus on fighting specific unfair trade practices that put American businesses at a disadvantage.

THE UNHRC MUST STOP UNFAIRLY TARGETING ISRAEL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Israel is America's treasured ally in the Middle East, and we must stand up for our friends when they are being treated unfairly. Recently, we have seen the United Nations targeting Israel with six anti-Israel resolutions passed in the last year alone. This is hypocritical discrimination.

That is why I introduced House Resolution 728, which recognizes that the

United Nations Human Rights Council wastes U.S. taxpayers' money by targeting Israel and reiterates that they need to stop the shameful, prejudicial behavior toward Israel. Even U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has expressed disappointment with the Human Rights Council singling out Israel, given the multitude of other human rights violations occurring around the world.

I was grateful for the opportunity to have attended the AIPAC Policy Conference this weekend, where I participated in a panel discussion on the threat to Israel from Gaza. There I highlighted the broad security concerns Israel is facing, such as the Hamas tunnels, and discussed ways in which the United States can assist to address the threats of kidnapping and murder, such as the murder of Taylor Force.

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

Americans appreciate Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, a world statesman, for his visit to Congress today.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF SNAPa IN THE LIVES OF STUDENTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will meet with leaders from the School Nutrition Association of Pennsylvania, commonly known as SNAPa, which is a statewide organization of school nutrition professionals.

SNAPa works to advance quality child nutrition programs through education and advocacy. Organized in 1955, SNAPa is an all-volunteer board of directors elected by its membership, which currently stands at more than 2,300 individuals. As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition and a senior member on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I know the essential services that SNAPa works to provide. Students throughout the Commonwealth receive high-quality, low-cost meals thanks to SNAPa.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that, for some students, the only meal they may receive may be at school. This organization works to keep our children healthy and ensure that they have healthy food options through the school meal programs.

I look forward to speaking with Travis Folmar, a food services director from State College. I sincerely thank SNAPa for advancing the availability, quality, and acceptance of school nutrition programs as an essential part of education in Pennsylvania for more than 60 years.

SUPPORTING THE COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

As a former regulator at the FDIC, I can tell you that the road to a really bad economy is paved with seemingly good regulations. Regulations like the ones that came out of Dodd-Frank were intended to protect the consumer, but ended up creating more burden, more complexity, more cost, and fewer choices.

By the way, it destroys relationship banking in rural America and districts I represent. The best way to protect consumers and weed out the bad-acting businesses is a healthy market with robust competition, transparency, and more choices for the consumer.

The last 8 years gave us an administrative state in place of the freest and greatest economy in the world. We inherited trillions of dollars in regulatory costs, millions of hours in paperwork, and an economy that has grinded to a near halt.

Let's continue to rein in the unnecessary regulations. Let's get this economy growing again, and let's make America great again.

HONORING CALIFORNIA FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, last December, the Thomas fire raged through Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties, eventually becoming the largest wildfire in California's history. Our heroic firefighters left their families behind during the holiday season to fight tirelessly on the front lines, saving homes, businesses, and lives.

A few short weeks later, our first responders were called back into action when heavy rains brought debris flows that tragically claimed the lives of 23 people in Montecito. As residents were evacuating, these brave firefighters ran towards the disaster without a second thought, pulling people out of the mud and debris for days afterward.

I would like to thank all our first responders who so bravely answered the call of duty in these difficult conditions.

Mr. Speaker, with us here today are firefighters from IAFF Local 2046, CAL FIRE Local 2881, and the Ventura County Professional Firefighters Association, and the California Professional Firefighters.

I thank them all for their unparalleled level of service to keep our loved ones on the central coast safe.

Thank you for your service.

A MESSAGE TO THE MILITARY RETIREES OF ALABAMA'S SECOND DISTRICT

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the news that I recently received that Alabama's Second District has the 13th largest population of military retirees in the Nation.

It goes without saying that this is significant. At the end of last year, there were more than 16,000 military retirees living in Alabama's Second District.

But, Mr. Speaker, while I am glad that these retired servicemembers chose us, we are truly honored to have them. As their neighbors, it is our job to make sure that they feel at home, welcome, and, most of all, appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, to the 16,000 retired military personnel who call Alabama's Second District home, I join our State and community in thanking them for their service to our country. We thank them for sacrificing on our behalf. Now let us care for them. That starts with making sure that our veterans are receiving the care that they were promised when they signed up to put their lives on the line for this Nation.

If you are a veteran who needs any kind of casework assistance with the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Social Security Administration, or other Federal agency, please contact my office now. Do not put this off. My staff and I work for you. We are grateful for you. As the Representative from Alabama's Second District, I am here to fight for you.

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 747, I call up the bill (H.R. 4607) to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 747, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-61, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 115-582, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4607

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS OF THE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND REGULATORY PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.

Section 2001(c) of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 252 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(8) COVERED PERSON.—The term ‘covered person’ has the meaning given such term in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

“(9) FEDERAL FINANCIAL REGULATOR.—The term ‘Federal financial regulator’ means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and the National Credit Union Administration Board.”.

SEC. 3. ENSURING A COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “10 years” and inserting “7 years”;

(2) by striking “each appropriate” and all that follows through “review” and inserting “the Federal financial regulators shall each conduct a comprehensive review”;

(3) by striking “such appropriate Federal banking agency” and inserting “such Federal financial regulator, jointly or otherwise,”; and

(4) by inserting “or covered persons” after “insured depository institutions”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is amended—

(1) in subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agency” each place that term appears and inserting “the appropriate Federal financial regulator”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agencies” and inserting “the appropriate Federal financial regulator”.

SEC. 4. CONSIDERATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW.

Section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311), as amended by section 3, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “10 years” and inserting “7 years”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(3) tailor other regulations related to covered persons in a manner that limits the regulatory compliance impact, cost, liability risk, and other burdens, unless otherwise determined by the Council or the appropriate Federal financial regulator.”.

SEC. 5. REVIEWS CONDUCTED BY THE BUREAU.

Section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311), as amended by section 4, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REVIEWS CONDUCTED BY THE BUREAU.—The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall—

“(1) use any relevant information from an assessment conducted under section 1022(d) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12

U.S.C. 5512(d)) in conducting the review required under subsection (a); and

“(2) conduct such review in accordance with the purposes and objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 1021 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 5511).”.

SEC. 6. REDUCTION OF SURPLUS FUNDS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$7,500,000,000” and inserting “\$7,495,714,285”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on May 1, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the bill before us in the House, not unlike yourself, I am a proud Texan—in my case, a fifth-generation Texan.

In listening very carefully to the gentleman from Texas, Judge Poe, I do wish to remind all my colleagues that it was this day in 1836 that brave men in Texas took on the minions of tyranny at the Alamo. And although they lost that battle, they inspired their nation at the time, Texas, that would later become part of our Nation. So, on this day that is special to all Texans, it should be special to all Americans.

We remember the cradle of liberty. Remember the Alamo. God bless Texas.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, otherwise, I rise also, today, in support of H.R. 4607, which is a very important piece of legislation brought to us by a very hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

It is a bill that helps address the burden of unnecessary, duplicative, and outdated regulations that too often have imposed cost on our community financial institutions that ultimately make credit more expensive and less available to our constituents. It passed out of our committee with a very strong bipartisan vote of 38–17, and I congratulate him for his bill.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, this bill requires that all of the prudential fi-

nancial regulators that now include the CFPB and the NCUA, the National Credit Union Administration—it ensures that all of our financial regulators, not just some, but all, will participate in the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, known as EGRPRA, a law that dates back to the Clinton era, and this ensures that our agencies review all rules that are prescribed by themselves that impact our insured financial institutions.

The purpose of this review, again, is to reduce regulation that is proven overly burdensome, duplicative, or outdated, while maintaining our safety and soundness standards. And, again, Mr. Speaker, all this is is a review. It ensures a review.

Additionally, H.R. 4607 will require that these agencies meet every 7 years for a comprehensive regulatory evaluation, as opposed to the current 10-year standard. This is especially important. I salute the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership, because we have seen our financial sector of the economy suffer under the weight, the load, the burden of regulation, particularly because six of the seven heaviest regulatory years occurred under the last administration; so we need a more thorough review of these regulations. And requiring our Federal agencies to simply review their actions in a transparent manner on a more frequent basis, it is simple; it is fair; it is straightforward; it is wise.

Mr. Speaker, a healthy financial system that provides equal opportunity to all Americans to achieve financial independence can only exist if we have smart regulation. And the explosive growth of regulation, following the enactment of Dodd-Frank, has made it significantly harder for our community banks and credit unions to serve their customers and members.

And, in fact, the complexity and cost of this regulatory burden has forced many of them out of business or has forced them to cut back services to their customers and members, and it is one of the reasons why, on average, we continue to lose one community bank or credit union a day, or every other day, in America. This should not be happening.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is not the banks and credit unions we are so concerned about. It is their customers. It is customers like Missouri mom, Michele, who explained to us how frustrating it has been for her 20-year-old daughter, with a full-time job, to get a loan to buy her first car. And, again, her daughter has a first-time job. And as Michele explained to us: “It’s a catch-22. You need credit to get credit, but no one will give you the credit to begin with. I would like to see our young adults be able to build the credit they need so they can have a decent future.”

Mr. Speaker, it is for people like Michele and her daughter that we need this regulatory review. It is why we need the bill from the gentleman from Georgia. These are the people we are trying to help.

Like Anne in Wisconsin, who was trying to get a loan to remodel her attached garage when her son was born, and she said: "My husband and I have very high credit scores, and we have equity in our home, but because my husband has a seasonal job and finds other employment in the winter, the many banks we contacted rejected our loan request. They base that on our annual income only on the job he was currently in and said it was part of the new regulation."

Well, of course it is, Mr. Speaker. That is why they need to be reviewed. It is people like Anne in Wisconsin we need to help.

Or Dan, a Navy veteran from Illinois, who actually had to close down—close down the small auto finance company he started with his wife 25 years ago, and he had to close it down because of new Federal regulation. He explains: "Large companies can afford a separate legal department to deal with these issues and the myriad of new regulations. A small business like ours cannot. We had to make a decision. It was just not worth the risk to continue operations in this antibusiness environment."

So, Mr. Speaker, it is people like Michele, it is people like Anne, it is people like Dan who deserve the opportunity to have credit for their homes, their autos, their small businesses, and so we must ensure that all of our Federal regulators—all of our Federal financial regulators take a thorough comprehensive review of their regulatory burden so that we can continue to support the people who need credit.

H.R. 4607, again, has garnered strong bipartisan support. It is practical; it is common sense; and I urge all of my colleagues to adopt it.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4607, the so-called Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act. So instead of advancing legislation that improves our financial regulatory framework, the Republican majority is pushing yet another bill that is a giveaway to Wall Street and predatory lenders.

Let's be clear. This bill is intended to dismantle rules considered inconvenient by the financial services industry. If this bill were enacted, financial services regulators would be forced to spend more time and resources on backward-looking reviews and deregulating the financial services industry rather than strengthening protections for consumers and the economy.

Allow me to explain. The Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, or EGRPA, currently requires the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the OCC to conduct a review of the regulations that they have issued in order to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on insured depository institutions.

The banking regulators conduct this review every 10 years, but until now, this review has been a relatively balanced, careful assessment that the banking regulators have done twice in the last two decades, and the regulators have taken this process seriously.

The last review took about 3 years to complete. It involved field hearings and public engagement. The final review included many balanced and thoughtful recommendations to improve rules. Many of these would provide relief for community banks and credit unions but in a way that also maintains safeguards for consumers and protects the interests of the public and the broader economy.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4607, this bill, would make three major mistakes in changing the current review process. First, this bill actually requires regulators to change regulations so that they are less costly and burdensome for "covered persons."

Well, who are these covered persons? Are they the millions of consumers who were harmed by Wells Fargo's scheme to open fraudulent accounts without their knowledge? Were they? No.

Are they the many consumers who learned just a few days ago that Citigroup violated the law by charging them too much interest on their credit cards? No, no.

Are these covered persons in this bill the Latino or African-American families who were discriminated against by JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, and so many other banks steering them into more costly mortgages when they qualified for more affordable loans? No, not at all.

Are they—the ones who are being protected—are they seniors or service-members who fall prey to payday lenders that trap them in a cycle of debt? No.

Are they college graduates who are harassed by debt collectors for their student loan debt? No.

Under this bill, Mr. Speaker, covered persons are defined as "any person that engages in offering or providing a consumer financial product or service; and any affiliate of"—such—"person . . . if such affiliate acts as a service provider to such person." You know what that means? You know who these so-called covered persons in this bill are who they are talking about? That means Wells Fargo, JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, Bank of America, payday

lenders, mortgage brokers, debt collectors, and thousands of other financial companies.

All of these companies would get easier rules that limit their costs and burdens without appropriately considering the impact they are going to have on their customers. And this bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to strengthen protections for consumers where there might be deficiencies or gaps in our regulatory framework.

Second, unlike the other banking regulators, which are tasked with ensuring the safety and soundness of the financial services sector, the Consumer Bureau's unique mission is the protection of consumers and of ensuring that the consumer marketplace operates in a fair, transparent, and competitive manner.

Although it may make sense for the banking agencies to periodically review their prudential rules, with a focus on their regulated entities, the Consumer Bureau should be making sure that its rules are appropriately protecting consumers and the interests of the public, not the big financial corporations.

In addition, the Consumer Bureau is already subject to unique accountability and oversight measures that the other financial regulators are not. These special checks and balances include the requirement that the Consumer Bureau have small business review panels as a part of its rulemaking process and the ability of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, that is, FSOC, to repeal any of its final rules. And the Consumer Bureau is already required to review all of the significant rules within 5 years of the time they go into effect, but in a balanced—balanced—manner.

The third problem with H.R. 4607 is that it would make it harder for the regulators to do their jobs. The bill would require a comprehensive review of all banking and consumer protection regulations once every 7 years instead of every decade. If regulators take these reviews as seriously as their previous reviews, as I believe they would, then that would mean they would be tied up spending nearly half of each 7-year cycle doing regulatory reviews instead of supervising their regulated entities and enforcing the law.

This bill would impose an unbalanced review process on regulators that favors industries' wishes—favors industries' wishes over consumers and the economy. The methodology in this bill promotes deregulation. That is what this is all about. This is a bill about deregulation instead of creating a robust process to identify gaps or deficiencies in oversight that harm consumers, undermine the safety and soundness of our financial system, or jeopardize the country's financial stability.

So I cannot support a bill that forces the Consumer Bureau to weaken rules

for Wall Street and payday lenders. I am talking about the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4607.

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

□ 1245

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), a very hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee and the author of H.R. 4607.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from the Republic of Texas, Chairman HENSARLING, for giving me this time to move away some of the hyperbole that you may hear today and speak about the truth of what this really simple and commonsense measure really does.

Mr. Speaker, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act is a bill that I introduced simply to reduce the burden that outdated and unnecessary Federal regulations place on our small banks and lending institutions across the landscape of America.

I would like to start by thanking some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked tirelessly to make this a strong, bipartisan piece of legislation. I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for negotiating reasonable changes to this bill and for being an original cosponsor. I also appreciate Mr. DUFFY and Ms. SINEMA and the others who have reached across the aisle to cosponsor this important piece of legislation.

To fully understand this bill, Mr. Speaker, we have to go back to 1996, when Congress gave the financial regulatory agencies a useful tool by passing the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, or, as you have heard today, more commonly known as EGRPRA. This law directed the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, and the FDIC to review their regulations once every 10 years to identify those regulations that may be outdated, unnecessary, or overly burdensome. After that, the regulators were to send a report to Congress and eliminate any regulations they determined were unnecessary.

This law has been somewhat useful, and it was a good idea back in 1996 because, after all, who would be opposed to eliminating rules that even regulators thought were unnecessary? But too often, EGRPRA has been viewed as merely a check-the-box exercise by the agencies and the financial sector.

Now that we have two EGRPRA reports, a 2007 and a 2017, it is obvious that EGRPRA could have been more effective and produced more useful recommendations to policymakers. In retrospect, we also realize we need more direct action from the regulators to clean up outdated and unnecessary rules. That is why it is important for

Congress to revisit EGRPRA, as this bill does.

My bill contains several reforms to the EGRPRA review process that will breathe new life into this law, this tool for the regulators, and make sure it is not simply a check-the-box exercise.

This bill will require more frequent regulatory reviews by moving the review cycle from once a decade to once every 7 years. It will expand EGRPRA to include all regulated financial institutions instead of only depository-insured institutions. It will codify the National Credit Union Administration into EGRPRA, since the agency participated in the latest review voluntarily.

The bill will also add the controversial Consumer Finance Protection Bureau, CFPB, to the EGRPRA review process. This provision is especially important because, before Dodd-Frank, consumer financial laws were implemented by the three banking agencies; but when Dodd-Frank was enacted, the CFPB was given the responsibility for enforcing consumer financial laws. Since the CFPB is exempt from EGRPRA, these laws and regulations are no longer being comprehensively reviewed.

Dodd-Frank requires the CFPB to review its regulations every 5 years after they are enacted, but this leaves out rules which are considered nonsignificant. It also excludes rules that were adopted before the CFPB was created. Also, the CFPB's regulatory reviews are under a single, 5-year look-back period.

We must ensure that each regulatory agency is comprehensively reviewing its rules, and on a regular basis.

This bill is not duplicative because it requires CFPB to use its findings from its existing regulatory reviews in its EGRPRA reports so the CFPB does not waste time on rules it has already reviewed. And, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill will require the agencies to tailor rules that they find to be unnecessary based on the size and risk profile of the bank or the credit union.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat that last point because it is so important. This bill does not require the agencies to cut regulations with a broad brush, as it has been presented so far, nor does it cut regulations on the payday lending industry, as some have argued. It simply states the rules will be adjusted based on a company's risk if the regulators determine that to be appropriate.

The bill ensures that if the financial regulators—the regulators—determine that a regulation is important to consumer protection for safety and soundness, the agency will still have every right to leave that regulation completely intact.

This bill is not just about eliminating unnecessary regulations; it is about good government and cleaning

up unnecessary red tape that inevitably hurts the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Secretary came to our committee for a hearing last month, and I asked him about this very issue. He simply said:

Rules and regulations need to be constantly looked at as markets continually change.

He also said:

I'm not sure why the CFPB was exempted from EGRPRA, so I agree with the change.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed out of committee with a strong bipartisan vote of more than two-thirds of the committee members, and I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I knew that my friends on the opposite side of the aisle would basically refer to small banks.

This is what is normally done when we see deregulatory efforts being made. They talk about how they are trying to help small and community banks, and they fail to talk about the major financial institutions that I have talked about in my presentation that are the beneficiaries, also, of this deregulatory effort that is being put forth.

When I take a look at the existing law now and the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, I see that their mission is to conduct a review of their regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on insured depository institutions.

This deregulatory bill that we have before us goes a lot further. As I said, it is about deregulation, and it is about reducing cost and liability risk. This does not benefit our consumers at all.

Again, what we would do in the passage of this bill is simply open up opportunities for the big banks and financial institutions to get rid of the kind of oversight, the kind of laws that we have worked so hard for because it is inconvenient for them or it interferes with their bottom line in some way.

So I do not want our Members to be tricked or fooled to think, number one, this is simply about further getting rid of paperwork or that this is about supporting the small banks. This is about new ways by which to deregulate so that the big banks that are now found to be defrauding, found to be discriminating, found to be doing things like Wells Fargo has done, this is about deregulation that will further enhance their ability to do the kinds of things that we claim to be so opposed to and that harm our consumers.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that they are now including by way of H.R. 4607 should be looked at very carefully.

First of all, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle hate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. They

want to get rid of it. They have tried, time and time again, to undermine it in so many ways. The President has sent Mr. Mulvaney over there, who is supposed to be over at the Office of Management and Budget, to basically destroy it.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the Members of Congress to be tricked or fooled that somehow this is helpful that they are bringing in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. What they want to do is tie the hands of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and basically change their mission from protection for consumers to deregulation for the biggest banks in America.

Why do we have the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau? That is the centerpiece of the Dodd-Frank reform legislation that we worked so hard on.

Are we forgetting about what happened in 2008?

Are with forgetting about the recession that was caused by the big banks who had been involved with all of these exotic products and ways by which they were enticing would-be homeowners to try and get mortgages?

We can't forget about all of that. We have to know that not only did we have a recession, we were headed for a depression. Dodd-Frank reform has gone a long way toward eliminating some of the bad practices that were in place that got us into that situation in the first place.

Now, little by little, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle keep trying to creep in with new ways that they can support these big banks and financial institutions and deregulate and let them get in the position again where they are tricking our consumers, where they are coming up with these exotic products that caused our consumers to eventually get into foreclosure, and that would allow the big banks again, like Wells Fargo, to come up with all of these tricks that they use in order to enhance their bottom line. I think we are smarter than this, and I don't think that we are going to go for this legislation that is just another way to open the doors to deregulate.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and the entire Financial Services Committee for their continued critical work on financial regulations.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I consistently hear from Main Street businesses, small businesses from all over the country, that overregulation is pre-

venting business expansion and job growth.

Just last week, I chaired a hearing on a recent report by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office that explored whether financial regulations were adversely impacting community banks and credit unions. One of the major takeaways from that report was that we need to improve the tools available to financial regulators to reduce those burdens.

Because small businesses most often rely on conventional bank borrowing to finance their development, any additional red tape that reduces access to capital can be a monumental problem for the Nation's smallest firms. The bill that we have before us today, which would reform the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996, is a move in the right direction.

Making sure all financial regulators have a comprehensive process in place to review regulations will strengthen our financial sector and make it more possible for America's small businesses to have access to the capital that they need to grow and expand and create more jobs for more Americans. Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge my colleagues to support the commonsense reforms that are in H.R. 4607, and I urge them to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), who is vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for this time to be able to speak to an important piece of legislation.

In my home State of Colorado, we have a tale of two economies. The urban areas have realized economic recovery since 2008, while the more rural communities have been slower to find sustained economic growth. Essential to these areas and their ability to be able to recover, a topic that I speak frequently on, is access to credit.

As Treasury's report to the President in June of 2017 notes: Regulations on capital, liquidity, and leverage requirements, as well as regulatory parameters that guide loan underwriting, have undermined the ability of financial institutions to deliver attractively priced credit in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of the economy.

□ 1300

In other words, our community financial institutions have lost access to the tools that they need to be able to help their communities recover as they have struggled to comply with regulations intended for the largest institutions. Mr. Speaker, it is our local com-

munities, our small businesses, our first-time home buyers, and our working families who suffer the consequences from these regulations.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you one example of what unbridled regulation does and how it impacts families trying to be able to live that American Dream.

I have an example of a credit union in my home State of Colorado that had to stop offering home equity lines of credit to its members because the cost of keeping the forms in compliance with Federal regulation exceeded the income generated by the program. In other words, regulation priced this credit union out of a critical market and at a time when the rural environment the credit union serves needed access to credit most.

Fortunately, Mr. LOUDERMILK's legislation being considered here today will take important steps to require regulators to consider the institution's size and risk profile as they evaluate the necessity and effectiveness of regulatory rulemaking under the self-review mandated to them by the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act. Importantly, Mr. LOUDERMILK's legislation will also expand the EGRPA process to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the National Credit Union Administration, encouraging the tailoring of regulations across the regulatory spectrum.

This legislation takes steps to encourage regulators to allow small institutions adequate leeway to exercise reasonably constructed consumer lending regimes to make sure consumers have the broadest array of choices and that institutions can appropriately navigate the compliance landscape.

Mr. Speaker, by requiring regulators to more frequently review and tailor regulations, this bill will help put Main Street back on the path to prosperity and help to end the tale of two economies in Colorado and throughout the Nation. Making these adjustments will help community banks and credit unions once again be able to meet the needs of their neighbors and encourage our businesses to be able to grow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), who is yet another hardworking member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, the House Financial Services Committee has been working hard for consumers, local banks, credit unions, and American entrepreneurs during the 115th Congress. Today, we continue our work with H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

Introduced by my colleague from Georgia, Representative BARRY LOUDERMILK, this bill brings accountability and modernization to the current regulatory review process for banks, credit unions, and financial institutions across the country.

Currently, the regulatory audit conducted by our Federal financial regulators happens just once every decade, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the National Credit Union Administration are not technically a part of that review.

It has been 21 years since we evaluated possible changes to this antiquated and inefficient system. That is why we need Representative LOUDERMILK's Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act to ensure the regulations we have in place are working to do what they are supposed to do: protect consumers.

This legislation is made even more urgent given that unchecked and inefficient regulations are working against the very consumers our regulatory regime was designed to help. Take, for example, the fact that the United States lost nearly 12,000 of its federally insured banks between 1984 and 2016, making it harder for small business entrepreneurs and families to access the credit and capital they need to create new opportunities and grow.

These banks struggled under the weight of new regulations, either to disappear completely or to be swallowed up by the big banks that are able to absorb the heavy cost of compliance. For those banks that are able to survive, significant tradeoffs are required.

In Rockford, Minnesota, for instance, instead of adding another lender to their team, one small community bank needed to hire a full-time compliance officer simply to keep up with the regulatory onslaught from Washington. That same bank is spending over \$100,000 each year on compliance costs instead of using that money in ways that would benefit the local community.

Minnesota's credit unions have also been hit hard by unchecked and outdated regulation. One study found that credit unions in my State of Minnesota have incurred \$102 million in costs directly related to the increased regulations created by the Dodd-Frank Act. Worse still, one in every four Minnesota credit union employees spends their time solely on regulatory compliance.

Mr. Speaker, we have a duty to stand up for these struggling financial institutions and, more importantly, the consumers whose communities are hurting without them. We can do that today.

Representative LOUDERMILK's legislation sailed through committee in January receiving support from both sides of the aisle because Republicans and Democrats know that H.R. 4607 takes

necessary and important steps to ease the regulatory burdens which challenge community financial institutions in each and every congressional district.

I appreciate the hard work of the bill's sponsor and the chairman of the committee to bring this legislation to the floor today, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), who is a Democratic member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Congressman LOUDERMILK for working together on the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act. Congressman LOUDERMILK has been a true partner who has been tireless in pursuing smart regulatory reform policies and in finding solutions for the people he serves. We both want to get something done for the people we represent.

I also want to thank Congresswoman SINEMA for her help and support in leading this legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bipartisan Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

America's economic engine has been under pressure for some time now from unnecessarily burdensome and outdated regulations building up on the books of our regulators. It costs us in economic growth. And while there are clear times where smart guardrails are necessary, there are others when it actually holds back smart growth for our country and for our families.

We need a smarter, more efficient government. It is time to relieve these unnecessary burdens and spur business job growth and access to credit in New Jersey's Fifth District and across the country while protecting consumers and our economy. This bipartisan regulatory relief bill does just that. It updates and expands regulators' mandatory review of financial institutions while protecting consumers. It also requires the review be performed every 7 years rather than every 10.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER: It requires regulators to consider tailoring regulations when appropriate. In short, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act will cut bureaucratic red tape and help our economy thrive without putting consumers at risk.

There should be nothing partisan about helping entrepreneurs and businesses of all sizes grow, create jobs, and expand the economy. With this measure, Democrats and Republicans

join together to ensure outdated, unnecessary, and burdensome regulations are eliminated or reformed to better fit the needs of individual financial institutions, which ultimately saves Americans money, helps consumers and families grow—and businesses, too—and it protects, always, American consumers.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia for leading on this issue.

I rise today in strong support of his bipartisan bill, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act.

It strikes me as common sense that Federal regulators should review their regulations and rules on a consistent basis. They should also seek comment from the people whom these rules actually affect. Mr. LOUDERMILK's bill helps accomplish this goal by requiring the CFPB and National Credit Union Administration do so every 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, since the implementation of Dodd-Frank, community banks and credit unions have had a more difficult time serving their customers. The red tape and additional burden brought on by Dodd-Frank has increased costs for the consumer and reduced their choices in the market for financial products.

One agency in particular that is guilty for this additional burden is the CFPB, which has finalized over 60 rules since their creation. Many of their rules are duplicative and unnecessary. I think, at the very least, they should review and study how their regulations are affecting real folks in the real world.

I hear from financial institutions back home how the CFPB has done nothing but harm their community bank or their credit union. They are being overwhelmed by the volume and complexity of regulations, and that is just not okay.

Harmonization is the goal of this bill, and that should not be partisan or even controversial. We simply want less people buried in paperwork and more people starting businesses through their local financial institution.

This bill is supported by folks across the political spectrum, and I am excited about the good it will do for our financial institutions back home and consumers in my district.

I want to again thank Mr. LOUDERMILK for introducing this important piece of legislation that will ensure our financial system is functioning efficiently for hardworking Americans.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is a real leader on our committee for commonsense regulation and the chairman of our Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for all his great work and leadership on our Financial Services Committee and also thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for crafting a commonsense, bipartisan bill that requires the Federal financial regulators and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to conduct a comprehensive review of all the regulations promulgated with the intent of identifying those that are outdated or duplicative.

Across the Nation, financial companies continue to suffer as a result of the burdensome regulations. What my friends on the other side of the aisle don't always recognize is the impact that has on the ability of those companies to serve their customers.

Take cybersecurity as an example. Financial firms of all sizes are forced to adhere to an overlapping regulatory regime that is focused on fighting yesterday's war.

I spoke with a major bank just last week that has cybersecurity examinations from the Federal Reserve, the Comptroller of the Currency, the FDIC, the Treasury Department, and multiple State banking agencies; and that doesn't include the foreign entities that regulate the international businesses of this bank. Each agency has a slightly different exam process and requires slightly different information.

This type of regime doesn't protect companies from cybersecurity threats. The lack of coordination means this institution spends more time reacting to the regulators than it does protecting its customers.

Or look at the antiquated regime surrounding examination and enforcement of the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering laws. What was originally intended to be a reasonable process that fostered collaboration between financial institutions and law enforcement to root out bad actors and illicit financing has become so onerous that banks are choosing to drop customers or close entire books of businesses just to avoid compliance burdens. Processes like these do very little to help consumers or the integrity of the financial system.

Every time I speak to a bank or credit union in Missouri, I ask what one rule or regulation they find to be the most burdensome or they would like to see changed. The answer is always the same: It isn't just one. It is the weight of all the rules combined that is restricting credit and the availability of financial services in our communities.

We have to make a change, Mr. Speaker. Mr. LOUDERMILK's legislation would institute a more thoughtful ap-

proach to regulations that will not only offer regulatory relief, but also foster a more responsible and stable financial marketplace.

As the gentleman from Georgia has said in the past, this bill isn't just about regulatory relief; it is about good government. This should not be a partisan exercise. I hope every Member of this body stands for responsible government and joins me in supporting H.R. 4607 today.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with my closing, I would just like to make a few comments about some of the information that was shared with us by Members on the opposite side of the aisle. I want to remind them that these poor little banks that you are talking about, which include all of the big banks in America, made record profits in 2016—more than \$170 billion—and they are going to make billions more from that tax bill, that tax scam giveaway to Wall Street. Lending is up 75 percent since 2010.

So when my friends on the opposite side of the aisle continue to talk about how the banks are suffering, I don't know who they are talking about. As a matter of fact, the real bipartisanship of this committee is about community banks, and Democrats have led and will continue to lead on every way and everything that we can do for community banks.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I notice that when my friends on the opposite side of the aisle come in with deregulation, they frame it in such a way that you would think that it is all about community banks, when, in fact, they always attach anything they do for community banks to the biggest banks in America.

So, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4607 demonstrates just how much my colleagues on the other side of the aisle value the interests of Wall Street over families and consumers on Main Street.

This bill would direct the banking, credit union, and consumer protection regulators to loosen their rules to benefit bad actors on Wall Street. The bill doesn't even allow regulators to consider how to improve safeguards to better protect consumers.

It is absurd that we are here today discussing yet another bill that leads to massive deregulation and seeks to tip the scales in favor of the financial industry. The interests of the public are what we should be focused on.

This bill is yet another piece of the harmful and reckless Republican agenda. Only a few months ago, Republicans jammed their tax scam legislation through this Chamber. They added

\$1.8 trillion to the Federal debt in order to line the pockets of Wall Street and other megacorporations with billions in tax cuts, leaving families on Main Street and generations of their children just to pick up the tab. Democrats rejected that terrible piece of legislation and should now reject H.R. 4607 as well.

Americans for Financial Reform, a coalition of more than 200 consumer civil rights, investor, retiree, community, labor, faith-based, and business groups said that H.R. 4607, "contains no consideration of the public benefits that are the justification for creating the regulations in the first place, and which regulators should be seeking to preserve. Any mandate to tailor regulations must include consideration of public benefits, rather than being a one-sided directive to reduce business costs." I agree.

For Members who are concerned with maintaining strong protections, I would highlight that Trump's OMB Director, Mick Mulvaney, has been illegally installed as Acting Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and is working every day to dial back the important work of the Consumer Bureau from within.

Congress should not be giving Mr. Mulvaney, or anyone the President eventually appoints and is confirmed to serve as the next Director of the Consumer Bureau, a green light to gut consumer protections and reduce the Consumer Bureau's ability to hold bad actors accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4607, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to my friend on the other side of the aisle. Again, her comments were very heavy on thematics, very heavy on extraneous material. Unfortunately, it was a little light on the facts of H.R. 4607.

The text of the bill is 3½ pages long; so it doesn't take very long to read. But I remind all of my colleagues that this is common sense. In and of itself, this bill changes no rules. All it does is tell our regulators that every 7 years, why don't you look at what you have done and publish a report.

If you want to change any rule, you have to go through the formal rule-making process to repropose a rule, to get public comment. So, again, in and of itself, it changes no rules. I almost want to ask my friend on the other side of the aisle: What is she scared of? What is so wrong with simply looking at the rules that have been promulgated to see if they are actually working? Are they helping our constituents? Are they making economic opportunity more available for all?

What is so odd is, the original EGRPA legislation that dates back to

the Clinton era was overwhelmingly supported on both sides of the aisle.

So what the gentleman from Georgia is doing in H.R. 4607 is simply saying all financial regulators, including the National Credit Union Administration and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which really didn't even exist in the Clinton era, ought to do the same thing. They are saying, instead of doing it every 10 years, let's do it every 7 years. Just take a look and report. That is all it is.

It is a self-reporting requirement, which I think, Mr. Speaker, is why this has already been supported overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis in the House Financial Services Committee.

So with all of the various scare tactics and horror stories that we have heard from the other side of the aisle on a mere reporting requirement, again, I ask, Mr. Speaker: What are they scared of?

What we are ultimately trying to do here is make sure that the regulatory burden is not such that it harms the very people I spoke about earlier in my opening comments: that it doesn't hurt Dan, a Navy veteran from Illinois who, because of the regulatory burden, was forced to shut down his small business; that it doesn't hurt Anne in Wisconsin, who is just trying to get a loan to remodel her garage; that it doesn't hurt Michele and her daughter in Missouri. Her daughter was just simply seeking a car loan to buy her first car.

These are the people whom we are trying to help.

And by the way, all banks—small, medium, and large—are lending to businesses and to consumers, and we want them to do that in a robust but responsible way.

So, from time to time, let's look at the regulations and ensure that they are still helping us achieve equal financial opportunity for all so that our constituents can achieve their share of the American Dream, that they can achieve financial independence.

This received strong, bipartisan support, Madam Speaker, in the House Financial Services Committee. It ought to receive strong, bipartisan support on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for and adopt H.R. 4607, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 747, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4607 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 21, strike "otherwise determined" and insert "such action is at the request of and for the personal gain of the President, his or her immediate family members, or senior Executive Branch officials who are required to file annual financial disclosure forms, or is otherwise determined inappropriate".

Mr. LEUTKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a commonsense measure that protects the American people from corruption and conflicts of interest.

My amendment simply states that before taking any action to eliminate or change a regulation, regulators must disclose any communications from the White House or the President's family advocating for the action and whether the President, his family, or any senior administration officials would benefit financially from such action.

The American people need to have confidence that their government is working in the best interest of the people and not to enrich a President and his family and wealthy friends.

Every day, the news is filled with stories that raise this very question. Does the Trump family benefit when the EPA loosens environmental safeguards on construction projects?

Does Jared Kushner's deeply indebted family business receive favorable treatment when he advocates for certain policies?

Do the President's sons get special permits from foreign governments when the President changes policies towards those countries?

Who in the administration gets richer when our coasts are opened up to oil drilling, when tariffs are levied on steel, or when predatory lenders are allowed to prey on college students?

President Trump has rejected the norm that all modern-day Presidents

have followed. His refusal to release his tax returns or to remove himself from his family business necessitates codifying the norms and practices of previous Presidents into law in this disclosure.

Congress must do its job and provide a necessary check on a President who has shown contempt for his basic duty to put Americans first. All of these policies affect American families. They affect the taxes we pay, the air we breathe, and whether our kids can afford to go to college.

We deserve to know if these decisions are being made to enrich a President and if they are being made at the taxpayers' expense. This simple act of disclosure will allow the American people to judge for themselves who this administration is really looking out for.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this matter today.

It is kind of interesting that we have before us an amendment that basically is something that deals with a financial services bill, something that deals with a financial services issue, yet we had the EPA and a whole bunch of other agencies brought into the discussion here, which has nothing to do with what we are trying to talk about here today.

The amendment talks about the President or his immediate family members. How is it possible that, unless those family members have the authority to make the request, they even should be considered?

This is sort of pulling things out of the air here that make no sense to me. This is a very simple bill that we have where all we are looking at trying to do is take the EGRPA law that says that, every 10 years, all the rules and regulations are reviewed.

All we are doing is putting two agencies back into this group of agencies that are under review, one that was not even in existence at the time of the bill's passage back in the nineties, the CFPB; and the other one that needs to be included is the National Credit Union. All we are doing is taking that 10-year review down to 7.

Why is this controversial? We are taking an agency that was not even included in this originally and putting it under the purview of this bill so that there can be a review of the rules and regulations.

Is there lack of transparency on the other side?

Do we no longer want to be concerned about what is going on?

Do we no longer want to know that the rules and regulations are appropriately adjudicated here by these agencies?

I think that is the wrong way to go. I think that we need to have more transparency. Reducing from 10 years down to 7 gives us an opportunity to have a more constant review of these things to make sure that the bureaucratic folks in the executive branch of the government don't run away with what should be, in my view, the authority of the Congress.

□ 1330

Madam Speaker, I think that the motion to recommit is way out of line here, and I don't think we need to waste any more time on it.

Madam Speaker, I ask folks to decline the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

PORTFOLIO LENDING AND MORTGAGE ACCESS ACT

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2226) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution's portfolio, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2226

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act".

SEC. 2. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.

Section 129C(b) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) SAFE HARBOR.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A residential mortgage loan shall be deemed a qualified mortgage loan for purposes of this subsection if the loan—

"(i) is originated by, and continuously retained in the portfolio of, a covered institution;

"(ii) is in compliance with the limitations with respect to prepayment penalties described in subsections (c)(1) and (c)(3);

"(iii) is in compliance with the requirements related to points and fees under paragraph (2)(A)(vii);

"(iv) does not have negative amortization terms or interest-only terms; and

"(v) is a loan for which the covered institution considers, documents, and verifies the debt, income, and financial resources of the consumer in accordance with subparagraph (C).

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a residential mortgage loan if the legal title to such residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person unless the legal title to such residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred—

"(i) to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of the covered institution that originated such loan;

"(ii) to an insured depository institution or insured credit union that has less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets on the date of such sale, assignment, or transfer, if the loan is retained in portfolio by such insured depository institution or insured credit union;

"(iii) pursuant to a merger of the covered institution that originated such loan with another person or the acquisition of a the covered institution that originated such loan by another person or of another person by a covered institution, if the loan is retained in portfolio by the person to whom the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred; or

"(iv) to a wholly owned subsidiary of the covered institution that originated such loan if the loan is considered to be an asset of such covered institution for regulatory accounting purposes.

"(C) CONSIDERATION AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—The consideration and documentation requirements described in subparagraph (A)(v) shall—

"(i) not be construed to require compliance with, or documentation in accordance with, appendix Q to part 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

"(ii) be construed to permit multiple methods of documentation.

"(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'covered institution' means an insured depository institution or an insured credit union that, together with its affiliates, has less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets on the date on the origination of a residential mortgage loan;

"(ii) the term 'insured credit union' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

"(iii) the term 'insured depository institution' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

"(iv) the term 'interest-only term' means a term of a residential mortgage loan that allows one or more of the periodic payments made under the loan to be applied solely to accrued interest and not to the principal of the loan; and

"(v) the term 'negative amortization term' means a term of a residential mortgage loan under which the payment of periodic payments will result in an increase in the principal of the loan."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2226, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, represents a very simple solution to a significant policy challenge facing our economy: how to expand access to mortgage credit without replicating the accumulation of excess risk in the mortgage-backed securities market like we witnessed in the run-up to the 2008 financial crisis.

My legislation achieves both goals by extending the qualified mortgage legal safe harbor to small creditors, banks, and credit unions with total consolidated assets of \$10 billion or less, that originate and hold residential mortgage loans in portfolio, rather than selling or securitizing them, allowing those lenders to satisfy Dodd-Frank's ability-to-repay rule.

Such a policy would actually incentivize private sector risk retention—a goal of the Dodd-Frank Act itself—and mark a return to relationship lending in which a bank or credit union can tailor products to a consumer's needs and credit risk, without running afoul of one-size-fits-all government requirements. Under CFPB regulations, only government-defined qualified mortgages enjoy a presumption that a lender has satisfied the Dodd-Frank law's ability-to-repay requirements.

Small banks and credit unions have been disproportionately impacted by these rules, given their reliance upon residential mortgage lending and greater involvement in small dollar or balloon loans that run afoul of current QM regulations. It is no surprise that Harvard researchers have found that, since Dodd-Frank's passage, community banks have lost market share at a rate double that experienced between 2006 and 2010, a period including the entirety of the financial crisis. It is also

not a surprise that many small community financial institutions have testified in front of the House Financial Services Committee and to many of my colleagues that they have simply left the mortgage business altogether because of the difficulties associated with the QM rule as currently constructed.

Indeed, a third of the National Association of Realtors survey respondents reported being unable to close mortgages due to a requirement of the qualified mortgage rule. Residential mortgages were the product or service most often identified by surveyed banks as a candidate for discontinuation as a result of Dodd-Frank. A recent study by the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University documents the falling share of bank participation in mortgage originations.

Everyone agrees, especially after the 2008 financial crisis, that a borrower should be required to show a demonstrable ability to repay. The only question is: Who is in the best position to make that determination—a community banker with a professional and, perhaps, even a personal relationship with the borrower who has full view of that borrower's character, creditworthiness, financial situation, and who is willing to assume 100 percent of the downside risk of default; or is it an unaccountable, unelected bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., who literally knows absolutely nothing about that borrower?

By bearing 100 percent of the risk, financial institutions have every incentive to make sure that a borrower can afford to repay a loan. Banks and credit unions would have more than just skin in the game. Under this legislation, their interests would align perfectly with that of a borrower.

As one witness in front of our committee testified: "A financial institution that retains a loan's credit and interest-rate risk has a keen interest in engaging in thorough, sound underwriting to determine the borrower's ability to repay. Allowing a financial institution to make a customer-specific lending decision on a loan it intends to hold in its portfolio can be a more effective way of protecting consumers than regulatory attempts to micromanage mortgage terms with inflexible standards."

No less than Barney Frank, former chairman of the committee, endorsed this concept in a hearing before this committee, saying he "would like the main safeguard against bad loans to be risk retention, because that leaves the decision in the hands of whoever is making the loan," the CFPB also, itself, acknowledged this key point in its own rulemaking, where it recognized that portfolio lenders "have strong incentives to carefully consider whether a consumer will be able to repay a portfolio loan at least in part

because the small creditor retains the risk of default."

This legislation also presents a viable alternative to the "originate to distribute" mortgage lending model that contributed to the subprime mortgage meltdown and bubble in residential real estate and taxpayer bailouts. The result is expanded access to mortgage credit without additional risk to the financial system or to the taxpayer.

In fact, this is particularly important for young families and first-time home buyers, who tend to have difficulty meeting the ability-to-repay requirements due to circumstances, such as significant student loan debt, but who are otherwise creditworthy.

I have been working on this legislation for 5 years now, and I am happy to announce that, this year, we had a bipartisan breakthrough. That is because, at the committee markup, I offered an amendment that limited the scope of this bill to financial institutions with less than \$10 billion in assets. And my distinguished colleague, Representative CAPUANO, offered a technical amendment that enhanced the legislation by clarifying a few key provisions. I am pleased to report that, because of those two amendments, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act passed with unanimous support in the committee and is now on the floor today for consideration.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, Representative CAPUANO, the Kentucky Bankers Association, the Kentucky Credit Union League, the American Bankers Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, the Credit Union National Association, the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, the National Association of Home Builders, and the United States Chamber of Commerce for their hard work on this important legislation.

If passed by the House, it is my hope that the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act moves quickly through the Senate. Eleven of our Democratic colleagues in the upper Chamber support this exact language, which is in Chairman CRAPO's community financial institution relief bill. Together, Republicans and Democrats can deliver on the regulatory relief that many of us in this body have promised to our constituents that will enable more of them to buy the home of their dreams.

Madam Speaker, I invite all of my colleagues to vote for this important pro-homeownership legislation that perfectly aligns lender and borrower interests to the benefit of America.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his persistence in offering this legislation. As he said, in com-

mittee, we had a successful markup where we were able to unanimously support this legislation. It is important legislation.

We don't agree on everything. One doesn't have to go very far. Back in committee, right now, where we have a rather contentious markup on a budget using estimates, as I said in that meeting: When we do agree, we should come together. Representative BARR and I have talked about this issue for quite some time, and I am really pleased to see it move forward.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2226, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, which would allow certain mortgages that are originated and retained in portfolio by a bank with less than \$10 billion in total assets to be considered as qualified mortgages.

In the lead-up to the financial crisis, there were a number of mortgage lenders that did not do their due diligence in underwriting mortgages. We saw a number of exotic products being offered to individuals and families premised on a continually rising housing market.

These included "no doc" loans where the lender did not document or verify a borrower's income. There were real consequences for those sorts of loans. Many of these borrowers never really had any hope of paying back those loans. As those mortgages went into default, the foreclosures helped lead to a financial crisis that devastated the U.S. economy, and millions of families were stripped from their single source of wealth: the equity in their home.

In the wake of that crisis, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Act and required lenders to assess a consumer's ability to repay their mortgage loans.

We also provided statutory penalties for mortgage lenders that did not follow these new underwriting standards.

Congress also directed the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to enact regulations to create a safe harbor for creditors, where it would be presumed that the creditor evaluated the borrower's ability to repay.

In 2013, under the direction of former Director Cordray, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau released its ability-to-repay and qualified mortgage rule. This rule defined how lenders could take advantage of that safe harbor.

Qualified mortgages, commonly referred to as QM loans, are a special category of loans that have strong underwriting standards and certain non-predatory loan features that help make them more likely that borrowers will be able to afford their mortgages.

So if a lender originates a QM loan, it means that the lender met certain requirements, and it is assumed that the lender followed the ability-to-repay

rule as drafted by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This also allows the lender to be shielded from certain types of liability associated with originating bad loans.

I and my colleagues were pleased that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau tailored the rule to ensure that lenders who serve rural and underserved communities have flexibility in serving their customers.

While that was a very good first step, Congress has pushed to expand this tailoring to include even more community banks and credit unions, consistent with safe and sound operations. H.R. 2226, as amended in the committee, provides this targeted and, I think, reasonable relief.

As Representative BARR and I have indicated, there are additional refinements to the bill that I would have still liked to have seen adopted, such as additional guardrails on the types of products offered. I am glad, however, and as Mr. BARR indicated, the leadership of the committee, the majority, agreed to crucial language offered by Mr. CAPUANO to improve the bill.

As amended, lenders are required to continually hold these loans in portfolio, and not only consider and document, but verify a borrower's income information.

Congress should not be in the business of allowing lenders to underwrite and offer mortgage loans that borrowers have no ability to repay.

I am supportive of this bill for that reason, but also because I believe it will help in areas of the country that have weaker housing markets. This has really been the reason that I have been interested in the issue of portfolio lending.

As many know, I represent Flint, Michigan, which not unlike a number of communities across the country have very weak and very low cost markets. You can purchase a single family home in Flint for \$25,000—not \$250,000—\$25,000.

Under the QM rules, financial institutions sometimes, justifiably, struggle to make these small mortgages, resulting in even more stagnant markets—it is a vicious cycle—and weakening these markets permanently. If we can't get people financed into mortgages, these communities and the market will never recover.

□ 1345

This bill will encourage community banks and credit unions to make those smaller mortgages, to help weaker markets.

It is for that reason and many others, but particularly for that reason, that I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a big step in the right direction for weak markets. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for his constructive comments, his support. And the gentleman is absolutely correct. He engaged with me and my colleagues who were co-sponsoring this legislation in a very constructive manner. He made valuable contributions, along with Mr. CAPUANO and the ranking member. Several other members on the other side of the aisle, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for example, offered his thoughtful comments as well. I appreciate the support, the bipartisan support, working through a compromise to get this legislation to where it is today, so I thank the gentleman for that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), who is also a sponsor of this legislation and a distinguished member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, when the House passed the Financial CHOICE Act to repeal Dodd-Frank last year, we did so because we believe in Main Street, we believe in the consumer, the American consumer.

Dodd-Frank promised to protect consumers from the big banks on Wall Street. In reality, Dodd-Frank has punished small banks and credit unions and, ultimately, the American consumer.

The loss of community financial institutions tells the story. In my State of Minnesota, we had 513 community banks in 2000. Today, we have about 309, and continue to experience a drought in de novo charters.

Credit unions have, unfortunately, faced similar challenges. This means there are fewer places for Americans to turn when they are seeking a loan for their first home or perhaps to get a small business off the ground.

One specific provision in Dodd-Frank requires lenders to deny loans to individuals who do not meet government-prescribed standards. This, according to Washington, makes loans safer, since, of course, government knows best. But in reality, these mortgages have not been made safer. They have been made unavailable. As a result, the likelihood of getting approved for a loan and becoming a homeowner has plummeted.

Representative BARR's legislation, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, takes steps to empower lenders in Minnesota and across the country and to better serve the needs of their customers by extending important protections to institutions and ensuring access to credit for American borrowers.

At the end of the day, the most effective way to ensure an individual has the ability to repay does not always need to be government-prescribed.

I appreciate my colleague from Kentucky's hard work to protect and reinvigorate our community financial institutions, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2226, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, as it comes before the House for a vote.

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

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is also, I believe, a sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman BARR for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 2226, the Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

This is something that Chairman BARR has worked on for at least two Congresses now, and I feel that we are finally in a place where we can get some commonsense changes to the CFPB's qualified mortgage rules that provide relief to community banks and credit unions.

I was very pleased to see this legislation get a unanimous vote in the Committee on Financial Services earlier this year. I am also very happy to see that the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is taking note of this issue and has advanced similar legislation.

The Dodd-Frank Act required the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to come up with a series of new rules regarding mortgage lending. One of these rules was the so-called qualified mortgage rule, which provides a safe harbor to loans if they meet certain criteria prescribed by the Bureau. This effectively means that the market treats any loans that are not qualified mortgages as being much riskier.

The Bureau's rule is especially challenging for community banks and credit unions. These lenders do not tend to be as automated as larger financial institutions. They also tend to put more time into underwriting mortgages to reflect the unique circumstances of the customers in their communities.

However, the CFPB's qualified mortgage rule took away much of this flexibility from these lenders by doing things like instituting a 43 percent debt-to-income ratio. This might be a good indicator of repayment risk for a lot of mortgages, but a one-size-fits-all is almost never a good approach.

The CFPB's rule also did not acknowledge the fact that small lenders do not tend to sell these loans into the secondary market. They keep 100 percent of the risk on their portfolio. This means these lenders have a very strong incentive to issue loans that they believe will be repaid.

If loans held on portfolio can be treated as qualified mortgages, then these banks and credit unions will have a stronger incentive to manage any risk associated with these mortgages.

The Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act would treat loans held on portfolio by community banks and credit unions as qualified mortgages if they meet some other criteria, such as not having a negative amortization or interest-only features.

This change to the CFPB's qualified mortgage rule will go a long way towards simplifying how our community financial institutions can help families achieve the dream of home ownership.

I have been hearing about this legislation from community banks and credit unions in Illinois, and I am confident it will help my constituents.

Madam Speaker, I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, just to reiterate, we don't agree on everything. Even some of the debate in this conversation, I think we could find areas of disagreement. But when it comes to the specifics of this legislation, I think it strikes a good balance. The balance, for me, being the notion that we can deem these mortgages held by smaller institutions, as long as they are held in portfolio, as meeting the QM requirements.

In exchange for that, what we get is, in weak markets, we get a chance for folks who essentially have been locked out of home ownership to be able to get a small mortgage literally on a \$25,000, \$30,000, or \$40,000 home and begin to build equity that will return value to that family and to that community for a long, long time.

For that reason, I support this legislation and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on it.

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

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, let me just reiterate that this legislation solves two problems. It solves the problem of responsible expansion of access to mortgage credit, access to that American Dream of home ownership; and, at the same time, preventing the mistakes that led to the 2008 financial crisis, the originate to distribute model where originators of mortgages had no skin in the game and they allowed those mortgages to be poorly underwritten or not underwritten at all, with no documentation, and then securitized and sold into the secondary market, really without any eye towards the consumer and the borrower's ability to repay.

Everybody in this institution, as evidenced by the bipartisan work here, we all recognize that a borrower should demonstrate an ability to repay that loan, but the crux of this legislation, at the core of this legislation is a recognition that a local community banker, a local credit union, a lender with a personal relationship with a borrower is in

the best position to determine whether or not that borrower, that prospective homeowner, can repay that loan.

When there is risk retention, when that lender is charged with the responsibility of maintaining that loan in portfolio, the lender is much more incentivized to properly underwrite that loan and make sure that that customer, that borrower, that future homeowner, has a demonstrable ability to repay. I think it is a much better substitute to a one-size-fits-all credit box from, frankly, bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., who have no eye towards the creditworthiness of that particular borrower.

We have worked with our friends on the other side of the aisle to make this a bipartisan piece of legislation limiting the size of the institutions that can access this regulatory relief. But, clearly, when community financial institutions, bankers from around the country, every part of the country, are saying that they see the QM rule as not "qualified mortgages," but as "quitting mortgages;" and when we see an unnecessary constraint of mortgage credit; and when the National Association of Realtors are reporting that they are unable to close mortgages due to this onerous qualified mortgage rule, clearly the pendulum has swung too far.

So, yes, we needed some reforms in the aftermath of the financial crisis. This QM rule went too far. This is a recalibration of that. And this is important regulatory relief for our community financial institutions that will inure to the benefit of the American home-buying public, and it will do so in a responsible way, providing a viable alternative to the originate to distribute practices that really led to the financial crisis.

Madam Speaker, let me just make one final observation, and that is to give credit to the administration. The Department of the Treasury, in their findings and recommendations in their report on banks and credit unions, they recognized that this was a problem in the mortgage lending space and they made a recommendation also to increase the portfolio lending safe harbor to institutions with \$10 billion in assets or lower; and that, as they argued, will accommodate loans made and retained by small depository institutions, provide that needed regulatory relief to our community financial institutions, and also expand access to mortgage credit in a responsible way.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support. At this time I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2226, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNITY BANK REPORTING RELIEF ACT

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4725) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require short form call reports for certain depository institutions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4725

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Community Bank Reporting Relief Act".

SEC. 2. SHORT FORM CALL REPORTS.

Section 7(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(12) SHORT FORM REPORTING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall issue regulations that allow for a reduced reporting requirement for a covered depository institution when the institution makes the first and third report of condition for a year, as required under paragraph (3).

"(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'covered depository institution' means an insured depository institution that—

"(i) has less than \$5,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

"(ii) satisfies such other criteria as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in support of H.R. 4725, the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act.

Community banks were hit hard by the Great Recession and the ensuing regulations. Numerous bankers have told me they are spending more and more money and resources and time on compliance costs and less money and resources on actually providing services to customers. This is particularly alarming because these small banks are so critical to their communities. From sponsoring the local T-ball team, to lending money to a farmer for the next year's crop, to helping the single mom purchase a used car so she can get to work, these banks are involved at every level of our communities all across America, but because of over-regulation, these banks are rapidly closing and consolidating.

Unfortunately, the headline for banks in the Commonwealth of Kentucky is no different. Since the enactment of the Dodd-Frank financial control law, we have seen a 20 percent drop in the number of banks in our State and there has been a dearth of charters for new banks. In fact, since 2010, there have been only a few *de novo* charters for banks nationwide.

Now, some people say that consolidation and mergers have been a long-term trend for the last 30 years and, therefore, not related to the recent uptick in regulations unrelated to Dodd-Frank, but they are clearly not seeing the bigger picture, because even after mergers, many branches in rural and other underserved communities are closing, leaving many Kentuckians to drive a town or two over just to get to the nearest bank.

It is not just about a long-term trend of consolidation. There have been literally no new charters, whereas before the Dodd-Frank law was enacted, there were many, many new charters every year; and since the Dodd-Frank law was enacted, no new charters. So the consolidation trend has gotten a lot worse since this avalanche of red tape coming out of Washington, D.C., and that is having a very negative impact on rural and underserved American communities.

While new technologies are helping bring banking services to anyone with an internet connection, many people still prefer the personal one-on-one banking style that they grew up with and the personal interaction often that helps the banks themselves understand the exact needs of their customers.

□ 1400

The Dodd-Frank law was almost 2,300 pages and required dozens of agencies to create new regulations or revise existing ones. As a result, these agencies issued hundreds of regulations and, according to the Mercatus Center, the law placed about 28,000 new restrictions on the banking industry, effectively doubling the number of regulatory restrictions in title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulation to more than 52,000.

Although not part of the Dodd-Frank rush of regulations, a growing number of banks have cited the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council's, or FFIEC, Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income—or call reports, as they are commonly called—as too burdensome.

Each quarter, all national banks, State member banks, insured State nonmember banks, and savings associations are required to file these call reports. The reports contain approximately 50 pages of financial data on each bank, including their assets, liabilities, capital accounts, expenses, and income. However, these reports are very burdensome for community banks with limited resources and offer little

value to the regulators relative to the last quarter's report.

Thankfully, H.R. 4725, the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act, is fighting back against the bureaucratic nightmare of complying with these 52,000 restrictions by allowing banks with less than \$5 billion in consolidated assets to file their call reports every 6 months as opposed to every 3 months.

The impact of this regulatory change will be a huge development for banks across the country. Now they will spend less time on call reports and more time on actually helping customers. This means more capital will be flowing into our local economies, spurring job growth and economic development, while making a real difference in the lives of Americans trying to access affordable capital to buy a new home or car or start a business.

I want to thank my good friend from Illinois, Congressman RANDY HULTGREN, for his leadership and for introducing this important legislation. Due to his leadership, this great community bank bill is being considered as a suspension on the floor today. That means that there is a great chance that this bill will build on its unanimous support earned during the House Financial Services Committee markup and will be a bipartisan provision in the Senate Banking chairman's Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, which is expected to pass out of the Senate very soon.

In addition to Congressman HULTGREN, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their hard work on this critical legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4725, the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 4725, the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act, which would reduce reporting requirements through first and third quarter call reports for depository institutions with less than \$5 billion in total consolidated assets.

This bill provides targeted regulatory relief to many of our smaller financial institutions, as has been the desire of both Democrats and Republicans on the committee and in this Congress for some time.

Under the Obama administration, the Federal banking agencies began taking a series of steps to reduce and streamline various bank reporting requirements. Many of these requirements had existed for decades, including the quarterly Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income for a Bank, which is commonly referred to as a call report.

These efforts by regulators have included creating a simpler call report for most community banks with less than \$1 billion. Regulators have al-

ready been exploring raising the threshold to a comparable level that is proposed by this legislation. The regulators also allow for some data to be reported semiannually, as this bill would allow, or annually rather than quarterly.

I am pleased that H.R. 4725 would give the regulators discretion to decide what information should be included in a reduced call report. It is also key that the bill would require a full call report every other quarter for banks under \$5 billion, including at the end of the year, to make sure that regulators and the public have sufficient information on the health of financial institutions.

Furthermore, this bill would permit regulators to limit the regulatory relief, as appropriate. This would, for example, exclude banks with foreign offices or ones that are affiliated with much larger banks, as they do today.

This bill would appropriately maintain robust oversight of our Nation's largest banks while providing targeted relief for smaller institutions.

As I said, we don't agree on everything. Many of us on this side believe that the robust protections built into Dodd-Frank have strengthened the financial system but that there are ways that we can improve and refine those restrictions in order to support particularly smaller institutions. This is a step in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4725.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the sponsor of the legislation and the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Community Bank Reporting Relief Act.

I would like to begin by thanking Leader MCCARTHY and Chairman HENSARLING for their support in getting this legislation to the floor. I also want to thank and express my appreciation to my colleagues, ANDY BARR and TERRI SEWELL, for serving as original cosponsors on this legislation.

I would also like to point out that this identical language has been included in the bipartisan regulatory relief bill that the Senate is expected to take up maybe sometime this week.

By way of background, the Federal Financial Institutions Examinations Council requires banks and savings associations to file a quarterly Consolidated Report of Condition and Income, also known as the call report. Banking regulators use data in the call report to monitor the safety, soundness, performance, and risk profile of each institution and to assess the overall condition of the banking system.

I think we can all agree that our Federal banking regulators should have

regular updates on the overall performance and health of financial institutions. For example, this is important if Federal banking regulators are going to be prudent stewards of Federal deposit insurance. However, this does not mean that the Federal banking regulators need regular reports about every single data point on every single financial institution.

Unfortunately, the reporting burden has grown significantly over the years, which means banks have to spend more time with compliance issues rather than working with families and businesses to meet their financial needs.

When I introduced similar legislation last Congress, one community banker in Illinois, Greg Ohlendorf, with First Community Bank and Trust, shared with me: "The quarterly call report has increased to some 80 pages supported by almost 700 pages of instructions, and it represents a growing burden on community banks."

According to a survey that the Independent Community Bankers of America conducted of its members in 2014, over 60 percent of the annual cost to prepare the call report goes to personnel salaries. This survey shows that this is not a highly automated process for those institutions and that oftentimes senior executives such as the chief financial officer are responsible for this regulatory burden.

We also heard testimony in the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee hearing from Robert Fisher, president and CEO of Tioga State Bank, on behalf of the ICBA, who stated: "When I first started in banking in the mid-1980s, the report was 18 pages long. No change in our basic business model since that time warrants the sharp growth in our quarterly reporting obligation."

The length of the call report has simply gotten out of hand. Washington needs to get out of the way so that community banks can focus on meeting the needs of their communities. The role of smaller financial institutions is especially important in more rural areas, such as in my district, where larger banks tend to not have as many branches.

The Community Bank Reporting Relief Act would require Federal banking regulators to permit for a short-form call report every other quarter for banks with less than \$5 billion in assets and that satisfy other criteria determined by bank regulators.

Federal banking regulators have not demonstrated there are statistically significant variations in this data quarter to quarter, and we heard testimony consistent with this from Tioga State Bank in the House Financial Services Committee. This means the banking regulators are simply collecting too much information too frequently. The Federal banking regulators would be required to take input

from our neighborhood banks under consideration when making these changes. This cannot be simply check-the-box exercises, but real reform is necessary.

However, nothing in this legislation would prevent regulators from having access to the information that they need to adequately understand the health of the banking system. Regulators will still receive the most important information every quarter.

The Independent Community Bankers of America has suggested this short form call report include three schedules: schedules RI, an income statement; schedule RIA, changes in bank equity capital; and Schedule RC, the balance sheet.

Furthermore, in the event there is any reason for concern about the health of the bank, regulators would maintain their authority to make ad hoc information requests.

This legislation is supported by the American Bankers Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, and the neighborhood banks in all of our districts who are looking for commonsense regulatory relief.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation. We must cut regulation for community banks.

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

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

Let me once again thank the gentleman from Illinois for his tireless advocacy on behalf of our community financial institutions and providing some commonsense, basic relief to those institutions so that, instead of dealing with paperwork, they could actually better serve their customers and grow our local economies.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I will just close by reiterating what I said earlier. From time to time, it is clear that we can come together on solutions to problems that we come across in any regulation, in any aspect of the Federal Government. Even in areas where we might find broad disagreement on the importance of many of the protections that were put in place after the financial crisis, across the aisle, we can often find common ground around particular solutions; and, when we do that, we should act.

I think that is why so many of us were pleased to see this legislation

come forward to give us a chance to demonstrate that this is a step in the right direction, particularly supporting some of our smaller institutions. I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4725.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING THE FINANCING OF TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS ACT

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4768) to require the President to develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4768

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury, shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the Director of the United States Secret Service, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the Federal functional regulators, develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals.

(b) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees and make available to the relevant government agencies as defined in subsection (a), a comprehensive national strategy in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) UPDATES.—After the initial submission of the national strategy under paragraph (1), the President shall, not less often than every 2 years, update the national strategy and submit the updated strategy to the appropriate Congressional committees.

(c) SEPARATE PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL.—Any part of the national strategy that involves information that is properly classified under criteria established by

the President shall be submitted to Congress separately in a classified annex and, if requested by the chairman or ranking member of one of the appropriate Congressional committees, as a briefing at an appropriate level of security.

SEC. 3. CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.

The national strategy described in section 2 shall contain the following:

(1) **THREATS.**—An identification and assessment of the most significant current transnational organized crime threats posed to the national security of the United States or to the U.S. and international financial system, including drug and human trafficking organizations, cyber criminals, kleptocrats, and other relevant state and non-state entities, including those threats identified in the President's "Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime" (published July 2011).

(2) **ILLICIT FINANCE.**—(A) An identification of individuals, entities, and networks (including terrorist organizations, if any) that provide financial support or financial facilitation to transnational organized crime groups, and an assessment of the scope and role of those providing financial support to transnational organized crime groups.

(B) An assessment of methods by which transnational organized crime groups launder illicit proceeds, including money laundering using real estate and other tangible goods such as art and antiquities, trade-based money laundering, bulk cash smuggling, exploitation of shell companies, and misuse of digital currencies and other cyber technologies, as well as an assessment of the risk to the financial system of the United States of such methods.

(3) **GOALS, OBJECTIVES, PRIORITIES, AND ACTIONS.**—(A) A comprehensive, research-based, discussion of short-term and long-term goals, objectives, priorities, and actions, listed for each department and agency described under section 2(a), for combating the financing of transnational organized crime groups and their facilitators.

(B) A description of how the strategy is integrated into, and supports, the national security strategy, drug control strategy, and counterterrorism strategy of the United States.

(4) **REVIEWS AND PROPOSED CHANGES.**—A review of current efforts to combat the financing or financial facilitation of transnational organized crime, including efforts to detect, deter, disrupt, and prosecute transnational organized crime groups and their supporters, and, if appropriate, proposed changes to any law or regulation determined to be appropriate to ensure that the United States pursues coordinated and effective efforts within the jurisdiction of the United States, including efforts or actions that are being taken or can be taken by financial institutions, efforts in cooperation with international partners of the United States, and efforts that build partnerships and global capacity to combat transnational organized crime.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on For-

eign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) **FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL REGULATOR.**—The term "Federal functional regulator" has the meaning given that term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(3) **TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.**—The term "transnational organized crime" refers to those self-perpetuating associations of individuals who operate transnationally for the purpose of obtaining power, influence, monetary or commercial gains, wholly or in part by illegal means, while—

(A) protecting their activities through a pattern of corruption or violence; or

(B) while protecting their illegal activities through a transnational organizational structure and the exploitation of transnational commerce or communication mechanisms.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4768, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

I want to, at the outset, applaud and thank my colleague Mr. KUSTOFF from Tennessee for his leadership on this important legislation and for bringing this solution to the Congress and this solution to the American people.

As Members of Congress, our number one responsibility is the national security and the well-being of the American people. Unfortunately, transnational criminal organizations threaten the safety of Americans, and we must do everything in our power to stop them. Transnational criminal organizations, or TCOs as they are called for short, are engaged in illegal business ventures around the world such as money laundering, cybercrime, and the trafficking of drugs, weapons, endangered species, and even human beings.

While TCOs may not be motivated by a particular radical, political, or religious ideology, they are motivated by money, and they will stop at nothing to get it. According to a 2011 report published by the Obama administration, entitled, "Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime," TCOs have dramatically ramped up their size, scope, and influence, and are even

teaming up with terrorist organizations and corrupt foreign officials to expand their networks and conceal their illicit financial assets.

These TCOs cost the Western Hemisphere about 3.5 percent of gross domestic product annually, and they generate for themselves around \$870 billion, which is roughly the value of the world's largest company, Apple.

President Trump, on February 9, 2017, issued Executive Order 13773 on "Enforcing Federal Law with Respect to Transnational Criminal Organizations and Preventing International Trafficking."

□ 1415

It states that TCOs in the form of transnational drug cartels have a stronghold in America and threaten the safety of the American people. From former President Obama to current President Trump, TCOs are recognized as a major risk to national security. That is why I am very pleased to see that my good friend from Tennessee, Congressman DAVID KUSTOFF, has introduced H.R. 4768, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

This legislation requires the President, the Treasury Secretary, financial regulators, and other appropriate officials to create a national strategy to combat TCOs and their illicit use of financial networks. Specifically, the legislation requires them to identify and assess the largest TCO threats to the United States. It also mandates that the strategy include the identification of the people or groups that facilitate access to financial networks for the TCOs through laundering assets, such as, real estate, art and antiquities, smuggling bulk cash, exploitation of shell companies, and the use of covert cryptocurrencies and other cyber technologies.

The legislation also requires the strategy to include long-term and short-term goals, an explanation of how goals will be integrated into existing national security apparatuses, and, if needed, suggest legislative and regulatory changes to better fight against TCOs.

This legislation passed the House Committee on Financial Services with unanimous support in January, and it is my hope that it passes with unanimous support today on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to Congressman KUSTOFF, I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their hard work on this issue. Together we can, in a bipartisan way, empower our government to better fight transnational criminal organizations, making the American people safer and our economy stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4768, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of

Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if ever there is a time for Democrats and Republicans to come together in a bipartisan fashion, it would be around this issue, around an issue to combat the financing of transnational criminal organizations. That is what H.R. 4768 would do. Specifically, it would require the Secretary of the Treasury to lead the effort, in consultation with other key agencies and departments, and update the strategy to fight these organizations at least every 2 years.

Additionally, the legislation requires the administration to assess the key threats, financial support networks, and methods used by criminal groups to launder the proceeds of illicit activities. In passing this legislation, we will not only build upon but also cement the importance of the interagency approach taken by the prior administration in combating the impact of global criminal enterprises.

Indeed, in 2010, the Obama administration conducted a comprehensive assessment of organized crime, the first such review that had taken place since the mid-1990s. The assessment came to the alarming conclusion that the threat of global criminal networks had become more complex, volatile, and destabilizing and that such groups were proliferating, striking new and powerful alliances, and engaging in a growing range of illicit activities such as we have never seen before.

To combat this growing threat and lessen its impact both domestically and on our foreign partners, the Obama administration, in 2011, issued a comprehensive interagency strategy that identified 56 priority actions across five strategic objectives. One of these key objectives included breaking the economic power of transnational criminal networks and protecting strategic markets and the U.S. financial system from penetration and abuse by transnational organized crime. This strategic objective, in particular, resonates with me, as I have always believed strongly that following the money and using our economic leverage is the best way to counter illicit activity. This is especially true in countering transnational criminal organizations, whose primary objective is economic gain.

In a number of ways, this legislation before us will ensure that the Treasury, as well as the intelligence and broader U.S. national security apparatus, remains focused on some of the emerging threats posed by transnational organized crime groups; including, kleptocrats, human traffickers, drug traffickers, and cybercriminals.

Additionally, the legislation explicitly requires the administration to examine how such groups exploit the use of shell companies, misuse digital currencies and other cyber technologies.

I am also pleased that, with the concurrence of the chairman and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), the committee agreed to adopt an amendment offered by Ranking Member WATERS that sharpens the bill's focus on the methods by which transnational organized crime groups launder illicit funds using real estate and other tangible goods, such as art and antiquities. These significant vulnerabilities have been identified as major threats to our national security and the integrity of our financial system by a broad range of bipartisan experts, including the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network and the Financial Action Task Force.

For example, just last year, FinCEN noted in a public advisory that: "Real estate transactions and the real estate market have certain characteristics that make them vulnerable to abuse by illicit actors. . . . For these reasons and others, drug traffickers, corrupt officials, and other criminals can and have used real estate to conceal the existence and origins of their illicit funds."

The entities and individuals that have sought to exploit real estate to conceal illicit funds includes Iranian banks subject to U.S. sanctions, Russian oligarchs and Russian-organized crime rings, as well as Venezuelan officials found to be engaged in narcotics trafficking.

The fact that these vulnerabilities are not merely theoretical and have been used by a wide range of criminal groups should disturb all of us. We also know that money laundering through the global art and antiquities market is another key method for washing illicit funds, and that is undoubtedly being exploited by well-organized transnational criminal groups. Indeed, we know that the looting and trafficking in cultural heritage is a source of revenue that has funded ISIS' heinous activities, and we know that the opaque characteristics of the high-end art market and its lack of basic anti-money-laundering requirements make it a target for illicit funds.

So I am pleased that the members of this committee were able to agree that real estate and art market vulnerabilities should be given due consideration when it comes to transnational organized crime. Again, this is one of those subjects around which bipartisanship should be assumed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join in this bipartisan effort and to support this legislation.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ten-

nessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), a member of the House Financial Services Committee and a former United States Attorney from the Western District of Tennessee, who has brought considerable prosecutorial experience in drafting and authoring this legislation.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

On February 9 of 2017, last year, President Trump issued an executive order directing the Federal Government to combat international drug trafficking. Now, before I go any further, I want to take note that this executive order was issued in the third week of the Trump administration. This early action gives us an idea of how seriously we must take this issue. The executive order recognizes that illegal drugs are pouring into our country and they are threatening American safety, primarily at the hands of cartels and other transnational criminal organizations.

These criminal organizations are responsible, in large part, for the rising opioid epidemic sweeping across our Nation. Take my district of west Tennessee, where we continue to see a rise in the deaths caused by opioid overdoses. From heroin to fentanyl, and the more potent synthetic opioid known as carfentanil, we must continue to use every available resource to prevent the further destruction of our communities. We have got to say enough is enough.

The important legislation that we are discussing today will create a plan to track illicit money channels and cut them off at the source. Specifically, it directs the United States Treasury Department to develop a national strategy aimed at disrupting these financial crimes. The Treasury Department will work hand in hand with the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the State Department, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to produce a yearly report outlining a strategy and detailing ways that the United States Government can continue to prevent these financial crimes.

For far too long, these criminal organizations have used illicit business ventures to further finance their activities, which range from money laundering and cybercrime to the trafficking of drugs, human trafficking, weapons trafficking, and trafficking in endangered species.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime estimates that these cartel and transnational criminal organizations generate nearly \$870 billion a year. This money is used to directly

threaten the security and the prosperity of the United States of America and other countries in the Western Hemisphere. Our legislation is a critical step in disrupting this illicit finance and putting an end to the need-less crimes committed by cartels.

As we have seen, these organizations have evolved in a continued effort to evade law enforcement. Therefore, in an effort to stay one step ahead of these bad actors, we have also got to evolve. These transnational organizations have developed interstate networks to and from the border in which drugs come up from Central America and the cash returns back to the country of origin. We simply cannot stand idly by as these activities continue. We must keep money out of the hands of those who intend to cause harm to our Nation.

I think this legislation does exactly that. I greatly appreciate the hard work done by my colleagues from the Financial Services Committee on this very important legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), a cosponsor of this legislation and a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4768, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Drug Enforcement Administration's Phoenix division, the Sinaloa cartel is the biggest, most violent, and nastiest organization threatening Arizonans, even bigger than MS-13. It is a dangerous and highly sophisticated organization. Sinaloa smuggles heroin and methamphetamine across the border into Arizona and, with it, a pattern of crime, intimidation, and addiction that rips at the very fabric of our communities.

Arizonans know we need to be tough, smart, and aggressive to confront Sinaloa and other cartels. Our bill cracks down on the drug cartels and other international crime syndicates that threaten Arizona families and our quality of life by hitting them where it hurts: their bank accounts.

Drug cartels like Sinaloa obtain wealth and power through money laundering; cybercrime; and human, drugs, and weapons smuggling. To stop the drug cartels and protect Arizona families, we need a comprehensive approach to cut off the money that fuels their operations.

□ 1430

That is why Congressman KUSTOFF from Tennessee and I introduced H.R. 4768. This bill requires the administration to develop and execute a strategy that cuts off funding and other resources for transnational criminal or-

ganizations and to routinely report to Congress and the American people on the strategy's progress.

Our bill is a commonsense solution that protects Arizona families, communities, and businesses from the threats of transnational organized crime.

By focusing on the money, we take a meaningful step in combating cybercrime, money laundering, drug trafficking, and human trafficking, as well as other issues that transnational criminals bring to our communities.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for supporting this important legislation, and I will continue working with my colleagues across the aisle to keep Arizona families safe.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BARR for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act. I want to thank my colleague Representative KUSTOFF for his work on this important issue.

The Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance has been examining global criminal organizations and the threat they pose to the United States financial system.

These sophisticated and dangerous organizations, like drug cartels, increasingly pose a direct threat to the safety and security of all Americans. They have fueled the opioid crisis that continues to kill tens of thousands of Americans each year, including the spread of human trafficking, among a host of other illicit activities.

I want to remind my colleagues that entire communities are still plagued by this crisis, including hard-hit communities in western Pennsylvania.

Beyond the opioid crisis, though, I want to highlight an exceptionally dangerous situation in which the United States finds itself.

Some of the cartels are now working directly with organizations like Hezbollah, a terrorist organization, as reflected in a recent Politico article. Fortunately, the new administration is taking a tougher stance now with the announcement of a newly created Hezbollah Financing and Narcoterrorism Team.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time America fought back against this growing international threat, and this bill will help ensure the government has a strategy to stay in this fight. Lives depend on it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Mr. KUSTOFF's bill, the National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for his leadership on this important issue, even if it does have a really, really long name.

I have seen firsthand how these transnational drug cartels can disrupt civil society. In my own district, the opioid epidemic has destroyed innocent people's lives, including kids, while transnational criminal organizations, or TCOs, profit on people's misery and their death.

TCOs have brought heroin to our streets and, along with it, increased crime, placing additional burdens on law enforcement in local communities.

We are in crisis mode, and targeted steps need to be taken to address this epidemic at all phases. We have to crack down on the pusher on the street. We have to crack down on the drug cartels. We have to crack down on the drug companies that have made a profit from overprescription and filling suspect orders.

Most of all, we have to crack down on the intricate faceless and unbelievably complex international criminal organizations that allow the profits from these activities into our economy.

We must eradicate the international illicit financing networks that are the linchpin of any criminal organization's operations. But we don't have a unified national plan.

Luckily, this committee has an opportunity to make a difference by coming up with a national strategy and plan to attack transnational criminal organizations' finances.

Mr. KUSTOFF's bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to provide that plan, a vital first step towards addressing the threat posed by the growing sophistication of illicit financing networks.

Passing this bill is a significant step toward an effective, sustained national strategy to attack the funding that makes these TCOs possible.

Therefore, it is critical that we continue to maximize cooperation among Federal departments to keep our policies ahead of these transnational criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of Mr. KUSTOFF's timely and important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I also thank the gentleman from Tennessee

for introducing this responsible legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to circumstances where this administration will have additional tools to deal with transnational criminal organizations, and I hope that we will use those tools to counter the threat posed by Hezbollah.

Hezbollah is not a political party. It is not a quaint reflection of history. It is a web of terrorists and criminals, and that web extends here to our hemisphere.

In fact, in 2009, there was an arrest made in Philadelphia, where Hezbollah operatives were looking to move 1,200 machine guns into Syria.

More recent arrests have been made in Latin America, where countries like Argentina, Peru, and Paraguay are dealing with an enhanced Hezbollah presence.

This important legislation will help us build a plan to leverage our allies, to leverage the Organization of American States and other assets so that we recognize the threat that Hezbollah and other terrorist organizations pose and so that we meet that threat head-on.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, obviously, as I said, we need a national strategy to combat the financing of transnational criminal organizations.

This legislation requires that such a strategy be put together. It is an issue that crosses virtually every partisan or ideological line. It is an example of legislation that we all can embrace and should support.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to do so, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I, once again, thank my colleagues for supporting this legislation. In particular, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) for his leadership on this issue.

I would note, also, in addition to all of the many sound and persuasive arguments that have been offered for why we need this legislation, this National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act, the National Fraternal Order of Police has endorsed this legislation, and I include in the RECORD their letter.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, February 15, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES
MCCARTHY, PELOSI, AND HOYER: I am writing

on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 4768, the "National Strategy for Combatting the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act."

The Office of National Drug Control Policy was established to set out our strategy in combatting our nation's drug problem. Similarly, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services has served as the cornerstone for our nation's crime-fighting efforts for more than two decades. With the growing threat posed by transnational criminal organizations, it is important that we adopt a comprehensive national approach.

President Donald J. Trump took the first step by issuing Executive Order #13773, the Enforcing Federal Law with Respect to Transnational Criminal Organizations and Preventing International Trafficking a year ago. The Threat Mitigation Working Group was set up to bring Federal agencies together a common goal of investigating, prosecuting and dismantling transnational gangs.

This bill would codify part of this Executive Order by developing a national strategy for combatting transnational criminal organizations. We need to attack their ability to profit from unlawful activity—whether it is money laundering, bulk cash smuggling, shell companies or digital currencies. Simply put, until we can stop the flow of criminal profits to these organized, unlawful enterprises, they will continue to survive no matter how many individuals we arrest and prosecute.

On behalf of the more than 335,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we believe this bill will make our country safe from these transnational criminal organizations. If I can provide any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor, Jim Pasco, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress representing a State that has been ravaged by heroin and opioid addiction, I can't think of a more important thing for this Congress to do than to develop a national strategy for combating these transnational gangs that are preying on our communities.

Once again, I commend Mr. KUSTOFF for his leadership in this area and in this effort and in this fight. I applaud my colleagues for supporting the legislation on both sides of the aisle.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4768, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPACK AIRWAVES YIELDING BETTER ACCESS FOR USERS OF MODERN SERVICES ACT OF 2018

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 4986) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reauthorize appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, to provide for certain procedural changes to the rules of the Commission to maximize opportunities for public participation and efficient decisionmaking, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4986

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018" or the "RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Commission defined.

TITLE I—FCC REAUTHORIZATION

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Application and regulatory fees.

Sec. 103. Effective date.

TITLE II—APPLICATION OF ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT

Sec. 201. Application of Antideficiency Act to Universal Service Program.

TITLE III—SECURING ACCESS TO NETWORKS IN DISASTERS

Sec. 301. Study on network resiliency.

Sec. 302. Access to essential service providers during federally declared emergencies.

Sec. 303. Definitions.

TITLE IV—FCC CONSOLIDATED REPORTING

Sec. 401. Communications marketplace report.

Sec. 402. Consolidation of redundant reports; conforming amendments.

Sec. 403. Effect on authority.

Sec. 404. Other reports.

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Independent Inspector General for FCC.

Sec. 502. Authority of Chief Information Officer.

Sec. 503. Spoofing prevention.

Sec. 504. Report on promoting broadband Internet access service for veterans.

Sec. 505. Methodology for collection of mobile service coverage data.

Sec. 506. Accuracy of dispatchable location for 9-1-1 calls.

Sec. 507. NTIA study on interagency process following cybersecurity incidents.

Sec. 508. Tribal digital access.

Sec. 509. Terms of office and vacancies.

Sec. 510. Submission of copy of certain documents to Congress.

Sec. 511. Joint board recommendation.

Sec. 512. Disclaimer for press releases regarding notices of apparent liability.

Sec. 513. Reports related to spectrum auctions.

TITLE VI—VIEWER PROTECTION

Sec. 601. Reserve source for payment of TV broadcaster relocation costs.

Sec. 602. Payment of relocation costs of television translator stations and low power television stations.

Sec. 603. Payment of relocation costs of FM broadcast stations.
 Sec. 604. Consumer education payment.
 Sec. 605. Implementation and enforcement.
 Sec. 606. Rule of construction.

TITLE VII—MOBILE NOW

Sec. 701. Short title.
 Sec. 702. Definitions.
 Sec. 703. Identifying 255 megahertz.
 Sec. 704. Millimeter wave spectrum.
 Sec. 705. 3 gigahertz spectrum.
 Sec. 706. Broadband infrastructure deployment.
 Sec. 707. Reallocation incentives.
 Sec. 708. Bidirectional sharing study.
 Sec. 709. Unlicensed services in guard bands.
 Sec. 710. Amendments to the Spectrum Pipeline Act of 2015.
 Sec. 711. GAO assessment of unlicensed spectrum and Wi-Fi use in low-income neighborhoods.
 Sec. 712. Rulemaking related to partitioning or disaggregating licenses.
 Sec. 713. Unlicensed spectrum policy.
 Sec. 714. National plan for unlicensed spectrum.
 Sec. 715. Spectrum challenge prize.
 Sec. 716. Wireless telecommunications tax and fee collection fairness.
 Sec. 717. Rules of construction.
 Sec. 718. Relationship to Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012.
 Sec. 719. No additional funds authorized.

SEC. 2. COMMISSION DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

TITLE I—FCC REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 156) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission \$333,118,000 for fiscal year 2019 and \$339,610,000 for fiscal year 2020.

“(b) OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.—The sum appropriated in any fiscal year to carry out the activities described in subsection (a), to the extent and in the amounts provided for in Appropriations Acts, shall be derived from fees authorized by section 9.”

(b) DEPOSITS OF BIDDERS TO BE DEPOSITED IN TREASURY.—Section 309(j)(8)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(C)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “an interest bearing account” and all that follows and inserting “the Treasury.”;

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “paid to the Treasury” and inserting “deposited in the general fund of the Treasury (where such deposits shall be used for the sole purpose of deficit reduction)”;

(B) by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”;

(3) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting “, and payments representing the return of such deposits shall not be subject to administrative offset under section 3716(c) of title 31, United States Code.”; and

(4) by striking clause (iii).

(c) ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 710 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-104) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 710.

(d) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—On the effective date described in section 103, any amounts in the account providing appropriations to carry out the functions of the Commission that were collected in excess of the amounts provided for in Appropriations Acts in any fiscal year prior to such date shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury of the United States for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

SEC. 102. APPLICATION AND REGULATORY FEES.

(a) APPLICATION FEES.—Section 8 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 158) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 8. APPLICATION FEES.

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY; ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHEDULE.—The Commission shall assess and collect application fees at such rates as the Commission shall establish in a schedule of application fees to recover the costs of the Commission to process applications.

“(b) ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In every even-numbered year, the Commission shall review the schedule of application fees established under this section and, except as provided in paragraph (2), set a new amount for each fee in the schedule that is equal to the amount of the fee on the date when the fee was established or the date when the fee was last amended under subsection (c), whichever is later—

“(A) increased or decreased by the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index during the period beginning on such date and ending on the date of the review; and

“(B) rounded to the nearest \$5 increment.

“(2) THRESHOLD FOR ADJUSTMENT.—The Commission may not adjust a fee under paragraph (1) if—

“(A) in the case of a fee the current amount of which is less than \$200, the adjustment would result in a change in the current amount of less than \$10; or

“(B) in the case of a fee the current amount of which is \$200 or more, the adjustment would result in a change in the current amount of less than 5 percent.

“(3) CURRENT AMOUNT DEFINED.—In paragraph (2), the term ‘current amount’ means, with respect to a fee, the amount of the fee on the date when the fee was established, the date when the fee was last adjusted under paragraph (1), or the date when the fee was last amended under subsection (c), whichever is latest.

“(c) AMENDMENTS TO SCHEDULE.—In addition to the adjustments required by subsection (b), the Commission shall by rule amend the schedule of application fees established under this section if the Commission determines that the schedule requires amendment—

“(1) so that such fees reflect increases or decreases in the costs of processing applications at the Commission; or

“(2) so that such schedule reflects the consolidation or addition of new categories of applications.

“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) PARTIES TO WHICH FEES ARE NOT APPLICABLE.—The application fees established under this section shall not be applicable to—

“(A) a governmental entity;

“(B) a nonprofit entity licensed in the Local Government, Police, Fire, Highway Maintenance, Forestry-Conservation, Public Safety, or Special Emergency Radio radio services; or

“(C) a noncommercial radio station or noncommercial television station.

“(2) COST OF COLLECTION.—If, in the judgment of the Commission, the cost of collecting an application fee established under

this section would exceed the amount collected, the Commission may by rule eliminate such fee.

“(e) DEPOSIT OF COLLECTIONS.—Moneys received from application fees established under this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.”

(b) REGULATORY FEES.—Section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 159) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9. REGULATORY FEES.

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Commission shall assess and collect regulatory fees to recover the costs of carrying out the activities described in section 6(a) only to the extent, and in the total amounts, provided for in Appropriations Acts.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHEDULE.—The Commission shall assess and collect regulatory fees at such rates as the Commission shall establish in a schedule of regulatory fees that will result in the collection, in each fiscal year, of an amount that can reasonably be expected to equal the amounts described in subsection (a) with respect to such fiscal year.

“(c) ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, the Commission shall by rule adjust the schedule of regulatory fees established under this section to—

“(A) reflect unexpected increases or decreases in the number of units subject to the payment of such fees; and

“(B) result in the collection of the amount required by subsection (b).

“(2) ROUNDING.—In making adjustments under this subsection, the Commission may round fees to the nearest \$5 increment.

“(d) AMENDMENTS TO SCHEDULE.—In addition to the adjustments required by subsection (c), the Commission shall by rule amend the schedule of regulatory fees established under this section if the Commission determines that the schedule requires amendment so that such fees reflect the full-time equivalent number of employees within the bureaus and offices of the Commission, adjusted to take into account factors that are reasonably related to the benefits provided to the payor of the fee by the Commission’s activities. In making an amendment under this subsection, the Commission may not change the total amount of regulatory fees required by subsection (b) to be collected in a fiscal year.

“(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) PARTIES TO WHICH FEES ARE NOT APPLICABLE.—The regulatory fees established under this section shall not be applicable to—

“(A) a governmental entity or nonprofit entity;

“(B) an amateur radio operator licensee under part 97 of the Commission’s rules (47 C.F.R. part 97); or

“(C) a noncommercial radio station or noncommercial television station.

“(2) COST OF COLLECTION.—If, in the judgment of the Commission, the cost of collecting a regulatory fee established under this section from a party would exceed the amount collected from such party, the Commission may exempt such party from paying such fee.

“(f) DEPOSIT OF COLLECTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts received from fees authorized by this section shall be deposited as an offsetting collection in, and credited to, the account through which funds are made available to carry out the activities described in section 6(a).

“(2) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—Any regulatory fees collected in excess of the

total amount of fees provided for in Appropriations Acts for a fiscal year shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.”.

(c) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION AND REGULATORY FEES.—Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 9 the following:

“SEC. 9A. PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION AND REGULATORY FEES.

“(a) JUDICIAL REVIEW PROHIBITED.—Any adjustment or amendment to a schedule of fees under subsection (b) or (c) of section 8 or subsection (c) or (d) of section 9 is not subject to judicial review.

“(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Commission shall transmit to Congress notification—

“(1) of any adjustment under section 8(b) or 9(c) immediately upon the adoption of such adjustment; and

“(2) of any amendment under section 8(c) or 9(d) not later than 90 days before the effective date of such amendment.

“(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) PENALTIES FOR LATE PAYMENT.—The Commission shall by rule prescribe an additional penalty for late payment of fees under section 8 or 9. Such additional penalty shall be 25 percent of the amount of the fee that was not paid in a timely manner.

“(2) INTEREST ON UNPAID FEES AND PENALTIES.—The Commission shall charge interest, at a rate determined under section 3717 of title 31, United States Code, on a fee under section 8 or 9 or an additional penalty under this subsection that is not paid in a timely manner. Such section 3717 shall not otherwise apply with respect to such a fee or penalty.

“(3) DISMISSAL OF APPLICATIONS OR FILINGS.—The Commission may dismiss any application or other filing for failure to pay in a timely manner any fee under section 8 or 9 or any interest or additional penalty under this subsection.

“(4) REVOCATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to or in lieu of the penalties and dismissals authorized by this subsection, the Commission may revoke any instrument of authorization held by any licensee that has not paid in a timely manner a regulatory fee assessed under section 9 or any related interest or penalty.

“(B) NOTICE.—Revocation action may be taken by the Commission under this paragraph after notice of the Commission’s intent to take such action is sent to the licensee by registered mail, return receipt requested, at the licensee’s last known address. The notice shall provide the licensee at least 30 days to either pay the fee, interest, and any penalty or show cause why the fee, interest, or penalty does not apply to the licensee or should otherwise be waived or payment deferred.

“(C) HEARING.—

“(i) GENERALLY NOT REQUIRED.—A hearing is not required under this paragraph unless the licensee’s response presents a substantial and material question of fact.

“(ii) EVIDENCE AND BURDENS.—In any case where a hearing is conducted under this paragraph, the hearing shall be based on written evidence only, and the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be on the licensee.

“(iii) COSTS.—Unless the licensee substantially prevails in the hearing, the Commission may assess the licensee for the costs of such hearing.

“(D) OPPORTUNITY TO PAY PRIOR TO REVOCATION.—Any Commission order adopted under this paragraph shall determine the amount due, if any, and provide the licensee with at least 30 days to pay that amount or have its authorization revoked.

“(E) FINALITY.—No order of revocation under this paragraph shall become final until the licensee has exhausted its right to judicial review of such order under section 402(b)(5).

“(d) WAIVER, REDUCTION, AND DEFERMENT.—The Commission may waive, reduce, or defer payment of a fee under section 8 or 9 or an interest charge or penalty under this section in any specific instance for good cause shown, where such action would promote the public interest.

“(e) PAYMENT RULES.—The Commission shall by rule permit payment—

“(1) in the case of fees under section 8 or 9 in large amounts, by installments; and

“(2) in the case of fees under section 8 or 9 in small amounts, in advance for a number of years not to exceed the term of the license held by the payor.

“(f) ACCOUNTING SYSTEM.—The Commission shall develop accounting systems necessary to make the amendments authorized by sections 8(c) and 9(d).”.

(d) TRANSITIONAL RULES.—

(1) APPLICATION FEES.—An application fee established under section 8 of the Communications Act of 1934, as such section is in effect on the day before the effective date described in section 103 of this Act, shall remain in effect under section 8 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, until such time as the Commission adjusts or amends such fee under subsection (b) or (c) of such section 8, as so amended.

(2) REGULATORY FEES.—A regulatory fee established under section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934, as such section is in effect on the day before the effective date described in section 103 of this Act, shall remain in effect under section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (b) of this section, until such time as the Commission adjusts or amends such fee under subsection (c) or (d) of such section 9, as so amended.

(e) RULEMAKING TO AMEND SCHEDULE OF REGULATORY FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date described in section 103, the Commission shall complete a rulemaking proceeding under subsection (d) of section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (b) of this section.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—If the Commission has not completed the rulemaking proceeding required by paragraph (1) by the date that is 6 months after the effective date described in section 103, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the progress of such rulemaking proceeding.

SEC. 103. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2018.

TITLE II—APPLICATION OF ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT

SEC. 201. APPLICATION OF ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT TO UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM.

Section 302 of Public Law 108–494 (118 Stat. 3998) is amended by striking “December 31, 2018” each place it appears and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

TITLE III—SECURING ACCESS TO NETWORKS IN DISASTERS

SEC. 301. STUDY ON NETWORK RESILIENCY.

Not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall

submit to Congress, and make publically available on the Commission’s website, a study on the public safety benefits and technical feasibility and cost of—

(1) making telecommunications service provider-owned WiFi access points, and other communications technologies operating on unlicensed spectrum, available to the general public for access to 9-1-1 services, without requiring any login credentials, during times of emergency when mobile service is unavailable;

(2) the provision by non-telecommunications service provider-owned WiFi access points of public access to 9-1-1 services during times of emergency when mobile service is unavailable; and

(3) other alternative means of providing the public with access to 9-1-1 services during times of emergency when mobile service is unavailable.

SEC. 302. ACCESS TO ESSENTIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS DURING FEDERALLY DECLARED EMERGENCIES.

Section 427(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5189e(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “telecommunications service” and inserting “wireline or mobile telephone service, Internet access service, radio or television broadcasting, cable service, or direct broadcast satellite service”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as clauses (i) through (v), respectively; and

(2) by striking “(1) provides” and inserting “(1)(A) provides”.

SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title—

(1) the term “mobile service” means commercial mobile service (as defined in section 332 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332)) or commercial mobile data service (as defined in section 6001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401));

(2) the term “WiFi access point” means wireless Internet access using the standard designated as 802.11 or any variant thereof; and

(3) the term “times of emergency” means either an emergency as defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122), or an emergency as declared by the governor of a State or territory of the United States.

TITLE IV—FCC CONSOLIDATED REPORTING

SEC. 401. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 13. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the last quarter of every even-numbered year, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the state of the communications marketplace.

“(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall—

“(1) assess the state of competition in the communications marketplace, including competition to deliver voice, video, audio, and data services among providers of telecommunications, providers of commercial

mobile service (as defined in section 332), multichannel video programming distributors (as defined in section 602), broadcast stations, providers of satellite communications, Internet service providers, and other providers of communications services;

“(2) assess the state of deployment of communications capabilities, including advanced telecommunications capability (as defined in section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302)), regardless of the technology used for such deployment;

“(3) assess whether laws, regulations, regulatory practices (whether those of the Federal Government, States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes or tribal organizations (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)), or foreign governments), or demonstrated marketplace practices pose a barrier to competitive entry into the communications marketplace or to the competitive expansion of existing providers of communications services;

“(4) describe the agenda of the Commission for the next 2-year period for addressing the challenges and opportunities in the communications marketplace that were identified through the assessments under paragraphs (1) through (3); and

“(5) describe the actions that the Commission has taken in pursuit of the agenda described pursuant to paragraph (4) in the previous report submitted under this section.

“(c) EXTENSION.—If the President designates a Commissioner as Chairman of the Commission during the last quarter of an even-numbered year, the portion of the report required by subsection (b)(4) may be published on the website of the Commission and submitted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate as an addendum during the first quarter of the following odd-numbered year.

“(d) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) ASSESSING COMPETITION.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall consider all forms of competition, including the effect of intermodal competition, facilities-based competition, and competition from new and emergent communications services, including the provision of content and communications using the Internet.

“(2) ASSESSING DEPLOYMENT.—In assessing the state of deployment under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall compile a list of geographical areas that are not served by any provider of advanced telecommunications capability.

“(3) CONSIDERING SMALL BUSINESSES.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1) and regulatory barriers under subsection (b)(3), the Commission shall consider market entry barriers for entrepreneurs and other small businesses in the communications marketplace in accordance with the national policy under section 257(b).”

SEC. 402. CONSOLIDATION OF REDUNDANT REPORTS; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ORBIT ACT REPORT.—Section 646 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 765e; 114 Stat. 57) is repealed.

(b) SATELLITE COMPETITION REPORT.—Section 4 of Public Law 109-34 (47 U.S.C. 703) is repealed.

(c) INTERNATIONAL BROADBAND DATA REPORT.—Section 103(b)(1) of the Broadband Data Improvement Act (47 U.S.C. 1303(b)(1)) is amended by striking “the assessment and

report” and all that follows through “Federal Communications Commission” and inserting “its report under section 13 of the Communications Act of 1934, the Federal Communications Commission”.

(d) STATUS OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKET FOR THE DELIVERY OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING REPORT.—Section 628 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 548) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);

(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (g); and

(3) by transferring subsection (g) (as redesignated) so that it appears after subsection (f).

(e) REPORT ON CABLE INDUSTRY PRICES.—Section 623(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “annually publish” and inserting “publish with its report under section 13”; and

(2) in the heading of paragraph (2), by striking “ANNUAL”.

(f) TRIENNIAL REPORT IDENTIFYING AND ELIMINATING MARKET ENTRY BARRIERS FOR ENTREPRENEURS AND OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES.—Section 257 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 257) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(g) STATE OF COMPETITIVE MARKET CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICES.—Section 332(c)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(c)(1)(C)) is amended by striking the first and second sentences.

(h) PREVIOUSLY ELIMINATED ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (k); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (l) through (o) as subsections (k) through (n), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(i) ADDITIONAL OUTDATED REPORTS.—The Communications Act of 1934 is further amended—

(1) in section 4—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii), by striking “and shall furnish notice of such action” and all that follows through “subject of the waiver”; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking paragraph (2);

(2) in section 215—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(3) in section 227(e), by striking paragraph (4);

(4) in section 309(j)—

(A) by striking paragraph (12); and

(B) in paragraph (15)(C), by striking clause (iv);

(5) in section 331(b), by striking the last sentence;

(6) in section 336(e), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) REPORT.—The Commission shall annually advise the Congress on the amounts collected pursuant to the program required by this subsection.”;

(7) in section 339(c), by striking paragraph (1);

(8) in section 396—

(A) by striking subsection (i);

(B) in subsection (k)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (F); and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B)(iii), by striking subclause (V);

(C) in subsection (1)(1)(B), by striking “shall be included” and all that follows through “The audit report”; and

(D) by striking subsection (m);

(9) in section 398(b)(4), by striking the third sentence;

(10) in section 624A(b)(1)—

(A) by striking “REPORT; REGULATIONS” and inserting “REGULATIONS”;

(B) by striking “Within 1 year after” and all that follows through “on means of assuring” and inserting “The Commission shall issue such regulations as are necessary to assure”; and

(C) by striking “Within 180 days after” and all that follows through “to assure such compatibility.”; and

(11) in section 713, by striking subsection (a).

SEC. 403. EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to expand or contract the authority of the Commission.

SEC. 404. OTHER REPORTS.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise prevent the Commission from producing any additional reports otherwise within the authority of the Commission.

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. INDEPENDENT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR FCC.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 8G(a)(2), by striking “the Federal Communications Commission,”; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, the Federal Communications Commission,” after “the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “the Federal Communications Commission,” after “the Environmental Protection Agency,”.

(b) TRANSITION RULE.—An individual serving as Inspector General of the Commission on the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to an appointment made under section 8G of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)—

(1) may continue so serving until the President makes an appointment under section 3(a) of such Act with respect to the Commission consistent with the amendments made by subsection (a); and

(2) shall, while serving under paragraph (1), remain subject to the provisions of section 8G of such Act which, immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act, applied with respect to the Inspector General of the Commission and suffer no reduction in pay.

SEC. 502. AUTHORITY OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the Commission has a significant role in—

(1) the decision-making process for annual and multi-year planning, programming, budgeting, and execution decisions, related reporting requirements, and reports related to information technology;

(2) the management, governance, and oversight processes related to information technology; and

(3) the hiring of personnel with information technology responsibilities.

(b) CIO APPROVAL.—The Chief Information Officer of the Commission, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the Commission and budget officials, shall specify

and approve the allocation of amounts appropriated to the Commission for information technology, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts, budget guidelines, and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 503. SPOOFING PREVENTION.

(a) EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING PROHIBITION ON MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

(1) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Section 227(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(1)) is amended by striking “in connection with any telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service” and inserting “or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States, in connection with any voice service or text messaging service”.

(2) COVERAGE OF TEXT MESSAGES AND VOICE SERVICES.—Section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service” and inserting “voice service or a text message sent using a text messaging service”;

(B) in the first sentence of subparagraph (B), by striking “telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service” and inserting “voice service or a text message sent using a text messaging service”; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) TEXT MESSAGE.—The term ‘text message’—

“(i) means a message consisting of text, images, sounds, or other information that is transmitted to or from a device that is identified as the receiving or transmitting device by means of a 10-digit telephone number or N11 service code;

“(ii) includes a short message service (commonly referred to as ‘SMS’) message and a multimedia message service (commonly referred to as ‘MMS’) message; and

“(iii) does not include—

“(I) a real-time, two-way voice or video communication; or

“(II) a message sent over an IP-enabled messaging service to another user of the same messaging service, except a message described in clause (ii).

“(D) TEXT MESSAGING SERVICE.—The term ‘text messaging service’ means a service that enables the transmission or receipt of a text message, including a service provided as part of or in connection with a voice service.

“(E) VOICE SERVICE.—The term ‘voice service’—

“(i) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1); and

“(ii) includes transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine.”.

(3) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 227(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)) is amended in the heading by inserting “MISLEADING OR” before “INACCURATE”.

(4) REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(e)(3)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009, the Commission” and inserting “The Commission”.

(B) DEADLINE.—The Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement the amendments made by this subsection not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date on which the Commission prescribes regulations under paragraph (4).

(b) CONSUMER EDUCATION MATERIALS ON HOW TO AVOID SCAMS THAT RELY UPON MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF MATERIALS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission, in coordination with the Federal Trade Commission, shall develop consumer education materials that provide information about—

(A) ways for consumers to identify scams and other fraudulent activity that rely upon the use of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information; and

(B) existing technologies, if any, that a consumer can use to protect against such scams and other fraudulent activity.

(2) CONTENTS.—In developing the consumer education materials under paragraph (1), the Commission shall—

(A) identify existing technologies, if any, that can help consumers guard themselves against scams and other fraudulent activity that rely upon the use of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, including—

(i) descriptions of how a consumer can use the technologies to protect against such scams and other fraudulent activity; and

(ii) details on how consumers can access and use the technologies; and

(B) provide other information that may help consumers identify and avoid scams and other fraudulent activity that rely upon the use of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information.

(3) UPDATES.—The Commission shall ensure that the consumer education materials required under paragraph (1) are updated on a regular basis.

(4) WEBSITE.—The Commission shall include the consumer education materials developed under paragraph (1) on its website.

(c) GAO REPORT ON COMBATING THE FRAUDULENT PROVISION OF MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the actions the Commission and the Federal Trade Commission have taken to combat the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and the additional measures that could be taken to combat such activity.

(2) REQUIRED CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall examine—

(A) trends in the types of scams that rely on misleading or inaccurate caller identification information;

(B) previous and current enforcement actions by the Commission and the Federal Trade Commission to combat the practices prohibited by section 227(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(1));

(C) current efforts by industry groups and other entities to develop technical standards to deter or prevent the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and how such standards may help combat the current and future provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information; and

(D) whether there are additional actions the Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and Congress should take to combat the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the findings of the study under paragraph (1), including any recommendations regarding combating the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed to modify, limit, or otherwise affect any rule or order adopted by the Commission in connection with—

(1) the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-243; 105 Stat. 2394) or the amendments made by that Act; or

(2) the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 (15 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.).

SEC. 504. REPORT ON PROMOTING BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE FOR VETERANS.

(a) VETERAN DEFINED.—In this section, the term “veteran” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on promoting broadband Internet access service for veterans, in particular low-income veterans and veterans residing in rural areas. In such report, the Commission shall—

(1) examine such access and how to promote such access; and

(2) provide findings and recommendations for Congress with respect to such access and how to promote such access.

(c) PUBLIC NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT.—In preparing the report required by subsection (b), the Commission shall provide the public with notice and an opportunity to comment on broadband Internet access service for veterans, in particular low-income veterans and veterans residing in rural areas, and how to promote such access.

SEC. 505. METHODOLOGY FOR COLLECTION OF MOBILE SERVICE COVERAGE DATA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “commercial mobile data service” has the meaning given the term in section 6001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401);

(2) the term “commercial mobile service” has the meaning given the term in section 332(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(d));

(3) the term “coverage data” means, if commercial mobile service or commercial mobile data service is available, general information about the service, which may include available speed tiers, radio frequency signal levels, and network and performance characteristics; and

(4) the term “Universal Service program” means the universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254) and the regulations issued under that section.

(b) METHODOLOGY ESTABLISHED.—Not later than 180 days after the conclusion of the Mobility Fund Phase II Auction, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to establish a methodology that shall apply to the

collection of coverage data by the Commission for the purposes of—

- (1) the Universal Service program; or
- (2) any other similar program.
- (c) REQUIREMENTS.—The methodology established under subsection (b) shall—
 - (1) contain standard definitions for different available technologies such as 2G, 3G, 4G, and 4G LTE;
 - (2) enhance the consistency and robustness of how the data are collected by different parties;
 - (3) improve the validity and reliability of coverage data; and
 - (4) increase the efficiency of coverage data collection.

SEC. 506. ACCURACY OF DISPATCHABLE LOCATION FOR 9-1-1 CALLS.

(a) PROCEEDING REQUIRED.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall conclude a proceeding to consider adopting rules to ensure that the dispatchable location is conveyed with a 9-1-1 call, regardless of the technological platform used and including with calls from multi-line telephone systems (as defined in section 6502 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1471)).

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROCEEDINGS.—In conducting the proceeding required by subsection (a), the Commission may consider information and conclusions from other Commission proceedings regarding the accuracy of the dispatchable location for a 9-1-1 call, but nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Commission to reconsider any information or conclusion from a proceeding regarding the accuracy of the dispatchable location for a 9-1-1 call in which the Commission has adopted rules or issued an order before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) 9-1-1 CALL.—The term “9-1-1 call” means a voice call that is placed, or a message that is sent by other means of communication, to a public safety answering point (as defined in section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222)) for the purpose of requesting emergency services.

(2) DISPATCHABLE LOCATION.—The term “dispatchable location” means the street address of the calling party, and additional information such as room number, floor number, or similar information necessary to adequately identify the location of the calling party.

SEC. 507. NTIA STUDY ON INTERAGENCY PROCESS FOLLOWING CYBERSECURITY INCIDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information shall complete a study on how the National Telecommunications and Information Administration can best coordinate the interagency process following cybersecurity incidents.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing the findings and recommendations of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 508. TRIBAL DIGITAL ACCESS.

(a) TRIBAL BROADBAND DATA REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Com-

merce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report evaluating broadband coverage in Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) and on land held by a Native Corporation pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

(2) REQUIRED ASSESSMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of areas of Indian country (as so defined) and land held by a Native Corporation pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act that have adequate broadband coverage.

(B) An assessment of unserved areas of Indian country (as so defined) and land held by a Native Corporation pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

(b) TRIBAL BROADBAND PROCEEDING.—Not later than 30 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall complete a proceeding to address the unserved areas identified in the report under subsection (a).

SEC. 509. TERMS OF OFFICE AND VACANCIES.

Section 4(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c)(1) A commissioner—

“(A) shall be appointed for a term of 5 years;

“(B) except as provided in subparagraph (C), may continue to serve after the expiration of the fixed term of office of the commissioner until a successor is appointed and has been confirmed and taken the oath of office; and

“(C) may not continue to serve after the expiration of the session of Congress that begins after the expiration of the fixed term of office of the commissioner.

“(2) Any person chosen to fill a vacancy in the Commission—

“(A) shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the commissioner that the person succeeds;

“(B) except as provided in subparagraph (C), may continue to serve after the expiration of the fixed term of office of the commissioner that the person succeeds until a successor is appointed and has been confirmed and taken the oath of office; and

“(C) may not continue to serve after the expiration of the session of Congress that begins after the expiration of the fixed term of office of the commissioner that the person succeeds.

“(3) No vacancy in the Commission shall impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the Commission.”.

SEC. 510. SUBMISSION OF COPY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by section 402(h), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) BUDGET ESTIMATES AND REQUESTS; LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, TESTIMONY, AND COMMENTS ON LEGISLATION; SEMI-ANNUAL REPORTS.—

“(1) BUDGET ESTIMATES AND REQUESTS.—If the Commission submits any budget estimate or request to the President or the Office of Management and Budget, the Commission shall concurrently transmit a copy of that estimate or request to Congress.

“(2) LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, TESTIMONY, AND COMMENTS ON LEGISLATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission submits any legislative recommendations, testimony, or comments on legislation to the President or the Office of Management and Budget, the Commission shall concurrently transmit a copy thereof to Congress.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No officer or agency of the United States may require the Commission to submit legislative recommendations, testimony, or comments on legislation to any officer or agency of the United States for approval, comments, or review prior to the submission of the recommendations, testimony, or comments to Congress.

“(3) OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL SEMI-ANNUAL REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Inspector General of the Commission shall concurrently submit each semiannual report required under such section 5(b) to the Commission and to the appropriate committees or subcommittees of Congress.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to modify the requirement for the Commission to submit to the appropriate committees or subcommittees of Congress each such semiannual report together with a report by the Commission under such section 5(b).”.

SEC. 511. JOINT BOARD RECOMMENDATION.

The Commission may not modify, amend, or change its rules or regulations for universal service support payments to implement the February 27, 2004, recommendations of the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service regarding single connection or primary line restrictions on universal service support payments.

SEC. 512. DISCLAIMER FOR PRESS RELEASES REGARDING NOTICES OF APPARENT LIABILITY.

The Commission shall include in any press release regarding the issuance of a notice of apparent liability under section 503(b)(4) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 503(b)(4)) a disclaimer informing consumers that—

(1) the issuance of a notice of apparent liability should be treated only as allegations; and

(2) the amount of any forfeiture penalty proposed in a notice of apparent liability represents the maximum penalty that the Commission may impose for the violations alleged in the notice of apparent liability.

SEC. 513. REPORTS RELATED TO SPECTRUM AUCTIONS.

(a) ESTIMATE OF UPCOMING AUCTIONS.—Section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(18) ESTIMATE OF UPCOMING AUCTIONS.—

“(A) Not later than September 30, 2018, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall make publicly available an estimate of what systems of competitive bidding authorized under this subsection may be initiated during the upcoming 12-month period.

“(B) The estimate under subparagraph (A) shall, to the extent possible, identify the bands of frequencies the Commission expects to be included in each such system of competitive bidding.”.

(b) AUCTION EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION REPORT.—Not later than April 1, 2019, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing a detailed justification for the use of proceeds retained by the Commission under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)) for the costs of developing and implementing the program required by section 309(j) of that Act.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

TITLE VI—VIEWER PROTECTION

SEC. 601. RESERVE SOURCE FOR PAYMENT OF TV BROADCASTER RELOCATION COSTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Broadcast Repack Fund.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission makes the certification described in paragraph (2), amounts in the Broadcast Repack Fund shall be available to the Commission to make reimbursements pursuant to subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) or (b)(4)(A)(ii) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in this paragraph is a certification from the Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury that the funds available in the TV Broadcaster Relocation Fund established under subsection (d) of such section are likely to be insufficient to reimburse reasonably incurred costs described in subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) or (b)(4)(A)(ii) of such section.

(3) AVAILABILITY FOR PAYMENTS AFTER APRIL 13, 2020.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(4)(D) of such section, the Commission may make payments pursuant to subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) or (b)(4)(A)(ii) of such section from the Broadcast Repack Fund after April 13, 2020, if, before making any such payments after such date, the Commission submits to Congress a certification that such payments are necessary to reimburse reasonably incurred costs described in such subsection.

(c) UNUSED FUNDS RESCINDED AND DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.—

(1) RESCISSION AND DEPOSIT.—If any unobligated amounts remain in the Broadcast Repack Fund after the date described in paragraph (2), such amounts shall be rescinded and deposited into the general fund of the Treasury, where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(2) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this paragraph is the earlier of—

(A) the date of a certification by the Commission under paragraph (3) that all reimbursements pursuant to subsections (b)(4)(A)(i) and (b)(4)(A)(ii) of such section 6403 have been made; or

(B) July 3, 2022.

(3) CERTIFICATION.—If all reimbursements pursuant to subsections (b)(4)(A)(i) and (b)(4)(A)(ii) of such section 6403 have been made before July 3, 2022, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a certification that all such reimbursements have been made.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The amount of auction proceeds that the salaries and expenses account of the Commission is required to retain under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)), including from the proceeds of the forward auction under section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452), shall be sufficient to cover the administrative costs incurred by the Commission in making any reimbursements out of the Broadcast Repack Fund.

SEC. 602. PAYMENT OF RELOCATION COSTS OF TELEVISION TRANSLATOR STATIONS AND LOW POWER TELEVISION STATIONS.

(a) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall reimburse costs reasonably incurred by a television translator station or low power television station on or after January 1, 2017, in order for such station to relocate its television service from one channel to another channel or otherwise modify its facility as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452). Only stations that are eligible to file and do file an application in the Commission's Special Displacement Window are eligible to seek reimbursement under this paragraph.

(2) LIMITATION.—The Commission may not make reimbursements under paragraph (1) for lost revenues.

(3) DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS PROHIBITED.—In the case of a low power television station that has been accorded primary status as a Class A television licensee under section 73.6001(a) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations—

(A) if the licensee of such station has received reimbursement with respect to such station under subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) of such section 6403 (including from amounts made available under section 601 of this title), or from any other source, such station may not receive reimbursement under paragraph (1); and

(B) if such station has received reimbursement under paragraph (1), the licensee of such station may not receive reimbursement with respect to such station under subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) of such section 6403.

(4) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—The Commission may not make reimbursement under paragraph (1) for costs incurred to resolve mutually exclusive applications, including costs incurred in any auction of available channels.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund shall be available to the Commission to make payments required by subsection (a)(1).

(B) AVAILABILITY AFTER APRIL 13, 2020.—Amounts in the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund shall not be available to the Commission to make payments required by subsection (a)(1) after April 13, 2020, unless, before making any such payments after such date, the Commission submits to Congress a certification that such payments are necessary to reimburse costs reasonably incurred by a television translator station or low power television station on or after January 1, 2017, in order for such station to relocate its television service from one channel to another channel or otherwise modify its facility as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(3) UNUSED FUNDS RESCINDED AND DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.—

(A) RESCISSION AND DEPOSIT.—If any unobligated amounts remain in the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund after the date described in subparagraph (B), such amounts shall be rescinded and deposited into the general fund of the Treasury,

where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(B) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this subparagraph is the earlier of—

(i) the date of a certification by the Commission under subparagraph (C) that all reimbursements pursuant to subsection (a)(1) have been made; or

(ii) July 3, 2023.

(C) CERTIFICATION.—If all reimbursements pursuant to subsection (a)(1) have been made before July 3, 2023, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a certification that all such reimbursements have been made.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The amount of auction proceeds that the salaries and expenses account of the Commission is required to retain under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)), including from the proceeds of the forward auction under section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452), shall be sufficient to cover the administrative costs incurred by the Commission in making any reimbursements out of the Translator and Low Power Station Relocation Fund.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOW POWER TELEVISION STATION.—The term “low power television station” means a low power TV station (as defined in section 74.701 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) that was licensed and transmitting for at least 9 of the 12 months prior to April 13, 2017. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the operation of analog and digital companion facilities may be combined.

(2) TELEVISION TRANSLATOR STATION.—The term “television translator station” means a television broadcast translator station (as defined in section 74.701 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) that was licensed and transmitting for at least 9 of the 12 months prior to April 13, 2017. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the operation of analog and digital companion facilities may be combined.

SEC. 603. PAYMENT OF RELOCATION COSTS OF FM BROADCAST STATIONS.

(a) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall reimburse costs reasonably incurred by an FM broadcast station for facilities necessary for such station to reasonably minimize disruption of service as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(2) LIMITATION.—The Commission may not make reimbursements under paragraph (1) for lost revenues.

(3) DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS PROHIBITED.—If an FM broadcast station has received a payment for interim facilities from the licensee of a television broadcast station that was reimbursed for such payment under subsection (b)(4)(A)(i) of such section 6403 (including from amounts made available under section 601 of this title), or from any other source, such FM broadcast station may not receive any reimbursements under paragraph (1).

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund shall be available to the Commission to make payments required by subsection (a)(1).

(B) **AVAILABILITY AFTER APRIL 13, 2020.**—Amounts in the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund shall not be available to the Commission to make payments required by subsection (a)(1) after April 13, 2020, unless, before making any such payments after such date, the Commission submits to Congress a certification that such payments are necessary to reimburse costs reasonably incurred by an FM broadcast station for facilities necessary for such station to reasonably minimize disruption of service as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(3) **UNUSED FUNDS RESCINDED AND DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.**—

(A) **RESCISSION AND DEPOSIT.**—If any unobligated amounts remain in the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund after the date described in subparagraph (B), such amounts shall be rescinded and deposited into the general fund of the Treasury, where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(B) **DATE DESCRIBED.**—The date described in this subparagraph is the earlier of—

(i) the date of a certification by the Commission under subparagraph (C) that all reimbursements pursuant to subsection (a)(1) have been made; or

(ii) July 3, 2022.

(C) **CERTIFICATION.**—If all reimbursements pursuant to subsection (a)(1) have been made before July 3, 2022, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a certification that all such reimbursements have been made.

(c) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The amount of auction proceeds that the salaries and expenses account of the Commission is required to retain under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)), including from the proceeds of the forward auction under section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452), shall be sufficient to cover the administrative costs incurred by the Commission in making any reimbursements out of the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund.

(d) **FM BROADCAST STATION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “FM broadcast station” has the meaning given such term in section 73.310 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, and, for an FM translator, has the meaning given the term “FM translator” in section 74.1201 of such title.

SEC. 604. CONSUMER EDUCATION PAYMENT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Broadcast Station Relocation Consumer Education Fund.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Amounts in the Broadcast Station Relocation Consumer Education Fund shall be available to the Commission to make payments solely for the purposes of consumer education relating to the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum under subsection (b) of section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452).

(c) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The amount of auction proceeds that the salaries and expenses account of the Commission is required to retain under section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)), including from the proceeds of the forward auction under section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1452), shall be sufficient

to cover the administrative costs incurred by the Commission in making any payments out of the Broadcast Station Relocation Consumer Education Fund.

SEC. 605. IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

The Commission shall implement and enforce this title as if this title is a part of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.). A violation of this title, or a regulation promulgated under this title, shall be considered to be a violation of the Communications Act of 1934, or a regulation promulgated under such Act, respectively.

SEC. 606. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall alter the final transition phase completion date established by the Commission for full power and Class A television stations.

TITLE VII—MOBILE NOW

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Making Opportunities for Broadband Investment and Limiting Excessive and Needless Obstacles to Wireless Act” or the “MOBILE NOW Act”.

SEC. 702. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(C) each committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over a Federal entity affected by the applicable section in which the term appears.

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) **FEDERAL ENTITY.**—The term “Federal entity” has the meaning given the term in section 113(l) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(l)).

(4) **NTIA.**—The term “NTIA” means the National Telecommunications and Information Administration of the Department of Commerce.

(5) **OMB.**—The term “OMB” means the Office of Management and Budget.

(6) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 703. IDENTIFYING 255 MEGAHERTZ.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than December 31, 2022, the Secretary, working through the NTIA, and the Commission shall identify a total of at least 255 megahertz of Federal and non-Federal spectrum for mobile and fixed wireless broadband use.

(2) **UNLICENSED AND LICENSED USE.**—Of the spectrum identified under paragraph (1), not less than—

(A) 100 megahertz below the frequency of 8000 megahertz shall be identified for use on an unlicensed basis;

(B) 100 megahertz below the frequency of 6000 megahertz shall be identified for use on an exclusive, licensed basis for commercial mobile use, pursuant to the Commission’s authority to implement such licensing in a flexible manner, and subject to potential continued use of such spectrum by incumbent Federal entities in designated geographic areas indefinitely or for such length of time stipulated in transition plans approved by the Technical Panel under section 113(h) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(h)) for those incumbent entities to be relocated to alternate spectrum; and

(C) 55 megahertz below the frequency of 8000 megahertz shall be identified for use on either a licensed or unlicensed basis, or a combination of licensed and unlicensed.

(3) **NON-ELIGIBLE SPECTRUM.**—For purposes of satisfying the requirement under paragraph (1), the following spectrum shall not be counted:

(A) The frequencies between 1695 and 1710 megahertz.

(B) The frequencies between 1755 and 1780 megahertz.

(C) The frequencies between 2155 and 2180 megahertz.

(D) The frequencies between 3550 and 3700 megahertz.

(E) Spectrum that the Commission determines had more than de minimis mobile or fixed wireless broadband operations within the band on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN OTHER SPECTRUM.**—Spectrum identified pursuant to this section may include eligible spectrum, if any, identified after the date of enactment of this Act pursuant to title X of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-74).

(5) **SPECTRUM MADE AVAILABLE ON AND AFTER FEBRUARY 11, 2016.**—Any spectrum that has been made available for licensed or unlicensed use on and after February 11, 2016, and that otherwise satisfies the requirements of this section may be counted towards the requirements of this subsection.

(6) **RELOCATION PRIORITIZED OVER SHARING.**—This section shall be carried out in accordance with section 113(j) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(j)).

(7) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In identifying spectrum for use under this section, the Secretary, working through the NTIA, and Commission shall consider—

(A) the need to preserve critical existing and planned Federal Government capabilities;

(B) the impact on existing State, local, and tribal government capabilities;

(C) the international implications;

(D) the need for appropriate enforcement mechanisms and authorities; and

(E) the importance of the deployment of wireless broadband services in rural areas of the United States.

(b) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to impair or otherwise affect the functions of the Director of OMB relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals;

(2) to require the disclosure of classified information, law enforcement sensitive information, or other information that must be protected in the interest of national security; or

(3) to affect any requirement under section 156 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 921 note), as added by section 1062(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, or any other relevant statutory requirement applicable to the reallocation of Federal spectrum.

SEC. 704. MILLIMETER WAVE SPECTRUM.

(a) **FCC PROCEEDING.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish a notice of proposed rulemaking to consider service rules to authorize mobile or fixed terrestrial wireless operations, including for advanced mobile service operations, in the radio frequency band between 42000 and 42500 megahertz.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting a rule-making under subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) consider how the band described in subsection (a) may be used to provide commercial wireless broadband service, including whether—

(A) such spectrum may be best used for licensed or unlicensed services, or some combination thereof; and

(B) to permit additional licensed operations in such band on a shared basis; and

(2) include technical characteristics under which the band described in subsection (a) may be employed for mobile or fixed terrestrial wireless operations, including any appropriate coexistence requirements.

(c) SPECTRUM MADE AVAILABLE ON AND AFTER FEBRUARY 11, 2016.—Any spectrum that has been made available for licensed or unlicensed use on or after February 11, 2016, and that otherwise satisfies the requirements of section 703 may be counted towards the requirements of section 703(a).

SEC. 705. 3 GIGAHERTZ SPECTRUM.

(a) BETWEEN 3100 MEGAHERTZ AND 3550 MEGAHERTZ.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and in consultation with the Commission and the head of each affected Federal agency (or a designee thereof), the Secretary, working through the NTIA, shall submit to the Commission and the appropriate committees of Congress a report evaluating the feasibility of allowing commercial wireless services, licensed or unlicensed, to share use of the frequencies between 3100 megahertz and 3550 megahertz.

(b) BETWEEN 3700 MEGAHERTZ AND 4200 MEGAHERTZ.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, after notice and an opportunity for public comment, and in consultation with the Secretary, working through the NTIA, and the head of each affected Federal agency (or a designee thereof), the Commission shall submit to the Secretary and the appropriate committees of Congress a report evaluating the feasibility of allowing commercial wireless services, licensed or unlicensed, to use or share use of the frequencies between 3700 megahertz and 4200 megahertz.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—A report under subsection (a) or (b) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the operations of Federal entities that operate Federal Government stations authorized to use the frequencies described in that subsection.

(2) An assessment of the possible impacts of such sharing on Federal and non-Federal users already operating on the frequencies described in that subsection.

(3) The criteria that may be necessary to ensure shared licensed or unlicensed services would not cause harmful interference to Federal or non-Federal users already operating in the frequencies described in that subsection.

(4) If such sharing is feasible, an identification of which of the frequencies described in that subsection are most suitable for sharing with commercial wireless services through the assignment of new licenses by competitive bidding, for sharing with unlicensed operations, or through a combination of licensing and unlicensed operations.

(d) COMMISSION ACTION.—The Commission, in consultation with the NTIA, shall seek public comment on the reports required under subsections (a) and (b), including regarding the bands identified in such report as feasible pursuant to subsection (c)(4).

SEC. 706. BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPLOYMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE STATE AGENCY.—The term “appropriate State agency” means a State governmental agency that is recognized by the executive branch of the State as having the experience necessary to evaluate and carry out projects relating to the proper and effective installation and operation of broadband infrastructure.

(2) BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term “broadband infrastructure” means any buried, underground, or aerial facility, and any wireless or wireline connection, that enables users to send and receive voice, video, data, graphics, or any combination thereof.

(3) BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE ENTITY.—The term “broadband infrastructure entity” means any entity that—

(A) installs, owns, or operates broadband infrastructure; and

(B) provides broadband services in a manner consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity, as determined by the State.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia; and

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPLOYMENT.—To facilitate the installation of broadband infrastructure, the Secretary of Transportation shall promulgate regulations to ensure that each State that receives funds under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, meets the following requirements:

(1) BROADBAND CONSULTATION.—The State department of transportation, in consultation with appropriate State agencies, shall—

(A) identify a broadband utility coordinator, that may have additional responsibilities, whether in the State department of transportation or in another State agency, that is responsible for facilitating the broadband infrastructure right-of-way efforts within the State;

(B) establish a process for the registration of broadband infrastructure entities that seek to be included in those broadband infrastructure right-of-way facilitation efforts within the State;

(C) establish a process to electronically notify broadband infrastructure entities identified under subparagraph (B) of the State transportation improvement program on an annual basis and provide additional notifications as necessary to achieve the goals of this section; and

(D) coordinate initiatives carried out under this section with other statewide telecommunication and broadband plans and State and local transportation and land use plans, including strategies to minimize repeated excavations that involve the installation of broadband infrastructure in a right-of-way.

(2) PRIORITY.—If a State chooses to provide for the installation of broadband infrastructure in the right-of-way of an applicable Federal-aid highway project under this subsection, the State department of transportation shall carry out any appropriate measures to ensure that any existing broadband infrastructure entities are not disadvantaged, as compared to other broadband infrastructure entities, with respect to the program under this subsection.

(c) EFFECT OF SECTION.—This section applies only to activities for which Federal obligations or expenditures are initially approved on or after the date regulations under subsection (b) become effective. Nothing in this section establishes a mandate or requirement that a State install or allow the installation of broadband infrastructure in a highway right-of-way. Nothing in this sec-

tion authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to withhold or reserve funds or approval of a project under title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 707. REALLOCATION INCENTIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, in consultation with the Commission, the Director of OMB, and the head of each affected Federal agency (or a designee thereof), after notice and an opportunity for public comment, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes legislative or regulatory recommendations to incentivize a Federal entity to relinquish, or share with Federal or non-Federal users, Federal spectrum for the purpose of allowing commercial wireless broadband services to operate on that Federal spectrum.

(b) POST-AUCTION PAYMENTS.—

(1) REPORT.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information shall—

(A) consider whether permitting eligible Federal entities that are implementing a transition plan submitted under section 113(h) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(h)) to accept payments could result in access to the eligible frequencies that are being reallocated for exclusive non-Federal use or shared use sooner than would otherwise occur without such payments; and

(B) include the findings under subparagraph (A), including the analysis under paragraph (2) and any recommendations for legislation, in the report.

(2) ANALYSIS.—In considering payments under paragraph (1)(A), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information shall conduct an analysis of whether and how such payments would affect—

(A) bidding in auctions conducted under section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) of such eligible frequencies; and

(B) receipts collected from the auctions described in subparagraph (A).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) PAYMENT.—The term “payment” means a payment in cash or in-kind by any auction winner, or any person affiliated with an auction winner, of eligible frequencies during the period after eligible frequencies have been reallocated by competitive bidding under section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) but prior to the completion of relocation or sharing transition of such eligible frequencies per transition plans approved by the Technical Panel.

(B) ELIGIBLE FREQUENCIES.—The term “eligible frequencies” has the meaning given the term in section 113(g)(2) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(g)(2)).

SEC. 708. BIDIRECTIONAL SHARING STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, including an opportunity for public comment, the Commission, in collaboration with the NTIA, shall—

(1) conduct a bidirectional sharing study to determine the best means of providing Federal entities flexible access to non-Federal spectrum on a shared basis across a range of short-, mid-, and long-range timeframes, including for intermittent purposes like emergency use; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the study under paragraph (1), including any recommendations for legislation or proposed regulations.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) consider the regulatory certainty that commercial spectrum users and Federal entities need to make longer-term investment decisions for shared access to be viable; and

(2) evaluate any barriers to voluntary commercial arrangements in which non-Federal users could provide access to Federal entities.

SEC. 709. UNLICENSED SERVICES IN GUARD BANDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—After public notice and comment, and in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information and the head of each affected Federal agency (or a designee thereof), with respect to frequencies allocated for Federal use, the Commission shall adopt rules that permit unlicensed services where feasible to use any frequencies that are designated as guard bands to protect frequencies allocated after the date of enactment of this Act by competitive bidding under section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)), including spectrum that acts as a duplex gap between transmit and receive frequencies.

(b) **LIMITATION.**—The Commission may not permit any use of a guard band under this section that would cause harmful interference to a licensed service or a Federal service.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the Commission or the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information from otherwise making spectrum available for licensed or unlicensed use in any frequency band in addition to guard bands, including under section 703, consistent with their statutory jurisdictions.

SEC. 710. AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECTRUM PIPELINE ACT OF 2015.

Section 1008 of the Spectrum Pipeline Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-74; 129 Stat. 584) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, after notice and an opportunity for public comment,” after “the Commission”.

SEC. 711. GAO ASSESSMENT OF UNLICENSED SPECTRUM AND WI-FI USE IN LOW-INCOME NEIGHBORHOODS.

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to evaluate the availability of broadband Internet access using unlicensed spectrum and wireless networks in low-income neighborhoods.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall consider and evaluate—

(A) the availability of wireless Internet hot spots and access to unlicensed spectrum in low-income neighborhoods, particularly for elementary and secondary school-aged children in such neighborhoods;

(B) any barriers preventing or limiting the deployment and use of wireless networks in low-income neighborhoods;

(C) how to overcome any barriers described in subparagraph (B), including through incentives, policies, or requirements that would increase the availability of unlicensed spectrum and related technologies in low-income neighborhoods; and

(D) how to encourage home broadband adoption by households with elementary and

secondary school-age children that are in low-income neighborhoods.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) summarizes the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a); and

(2) makes recommendations with respect to potential incentives, policies, and requirements that could help achieve the goals described in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 712. RULEMAKING RELATED TO PARTITIONING OR DISAGGREGATING LICENSES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED SMALL CARRIER.**—The term “covered small carrier” means a carrier (as defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153)) that—

(A) has not more than 1,500 employees (as determined under section 121.106 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto); and

(B) offers services using the facilities of the carrier.

(2) **RURAL AREA.**—The term “rural area” means any area other than—

(A) a city, town, or incorporated area that has a population of more than 20,000 inhabitants; or

(B) an urbanized area contiguous and adjacent to a city or town that has a population of more than 50,000 inhabitants.

(b) **RULEMAKING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to assess whether to establish a program, or modify existing programs, under which a licensee that receives a license for the exclusive use of spectrum in a specific geographic area under section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301) may partition or disaggregate the license by sale or long-term lease—

(A) in order to—

(i) provide services consistent with the license; and

(ii) make unused spectrum available to—

(I) an unaffiliated covered small carrier; or

(II) an unaffiliated carrier to serve a rural area; and

(B) if the Commission finds that such a program would promote—

(i) the availability of advanced telecommunications services in rural areas; or

(ii) spectrum availability for covered small carriers.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In conducting the rulemaking proceeding under paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider, with respect to the program proposed to be established under that paragraph—

(A) whether reduced performance requirements with respect to spectrum obtained through the program would facilitate deployment of advanced telecommunications services in the areas covered by the program;

(B) what conditions may be needed on transfers of spectrum under the program to allow covered small carriers that obtain spectrum under the program to build out the spectrum in a reasonable period of time;

(C) what incentives may be appropriate to encourage licensees to lease or sell spectrum, including—

(i) extending the term of a license granted under section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301); or

(ii) modifying performance requirements of the license relating to the leased or sold spectrum; and

(D) the administrative feasibility of—

(i) the incentives described in subparagraph (C); and

(ii) other incentives considered by the Commission that further the goals of this section.

(3) **FORFEITURE OF SPECTRUM.**—If a party fails to meet any build out requirements set by the Commission for any spectrum sold or leased under this section, the right to the spectrum shall be forfeited to the Commission unless the Commission finds that there is good cause for the failure of the party.

(4) **REQUIREMENT.**—The Commission may offer a licensee incentives or reduced performance requirements under this section only if the Commission finds that doing so would likely result in increased availability of advanced telecommunications services in a rural area.

SEC. 713. UNLICENSED SPECTRUM POLICY.

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to maximize the benefit to the people of the United States of the spectrum resources of the United States;

(2) to advance innovation and investment in wireless broadband services; and

(3) to promote spectrum policy that makes available on an unlicensed basis radio frequency bands to address consumer demand for unlicensed wireless broadband operations.

(b) **COMMISSION RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Commission shall ensure that the efforts of the Commission related to spectrum allocation and assignment made available on an unlicensed basis radio frequency bands to address demand for unlicensed wireless broadband operations if doing so is, after taking into account the future needs of homeland security, national security, and other spectrum users—

(1) reasonable; and

(2) in the public interest.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section confers any additional rights on unlicensed users or users licensed by rule under part 96 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, to protection from harmful interference.

SEC. 714. NATIONAL PLAN FOR UNLICENSED SPECTRUM.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **SPECTRUM RELOCATION FUND.**—The term “Spectrum Relocation Fund” means the Fund established under section 118 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 928).

(2) **UNLICENSED OR LICENSED BY RULE OPERATIONS.**—The term “unlicensed or licensed by rule operations” means the use of spectrum on a non-exclusive basis under—

(A) part 15 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(B) licensing by rule under part 96 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) **NATIONAL PLAN.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission, in consultation with the NTIA, shall develop a national plan for making additional radio frequency bands available for unlicensed or licensed by rule operations.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The plan developed under this section shall—

(1) identify an approach that ensures that consumers have access to additional spectrum to conduct unlicensed or licensed by rule operations in a range of radio frequencies to meet consumer demand;

(2) recommend specific actions by the Commission and the NTIA to permit unlicensed or licensed by rule operations in additional radio frequency ranges that the Commission finds—

(A) are consistent with the statement of policy under section 713(a);

(B) will—

(i) expand opportunities for unlicensed or licensed by rule operations in a spectrum band; or

(ii) otherwise improve spectrum utilization and intensity of use of bands where unlicensed or licensed by rule operations are already permitted;

(C) will not cause harmful interference to Federal or non-Federal users of such bands; and

(D) will not significantly impact homeland security or national security communications systems; and

(3) examine additional ways, with respect to existing and planned databases or spectrum access systems designed to promote spectrum sharing and access to spectrum for unlicensed or licensed by rule operations—

(A) to improve accuracy and efficacy;

(B) to reduce burdens on consumers, manufacturers, and service providers; and

(C) to protect sensitive Government information.

(d) **SPECTRUM RELOCATION FUND.**—To be included as an appendix as part of the plan developed under this section, the NTIA, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall share with the Commission recommendations about how to reform the Spectrum Relocation Fund—

(1) to address costs incurred by Federal entities related to sharing radio frequency bands with radio technologies conducting unlicensed or licensed by rule operations; and

(2) to ensure the Spectrum Relocation Fund has sufficient funds to cover—

(A) the costs described in paragraph (1); and

(B) other expenditures allowed of the Spectrum Relocation Fund under section 118 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 928).

(e) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes the plan developed under this section, including any recommendations for legislative change.

(2) **PUBLICATION ON COMMISSION WEBSITE.**—Not later than the date on which the Commission submits the report under paragraph (1), the Commission shall make the report publicly available on the website of the Commission.

(f) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section confers any additional rights on unlicensed users or users licensed by rule under part 96 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, to protection from harmful interference.

SEC. 715. SPECTRUM CHALLENGE PRIZE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Spectrum Challenge Prize Act”.

(b) **DEFINITION OF PRIZE COMPETITION.**—In this section, the term “prize competition” means a prize competition conducted by the Secretary under subsection (c)(1).

(c) **SPECTRUM CHALLENGE PRIZE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of

Commerce for Communications and Information and the Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology, shall, subject to the availability of funds for prize competitions under this section—

(A) conduct prize competitions to dramatically accelerate the development and commercialization of technology that improves spectrum efficiency and is capable of cost-effective deployment; and

(B) define a measurable set of performance goals for participants in the prize competitions to demonstrate their solutions on a level playing field while making a significant advancement over the current state of the art.

(2) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary may—

(A) enter into a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other agreement with a private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity to administer the prize competitions;

(B) invite the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, or any other Federal agency to provide advice and assistance in the design or administration of the prize competitions; and

(C) award not more than \$5,000,000, in the aggregate, to the winner or winners of the prize competitions.

(d) **CRITERIA.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which funds for prize competitions are made available pursuant to this section, the Commission shall publish a technical paper on spectrum efficiency providing criteria that may be used for the design of the prize competitions.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 716. WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS TAX AND FEE COLLECTION FAIRNESS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Wireless Telecommunications Tax and Fee Collection Fairness Act”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FINANCIAL TRANSACTION.**—The term “financial transaction” means a transaction in which the purchaser or user of a wireless telecommunications service upon whom a tax, fee, or surcharge is imposed gives cash, credit, or any other exchange of monetary value or consideration to the person who is required to collect or remit the tax, fee, or surcharge.

(2) **LOCAL JURISDICTION.**—The term “local jurisdiction” means a political subdivision of a State.

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(4) **STATE OR LOCAL JURISDICTION.**—The term “State or local jurisdiction” includes any governmental entity or person acting on behalf of a State or local jurisdiction that has the authority to assess, impose, levy, or collect taxes or fees.

(5) **WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE.**—The term “wireless telecommunications service” means a commercial mobile radio service, as defined in section 20.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(c) **FINANCIAL TRANSACTION REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A State, or a local jurisdiction of a State, may not require a person who is neither a resident of such State or local jurisdiction nor an entity having its principal place of business in such State or

local jurisdiction to collect from, or remit on behalf of, any other person a State or local tax, fee, or surcharge imposed on a purchaser or user with respect to the purchase or use of any wireless telecommunications service within the State unless the collection or remittance is in connection with a financial transaction.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the right of a State or local jurisdiction to require the collection of any tax, fee, or surcharge in connection with a financial transaction.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.**—Any person aggrieved by a violation of subsection (c) may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States for equitable relief in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) **JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS.**—Notwithstanding section 1341 of title 28, United States Code, or the constitution or laws of any State, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy or citizenship of the parties, to grant such mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief, interim equitable relief, and declaratory judgments as may be necessary to prevent, restrain, or terminate any acts in violation of subsection (c).

SEC. 717. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **RANGES OF FREQUENCIES.**—Each range of frequencies described in this title shall be construed to be inclusive of the upper and lower frequencies in the range.

(b) **ASSESSMENT OF ELECTROMAGNETIC SPECTRUM REALLOCATION.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect any requirement under section 156 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 921 note), as added by section 1062(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

SEC. 718. RELATIONSHIP TO MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2012.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit, restrict, or circumvent in any way the implementation of the nationwide public safety broadband network defined in section 6001 of title VI of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401) or any rules implementing that network under title VI of that Act (47 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

SEC. 719. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, or the amendment made by this title. This title, and the amendment made by this title, shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today that the House of Representatives is taking up an important bill from the House Energy and Commerce Committee. It is titled the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018, or RAY BAUM'S Act.

I thank our subcommittee chairman, MARSHA BLACKBURN, for her hard work in introducing and moving this legislation forward.

Before I get into the policy side, I want to touch on the meaning behind this bill's title.

H.R. 4986 is a nod to our dear friend, and mine of 30 years, the former staff director of our Energy and Commerce Committee, who recently lost his battle with cancer.

It is a testament of not just Ray's dedication to telecom policy—as you know, he served as public utility commissioner, he chaired the Joint Board with the FCC on communications issues, and was such a policy brain for our committee—but also his ability to work across the aisle and with all levels of government officials. He got good things done for America.

Years ago, when I became chairman of what was then called the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, Ray, at my invitation, finally agreed to come back to Washington and work on the committee.

He had served as a State representative and as majority leader of the Oregon House. He had been chairman of the public utility commission in Oregon and brought a lot to our process as senior policy adviser.

In the years that followed, these issues remained both a priority and a passion for Ray, and I believe and I hope our bipartisan work today reflects admirably the kind of commitment he wanted all of us to share in making good public policy.

By the way, that is Ray right there, for those who didn't know.

The RAY BAUM'S Act reauthorizes the Federal Communications Commission. It includes efficiency and transparency reforms for the FCC, and it spurs the development of next generation 5G technologies.

It is good for consumers, and it is good for our Nation's critical telecommunications services.

Importantly, the bill before us today is the product of a bipartisan and bicameral agreement, House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats, including my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), Senate Commerce Committee chairman Mr. THUNE, and the ranking member in the Senate, BILL NELSON.

Mr. Speaker, we bring you a good product today of sound policy named for a wonderful individual, and I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WALDEN: I write concerning H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that foregoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, this is conditional on our understanding that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration. Lastly, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

I would ask that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest as well as the mutually agreed upon changes to be incorporated into the bill be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor, to memorialize our understanding.

I look forward to working with the Committee on Energy and Commerce as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018, which includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I appreciate your Committee's willingness to forego action on H.R. 4986 so that this legislation may be brought before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner.

I agree that foregoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I agree that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration. Lastly, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I will support the appropriate appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during

consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy & Commerce,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in H.R. 4986, the "RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018." As a result of your having consulted with me concerning the provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forego further consideration by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4986 at this time we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Energy & Commerce, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOWDY: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018, and I appreciate your willingness to forego further consideration by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

I agree that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4986 at this time, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter will be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act. This bill is the product of extensive bipartisan collaboration. After exhaustive negotiations, we were able to reach a deal that includes bills introduced by Democrats and Republicans in both the House and in the Senate. That does not

happen often, and I would like to thank my colleagues for working with me so closely.

This bill is a real tribute to its namesake, Ray Baum. Ray had a passion for telecommunications policy and a special place in his heart for broadcasting. Ray was also an eternal optimist. He never faltered in his belief that we could find a way to work together to find a solution, and he was right.

We were able to incorporate proposals from Members on both sides of the aisle, just the way Ray would have liked it, and we were able to produce this legislation that will reauthorize the FCC for the first time in 28 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly mention some aspects of this bill that I am most proud of. First, we were able to include the SANDY Act, which is named to honor those affected by Superstorm Sandy, a storm that ripped through the Northeast, including my district, over 5 years ago. During that superstorm, we saw firsthand how important communications were for survival. From television and radio broadcasters to wireless providers and cable networks, each played its own role in making sure people knew how to find help, look for loved ones, and stay out of harm's way.

□ 1445

I used the lessons we learned from Sandy in writing this legislation. When this bill is signed into law, our networks will be stronger, more resilient, and more capable to serve in an emergency.

This FCC reauthorization bill also includes the Viewer Protection Act. I introduced the Viewer Protection Act to make sure no viewer loses signal as a result of the FCC's incentive auction. Access to local information has become even more important as the number of natural disasters has increased over the past few years.

Not only does this bill help ensure consumers' broadcast stations don't go dark, as part of this bipartisan, bicameral deal, we have agreed to provide \$50 million in funding to help educate consumers about the transition. This funding is critical to make sure that people have access to information about how to get their televisions to work.

My colleagues will discuss other important aspects of this deal. But before they do, I would like to point out two important provisions that we included as part of the reauthorization. First, we included a provision that makes the FCC's inspector general independent of the Commission's chairman. The IG is currently conducting a number of critical investigations, including one into whether the chairman of the agency has been improperly favoring Sinclair Broadcast Group. But under current law, these investigations are being conducted under a cloud—the very chair-

man who is under investigation can obstruct the review by firing the inspector general or his or her staff at any time. So by passing this bill, we are ensuring that these important investigations can conclude without any interference.

Finally, I do not normally support unnecessarily cutting the budget of our agencies. But in this case, I would like to thank my colleagues for agreeing to limit this cut to the length of this administration. The current leadership of the FCC, in my opinion, has proven that it cannot be trusted to serve the public interest. Most notably, the agency has ignored its statutory duty and the call of the American people by destroying our net neutrality protections. Net neutrality safeguards our American values by empowering small businesses, creating new jobs, and ensuring free speech online.

By limiting the resources that we provide for the next 3 years, this reauthorization will limit this Commission's power, in my opinion, to do more harm.

For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan and bicameral agreement embodied by the RAY BAUM'S Act.

I would like to also thank the Democratic committee staff—David Goldman, Gerald Leverich, and Dan Miller—for all of their hard work in getting this bill to the floor today.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the chair of the subcommittee, who has been an incredible leader on our communications issues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for some time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the recognition, and I thank him for his efforts on this.

Mr. Speaker, it really is a pleasure to come here today to talk about the RAY BAUM'S Act. We have, for so long, talked about the need to push this through to completion, and Ray served as our staff director and really helped the committee and our subcommittee push this forward to the point that we could say: Yes, we have the FCC reauthorization done.

As Mr. PALLONE said, it has been 28 years since this agency has been reauthorized. It is certainly an honor to say we have done this in Ray's name, and we have done it in a bipartisan way.

There are so many things that are included in this bill, and one of the provisions that is in here is Chairman WALDEN's FCC reform. Many times you will hear us talk about needing to bring sunlight to these agencies, bringing order, and the ability for constituents and citizens to know what is happening. We have that included in this bill.

We also have provisions that our whip, STEVE SCALISE—the Consolidated Reporting Act—has included in this bill. We have provisions from Ms. ESHOO and from Representative ENGEL. These are all bipartisan provisions that you will see included in this legislation. Mr. JOHNSON has a provision that is included that will change the way the inspector general works in this agency so that he truly is an inspector general who is independent.

So we have worked together in a bipartisan way to do our repack which deals with our broadcasters and our spectrum to handle MobileNOW, which has been a priority of the Senate. They could not get it finished. We have finished that process, and then also the FCC reauthorization.

So I express my gratitude to the committee members, both Democrats and Republicans, and the staff members from both sides of the dais to say thank you for the work that is done to bring this bipartisan effort together to reauthorize this agency to deal with our spectrum repack and to address the MobileNOW concerns.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE), who is the ranking member of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to speak in memorial to the late Ray Baum. He was a dedicated husband and father, the staff director for the majority on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a trusted adviser and friend to Chairman WALDEN. We were all saddened by his passing, and I would like to express our condolences to his friends and family.

The legislation before us today is the product of bipartisan and bicameral compromise. While it is not perfect, it represents a good faith effort by Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman WALDEN, Senator NELSON, and Senator THUNE.

This compromise incorporates a number of Democratic priorities, including Ranking Member PALLONE's Viewer Protection Act and SANDY Act, and Congresswoman ESHOO's RESPONSE Act and "Dig Once" bill, and a number of provisions from other members of our committee on cybersecurity, Tribal broadband, broadband access for veterans, and others.

Like Ranking Member PALLONE, I am also happy to see bipartisan language included in the bill which makes the FCC inspector general an independent entity.

This sends a strong bipartisan and bicameral message to Chairman Pai that he cannot end the FCC inspector general's investigation into collusion between his office and Sinclair Broadcast

Group simply by firing the current inspector general. These allegations also require congressional oversight and investigation.

I am also happy to see that we have an agreement to provide the remainder of the funds necessary to transition broadcasters as part of the FCC's incentive auction—keeping a promise that we made to them that they would be held harmless.

The agreement also includes funds for consumer education about the transition. It is critical that the public be educated about the upcoming television repack and understand the what, when, and where of how it will work.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing to work on this legislation with my colleagues as it moves forward.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), who is a talented member of our committee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the RAY BAUM'S Act, which reauthorizes the Federal Communications Commission for the first time in 28 years.

How appropriate that this critical legislation is named for Ray Baum, who dedicated his tremendous public service to these issues, and whom we all admired.

I commend the leadership. The Energy and Commerce Committee puts more bipartisan bills on the President's desk than any other committee here on Capitol Hill. This is important legislation strengthening the FCC, protecting consumers, and, most important of all, expanding the information channels our lives and the economy need.

I am pleased that this legislation includes the Anti-Spoofing Act, a bill I have worked on with Congresswoman MENG and Chairman Emeritus BARTON for several years. Spoofing is an insidious practice used by scammers to call consumers using a faked phone number, often pretending to be a bank or government agency. Millions of Americans continue to be defrauded by con artists and scammers who perpetrate this despicable crime. This disgraceful practice must end, and it will be ended in large part due to this legislation. I am pleased this FCC reauthorization enacts consumer protections like those in the Anti-Spoofing Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today we are reauthorizing the Federal Communications Commission through the RAY BAUM'S Act, which, among other things, ensures our local broadcasters have the resources they need and will deliver additional spectrum into the commercial marketplace. Spectrum is the invisible infrastructure that supports our wireless economy.

As the way we do business continues to depend on connectivity and mobility, spectrum will be a part of everything from remote health monitoring to precision agriculture, to public safety communications and connected devices.

That is why I am pleased that this package includes several of my priorities, including my Spectrum Auction Deposits Act, which I coauthored with Congressman GUTHRIE. This legislation will enable the FCC to continue to conduct auctions that will unlock the spectrum necessary to deploy next generation broadband networks. Without this fix, auctions to deliver more spectrum into the commercial marketplace may be put on hold indefinitely.

This package also includes my legislation to create a Federal spectrum challenge prize, which would accelerate the development and commercialization of innovative technologies to make spectrum use more efficient.

It could also facilitate the application of existing technologies, such as blockchain, to develop spectrum sharing mechanisms that will allow providers to access spectrum on a real-time basis.

This bipartisan legislation will promote the expansion of current and next generation broadband networks across America. It is an important step forward, and I am proud to support its passage.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), who is a great member of our committee.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the RAY BAUM'S Act. It is fitting that this bill be named for him, a shining example of public service and a great friend. My heart goes out to his wife and all his family and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation reauthorizes the FCC for the first time in 28 years. I am proud of the inclusion of two of my bipartisan bills.

First is the Rural Spectrum Accessibility Act, which Mr. LOEBSACK and I introduced. It expands access to coverage in rural communities by allowing licensed, unused spectrum to be sub-allocated to carriers serving rural populations.

The second is the Improving Broadband Access for Veterans Act, which Mr. MCNERNEY and I introduced. It requires the FCC to thoroughly examine veterans' access to broadband and provide recommendations to increase access, especially for rural and low-income veterans.

Again, this legislation is one more example to show the majority of the work done in Congress is bipartisan and sometimes even bicameral.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and everybody for working together to get this done, and I urge my colleagues to support the RAY BAUM'S Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member and the chairman for yielding. I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their bipartisan efforts here.

I rise in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act. In the first place, this bill will help ensure that the incentive auction repack can move forward in a timely fashion and that Americans can have access to their local broadcasting stations during this period of time.

On the other hand, I am very proud that this bill includes a bipartisan provision that Congressman KINZINGER and I worked on.

This provision will move us forward in closing the digital divide for our Nation's veterans. Access to broadband internet service is critical for the more than 20 million veterans across our country, with the highest population of veterans residing in California.

Having a broadband internet connection helps veterans apply for jobs more easily, obtain necessary vocational training, communicate with family and friends, keep up with current events, access healthcare services, and get important information about their benefits and military records.

Without broadband internet access, it is difficult to fully participate in today's society. Veterans face many challenges when they return home, and not having internet access makes what is already an incredibly tough transition process even harder. This is particularly likely to be the case for low-income veterans and veterans living in rural areas.

Although we lack specific data on the number of veterans with broadband internet access, we know that Americans who live in rural areas are less likely to be connected. This is also the case for Americans who live at or below the Federal poverty level.

We must find ways to ensure that veterans, especially the more than 1.4 million veterans living below the Federal poverty level and the 5.3 million residing in rural areas, are not left behind.

This is why my provision directs the Federal Communications Commission to examine the current state of broadband access for veterans and what can be done to increase access, with a focus on low-income veterans and veterans residing in rural areas.

The findings and recommendations from this report will be important for paving the way to get more veterans connected. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) to speak on this important legislation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, named in memory of a hardworking and honorable man, the RAY BAUM'S Act reauthorizes the Federal Communications Commission for the first time in 28 years.

This bill is the result of a wholly bipartisan process that includes important provisions that will benefit all our constituents.

□ 1500

This includes further prohibitions on spoofing calls, reports on promoting internet access for low-income veterans, and improving 911 caller information.

The bill also provides additional funding for the repack process and fosters technology growth by authorizing studies on spectrum available for future auctions.

I applaud the work of the subcommittee on getting this done. This bill will truly benefit innovation and our constituents, and I support its passage.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair and ranking member for working to bring this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the RAY BAUM'S Act moving forward. This bill really is a good example of compromise. No one got everything that they wanted, but we worked together to find common ground. I think it represents what we need to be doing more of in Washington and in this body and what people and I want to see happen more often, namely, that Members of Congress come together in a bipartisan manner to reach a commonsense agreement.

But today I come to the floor to talk about a piece of legislation, the Rural Wireless Access Act, which I was pleased to help introduce and incorporate into the larger FCC Reauthorization Act.

I want to thank, in particular, my friend Mr. COSTELLO for working with me on this bipartisan bill. I also want to thank Mrs. BLACKBURN, chair of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, for helping to move this forward.

This bill, which I introduced last year, would require the FCC to establish standards for collecting wireless coverage data. Everyone at some point has been driving through places in rural America that don't get wireless coverage. Unfortunately, the maps that the FCC uses to fix coverage gaps are often inadequate.

Currently, the standards that define how wireless coverage is determined are not sufficient, meaning the coverage maps can be incomplete or inaccurate. Without accurate coverage maps, resources needed to improve

wireless access will not be directed to the areas that need the most help, including rural areas.

I am pleased that the Energy and Commerce Committee agreed to include this legislation, the Rural Wireless Access Act, as part of the larger package so that we can improve wireless voice and mobile internet services and ensure the resources go to the areas that need it the most.

In order to fix the problem, we have to get the data right. I am hopeful that the passage of the FCC Reauthorization Act will help folks in rural areas get the wireless coverage they need.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who has been a real leader on telecommunications issues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my strongest, deepest sympathies and condolences to Ray Baum's family on his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act, to reauthorize the FCC for the first time in 28 years. This important legislation also provides transparency and efficiency reforms, including language from my bill, H.R. 2636, to create an independent inspector general for the FCC.

Currently, the IG is not only appointed by the chairman, but also reports to and is under general supervision of the Chairman of the Commission. This legislation would require the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint the inspector general. It is simply good governance and a matter of transparency and accountability to have an independent IG.

Importantly, this legislation also creates and authorizes a broadcast repack fund to address the anticipated shortfall in funding available to relocate broadcasters who are displaced from the most recent spectrum auction. It is important that we provide the funding necessary to successfully relocate these broadcasters and ensure an efficient and timely transition.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to reauthorize the FCC.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WALDEN, Ranking Member PALLONE, and the committee for their hard work on this bipartisan bill.

This legislation includes my bill, H.R. 5007, the Tribal Broadband Deployment Act, which will direct the FCC to improve broadband access on Tribal lands within 30 months.

For the communities in my congressional district, California's 36th District, and throughout our Nation, this will be a game changer. Throughout the Coachella Valley, the San Jacinto

Mountain communities, and the Pass regions of California, rural, underdeveloped Tribal lands are spread out among non-Tribal communities, both of which are often lacking broadband internet and both of which will benefit.

My bill will bring real resources and opportunities to these areas, improving connectivity and helping to close the digital divide in these historically underserved communities. With expanding access to the internet, families, students, workers, and businesses will be able to harness the power of their ideas and information to achieve their dreams and grow our local economies.

I want to thank Chairman BLACKBURN for honoring her commitment to work with me on this issue.

I urge the House to pass this important bipartisan bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), a very important member of our committee.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018, named after the late Ray Baum, who dedicated his life to public service.

Mr. Speaker, this bill includes important provisions to modernize our telecommunications agencies and to craft policies that will fuel next generation services like gigabit service and 5G networks. We are going to increase access to information and services for millions of Americans with this bill, Mr. Speaker.

5G networks mean doctors can more effectively treat patients that live hours away from the closest hospital, automated vehicles can offer mobility to our Nation's most vulnerable, small or rural businesses can compete beyond their local markets, and it means that first responders can more quickly reopen critical lines of communications in the aftermath of a natural disaster.

By passing this bill, we can fully realize the benefits of an interconnected and increasingly wireless world. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4986.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

This bill, I think, is an example of the politics and legislation that Ray Baum would be particularly proud of, characterizing his work as a policymaker and a policy adviser.

I had a chance to work with Ray in his other hats: chairing the Public Utilities Commission, as a distinguished legislator and majority leader, and, of course, his role here in Congress.

I appreciate the product we have before us today. I have enjoyed listening to people reaffirm areas that they are proud of, making a difference for people.

I appreciate, in particular, the authorization of new spending to help broadcasters' expenses relating to spectrum reallocation. This is very important, especially for public broadcasting stations.

But I want to raise one item of concern, and I hope the chairman and ranking member would work with us to look at the bill's study of spectrum for commercial uses dealing with the mid-band, or C-band, to consider public broadcasting.

I fear that if we are thrust into competitive bidding with public broadcasting, they are likely to not be able to compete effectively. But it will affect millions of people across the country.

I applaud the committee's bipartisanism and work with the Senate, but I hope that future consideration of the impact of C-band reallocation on public broadcasting would be something that the committee could look at to make sure that we are protecting those vital interests.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would concur with my friend's comments. I am happy to work on these issues involving spectrum. I know there are multiple uses around, and we want to make sure that those using these frequencies are not disadvantaged. I look forward to working with the gentleman on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. He also happens to have a pretty important title around here as the whip of the House. He has been very involved in telecommunications policies since he first came on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership working together in a very bipartisan way to bring forward RAY BAUM'S Act. Not only is this piece of legislation important to reauthorize the FCC and the important work that they do, but it also is a fitting tribute to Ray Baum himself and, in so many ways, to all of the work that our great staffs do to allow this Capitol to work properly and to allow Congress to work for the American people.

It doesn't just take Members of Congress, but an incredibly dedicated and talented staff, and each of us are blessed to have wonderful staffs—I am surely no exception—who allow us to do our jobs so well. The fact that we are using this legislation to pay tribute to Ray Baum and all of the staff of the Capitol, I think, is equally important that we do just this.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump challenged Congress to make the Federal Government more accountable to the American people and to eliminate red tape that hurts job creation and economic growth. The RAY BAUM'S Act does just that.

First of all, we meet those two goals by doing a number of things. The legislation will reauthorize the Federal Communications Commission for the first time in 28 years.

The FCC does important work for our country, especially in the telecommunications arena. I am proud to continue to serve on the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, which is one of the great examples of United States dominance—America is the dominant force in technology—and it is important that we have fair rules of the game. The FCC is that arbiter. The fact that they haven't been reauthorized for 28 years, I think, it is long past due that we get this done. We also make critical reforms that will modernize the agencies with tools that it needs to meet the demands of consumers for the 21st century.

This legislation creates an important backstop for our local radio and TV broadcasters who have been completing the final stage of the incentive auction. This keeps America on track to be the global leader on 5G communications by implementing new spectrum policy.

This is something our committee has led on. The country needs more spectrum. We have been able to find creative ways to free up more spectrum so that billions of dollars of private sector investment can be used to build out these great networks in 3G, 4G, and, now, 5G so that we can continue to advance technology.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank Chairwoman BLACKBURN for including the FCC Consolidated Reporting Act that I worked so closely on with Senator HELLER for years to try to get this legislation passed. This is included as part of this legislation. This will provide relief to so many job creators and to the FCC by consolidating and eliminating so many outdated reporting requirements.

What do I mean by eliminating outdated reporting requirements, Mr. Speaker?

How often do we hear about things that are on the books, laws that are on the books that are so outdated and so unnecessary? This is one of the reports that we are outdated in this bill.

Right now, there is still, on the books, a requirement that the FCC report on the annual competition within the telegraph industry. Mr. Speaker, that is right.

Since Samuel Morse invented the telegraph back in the 1830s, that might have been important in the 1800s, even in the early 1900s; but the fact that today, in 2018, there is still a requirement that the FCC issue a report on competition within the telegraph industry is a glaring example of why it is

so important for us to update our laws and eliminate outdated laws.

We are getting rid of this ridiculous requirement and a number of other unnecessary and ridiculous requirements like that so that we can free the FCC up to do the important work they need to do.

□ 1515

So, again, I commend the chairman for the work that he has done in a very bipartisan way to bring forth the RAY BAUM'S Act, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), who has been a very important member of our committee and active on these issues, and he had a provision in this legislation as well.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to start off by remembering Ray Baum, whom this legislation is named after, very appropriately, and I thank the chairman for sharing him with us. As was correctly stated by the whip, we appreciate the staff that does so much work for us. Leaders like Ray Baum are special. He will be missed, but we will carry on in his memory and in the quality of service that he supplied.

The RAY BAUM'S Act does something that hasn't been done in over 28 years: it reauthorized the Federal Communications Commission. It is amazing to think that we have a commission as important as that and it hasn't been authorized—or reauthorized, or reauthorized. It is time to do it and bring it up to this century, as well, and beyond.

This bipartisan bill is good, forward-thinking policy that modernizes the FCC to ensure it is more transparent, efficient, and able to tackle the issues of the 21st century. It maintains the credibility of spectrum auctions and the promise the FCC made to Michigan broadcasters.

It paves the way for new spectrum auctions that will allow for the United States to maintain its leadership in developing and deploying technologies such as 5G and, ultimately, win the race to 5G.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Additionally, it requires the FCC to report to Congress on its efforts to promote broadband internet access for veterans, especially low-income and rural veterans.

I would love to have broadband to my home, as well.

This bill is critical for consumers and our Nation's telecommunications infrastructure, and I urge its passage today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say, again, that this bill is a bipartisan bill. There has been a lot of work done on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the fact that we are able to accomplish this and also include a lot of initiatives from Members on both sides of the aisle. And, again, as a tribute to Ray Baum and all that he did for us over the many years, I am proud to say that we enthusiastically support the bill and urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New Jersey for his good work on this legislation and his kind words in memory of our mutual friend, Ray Baum.

I think it would be appropriate, as well, to thank the staff who put so much work into this, including Robin Colwell, Tim Kurth, Sean Farrell, Lauren McCarty, Evan Viau, and Elena Hernandez on the Republican side, and David Goldman, Gerald Leverich, and Dan Miller on the minority side. We thank all of them for working both here and on the Senate side.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to quickly go through the provisions again, because this really is important.

For more than a quarter of a century, the FCC has not been reauthorized. We do that here, thanks to Chairwoman BLACKBURN's legislation.

Second, we take care of our broadcasters, both public and private, and their translators, including FM translators as well as public broadcasting.

Mr. PALLONE has been a long champion of the repack effort and, of course, his SANDY legislation.

You heard from Mr. SCALISE on the legislation to consolidate redundant and outdated FCC reports: get rid of the ones we don't need, streamline the rest, and bring efficiency.

Mr. JOHNSON's legislation to establish an independent inspector general at the FCC, this is just good government we can all embrace.

Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS' legislation gives the chief information officer of the FCC the authority to play a significant role in planning, budgeting, and programming.

Congresswoman GRACE MENG's bill to prohibit spoofing calls or texts originating outside the U.S., plus an 18-month shot clock, is put on the FCC to conduct rulemaking in this matter. I think we are all kind of getting tired of those spoofs we get on our phones. It looks like they are coming from our hometowns, and it turns out they are not. We are going to try to get to the bottom of this and have the FCC work to do that.

Congressman GUTHRIE and Congresswoman MATSU's bill to include a spectrum auction deposit fix, this will actually allow future actions to go for-

ward legally. They couldn't do that under existing law because of an interpretation, and so we fixed that. That was very, very important.

Congressmen MCNERNEY and KINZINGER's legislation to require the FCC to report to Congress on promoting internet excess for veterans, we all know how important that is, especially those low-income veterans in our rural communities.

Congressman LOEBACK's legislation to improve mapping methodology for mobile coverage, we need to know where we have service in America and where we don't and have numbers we can trust.

Representative RUIZ's legislation is very, very important, dealing with broadband in Tribal areas and carrying out rulemaking to address unserved Tribal areas. We have lots of Tribal areas in our country that lack service.

ANNA ESHOO's legislation to provide further improvements on 911 caller information that builds on Kari's Law that we have already approved, that is really, really important.

And, again, ELIOT ENGEL's legislation requires the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, the NTIA, to study and consider how the agency can best coordinate the interagency process following cybersecurity incidents.

It just goes on and on, including Senator THUNE's MOBILE NOW Act that will help us move forward on 5G.

So, as you can see, this is comprehensive, thoughtful, well-written legislation on telecommunications, moves our country forward, reauthorizes the FCC, and is a fitting tribute to my friend and our policy leader, Mr. Ray Baum from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act, the first FCC reauthorization in 28 years, named for our dear friend, the late Ray Baum.

This bill is the product of many long hours of hard work to achieve a bipartisan, bicameral compromise. While no bill is perfect, this legislation contains many solid policy advancements for digital communications in the 21st century.

I'm especially glad to see two bills I've championed for many years included in this package, 'Dig Once' which I first introduced in 2009, and the RESPONSE Act, which I first introduced in 2010. Broadband is essential for every community in our country to function today, just as the physical roads and bridges we travel on are. For nearly a decade, I've been pushing for a 'Dig Once' policy, a commonsense proposal to ensure broadband conduit is included in the buildout of roads and highways when they're being built and where there's a demonstrated need for broadband access, rather than tearing up roads later. Dig Once will enable states to make it easier for broadband providers to enter new and underserved markets by laying the broadband conduit during construction.

H.R. 4986 also includes the RESPONSE Act that ensures that multi-line telephones commonly found in office buildings and hotels are equipped with location accuracy technologies. This is essential for responders to locate a 911 caller in a large building as quickly as possible because lives are literally on the line and every second counts. This provision will help save lives.

I'm disappointed that the FCC Collaboration Act was excluded from the final version of H.R. 4986. This is another bipartisan, commonsense proposal that I have consistently introduced since 2009. It passed out of the Communications and Technology subcommittee, the full Energy and Commerce committee, and previously passed the full House, all with bipartisan support. All of the former Democratic and Republican FCC members have supported this policy one hundred percent. It's unfortunate that despite such broad support, this provision was stripped from the final bill despite our work in Committee.

I also want to express my concerns about some parts of the bill which consolidate the FCC's reporting on issues like price hikes, competition, and program diversity, and the scaling back of provisions on critical unlicensed spectrum. I worry that we'll regret weakening these public interest policies. Nonetheless, I support H.R. 4986 as a set of largely positive developments for consumers, policymakers, and many other stakeholders in the communications marketplace. I want to thank Chairman Walden for his hard work on this, and urge my colleagues to vote YES on H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act of 2018.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4986, the RAY BAUM'S Act.

This important, bipartisan legislation will reauthorize the Federal Communications Commission for the first time in 28 years and includes reforms that will make the FCC more efficient and transparent.

Today's bill includes provisions based on the Radio Consumer Protection Act, legislation I was proud to introduce with Congressman BILL FLORES of Texas last September, that will reimburse radio broadcasters for costs related to the FCC's spectrum auction.

The creation of the Broadcast Repack Fund and the FM Broadcast Station Relocation Fund in this legislation will help ensure that television and radio broadcasters will not be hit with the full cost of moving or adjusting transmitters and antennas, installation, and other costs that are part of the spectrum repack.

The RAY BAUM'S Act, additionally, will provide \$50 million to help educate consumers about the broadcaster repack and help make sure that the viewing and listening public continues to have access to important local news, weather, and emergency alerts provided by our local broadcasters.

Finally, I was happy to see the inclusion of a provision that will make the FCC's Inspector General independent of the Chairman of the Commission. IG investigations, regardless of the party in power, must be independent of the individuals they are empowered to investigate.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in support of the RAY BAUM'S Act.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4986, RAY BAUM'S Act, to reauthorize the FCC. I am particularly pleased to see that we are addressing potential problems imposed upon our nation's radio broadcasters as a result of the 2012 spectrum repack.

That auction has been a tremendous catalyst for broadband deployment, but it created unintended consequences. Many radio stations that are co-located on TV towers could be forced to shut down during spectrum relocation. With 670 radio stations possibly being impacted, we must ensure our local radio stations are protected in a process from which they will receive no benefit.

I appreciate the inclusion of section 603, which makes funds available for radio broadcasters to address this problem. This section incorporates the fundamentals of the bill that Representative GENE GREEN and I introduced in H.R. 3685, the Radio Consumer Protection Act. Our bipartisan bill established a radio protection fund to reimburse impacted stations for their costs incurred as a result of the repack.

I am also appreciative of the addition of FM translators in section 603. Many FM and AM stations rely on these translators to provide service in rural and remote areas across America. Passage of H.R. 4986, ensures that the spectrum repack fund will include FM translators.

In closing, I think it is fitting that H.R. 4986 is named the "RAY BAUM'S Act" in honor of the former staff director of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Ray Baum. Ray dedicated his life to serving the people of Oregon and the people of this country. It has been more than 25 years since Congress last reauthorized the FCC and I can think of no better way to honor Ray.

I urge support for H.R. 4986.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4986, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reauthorize appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLITICAL APPOINTEE BURROWING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1132) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a 2-year prohibition on employment in a career civil service position for any former political appointee, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1132

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON EMPLOYMENT OF POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN CAREER CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 3115. Employment of political appointees

"(a) APPOINTMENT APPROVAL REQUIRED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not appoint any individual described in paragraph (5) to a career position within the agency without receiving prior written approval from the Associate Director of Merit Systems Accountability and Compliance, consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

"(2) REQUEST.—The head of an agency shall submit a request to the Associate Director to approve the appointment of any individual described in paragraph (5) to a career position. Any such request shall include certification by the head of the agency to the Associate Director that the appointment is necessary for the agency to meet its mission.

"(3) REVIEW AND DETERMINATION.—The Associate Director shall review any request received pursuant to paragraph (2) and deny any such request unless the Associate Director determines that the appointment process with respect to the request was fair, open, and free from political influence. If the Associate Director makes that determination, the Associate Director may approve the request.

"(4) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—With respect to any request approved under paragraph (3), the Associate Director shall, not less than five days before the date the Associate Director provides approval to the head of the requesting agency, provide to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate the agency certification under paragraph (2) and the agency head's rationale for that certification.

"(5) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—An individual described in this paragraph is—

"(A) a political appointee;

"(B) a former political appointee who held any political position during the five-year period before the date of the request described in paragraph (2); or

"(C) at the discretion of the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, a former political appointee who held any political position before the five-year period described in subparagraph (B).

"(b) RESTRICTION ON APPOINTMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other law, rule, or regulation, during the 2-year period following the date a political appointee leaves or departs from a political position, such appointee may not be appointed to any career position in the civil service.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a political appointee who has not personally and substantially participated in any particular matter while employed in a political position.

"(c) APPLICATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the appointment of an individual who is—

"(1) entitled to reinstatement under section 3593(b); or

"(2) eligible for reinstatement under section 3593(a).

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the term 'agency' has the meaning given the term 'Executive agency' in section 105;

"(2) the term 'Associate Director' means the Associate Director of Merit Systems Accountability and Compliance at the Office of Personnel Management;

"(3) the term 'political appointee' means an individual serving in an appointment of any duration to a political position;

"(4) the term 'political position' means—

"(A) a position with respect to which appointment is made—

"(i) by the President; or

"(ii) by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(B) a position which has been excepted from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character;

"(C) a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 (relating to the Executive Schedule); and

"(D) a general position in the Senior Executive Service during such time as it is filled by—

"(i) a noncareer appointee, as defined in paragraph (7) of section 3132(a); or

"(ii) a limited term appointee or limited emergency appointee, as defined in paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 3132(a), who is serving under a political appointment.

"(5) the term 'career position' means—

"(A) a position in the competitive service filled by career or career-conditional appointment;

"(B) a position in the excepted service filled by an appointment of equivalent tenure as a position described in subparagraph (A);

"(C) a career reserved position, as defined in paragraph (8) of section 3132(a), in the Senior Executive Service; or

"(D) a general position in the Senior Executive Service when filled by a career appointee, as defined in section 3132(a)(4);

"(6) the term 'participated' means an action taken as an officer or employee through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or other such action; and

"(7) the term 'particular matter' includes any investigation, application, request for a ruling or determination, rulemaking, contract, controversy, claim, charge, accusation, arrest, or judicial or other proceeding."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 3114 the following:

"3115. Employment of political appointees."

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT REQUESTS.—Section 3115(a) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to any appointment or request for appointment described in such section submitted to the Associate Director of Merit Systems Accountability and Compliance after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENTS.—Section 3115(b) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to any individual who leaves or departs from a political position (as that term is defined in section 3115(c)(2) of such title, as added by such subsection) after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue regulations necessary to carry out this Act. Such regulations shall include guidance on the definition of the term "personally and substantially participated in a particular matter" in section 3115(b)(2) of title 5, United

States Code, as added by subsection (a), consistent with section 2641.201 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1132, the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, Representative BUCK.

This important bill will protect the integrity of the civil service and ensure the American people are served by a competent, nonpolitical career workforce.

Under current law, each administration appoints a political staff to help advance the administration's political goals. These political employees leave at the end of the administration to make way for the next administration's appointees.

In contrast, the career civil service is designed to carry over from administration to administration. These employees should be hired based on their qualifications and promoted based on their performance. Despite the significant differences between the two types of positions, however, political appointees are currently allowed to convert to career positions. This practice is known as "burrowing."

As the Government Accountability Office explained: "Circumstances surrounding conversions can raise questions as to whether the individuals selected experienced favoritism or enjoyed an unfair advantage in the selection process."

GAO went on to say: "Any appearance of this could compromise the merit system's integrity."

H.R. 1132, the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act, will enact in law the requirement for OPM to review political conversions.

The bill also raises the bar for political conversions, requiring an agency certify the conversion is necessary to meet its mission. To ensure Congress can continue to monitor for abuse, the certification must be provided to Congress before it is approved.

Finally, the bill prohibits political conversions within 2 years of leaving a political appointment. This ensures

sufficient time has passed between when political appointees finish their appointment and when they may become a career employee.

In closing, this bill protects the integrity of the merit-based system so career politicians stay free of politics. The American people deserve nothing less.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is H.R. 1132, the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act, as amended.

I want to thank my friends on the majority for working with us to improve this bill since its consideration by the committee. Because of the improvements we have been able to make, I support moving this bill forward in the legislative process; however, I continue to believe that some further changes may be needed.

The bill would make it very difficult to hire former political appointees into career positions in the Federal Government. It would prohibit hiring a former political appointee into a career position for 2 years after that individual held a political position.

It would also add significant hurdles for agencies seeking to hire an applicant to a career position who separated from a political appointment in the last 5 years. The agency would be required to certify to the Office of Personnel Management that the appointment is "necessary to the agency's ability to meet its mission."

There are several controls already in place to ensure that the process used to hire former political appointees into career positions is fair, open, and based on merit. For example, the Office of Personnel Management must ensure, right now, that the appointment process was free from political influence and report the results of its reviews to Congress.

A February 2017 report found that OPM reviewed just 16 requests by agencies to hire former political appointees from October 1, 2016, through January 20, 2017, and did not find any reason to deny any of those requests.

We all want the best people in the Federal service, and there should be no undue favoritism in the hiring process.

In comments on this bill, OPM suggested that certain provisions may conflict with the merit system principles that have formed the basis of the Federal civil service for over a century. That issue should be clarified before this bill becomes enacted into law.

Nonetheless, we support the spirit with which the bill is offered us today, and we have no objections to the legislation in front of us.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colo-

rado (Mr. BUCK), the sponsor of the bill and my esteemed colleague.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for the time today to talk about this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on behalf of the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act. This important legislation addresses a problem affecting our Federal workforce.

Our Federal civil service hiring process is supposed to be a competitive, merit-based system where the best and brightest individuals are considered based on their qualifications and ability to do their job, not because of their political connections. However, we have seen a concerning trend where accepted service employees, specifically political appointees, are converted into high-paying, lifelong civil service positions, bypassing the normal competitive hiring process.

This process, also known as "burrowing," defeats the purpose of having a nonpartisan, merit-based civil service. In fact, the Government Accountability Office reports that the Obama administration converted 78 political appointments into career positions, while the Bush administration allowed 135 political appointees to burrow into career positions.

This trend raises significant concerns that individuals who were not chosen based solely on their merits may, at best, not be the most qualified candidate for the job, or, at worst, may not be willing to properly execute the law under a new administration.

□ 1530

Political appointees are supposed to serve their appointing President's agenda for a temporary period of time. Part of their duty to the Nation is to know when it is time to step down from their position of power.

Congress must act to ensure this principle is upheld and to protect the independence of our merit-based civil service. That is why I, along with my friend and colleague, Representative TED LIEU, have offered an equitable solution to ensure this problem is stopped in its tracks.

Our bill, the Political Appointee Burrowing Prevention Act, places a 2-year ban on political appointees being hired for any job in the civil service after they depart a political position.

Additionally, the bill ensures that after the 2-year ban is completed, the head of the agency seeking to employ the individual must submit a written request to OPM detailing why hiring a former appointee is necessary to the agency's mission.

Furthermore, OPM is instructed to deny the application unless the agency head can prove why it is necessary to hire this individual instead of an applicant from the merit-based hiring pool.

This commonsense bill ensures that our Federal workforce is filled with career civil servants who are the most

qualified, not the most politically connected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation that ensures our Federal workforce is being selected by merit, not by political patronage.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I do support the bill in the spirit in which this bill is offered. I think we want to make sure we preserve the integrity of the civil service system that we have worked so hard to build in this country, where we build in integrity and we avoid nepotism and favoritism and political connections over merit.

One caveat, though, as I mentioned: once in a while, there may be a political appointee who is the best thing since sliced bread, who brings a level of expertise that we need, and we don't want to make it harder to look at those credentials on their merits. I know that is not the intention of the bill, but it may be one of the unintended consequences, and that is what we want to just make sure we are not doing as we move forward, but with that, I support the bill.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1132, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL MEDIA USE IN CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS ACT OF 2017

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3737) to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3737

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. STUDY ON USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA IN SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on the examination of social media activity during security clearance investigations, including—

(1) the current use of publicly available social media in security clearance background investigations;

(2) any legal impediments to examining publicly available social media activity, and whether those impediments are statutory or regulatory in nature;

(3) the results of any pilot programs to incorporate social media checks in such investigations, including the effectiveness and cost of such programs;

(4) options for widespread implementation of the examination of social media activity during such investigations; and

(5) estimates on the cost for such options as part of—

(A) all Top Secret investigations; or
(B) all Secret and Top Secret investigations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3737, the Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act of 2017, introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Representative DESANTIS.

According to the Pew Research Center, 7 in 10 Americans use social media today. A significant portion of those Americans' personal and professional interactions occur online. It is just common sense that the government should check the social media of individuals who apply for security clearances, but it doesn't.

H.R. 3737 will move the government toward implementing checks of social media for individuals we trust with our country's most sensitive information.

The bill requires a study of the use of social media in security clearance investigations to inform government-wide implementation of social media checks. The study will provide comprehensive information on existing pilot programs, lessons learned, and costs.

We must begin the process of strengthening the system now, and that starts with determining best practices for moving forward.

H.R. 3737 will help ensure that government checks social media before issuing security clearances.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is long overdue and recognizes the internet world in which we live and operate.

This bill would require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to issue a report to Congress on the use of social media checks in background investigations for security clearances.

In recent years, a number of agencies have begun pilot programs to help develop the best methods of incorporating social media into those background checks. For example, the Army initiated a pilot program that found that while checking social media is a valuable tool, it can be costly and may raise some legal issues.

This bill would require that OPM conduct a comprehensive study on those issues and report back to the Congress. This one-time report would describe the current uses of social media postings for investigative purposes and any legal concerns or impediments that may arise. In addition, the report would summarize the results of any pilot programs on the use of social media conducted to date and provide cost estimates for implementing their widespread use in background investigative processes.

The report would greatly assist Congress, I believe, in determining whether further legislative action is needed when it comes to the Federal Government's use of social media in background investigations.

This bill was approved without opposition by our committee, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, last year, and I certainly commend it to our colleagues today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. LYNCH for their leadership on what I think is a commonsense measure that will actually improve the process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the private sector, if an employer is going to hire somebody, a lot of times they will do a Google search, they will check social media postings to try to learn a little bit more about this prospective employee.

It may be hard to believe, but the Federal Government often fails to conduct a simple internet search on individuals before they are trusted with a security clearance.

Publicly available social media is one of the best ways to understand an individual's interests and intentions, but our investigatory process still focuses on interviewing the applicant's family, friends, and neighbors. For over a decade, various agencies, including the Office of Personnel Management, have conducted studies and pilot programs to assess the effectiveness of social media checks in security clearance investigations. Congress has not been provided those results.

What this bill will do is it will require these agencies to identify best practices so that we can use this going forward to make sure that the people who are employed by this government, armed with a security clearance, who have access to sensitive information that puts the security of the country at risk, that these are people whom we want to have there and they are not folks who have ulterior designs.

A lot of times it is going to be much more informative to look at their publicly available writings than to talk to somebody who may have lived next door to them in an apartment 10 years ago.

I think that this bill is overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) for cosponsoring it for me, and I am proud to be here today as the sponsor. I think this should have bipartisan support. I think it will give us some good answers and we can move forward and modernize this process.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we think this is a commonsense bill. I agree with the sentiments just expressed by our friend from Florida that, in today's day and age, we can't not take cognizance of social media, and it can be a useful tool in evaluating someone's security clearance application.

We also understand it could be a tool that is used to invade people's privacy, and we want to avoid that. That is why what this bill does is call for a report looking at all of the legal ramifications and the practicality of utilizing this tool to get to a better outcome in the process of security clearances.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and commend it to our colleagues.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3737.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4043) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4043

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Whistleblower Protection Extension Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by striking "Ombudsman who shall educate agency employees—" and inserting the following: "Coordinator who shall—

"(i) educate agency employees—";

(C) in subclause (I), as so redesignated, by striking "on retaliation" and inserting "against retaliation";

(D) in subclause (II), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: "; including—

"(aa) the means by which employees may seek review of any allegation of reprisal, including the roles of the Office of the Inspector General, the Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and any other relevant entities; and

"(bb) general information about the timeliness of such cases, the availability of any alternative dispute mechanisms, and avenues for potential relief;"; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) assist the Inspector General in promoting the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures and allegations of reprisal, to the extent practicable, by the Inspector General; and

"(iii) assist the Inspector General in facilitating communication and coordination with the Special Counsel, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the agency, Congress, and any other relevant entity regarding the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures, allegations of reprisal, and general matters regarding the implementation and administration of whistleblower protection laws, rules, and regulations.";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "Ombudsman" and inserting "Coordinator";

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) The Whistleblower Protection Coordinator shall have direct access to the Inspector General as needed to accomplish the requirements of this subsection."

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CIGIE.—Section 11(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.—The Council shall—

"(A) facilitate the work of the Whistleblower Protection Coordinators designated under section 3(d)(C); and

"(B) in consultation with the Office of Special Counsel and Whistleblower Protection Coordinators from the member offices of the Inspector General, develop best practices for coordination and communication in promoting the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures, allegations of reprisal, and general matters regarding the implementation and administration of whistleblower protection laws, in accordance with Federal law."

(c) REPORTING.—Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (20) to read as follows:

"(20)(A) a detailed description of any instance of whistleblower retaliation, including information about the official found to have engaged in retaliation; and

"(B) what, if any, consequences the establishment actually imposed to hold the official described in subparagraph (A) accountable;"; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(D), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) whether the establishment entered into a settlement agreement with the official described in subsection (a)(20)(A), which shall be reported regardless of any confidentiality agreement relating to the settlement agreement; and"

(d) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 117 of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-199; 126 Stat. 1475) is repealed.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on November 26, 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4043, the Whistleblower Protection Extension Act, a bill I introduced with Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

The Whistleblower Protection Extension Act reauthorizes the whistleblower ombudsman program.

Whistleblowers are the front line of defense against waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government, but too many Federal employees are unaware of the laws that protect them and the options available for dealing with retaliation and other actions intended to silence them.

To address this problem, Congress created the ombudsman program in 2012. The program directs agency inspectors general to designate an ombudsman for whistleblower protections at the agency. They provide information to employees on whistleblower protections and remedies in the event of retaliation.

This program was originally a component of the 2012 Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act and was set to expire after 5 years. Over the past 5 years, the ombudsman program has received high marks from the inspector general community. This benefits the country as a whole and makes the Federal Government more efficient. For that reason, it is imperative that we pass H.R. 4043 and make the ombudsman program permanent.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the need for this bill comes into recent focus just today with reports, maybe unconfirmed, that one of the Trump Cabinet members is engaged in a witch hunt against a whistleblower. We need this kind of protection.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4043, the Whistleblower Protection Extension Act.

Representative BLUM and Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS introduced this bill to extend the pilot program that requires every inspector general's office to have a liaison dedicated to assisting whistleblowers.

Under this legislation, the whistleblower protection coordinator would help educate agency employees about whistleblower protection laws. This bill would help employees who want to blow the whistle know their rights, and it would put agency management on notice that it is against the law to retaliate against whistleblowers.

This bill would require whistleblower protection coordinators to provide whistleblowers who have suffered retaliation information about options available to them to have their allegations evaluated.

□ 1545

No matter how strong we make our whistleblower protection laws, they will not help if whistleblowers do not know how to exercise their rights under those laws.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bipartisan measure to strengthen whistleblower protections. I urge passage of this commonsense bill, this good government bill coming out of our committee. I thank my friend from Iowa for collaborating with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) on this commonsense piece of legislation, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4043, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING GOVERNMENT-FUNDED OIL-PAINTING ACT

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 188) to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 188

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Eliminating Government-funded Oil-painting Act" or the "EGO Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PORTRAITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1355. Prohibition on use of funds for portraits

"(a) No funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Federal Government may be used to pay for the painting of a portrait of an officer or employee of the Federal Government, including the President, the Vice President, a Member of Congress, the head of an executive agency, or the head of an office of the legislative branch.

"(b) In this section—

"(1) the term 'executive agency' has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41; and

"(2) the term 'Member of Congress' includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter III of chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1354 the following new item:

"1355. Prohibition on use of funds for portraits."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration, including an exchange of letters on the House companion bill, H.R. 1701, between the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 188, the Eliminating Government-Funded Oil-Painting Act, a bill introduced by Senator BILL CASSIDY. In years past, the Federal Government spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on portraits of government officials. Taxpayer funds should be invested in programs that benefit taxpayers and our country, not oil paintings of Cabinet members to boost their egos.

That is why today we consider S. 188, the Eliminating Government-Funded Oil-Painting Act, otherwise known as the "EGO Act." The EGO Act makes clear, once and for all, that government agencies cannot spend taxpayer dollars on oil paintings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, December 6, 2017.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,

Chairman, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On September 13, 2017, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 1701, the "Eliminating Government-funded Oil-painting Act" with an amendment, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on House Administration.

I ask that you allow the Committee on House Administration to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on House Administration represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, Washington, DC, December 6, 2017.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,

Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1701. As you know, the bill was received in the House of Representatives on March 23, 2017, and referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and in addition to the Committee on the Committee on House Administration. The bill seeks to restrict funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Federal Government from being used to pay for the painting of a portrait of an officer or employee of the Federal Government,

including the President, the Vice President, a Member of Congress, the head of an executive agency, or the head of an office of the legislative branch. On September 13, 2017, your Committee ordered H.R. 1701 to be reported with an amendment by voice vote.

I realize that discharging the Committee on House Administration from further consideration of H.R. 1701 will serve in the best interest of the House of Representatives and agree to do so. It is the understanding of the Committee on House Administration that forgoing action on H.R. 1701 will not prejudice the Committee with respect to appointment of conferees or any future jurisdictional claim. I request that your letter and this response be included in the bill report filed by your Committee, as well as in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

GREGG HARPER,
Chairman.

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

This is a sad day in the swamp, to eliminate oil paintings of men and women who consider themselves very important, to make sure that taxpayer funds are never used for such a thing; sad day for the swamp in Washington.

One can come to the Capitol and look at oil paintings that bestride every corridor and wall, in hearing rooms here in the Capitol, and not know most of these people. We haven't got a clue who most of them are. We recognize John Adams, but when we go to committee hearing rooms, one or two chairmen past, we often don't know who they are.

I guess it was an attempt to achieve immortality, but it really is an act of ego that is a little embarrassing, even for Washington, D.C.

This is an important bill, a common-sense bill, that brings us all back to Earth; that none of us is expendable and that, frankly, we make our contribution and we move on.

This bill strikes at the uncontrolled egos and, I hope, sends a message to those narcissists among us that they can stay that way if they wish, but the taxpayer is not going to pay for their oil painting.

I thank my friend from Iowa for bringing up the bill. I support the bill, and urge its passage.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the gentleman from Virginia aware that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close. I enjoy my colleague from Virginia's rather dry sense of wit and humor.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Iowa, with whom I share a dry sense of humor. I will remind him, being Irish, that leprechauns are always on the shoulder, especially this time of year.

Mr. Speaker, I like this bill. I think most taxpayers are going to like this bill. I think it is high time we acted on

this kind of improvement and injected a sense of humility and humanity into our enterprise here in the United States Capitol. I urge passage of this bill.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 188, the Eliminating Government-funded Oil-painting Act, an acronym for the EGO Act.

S. 188 is the Senate companion to H.R. 1401, legislation that I introduced along with Representatives JIM BRIDENSTINE, CHERI BUSTOS, WALTER JONES, LEONARD LANCE, DAVID MCKINLEY, PETE OLSON, and TOM RICE.

My friend and former House colleague, Senator BILL CASSIDY, is the lead sponsor of S. 188 which passed the Senate unanimously on September 18, 2017.

The EGO Act would prohibit Federal funds from being used to pay for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government. Federal agencies have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on portraits that are displayed within agency buildings, often in secure locations that are not open to the public. Although this money is only a fraction of a percentage of the federal budget, it represents a failure to exercise fiscal restraint. Every dollar the government spends on vanity projects for federal officials is a dollar that is not spent improving the lives of everyday Americans.

Congress has the responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being used efficiently and effectively. For these reasons, I am proud to sponsor the EGO Act, and urge the House to pass S. 188, sending it to the President's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 188, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 4607; and

Passage of H.R. 4607, if ordered.

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

electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 4607) to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 228, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—182

Adams	Eshoo	Maloney,
Aguilar	Espallat	Carolyn B.
Barragán	Esty (CT)	Maloney, Sean
Bass	Evans	Matsui
Beatty	Foster	McCollum
Bera	Frankel (FL)	McEachin
Beyer	Fudge	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	McNerney
Blum	Gallego	Meeks
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Meng
Blunt Rochester	Gomez	Moore
Bonamici	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Boyle, Brendan	Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)
F.	Green, Al	Nadler
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Napolitano
Brown (MD)	Gutiérrez	Neal
Brownley (CA)	Hanabusa	Norcross
Bustos	Hastings	O'Halleran
Butterfield	Heck	O'Rourke
Capuano	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Carbajal	Himes	Panetta
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Pascrell
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Payne
Cartwright	Jayapal	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Chu, Judy	Jones	Pingree
Cicilline	Kaptur	Pocan
Clark (MA)	Keating	Price (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Clay	Kennedy	Raskin
Clyburn	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Cohen	Kihuen	Richmond
Connolly	Kildee	Rosen
Cooper	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Correa	Kind	Ruiz
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Rush
Crist	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Davis, Danny	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
DeGette	Lee	Schneider
Delaney	Levin	Schrader
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
DelBene	Lipinski	Scott, David
Demings	Loeb	Serrano
DeSaulnier	Loeb	Sewell (AL)
Deutch	Lofgren	Sherman
Dingell	Lowenthal	Sinema
Doggett	Lowey	Sires
Doyle, Michael	Lujan Grisham,	Slaughter
F.	M.	Smith (WA)
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Soto
Engel	Lynch	Speier

Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko

Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1617

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, YOHO, RENACCI, BRIDENSTINE, COLLINS of New York, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. MULLIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. NORCROSS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 143, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—264

ABRAHAM
ADERHOLT
ALLEN
AMASH
AMODEI
ARRINGTON
BABIN
BACON
BANKS (IN)
BARLETTA
BARR
BARTON
BERGMAN
BIGGS
BILIRAKIS
BISHOP (MI)
BISHOP (UT)
BLACK
BLACKBURN
BOST
BRADY (TX)
BRAT
BRIDENSTINE
BROOKS (AL)
BROOKS (IN)
BUCHANAN
BUCK
BUCSHON
BUDD
BYRNE
CALVERT
CARTER (GA)
CARTER (TX)
CHABOT
CHENEY
COFFMAN
COLE
COLLINS (GA)
COLLINS (NY)
COMER
COMSTOCK
CONAWAY
COOK
COSTELLO (PA)
CRAWFORD
CULBERSON
CURBELO (FL)
CURTIS
DAVIDSON
DAVIS, RODNEY
DENHAM
DENT
DESANTIS
DESJARLAIS
DIAZ-BALART
DONOVAN
DUFFY
DUNCAN (SC)
DUNCAN (TN)
DUNN
EMMER
ESTES (KS)
FARENTHOLD
FASO
FERGUSON
FITZPATRICK
FLEISCHMANN
FLORES
FORTENBERRY
FOX
FRELINGHUYSEN
GAETZ
GALLAGHER
GARRETT
GIANFORTE
GIBBS
GOODLATTE

NOT VOTING—20

Burgess
Clever
Cramer
Cummings
DeFazio
Gohmert
Green, Gene

Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Lieu, Ted
Marchant
Nolan
Olson
Pearce

Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Polis
Scalise
Shea-Porter
Stivers
Veasey
Walz

McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker

NAYS—143

Adams
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españat
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Higgins (NY)
Hoyer
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Krishnamoorthi
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Nadler

NOT VOTING—23

Black
Burgess
Clever
Cramer
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)

DeFazio
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Lieu, Ted

Stefanik
Stewart
Suozi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Black
Burgess
Clever
Cramer
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)

DeFazio
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Lieu, Ted

Marchant
Nolan
Olson
Pearce
Poe (TX)

Polis
Scalise

Shea-Porter
Stivers

Veasey
Walz

□ 1630

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

□ 1625

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 95.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 94 and "yea" on rollcall No. 95.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Val Butler Demings, am submitting my resignation from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in compliance with the Rules of the Democratic Caucus. It has been a privilege and honor to have served on this Committee.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

VAL BUTLER DEMINGS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 764

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Gomez (to rank immediately after Mr. Raskin), Mr. Welch, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. DeSaulnier, Ms. Plaskett, and Mr. Sarbanes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING MARVIN KAHN, FLORIDA CITRUS GROWER

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when you drive through Florida's heartland in Highlands County, you will probably see signs that say "Kahn Groves," and then you will drive through miles of citrus groves.

Marvin Kahn has been a passionate advocate for citrus over the last five decades, leading his management company from managing 400 acres to over 5,500 acres at its peak.

Mr. Kahn is one of the State's most innovative growers, caretakers, and marketers. He served on the Florida Citrus Commission for 8 years and worked on the long-range planning committee for several years after that. His devotion to Florida citrus and agriculture was real, and he did everything he could to share his passion with others, especially with young people.

Each year, the Florida Citrus Hall of Fame honors the most distinguished leaders who have made significant contributions to the Florida citrus industry, and there is no one more deserving of a spot on that hall of fame than Mr. Marvin Kahn. When it comes to serving Florida's agriculture industry, his passion for Florida's citrus is unparalleled.

Florida is a better place because of Mr. Kahn, and it has been an honor to serve him in the House of Representatives.

COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of death for men and women combined. It is a silent killer because the disease often has no signs or symptoms. Each year, more than 50,000 Americans die from colorectal cancer even though it is mostly preventable and treatable if caught early.

Six years ago today, my father, the late Congressman Donald Payne, died from colorectal cancer. Colorectal cancer screening just wasn't something people of his generation did.

Mr. Speaker, my father might have lived had he gotten tested for colorectal cancer. That is why each year I sponsor a resolution to recognize March as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month, a time to educate the public about the disease and the need for screening.

By educating people, increasing research funding, and making Medicare coverage better for seniors, we can save tens of thousands of lives each year.

I would rather not have to make this 1-minute speech every year, to have my father still be a Member of Congress from the 10th Congressional District.

MILITARY SAVE ACT

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Military SAVE Act.

Last year, the Department of Defense reported there were an estimated 20,300 military members who indicated they had experienced a sexual assault the year prior. Many of these military sexual trauma survivors expressed concerns that services available within the VA healthcare system did not meet their post-trauma needs.

This bill will now require the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish a 3-year pilot program to allow these survivors treatment related to their injuries from the provider of their choice. Then the VA will compare the care received from outside providers with the VA so that they can find ways to provide better care for MST survivors.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who is sexually assaulted should be able to receive the care that they need, and that stands true for the men and women protecting our Nation. Members of the military should be confident in the quality of care they receive from the VA, and this new bill, when it becomes law, would help the VA to improve the services that they offer.

INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I see my colleagues from the great South are here, and they should be listening very carefully as we discuss infrastructure. I might like to draw the attention of the House to this, if I might, a fellow that we know etched in marble at the FDR Memorial: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much"—keep in mind the tax bill that passed here and was signed by the President in January. "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

These are words to legislate by, wouldn't you say?

So I ask my colleagues to please keep this in mind and not leave right in the middle of a good discussion. If we are

to pay attention to what is important here, keep in mind those who have little.

It turns out that the great tax cut was probably best described by the President. Shortly after he signed the bill, he went down to his Mar-a-Lago club and told his friends who had gathered there, all of whom were the great beneficiaries of that tax cut: I have made you so much more wealthy.

Indeed, that is exactly what the tax cut did. It made the wealthy in America even more wealthy to the tune of several hundred billion dollars. The American corporations saw their tax rate fall from 35 to 20 percent, and the top income earners in America saw their tax rate go down by 2½ percent. It was marvelous if you have a great deal of money, because 80 percent-plus of the \$1.5 trillion—perhaps more—of the benefits went to the top 10 percent: American corporations and the super-wealthy.

Is there such a thing as trickle-down economics? Is there really a probability that the superwealthy are going to buy more cars and build new homes—palatial palaces—in America with all of the new money that they received? The answer is probably not in America but probably on some island somewhere where they can use the new tax breaks for foreign investment that are in this tax bill.

Oh, they were going to close the loopholes for corporations and individuals who wanted to go offshore. No, it didn't happen. Instead, new offshore tax advantages are created for American corporations.

Were inversions eliminated? No. Corporate inversions are not eliminated. They are, in fact, continued and increased.

How did this come to pass? It probably came to pass because there was not one substantive hearing in the Ways and Means Committee and in the Senate Finance Committee on the most important tax bill that has passed out of Congress in the last 25 years.

So now we live with this. Now we live with the situation where the Treasury Department announced a couple of weeks ago that the tax revenues for the 2018 fiscal year—that is now—are down by a couple of hundred billion dollars.

So what is going to happen? When the tax bill was moving along, all of the deficit hawks—and there used to be, I don't know, a couple hundred of them over here on my Republican colleagues' side—left town in December. There was not one word about the new \$1.5 trillion addition to the deficit. But like most migratory birds, they are going to come back when the weather warms up in Washington, and they are going to go after the deficit with a vengeance. I will bet they are not going to propose that we go back and clean up the tax mess that was created.

My guess is what they are going to do is go after programs. I think we know what programs they are, because the Speaker of this esteemed House has very clearly laid out in previous budgets that he wrote when he was head of the Budget Committee that he is going to go after Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—the programs of the social safety net.

I had a phone call just a few moments ago from a constituent in my district, saying:

You have got to understand that more and more of your constituents are getting elderly. They are getting Alzheimer's, and they need care. Their husband or their wife needs respite care. What about the programs for that?

I had the answer. It doesn't look good, because we know what the Speaker said he wanted when he was chairman of the Budget Committee, and unless he is having an epiphany, he is likely to want it again. In fact, I believe he already said they are looking at cutting Medicare and Medicaid.

So what does that mean for the working men and women who are taking care of their parents? It means there are tough times ahead. It means that the proposed discussion about the reduction in Medicaid is \$1,400,000,000,000 over the next decade. It means that \$500 billion will be cut from Medicare.

So, if you are a senior, you should worry. If you are among the working men and women of America whose father or mother is now a senior, you should worry.

The most expensive illness now and in the future is Alzheimer's. So what of Alzheimer's research? It is going to get reduced.

Oh, and that corporate tax cut for Pfizer? Do you remember how happy they were to have the extra \$12 billion? Are they going to spend it on Alzheimer's research? No, they are not. They stopped their Alzheimer's research. Instead, guess what they are going to do with the money that they were investing in Alzheimer's research. They are going to use it, together with their tax cut money, to buy back their stock which has the marvelous result of increasing the value of their stock because there are fewer shares out there.

It is brilliant for the managers and for the corporate officers because their pay is based on the stock price. What a marvelous way to use the tax cut: end research on the most expensive illness in America, Alzheimer's and dementia, and instead use that money to buy back stock so that you can increase your pay as the corporate president.

Now, there is a good, American, capitalistic idea. That is where we are.

So today we had a hearing on infrastructure in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, a great opportunity to understand the President's

infrastructure plan. Wow. It is big and it is beautiful, he says, and it is going to provide a gazillion jobs.

We took a look at it, and we said: Where is the beef? Where is the money? \$200 billion over a 10-year period, \$20 billion a year, said to be new money.

And then you look at the President's budget proposal and you tee it up with the infrastructure proposal, and you say: Wait a minute. What kind of shell game are you playing here? Your budget removes over \$200 billion from infrastructure, and you come over here on your infrastructure plan and you say you have \$200 billion of new money.

No, you don't. You really don't have \$200 billion of new money. You have \$200 billion of repurposed money in programs that actually devolve the Nation's infrastructure back to the States and the counties so that we will have a disconnect between an interstate in one State and an interstate in another State that connect at the State lines, and one is repaired and the other is not.

□ 1645

So infrastructure and transportation is a national network. But in this case, what happens is that the States are said to be given the responsibility and the Federal Government will simply pick and choose among those programs that the administration happens to like.

I represent a rural area. Sure, it is nice to have an extra \$50 billion for rural infrastructure. That would be great.

But what is the definition of rural?

It is 55,000 people.

How much territory? Is it an entire State?

Well, there is no State that is rural, then.

In a county? In a multitude of counties? In a metropolitan statistical area?

We don't know.

But I will tell you that I do have a rural area. I have got two cities, Yuba City and Marysville together, with 100,000 people. Rural is 10 miles down the road.

So where is the line around this rural area?

I am concerned, particularly because the Federal Government will maintain control of that money. It doesn't go out by formula, at least as we now look at the language.

So it is a grand, a glorious, a wonderful, spectacular infrastructure plan. Incidentally, there is a small problem for cities and counties. Presently, if the Federal Government is involved in a levee project to prevent floods, an interstate highway or one of the federally designated highways, or an airport, they will usually come up with somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of the money. That is all well.

Well, let's see. It is 70 to 80 percent Federal and another 20 to 30 percent

local money. In the President's proposal, that flips. The State and the local government come up with 70 to 80 percent and the Federal Government comes up with 20 to 30 percent. The role of the Federal Government is diminished. It becomes the minor partner, and the State or local community becomes the major partner.

I had a meeting today with Hamilton City, a community of about 1,600 people right on the Sacramento River with a levee that is maybe good for a 10-year high water, but not for any extended amount of flood beyond what normally occurs. They have been trying for 30 years to raise the money locally to match the 80 percent by the Federal Government. They did it.

Are they going to be able, going into the future, to complete that flood project if this program goes into effect and they have got to come up with 80 percent of the money?

It won't happen.

I would dare say, all across this Nation, with the possible exception of Houston, Texas, no community is going to be able to come up with 70 to 80 percent of the money for a flood control project.

This is a role that has traditionally been the Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Government. But, no. In their infrastructure proposal, this administration flips it over so that now the great burden lies with the local government.

"Oh, that is fine," you say. Well, I think not. All across this Nation, small communities, rural communities, and even urban communities do not have the resources.

So here we are. Here we are in a situation where we had a massive tax cut that benefits the superwealthy and American corporations. The American corporations clearly indicate—not from me; go look at the Wall Street folks that have done the analysis—clearly indicate that that tax reduction, which is now in the pockets of the corporations, is not being used for higher wages, is not being used for the plant and equipment and new jobs above the 16 percent. The rest of the money is used for acquisitions and buying back stock. So much for trickle down.

Of course, how much can the superwealthy possibly spend? How much can you possibly spend on your McMansion? How much can you possibly spend on a fleet of Mercedes?

The bottom line of it is, when it comes to infrastructure, there is no money. It is gone. It disappeared with the tax cut.

Think about what could have been done if that tax bill had actually had hearings in which the Democrats could have put forth proposals that we have introduced in bills—proposals to repatriate the offshore earnings of corporations with a lower tax and then use

that money for infrastructure. We would have real dollars for an infrastructure program to the tune of maybe \$50 billion to \$100 billion over a period of time.

But, no. No hearings, no amendments from Democrats. No, not at all.

We could have used that tax bill to create infrastructure banks so that there would be a financing mechanism for those small communities around the Nation that needed to build a road, needed to build a levee, needed to build broadband infrastructure for their community.

But no, that didn't happen either. Not one hearing. Not one Democratic amendment to that tax bill. Therefore, we go into the great infrastructure program where we really need to do some things.

What do we need to do?

Some of you may have noticed just 12, 13 months ago the man-made creation of the biggest waterfall in the world, Oroville Dam, and the breakdown of the spillway. And 200,000 of my constituents had to evacuate within hours because that spillway, the emergency spillway next to it, was being overtopped by the river and eroded at the base and a 30-foot wall of water almost descended upon those 200,000 people. The number of deaths would be unknown, but it would have been in the thousands because they couldn't get out of town fast enough.

Thankfully, the rain stopped and the reservoir receded. Had it not, had it continued and the water continued to spill over the emergency spillway here, it would have been an unmitigated disaster.

Why did this fail?

This failed for lack of repair, for lack of maintenance. It is just one example of the thousands of dams in America that could fail. We saw this potential failure in Puerto Rico with one of the major reservoirs there. Fortunately, a third hurricane didn't occur.

Or maybe you are interested in bridges. This isn't a picture of a bridge to nowhere. This happens to be one of the main bridges on Interstate 5, an interstate highway system that goes from Vancouver to Tijuana, Mexico. It goes down through Oregon, Washington, and California. It is the major trade route on the West Coast. This is about 7 years ago. The bridge fell down.

I could put a picture up here showing another bridge that failed on the Mississippi River, in the Twin Cities area. We could put thousands of pictures up here of bridges that could fail and have failed.

This is an infrastructure structure issue. Where is the money to rebuild this?

Well, it is in the hands of the corporations who are spending it to buy back their stock and to increase the stock price so that the corporate officers can have a higher paycheck.

Oh, did I forget to mention how generous they were in bonuses?

We are talking about one-time bonuses here. We are not talking about increasing the paycheck over time. We are talking about one-time bonuses.

I do like my San Francisco-based Wells Fargo, that so generously said: "We are going to increase the pay for the minimum wage workers."

Good for you. You are obeying the State laws that require minimum wage increases. Good for you, obeying the law. Take credit, if you will, but it is not out of the generosity.

Where is the money for all this?

It is gone.

What if we had a chance in that tax bill to talk about a program the Democrats have been putting forth for the last year?

It is A Better Deal for America, a tax policy that actually provides benefits to the working men and women of America and the families that are on the edge of poverty. It actually provides an infrastructure program that has real money—money that can be used to build the foundation for economic growth, money that can be used for employing people in high-paying construction jobs.

By the way, it is not at all clear—in fact, there are those of us who think this may actually be in the present infrastructure plan—all of the talk about Buy American, Build America. It appears that language in that infrastructure plan would do away with the Buy American provisions in highway infrastructure.

We can't let that happen. A Better Deal for America would be tax policy. It would be a program that would provide the education and training for the men and women who we need in our manufacturing sector.

Every 6 months, I do a manufacturing advisory organization meeting of manufacturers. Every time over the last 8 years we have met, they have come back with the very same concern. And that concern is: We need highly skilled workers.

How do you get highly skilled workers?

You train them. You provide the job training for those who have lost their jobs, for those who want to improve themselves.

Whatever happened in our high schools to technical training, vocational training?

It is critically important. The programs that are out there need this support. The programs where American unions have apprenticeship training are a critical way of building our economy. They are highly skilled men and women that earn a good, solid living as welders, plumbers, and technicians of all kinds. That is what we want. It takes money to do those things.

So what are we going to do?

I don't know how we are going to come back from this tax cut. It is not

going to be done anytime soon. But I know this: we are going to be really, really short of money. It has been estimated that in this current budget year, the deficit will reach \$1 trillion.

I know that we are just weeks away from the return of the deficit hawks on this floor who are going to say: "Oh, my goodness, the money is gone. We are going to have to make cuts. We can't have these kinds of deficits."

I can hear them already. I hear the voices of the past and I hear the voices of the future. I know they are going to come back. They are going to go after programs that are absolutely essential.

We have got work to do. We have got things we need to do in America.

The American Society of Civil Engineers points out where we need work.

Aviation. We got a D for how good our aviation system is.

Bridges, C; dams, D; drinking water, D.

Is anybody here from Michigan?

Is anybody here from the Central Valley of California?

Shall we talk about water supplies?

I remember when I was in college, you would never go outside the United States and drink the water from the tap. Now you don't go to the United States and drink water from a tap, because there is a high probability that it is contaminated. We have seen this story. We have seen this story in Flint, Michigan. We have seen this up and down the Central Valley of California.

So what are we spending our money on?

Not on drinking water, not on energy systems, hazardous waste, or inland waterways.

Oh, this is a good one. If you are on the Mississippi and the Ohio River and you have got your tugboat and a fleet of barges, you depend upon the Federal Government lock system so that you can travel up and down the river.

□ 1700

If you are out there in the maritime and you are an international shipper and you want to go into one of the harbors on the East Coast, where is the money for dredging?

Well, it disappeared with the tax cuts. It is not there.

So is your ship going to run aground?

No, you won't let that happen. What you do is you will go to some other port.

Cuba. We love to talk about Cuba, so let's talk about Cuba. At Mariel, they are building an international port for the purpose of taking the new ships that are able to go through the Panama Canal, bring them to Cuba, offload them, and put them on a smaller ship so they can get into American harbors. Now, there is an American success story. We don't have the money to dredge our harbors, but we have the money for a new Mercedes for the superwealthy.

Parks and recreation. Ports. Rail systems.

Rails are doing pretty good, but not Amtrak. The President's budget proposes to cut Amtrak—to basically defund Amtrak. If you want to go on the East corridor here, if you want to go from Washington to Boston, if you want to take a plane, well, we know we have an aviation problem. If you want to take the train, I guess you are going to hop a freight train, because Amtrak isn't going to be around to run. That is the President's budget proposal.

Schools, D-plus.

Solid waste. Transit. Wastewater.

The American Society of Civil Engineers rate America in the D range. We should be so proud of the most advanced Nation in the world. No, I think not. I certainly wouldn't take pride in our infrastructure. But it takes money.

Where did the money go?

Well, it just happens I like charts.

The Trump infrastructure scam cuts more than \$168 billion from existing transportation and infrastructure programs.

I haven't talked about this one.

Do you remember I told you about the flip—80 percent Federal, 20 percent local flipped to 20 percent Federal, 80 percent local, unless you happen to be a private investor. Do you want to buy Dulles International Airport or maybe Reagan National—excuse me, I promise not to do that. Whatever the name of that airport here is. Okay, I will say Reagan. The Reagan National Airport. Do you want to buy it? It is up for sale, according to the Trump administration. And, by the way, the Federal Government will come up with 80 percent of the money. Not a bad deal.

Slashes Federal investments and passes the buck back to the local governments. We just talked about that.

We haven't talked about the environmental programs, the environmental protection programs that are significantly harmed, reduced, gutted in the proposal. The Senate is going to speed up projects. Hello? Does anybody around here know that over the last two transportation programs this Congress, with Democrat and Republican support, significantly reduced the time for an infrastructure program to be done? It is not 14 years.

The laws that have been in place now for the last almost decade significantly reduced the processing time for infrastructure projects in which the Federal Government is involved in, without harming the vital environmental protections that are out there: clean water, clean air, all of those things. Anyway, they are gone.

We have a task before us. I see my Republican colleagues anxious to get up and engage me in a debate. If they want to, I could yield to them, and we could debate the wisdom of what has happened here, but that is not happening.

What is happening is there is an alternative, an alternative that we put forth from our side that, unfortunately, was not considered in the tax legislation.

We are going to be working on the infrastructure bill. I dare say that the President's infrastructure program is going nowhere in Congress. At least it shouldn't.

We are going to have to find the money as best we can. And I have an idea. Over the next 15 years, we are going to spend \$1 trillion rebuilding our entire nuclear armaments. All of the delivery system, all of the bombs, all of the satellites, all rebuilt. So will Russia and so will China, and we are in the midst of a nuclear arms race—well into the second quarter of a new nuclear arms race, exceedingly expensive and exceedingly dangerous, because the delivery systems are stealthy, designed not to be observed. That is a problem because that increases the risk.

Maybe we can use some of that money to build the infrastructure to educate our kids, to provide for seniors who have Alzheimer's, to care for the caregivers that are taking care of their parents, to build an infrastructure program that really gives America a solid foundation for economic growth, one in which the research facilities are the most modern and in which the most advantageous research is conducted. Maybe we could find, amongst our choices here, money to build a highway system that is worthy of this Nation, one in which there are not potholes every 100 yards, one in which bridges don't collapse; that we can build water systems in which you can take tap water from every fountain in this Nation and drink it, without a concern about contamination of lead or something else. We could do that. We could make some choices.

We can go back and revisit the tax scam in which there are specific inducements for offshoring American jobs. Maybe we can do that.

Maybe we can look at some of the military spending and say: Why does it cost \$1 billion to launch a satellite with one system and \$90 million with another system to do the same thing? There are things we can do.

And, most of all, it is time for a better deal for America: a better deal for the working men and women, a better deal for the elderly, and a better deal for the children. That is what we need to do.

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

TAX REFORM

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this is the second week of the tax truth squad effort to share the facts, the real facts about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and the impact it has already had on the American economy and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with my fellow colleagues representing Michigan and Illinois. These two States include diverse industries and diverse people, from farmers, to bankers, to manufacturers.

I am humbled to represent the hard-working people of the 10th Congressional District and the Midwest. This is exactly what the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has done: helped our constituents work every day supporting their family and helped their local economy.

My colleague before me proceeded to speak about we should pay attention to the needs of those close to and living in poverty. Well, I wish he had stayed. I grew up in poverty.

Like many in Michigan, I grew up in a large family. I have six brothers and sisters. My dad had a good job building trucks in a line at General Motors. My mom often had a full-time job to help make ends meet. That is why I committed to supporting policies that create real economic growth and economic opportunity for families like the one in which I grew up.

I was but a young pup in 1986, the last time our Tax Code was modernized. Since then, the Tax Code grew to 74,000 pages of rules and regulations that have only confused people. You would need to be a wizard to understand what is in the Tax Code as it stood at the end of the year. That is why I promised my constituents, when I came to office, when I ran for office, I would work hard to achieve meaningful tax cuts and reforms for the American people.

I believe Americans can, and should, make independent decisions about the use of their own money, the money they work for, not the government. The government shouldn't come first. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act allowed hardworking individuals and business owners to do just that.

Across the Nation and back home, we have already seen the direct impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. More than 400 companies have already announced pay raises, bonuses, and increased 401(k) contributions and benefits, or, in the case of utility companies, lowered rates.

Direct bonus announcements have already reached over \$3 billion across this Nation. Let me repeat that: \$3 billion. Companies in Michigan have already committed more than \$180 million in bonuses to employees.

A couple of examples: Fiat Chrysler, one of the State's largest employers, is reinvesting its tax savings to its employees in our community, in addition to giving a \$2,000 bonus to 60,000 employees. And that is in addition to profit sharing as part of their contract.

Fiat Chrysler announced it will move heavy-duty Ram truck production from Mexico to Macomb County: a \$1 billion investment that will create 2,500 jobs.

In my district, Michigan's 10th, Lakestone Bank & Trust, a small community bank, operating in Lake Lapeer, St. Clair, and Macomb Counties, gave hourly employees \$1 an hour raise. I know some consider that to be crumbs. Where I grew up, \$1 an hour more is real money. They gave all of their salaried employees a \$1,000 bonus saying: "We are very appreciative of all Lakestone Bank & Trust employees and certainly what they have accomplished over the years. . . . This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, and we know we want to reinvest much of the savings"—in the tax bill—"back into our bank, and the first place we are going to put it is into the hands of our employees. Employees are our most important asset."

Stories like this are not unique. From CVS to Chipotle, and AT&T to Wells Fargo, they are reinvesting tax reform savings in our hardworking employees in our communities throughout the country.

This is the second week of the tax reform truth squad—we are calling it—an initiative where Members from States across the Nation are invited to tell their stories about the benefits of tax reform. There are countless stories they are anxious to express.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), one of those Members, my colleague, serving on the Energy and Commerce Committee, a defender of a strong rural economy and a good friend, representing the Seventh Congressional District.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the truth.

We heard so much dismissal of the tax cut plan before we passed it. Now that we passed it, not only did we read it beforehand, but rereading it again we are seeing the truth is working out.

As I travel around, Mr. Speaker, the Seventh District of Michigan, optimism about the new tax cuts is hard to miss.

I have people coming up to me at the grocery store, at gas stations, even in church, saying: You know, Congressman, we heard a lot of reports that this

wasn't for middle class people, but I saw my paycheck in February and, it is true, I got a raise because the government is taking less out of it.

I have heard from a number of workers excited about their bonuses and pay raises and from businesses that are looking to expand their operations.

Just last week, I toured Lowe's home center in Adrian, Michigan, to visit with their team. Because of the new tax law, their employees are receiving \$1,000 bonuses and expanded maternity and parental leave.

I toured Cintas' Lansing operations. The tax cut afforded their employees \$1,000 bonuses, and they reported to me that day that they jumped now on a plan that they were holding off, but now they are going to build a \$17 million facility to add on to their operations.

We already heard about Fiat Chrysler giving out \$2,000 bonuses to all of their workers. They are also moving production of the Ram heavy-duty truck plant back from Mexico to Michigan—I wanted to reiterate that—that is coming home and creating 2,500 new good-paying jobs.

We have also seen announcements from DTE Energy and Consumers Energy, utilities in Michigan and in other States, that their customers can expect to see lower utility bills, thanks to the tax cuts. In fact, they have submitted a request to the PSC for almost \$400 million in rate reductions. That is real money.

As Vice President PENCE said last week when we welcomed him to the Motor City, tax reform is working for Michigan.

Here is even more good news: the benefits are just beginning to kick in.

This tax season is the last time taxpayers will have to file under the old and broken Tax Code.

Under the updated Code, individuals and families at every income level will see tax relief.

The standard deduction is nearly doubled to protect more of people's hard-earned income from taxation.

□ 1715

The child tax credit is expanded from \$1,000 to \$2,000 to help with the cost of raising kids.

With these new reforms, the typical middle-income family of four will receive a tax cut of more than \$2,000.

On top of that, the law will help small businesses thrive, boost job creation here at home, and make our economy stronger and more competitive, like it ought to be, in the United States and in Michigan.

For families across Michigan, the new tax cut law means bigger paychecks and more money in their pockets, not in the Federal Government's pockets. And that is where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity at any time to put forward

truth, but, more importantly, truth that is optimistic, that builds on our people, that builds on letting them do for themselves with the resources they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I express appreciation to my colleague for holding this “truth squad” opportunity again tonight because people need more of that. They need more optimism that comes from truth that impacts them in a growing and positive way, and I am glad to be part of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WALBERG for his comments. I failed to recognize that I serve with Mr. WALBERG on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, on which he is a subcommittee chair. So I thank him for joining us.

I made a notation that I want to share with everyone tonight as we move forward. With the changing of the standard deduction, with the nearly doubling of the standard deduction, about 90 percent of taxpayers will be able to file their taxes on a form about this size. They will be able to file their taxes like this, rather than the pile of paperwork they have dealt with for years. Here it is on a larger scale.

Most are going to be able to simply file their wage and compensation income and use the standard deduction. They will be done except for a few other tax credits we will talk about, the tax credit they can get, for example, on investment tax credit or family child credit. We will talk about that. But most Americans can file like this. That is one of the things we wanted to achieve, one of the great achievements of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Mr. Speaker, next I yield to Congressman FRED UPTON, who represents Michigan’s Sixth Congressional District, the former chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, another colleague of mine from Michigan, the senior member of our delegation, experientially only, not age, with decades of experience in Congress focusing on job creation and economic opportunity for our State and for our Nation.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my good friend for yielding and for hosting this hour tonight. I look forward to the comments by all my colleagues from Michigan and Illinois.

Let me just start out by saying a couple of things. I had a great ninth grade teacher, Mr. Denekas. We learned about how the government worked. You pass a bill in the House and you pass a bill in the Senate. I learned later on that the House bill is always better than the Senate. But in this case, JOHN SHIMKUS and I—and he is going to be a speaker from Illinois a little bit later on this evening—were two conferees on this bill.

I have got to say that, as we debated this bill, there were some elements

that were not so good. But at the end of the day, as this bill meshed together, we took the best elements of both the House and the Senate bill and we got a bill that the President was able to sign.

I can remember being trashed left and right back in November and December about what this bill was going to do or not going to do: it wasn’t going to provide real tax relief to the working class; companies weren’t really going to give bonuses; this was all just going to be bogus arguments.

Now, at the end of the day, 2-plus months since the bill was signed and became enacted, my constituents are finding out good things about the bill. Yes, they are getting real take-home pay increases from the jobs that they do. Yes, they are getting bonuses.

I was at a small, little almost farmers market, multigenerational market down in Niles, Michigan, just north of Notre Dame, Shelton’s Farm Market. They have 83 employees. The owners gave every employee there a bonus. I talked to one of them who literally stocks the shelves. He got \$600.

He said: You know, Mr. UPTON . . .

I said: Call me FRED.

He said: This wasn’t just crumbs. This made a real difference.

I said: What are you going to do with that \$600?

He said: You know, my wife has cancer, and I bought her a new dress.

He was so excited that that increase in the take-home pay was actually going to do some real benefit for him and his family.

I was at a groundbreaking at Pfizer, my largest employer, in Portage, Michigan. Not only did they announce that they are going to, in the next couple of years, invest \$6 billion—that is B as in “big”—in new facilities here in North America, they also announced that they are going to give \$100 million in bonuses for all of their nonexecutive employees. That is real money, and that is thanks to tax reform.

Mr. WALBERG talked a little bit about some of the utilities in Michigan. A little bit earlier today, I was with the chair of Consumers Energy, a very important player; and the chair of DTE Energy as well. Yes, because of the reduction in the corporate tax rates, they are going to pass on those savings, as they want to, to the consumers. In the case of Consumers Energy, they are going to give back \$200 million in rate relief to virtually every one of their customers that they serve across the board. That is good news. It has to be approved by the Public Service Commission, but, in fact, that money is going to be there.

So whether it is a small business who is now going to get a lower rate in that passthrough rate, which means a lot, keeping your deductions on healthcare, seeing the highest corporate rate being reduced to 21 percent—and I remember

well that debate that we had between Mitt Romney and Barack Obama back in 2012. In September of 2012, the question was on tax reform, and even Barack Obama said that he would support lowering that corporate tax rate to 25 percent, because we were already at the highest corporate tax rate in the world. That is what this bill did, and thank goodness.

The last point I would make is I was tired of economic growth being at .7 percent or 1 percent. We can do better than that. This bill is now starting to lead the way to see that happen. In fact, the report even this week, I think, is predicting a 3.5 percent growth rate for calendar year 2018.

That is a far cry from where we were just a few years ago. I dare say, in large part, it is due because workers are, in fact, getting more money from their paychecks. We have reduced the corporate rates so companies, instead of having an incentive to go overseas, as they did with my largest employer in one of my counties a few years ago, they now have a reason to come home and invest that money here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for hosting this hour. I look forward to the other folks’ comments tonight.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. UPTON for joining us. I appreciate him taking time out of his busy schedule to talk about how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has impacted his district and the State of Michigan.

Let me state, as we get our next speaker to come forward, that in my district alone, the average savings for the average filer in my district is \$2,700 a year.

Now, I know that some of the colleagues on the other side of the aisle refer to that as crumbs, as meaningless, but that is real money that allows people to make a difference in their lives, to move forward, make decisions about fixing their houses, go on vacation, put a downpayment on a new car, all things that wouldn’t be possible.

More importantly, that is money they worked for. That is not money somebody gave them. That is their money to begin with, and they get to keep it. That is what is so important about it.

Mr. Speaker, our next speaker who wants to come forward and talk about his district is Representative SHIMKUS, who, as Mr. UPTON said, was a conferee on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman JOHN SHIMKUS, who represents the 15th Congressional District, a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, a conferee on the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and who has been an advocate for smaller government for years.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. It is great to be here with my friends from the State of Michigan.

As a Republican, sometimes people ask: What is the difference?

I always say: Well, Republicans, we believe in less government, individual responsibility, lower taxes, more personal freedoms and liberties.

From my time here in Washington, I have always wanted a fairer, flatter, simpler Tax Code. We shouldn't have to fear filing our income taxes. We shouldn't have to fear whether we have the receipts.

I think the other thing that was always frustrating about the Tax Code is you never know if you have done enough of the itemizing that you are actually going to get anything or not. And then, have you forgotten something that you are not recouping?

So having said that, that is why—and I am glad Congressman MITCHELL raised this issue, the fairer, flatter, simpler Tax Code.

Before we passed the bill, 80 percent of my constituents did not itemize. Under this tax reform, 90 percent of all of my filers—90 percent—will be able to do it on this simple postcard. And it is easy to find. People can pull it up at fairandsimple.gov to check it out.

Congressman UPTON was correct: this process worked. We had a House bill and we had a Senate bill, and then the two sides merged to keep some of the deductions that people really thought were important, and a great compromise that was working.

So the question is: Is the proof in the pudding?

In other words, is it operating as advertised for either side?

I think we are down here to say it is operating as advertised and we can proudly stand down here and tell some of these stories.

What we did is we posted a question on our newsletter to ask people to respond, and I want to share some of these responses. These are on the individual side. I will talk about the corporate side in a minute.

Ken and Pam from St. Joseph—we call it St. Joe—they say: "Personally we have seen an increase in our net wages each week. With our business, we seem to have an increase in other companies starting new things."

Gregg from Charleston says: "More money in my take-home check."

A pretty simple statement.

James from Marine says: "My retirement check just went up. Thanks."

Jeff from Carlyle says: "Positive results only so far, just as expected with a commonsense tax cut."

Carl from Collinsville, which is my hometown. I am glad Carl is happy. He says: "I am seeing more on my paycheck each week. Keep up the good work."

So that is just on the individual side.

Then we briefly want to talk about what is going on from business. You know, these are great announcements. I had the chairman of the Committee

on Ways and Means, my good friend, KEVIN BRADY, tell me 50 percent of all manufacturers in this country are planning expansion. Not 50 percent of the manufacturers in Illinois or Michigan; across the country. That is pretty awesome.

So what is going on in my district?

Griffith Trucking, Broadway Express, Heartland Peterbilt, and Heartland Classics—which are in Effingham and Newton—gave \$1,000 bonuses to 65 full-time employees.

FedEx has a big distribution hub in my district, same place, in Effingham. FedEx has committed to more than \$3 billion in wage increases, bonuses, pension funding, and expanded U.S. capital investment.

Charter Communications is raising their minimum wage to \$15 an hour as a result of this tax cut plan.

It is great to see Congressman ROSKAM on the floor. He will get a chance to speak later. He was a major architect of this. I am very proud that he comes from Illinois. These stories are attributed to Peter's great work.

The other one I wanted to mention—of course, I live in the metro St. Louis area. Boeing has a big presence in St. Louis, but a lot of their great workers, probably their best workers, live on the Illinois side. Boeing has announced employee-related and charitable investments of \$300 million as a result of the tax law.

So great things are happening.

I want to follow what FRED UPTON said, in that we as a body were tired of being in a malaise.

Is this all we can hope for?

We wanted an economy that would grow and create jobs and be vibrant, that people would be excited about going back to the workforce, working hard, taking home more of their pay, investing it into the market or in their retirement savings; and that is just what we are having.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of my colleagues here on the floor, so I could talk a long time on the benefits of the bill. I am very, very excited about it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MITCHELL for organizing this tonight.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for the enthusiasm, the detail on the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue on this conversation and talk a little bit about the trade States, because it has had a great impact not only on Illinois, but also on Michigan.

Joining us at this point is Congressman MIKE BISHOP, a neighbor of the 10th Congressional District, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means that had a direct impact on this bill. He has been a leading advocate for a fair and simple Tax Code. He represents the Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman MIKE BISHOP.

□ 1730

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for leading in this effort.

It is very exciting back in the great State of Michigan, the comeback State of Michigan, our home State. After years of stagnant economic growth, our workforce is finally experiencing the benefits of a modernized Tax Code. So far, more than 4 million hard-working Michiganders have received bonuses, notices of increases in their take-home pay, and have benefited from higher wages.

Across Michigan, I have had the opportunity to travel not only in my district, but across this great State, and I have seen firsthand great things, so many great stories to tell, sitting down with folks, hearing about the new tax law and how it is impacting their community and how it is impacting their businesses. I take away from this a number of really excited testimonials from everyone that I sat down with.

For example, Dan, a small-business owner from Rochester Hills, Michigan, shared with me that, as a result of tax reform, he was able to invest in his new car wash by buying new equipment.

Erwin, a constituent from Oxford, Michigan, is seeing extra money in his monthly take-home pay.

I stopped by the Fiat Chrysler truck assembly plant to talk with workers about the new Ram truck production line that is relocating from Mexico all the way back to Michigan, where it belongs, bringing with it 2,500 new jobs. As you can imagine, there is extreme excitement within the four walls of that beautiful plant.

Michigan is the auto capital of the world. We produce more than 2.2 million cars and trucks. We produce more cars and trucks than any other State in the Union, and we are excited and proud to be the auto capital of the world, the State that put the world on wheels.

The Fiat Chrysler decision will provide more than \$1 billion in U.S. investment and \$2,000 bonuses, \$2,000 for each employee, all as a result of tax reform.

In Lake Orion, Michigan, Complete Automation, they employ about 250 employees. I visited their operation to talk with the employees about the new benefits they will soon be seeing. As a result of tax reform, employees will see in their 401(k) contribution a match of 50 percent, up to 4 percent of their investment in their 401(k).

That is a big deal for a lot of people. It is a great deal for their family. It is a great deal for them individually, but it is a great deal for their family.

And I also say this. With the average tax cut in my district of about \$2,500 per family, average family, that is not crumbs. That is real, real relief for families that could really use it right now.

The takeaway from all these conversations that I have had across my district is that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is working. America's optimism is rising, and the workforce is taking notice. We are finally creating an environment that fosters economic growth and brings jobs back to the United States and back to my home State and the comeback State of Michigan. And this is just the beginning.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his feedback on the impact of the Tax Cuts bill, and I thank him for taking time out of his schedule.

Next, I have the privilege of recognizing a key player in the effort to reform our Tax Code and cut taxes, the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tax Policy. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this and, hopefully, continued success on our tax laws.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

You know, I think it is so interesting. We are all coming together, various States, to celebrate these accomplishments and to take a step back: how far we have come in the past year or the past several months where you look back and, basically, there was a national consensus that had developed, and the consensus was nobody liked our Tax Code—I mean nobody. Nobody could defend it because it was absurd. It was so complicated.

Those of us who are from the Chicago area, we know that the last time the Tax Code was updated was when the Bears won the Super Bowl, so that is 30 years ago. And yet we have got this Tax Code that had been a complete throwback. The Tax Code was such a throwback that the last time it was updated, 1986, the internet didn't exist, basically, as a commercial enterprise.

There was no shared economy, per se. Airbnb, Uber, Lyft, all those things, they didn't exist. Global supply chains were nowhere nearly as connected as they are today, which all begged the question that we needed a Tax Code to update things.

Now, here is what was interesting: The hyperbole that surrounded the debate on the tax reform bill as H.R. 1 kept moving in and, ultimately, came to a crescendo, passed through the House, passed through the Senate, and was signed into law, it was described by, God bless them, our friends on the other side of the aisle as the worst bill ever, Armageddon, and, obviously, now, the famous line that the result of these things were crumbs. Well, none of that turned out to be true. This was a terrific bill.

Let me just give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker, of people in my

constituency who have written publicly or they have written to me privately about this bill.

Here is Mary from Wheaton, Illinois, my hometown. She said: "Our family is already feeling the positive impact of the changes made in the Tax Code. Our daughter and her husband just had their first baby and will be able to take advantage of the doubled child tax credit next year. Throughout our extended family, those who work for big and small businesses alike are witnessing immediate effects. Companies are investing the anticipated benefits of the new tax law in the form of bonuses, pay raises, capital improvements, and new hires. And that's just the beginning. The true value of this Tax Code will become even more evident in the months and years ahead."

Mary is absolutely right.

Or another person, Nicole, from Elgin. She says: "Thanks to the new tax bill, my family will be saving an estimated \$4,000 on our taxes next year. Not only that, but I'm getting a \$1,000 bonus and an extra \$1,500 in my employee pension account from my employer as a result of the changes."

Or how about an enrolled agent, Stephen, from Wayne. He prepares people's taxes. He says: "As an enrolled agent entering my 35th tax season, I am anxiously awaiting the smiles I will be getting from my clients when I inform them how much they will be saving on their 2018 tax return . . . the clear majority of my clients will be paying lower tax rates in 2018 due to the recently passed Tax Cuts and Jobs Act."

And then I will go to the end of his note. He says: "I haven't been able to say this very often over the past 35 years, but I am actually looking forward to this tax season."

So we know that these things are true. We know that they are manifesting themselves.

I have got a constituency where there are about 30,000 people who get hit hard by the alternative minimum tax, and they are not going to be hit by the alternative minimum tax. They are going to be spared that tax.

There are many other examples in the State of Illinois where you see real progress being made.

Up by me in Chicagoland, MK Incorporation, a fleet management company, is giving \$1,000 bonuses to 150 employees.

Ameren Illinois, the customers are using both electricity and natural gas. They will see a combined savings of lower utility rates.

We have talked about AT&T already today: \$1,000 bonuses to 10,000 Illinois-based employees and, nationwide, over \$1 billion increase in capital expenditures.

There is example after example after example after example.

Look, if all the critics can do is basically say, well, this isn't enough or

this is crumbs, they have not been to my constituency. To tell a family that I represent, Mr. Speaker, that \$1,000 is crumbs is just patently obtuse. \$1,000 is real money: \$1,000 is getting ahead on a car payment; \$1,000 is the ability to move forward and say we are going to go on a little extra special vacation, we are going to put a little bit more money toward our college fund, we are going to put a little bit more money toward our retirement. And that is just one particular example.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for organizing this, and I very much appreciate his bringing us together to celebrate these things.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to stay for just a moment for a real quick question.

First, I would say that the Bears is his example—and my example is Steve Yzerman was a rookie in the NHL and captain of the Detroit Red Wings. If you ask a young hockey fan now who Steve Yzerman is, they would look at you blankly. That is how long ago tax was tackled.

I have a question for the gentleman. Ninety percent of our taxpayers, we believe, are going to file a standard deduction, but we kept—we talked about it a great deal. We kept some key tax cuts in the Tax Code to actually help families.

Can the gentleman briefly talk about, maybe, the family and child tax credit and what we did with that and why we think that is important.

Mr. ROSKAM. What we did with it is we doubled it so that the family tax credit is now doubled. So, you know, when folks say, "Well, I don't like this tax plan," really? You don't like doubling the child tax credit?

So there was very much an intentionality, as you know, to say we value family, we value children, we value domestic life, and, toward that end, we are going to support it through the Tax Code. So there was a very specific design not just to keep it, but to enhance it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to be clear with folks. There is a child and family tax cut, the earned income credit, and the higher education credit, and those are all credits against your tax liability. This is not simply a deduction. After taxes are determined, those are credits back, not a tax deduction.

Mr. ROSKAM. Right.

Mr. MITCHELL. People don't understand the difference some days.

Mr. ROSKAM. That is right.

So, to the gentleman's point, a deduction is a decrease in a taxable liability; a credit is a credit. Once the tax is calculated, the credit is an amount that comes off of that tax liability, so it is a very significant thing. Said another way, credits are more valuable than deductions.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for clarifying

that, and I certainly hope people listen to the difference because some people don't understand that. I appreciate the gentleman taking time to join us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman representing the 12th District of Illinois (Mr. BOST), a small family business owner himself.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order tonight. And I also say, just because we are following a theme, if we put in perspective how long ago it was that we did tax reform in this Nation, I was running for my first political office for county board. I had a mullet, and it looked good—at least my wife told me it did.

But let me tell you that, after we passed this tax reform—I come from deep southern Illinois, nowhere near Chicago, a very rural district, a little bit of metropolitan—a typical family of four will receive a break of over \$2,000 per year.

Now, folks, I don't know how it would be in your district or in your hometown if you are listening to this tonight, but that is not crumbs where I come from. Some of the folks here in Washington may think that that is the case, but that is not.

Let me tell you that I have been around my district talking to people; and you go to barber shops and coffee shops, and my wife and I own a beauty salon, and you hear from the people how much they are saving, so much so that we actually asked for people to start replying on our Facebook and to tell us what their story was.

I am just going to give you a few of these. I know that we are on limited time, but I am going to tell you that Bobby from Makanda, here is what he writes:

I am a police officer and my wife is a high school teacher. Combined, the new tax rates save us over \$300 a month. We have two teenage children. The additional income will help us save for upcoming college expenses.

Terry from Royalton writes:

My wife is an educator and I am in healthcare. Since these changes have affected my pay about the same as hers, we know how much it changes our monthly income. About \$300.

His statement is:

Hey, Nancy, if that is crumbs in your world, it's not in mine.

Tracy from Wood River writes:

Tax reform allows more money for college, more money to be put towards paying off our home, provides more activities for our children, and allows us to save more money for the future.

These are just three stories of countless that we have heard. Countless have come in not only from individuals on the individual tax rate, but the business tax rate as well: expansion of business, growing of business, using it to expand the 401(k)s of their employees, giving increases in pay to their employees.

The bottom line is this: The tax reform allows people to keep more money of their paycheck. It allows them the opportunity to use that money in the way they see fit, not how the government wants to use it. They earned that money. It is theirs. They should be able to keep more of it to spend and save as they please. This new tax reform does just that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us this evening.

Next is Congressman ADAM KINZINGER, who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee as well as on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Like many Members around here, he is a very busy man.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman representing the 16th District of Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) to talk about tax cuts in his district.

□ 1745

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This was a great thing we did. It had been—I was 8 years old the last time the Tax Code was reformed, and I think this is something we, frankly, ought to do every decade; at the worst case, every two decades; definitely not every 30 years. So it is about time to get it done.

I wish this could have been bipartisan. I think there are a lot of fantastic things in here, and I think it is quite obvious that the economy is showing some really big benefit as a result. I think it is hard to hide that. It is hard to pretend that that is not the case, even though some of our friends try to do that, but it is quite obvious it has worked.

I just want to tell a few stories of my district, the 16th District of Illinois. I was at a tax reform roundtable last month at the Illinois Valley Chamber of Commerce, and I heard from my local business community about how this bill affects them and what they would like to see moving forward. One gentleman from Walnut, Illinois, in Bureau County, was really excited about the tax cuts his small business would receive. He plans to increase hourly wages and hire 7 to 10 new employees over the next 2 years. That, my friends, is not crumbs. That is important.

The tax relief for businesses, large and small, is being shared with employees all over. Over the last few months, more than 300 companies, and counting, have announced plans to add people, add bonuses, add to retirement benefits, and give back to the U.S. economy.

Employees at UPS in my district, Home Depot, Bank of America, Ryder, AT&T, U-Haul, and many others with Illinois locations will receive these bonuses and benefits.

A few weeks ago, I went to the Fiat Chrysler plant in Belvidere, Illinois,

and I met with employees who were excited and encouraged by the \$2,000 bonus they will receive in the second quarter of this year.

According to the nonpartisan Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, 85 percent of Illinoisans will see a tax cut next year, and the nonpartisan Tax Foundation has estimated that the State of Illinois stands to gain tens of thousands of jobs from this reform.

This is great news. By bringing the Tax Code into the 21st century to reflect current day is real and tangible in terms of the benefits it will put into our economy.

Our future is bright, our economy is growing stronger, and, with tax relief, the American Dream is once again on the horizon for folks in my district and across the country. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. KINZINGER for joining us this evening. I appreciate the detail in his district.

We are going to continue with Illinois for a bit here. I guess it is Illinois' night for awhile.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the Representative from the 14th District of Illinois, Congressman RANDY HULTGREN, who has consistently been a voice of business owners across America through his work on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MITCHELL for yielding.

Illinois is a high-tax State. We have seen Illinois State taxes continue to go up, so it is a welcome relief that Congress has brought Federal tax relief to the people of Illinois, and especially I am grateful for the residents of the 14th Congressional District, the suburbs of Chicago, who are seeing great relief and especially the benefits that come to small businesses, truly the energy and the engine behind Illinois' economy.

They are going to receive immediate benefits from a reduced tax burden and more flexible accounting rules. I am also pleased that the final version of the legislation included this portion of my bill, which was to lower taxes on Illinois' largest employers, which is small businesses, and it is called the Bring Small Businesses Back Tax Reform Act.

Further, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act reduced corporate tax rates to 21 percent and includes provisions to deter U.S. companies from moving their headquarters and investments abroad and encouraging them to bring income and jobs back home again. Again, this is welcome news for Illinois residents.

Numerous companies who employ residents of the 14th Congressional District have announced new investments and new hiring and giving more money to their employees, wages, bonuses, trainings, and more. Just a sampling of

these are: AbbVie, American Community Bank, First Midwest Bank, EMKAY, Boeing, U.S. Bank, Wells Fargo, Wintrust Financial, Home Depot, Walmart, CVS, and Starbucks.

American manufacturers are hiring more workers. In my district, a Geneva manufacturer has already brought on two new employees to manage the equipment the company invested in under the new expensing rules. A Will County food distributor plans to hire two new employees in 2018, with the money the company saved through tax reform, and the list goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, it is time Americans were given the truth about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Eighty percent of U.S. households will see a tax cut in 2018, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, but only 17 percent of Americans actually think they will.

In fact, the bill lowers individual rates for low- and middle-income Americans across the board and doubles the standard deduction for both individuals and families. If you are one of the 70 percent of Americans who currently take the standard deduction, getting an immediate rate cut and a doubling of the earnings you can keep tax free will make a big difference to you and to your family.

This bill does not cut Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security, period. This bill does not get rid of the medical expense deduction or the charitable deduction. Those are protected and expanded. The bill did not take away healthcare from Americans. Eighty percent of the people who pay for the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate tax are families making less than \$50,000 a year. This bill gets rid of the individual mandate penalty so struggling families aren't burdened by yet another tax.

It is clear: the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is already delivering positive results to Illinois individuals, families, and small businesses; and to Americans everywhere. It is good news, and more good news is coming.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HULTGREN for joining us. I appreciate him taking the time to explain the importance of this in his district.

My next speaker has extensive experience on economic development and creating a better business climate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman DARIN LAHOOD, representing the 18th District of Illinois, a member to both the Joint Economic Committee and Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MITCHELL for yielding. I thank him and Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS for putting together and organizing this Special Order in order to highlight the effects of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act on families in Illinois and across the country.

Thirty-one years is way too long. That is what it took before we passed

comprehensive tax reform at the end of last year. And in my 2½ years here, I couldn't be more proud to support the bill. And when I went in to looking at the legislation in the bill, I really looked at two things as we looked at comprehensive tax reform. One is, how do we help middle class and lower middle class people across this country and in my district? And secondly, how do we get the economy roaring again?

We, for almost 9 years, had a very sluggish economy and stagnant wages. How do we get the economy healthy, robust, vibrant again? We succeeded on both those counts with this bill, and I am very proud to support it.

This historic tax reform law is making a real difference for our families and our workers. But you don't have to take my word for it. Take it from the hardworking people I have spoken with across Illinois' 18th District. The workers I have spoken with are already seeing the results of the new withholding tables, which is no surprise.

In fact, the median family of four in my district will save \$2,593—again, let me repeat that, \$2,593 every year from this new law. This figure is certainly not crumbs, as some people would describe it.

When half of Americans say they are living paycheck to paycheck, this is real money for them. The benefits have already gone beyond lowering the rates, with more bonuses and pay raises being announced every single day.

One example from my district is the Five Senses Spa in Peoria, Illinois. This is a small business. And for over a decade, the owner, Paola Hinton, has provided clients with relief from the stresses of their life at her spa. With the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Five Senses Spa is now providing tax relief to their employees. After calculating the savings from her business that she saw through the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Paola handed out \$500 bonuses to all of her employees as a "thank you" for their hard work. This is real money that the employees can put towards expenses, new purchases, or even saving up for things like education or a home or a new car.

But tax reform also has positive effects beyond larger paychecks. Last month, I spoke with a constituent named Chris, who is a small-business owner, and also the fire marshal for Springfield and Sangamon Counties. Chris attended a roundtable discussion I hosted in Springfield and talked about how the new depreciation rules, as a part of the tax reform law, have already incentivized building owners to upgrade their sprinkler and safety equipment, which has benefitted his small business. Safer buildings and up-to-date fire prevention are a win-win for everyone.

I was glad to hear that even our local fire marshal was seeing the real effects

of commonsense tax reform and reforming our Tax Code. Stories like these are coming from every district across this great country, and the benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act show no sign of slowing down, and that is good news for all Americans.

It should be clear by now that letting workers keep more of their hard-earned paychecks is a recipe for a healthy economy, and I am excited to see how this bill continues to improve the lives and security of all American families.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, could the Congressman stay one moment for a quick question?

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, sure.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, he was talking a little bit about the depreciation allowance and what that depreciation means for small business—especially small business.

One of the important things we did was to change how the taxes are structured for a path we call pass-through to small businesses. Maybe he could explain that briefly, what was done to help small business be viable and grow in this country.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think we acknowledge that small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy. They create the most jobs in our economy. So when we looked at comprehensive tax reform, we obviously talked to those small businesses, those independent folks, and said: What can we do to help you in terms of lowering the rates, depreciation, expensing?

We took that into account, and now you are seeing the results of that. So when you talk to small businesses on the real effect, what does that mean? What do they do with those savings?

Well, they are hiring more people, they are investing in higher wages, they are investing back into their companies, which has a downstream effect throughout this country, and those are real results; and, again, that is a positive nature, which will continue into the future, and we are awful proud of those provisions.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LAHOOD for detailing that, and I appreciate him taking time this evening.

We now will rotate back to Michigan, a fellow freshman, good friend of mine, also a proud Yooper. I am proud to introduce my fellow colleague in the freshman class from the northern regions of Michigan, who, throughout this process, served on the Budget Committee and had input into what this bill is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman JACK BERGMAN from the First District of Michigan.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, what a great opportunity to really stand up here and smile and talk to the American public with the words of constituents from Michigan's First District, because these are not my words. These

are their words over the last 2½ months or so since we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

You know, in November 2016, the great people of Michigan's First District sent me to Washington with a direct, yet simple, mandate: Get Washington, D.C., out of our pockets and off our backs. For a marine, that is a pretty simple mission-oriented instruction.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was the first major step to accomplishing that goal. Since we passed tax reform, I have travelled throughout many of the First District's 32 counties talking with constituents, business owners, and hearing their individual stories. Farmers, businesses, both large and small, and families are already seeing the benefits that tax reform brings, and we are just getting started.

Many of these small companies said: Well, I don't know yet, but I have got to meet with my accountant around the middle of April, and then we will really see.

But now they are starting to see wage increases and bonuses, and business expansions are all beginning to roll in and take effect, and it is long overdue in our neck of the woods. And when I say, "our neck of the woods," that is not a figurative statement. That is a literal statement.

You know, many families in our district live paycheck to paycheck, and even a small crisis could send them into a tailspin. An extra \$100 or \$150 in a paycheck in my district is not crumbs. It is not Armageddon. It is a big plus. It gives that family flexibility to live their life and to raise their kids and be a proud community—wage-earning members of that community.

That \$1,000 a year may mean a new set of snow tires. And by the way, we only have, roughly, a little over 2 weeks of winter left, but we use our snow tires up there through about mid-May. That is just the way it works.

That money might go for the kids to play on a sports team. Hockey is not a cheap sport to put your son or daughter in. Or it could be, possibly, just saving up in that family rainy day fund for an emergency.

We hear of businesses from Boyne City to Marquette expanding, growing their staff, raising wages, all a result of a fairer and simpler Tax Code.

You know, when I talk to some folks, they say: You know what, I don't mind working. I am proud to work. The dignity of work is what makes me strong as an individual, what makes me strong as a mother or a father.

They just think, in some ways, it is just not fair if you don't earn your wage. So there is a certain sense of pride that goes along with that.

□ 1800

We all know that if you are looking for thanks, running for office probably isn't the field of work you should get

into. Yet everywhere I go in the district these last couple of months, constituents have been coming up to me saying: Thank you.

They don't know who I am. We get to talking, and they say: You are the guy on TV. Yeah. Well, thank you for what you did. Thank you for passing tax reform.

Just a few weeks ago, I was at the Home Depot in Petoskey, and a gentleman who was working there pulled me aside and thanked me for getting tax reform done. That allowed him to keep more of his check plus a sizable bonus that was paid by Home Depot.

In the Upper Peninsula, U.S. Special Delivery gave all 200 employees \$1,000 bonuses after tax reform passed because of the money that they will save as a company on their taxes this year.

A couple of weeks back, when I was in Traverse City, Traverse City State Bank announced that they are giving out new bonuses.

So many more businesses in the First District are raising wages, adding workers, giving bonuses, and expanding.

We know that this is just the beginning, and Americans can expect much more in the days ahead because of the energy that we have put into the growth of our American economy.

Mr. Speaker, this confirms the very core beliefs that I have and conservatives all throughout the country believe in. If we get the Federal Government off our back, where it is not supposed to be, and out of our pockets, we will unleash unprecedented economic potential for the citizens of our great country.

I would just close with one note, and that is I am Scandinavian, and there is a wonderful delicacy that you can only afford at the holidays, and I think more people are able to afford it now, and it is called a crumb cake, and it is great.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BERGMAN, and we are wishing for spring in northern Michigan sooner than mid-May.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wrap up this evening by talking a little bit about what all my colleagues spoke about: our principles.

Our principles were that people who worked hard should keep more of their money, that their families and their pocketbooks should come first and not government come first. We have achieved that with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

How did we achieve that?

We almost doubled the standard deduction. For a married couple, the standard deduction is \$24,000 this tax year—\$24,000, and you pay no taxes.

We lowered the individual tax rates for all tax brackets.

We simplified the Tax Code so that taxpayers can file their taxes, 90 percent of them, on a form about this size.

No, you don't have to mail a postcard. You put it in an envelope. But the good news is you don't need multiple pages. You don't have to hope that you have got a wizard to help you. Ninety percent of Americans can fill out a few items on here, include the W-2, and send it on in.

We expanded, as was discussed earlier, the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000 for single filers and married couples to help parents with the cost of raising their children. We made that fully refundable up to \$1,400. That is, even if your taxes are zero, you get a refund from the government for \$1,400 to help you with childcare and taking care of your dependents.

For taxpayers that the standard deduction did not work as well, we kept a number of important deductions, the three most popular ones: Charitable deduction, kept that; the home interest deduction, we kept that; and State and local taxes.

What that means is, for 95, 98 percent of my tax filers in the 10th Congressional District, even if they fill out their deductions rather than do the standard deduction, they are much better off.

Since the tax reform bill passed, as I stated earlier, 400 companies, in about 70 days, have given a pay raise or a bonus or both, increased benefits, 401(k) contributions.

In the case of utilities, you heard in Michigan, almost \$400 million a year in rate cuts, something we hadn't thought about, hadn't anticipated—real money saved by our consumers.

Four million people have received a special tax bonus, resulting in about \$3 billion injected into the economy. In Michigan, it is \$180 million already.

That is real money. It is not economic Armageddon. I am proud to have been part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. We will continue with the Tax Truth Squad every week through the summer to send a message to the American people that we are looking out for their paychecks and the well-being of their family.

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

THE DREAM WILL SURVIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise for the 92,000 Dreamers in the State of Florida. Tonight, I rise for the 3.6 million Dreamers across this Nation.

President Trump may have terminated the DACA program this week, but the dream will survive.

These Dreamers are serving in our military. They are our teachers. They

are students and businessowners, lawyers, doctors, and engineers. They are an ambitious group of young people who are renewing our democracy and who are some of the very best of what the next generation has to offer.

I have no doubt, despite this termination this week, these young people will continue to fight, and we in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus will stand with them. We in the Democratic Caucus will continue to stand with them.

I hope some of my colleagues who have signed on to this bill in the Republican Conference will continue, but we need a vote on the floor.

Seventy percent of Americans already stand with our Dreamers.

It is true that the Federal courts this week have continued with their injunction enjoining the termination of the DACA program. This will help those who are already in the program, but that is a small fraction of the Dreamers in this country.

It is a sad state of affairs that Dreamers could only find justice in our courts. This is the people's House, and the people's business needs to be done. It is time to have a vote on the floor in a bipartisan fashion—a clean Dream Act now, or in November the voters will have their own vote regarding Dreamers.

HONORING SERETHA TINSLEY DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Seretha Tinsley.

Seretha Tinsley is a Winter Haven resident, trailblazer, and overachiever. She was the first African-American female to attend and graduate from Wesleyan College, in 1971.

In the early 1980s, Seretha became one of the first Black female general managers in radio.

In 2008, she became the first African-American president of the Winter Haven Chamber of Commerce board of directors.

She is an entrepreneur, civic leader, mother, and wife.

Desiring to become a missionary, she took a trip to West Africa, visited six countries, and studied with educators. Consequently, she became an educator so that she could have a greater impact empowering young lives with knowledge.

Tinsley served as executive director and cofounded Chain of Lakes Achievers, an achievement center devoted to empowering youth through tutoring, leadership, and life skills training. She maintains her passion for teaching by mentoring on a daily basis.

She is a businesswoman who takes pride in assisting others in reaching their phenomenal potential. Tinsley is the CFO/owner of several family businesses, KFC, Tinsley Family Concessions, where she oversees administrative and fiduciary responsibilities.

Seretha's community service and progressive leadership have earned her numerous honors, recognitions, and media coverage.

Seretha is involved with multiple organizations in the community. She is a Winter Haven Chamber of Commerce business member; First Missionary Baptist Church trustee; life member of the NAACP; Polk Academies Advisory Board; Winter Haven Chamber; past president of the National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Polk County Chapter; among many other accomplishments.

Seretha Tinsley, we honor you.

HONORING LISA LANDERS DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Lisa Landers.

Lisa Landers has served in the executive director position of the Winter Haven Housing Authority since 2009. She leads in the overall operations of the agency's public housing Section 8, low-income tax credit, and multifamily housing programs.

Known for her tenacious spirit, Lisa has been recognized for successfully transforming a once nonperforming troubled agency into one now competitively recognized by Florida housing officials.

Prior to joining the WHHA in 2004 as a volunteer, Lisa championed research on infant mortality and neonatology for the late Florida Governor Lawton Chiles and wife, Rhea Chiles, at their Center for Healthy Mothers and Babies at the University of South Florida in Tampa.

Ms. Landers is also an award-winning journalist for The Tampa Tribune.

Her career includes leadership as director of public relations for The Spring of Tampa Bay, one of Florida's largest domestic violence centers.

A graduate of Florida A&M University with a B.S. in journalism, Ms. Landers has also pursued advanced studies in public administration at USF and holds the distinguished Executive Director's Education Certification from Rutgers University's Center for Government Studies.

Among her board and outside interests, Ms. Landers is a member of the Winter Haven Leadership Class of 35, currently serves as the Florida State public relations representative for the Florida Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials and its Southeastern Regional Council, and is currently a member of the Leadership Polk Class XI.

Lisa Landers, we honor you.

HONORING TWANNA DEWDNEY DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Twanna Dewdney.

Twanna Dewdney is a Winter Haven resident and proprietor of Salon Ashanti. She has proudly operated her

salon in Winter Haven for over 13 years and considers it a vital resource to the community.

As a community activist, Twanna advocates for HIV and AIDS education and prevention. Her salon is an HIV testing site for the Polk County Health Department.

Salon Ashanti also serves as a location for voter outreach, registration, and school supply drives. Children within the neighborhood utilize Salon Ashanti as a place of refuge, and she prides herself as a mentor to young women.

Her ministry extends beyond her local community, as she also organizes toiletry drives for women's and men's prison ministries.

Twanna began Project Park Bench as a drive where warm items and food could be brought to the salon for donations to the homeless. Items are then donated to the Mission of Winter Haven.

Further, she also uses her salon to promote other entrepreneurs.

In 2010, Twanna received the Community Service Award from the Jewett Alumni Association and the Bringing Your Business Back Award from the NAACP.

In 2011, she received her associate of arts degree from Polk State College and bachelor of applied science in supervision management in 2013.

Twanna is an usher, president of HIV/AIDS Ministry, and member of the Willing Workers Committee at Hurst Chapel AME Church.

She was the 2014 recipient of Girls Inc. She Knows Where She's Going "George Jenkins" Award.

In 2015, Twanna received the Outstanding Entrepreneur's Self-Determination Award, presented by presiding elder Jimmy Thompson and the Lakeland District African Methodist Episcopal Church.

She also received the Shining Star Award for outstanding ministry and community service and was the recipient of the Minerva Achievement Award from the Lakeland Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc.

Twanna Dewdney, we honor you.

HONORING GLENDA JONES DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Glenda Jones.

It has been said that humility is often found in those who serve others. Glenda Jones best personifies that statement.

For 45 years, Glenda has and continues to champion the elderly by seeking to empower them with knowledge, skill, and resources through the Winter Haven Neighborhood Service Center Inc.

As a registered nurse, she provides care and compassion for her community through civic engagement. Glenda actively serves her community and has

been recognized for her participation with a number of organizations in our community.

Glenda won Woman of the Year, the highest honor in Winter Haven, in the 2008 Banker's Cup. She is involved with St. Joseph's school board, the Keep Winter Haven Clean and Beautiful organization, a charter member of the East Central Democratic Club, secretary for the Polk County Democratic Black Caucus, and the United Way of Central Florida board of directors.

She is also a current member of the Agricultural and Labor Program board of directors, PRIDE of Polk County, the Women's Club of Winter Haven, Silver Life member of the NAACP, and chair of the Winter Haven Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Commemorative Commission as well.

Glenda has been an official sponsor of the Winter Haven MLK Parade and other activities during King Week. She is current chair of the Florence Villa CRA in the city of Winter Haven and a past recipient of the Winter Haven Girls, Inc., She Knows Where She's Going Award.

Glenda Jones, we honor you.

□ 1815

HONORING LAKECIA GUNTER DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Lakecia Gunter.

Lakecia Gunter is a Haines City native. She is currently Intel's chief of staff and technical assistant of Intel. Prior to her current role, she was the general manager of the consumer desktop segment marketing team in the client computing group, where she was responsible for maximizing desktop profitability to grow the desktop P&L.

She is an active member of the Intel Black Leadership Council, Intel's network of Intel African Americans, and Women at Intel.

Lakecia started from humble beginnings, growing up in a single-parent household. Her late mom, Barbara Griffin, always described her as a curious child. She is a trailblazer who has never been afraid to be the only one.

"If they let me in the door, I'm going to make the entrance wider," she says. And she does just that by sharing her time and talents with several nonprofits focused on improving educational outcomes for high school dropouts and underprepared college students. In her mentoring, she tries to impress upon kids that challenges are designed to help them grow.

Lakecia earned an MS in electrical engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology and a bachelor of science degree in computer engineering from the University of South Florida. She also earned her project management professional certification.

Her efforts in the engineering career field and the community have garnered

her national recognition. She recently was named to Business Insider's list of the 26 most powerful female engineers in 2016. She was the recipient of the Society of Women Engineers' Prism Award for demonstrating outstanding career technology leadership as well as leadership in STEM and in the community.

Further, she was named to Diversity MBA Magazine's 2014 list of top 100 under 50 diverse executive leaders for her technology leadership and achievements at Intel and in the community.

For that, Lakecia Gunter, we honor you.

HONORING GLORIA NIEC DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Gloria Niec. Ms. Niec is the executive director of the Celebration Foundation and has tackled serious issues affecting Osceola County.

In 2012, the Celebration Foundation led the effort to increase awareness of those experiencing hunger in the county by creating Osceola Connected. The group became very involved in combating childhood hunger. Today, Osceola Connected provides food to over 1,000 Osceola County elementary students every week during the school year.

While handing out bags of food or taking children to summer camp, Gloria learned that many graduating seniors had no postsecondary plans. Once she learned that most students had never even visited a college campus before, Gloria and her committee began sponsoring campus tours of Technical Education Center Osceola and Valencia College Osceola Campus. The first year, just over 100 students toured the campuses. Since then, over 6,000 students have toured the campuses, which have helped improve the county's college-going rate.

Education is one of the cornerstones of Celebration Foundation's mission "to work hand in hand with our neighbors to build a strong and caring central Florida community."

Gloria was concerned about the effect of media on girls and young women. She convened a group of talented women, and they formed WINGS, Women's Initiative Nurturing Girls' Strength. The goal is to help girls and women create powerful life journeys.

Gloria also gathered a group of architects and urban planners who are committed to preserving, protecting, and advancing the principles upon which Celebration was based. They teach at Lifelong Learning, lead tours, and sponsor an annual speaker.

The Concert Series, in its 16th year, is enjoying robust attendance and sponsorship. Gloria has helped to grow the series, which offers a cultural opportunity for residents in Celebration, Osceola County, and central Florida. She has also been involved with Thriv-

ing in Place and Lifelong Learning, programs that enable seniors to live healthy, safe, independent, and have enriched lives.

And for that, Gloria Niec, we honor you.

HONORING HEATHER WILKIE DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Heather Wilkie.

Heather Wilkie is the executive director of the Zebra Coalition, a network of community organizations which provide services to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and all youth. Following the tragic Pulse nightclub shooting, the Zebra Coalition evolved as a leading organization in the community's provision of services to victims and their families, and Wilkie continues to lead these efforts to ensure the LGBTQ-plus youth in central Florida have a safe space to turn.

Wilkie serves on the task force for the LGBTQ Alliance, a group of appointed LGBTQ organizations and community leaders formed to address our community's needs as a result of the Pulse shooting.

She is an experienced executive leader in the nonprofit sector with over 13 years of personal commitment and dedication to community service. A dynamic and energetic advocate for global change and equality, Wilkie contributes a strong passion for social justice.

Prior to joining the Zebra Coalition, Wilkie served as chief operating officer for the leading central Florida domestic violence organization Harbor House. During that time, she chaired the LGBTQ Caucus with the Coalition Against Domestic Violence, where she led the statewide initiative to enhance services for LGBTQ survivors of abuse.

Wilkie holds a master's degree in mental health counseling from Rollins College.

And for that, we honor you, Heather Wilkie.

HONORING MARY DOWNEY DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Mary Downey.

Reverend Mary Lee Downey is the executive director and founder of the nonprofit Community Hope Center. The Community Hope Center is a one-stop shop providing services to the homeless and disenfranchised in Osceola County. In 2016, the Community Hope Center was awarded the prestigious Bank of America Neighborhood Builders Award and, in 2015, the Bob Allen Award by Walt Disney World for innovative approaches to helping the homeless in the community.

In the last five years, the Community Hope Center has served over 25,000 individuals in the central Florida area. The Center focuses on a "housing first" model of care while also including a strong position regarding poverty alleviation.

Reverend Downey is a deacon in the United Methodist Church for the Florida Annual Conference. Her focus is on missional outreach through social justice in the nonprofit organizations. She is also a clergy at the Spring of Life United Methodist Church.

Previously, Mary served as the deputy director of Helping Others Make the Effort, HOME, a nonprofit committed to ending homelessness in Osceola County. She was also the program and evangelism director for the First United Methodist Church of Kissimmee, where she focused on spiritual formation, outreach, and missions.

Before moving to central Florida, Mary was a journalist. In 2004, Mary graduated cum laude from Henderson State University in Arkansas with a bachelor of art in mass media. In 2016, she graduated from Henderson State with a master of art in art history and liberal arts. In 2012, Mary graduated with a master of Christian leadership with an emphasis in missions from Asbury Theological Seminary.

Mary and her amazing husband, Martin, have three children. She enjoys writing, preaching, and reading. In her free time, you can find her and her family enjoying the theme parks in central Florida.

And for that, Mary Downey, we honor you.

HONORING SHERI MORTON DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Sheri Morton.

For over half a century, Sheri Morton has volunteered for progressive causes. From the peace, civil rights, and women's movements in the 1960s to voting, equal rights, and quality affordable healthcare, Ms. Morton has volunteered tens of thousands of hours to help improve the quality of life for people in our community, our country, and our world.

Ms. Morton began volunteering as a teenager and continued doing so during her undergraduate years, when she was the first woman from her high school to attend Harvard College. She earned a master's degree at Harvard Graduate School of Education, where she later worked.

After receiving her JD, she became an attorney and is now retired.

Sheri has held numerous volunteer political positions as well as served on the Osceola County Library Advisory Board.

A lifelong supporter of quality affordable healthcare for all Americans, she was a local volunteer spokesperson, encouraging enrollment in the Affordable Care Act health insurance exchanges.

Ms. Morton's volunteer work has ranged from teaching English to immigrants and tutoring a blind student in high school math to collecting food for Appalachia's needy and warm clothes for the homeless. Currently, she regu-

larly volunteers hosting Jewish cultural events for the residents of a local assisted living facility.

After half a century of volunteering, Ms. Morton's dedication to improving the lives of others continues unabated.

And for that, Sheri Morton, we honor you.

HONORING KATHLEEN PLINSKE DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Kathleen Plinske.

Kathleen Plinske serves as campus president of the Osceola, Lake Nona, and Poinciana campuses at Valencia College in Orlando, Florida, and in central Florida. She has served as an advocate for increasing access to higher education in historically underserved communities and has been instrumental in Osceola County's "Got College?" efforts, which have resulted in an increase in the community college's going rate by more than 20 percent over the last 5 years.

Prior to joining Valencia in 2010, Plinske began her career at McHenry County College, rising up to ultimately becoming interim president of institutional effectiveness. A graduate of Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy, Plinske attended Indiana University Bloomington as a Herman B. Wells scholar, earning a bachelor of arts in Spanish and physics with highest distinction and honors. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, she completed a master of arts in Spanish from Roosevelt University, a doctorate in education technology from Pepperdine University, and a master of business administration from the University of Florida.

Actively involved in her community, Plinske has served as a board chair of the Education Foundation of Osceola County and as president of the Rotary Club of Lake Nona. She has also served on the board of CareerSource Central Florida, the Osceola Center for the Arts, Junior Achievement of Osceola County, and the Lake Nona Education Council.

In 2010, Plinske was recognized as one of 24 emerging leaders in the world by Phi Delta Kappa. In 2012, she was named Woman of the Year by Orlando Business Journal in its 40 Under 40 competition and the Outstanding Young Alumna by Indiana University.

In 2014, she received the Compadre Award from the Hispanic Business Council of the Kissimmee/Osceola Chamber of Commerce and the Don Quijote Hispanic Community Champion Award from the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando.

Plinske was selected as an Aspen Presidential Fellow in 2016 and was named Pepperdine University's Distinguished Alumna in 2017.

And for that, Kathleen Plinske, we honor you.

HONORING KATHY WANDEL DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Kathy Wandel.

Kathy Wandel comes from a career in transportation, which focused on sales, operations, and training. Upon her retirement, she and her husband relocated from Texas to central Florida.

She served on the board of directors for the Senior Resource Alliance, the Area Agency on Aging for Central Florida, representing Osceola County, and was board chair for three years. She also delivered Meals on Wheels for the Osceola County Council on Aging.

□ 1830

She became a volunteer guardian ad litem, helping to provide a powerful voice in court on behalf of Florida's abused, neglected, and abandoned children in 2003.

She was soon invited to join the local nonprofit for the Guardian Ad Litem Program in Osceola County, Voices for Osceola's Children, where she is serving as board chair. This nonprofit supports the efforts of over 200 certified local volunteer GALs, as well as provides for the unmet needs of over 500 local children while they are under the supervision of the court dependency system.

She is a longtime member of Rotary International's Kissimmee West Rotary Club in Osceola County. She plans on continuing to support her club's fundraising efforts through local causes, including the Adopt-A-Precinct program for the Osceola County Supervision of Elections.

She finds the Rotary ideal of "Service Above Self" a wonderful way to meet new people who share the ideal and work to give back to the community.

For that, Kathy Wandel, we honor you.

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

ABORTION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to have the opportunity to be here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I ask that people who are listening to our conversation weigh heavily on some of the remarks that will be made here this half hour.

I come to the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, to address the situation of innocent, unborn human life in America and to recount the path that we have followed and to lay out a path for the future that gives us a better opportunity to save as many lives as possible.

For me, Mr. Speaker, I recall that when 1973 rolled around—January 22, 1973—on that date, we had two major decisions that came down from the United States Supreme Court: *Roe v. Wade*, which most everybody knows; and the other was *Doe v. Bolton*. Of those two cases that dropped on us in January of 1973, not very many people, if any, understood the magnitude of the decisions that had been made that day or the impact it would have on the population of the United States of America.

They did not believe that we would see 45 years of pro-life marches coming to the city in the middle of the winter and sometimes marching through the snow from down on the Mall, all the way up to the United States Supreme Court building, calling upon the Supreme Court to correct the decision that was made by an activist court in 1973.

The bottom line of that decision was that an abortion was essentially declared to be, some would say, a constitutional right for any reason or no reason at all, as much as you might want to parse the phrases in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, for me, I didn't realize the impact of this in 1973. But by 1976, when my first son was born, I remember holding him in my hands and looking at David Steven King, understanding the miracle of life and the miracle of birth and thinking within that first hour of his life how anyone could take his life now, this little miracle child with that big head and dark hair and blue eyes and gurgling a little bit and crying some and squirming a lot, but a miracle.

I thought: How could anyone take his life now, when he is an hour old or a minute old or a minute before he was born or an hour before he was born? Could they take his life a day before, a week before, or a month before, or a trimester before?

When could you decide that this child's life could be ended, and do so within a moral framework rather than a framework of maybe self-interest?

I concluded that there was only one moment, only one instant. We have to choose that moment when life begins. There is only one, and that is the moment of conception. We all know that. I knew it in 1973. I am sure I knew it before then, but I hadn't thought about it very much.

And here we are today and we know. We know by the benefit of ultrasound. We are watching little babies squirm around in the womb. We are watching them yawn and stretch and suck their thumbs and try to talk and stretch themselves and belch and do all the things inside the womb that they do pretty shortly when they get outside the womb. It is life. It is miraculous life. Little hands, little feet, little fingers, a little nose, little eyes. They are little babies that are defenseless.

This Congress has allowed a Supreme Court to impose abortion on demand in America, and we have worked to put together very few limitations on that abortion on demand. I don't think we have done enough, either, to send the message to America that life begins at the moment of conception. But ultrasound has shown many of us in this country—millions of us—that life does exist inside the womb.

We know that we can, even with a transabdominal ultrasound, verify a heartbeat in 7 to 8 weeks from conception. In 7 to 9 weeks, that little baby is formed by then with a beating heart. We know that of those babies that have a detectable beating heart, 95 percent of those babies will experience a successful birth. It is at least 95 percent. Some say more.

So 95 percent of them, or more, are destined to experience a successful birth. Yet the most dangerous place for a baby is in the mother's womb. It is the most dangerous place because our hearts are hardened by a Supreme Court decision that some think will not change, that we have to live with it in perpetuity and accept the consequences of 60 million Americans being aborted.

There is a hole in the population of America that is 60 billion babies strong. Some of those little girls who were aborted would be mothers by now. When you do the math on that just on the back of the envelope, that is perhaps as many as another 60 million babies—a missing 120 million Americans that would otherwise have been born in this country and had the opportunity to live, to love, to laugh, to learn, to worship, to be mothers or fathers themselves. That is what we are asking for here in this Congress with 170 cosponsors on the Heartbeat bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), one of those cosponsors who is a bit of a rare commodity himself, a conservative from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am, indeed, pleased to join my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING) tonight, who has been a very strong, tireless leader on this issue and many other important ones for our Congress and our country. So I thank him for that and for letting me be here to be a part of this tonight.

Obviously, this is a very important issue and we need to have a much better discussion than we have had in a long time in this country.

The moral of the Heartbeat Protection Act is extremely simple to understand. It is against the law for a physician to perform an abortion after detecting a heartbeat, other than to save the life of the mother.

Mr. KING was speaking a moment ago about this. For anybody who uses common sense, life begins at that moment of conception. At that moment of conception, you have a life. If you don't

have a conception, obviously, you don't have a life.

So how is it that it is even a debate? How do people hide on the sidelines, in the shadows, somehow debating it as something like, "Well, is it really a life," or, "At what line do we draw that point at?"

That is an important point Mr. KING made as well with all the different ideas of when an abortion is appropriate.

We have a 20-week mark. We have the end of the first trimester, the end of the second trimester.

What date is appropriate?

We have people these days talking about partial-birth abortion not being a problem at all. Even in some extreme quarters, some people are saying that post-birth is somehow an acceptable way and that it isn't really a person with rights at that point.

We are talking about a much narrower thing here, with the heartbeat being a true detectable moment of life. When prospective mothers go in for those ultrasounds, it is a very moving moment for her, and, hopefully, her mate there with her, to see what is going on inside there with all those little baby parts that are being formed and the miracle that life is.

But it is really a telling moment when that prospective mother hears that heartbeat. That is what is so important in this debate about having the tool of an ultrasound to show what is really going on here, for those who try to obfuscate what is happening with the pregnancy. Let that prospective mother make an informed decision, not one that is hidden, not one that is obfuscated by, "Oh, it is just a tissue mass or something."

The crime about a lot of this is that a lot of these women are not being allowed to make an informed decision about what is really going on.

So this Heartbeat bill that Mr. KING is championing here is an important moment in time for a prospective mom and her mate to be able to have an informed decision and really contemplate this life that is happening and the downside of what that abortion might mean.

So, indeed, is it not a crime to murder a human being with a heartbeat?

It really shouldn't be any different for babies that are yet to be born.

Arguably, since they are innocent, isn't it more important we protect their rights?

They don't really have someone to speak for them, except for those of us who realize what we are truly taking about here: an innocent life with a heartbeat that will become a life outside of the womb and walk amongst the rest of us humans with dignity, with passion, with ideas, with dreams. That is what we are defending here.

It really mystifies me how legislation like this is so difficult to move

through this body, the Senate, the Congress as a whole, or State legislatures in other types of bills we have tried in order to preserve life, to preserve the value of life.

Indeed, if we are not a country that is going to value life in all of its human forms, then what are we?

Our Founders placed a great value on those liberties that have formed this country. Indeed, right above the dais it says: "In God we trust."

I think God watches what we do here. He is watching what is happening to these babies and he wants us to tell the truth and know the truth and be able to project the truth on what is really going on with a pregnancy or those who are contemplating a very serious decision.

This bill will go a long way toward shedding the light on a quantifiable moment when there is a detected heartbeat that anybody around that ultrasound can hear. That should be a reality moment. I think more times than not, a prospective mother will make a decision for life, given that.

I commend my colleague, Mr. KING, for battling this for those who have lost their lives so many millions of times in the past and had nobody to defend them. But he is building momentum on this legislation and his effort with so many pro-life groups around the country, so many pro-life legislators that are onboard with this. We need a couple more of these national groups to get involved and not see the fog, but, instead, see the clear path that this is.

I implore people to contact their legislators and contact the organizations that are supposed to be standing for life and make sure they get onboard with this effort, because a heartbeat is a true indication of life.

I thank Mr. KING for his effort with this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman gives me a little too much credit and doesn't take enough credit for himself.

□ 1845

That is that measure of humility I was asked about earlier today. Trent Franks always said: The funny thing about humility, about the time you think you have achieved it, you have lost it.

Mr. LAMalfa is a solid principled conservative, and I appreciate him coming to the floor to defend life. The effort that we have had is the whip team has gone out and pulled together 170 cosponsors on this bill that has set the stage for a path that I believe soon will be to the floor of the House of Representatives. Let's put the Heartbeat bill over on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk. That is a good place for a lot of good things to have a chance to happen, even though they are a little slower at moving over there than we are over here.

One of the nimble folks who has been actively engaged in the pro-life movement in the House of Representatives is Mr. LAMBORN from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KING for his endless and tireless leadership in reminding us of the humanity of the unborn. I am a proud cosponsor of the Heartbeat Protection Act. I am one of those 170 who have stepped forward to support this much-needed piece of legislation.

The development of an unborn baby is truly miraculous. Around 6 to 8 weeks, you can detect, through ultrasound, the heartbeat of the little child inside the mother's womb; 6 to 8 weeks. So I don't see how people can deny that an abortion is the taking of a human life.

How many lives would we save if we remembered that simple fact?

What if instead of rushing to abortion, which some people think is their only option, we instead turned our attention to addressing practical needs, the needs of a woman facing a pregnancy decision?

What if we empowered women to carry and raise their child?

Or what if we did everything we could to promote a stable and happy life for the child through adoption?

America was built on the principle that life is a God-given gift. Here, in Congress, it is our duty to protect human life at all stages. I will continue to do so, and I know Representative KING will continue to do so. I thank him for his leadership. I am glad that I can support him with this wonderful piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for coming to the floor to make such a strong message here on the sanctity of human life.

When I think about that heartbeat, a heartbeat is a certain indicator of life. If the baby has a beating heart, we know that baby is alive. Statistically speaking, 95 percent or more of those little babies that have a beating heart, that can be detected by an ultrasound in that 6- to 8-week period of time, 95 percent of them will experience a successful birth.

I have asked the question to those who weren't supportive of the bill: Did you ever hear the expression, "Let's error on the side of life?"

Well, let's not error with life at all if we can help it. If we have a 95 percent chance of a successful birth, we can't take a chance on ending that little baby's life.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bill that has come together over the last year and a half or so. Just to mention some of the points here that I think are important is that we have at least 162 pro-life organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. I have a little demonstration here.

These are some of the organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. We have to really search pretty hard to find somebody that is not onboard.

You can go down through this list. I could read these all off, but I think it would be a little bit tiresome and maybe a little bit redundant. I put this together. This may be one-third of—or maybe even one-fourth—of the overall list of 162 pro-life organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. It is nearly universal across this country.

Of course, we don't have Planned Parenthood on here. We don't have the NARAL here. The National Abortion Rights Action League is what they used to be. They say they aren't anymore, but, yes, they are.

We have the pro-life organizations here: the people who care about life, the people who understand that human life is sacred in all of its forms, it begins at the moment of conception, that we have to protect life from that time on, and that we have a constitutional duty to do so. We have an equal protection clause in the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution that tells us that.

But it seems as though the United States Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, upset that. They decided that a right to privacy, which was a manufactured right—I don't think I have it in my memos—but it is *Griswold v. Connecticut* back in the 1960s. It is a decision that a couple had a right to privacy in order to buy birth control pills. It was in Connecticut in that period of time. Shortly after that decision, they decided it wasn't just a married couple that had a right to privacy; it was an unmarried couple that had a right to privacy in the form of contraceptives. That was only in the mid-sixties.

Then *Roe v. Wade* came along. I think that this Court can never be defended for the decision that they made, the idea that privacy trumps life, and that the privacy of a mother will allow for an abortion at any stage, is how this all came together between *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*.

But even some of our professors that you might think have been on the other side of the issue had their skepticism. In fact, there is a bit of it here in Ruth Bader Ginsburg in a statement that she made in 1985. Our Supreme Court Justice Ginsburg said:

Roe, I believe, would have been more acceptable as a judicial decision if it had not gone beyond a ruling on the extreme statute before the court. Heavyhanded judicial intervention was difficult to justify and appears to have provoked, not resolved, the conflict.

I would restate the Fourteenth Amendment. It says this: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States;

nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

This comes back to personhood. I believe that a conceived baby from that moment is a person. We don't have the technical medical ability to define that moment at this point, Mr. Speaker, but we can define "heartbeat," and we have done so in the Heartbeat Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), who has been a leader and a fighter for life since back in the 1980s or so, when I was still in the crib.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Mr. KING for his work on the Heartbeat Protection Act. It gives us an opportunity to reflect on some of those bigger issues that we have going on in our society.

This is personal to everybody. We all have our own stories of when we are in a family situation and somebody becomes pregnant. I certainly remember that when my wife and I had our first child. The first visit to the doctor when you got to hear the heartbeat was just amazing.

I remember also having a subsequent appointment where the doctor couldn't find the heartbeat. We were very concerned, very worried, so they sent us to the hospital. They wanted us to have another test. It is a small town we were in. The hospital was where they had the sonogram. My wife and I were praying all the way: Please, let this baby be okay.

Well, we got to the hospital and the technician did a sonogram, and, lo and behold, we saw the baby, we saw the beating heart, and we were just in awe at this new human life.

Mothers and fathers are forever changed when they first hear that heartbeat, that tiny pulse that reinforces the big and beautiful reality of a precious human life.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I rise in support of H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act. As a lawmaker, I took an oath to our Constitution to protect the constitutional rights of all Americans. That is why I am cosponsoring this bill.

This legislation protects a pre-born baby's life when his or her heartbeat is detected. A heartbeat is a very basic sign of life. The pulse represents a unique person with inherent dignity and natural, human and constitutional rights that extend throughout the continuum of life through conception until natural death.

And where do these rights come from?

The Founders who signed the Declaration knew, for the Declaration itself says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their

Creator with certain unalienable rights."

That is interesting, Mr. Speaker, because the first unalienable right that is identified is the right to life.

Do you know who else knew?

President Kennedy.

President Kennedy reminded us in a different context, in the struggle against atheistic totalitarian communism. He said these words: "And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

The right to life, defined in our Declaration, protected in our Constitution, and reiterated time and again by leaders across the religious and political spectrum, applies to every human life. It is easy to see who is human, if you look.

Twenty-six years ago, the late Governor Bob Casey from Pennsylvania, and others, including Sargent Shriver and Eunice Kennedy Shriver, signed onto a statement regarding abortion as true today as when it was published. Under the section of that document that was titled "Without a Doubt, a Human Life," Governor Casey and his coauthors observed:

From the beginning, each human embryo has its own unique genetic identity. Three and a half weeks after conception, its heart starts beating. At 6 weeks, brain activity can be detected. At the end of 2 months, the limbs, fingers, and toes are complete. By 3 months, the baby is quite active, forming fists, bending arms, and curling toes. At 4 months, vocal cords, eyelashes, teeth buds, fingernails, and toenails are all present. By 5 months, the baby is sucking its thumb, punching, kicking, and going through the motions of crying. By 6 months, it responds to light and sound and can recognize its mother's voice.

The statement went on:

Advocates of unrestricted abortion do not want the public to focus on these undeniable facts of fetal development, but the facts cannot be ignored. They may claim that abortion is a violent act, not against potential life, but against a living, growing human being, a life with potential.

Governor Casey subscribed to that belief.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Intentionally stopping a heartbeat is not healthcare.

H.R. 490 recognizes what science has already affirmed: that there is a baby growing in her mother's womb, one with her own distinct heartbeat.

Therefore, we have an obligation to protect the most vulnerable among us: to defend the defenseless.

How can our country continue to flourish and claim itself as a champion of human rights when we allow our society to rid ourselves of our own future generations?

That is why I came to the floor today to urge support for the Heartbeat Protection Act, to give our country a

chance to reflect on some of the deeper questions and deeper values, to walk in solidarity with one another when one encounters a difficult situation, and to stand in each another's shoes with empathy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his eloquent words.

I hadn't heard the description delivered by Governor Casey in those years back. But Governor Bob Casey—God rest his soul—captured my attention years ago, 20 or more years ago. I had a quote from Governor Bob Casey, a Democrat, that I had on my bulletin board that I don't have to look up anymore. And it was this:

Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

It rang so clear and true to me that I cut it out of the magazine and stuck it up on the bulletin board. His words echo in this Chamber today. I wish they echoed in his son over in the Senate the same way they echoed out of the mouth of Governor Bob Casey back in those days when he was denied the opportunity to speak before the Democratic National Convention because he is pro-life. And we look today and we see this issue has been more and more polarized. I hope that we can be more broad with this and that we can be more bipartisan than we are.

□ 1900

We do have bipartisan cosponsorship on this bill. It is narrow, but it exists.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, this body to take this bill to the floor. 170 cosponsors is further ahead than any comparable piece of pro-life legislation. To have that many cosponsors and a good number of other Members who have said, "I am not ready to sign on the dotted line, but you bring it to the floor, and I will vote 'yes,'" I think we get to "yes," but we need to bring it here.

There are concerns that, well, if we pass it off the floor of the House, the Senate won't take it up. Well, we know they won't take it up if we don't pass it off the floor of the House.

There is concern about the Supreme Court. Of course there is. We have to challenge the Court. We are going to live with the 1 million abortions a year in this country until we are willing to challenge the Court and do so successfully.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to see one or two more appointments to this Court in the next 2 or 3 or more years, and we need to get the bill off the floor, onto the desk of Leader MCCONNELL so that it has a chance then to go to the President's desk, where I am very confident that President Trump will sign the bill. And then it has a chance to go—I am happy with

it not being litigated, but we expect it will be litigated like every other effective piece of pro-life legislation.

I appreciate the attention tonight, Mr. Speaker, and the speakers who have come to the floor to weigh in for innocent, unborn human life and to lay out the path for the future that we have to follow here if we are to answer to God and country for that gift from God, which is life, in the first priority, then liberty, then the pursuit of happiness.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for after 4 p.m. today and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and March 7 on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delays.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY2018 AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY2018 THROUGH FY2027

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congress-

sional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. This status report is current through February 23, 2018. The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to the overall limits, as adjusted, contained in H. Con. Res. 71, as agreed to on October 26, 2017, for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, which establishes a rule enforceable with a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2018 because appropriations for those years have not yet been completed.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for legislative action completed by each authorizing committee with the limits contained in the Statement of Committee Allocations of the Fiscal Year 2018 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017, for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. For fiscal year 2018 and the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027, "legislative action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the levels set forth in H. Con. Res. 71 and the Statement of Committee Allocations published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2018 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending limits allowed under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

Table 4 compares the levels of changes in mandatory programs (CHIMPs) contained in appropriations acts with the permissible limits on CHIMPs as specified in section 5103 of H. Con. Res. 71. The comparison is needed to enforce a rule established in H. Con. Res. 71 against fiscal year 2018 appropriations measures containing CHIMPs that would breach the permissible limits for fiscal year 2018.

Table 5 displays the current level of advance appropriations for fiscal year 2019 of accounts identified for advance appropriations pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017. These tables are needed to enforce a rule against appropriations bills containing advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of the Chairman published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017 and (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in section 5104 of H. Con. Res. 71.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregates in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Brad Watson.

Sincerely,
STEVE WOMACK,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

TABLE 1—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2018, AND 2018–2027 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2018 ¹	Fiscal Years 2018–2027
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	3,136,721	n.a.
Outlays	3,131,688	n.a.
Revenues	2,490,936	31,171,521
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	3,314,353	n.a.
Outlays	3,244,451	n.a.
Revenues	2,503,102	31,096,088
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	+177,632	n.a.
Outlays	+112,763	n.a.
Revenues	+12,166	–75,433

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2020 through 2027 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

¹ The FY2018 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget was agreed to in H. Con. Res. 71.

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2018		2018–2027	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
302(a) Allocation	–2,243	–1,991	–209,852	–206,919
Legislative Action	+55	+55	+1,282	+1,369
Difference	+2,298	+2,046	+211,134	+208,288
Armed Services:				
302(a) Allocation	–1,651	–1,485	–32,949	–32,601
Legislative Action	–78	–69	–1,142	–1,082
Difference	+1,573	+1,416	+31,807	+31,519

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2018		2018–2027	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Education and the Workforce:				
302(a) Allocation	– 16,809	– 9,799	– 353,852	– 326,214
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	+16,809	+9,799	+353,852	+326,214
Energy and Commerce:				
302(a) Allocation	7,805	– 24,661	– 1,652,820	– 1,656,131
Legislative Action	+22,268	+5,408	– 70,992	– 140,028
Difference	+14,463	+30,069	+1,581,828	+1,516,103
Financial Services:				
302(a) Allocation	– 10,980	– 10,695	– 124,012	– 123,666
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	+10,980	+10,695	+124,012	+123,666
Foreign Affairs:				
302(a) Allocation	0	0	0	0
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
302(a) Allocation	– 430	– 193	– 25,270	– 24,689
Legislative Action	0	0	– 3,320	– 3,320
Difference	+430	+193	+21,950	+21,369
House Administration:				
302(a) Allocation	0	0	0	0
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:				
302(a) Allocation	– 16,098	– 1,528	– 67,078	– 67,178
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	+16,098	+1,528	+67,078	+67,178
Natural Resources:				
302(a) Allocation	– 3,816	– 3,171	– 60,417	– 59,302
Legislative Action	+75	+26	– 379	– 379
Difference	+3,891	+3,197	+60,038	+58,923
Oversight and Government Reform:				
302(a) Allocation	– 12,746	– 12,746	– 281,830	– 281,706
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	+12,746	+12,746	+281,830	+281,706
Science, Space and Technology:				
302(a) Allocation	0	0	0	0
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
302(a) Allocation	0	0	0	0
Legislative Action	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
302(a) Allocation	– 241	– 193	– 122,290	– 3,066
Legislative Action	– 2	– 2	– 42	– 42
Difference	+239	+191	+122,248	+3,024
Veterans' Affairs:				
302(a) Allocation	– 748	– 748	– 49,022	– 49,022
Legislative Action	+2,100	+1,050	+2,100	+2,100
Difference	+2,848	+1,798	+51,122	+51,122
Ways and Means:				
302(a) Allocation	– 19,499	– 19,108	– 800,344	– 799,687
Legislative Action	– 8,233	– 8,584	– 102,388	– 87,522
Difference	+11,266	+10,524	+697,956	+712,165

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

[Figures in Millions]¹

	Allocations		302(b) for GWOT		Current Status General Purpose ¹		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20,001	21,459	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Commerce, Justice, Science	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	53,935	64,318	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Defense	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	584,169	553,725	75,112	39,395	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Energy and Water Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	37,562	38,915	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Financial Services and General Government	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20,230	22,384	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Homeland Security	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	51,989	48,687	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Interior, Environment	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	31,442	32,090	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	157,936	168,354	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Legislative Branch	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	3,580	3,697	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	88,166	84,593	638	6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
State, Foreign Operations	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	34,469	45,194	12,019	4,725	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	56,512	120,914	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Full Committee Allowance	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Total	1,064,806	1,167,885	76,591	43,121	1,139,991	1,204,330	87,769	44,126	+75,185	+36,445	+11,178	+1,005
Comparison of Total Appropriations and 302(a) allocation									General Purpose		GWOT	
									BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation									1,064,806	1,167,885	76,591	43,121
Total Appropriations									1,139,991	1,204,330	87,769	44,126
Total Appropriations vs 302(a) Allocation									+75,185	+36,445	+11,178	+1,005
Memorandum					Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec 251(b) Designated Categories					BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA					n.a.	n.a.	4,868	3,125	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science					n.a.	n.a.	1,199	328	0	0	0	0
Defense					n.a.	n.a.	4,921	1,087	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development					n.a.	n.a.	17,420	411	0	0	0	0

Memorandum	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec 251(b) Designated Categories								
Financial Services and General Government	n.a.	n.a.	1,786	1,310	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	n.a.	n.a.	59,323	21,709	6,793	340	0	0
Interior, Environment	n.a.	n.a.	1,278	920	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	n.a.	n.a.	3,987	1,762	0	0	1,896	1,576
Legislative Branch	n.a.	n.a.	14	11	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	n.a.	n.a.	1,014	66	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	n.a.	n.a.	0	3	0	0	0	0
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	n.a.	n.a.	29,829	921	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	125,639	31,653	6,793	340	1,896	1,576

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown in this table.

TABLE 4—CURRENT LEVEL OF FY 2018 CHIMPS SUBJECT TO H. CON. RES. 71, SECTION 5103 LIMITS (IN MILLIONS) AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

Appropriations Bill	Budget Authority
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0
State, Foreign Operations	0
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	0
Total CHIMP's Subject to Limit	0
H. Con. Res. 71, Section 5103 Limit for FY 2018	19,100
Total CHIMP's vs. Limit	– 19,100

TABLE 5—2019 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 5104 OF H. CON. RES. 71 AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2018

(Budget Authority, millions)

Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations	2019
Appropriate Level	70,699
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Department of Veterans Affairs	
Veterans Medical Services	0
Veterans Medical Support and Compliance	0
Veterans Medical Facilities	0
Veterans Medical Community Care	0
Subtotal, enacted advances	0
Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(1) Limit	– 70,699
Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations	2019
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Special Education	0
Career, Technical and Adult Education	0
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	0
Project-based Rental Assistance	0
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	0
Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(2) Limit	– 28,852
Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations	2019
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445
Total, enacted advances	445

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2018.
Hon. STEVE WOMACK,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on

the fiscal year 2018 budget and is current through February 23, 2018. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H.

Con. Res. 71, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

This is CBO's first current level report for fiscal year 2018.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2018 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH FEBRUARY 23, 2018

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^{a b c}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,658,139
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,070,788	1,985,384	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	513,307	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	– 866,685	– 866,685	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,204,103	1,632,006	2,658,139
Enacted Legislation ^b			
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (P.L. 115–91)	– 33	– 24	0
CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (P.L. 115–96, Division C)	705	205	0
An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 . . . and for other purposes (P.L. 115–96, Division D)	2,100	1,050	0
An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (P.L. 115–97)	– 8,600	– 8,600	– 143,800
An act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–120, Divisions C and D)	14,509	1,203	– 1,263

FISCAL YEAR 2018 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH FEBRUARY 23, 2018—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Divisions A and C–G) ^a	7,504	4,050	– 9,974
Further Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 3) ^a	– 315	– 315	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	15,870	– 2,431	– 155,037
Continuing Resolution ^{c,d}			
Further Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 3) ^e	627,733	0	
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	1,008,810	987,143	0
Total Current Level ^{c,e}	3,314,353	3,244,451	2,503,102
Total House Resolution	3,136,721	3,131,688	2,490,936
Current Level Over House Resolution	177,632	112,763	12,166
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2018–2027			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,096,088
House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	31,171,521
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	75,433

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable, P.L. = Public Law.

^aIncludes the budgetary effects of the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues and were cleared by the Congress during the 1st session of the 115th Congress, but before the adoption of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018: the VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–46); the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–48); a joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission (P.L. 115–54); the Continuing Appropriations Act 2018 and Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–56); the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of Hurricanes Irma and Jose Overseas Act (P.L. 115–57); the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–62); the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63); the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–64); and the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–72).

^bPursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act), amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act, and are excluded from current level totals. In addition, emergency funding designated that was not designated pursuant to the Deficit Control Act does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. Those amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Deficit Control Act:			
Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act 2017 (P.L. 115–56, Division B)	0	3,406	0
Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–72)	36,517	16,256	0
Department of Defense Missile Defeat and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division B)	4,686	803	0
Further Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 1)	84,436	11,185	0
Subtotal, Deficit Control Act emergency requirements	125,639	31,650	0
Other Emergency Requirements			
Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63)	263	263	0
Bipartisan Budget Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 2)	2,217	1,469	– 509
Subtotal, other emergency requirements	2,480	1,732	– 509
Total, amounts designated as emergency requirements	128,119	33,382	– 509

^cPursuant to sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255), certain funding provided to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—in 2017 through 2026 shall not count for the purposes of the Deficit Control Act or the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts shown in this report do not include \$866 million in budget authority and \$706 million in estimated outlays from such amounts.

^dThe Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123) contains seven divisions. Division A, Subdivision 2 of Division B, and Divisions C–F contain authorizing legislation, of which the budgetary effects of Subdivision 2 of Division B were designated as being for emergency requirements. Subdivisions 1 and 3 of Division B contain appropriations legislation. Subdivision 1 provided supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for disaster relief and designated those amounts as being for emergency requirements; Subdivision 3 provided continuing appropriations until March 23, 2018, while Section 158 provided authority, for the duration of fiscal year 2018, for the Secretary of Energy to draw down and sell crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Division G of P.L. 115–123 provided for the budgetary treatment of Divisions A–F.

^eFor purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3656. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a consistent eligibility date for provision of Department of Veterans Affairs memorial headstones and markers for eligible spouses and dependent children of veterans whose remains are unavailable.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4181. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2017 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827(a)(2); September 21, 1950, ch. 967, Sec. 2(17)(a) (as amended by Public Law 101-73, Sec. 220(a)); (103 Stat. 263) and 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4182. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Computation of Annual Liability Insurance (Including Self-Insurance), No-Fault Insurance, and Workers' Compensation Settlement Recovery Threshold", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395y(b)(9)(D); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1862(b)(9)(D) (as added by Public Law 112-242, Sec. 202(a)(2)); (126 Stat. 2379); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4986. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reauthorize appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, to provide for certain procedural changes to the rules of the Commission to maximize opportunities for public participation and efficient decisionmaking, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-587, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1116. A bill to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4545. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other

purposes (Rept. 115-589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4986 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 5171. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the establishment of a Ski Area Fee Retention Account; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 5172. A bill to assist Indian tribes in maintaining, expanding, and deploying broadband systems; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5173. A bill to include Portugal in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E-1 and E-2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Portugal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 5174. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act with respect to functions assigned to Assistant Secretaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 5175. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5176. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide coordinated care to patients who have experienced a non-fatal overdose after emergency room discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5177. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5178. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for small business con-

cerns located in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 5179. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to coordinate a National Cyber Hacking Competition for high school students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5180. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide protections for employees receiving tips, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 5181. A bill to require certain licensees under the Federal Power Act make annual payments to the county in which a licensed hydropower facility is located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLEGÓ (for himself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 5182. A bill to require annual reports on funds expended by the Federal Government with the Trump Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5183. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply the rules related to the treatment of certain qualified film and television and live theatrical productions to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5184. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to improve conservation practice standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5185. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for the Cops in Schools program for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5186. A bill to amend the definition of a school resource officer to include certain veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 5187. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1585 Yanceyville Street, Greensboro, North Carolina, as the "J. Howard Coble Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to land stewardship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 764. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 765. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 15, 2018, as "National Senior Fraud Awareness Day" to raise awareness about the barrage of fraud attempts that seniors face, to encourage the implementation of policies to prevent these scams from happening, and to improve protections from these scams for seniors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. SCHNEIDER introduced a bill (H.R. 5189) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Francis E. Normoyle for acts of valor during the Korean War while a member of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States;"

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 5175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 5179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 5181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GALLEGÓ:

H.R. 5182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 5183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [. . .]

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

Moreover, the Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 states, "The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ."

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 states, "The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ." And; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 states, "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 5187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish post offices and post roads.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 5188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill can be enacted pursuant to Article I Section 8

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 103: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 299: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 350: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 362: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 394: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 440: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 681: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 807: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 809: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 881: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 911: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 930: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1120: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1156: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1223: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1276: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1439: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1484: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1615: Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1683: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1697: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. YOHO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1734: Mr. BARR and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1772: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1828: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1904: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1905: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1972: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2044: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2069: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 2259: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2285: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2358: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2452: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2803: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2856: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2886: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3207: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. O'ROURKE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3391: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3497: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3592: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3611: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 3613: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3637: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3641: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3681: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ROSEN, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3773: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3784: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3790: Mr. BARR, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3867: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3871: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 3889: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 4052: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4058: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4090: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4099: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 4101: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4143: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 4177: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 4198: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4223: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 4238: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 4245: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 4265: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4373: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4444: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 4471: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 4486: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 4489: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4527: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4573: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4575: Mr. MESSER, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4635: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 4659: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4677: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 4681: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4703: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 4706: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4720: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BOST, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4732: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 4747: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 4772: Mr. PAULSEN.

- H.R. 4779: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 4800: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4808: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 4811: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BERA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4821: Mr. ROSS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 4828: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4841: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4846: Ms. TITUS, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4878: Mr. RUSH and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4886: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4888: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 4909: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLUM, Mr. COLE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. FASO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 4910: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 4912: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4916: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 4932: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 4940: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4944: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 4995: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 5002: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5006: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 5012: Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 5022: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5031: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5042: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 5062: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 5083: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 5085: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5086: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5104: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 5106: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 5116: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 5129: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 5132: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 5140: Mr. COLE.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 108: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 128: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H. Res. 199: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H. Res. 257: Mr. VALADAO.
H. Res. 344: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H. Res. 361: Mr. HASTINGS.
H. Res. 576: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. CURTIS.
H. Res. 632: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H. Res. 697: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 752: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 755: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 760: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, and Miss RICE of New York.
H. Res. 761: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. PANETTA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNITION OF MR. BELL

HON. DAVE BRAT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of a constituent Richard Bell, Jr. Mr. Bell lived in Blackstone, and served as a truck driver in the renowned Red Ball Express where he drove supplies to the front line in France during the invasion of Normandy. It was this group that preserved the 28 Army divisions through the summer and fall of 1944 throughout France and Belgium, and allowed the allied troops to advance relentlessly, pushing the Germans out.

My office was privileged to assist his family when they learned there were seven medals he earned, but never received, during his service during World War II. Having the opportunity to present those medals to him at a special ceremony organized by his family is a memory I will never forget. I am extending my heartfelt sympathy to his family as they mourn his passing.

HONORING THE WORK OF WILLIAM MILLER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include in the RECORD a tribute to Master William Miller who has written a book entitled, Biography of Congressman George Miller. In his book, William outlines the life and work of his grandfather, The Honorable George Miller.

William's detailed account of his grandfather's early life paints a vivid picture of his time as a firefighter and a pear-picker, and moves on to discuss Congressman Miller's work, including some of his greatest legislative accomplishments.

I thank William for his detailed research and hard work to write this book for all to learn from, enjoy, and be inspired by one of the most consequential legislators of our time.

BIOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE MILLER
(By William Miller)

INTRODUCTION

Do you want to learn about the coolest congressman ever? Yes, you do? Then read this awesome book to find out all about George Miller! I will tell you about when he was growing up. He was a working man! George did jobs like being a firefighter, a pear picker and much more. I will also tell you about some of George's biggest accomplishments. Keep on reading to learn more about this totally awesome man!

CHAPTER 1: GROWING UP

George Miller was born in San Francisco, CA at the Children's Hospital on May 17, 1945. He lived in Richmond until he was five years old. When George moved to Martinez. He has 3 sisters Laura, Gretchen, and Katie. For fun, George rode horses and participated in the rodeo. He also likes hiking, skiing, and fishing. George was a working man. For

jobs George was a firefighter. "Wow, that must have been HOT!" and he was a pear picker and baled hay.

CHAPTER 2: WORK AND CONGRESS

How did George get interested in Congress? Well, he got interested by his dad who was the state senator too. George always wanted to help people. The first year was fun and exciting. Making laws for are country is fun. Did you know that the first law he made was letting kids with disabilities go to school. Some of his friends were Nancy Pelosi and John Burton. Did you know that he rode with several presidents on Air Force one the president's plane. He rode with President Ford, Carter and Clinton.

CHAPTER 3: BIGGEST ACCOMPLISHMENTS

His Biggest Accomplishment was his first law that helped let kids with disabilities go to school and work.

He also helped in the Head Start committee. This was a program for children from low income places where they could get help with school work, supplies, and food. This started in 1965.

And health care for all or known as Obama Care.

GLOSSARY

Congressman: Someone who serves the community by making laws in Washington, D.C.

Committee: A group of Congressman that work together to help make a law.

Head Start: A program for kids in low income neighborhoods that help kids with school work.

Obama Care: A health care program for anyone that needs it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for roll call votes 92 and 93 on Monday, March 5, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on both of these votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes due to a mild medical issue. Had I been present for roll call vote number 81, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 1222 the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017 I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 82, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 2422 the Action for Dental Health Act of 2017 I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 83, on the Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 84, On Ordering the Previous Question, on H. RES. 748 Providing

for consideration of the bill H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017, I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 85, On Agreeing to the Resolution to H. RES. 748 Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 1865, the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017, I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 86, On Ordering the Previous Question, to H. RES. 747, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4296 to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, and providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4607 the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 87, On Agreeing to the Resolution, to H. RES. 747, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4296 to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, and providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4607 the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 88, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions, H.R. 4296, To place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, I would have voted "nay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 89, On Passage to H.R. 4296 To place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 90, On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 1865 Mimi Walters of California Amendment No. 2, I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 91, On Passage of H.R. 1865 Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, I would have voted "yay."

IN MEMORY OF DR. LAKSHMI
CHAPARALA, PH.D.

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Lakshmi Chaparala, Ph.D.—Gothram Koundinyasa, on the anniversary of her death. Dr. Chaparala was born and raised in Eluru, Andhra Pradesh, India, on a particularly important day in the Hindu calendar—the date of Krishna's birthday—and belonged to a Hindu Brahmin Telugu community in India. Throughout her life, she educated thousands of students and believed that America is the greatest nation in the world. Lakshmi held strong beliefs that education, discipline, diligence, cleanliness and devotion to God are of utmost importance to succeed in life.

Lakshmi is the loving mother of one of my constituents, Praveen. She is also survived by her husband, Dr. Babji Chaparala, along with her two other children, Suneetha and Swapna. She was an extraordinary woman who

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

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

touched the hearts of many. Although no words can really help to ease the loss, her life was truly a blessing and she is held very close in thought and prayer. In honor of her memory, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Lakshmi Chaparala for her service to our country and her faith in our great nation.

PVT. ALBERT M. PERRY

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Private Albert Perry, who was killed in action in Saarlautern, Germany on December 18, 1944.

Private Perry was born on October 1, 1920 in Banta, Indiana, to William Herman Perry and Dessie Day Perry. He was the ninth of ten siblings, with two sisters and seven brothers. He attended Bargersville and Center Grove schools, but after only one year of high school he went to work full-time at the Earl Wilson Service Station and Garage in Franklin, Indiana to help his family.

Private Perry enlisted in the Army on March 3, 1944 at Fort Benjamin Harrison in Indianapolis. After several months of training, he was deployed on August 6, 1944 from Boston, MA on the SS *Mariposa*. He served with the Company K, 378th Infantry Regiment, 95th Infantry Division of the Third Army, which earned the nickname "Iron Men of Metz" after defending the town in France from repeated German attacks.

Like many of our brave young soldiers, Private Perry paid the ultimate sacrifice defending and protecting our freedom. Although our debt to him can never be repaid, we have a duty to honor and recognize the sacrifice that he made protecting this great country.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND
SERVICE OF EDMUND L. REGALIA

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of a longtime Contra Costa resident, Mr. Edmund Regalia.

At an early age, Ed committed to his passion for serving others by participating in school leadership, acting as President of a social-civil rights club, and joining the Naval ROTC while attending U.C. Berkeley. He spent his summers with the Navy in locations around the country and abroad, including travel through the Panama Canal. After graduating with a degree in Political Science in 1952, Ed reported for duty immediately to San Diego where he served mainly on destroyers in the Pacific during the Korean War. Toward the end of his tour, he served as Legal Officer on his ship, the *Laws*. During his time with the Navy, Ed visited Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Guam, the Philippines, Taiwan, and Hawaii. Ed retired from active service in 1955 as a Lieutenant.

After he left the military, Ed enrolled at Boalt Hall Law School at U.C. Berkeley, and in 1964 was a co-founder of Miller Starr Regalia, a law firm focusing on real property cases. During his time as a practicing attorney, Ed received numerous awards for his work and contributions to the legal field. Ed went on to serve

two terms on the California Law Revision Commission, appointed first by Governor Davis and re-appointed by Governor Schwarzenegger.

Motivated by the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert Kennedy in 1968, Ed and other members of the Walnut Creek Democratic Club formed the Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund, a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. From 1968 through 2017, he served continuously on the Board where he oversaw \$4.4 million in scholarships awarded to assist 750 students from Contra Costa County Community Colleges transition to four-year universities. Ed also served on Homeowner's Boards, both as President and pro-bono legal advisor, and the Board of both the Diablo Symphony and the Walnut Creek Library Foundation.

Ed's dedication to his job, his family, and his community was admirable. Ed passed away on February 6, 2018. He will be missed sincerely by those who had the pleasure of knowing him, including his wife Gwen; children Doug, Ken, Phil, and Connie; and his grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

CONGRATULATING MELISSA
BURNISON

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Melissa Burnison on her recent confirmation to serve as the Department of Energy's Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs. Melissa is well known to Members of the House, and President Trump made an excellent choice when he nominated her for this important position.

Melissa Burnison is a native of Kentucky and she began her career on Capitol Hill working for Senator Mitch McConnell. Melissa later worked for Congressman Zach Wamp of Tennessee where she focused on Department of Energy issues. She later served as a senior advisor at the Department of Energy and most recently represented the Nuclear Energy Institute as Director for Federal Programs. In that capacity, my staff and I have worked closely with Melissa to address challenges and opportunities facing the nuclear industry. Melissa also worked tirelessly to foster increased collaboration between the DOE national labs and the nuclear industry. I have especially appreciated her work in this area.

While Melissa Burnison is a respected and effective professional, she truly stands out as a wife and mother. Melissa is an adoring mother of three daughters and with her husband, Scott, they have formed a warm and close family.

One of the pleasures of serving in the U.S. House of Representatives is seeing young, talented people come to Washington to serve their country. I commend Melissa for her confirmation in this important position, and I expect we will be hearing more about this talented and gracious public servant in the years ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY J. WALZ

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the vote on the passage of H.R. 1865 (Roll Call No. 91). Had I been present, I would also have voted yea.

I was also absent for the vote on the passage of H.R. 4296 (Roll Call No. 89). Had I been present, I would have voted no.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen flight delays, I was absent for roll call votes 92 and 93 on March 5, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted AYE on Roll Call No. 92 and AYE on Roll Call No. 93, both naming certain post offices.

TRIBUTE TO POLICE CHIEF ALAN
R. GORDON

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Chief Alan R. Gordon for his 43 years of exceptional service to the people of Westborough, Massachusetts. Though Alan retired as Chief of Police in January, his reputation of integrity, excellence, and service above self will remain an example for law enforcement officers throughout the nation.

Alan first joined the force in 1972, and became a full-time officer in 1978 after attending the Worcester Police Department Academy. While supporting a family and working long hours, often on the midnight shift, Alan rose through the ranks of the department, becoming Sergeant in 1988, Lieutenant in 1994, and Chief of Police in 2005.

His bravery and quick thinking have saved lives and property countless times. One night in particular stands out in his mind; in October of 1983, he raced to the scene of a 911 call. A baby was not breathing. With seconds to spare, Alan's training kicked in, and alongside another officer, Alan administered CPR and saved the baby's life.

Though Alan's duties changed as Chief, he always put the people of Westborough first: spending time listening to residents, addressing their concerns, and communicating the work of the department to his neighbors. And he always led by example—ensuring that his officers had the tools, training, and compassion they needed to effectively do their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, all of Alan's professional accomplishments would be praiseworthy on their own. Alan's work has no doubt made Westborough a safer community and a better place to live. But what really makes Alan a model public servant—what really sets him apart—is how he goes above and beyond to give back to his community time and time again.

As President of the Westborough Police Patrolmen's Association, Alan started a program to provide food for the less fortunate on

Christmas and Thanksgiving. As a volunteer at the Lighthouse Mission Soup Kitchen, Alan regularly served meals to the homeless in Worcester.

Alan continues to volunteer at the Boston Marathon, the Falmouth Road Race, and as a baseball umpire and basketball referee at Westborough Middle School and High School. And, he serves as the Police Department's liaison to numerous statewide boards.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to Alan on his retirement, and our heartfelt gratitude to him and his family on behalf of the residents of Westborough and the United States Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 3183—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office", (Roll Call No. 92), I would have voted "aye."

Additionally, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 4406—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the "Tuskegee Airman Post Office Building", (Roll Call No. 93), I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber on Tuesday, February 13. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 70 and 71.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 26, 2018, and Tuesday, February 27, 2018 I was unable to vote on any legislative measures. Had I been present, I would have voted the following:

(Roll no. 81) On passage of H.R. 1222—Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act, had I been present I would have voted yes;

(Roll no. 82) On passage of H.R. 2422—Action for Dental Health Act, had I been present I would have voted yes;

(Roll no. 83) On motion to table the appeal of the PERSONAL EXPLANATION ruling of the chair, had I been present I would have voted yes;

(Roll no. 84) On ordering the previous question providing for consideration of 1865—Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017, had I been present I would have voted yes;

(Roll no. 85) On adoption of the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1865—Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Traf-

ficking Act of 2017, had I been present I would have voted yes;

(Roll no. 86) On ordering the previous question providing for consideration of H.R. 4296—to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency and H.R. 4607—the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, had I been present I would have voted yes;

(Roll no. 87) On adoption of the combined rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4296—to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency and H.R. 4607—the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, had I been present I would have voted yes;

(Roll no. 88) On democrat motion to recommit, had I been present I would have voted no;

(Roll no. 89) On passage of H.R. 4296—to place requirements on operational risk capital requirements for banking organizations established by an appropriate Federal banking agency, had I been present I would have voted yes;

(Roll no. 90) On Walters of California Amendment to H.R. 1865—Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, had I been present I would have voted yes; and

(Roll no. 91) On passage of H.R. 1865—Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, had I been present I would have voted yes.

HONORING OWEN J. ROBERTS
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER JAMES
B. FREES II

HON. RYAN A. COSTELLO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a true champion for students and a tireless advocate for educational excellence in the Owen J. Roberts School District.

James B. "Jamie" Frees II graduated from Owen J. Roberts High School in 1989. He began giving back to his alma mater in December 2009, following in the footsteps of his father and grandfather by becoming a third-generation member of the Owen J. Roberts School Board.

With a background in banking, Jamie was instrumental in the annual budget process and served as Finance Committee Chairman. He was later selected as Board Vice President and Board President.

Jamie's contributions went well beyond serving as a School Board Member.

As an OJR Music Parents Organization member, Jamie spent many weekends driving the equipment truck for the Marching Band and serving as announcer at the Fall Preview and Annual Cavalcade of Bands.

In addition, he founded and served as president of the Coventry Rugby Football Club, was a member of the Famous Bucktown Boosters and a member of the board of the Charlestown Playschool.

Sadly, Jamie passed away unexpectedly on February 1st. His death is a profound loss for the entire community.

Mr. Speaker, I join the Owen J. Roberts community in mourning Jamie's passing, expressing gratitude for the countless ways he made the entire district better during his three

terms on the school board, and extending my condolences to the Frees family.

RECOGNIZING THE TREMENDOUS
SERVICE OF COUNCILMAN LANCE
LIVERMAN

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous service of Councilman Lance Liverman as he prepares to retire from Princeton's Town Council this year.

Born at Princeton Hospital in 1962, Lance Liverman has been a lifelong resident of the town he loves. He was educated in Princeton public schools before attending college at Fairleigh Dickinson University and then transferring to Trenton State College, now known as the College of New Jersey so that he could be closer to home to help his ailing stepfather. After graduating college, Lance went into his stepfather's business before working for himself—first as a special courier and then in real estate.

A native son of Princeton, Lance has given 30 years of public service to his community. For the last 15 years, Lance Liverman has served as a member of the Princeton Town Council where he has been hands on in addressing the issues facing residents.

With his deep understanding of how Princeton works and with his charitable nature, Councilman Liverman has been a great asset on his council assignments. On the Affordable Housing Board, the Councilman uses his real estate knowledge to benefit the community, while he provides counseling for youth and their families dealing with alcohol and drug addiction on the Princeton Alcohol & Drug Alliance.

All of Councilman Liverman's colleagues have called him, "a truly unique Princeton citizen and a great human being." Another member of the council has called him "Princeton's Hero," as he not only serves on the council, but also through his church, working with youth, and through his constant presence around town. This is why the local paper has described him as the "Son of the Community."

Though Councilman Liverman will be stepping down from his seat at the end of this year, this does not end his service to his community. He has pledged that he will continue to serve the community and help make Princeton a model for social justice. He will also use his time away from the council to spend more of it with his wife LaTonya and his three daughters, Kelsey, Ashlyn, and Savannah.

I urge my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the tremendous work of Councilman Lance Liverman and to wish him the best in his future endeavors.

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT FOR
H.R. 620

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I supported H.R. 620, the ADA Education and Reform Act last month on the House floor. The bill will improve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and curb lawsuit abuse. H.R. 620 requires the Department

of Justice to develop a program to educate state and local governments and property owners on strategies for providing improved access to public accommodations for persons with disabilities. The legislation also gives owners and operators of public accommodations, after receiving written notice of ADA violations, an opportunity to address those violations before being sued.

The bill's notice and cure provisions apply to the owners and operators of public accommodations just like the underlying ADA statute. They are in the best position of control over the condition of their premises and compliance with the ADA. It is appropriate that disabled individuals who have been subject to discrimination in violation of the ADA should seek redress from owners and operators.

This does not affect the ability of owners and operators to seek indemnity from design and construction entities. However, such intent is not meant to authorize direct lawsuits against design and construction entities with or without compliance with notice and cure requirements on owners and operators under H.R. 620.

HONORING THE WORK OF MIRAH HOROWITZ

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the special leadership of Mirah Horowitz, the Founder and Executive Director of Lucky Dog Animal Rescue, and include in the RECORD an article entitled, Southwest and Lucky Dog Animal Rescue Fly Plane to Puerto Rico to Save 62 Pets and Donate 14,400 lbs. of Supplies that was published by People Magazine. This article outlines the rescue mission embarked on by Southwest Airlines and Lucky Dog Animal Rescue.

It was the extraordinary leadership of Mirah Horowitz that this rescue effort was launched and coordinated with Southwest Airlines. I'm exceedingly proud of my constituent for her professionalism, dedication and compassion. Mirah has built an organization that is highly respected, and it is her determination that led to the nationally recognized rescue of animals in Puerto Rico, bringing them to their new homes in the United States.

I salute Mirah and all the volunteers involved in this historic effort. In this unique undertaking, they demonstrated the very best of America.

[From People Magazine]

**SOUTHWEST AND LUCKY DOG ANIMAL RESCUE
FLY PLANE TO PUERTO RICO TO SAVE 62
PETS AND DONATE 14,400 LBS. OF SUPPLIES**

(By Kelli Bender)

On Saturday Jan. 20, Lucky Dog Animal Rescue and Southwest Airlines drastically changed the lives of 62 Puerto Rican animals, flying the homeless, furry passengers up the East Coast to a new life.

It was a trip long in the making, powered by dozens of brilliant, compassionate animal lovers, who asked for nothing in return except the chance to change an animal's life.

Southwest Airlines has a history of helping those in need, especially after natural disasters. So when Washington D.C.-based Lucky Dog Animal Rescue approached the company about flying out homeless pets stranded in Puerto Rico following the devastation of Hurricane Maria, Southwest responded immediately.

"We had a goal to do something for each of the hurricanes. The situation in San Juan

was a little different because our employees and their families were affected, and with the electricity being out, we couldn't focus on the animals right away," Lisa Tiller, Southwest's Senior Communications Manager told PEOPLE.

But just because they couldn't fly pets out, didn't mean Southwest wasn't bringing help in. The airline routinely shipped planes loaded with supplies to the island, much of which is still without running water and electricity. Many of the runs included pet essentials to help rescuers in Puerto Rico look after animals.

In January, three months after the hurricane hit, things were finally in a place where Lucky Dog Animal Rescue and Southwest could put their plan into action.

For the mutt-filled mission, Southwest took one of its planes out of service and staffed it with some of its finest employees, all of whom chose to donate their time to this effort.

The plane's cargo hold and overhead bins were filled with supplies Puerto Rico's humans and animals needed before taking off from Baltimore-Washington International airport at 5 a.m. on Saturday.

"The morning started off with Lucky Dog getting Starbucks for everyone," Lucky Dog Animal Rescue's founder and Executive Director Mirah Horowitz said of the day, which began at 3:45 a.m. "The pilots brought doughnuts. My parents brought doughnuts. We had a lot of doughnuts on that flight, a lot of sugar."

After three hours and 45 minutes in the air, the volunteers landed in San Juan and began unloading the 14,400 lbs. of much-needed supplies they brought with them.

"Everyone was just so nice and helpful. The minute we landed, Lucky Dog volunteers were unloading, Southwest volunteers were unloading, the cargo staff on the ground was unloading," Horowitz recalled. "Everyone jumped in to help. It was truly amazing how wonderful everyone meshed for two groups that had never met before."

Next it was time to handle the precious cargo. Sixteen cats and 46 dogs looking for forever homes were carefully loaded into carriers off the tarmac and prepared for their flight to a new life.

"Everyone was jubilant. I was shocked! For as long of a day as it was, and as early as it started, people were just in the best moods the whole time," Horowitz said.

The furry passengers were a mix of pets from different circumstances. Some were living in foster homes before the storm hit, others were abandoned by their previous owners once Hurricane Maria touched down. But it was the rescuers of PR Animals who were caring for these pets before Lucky Dog Animal Rescue and Southwest arrived. And it was these rescuers who were there on the ground to greet the volunteers and say their goodbyes.

"It was very emotional; the rescuers putting their dogs in the crates and saying goodbye to them, because these are animals they have been caring for through very difficult and traumatic times—whether they were caring for them before Maria and weathered the storm with these people, which were a few of the dogs, or whether they were rescued in the immediate aftermath," Horowitz added.

While the rescuers had to say goodbye to the animals they sacrificed so much for, they didn't leave empty-handed. All of the PR Animal rescuers present left in vehicles packed with donated supplies. Important items like batteries, bottled water, towels and tarps were given to the rescuers, more than half of whom are still living without running water and electricity.

"It wasn't about taking the pets off the island, it was about giving hope and physical help to people and reminding them that we haven't forgotten them," Horowitz said of the trip's mission. Once the pets were packed up, they were loaded on to the plane with their carriers securely strapped into the seats.

You might think a plane packed with 62 pets in the cabin would be a bit of a circus, but there were only a few howls upon landing.

"Amazingly during the flight, the hum and vibration kind of put them all to sleep," Horowitz said.

With carriers of kittens and puppies aboard, not everyone stayed in their crate during the trip. Horowitz admitted that the volunteers and flight attendants couldn't resist getting some quality puppy-holding and kitten-cuddling time in during the trip back.

"It was great," the Lucky Dog Animals Rescue founder said of the ride back to BWI. Even the pilots got a chance to hold the pups.

Back on the mainland, the dogs and cats were loaded into transport vans and driven to Dogma Dog Bakery in Virginia, where a crowd was waiting to welcome the animals, including several new pet parents.

Nine dogs and two cats were adopted right off the transport vans by animal lovers who had falling in love with the pets' pictures online.

An adoption event the following day found homes for 10 more of the Puerto Rican natives. By the end of the weekend, 21 of the 62 pets were with their forever families. The rest spent some time in foster homes before being moved to local rescues, including Lucky Dog Animal Rescue, where they will surely find their own pet parents soon.

It was a trip that made sense to Southwest, whose logo is a large heart—even if it meant giving up time and money.

"We've always been an airline that has lead with heart," Tiller said of her company. "It's hard to find a spare aircraft with more than 3,500 flights a day. To be able to get our top leadership to donate time and plane fuel to save animals is touching. It's when our employees shine the most are, when people donating time. Everyone is almost in tears because they are so touched to be a part of this."

And for Lucky Dog Animal Rescue, this trip was another small but important step to finding loving homes for all the needy animals of the world.

The non-profit plans to continue helping the pets of Puerto Rico and is working to send more animals to the mainland through the pressurized cargo holds of United Airlines planes, because caring for animals is a way to help everyone.

"When we lose sight of how we treat animals, we tend to lose sight of our humanity," Horowitz said of what the trip meant to her. "We can't forget the pets."

CONGRATULATING THE UCONN FIELD HOCKEY TEAM ON THEIR HISTORIC NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the latest achievement of the University of Connecticut Women's Field Hockey team. On Sunday, November 19, 2017, the UConn women celebrated a 2-1 win over the University of Maryland in the National Collegiate Athletic Association's Division I Field Hockey championship. The victory marked the 23rd straight win of the Huskies' historic undefeated season.

The championship is the fifth in UConn field hockey history, and caps the sixth perfect season in all of NCAA field hockey history. The team's senior class is also the most successful in the school's history, with a record of 87-6 and a pair of national championships.

The victory was Coach Nancy Stevens' third championship title. Stevens, who is field hockey's winningest coach, has brought much success to UConn. In the past five seasons alone under Stevens, UConn has won three of those five national championship titles.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in congratulating the University of Connecticut Field Hockey team on yet another successful season. May their win be an example to all, that with hard work, dedication, and passion, greatness is within reach.

TRIBUTE TO BRIGITTE MARIE
KELLEY

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Brigitte "Brig" Kelley, who passed away in California on December 10, 2017. Brig was the loving wife of former California State Senator David G. Kelley and she will be deeply missed.

Brig was born in Potsdam, Germany, a suburb of Berlin, to Dr. Herman-Walter Frey and Marie Frey-Richter on Nov. 20, 1926. She spent her youth in Berlin, Germany; Salzburg, Austria; Rome, Italy; and Freiburg, Germany. She studied English at the University of Freiburg and in 1948 she received a Quaker Scholarship to attend Mills College in Oakland, California.

Brig spent two years in the United States and upon her return met David, her husband to be. They married in 1953 and returned to Hemet in 1955 to settle on their citrus ranch in Bautista Canyon. Brig taught German in Adult Continuing Education and Spanish at Mt.

San Jacinto Junior College. She loved collecting art and antiques—in particular Spanish and religious art—and enjoyed traveling all over the world.

I have had the distinct privilege of knowing Brig for many years. I was proud to call her my friend and I will deeply miss her. I extend my heartfelt condolences to my good friend Dave Kelley as well as the entire Kelley family. Although Brig may be gone, her legacy and memory will live on.

HONORING JOSEPH GERCZAK

HON. LLOYD SMUCKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, today I honor and remember one of Pennsylvania's sons, and a native of Philadelphia, United States Coast Guard Signalman Third Class Joseph Gerczak.

Working as an apprentice machinist making gun parts after graduating high school, Joseph enlisted in the U.S. Coast Guard on September 26, 1942.

Following his training and early assignments, Joseph joined the crew of *Landing Ship Tank 66*, and was on board during the first assault against the Japanese-held Borgen Bay Area of New Britain on December 26, 1943.

Joseph's ship was in the bay while other vessels unloaded cargo onto the beach when seven Japanese dive bombers attacked his ship. He immediately manned his battle station and was the first crew member to return fire against the enemy.

Joseph opened fire, unloading his drums of ammunition into the dive bombers, blasting

two from the sky while bombs fell from the planes, striking his ship. He continued his assault against the enemy planes until he was struck by a blast that fatally wounded him and destroyed his battle station.

The American assault at Borgen Bay was successful, due in part to Joseph's courage, perseverance, and unwavering strength in the face of tremendous odds. Joseph was recognized for his sacrifice, posthumously awarded the Silver Star, Purple Heart, and the Presidential Unit Commendation.

This weekend, on March 9th, 2018, the Coast Guard will commission a Fast Response Cutter in Honolulu, Hawaii. The cutter will be named USCGC *Joseph Gerczak*. Joseph's sister and only surviving sibling, 92-year-old Stella Gerczak, will be in attendance at the ship's commissioning. Stella lives in my community, and we owe her, Joseph, and their entire family a debt of gratitude we will never be able to fully repay.

The commissioning of the USCGC *Joseph Gerczak* is just one way we can show our heartfelt and lasting gratitude for a brave young man who gave his life in service to our great nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 5, 2018 I missed the following votes and was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 92, and YEA on Roll Call No. 93.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 7, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 7, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

TURNING ABUNDANCE INTO SCARCITY

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Frederic Bastiat, the great 19th century economist, posed a simple question that we need to think about carefully as we consider tariffs and trade wars.

What is better: abundance or scarcity?

The answer might seem self-evident, but protectionists down through history just don't seem to grasp it.

Suppose widgets cost \$1 in Canada, but \$2 in America. That means you can buy twice as many Canadian widgets by importing them. That is called abundance.

But some say that is not fair. We need to slap a \$1 tariff on Canadian widgets to level the playing field. That means we can only afford to buy half as many. There is no more perfect way to turn abundance into scarcity than by levying a tariff on imports.

Yet that is what was precisely proposed for steel and aluminum. By slap-

ping a tariff on foreign steel imports, the amount of steel Americans can afford will diminish as the price rises, so, too, the price of everything we make from steel, from cans to cars.

We are told this is necessary to save American steel jobs. Well, Bastiat would tell us that what we cannot see is just as important as what we can. We see the American steel jobs the tariff has saved by blocking foreign competitors. What we don't see as clearly are the jobs that disappear in every American industry that uses steel as their prices rise and demand for their products falls.

Remember, every producer in a society is also a consumer. No consumer benefits from higher prices, and no producer benefits from scarcer materials.

Every country that has cried protectionism has suffered terribly, including ours. Thomas Jefferson thought high tariffs could fund the government and promote domestic manufacturing. That caused a devastating recession that nearly destroyed our fledgling economy. Herbert Hoover responded to the recession of 1929 with the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. It didn't end well.

Trade is simply the exchange of goods, and both parties have to benefit from the trade or it just doesn't happen. If I pay you \$1 for a cup of coffee, I am telling you that your coffee is worth more to me than my dollar, and you are telling me that my dollar is worth more to you than your cup of coffee. When we make that exchange, we both take away something of greater value than we had.

But what happens if we slap a \$1 tariff on that cup of coffee. Only two possible things: I am either going to buy less coffee, or I am going to buy less of other things to afford the tariff. Neither is good for the economy.

True, some governments subsidize their exports, and that puts our producers at a great disadvantage. In effect, these governments are picking up part of the tab for the stuff that we buy. As Milton Friedman observed, that is simply foreign aid to American factories and consumers, paid for by the unfortunate taxpayers in the exporting countries. The appropriate response for us is to say, "thank you."

Yes, that hurts the 140,000 American jobs that produce steel. But the other 6.5 million Americans who manufacture products using steel can make more of their products, causing their producers to hire more workers and to pay them more. Jobs will disappear in the steel mills, but they will reappear

as better jobs in industries that can now obtain more steel at lower prices.

What would happen if we had a war?

Bastiat answered that question 150 years ago. He said trade, by its very nature "is a reciprocal dependence. We cannot depend on the foreigner unless the foreigner depends on us." If war clouds should gather between Canada—our biggest foreign supplier of steel—and the United States, we might face the prospect of losing their steel, but Canada would lose all of the American resources and products that their steel exports buy. Trade reduces the risk of war because it increases the value of peace.

Bastiat marveled at how much we spend to build ports and harbors, railroads and highways, all for the sole purpose of surmounting the obstacles to trade that nature has created. What sense does it make to erect artificial barriers to replace the natural ones that we have overcome?

By that same token, President Trump has set the stage for rapid economic expansion by reducing the tax and regulatory burdens that were crushing our economy, and the economy is responding. What sense does it make to ruin that progress by replacing the taxes and regulations we have shed, with new ones?

BLOCKING IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I talked about immigrants Donald Trump doesn't really care for, like the Dreamers who were raised in the United States and are now vulnerable to deportation. Then there are the refugees from war and religious persecution. He doesn't really care for them either.

Let's see, there are the people from El Salvador, Haiti, or Africa—the people from shithole countries. Trump would rather deport than protect them. And he doesn't want them coming here legally either.

No, as we all know by now, Trump prefers immigrants from snowhole countries like Norway. Yep, you take a look at the Winter Olympics leaderboard of the countries that won medals and that is a pretty good list of who Trump wants to have here. Norway, check. Canada, great. Netherlands, okay. And we better add Russia to that, too.

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

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

President Trump has been blocking any kind of immigrant legislation because he will only agree to protect Dreamers from deportation if he can eliminate whole categories of legal immigration. And not just any immigration, but specifically the programs that are filled with people who want to come to the United States legally from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

He is especially opposed to diversity in our immigration system, and among the programs he insists we eliminate is the one most often used by immigrants from Africa.

So Trump's immigration approach is pretty simple: If you are White, you are all right. If you are Brown, you are a little lower down. And if you are Black, just go back.

The other group of people Trump is particularly angry about are family members of U.S. citizens—yes—and those who are on the path to becoming U.S. citizens. He insists that we need to take away the rights of U.S. citizens to petition for their family members. Nope, Trump thinks U.S. citizens cannot be trusted to petition for their own family members, which is kind of strange because he doesn't have to look very far to find an immigrant American citizen who petitioned—legally—for Melania's parents to come to the United States.

According to The Washington Post: "The parents of First Lady Melania Trump have become legal permanent residents of the United States and are close to obtaining their citizenship, according to people familiar with their status. . . .

"Immigration experts said"—they—"very likely relied on a family reunification process that President Trump has derided as 'chain migration' and proposed ending in such cases."

Remember, the in-laws are from Slovenia, and that country won two medals at the Winter Olympics, so I guess they are okay. It is okay, apparently.

Now, let us remember that the First Lady of the United States is here in this country because she applied for, and received, an "extraordinary ability visa," which is often called the Einstein visa because we give it to Nobel Prize winners. But I guess we also give the Einstein visa to musicians and artists and runway models.

The First Lady's extraordinary abilities are many, I am sure. Now, I want you to recall that one of the issues in Jared Kushner's security clearance was that he owes so much money to foreigners, that some people might be able to leverage that debt into an application for another visa program just for millionaires and fat cats. Yes, in America, if you have \$1 million, or you look like \$1 million, you can get a visa. But if you look like a parking attendant or a busboy or a field hand or the king of Wakanda, in the eyes of our President, you are just not welcome in the United States of America.

Look, let me break it down from my perspective. This is not the country we aspire to be. My mother came from Puerto Rico with a fifth grade education, and Puerto Rico has never won a gold medal at the Winter Olympics. But guess what? Her daughter—my sister—is a great public school teacher and her son is a Member of Congress, and I think that is what the American story should always be about. Not special treatment, not special programs just for the rich and the beautiful, and not, apparently, fast-tracking for the President's family, especially when he is going after so many other people's families who look just like mine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in profanity in debate.

Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

VENEZUELA HUMANITARIAN SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to bring attention to the sad and tragic truth of what is going on in Venezuela today under a cynical socialist thug, the Maduro regime.

Even though this administration has stepped up and has taken a strong stance against Maduro—we have sanctioned a lot of individuals—there is still much more that needs to be done.

And the first step is getting more action by making sure that my fellow colleagues are aware of the ongoing crisis in Venezuela and helping those who refuse to believe that Maduro can be that bad. Yes, he really can be that bad. And we need to understand the suffering and the frustration of the Venezuelan people.

The second step is urging the administration to increase the pressure, to use the tools that are available to us, to hold Maduro and his evil cronies accountable. We have already seen how some of these tools are working, Mr. Speaker.

Our sanctions are working, so much so that Maduro is actively looking at ways to circumvent our sanctions, like this crazy idea of launching his own cryptocurrency. We are hitting him where it hurts, and we need to build on that momentum.

But we must also not forget to advocate on behalf of the people of Venezuela who are suffering, who are malnourished, and who are sick and poor. They lack the most basic medical and food supplies that they need—again, all as a result of Maduro's policies. Who would have ever thought 30 years ago that Venezuela, that was a breadbasket for South America, is now having food shortages throughout the country.

So I call on the international community to try to see what we can do to ease this humanitarian crisis that Venezuelans are going through, because this situation is terrible, but I fear that it will get worse.

Maduro and his thugs are taking advantage of the worsening humanitarian situation, defrauding organizations that are looking to bring much-needed food and medicine into the country, and making it much harder to deliver aid to those who desperately need it.

This is why my dear friend, Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of our Foreign Affairs Committee, and I have introduced the Venezuela Humanitarian Assistance Act. This bill calls attention to the food shortages, to the water shortages, to the severe lack of medicine, to the severe lack of medical supplies, and to the lack of other vital goods and services. But, more importantly, it directs our great agencies—the USAID, especially, and the Department of State—to develop a plan to determine how the U.S. can help send in some humanitarian assistance through credible and independent nongovernmental organizations that are operating in Venezuela or in neighboring countries. It is very difficult to get that aid to the people who need it because Maduro does not want to help the suffering Venezuelan people.

This bill passed the House last year, and it sends a strong message that we see the millions of people of Venezuela who are suffering and that we want to help. As the political situation continues to deteriorate because socialism does not work, communism does not work, with Maduro announcing his sham of elections, another round of elections that only the opposition is shut out and only the cronies can win, political leaders are still in prison, and protestors continue to be met with violence, we must do what we can until this grave humanitarian crisis is resolved.

□ 1015

That is why I urge the international community to take notice of what is going on in Venezuela, see how we can come together and pass these important measures so that we can help the Venezuelan people. We must not stop working until we see once again a free and open, democratic Venezuela, free from this socialist and communist regime.

RECOGNIZING ZOO DIRECTOR MICHAEL BLAKELY

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember Michael Blakely of Little Rock, who passed away at the age of 67 just before the new year.

Mike served as the director of the Little Rock Zoo for 17 years prior to

his death. Next to his family, Mike's greatest love was for animals, from the smallest of snakes to the largest of elephants.

As a teenager, Mike began working as a zoologist in Portland, Oregon, and Oklahoma City before finally joining our community in Little Rock.

In Little Rock, he became the director of the Little Rock Zoo and held that position from 1999 until 2016. His work at our zoo enriched the lives of the thousands who visited each year, as well as the staff that he mentored so well.

He was dearly loved by his wife, Nancy, with whom he shared 34 years of marriage, and his two kids, Thomas and Elizabeth.

Martha and I thank him and his family for their dedication to animals and to the natural state of Arkansas.

RECOGNIZING BRYANT CITY COUNCILMAN JERRY HENSON

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of a man who had an indelible impact on central Arkansas, Mr. Jerry Henson, who passed away last month after a long battle with health issues that culminated in a sudden diagnosis of stage 4 liver cancer.

Jerry Henson dedicated his life to answering the call to serve others. From serving as an alderman for the city of Bryant, to volunteering his time at the Boys & Girls Club, Jerry lived his life to serve others.

In 2016, Jerry was honored with the Boys & Girls Club Hometown Hero Award and, in December, he received the Charles Broadway Community Excellence Award.

Jerry's example is one all Americans and Arkansans can admire.

I extend my deepest condolences to Jerry's wife, Star; his children, Stephanie and Gerald; and I pray for the well-being of his family and loved ones during this very difficult time.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT JAMES A. MAZZUCHELLI

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

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant James A. Mazzuchelli of Orange Park, Florida, a naval flight surgeon who passed away on February 24 as the result of a tragic accident that occurred while he was on duty.

Lieutenant Mazzuchelli graduated from Clay High School in 2003, where he served in the Naval JROTC program. Upon graduation, he received a full scholarship to Drexel University in Pennsylvania, where he studied commerce and engineering.

After graduation from Drexel, he decided to follow in his parents' footsteps and join the Navy. He did so while attending medical school at Lake Erie

College of Osteopathic Medicine, and received his naval officer's commission while finishing his studies.

Lieutenant Mazzuchelli served as a flight surgeon with the Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 267 stationed out of Camp Pendleton, California, and was deployed to Japan as part of the Marines' Unit Deployment Program in 2016.

Over his 7 years of service, Lieutenant Mazzuchelli provided exemplary medical care to the brave men and women who protect America. In fact, 2 weeks before his death, he completed his aircrew syllabus and received his aerial observer/aircrew wings, making him one of the very few naval doctors to have them.

He is survived by his parents and stepparents, as well as two sisters. I know his family, his community, and his squadron will miss him dearly.

Hailed by his fellow soldiers for his enthusiasm and dedication, Lieutenant Mazzuchelli's example of leadership through service will continue to inspire others.

We as a nation thank James and his family for his dedication and service to our great Nation. He will be missed, but not forgotten.

LET'S NOT INCREASE TAXES AS A WAY OF PROTECTING JOBS AND CAPITAL IN THIS COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage folks at home, folks in this body, folks wherever they may be scattered across this country to speak out against what the administration has proposed with regard to raising tariffs on steel and aluminum. At the end of the day, I believe it would be disastrous not just for the economy at large, but, frankly, for every one of us in the way that it would impact our pocketbook or our wallet.

In short, what I guess I am saying is that you don't have to do stupid to find that stupid is indeed stupid.

What I am getting at here is that we have had real-world experiments about once every 100 years in this country on these kinds of policies.

It was in 1828 that you had the so-called tariffs of abomination, and it was designed to supposedly protect jobs and protect industry. It proved to do neither. It actually proved to be disastrous for the South and, in particular, South Carolina, where I am from.

About 100 years later, you had the Smoot-Hawley tariffs that were equally disastrous in not producing what they were supposedly designed to do. They didn't protect jobs, didn't protect industry, and, in fact, world trade declined by about two-thirds during that time period.

So as a country, what I am suggesting is that we need to take a breath, we need to look before we leap.

In life, I would say there is a value to listening to the advice and counsel of others. In this case, Gary Cohn, the President's chief economic person, who is actually leaving based on this dispute, has said this is not a good idea. Steelworkers unions have said this is not a good idea for the way it will impact Canadian steel and, by virtue, American steel. The markets, which are sort of the collective opinion of what we all think is going to come next economically, dropped 600 points on Thursday and Friday, saying this is not a good idea. In fact, the Prime Minister of Sweden was here yesterday, and he was saying it was not a good idea.

A lot of folks have spoken out and said: This is a genuinely bad idea. Let's not move forward.

I would say further that, in negotiations, rescue teams shouldn't be the ones shooting the hostage.

In this case, we have our Cs mixed up. The administration talks about doing something about China, but, in fact, the group—the country—most impacted would be the Canadians. The Canadians have to be some of our staunchest allies over a long period of time, with us in war, with us in trade, with us culturally; yet the bulk of all steel that is imported to the United States comes from Canada and 50 percent of what we export in steel goes to Canada.

Let me put it this way: what I am saying is that what we need to do here is to trust our allies. If you walk into a bar and somebody says, "If you take one step closer, I am going to hit you in the face," we need to trust them that they are telling the truth. And what they said is: If you do this to us, we are going to do it to you.

In short, a trade war will ensue.

I remember watching a movie back when I was in high school or college, somewhere along there, called "War Games," and basically what it said was: the only way to win was not to play.

If we move forward, we are going to get hurt. Nobody wins in a trade war.

Finally, I would say this: in life, it is easier to burn down than to build up. You can take years constructing something and have it gone as a consequence of a match in a matter of moments or hours.

As we look at this, this administration, in conjunction with the Congress, has worked hard to construct a better environment for jobs, capital, and way of life with the tax cuts, with regulatory reform; but all that could be erased if we move forward with these tariffs.

More telling is the 70-year apparatus that has been created—over 70 years, since the time of World War II—that

had us engage with the rest of the world, and we see movement in the wrong direction.

Do we want better trade?

Yes.

Can there be changes that are made?

Yes. But this is not the answer.

A tariff, at the end of the day, is a tax.

My simple presumption and my simple ask of this administration, the ask of everybody in talking about what is occurring here, is to say: Let's not increase taxes as a way of "protecting jobs and capital in this country."

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MARVIN R. EDWARDS

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Mr. Marvin R. Edwards, who was a veteran, a hero, and a predominant member of the Jacksonville community.

Mr. Edwards served his country during World War II flying missions with the Office of Strategic Services, which was the precursor of the CIA. He often flew into enemy territory, collecting information that changed the course of the war. For his bravery with the OSS, Mr. Edwards was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 2016.

Following the war, he returned to Jacksonville, where he became an economist and a fixture in our community, starting organizations such as the Economic Roundtable of Jacksonville, which brings together businesses and community leaders to discuss economic trends.

In addition to his passion for business and economics, Mr. Edwards was a champion of public schools and fought for accountability in local and State governments. He was active in the community and never shy about sharing his opinion on major projects in Jacksonville.

Mr. Edwards passed away at 96 years of age. He is survived by his wife, Helene Edwards; and his children, Jeffrey, Douglas, and Carolyn.

On behalf of a thankful city and country, I stand today to thank Mr. Edwards for his years of dedication to his community and public service.

CONGRATULATING PETTY OFFICER 1ST CLASS
GENESIS MARIANO

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Petty Officer 1st Class Genesis Mariano for being named the 2017 Sea and Shore Sailor of the Year.

Growing up, Petty Officer Mariano's father served in the Navy until 1994, when he retired as a chief petty officer. Genesis credits his father's service as the source of his inspiration for joining the Navy.

After his father's retirement, Mariano's family continued to reside in

Jacksonville, where he attended school at Florida State College, pursuing his associate's degree until he joined the Navy in 2004, following in his father's footsteps.

He went to boot camp in April of 2004, and upon completion, went to Field Medical Service School in Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

He worked at duty stations all over the world and is now the medical leading petty officer for Expeditionary Warfare Training Group Pacific.

He aspires to make chief petty officer and to eventually become a master chief.

When asked about him, Mariano's commanding officers have only the highest regard for him. They speak of his integrity and his loyalty to his fellow soldiers and sailors, as well as his exceptional medical program expertise.

One of Mariano's primary goals is to have an impact on all the sailors and marines he encounters. He wants to provide them with the same mentorship and leadership that he was shown during his early years in the Navy.

Outside of his service, Mariano is actively pursuing his bachelor's of science in healthcare administration from Kaplan University. He currently maintains a 4.0 GPA and plans to receive his master's degree.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I salute Petty Officer 1st Class Genesis Mariano for being named Sea and Shore Sailor of the Year. He exemplifies the Navy's core values in every aspect of his life, and I admire Petty Officer Mariano's commitment to the military and our Nation. I congratulate him on receiving this honor and I thank him for his service.

□ 1030

RECOGNIZING THE GENEROSITY AND COMMITMENT OF PENN COMMUNITY BANK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the generosity and commitment to community service of Penn Community Bank in my district in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Over the course of the last year, 325 bank employees, executives, and directors raised nearly \$78,000 for a variety of programs and activities in our community, which they generously donated to the United Way of Bucks County. Todd Hurley, Penn Community Bank's executive vice president and chief relationship officer, explained it best. He said: "Each of our team members is proud of Penn Community Bank's continued support of United Way of Bucks County. We're dedicated to improving our local com-

munities and helping United Way alleviate poverty, support education, and increase self-sufficiency across Bucks County."

Mr. Speaker, this gift will ensure that the United Way of Bucks County can continue their important mission, better serve the needs of the community, and reach even more of our neighbors in need. I applaud Penn Community Bank and encourage everyone throughout our community to follow their lead in helping those in need.

CONGRATULATING PENNSBURY HIGH SCHOOL
STUDENTS FOR THEIR FUNDRAISING EFFORTS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pennsbury High School students on raising more than \$50,000 to fight childhood cancer during their fourth annual Mini-THON.

Students raised the \$50,000, which benefits the Four Diamonds fund at the Penn State Health Milton S. Hershey Medical Center by hosting a football game fundraiser, through smoothie sales, and Mini-THON Thursdays. These efforts culminated in an 8-hour dance marathon on a Saturday. Mini-THON, which raised \$18,000 in its inaugural year, has grown, according to the students involved, because of the group's ability to try different ideas each year. This keeps students engaged in fundraising and allows them to figure out ways and different methods that work best.

The program is run by students, with the help of two faculty advisers. This year's student co-chairs who helped make Mini-THON a success were Charlie Bluestein and Kate Goldinger. As a Penn Stater myself and a member of our community, I could not be more proud of what these students have done, and I encourage everyone in our community to follow their lead to serve others in need.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Lord our God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

The prophet Isaiah warns us: O Lord, unless we acknowledge You as Lord with living faith and lasting reverence, we go adrift.

You have raised us and reared us. Our pets know their owners, our appetites know where to be fed, yet there are times when we do not know where to turn unless we truly belong to You.

As Your people, should we hear You call us: “. . . a sinful nation, a people laden with wickedness, an evil race, corrupt children,” should we run away from You? Or toward You?

In those times, is it You we fear and cannot face? Or is it the truth about ourselves? Strengthen us that we may be drawn into the truth by You, now and always.

May all we do in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIPS ARE GOOD FOR BUSINESS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week we have representatives from the South Carolina Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP, visiting for their annual legislative day. MEPs are public-private partnerships that help small- and medium-size manufacturers grow their business. There are MEP centers in all 50 States and Puerto Rico.

Manufacturing is one of America's major economic drivers, comprising over 12 percent of our annual GDP, with most manufacturing firms in the United States having 500 employees or less. MEPs provide much-needed assistance for manufacturers to become

more successful. MEPs help manufacturers grow their global market with export guidance on where to eliminate waste.

Last year, MEPs across the country generated \$1.7 billion in cost savings, \$3.5 billion in new client investments, and helped create and retain over 100,000 jobs. You can see these benefits firsthand in the Second Congressional District, where the South Carolina Manufacturing Extension Partnership, led by Chuck Spangler, served over 40 companies last year, resulting in \$25 million in new sales and 25 retained jobs.

I am grateful for the MEP's positive impact in communities across the country.

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

BIPARTISAN ACTION ON GUNS

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the students, faculty, staff, families, and community around Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School who lost 17 of their own 3 weeks ago today.

I rise to join the entire community of Parkland and millions of Americans all across the country, Democrats and Republicans, who are saying enough is enough. The time for action is now.

We cannot allow partisan politics to get in the way of taking meaningful action in areas where both parties agree and that have the support of most Americans across this country. Here are a few examples:

Both Democrats and Republicans support legislation I have cosponsored to ban bump stocks.

Both Democrats and Republicans support legislation to close the loophole exploited by the Sutherland Springs, Texas, shooter last year.

Both Democrats and Republicans support legislation to uphold Second Amendment rights and strengthen the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Now is the time for us to come together and to take meaningful action towards responsible, commonsense gun safety reform.

FEARS OF A TRADE WAR ARE BEING GREATLY EXAGGERATED

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in his column yesterday, Pat Buchanan wrote that, through most of its history, the Republican Party was the high tariff party, favoring tariffs rather than income taxes. He wrote

that those tariffs helped the U.S. to become the strongest industrial power in the world.

In the 1950s and 1960s, 53 percent of American jobs were industrial based, many of them white collar. Now only around 10 percent are in manufacturing, and many thousands of college graduates are working as waiters and waitresses or in other low-paying jobs and living with their parents.

Fears of a trade war are being greatly exaggerated. We have been in a trade war for many years, and we have been losing. With only 4 percent of the world's population, we buy almost 23 percent of the world's goods.

Every country wants into our markets, and we have tremendous leverage on trade that we haven't been using. President Trump's proposed tariffs apply only to two products. I commend him for his effort to try to protect American jobs.

GOP TAX BREAK FOR BILLIONAIRES

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, despite their best efforts, my Republican friends have not fooled the American people.

They provided a modest, temporary tax cut for some Americans, but their tax bill raised taxes on 86 million middle class families. Eighty-three percent of the tax cuts go to the top 1 percent. It creates \$2.3 trillion in debt and pays for it with deep cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

It also provides a huge tax break, \$1.3 trillion, for the biggest corporations in this country and further incentivizes shipping American jobs overseas. Corporations have announced more than \$200 billion in stock buybacks in just 3 months, more than 30 times what workers received.

Corporations like Walmart and Pfizer, at the same time, are laying off thousands of workers as they pocket massive tax breaks for themselves, and we gave them incentives to ship more jobs overseas.

Democrats want real bipartisan tax reform that starts with a real permanent tax break for the middle class that will produce better jobs and better wages for a better future. The American people deserve A Better Deal than this raw deal that they got from the Republicans in this tax bill.

IN MEMORY OF DEPUTY LOCKLEAR

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Scotland County,

North Carolina, Deputy Alexis “Thunder Eagle” Locklear, who was killed in the line of duty last Thursday while rushing to the aid of a fellow officer.

Deputy Locklear was just 23 years old and had only been on the force for 10 months, yet those who knew him best said he died doing what he loved.

My friend, Scotland County Sheriff Ralph Kersey, said that Deputy Locklear made friends everywhere he went. Sheriff Kersey said: “He wanted to be a law enforcement officer, and he chose the Scotland County Sheriff’s Office. It did not take a long time spending with Thunder to know that he would fit right in with this family.”

Deputy Locklear leaves behind a 4-year-old daughter as well as his parents, grandparents, and six sisters.

Last week, Scotland County lost a hero, but a hero remembered never dies in our hearts. Please join me in offering condolences to the Locklear family, Sheriff Kersey, and the Scotland County Sheriff’s Office.

ELECTION SECURITY

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the threat of foreign interference in our elections is real. Our intelligence chiefs are sounding the alarm that Russia views the 2018 election as a target for additional interference. And finally, yesterday, President Trump at last acknowledged Russian meddling and vowed to guard against it, saying: “We won’t allow that to happen.”

But, Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words, and time and time again, this administration has proven unwilling to confront this threat. We learned this week that the State Department is not using any of the resources they have been given to counter election interference. U.S. Cyber Command Chief Admiral Mike Rogers said the President has not granted him authority to disrupt Russian hacking operations. And we are still waiting on the administration to impose sanctions on Russia passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority in this Congress.

This isn’t a future concern. Americans voted in Texas primaries yesterday, and they are already heading to the polls in my State, Illinois, where early voting began on Monday.

I urge the administration to get serious about this threat and support funding for the Election Assistance Commission and resources for State election officials on the front lines of this battle. This is not a partisan issue. It is about protecting our democracy and ensuring the integrity of every American’s vote.

VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES SPENDING 100 PERCENT OF THEIR TIME ON UNION ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor today to speak about my cotton farmers, but my heart is heavy after a conversation with our veterans—our VFW, to be exact—about this issue of union time, union activities on the taxpayer dole.

There was a GAO report a year ago that said there were hundreds of VA employees spending 100 percent of their time on union activity, not the job they were hired to do, not in service to our veterans who wait in line to get healthcare, who sometimes get sicker and sometimes even die.

The law says that the only way to do official time is it must be administered in a way that is reasonable, necessary, and in the public’s best interests. Somebody spending 100 percent of their time on anything other than what they were hired to do, and especially in service to our veterans, is not reasonable; it is not necessary, and it certainly isn’t in the best interests of the American people. It is outrageous.

SUPPORTING HMONG VETERANS WHO FOUGHT DURING THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the support of the Hmong Veterans’ Service Recognition Act.

This bipartisan legislation extends veterans’ burial benefits to Hmong and Laotian-American veterans who fought in the United States Armed Forces during the Vietnam war. These brave men and women risked their lives fighting alongside American servicemen and -women as soldiers in the Special Guerrilla Units, otherwise known as SGUs.

The SGUs were covertly trained by the CIA during the Vietnam war and then led into direct combat support for American forces, yet they have never been recognized for their service, which is why I introduced the legislation with Congressman PAUL COOK, himself a decorated Vietnam veteran, who was a colonel in the United States Army and knows their story well.

There are only an estimated 5,000 Hmong veterans still alive today, with thousands of them in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent.

We extended this honor to Filipino soldiers years ago. I ask that we honor these courageous individuals with their choice of being laid to rest next to their brothers in arms. It is the right thing to do.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as Congress fails to advance commonsense gun safety legislation, I would like to share a letter from a young constituent of mine, Bella, from Skokie, Illinois.

Bella recently had a lockdown at her school. She writes: “While my peers and I crowded in the corner of my classroom, my mind instantly thought about the rise in school shootings in 2018. I thought, ‘Am I going to be part of that statistic?’ . . . This lockdown made me realize that something like that could happen to anyone anywhere. Please do something.”

Well, Bella, we have solutions that are supported by an overwhelming majority of Americans: banning assault weapons, passing comprehensive background checks.

Students and parents around the country are telling us to do something. It is time, now, for Congress to listen.

□ 1215

YOUNG VOICES ON GUN VIOLENCE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share excerpts from a letter I received from a 15-year-old in my district of San Diego. It shows the impact the Parkland, Florida, school shooting is having on our young people.

This young person writes: “I have never been in a school shooting nor do I know anyone who has, yet I feel every time I think about it or have a dream about it, I experience it.

“I’m only 15 years old, why am I terrified to go to places I used to love because someone could shoot me?

“Why is it so easy to buy and make guns in this country?

“Why can nobody seem to do the right thing and put a stop to this?

“Why does nobody pay attention to the kids in this country who have never been in a shooting but live in constant fear and do not feel safe?

“I am asking you to do something about the gun policies in this country so people stop dying and younger generations of people can feel safe.

“Put us first, not guns.”

Mr. Speaker, what is the Chair’s answer to this young voice?

MEDICARE FOR ALL

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today and the people of the United States because America

needs universal, single-payer healthcare. We spend more—over \$9,000 per person—on healthcare than any other nation in the world.

But for all that money, Mr. Speaker, we still have tens of millions of uninsured. We have the highest infant mortality rate of any wealthy nation on Earth, and we are last, last, in life expectancy among wealthy countries.

Mr. Speaker, in a few moments I expect to ask for unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered the first sponsor of H.R. 676, the Expanded & Improved Medicare For All Act. The bill was originally introduced by my friend, John Conyers. I have his support in picking up the mantle where he left it and for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings. I will do that in a moment.

But, Mr. Speaker, the money that we are spending on healthcare isn't going to the patients; it isn't going to the surgeons. It is going to the pharmaceutical industry and the insurance industry, who are raking in record profits every day and are the major beneficiaries of our policy.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 676

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 676, the Expanded & Improved Medicare For All Act, a bill originally introduced by Representative John Conyers from Michigan, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

TAKE ACTION TO ABATE THE GUN EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, in a few moments I will manage today's rules; but right now, I would like to thank the staff of the Rules Committee on both sides for the hard work that they do, especially the staff director for the Democrats, Don Sisson.

I would like to also take a moment to recognize Ms. Kira Sisson, a senior from Albion High School in western New York. Kira is here with us today, along with classmates from her school. Don is her uncle.

Today we will not address Dreamers. Today we will not address the gun epidemic. I encourage all adult Americans to work with the students on March 24 that are coming here to Washington in a march for what they describe as our future. I hope adult Americans will en-

courage massive attendance at this march, and that this Congress will take action to abate the gun epidemic.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in my district, over the past couple of days, a baby, 8 years old, has been shot. A baby, 5 years old, has been shot. Other individuals have been shot and killed. And, of course, the death and the pillage of mass murders continue, and those in Florida are still suffering, and no gun action at all, no debate.

Additionally, young people are in the streets, their families are fearful because the DACA fix promised by this President has not been done.

We need to do our work, if we are Americans; we need to do it for good for all of those who live within the confines of this Nation.

Then, finally, we had an election yesterday in Texas full of mistakes and closed polls and nonworking machines. Yet, the President of the United States has \$120 million to safeguard our elections in 2018 and he has done absolutely nothing.

It is a demand that we begin to look at the Russian intrusion, faulty voting polls and machines, and begin to address the American people's right and civil liberty of voting—one vote, one person—without the fear and the apprehension of Russians intruding into an election in 2018 in order to skew the Federal elections.

Enough is enough. It is time for us to act.

RECOGNIZING REPRESENTATIVE MARCY KAPTUR FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Women's History Month and the resilient women who have challenged the status quo, I am honored to recognize my congressional colleague and dear friend, Representative MARCY KAPTUR.

In 1981, MARCY defeated the incumbent in an upset that gained national attention, leading her to become the longest-serving woman in the U.S. House of Representatives and a senior member of the powerful and highly coveted Appropriations Committee.

I met MARCY during my first tenure in the House back in 1989, and at that time there were only 31 women serving in all of Congress. MARCY welcomed me with open arms, and I quickly realized that MARCY embodies what any legislator should be: principled, truthful, and a fierce fighter for her constituents.

It was because of MARCY's vision and tireless advocacy that Americans from all over the country are now able to visit the World War II Memorial here in D.C. and honor the dedication and sacrifice of the brave men and women who defended our country.

MARCY, you are an inspiration to women everywhere, and I want to thank you for your commitment to advocate for so many important issues that matter to all Americans. Congratulations on this honor, the longest-serving woman in U.S. history.

DEMAND SERIOUS TREATMENT OF THE GUN VIOLENCE PROBLEM

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great things about our job is we have all these wonderful young people come to us from all over the world. And in school, they read about the social contract. They read John Locke. They read Thomas Hobbes. They read Rousseau. The whole premise of the social contract is that we will be safer in civil society together than we would be if we stay in the state of nature, which Hobbes described as solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

But we are failing the elemental test and obligation of civil government because we are not keeping our people safe when a teenager can access an AR-15, go into a school, and assassinate at point-blank range 17 teachers and students.

And what are we doing here in Congress?

Nothing. Here in the House of Representatives, we have not had a single hearing on gun violence. We have not had a single hearing on a universal criminal and mental background check, which is supported by 97 percent of the American people. It is almost unanimous, and we can't even have a hearing about it.

We are demanding a hearing, and we are demanding, with the young people who are coming to Washington on Saturday, March 24, serious treatment of the gun violence problem which does not belong in a civil society.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1119, SATISFYING ENERGY NEEDS AND SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1917, BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 762 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 762

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1119) to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1917) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-62 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 762, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 1119, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment—or SENSE—Act, and provides for consideration of H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference

from Closing Kilns—or BRICK—Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, for many years our domestic energy industry has suffered under unnecessary and politically motivated regulations and burdensome, bureaucratic red tape, prohibiting growth and innovation. President Trump and his administration have been working hard, along with this Congress, to undo the policies which have so harmed our domestic energy industry.

Today's rule allows for the consideration of two bills, which will further those efforts and reform our regulatory framework so our energy producers can do their jobs more efficiently and economically, along with safeguards that will still be in place to protect health and safety. These bills provide a commonsense solution to tailor EPA emission standards, and they provide reasonable compliance timelines for the specific regulated industries.

The first bill, H.R. 1119, the SENSE Act, is sponsored by my colleague, Mr. ROTHFUS from Pennsylvania. This bill would provide for targeted modifications to the EPA's Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, MATS, as it applies to coal refuse-to-energy facilities. The EPA has included certain emissions limits in the new standards that are just simply not achievable for these refuse plants.

These specialized power plants have been developed to recycle coal refuse by using it as an energy source to generate affordable, reliable electricity. These facilities have thus far removed 214 million tons of coal refuse from the environment, at no expense to taxpayers.

In addition to helping address coal refuse, these facilities have created an estimated 1,200 direct jobs and 4,000 indirect jobs in areas that have been economically distressed for many years.

□ 1230

There are 19 of these coal refuse-to-energy facilities, many of which are at direct risk of being shut down absent passage of the SENSE Act.

The SENSE Act would create a way for coal refuse-to-energy facilities to continue their much-needed work by allowing these plants to demonstrate compliance with EPA's hydrochloric acid standard by using sulfur dioxide as a proxy and assuming that a 93 percent reduction in sulfur dioxide demonstrates compliance with the hydrochloric acid emissions reduction standard.

The bill would still require these coal refuse-to-energy facilities to be subject to emissions limitations and to achieve substantial declines in emissions; but it would do so in a way that these facilities can achieve while also remaining operational, recognizing the crucial role they play in providing energy, and helping to clean up coal refuse sites.

Mr. Speaker, our rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns, or BRICK, Act of 2017 sponsored by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON). This bill will help preserve America's brickmaking industry and its 7,000 jobs and protects them from an EPA rule that created a far too rushed compliance timetable for businesses across the Nation.

The emissions standards in this rule apply to kilns at brick and structural clay products manufacturing facilities and at clay ceramic manufacturing facilities. Industry has estimated the cost of this rule, if allowed to go into effect, would potentially exceed \$100 million annually, which is four times higher than what the EPA initially estimated. This is yet one more example of how poorly thought-out and misguided regulations are harming industries and have been a severe hindrance to the kind of job creation we know we can now see unleashed across our Nation.

We have got to ensure businesses have time to comply and that regulations make sense. We should not force them into arbitrary time lines that will make them shut down. H.R. 1917 provides that needed time and makes compliance possible.

The BRICK Act also includes the text of the Relief from New Source Performance Standards. This legislation was authored by my Democratic colleague from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON). The provision in this bill will help both manufacturers and users of wood heaters by providing relief from overly burdensome and arbitrary time lines that have been imposed by the EPA's New Source Performance Standards. Specifically, this bill provides an additional 3 years for businesses to comply with this rule.

Wood heaters are an affordable source of home heating, especially in rural America, and it is critically important that we protect this low-cost source of heating. The New Source Performance Standards for wood heaters, which took effect in 2015, include a provision that is proving nearly impossible, once again, for manufacturers to comply with as they are struggling to design compliant models in the short timeframe allowed by the agency. As a result, we have seen workers laid off and other companies fearing that they will not be able to stay in business after 2020.

Wood heater users in many low-income households across the country face the likelihood of having to pay more and having a reduced product choice. This is one more example of Federal overreach in which the agency failed to take into account the real impact of these regulations on everyday Americans across our country.

It is crucial that we pass the BRICK Act, which would extend the deadline

for the second phase of the wood heater standards from 2020 to 2023, and provide time for meaningful judicial review of the Brick and Structural Clay Products: National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants before the owners and operations of these facilities are required to make significant and potentially irreversible decisions regarding capital investments, or driving them out of business altogether.

Mr. Speaker, we must ensure emissions standards are reasonable and do not unnecessarily cripple small businesses, which we know are the drivers of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I encourage support for the rule for these important bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like first to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Today's bills would modify Clean Air Act regulations, or the act itself, to give a handout to specified industries to emit more pollution into the air. These bills, in my view, would result in more smog, more fine particle pollution, and more toxic air pollution. The effects would be worse, resulting in more asthma attacks, more kids in emergency rooms, more bronchitis, more cancer diagnoses, and more birth defects.

Mr. Speaker, these bills represent a fundamentally unfair and deeply troubling approach to regulation. In bringing up these bills, the Republican-controlled Congress is granting favors to special interests at the expense of public health. Shocking, but not surprising. By bringing up these bills, the majority intends to overturn evidence-based, scientific decisions made by the Environmental Protection Agency, States, and courts after a transparent and extensive process.

To date, the Trump administration, with the help of the Republican-controlled Congress, has targeted 67 environmental rules. One of those rules was the requirement that mining companies prove they have the financial wherewithal to clean up their pollution. Another is the rule regulating airborne mercury emissions from fossil fuel power plants. And most recently, the administration announced it was targeting oil rig safety regulations, regulations that were implemented after the 2010 Deepwater Horizon explosion and oil spill, a spill that burned for 36 hours, released 4.9 billion barrels of crude oil into the Gulf of Mexico, spread 3,850 square miles, and resulted in billions of dollars of losses to the U.S. fishing industry and the Gulf Coast tourist industry.

Mr. Speaker, since passage of the Clean Air Act in 1970, America has

made substantial progress in cleaning up this Nation's air. We have done this by following a fundamental principle: holding polluters accountable for their pollution.

Instead of following this common-sense, bedrock principle, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle insist on creating loopholes for a few favored industries: waste coal plants, brick manufacturers, and those who manufacture residential wood heaters.

Mr. Speaker, the first of these bills, the ironically titled SENSE Act, weakens the critical Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule, which established the first national standards to address power plant emissions of toxic air pollutants. This Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule requires coal-fired power plants to meet emissions standards for mercury, other metals, and acid gases.

Has the majority engaged in any in-depth analysis of what will happen when this rule is weakened? Has the majority filled its ranks with experts, scientists, and doctors who will be able to put forth a case for why undermining this rule is good policy? Of course not.

Mr. Speaker, here is what we know: The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that for every dollar spent to reduce pollution under this rule American families receive up to \$9 in health benefits. In fact, the EPA estimated that, in 2016, the MATS rule would avoid up to 11,000 premature deaths, 2,800 cases of chronic bronchitis, 4,700 heart attacks, 130,000 cases of aggravated asthma, 5,700 hospital and emergency room visits, 6,300 cases of acute bronchitis, 140,000 cases of respiratory symptoms, and 540,000 days when people miss work. My Republican colleagues want to do away with those health benefits and, instead, permit favored industries to pollute more.

Mr. Speaker, the second measure combines two bills: H.R. 1917, the BRICK Act; and H.R. 453, the Relief from New Source Performance Standards Act. The BRICK Act unjustifiably delays reductions in toxic air pollution from brick manufacturers by allowing them to continue to pollute until all their lawsuits are exhausted. The bill throws out existing judicial process by providing a blanket extension for any compliance deadline, regardless of the merits of the case.

Under well established legal norms, the court of appeals for the district circuit may stay a rule during litigation if it finds that the party seeking the stay has demonstrated that there is a likelihood of success on the merits, the prospect of irreparable harm to the party requesting the stay, and, most importantly, whether granting the stay is in the public interest. To date, not one of the industry litigants have even asked the court to stay the Brick and Structural Clay Products rule. Not

one. Presumably it is because they recognize that they cannot meet this legal standard.

Mr. Speaker, the existing judicial process is the appropriate method to seek a stay of the rule and is the preferable method to unnecessary congressional intervention proposed by the BRICK Act.

This brings me to H.R. 453, the Relief from New Source Performance Standards Act, which delays cleaner burning wood stoves until 2023, on top of the 5 years manufacturers already had to comply, exposing communities to additional years of unhealthy fine particle pollution, carbon monoxide, and volatile organic compounds.

In 2015, the EPA strengthened the pollution control requirements for new residential wood heaters. The new standards would cut fine particle pollution and volatile organic compounds from new wood heaters by almost 70 percent and will cut carbon monoxide pollution by 62 percent. The EPA even included provisions in the rule to help manufacturers achieve the new standards, giving the manufacturers 5 years to comply.

Mr. Speaker, these pollutants combine with other pollutants in the air from smog, black carbon, and benzene, harming the health of the American people, particularly our kids and seniors, who will have to pay for these special interest breaks with their health and, in some cases, with their lives. These three bills sacrifice Americans' health with additional years of unnecessary pollution.

Mr. Speaker, it is as disappointing as it is frustrating that we come here today to debate bills that will increase pollution in our country and also have very little hope—let me underscore that: very little hope—of ever becoming law. We have real work to do in this place, and these bills are not that work.

This body must turn its attention to finally addressing the gun violence epidemic that has taken over our country. Most recently at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, in a district adjacent to the district that I am privileged to serve, less than a month ago, a 19-year-old legally purchased a semiautomatic AR-15 and used it to methodically murder 14 of his former classmates and three teachers.

What was the response of this body? Well, we did prayers and thoughts, which is good. But did my Republican colleagues bring to the floor a bill that would ban assault weapons? Did they bring to the floor legislation to close the gun show loophole? Did they bring to the floor legislation that would raise the minimum purchase age for rifles? Or mandatory comprehensive background checks for gun buyers and ban bump stocks? Or allow the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to study gun violence?

□ 1245

No, Mr. Speaker. Instead this body offered, as I said, its thoughts and prayers.

And I have said it before and I will say it again today: those who stand in the way of legislation that will address our country's gun violence epidemic are increasingly culpable for its need-less continuation.

So what we choose to talk about is pollution. What we should be talking about is the gun epidemic, and I will get to DACA a little bit later in my closing.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), my colleague and the sponsor of the SENSE Act.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, just listening to the other side's comments about the SENSE Act, I am wondering if they have read the same bill or if they have ever visited the hills of western Pennsylvania where we see the environmental damage that waste coal piles have done and the tremendous progress that we have seen over the last number of decades in actually cleaning up the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of H. Res. 762, the rule that is under consideration, and I want to talk about the SENSE Act, which is included within this rule, H.R. 1119.

This is a pro-environment bill. The purpose of the bill is to ensure that coal refuse-to-energy facilities can be held to strict but achievable standards.

To be clear, these plants comply with nearly all standards as it is, including mercury emissions. We are talking about a modification, a customization, as it were, in recognition of the tremendous benefit that these plants have made to the environment.

I have introduced versions of this bill during prior Congresses, and I am hopeful that this bill can become law. It enjoys bipartisan support.

As many of you know, coal refuse is a by-product of historic coal mining operations. Throughout many parts of coal country, towering black mounds of this material loom beside cities and towns, especially in Pennsylvania and in West Virginia.

I would invite my colleague from Florida to come up to western Pennsylvania and take a look at the scarred landscape and polluted rivers we have there as a result of these coal refuse piles.

Many of these piles can smoulder, can spontaneously combust, giving off emissions with no controls, zero controls. They catch fire, burning uncontrollably, sending hazardous smoke into the air and into surrounding communities. Local governments are then

forced to spend increasingly scarce taxpayer resources fighting these fires.

Rainwater leaches terrible chemicals from these mounds, polluting nearby rivers and streams.

Fortunately, the coal refuse-to-energy industry turns this material into energy, while cleaning up and remediating many polluted sites, at no cost to the taxpayer.

These power plants are really the only practical solution to this massive environmental problem that we have in Pennsylvania and West Virginia that could cost, in Pennsylvania alone, an estimated \$2 billion to remediate. This is being done without taxpayer funding right now, the cleanup, because of these plants.

For several years, I have spoken about the tremendous work being done by hardworking folks in this industry, which I have seen firsthand. I have stood on coal refuse piles in the process of remediation, and I have also walked on restored sites, many of which are parks and meadows, now regarded as community assets rather than liabilities. I have seen the streams that were once dead that now have fish.

Despite all the good that this industry does for Pennsylvania and West Virginia, five coal refuse-to-energy facilities are under threat from Federal regulations, seemingly incapable of needed flexibility to accommodate private sector work that is actually improving the environment.

If rigid EPA orthodoxy makes no exceptions for this pro-environment industry, it is not just the environment that will continue to suffer. These plants support family-sustaining jobs, and thousands of jobs are at stake if these plants are regulated out of business, both direct and indirect.

I should note that many of these jobs are in localities that have already been hit exceptionally hard by both the last recession and the ongoing opioid crisis.

The people expect us to stand for them, especially when their livelihoods come under threat from heavy-handed, one-size-fits-all Washington policies. So as we debate the SENSE Act, please keep in mind what the bill's supporters are fighting for.

Here is what is going to happen if this law doesn't pass: rivers and streams aren't going to come back to life; hillsides aren't going to be restored; and these piles, they can spontaneously combust, again, with no emissions control whatsoever.

The SENSE Act is about protecting family-sustaining jobs and ensuring the continuation of the environmental success story of the coal refuse-to-energy industry. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the rule and the SENSE Act.

Again, are we capable of making judgments in this House? Are we capable of customizing one-size-fits all.

The EPA, frankly, has recognized the work of this industry. "Coal refuse

piles," the EPA has said, "are an environmental concern because of acid seepage and leachate production, spontaneous combustion, and low soil fertility. Units that burn coal refuse provide multimedia environmental benefits by combining the production of energy with the removal of coal refuse piles and by reclaiming land for productive use. Consequently, because of the unique environmental benefits that coal refuse-fired EGUs provide," the EPA said, "these units warrant special consideration. . . ."

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

Ms. CHENEY. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will see the benefits that can come from this. This isn't a special interest carveout, unless you consider cleaning up the environment in western Pennsylvania to be a special interest.

Again, are we capable of making judgments about what this town puts out, one size fits all, seemingly with blinders on, not having the ability to recognize that in certain circumstances customization is appropriate?

That is what this underlying bill, the SENSE Act, does. It does make sense: satisfying energy needs and saving the environment. I hope my colleagues would see the sense in that and work with us to allow the environmental cleanup to continue and to protect hundreds of family-sustaining jobs across western Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

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

Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago, Donald John Trump decided to end the DACA program, a program which gave hundreds of thousands of hardworking young people hope for the future. He gave Congress until March 5—that was 2 days ago—to pass a bill. Since then, House Democrats have tried 23 times to pass bipartisan legislation to fix this problem. Donald John Trump even tweeted: "Total inaction on DACA by Dems. Where are you?"

Well, Mr. President, where we are is right here, waiting for this deal that you say can be made. Yet, on 23 occasions, it was our friends on the other side of the aisle who refused to make a deal and rejected even considering the bipartisan Dream Act that was deadlined by you, Donald John Trump, on March 5.

We need to address this vital issue now. Approximately 120 Dreamers lose their status each day. Over 22,000 have lost their status since the administration ended the program.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues: Let's do something now to lift the cloud that hangs over these young people who are American in every way except on paper.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer for the 24th time an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation will help solve the problem created by Donald John Trump's decision to end the DACA program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to a perceived viewing audience.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my good friend, a member of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Committees of this Congress, who will discuss our proposal.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the United States, as we know, is a nation of immigrants, past and present. For hundreds of years, people have come to our shores in search of a better life for themselves and for their children.

Immigrants from across the world have made incredible contributions to our country. We know that as fact. From starting businesses to healing the sick, to harvesting our fields and putting food on America's dinner table, to ensuring safety and pursuing justice, immigrants have made America a great nation because of their contributions. Yet there have been times when our Nation has struggled to live up to our own ideals, and right now, I think, is one of those times.

This week, the President's deadline, March 5, 2 days past, to end the DACA program took effect, threatening hundreds of thousands of lives of Dreamers. Now, let us remember, this is because of President Trump's unilateral action last September to repeal DACA that we are in the position that we are in today.

Mr. Speaker, I am standing here with the Dreamers, with over 80 percent of Americans, and with many of my colleagues who believe we ought to fix this problem. I ask Speaker RYAN and I call upon this Chamber to vote now on the bipartisan, bicameral Dream Act.

This bill would provide permanent legislative protections for our Dreamers, immigrants who were brought to the United States' shores as children at the average age of 6 years. For them, America is the only country they have ever known. The Dream Act will provide these young people with legal sta-

tus and, ultimately, a path to citizenship.

In my district, there are thousands of DACA recipients, thousands of Dreamers, currently, over 600 at the University of California, Merced, and more than that at my alma mater, Fresno State.

President Castro at Fresno State and I had a meeting with a group of Dreamers recently. Let me tell you about one student whom I met, who would be helped by the Dream Act, Rodolfo. What a story he had to tell, along with the other students.

Rodolfo came to the United States with his mother and siblings when he was 4 years old, at great risk. He is set to graduate from Fresno State with a degree in chemistry this year.

DACA gave him the ability to work through school and help his family. And after all, isn't that the immigrant way?

Just last week, Rodolfo got some great news. He learned that he was admitted to the University of California, San Francisco's School of Pharmacy, one of the best schools in the Nation. His dream as a Dreamer is to use his education and skills to give back to our communities by providing healthcare to underserved communities.

Rodolfo, we want Dreamers like you here in the United States. There are over 800,000 of you, all contributing and giving. Many of you serve in our armed services today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote. Support this legislation. They should not be held hostage for other agendas that are out there, and clearly this is the case.

This is common sense. I ask my colleagues to do the right thing. Let's bring the Dream Act to the floor as soon as we can.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the sponsor of the BRICK Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I am actually a little bit confused. I thought this was supposed to be a debate on a rule dealing with overturning onerous EPA regulations. Instead, our colleagues on the left want to talk about something totally nongermane and change the subject. And then we wonder why the American people get so frustrated that this institution can't seem to address its big issues.

□ 1300

I also heard a little bit ago an impassioned claim by my colleague on the left over here that the legislation that we are talking about today somehow flies in the face of the courts. That is not true because the courts have already overturned this regulation one

time and set it aside, and it has cost the industries millions and millions of dollars that they shouldn't have had to spend.

I also heard it claimed that it flies in the face of commonsense, science-based evidence. That is not true because, if it were, then the courts wouldn't have made the decision to set it aside in the first place.

H.R. 1917, the BRICK Act, is about regulatory common sense, Mr. Speaker, but it is also about preserving good-paying jobs in rural communities across America. Brickmakers and tile manufacturers are primarily small businesses, and their product is critical for our infrastructure. They have built some of the most iconic towns and buildings across America, and this bill will help ensure that these small businesses are able to continue to do exactly that.

The EPA's current Brick MACT rule, finalized in 2015, would impose millions of dollars in costs on these small businesses, all before judicial review of the rule is complete. And while the EPA, under the former administration, estimates that the annual costs to comply with the rule will be about \$25 million, other estimates have projected the annual costs to be up to \$100 million or greater.

For a facility with two kilns, which is the industry average, the costs are estimated to be \$4.4 million. Securing capital for these projects will be very difficult, and some worry that it will simply not be available considering that these compliance costs will not improve plant productivity nor help its bottom line. What is worse is that these costs are over and above the tens of millions of dollars spent by the industry to comply with an earlier version of the rule vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court in 2007.

H.R. 1917 simply allows for the consideration and completion of any judicial review regarding the 2015 regulation before requiring compliance. For an industry that has faced so much regulatory uncertainty, through rules, vacated rules, and now new regulation, H.R. 1917 will help inject a bit of much-needed regulatory certainty back into this industry.

Additionally, this bill provides regulatory relief for our wood heater manufacturers, which helps provide an affordable source of heat for many low-income and rural households. EPA regulations set to take effect in 2020 are causing some manufacturers to already lay off workers. This industry needs more time to comply, and a provision within H.R. 1917 will simply extend that compliance deadline from 2020 to 2023. If left unchanged, product choice will diminish, prices will rise, and more jobs will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, we must ensure our Federal agencies are not needlessly regulating companies out of business.

Brick manufacturers have suffered heavy losses since the recession, losing about 45 percent of jobs between 2005 and 2012. Increased compliance costs from these EPA regulations will only lead to more job losses and consolidations within this primarily family-owned business industry.

We owe this industry regulatory certainty. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support H.R. 1917 because, if we don't, if the brick industry gets shut down because of these onerous rules, we are going to start building buildings, Mr. Speaker, out of straw and sticks instead of bricks.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have watched this last year as members of the Republican majority worked diligently to eliminate Federal environmental regulations that serve to keep the American people safe from harmful toxins in their air and water.

I couldn't help but be amused by my colleague on the right's comments at the end that we will be using sticks instead of bricks. Very clever. But the real truth of the matter is, in certain parts of the world—and I would urge him to visit some of them—there are examples of things other than brick for construction. I have no quarrel with the brick industry. I just urge—and in many instances they are already doing it—that they do everything they can not to pollute the environment.

I have watched members in the Republican majority work relentlessly for special interest groups instead of working for all of the American people. I have watched members of the Republican majority put the wish list of the powerful corporate gun lobby ahead of the safety of the American people.

On Monday, we all watched a self-imposed Republican deadline slip by, to the detriment of thousands upon thousands of young people in our country who we have identified as Dreamers, young people who know no other country as home than the United States of America. Every day of inaction on the part of my friends across the aisle means another day that families are needlessly and cruelly made to live under the threat of being torn asunder.

My colleague, LOIS FRANKEL, and I were at a men's club before a couple of hundred of men in the Valencia Cove in Boynton Beach. The question was put to both of us: Why do we support illegal immigrants in this country?

We tried to make the distinction for him with reference to Dreamers and the fact that all of these young people were brought here against their volition by their parents. So it is the Dreamers that we are supporting. I think he finally understood the importance of our doing comprehensive immigration reform in this country.

Democrats have offered to bring the Dream Act to the floor now 24 times.

We are going to give them one more chance. We have done it 23, and every single time this effort has been blocked by the majority.

To address my friend who correctly cited that we were bringing this up: It is not so much to change the topic of the day. We don't have that prerogative. But we do have embedded in this rule the prerogative to bring a previous question, and that can be on any subject that we choose. What we choose to do is to prioritize things that we consider to be important. It would not have blocked this particular measure.

But the fact is, enough is enough. The President says he wants to fix this problem. The Speaker says he wants to fix this problem. We on this side of the aisle clearly want to fix this problem. So let's do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, on the previous question, and on the underlying bills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy very much serving on the Rules Committee with all of my colleagues on the committee. One of the things that I am often asked because I am a new Member of this body is: What has surprised me most about being a Member of Congress?

My answer is: Often you see on the outside what looks like a lot of vitriol between the parties, but, in actuality, I believe that every Member of this body is here for the right reasons. They are here because they want to serve the people of their districts, the people of their States, and the people of this Nation.

I think it is crucially important, Mr. Speaker, particularly when we are talking about something as sacred as the safety of our children, that we not engage in the kind of partisan attacks, that we not exploit tragedy, that we not engage in the kind of questioning of motives that I just heard my colleague on the other side of the aisle do.

I know my colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, knows that we may have disagreements, but the reason that I, as a mother, feel so strongly about the Second Amendment is because I want to keep our kids safe. I know he knows that my beliefs about the Second Amendment, though they are different from his, are not based upon any campaign donations and any campaign contributions. I know he knows that they are based very firmly on a fundamental commitment to the importance of the Second Amendment as part of what makes this Nation safe, as part of what makes our individuals secure, and how important it is for us not to use this tragedy to take steps—that may make people feel better—that fundamentally violate our constitutional rights and that won't keep our kids safe.

When you go down the path that we have heard so many on the other side

of the aisle suggest we go down, whether they are talking about banning entire classes of weapons, whether they are talking about expanding background checks so that they are somehow universal—our background check system right now is broken. It doesn't work.

We have a situation in which States are not reporting in the way that they ought to report. So when I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggest that what we ought to do, frankly, is expand a system that is failing and call that progress, I can't help but think that that is pretty much their standard operating procedure: No matter what the policy is, let's expand the broken system, let's ignore whether or not it is really working, and let's call it progress.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be a party to that. I will not be a party in a situation in which we have had tragedy after tragedy, a situation in which in this most recent tragedy law enforcement fundamentally at all levels failed our children. When you have individuals inside of a school who were killed because armed officers outside the school failed to enter, when you have children who are killed because call after call after call to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to the local law enforcement officials went unheeded because specific tips about this particular individual went unheeded, that is not a time, Mr. Speaker, for us to say: What we ought to do then is prevent law-abiding Americans from having access to the firearms that they need to defend and protect themselves.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if you look at what those on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do with respect to the debate about guns and the debate about school safety, it is critically important for all of us to stand up and say: No, we will not go down a path that is going to violate constitutional rights, that will not keep our children safe, and find some kind of false comfort in that.

When you are talking about the bills that are before us today, Mr. Speaker, we are in a similar situation. We have had 8 years in the Obama administration where they imposed regulation after regulation after regulation in the name of somehow protecting the environment.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's own EPA Administrator testified in front of Congress that the Clean Power Plan would, in fact, not have any sort of positive impact on the environment or on global temperatures, yet they imposed it anyway, imposing massive costs on our industry in the name, I suppose, of trying to feel better and trying to feel like they are doing something. But what they are really doing is actually putting ourselves in a situation where we are harming small businesses, where we are strangling them,

and where we are preventing their ability to grow and to thrive. We know we can do that, Mr. Speaker, in a way that also protects our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. JOHNSON, for their work on these very important bills.

In Wyoming, Mr. Speaker, we know that our coal and our fossil fuels are national treasures. They are absolutely crucial to providing the power that runs this Nation. I am proud of all that we in this body and President Trump together have done to roll back dangerous and ill-advised Obama-era regulations that have been aimed at killing our fossil fuel industry.

We can no longer go down the path of allowing these regulations to exist in a way that devastates industry, puts the fundamental reliability of our electricity and of our energy grid at risk, and achieves no measurable impact for the environment. It is long past time for that indefensible approach to end. That is what we are doing here today.

These are good bills. They are important bills. They will take this next step in rolling back the kind of overwhelming regulation that we have seen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of both the rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 762 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 183, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—229

Abraham	Flores	Marshall
Aderholt	Fortenberry	Massie
Allen	Fox	Mast
Amash	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Amodei	Gaetz	McCaul
Arrington	Gallagher	McClintock
Babin	Garrett	McHenry
Bacon	Gianforte	McKinley
Banks (IN)	Gibbs	McMorris
Barletta	Gohmert	Rodgers
Barton	Goodlatte	McSally
Bergman	Gosar	Meadows
Biggs	Gowdy	Meehan
Bilirakis	Granger	Messer
Bishop (MI)	Graves (GA)	Mitchell
Bishop (UT)	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar
Black	Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)
Blackburn	Griffith	Mullin
Blum	Grothman	Newhouse
Bost	Guthrie	Noem
Brady (TX)	Handel	Norman
Brat	Harper	Nunes
Bridenstine	Harris	Olson
Brooks (AL)	Hartzer	Palazzo
Brooks (IN)	Hensarling	Palmer
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Bucshon	Hill	Pittenger
Budd	Holding	Poliquin
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Posey
Byrne	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Calvert	Huizenga	Reed
Carter (GA)	Hultgren	Reichert
Carter (TX)	Hunter	Renacci
Chabot	Hurd	Rice (SC)
Cheney	Issa	Roby
Coffman	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Cole	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Comer	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Comstock	Jones	Rooney, Francis
Conaway	Jordan	Rooney, Thomas
Cook	Joyce (OH)	J.
Costello (PA)	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rothfus
Curtis	King (NY)	Rouzer
Davidson	Kinzing	Royce (CA)
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Russell
Denham	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford
Dent	Labrador	Sanford
DeSantis	LaHood	Scalise
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Donovan	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Latta	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Lewis (MN)	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Simpson
Dunn	Long	Smith (MO)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Estes (KS)	Love	Smith (NJ)
Farenthold	Lucas	Smucker
Faso	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Ferguson	MacArthur	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Taylor
Fleischmann	Marino	Tenney

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 185, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

AYES—227

ADAMS—183
Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NAYS—183

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Barton
Bergman
Schakowsky
Biggs
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barietta
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann

Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Barr
Cramer
Cummings
Hice, Jody B.
Johnson, E. B.
Lieu, Ted

□ 1339

Messrs. SCHNEIDER, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, BISHOP of Georgia, GENE GREEN of Texas, CLEAVER, ELLISON, and RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. UPTON, MCCLINTOCK, WALDEN, and SMITH of New Jersey

Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (FL)

Flowers
Fortenberry
Foss
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall

Barr
Cramer
Cummings
Gabbard
Hice, Jody B.
Hollingsworth

NOT VOTING—18

Johnson, E. B.
Lieu, Ted
Nolan
Palazzo
Pearce
Poe (TX)

Polis
Shea-Porter
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Stivers

□ 1346

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT OF 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 762, I call up the bill (H.R. 1917) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 762, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-62 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1917

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. EXTENDING COMPLIANCE DATES (PENDING JUDICIAL REVIEW) OF RULES ADDRESSING NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS FOR BRICK AND STRUCTURAL CLAY PRODUCTS MANUFACTURING OR CLAY CERAMICS MANUFACTURING.

(a) *EXTENSION OF COMPLIANCE DATES.*—

(1) *EXTENSION.*—Each compliance date of any final rule described in subsection (b) is deemed to be extended by the time period equal to the time period described in subsection (c).

(2) *DEFINITION.*—In this subsection, the term "compliance date" means, with respect to any requirement of a final rule described in subsection (b), the date by which any State, local, or tribal government or other person is first required to comply.

(b) *FINAL RULES DESCRIBED.*—A final rule described in this subsection is any final rule to address national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) for brick and structural clay products manufacturing or clay ceramics manufacturing under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412), including—

(1) the final rule entitled "NESHAP for Brick and Structural Clay Products Manufacturing; and NESHAP for Clay Ceramics Manufacturing" published at 80 Fed. Reg. 65469 (October 26, 2015);

(2) the final rule entitled "NESHAP for Brick and Structural Clay Products Manufacturing; and NESHAP for Clay Ceramics Manufacturing: Correction" published at 80 Fed. Reg. 75817 (December 4, 2015); and

(3) any final rule that succeeds or amends the rule described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(c) *PERIOD DESCRIBED.*—The time period described in this subsection is the period of days that—

(1) begins on the date that is 60 days after the day on which notice of promulgation of a final rule described in subsection (b) appears in the Federal Register; and

(2) ends on the date on which judgment becomes final, and no longer subject to further appeal or review, in all actions (including actions that are filed pursuant to section 307 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7607))—

(A) that are filed during the 60 days described in paragraph (1); and

(B) that seek review of any aspect of such rule.

SEC. 3. STEP 2 COMPLIANCE DATE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL WOOD HEATERS, NEW RESIDENTIAL HYDRONIC HEATERS, AND FORCED-AIR FURNACES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Step 2 compliance date (as such term is used in the final rule entitled "Standards of Performance for New Residential Wood Heaters, New Residential Hydronic Heaters and Forced-Air Furnaces" published at 80 Fed. Reg. 13672 (March 16, 2015)) is deemed to be May 15, 2023.

(b) *CONFORMING CHANGES.*—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall make such technical and conforming changes to rules and guidance documents as may be necessary to implement subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1917.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we have a chance to help hundreds of small businesses, manufacturers, as well as thousands of employees, while also lowering prices for consumers.

I thank the bipartisan cosponsors of H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act, the BRICK Act, and urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

American brickmakers literally produce the building blocks of our Nation. They are primarily small businesses, and they are often the most important employer in small communities across America, where many are located.

Like an old brick house, this industry has had to weather a lot, including a long economic downturn, that we have finally come out of, that suppressed new construction activity and, thus, brick sales for many years.

They even weathered the 2003 EPA regulation that cost many millions of dollars to comply. That regulation was later thrown out by a Federal court, but the judicial relief came too late, as the industry had already spent considerable sums to meet EPA's tight deadlines.

We don't want to see a repeat of that unfair result, but, once again, EPA has imposed another regulation with difficult deadlines that will likely take effect before judicial review is complete.

Brickmakers have testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that this regulation may result in layoffs and even plant closures. H.R. 1917 would simply extend the compliance deadline until after judicial review is final.

This industry has already reduced its emissions by up to 95 percent, according to a study from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It should not be forced to comply with another new regulation that may not withstand judicial scrutiny. We owe it to these brickmakers, their employees, and consumers of building materials to allow meaningful judicial review.

I might add that a Senate bill has been recently introduced that also provides regulatory relief for brickmakers, but it takes a somewhat different approach than our version. I pledge to work with the Senate so that we can provide timely relief to this important industry.

The bill also deals with wood heaters. As with bricks, the wood heaters industry is dominated by small business manufacturers who are often the economic anchors of rural communities, where many are located. Many wood heater buyers are low-income, rural households that rely on them to get through the winter.

In 2015, EPA set a two-step wood heater emission rule. The first step took effect in 2015 and reduced emissions in new models by up to 90 percent.

The more stringent second step is scheduled to take effect in 2020, but is causing a great deal of difficulty. Only a small fraction of the wood heating models currently available can meet the 2020 standards, and time is running out to design and certify any additional models.

One wood heater manufacturer testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that he has already had to cut staff as a result of the 2020 deadline, and others feel there will be additional job losses if the 2020 standard is retained, but this is not just a jobs issue.

Users of wood heaters face both reduced product choice and higher prices for new models. Many would have to forgo buying a new wood heater and continue using older and dirtier ones, which undercuts the claims that the current deadline will improve air quality.

The provisions in the bill retain the 2015 standards, but extend the 2020 deadline by 3 years to 2023.

This is a reasonable fix that would avoid unnecessary economic damage while still prioritizing environmental protection.

In conclusion, the brick industry and the wood heater industry may both be small, but they are far from small to those who owe their jobs to them and to those who rely on their products.

I urge my colleagues to provide targeted relief to these two industries by supporting H.R. 1917.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns, or BRICK, Act.

EPA issued the Brick and Clay MACT rule in 2015, which sets maximum achievable control technology based on what is already being achieved at similar facilities.

Section 2 of the BRICK Act seeks to delay compliance with the Brick and Clay MACT until “judgment becomes final, and no longer subject to further appeal or review.”

This would incentivize frivolous litigation simply to put off having to comply with the rule.

Courts already have the ability to issue a stay of any compliance dates in a final rule. Congress should not insert itself into the judicial process.

The courts have regularly used this process. There is no reason for Congress to override it.

To date, no one has petitioned the court to stay the Brick and Clay MACT rule.

Section 3 of H.R. 1917 incorporates another bill reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee, H.R. 453, the Relief from New Source Performance Standards Act.

This section, Mr. Speaker, delays implementation of the EPA’s step 2 emission standards for three categories of wood-fueled heaters.

EPA finalized the rule in 2015. Under the rule, manufacturers have until 2020 to comply with the new standards. This bill would delay the standards until 2023.

Much like the Brick MACT, these standards are achievable.

In a recent list of devices certified under the 2015 standard, 171 devices report certified emission levels that already meet the 2020 standards.

These 2020-compliant products are both cleaner and more efficient, generating more heat per unit of wood burned and making them less expensive to operate.

By delaying these standards, Congress is unfairly punishing companies that made investments to produce cleaner, more efficient products by the original deadline.

Since these appliances typically last for 25 years or more once installed, delaying this standard will result in decades of additional pollution in and around people’s homes.

The original bill, H.R. 453, was opposed by State attorneys general of New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, Oregon, Rhode Island, and the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.

In a letter from December 12, these officials pointed out that EPA esti-

mated the net benefits of implementing the rule at more than 100 times the costs.

Wood smoke contains considerable amounts of fine particle pollution, carbon monoxide, and other toxic pollutants.

In my home State of New York, less than 2 percent of residents heat their homes with wood, but residential wood heating accounts for 41 percent of the State’s particulate emissions.

□ 1400

Because the emissions are released close to ground level and homes, there is significant human exposure, which is why this bill is also opposed by a number of public health and medical organizations.

The BRICK Act gives special treatment to a couple of industries by shifting the health and financial burdens of pollution on to the public. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the excellent work that he has done on the BRICK Act, and also Mr. JOHNSON, who brought this legislation forward and who has worked so closely with individuals, with companies in his district to address their concerns on this.

Now, what brings us here today is the fact that, once before, the brick industry faced an EPA rule that went on the books, hadn’t gone through judicial review. This happened in 2003.

Over a period of 5 years, they began ramping up to make these changes. This is expensive because most of the brick manufacturers in our country are small businesses. They have two kilns, and they are working very, very hard to keep the jobs and keep people employed. When they look at having to change to this new equipment, the investment is going to be \$3 million, \$4 million, \$5 million, depending on the size of their business.

Now, previously, a rule went through the process of judicial review, and then it was withdrawn. What this legislation does is to say, look, let’s finish this entire process before we move that expense to the industry, because when you put it to the industry and they are incurring this cost that could end up being an unnecessary cost, what happens? Brick costs more. Building materials cost more.

Who ends up paying for that? Consumers, purchasers, individuals who are buying homes, individuals who are remodeling homes, individuals who are building commercial buildings.

So what we are saying is let’s exercise some wisdom. Let’s exercise a little bit of experience that comes from

having been here before, and let’s delay until this entire process is finished.

As we have talked about bricks, we are also addressing the wood heater industry, which is a primary source of heat for many of our homes, and just saying let’s be mindful, let’s be careful, let’s put consumers and taxpayers in front of the bureaucrats who are looking to implement these rules and regulations.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member, and I thank the chairman for his work on this, but I am going to rise in opposition to H.R. 1917, the BRICK Act.

This bill will delay the implementation of the EPA’s final Brick and Structural Clay Products rule and the final Clay Ceramic Manufacturing rule by extending all compliance deadlines based on pending judicial review.

So what does that mean? That means it will delay implementation until judgment becomes final and not subject to review or appeal. This is a blanket extension that could have lasting negative impacts on the public’s health.

Brick and clay plants, if unregulated, can be major sources of toxic air pollutants like hydrogen fluoride, hydrogen chloride, and hazardous metals, pollutants that are associated with a variety of acute and chronic health effects, including cancer. It is estimated that the final Brick and Clay MACT rule will reduce nationwide air toxics by approximately 375 tons per year.

Last Friday, the OMB issued a report showing that regulations have high benefit and low cost. The aggregate benefits of Federal regulations is between \$219 billion and \$695 billion; whereas, the aggregate costs are \$59 billion to \$88 billion. Many regulations spur innovation that benefit the economy as well as human health.

Now, it is no surprise to me that this administration and the Republicans are targeting air pollution regulations. The OMB noted that EPA rules “account for over 80 percent of the monetized benefits and over 70 percent of the monetized costs” of Federal regulation between 2006 and 2016.

Since regulations protect human health and safety and have more benefits than costs for industry, I stand in opposition to bills like this one that seek to undermine these protections. I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 1917.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the next individual, I just want to say it is not a low cost to the individuals in these small communities who lose their job, and it is not a low cost to the communities that lose the tax base when these small businesses fold up and go away in small towns.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), a person who also represents big parts of rural America.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage Members to support this commonsense bill, H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act, H.R. 1917, also known as the BRICK Act, which includes provisions that will provide a compromise approach to delaying a regulation on manufacturers of wood heaters.

Wood heaters are frequently used by households in rural America. EPA's rushed 2020 deadline would raise the price of a new wood heater on those least able to afford it. It would also restrict consumer choice, as many currently available models may not be able to meet the 2020 deadline. H.R. 1917 will not remove any regulations. It would simply extend the deadline to 2023.

Frank Moore of Hardy Manufacturing, located in my district, testified before the Environment Subcommittee in September that he and other manufacturers are working to meet the 2020 step 2 standards, but that a lack of technology is making compliance nearly impossible. In that hearing, Mr. Moore said: "... we provide jobs for about 50 people with payrolls exceeding \$2 million," and that "even if a product can meet the step 2 requirements, I believe it would not be consumer friendly, durable, or affordable."

Again, extension of this effective date doesn't remove any regulations. Extension simply provides more time for manufacturers to come into compliance with much stricter requirements. It is best for the consumers; it is best for the businesses; and it will not undo the regulations that are requested.

I hope that Members will agree that this bipartisan legislation is a compromise solution that helps small businesses and our constituents. I encourage Members to support H.R. 1917.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, every American—in fact, every human being—has the right to breathe clean air. If this Congress trammels that right in the name of corporate profits, that choice is not just an abstract moral failure, it is a concrete public health disaster, one that will cause needless suffering, especially for our most vulnerable friends and neighbors.

The regulations this bill seeks to impede are long overdue. The earliest form of the Brick and Clay rule dates back to 2003. That was more than 14 years ago, and now some of my friends in the majority are seeking even longer delays.

We have been putting pollutants into our air and we can never unring that

bell, but we can do better moving forward, and we need to make those improvements sooner rather than later.

We all know that justice delayed is justice denied. Justice has already been delayed by more than a decade. We can measure that cost.

The Brick and Clay rule, in its current form, would reduce the amount of toxins in our air by hundreds of tons per year. If we delay the rule another year, or 2 years or longer, all of our families, all of our constituents are going to be breathing dirtier and more dangerous air.

This bill is a direct attack on our right to live in a clean and healthy environment. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), a Democrat who is going to speak on behalf of part of his bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the BRICK Act, particularly section 3, which includes language from my bill to bring much-needed regulatory relief to wood heater manufacturers that are in my district and also across the Nation.

Section 3 delays the second phase of Federal emission regulations for wood heaters by 3 years. It is important to note that, since 2007, manufacturers have voluntarily invested in technology to reduce the emissions to comply with the first phase of the regulations.

I had one situation in the north part of my district where they spent I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars coming up with this 90 percent reduction; and 6 months after they accomplished it, they came in with these new regulations to do another 90 percent, which can't be done, and it is going to put them out of business.

So these businessowners in my district and around the country have approached me and said, as I said, that they will go out of business if this second phase is not delayed. Some of them have already begun laying people off in towns like Greenbush, Minnesota, in my area. And in these small communities, these layoffs are devastating.

These companies already produce some of the cleanest wood heaters in the Nation, and they are telling me that the EPA has just gone too far. So I wrote this language to help these businesses, these workers, these communities that depend on the production of these important appliances, and I urge my colleagues to support the BRICK Act.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the author of the BRICK Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the majority of U.S. brick and ceramic plants are small, family-owned operations, often located in rural communities that depend on the plant for their very livelihood, for the good-paying jobs. They have built some of the most recognizable buildings, cities, and towns in existence across America, including many within my district in eastern and southeastern Ohio.

Unfortunately, these industries have borne the brunt of an unpredictable regulatory process that is nearly two decades in the making. In 2003, the EPA required brickmakers to install expensive new equipment to comply with the Agency's Maximum Achievable Control Technology, or their MACT rule.

In 2007, after companies spent millions to implement these controls, the U.S. Court of Appeals in the D.C. Circuit vacated the rule. Our brickmakers now find themselves in a very similar situation today. In 2015, the EPA again finalized a rule requiring the industry to once again invest in similar control equipment technologies.

Additionally, this new regulation uses the emission reductions achieved under the vacated regulation as a baseline for further emission reductions. In other words, the EPA, under the former administration, chose not to recognize the great strides this industry achieved under the previously vacated rule. The Agency neglected to take this past regulatory and compliance history into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, that is simply not right. The bill before us today, H.R. 1917, the BRICK Act, ensures history does not repeat itself. This legislation simply allows for the consideration and completion of any judicial review regarding the 2015 regulation before requiring compliance.

Now, some of my colleagues across the aisle say they are worried that this legislation sets a dangerous precedent. Many of these same colleagues are also quick to recognize the very unique regulatory situation this industry finds itself in. They even go so far as to say they are sympathetic to the unique situation.

□ 1415

However, they are unwilling to support this bill that simply extends the compliance deadlines, which would give the brick and tile industries a bit of regulatory certainty while the courts complete their work.

Mr. Speaker, that logic baffles me. We need a bit of pragmatism when we approach this situation. Because if you really want to talk about a dangerous precedent, consider this: this new regulation also caps the economic productivity of the clay ceramics industry. While the former administration admitted that this regulation will not reduce emissions emitted by the industry, it decided to set new emission standards through regulations anyway.

Regulating an industry for no immediate reason or environmental benefit? Now that is a dangerous precedent. Brick manufacturers have suffered heavy losses since the recession, shedding 45 percent of jobs between 2005 and 2012, and these increased compliance costs from EPA regulations are driving more job losses and consolidations within this primarily family-owned industry.

Brick plant owners already struggle to obtain financing for plant modernization projects, and brick companies estimate that this rule will cost as much as \$100 million a year to comply. Many are worried that the financing needed to comply with this most recent reiteration of this rule will not be available, considering that the required control equipment will not improve plant productivity, nor help the bottom line.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation today, and I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues to quickly address this issue. I know some recent bipartisan progress has been made in the Senate between Senator WICKER and Senator DONNELLY, and I am very encouraged by that progress.

I am hopeful that this vote today will help push the Senate to act and act sooner than later. The compliance deadlines are quickly approaching, and we need a solution now to this important issue. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we are in danger of having to build buildings in America out of sticks and straw, or, worse yet, out of bricks imported from foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to shut down these businesses, but H.R. 1917 is the wrong remedy. We understand the circumstances, and those circumstances should be brought to the attention of the courts.

The court has the power to grant the stay of this rule. For some reason, the industry has not yet made that request, even though there are a number of pending lawsuits challenging the rule. In fact, industry petitioned the court to put their lawsuits on hold until EPA decides whether to grant their request to reconsider the rule.

The pending decisions by the court and the EPA indicate there are still a number of remedies available to address the industry's concerns, including a request to the court to stay the rule. There is no need for H.R. 1917.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Blocking Regulatory Inter-

ference from Closing Kilns Act of 2017. This bill is very simple, Mr. Speaker, as it simply aligns the timeline for compliance with judicial review of these rules and regulations.

American businesses are finding themselves facing millions of dollars in compliance costs due to burdensome EPA regulations. It is estimated that the EPA's rules may cost the brick and ceramics industry millions annually, with the cost of compliance for the average facility at over \$4 million.

Industry won't be able to meet the requirement deadlines imposed by the rule, which is currently being reviewed in our court system. The EPA's first attempt at a rule was vacated, but not before the industry spent millions in compliance measures that were ultimately found to be invalid.

Small brick and ceramics businesses have been the hardest hit by the first rule; and if something isn't done, many of these small businesses will be forced to close their doors for good.

H.R. 1917 would provide much-needed regulatory relief to brick and ceramics businesses by simply stating that we need to let the judicial review process move ahead before we penalize hard-working people.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and to support businesses all across the country.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SHIMKUS yielding. And I want to thank Chairman WALDEN, as well, for his hard work in this area, as well as Mr. SHIMKUS', and the entire Energy and Commerce Committee for their leadership in this area.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I continue to hear from small-business owners all across America that compliance with regulations is one of the greatest challenges that they face, and this is, in essence, what this is.

In fact, today, I chaired a hearing on how the regulatory process is impacting small businesses. The bill before us today, the BRICK Act, would provide crucial relief to America's brick, clay, and tile industries, the majority of which are, by definition, small businesses; and we should always remember that small businesses create about 7 out of every 10 new jobs in America.

The BRICK Act would ensure that small-business owners don't have to worry about spending millions of dollars to comply with a regulation that may well be thrown out in court. I would urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should not be in the business of encouraging frivo-

lous litigation or penalizing businesses that made the necessary investments to comply with standards, especially when clean air is at stake.

Unfortunately, that is what the BRICK Act would do. These standards are achievable, long overdue, and provide considerable health benefits. It has been nearly two decades for pollution control standards for brick and clay facilities and nearly three decades since the last Federal standards for wood stoves.

We shouldn't have to choose between a giveaway to a couple of special interests over clean air for all of our constituents. Again, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's good work on this legislation.

In my district and in many rural communities around the country, wood burning stoves and heaters are a popular heat source, and an affordable one as well; and it is a renewable fuel. And I will tell you what: the person who utilizes a wood stove to heat their home is not a special interest.

The EPA's New Source Performance Standards for products like wood and pellet stoves and wood furnaces have raised significant concerns. This regulation sets forth an unrealistic and unachievable timeline for manufacturers of these products to come into compliance with the standards in time.

I have heard from manufacturers and retailers, like England's Stove Works in Amherst County in my district, that it is not that they don't want to comply with the rule, they just simply need more time. For just one wood stove, it can take up to 6 months to complete the EPA certification process.

In the meantime, the availability of wood stoves—the affordability of this heating source for my constituents and other people in mostly rural areas, but other communities as well around the country, is going to go up.

The BRICK Act, before the House today, includes provisions from a bill that I introduced along with Representative COLLIN PETERSON, the Relief from New Source Performance Standards Act. This provision is a simple one. It simply extends the time wood stove manufacturers have to comply with Federal regulations by 3 years.

Affordable heat is important to my constituents, and Federal regulations must take into account the real world needs and time constraints of the industries that make these products and must now develop new technologies.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill today to give this industry more time and ensure consumers can choose wood heat sources to help keep their families warm.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good debate and discussion. It is one we had in the subcommittee; it is one we had in the full committee; and we are bringing it to the floor. It just focuses on a different way in which we view manufacturing and, really, as you heard in this debate, small manufacturers—small brick manufacturers, small wood heaters, because, as everyone knows, when you are in a big corporation, you have got lawyers and you have got—you can do an economic analysis and you can do research and development, but a lot of these folks are just small local operations, probably started by a husband and wife, probably brought on a kid and next-door neighbor.

In my opening statement, I mentioned how, in rural America, there are not a lot of businesses, other than maybe agriculture, people coming into the town; so not only are these manufacturers, they are the backbone of these small communities.

So, simply put, this bill is a combination of two. One says you really shouldn't force someone to comply with a rule and regulation until they have fought the litigation battle, because, in the example that we are talking about today, the claimants, the manufacturers, won, where either they went out of business because they were trying to comply or they had to have this excessive cost. That is issue one.

Issue two on the small wood heaters is just say they were forced to move forward in cleaner technology, increasing their environmental ability 90 percent; and we all know that the cleaner you get, the harder it is to get the last percentages. So all the folks are asking for is more time to comply.

They are both bipartisan bills. I applaud folks coming down to talk and defend those. This is an exciting time in our country. It is exciting because we are having economic growth. We are having economic growth for two reasons. One, our historic tax cuts. Fifty percent of all manufacturers of the country have said they are going to invest in capital investment. Pretty exciting.

There is optimism again. Wages are increasing. Benefits are increasing. You have people getting checks increasing or new growth capital expenses.

There is another component of this exciting time for jobs in the economy, and this other component is easing up on the assault that the EPA has done over the past decade on our manufacturing sector and our job creators.

So you put these two together, the American worker has a greater oppor-

tunity, and these are just a couple of examples of the bills we are moving today, how we can continue to make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, the BRICK Act, makes commonsense adjustments to preserve small businesses and American jobs while still protecting the environment. This bill addresses the impact of regulations and policies aimed at brickmakers, and—particularly important to many in my home state, wood stoves.

In many parts of Oregon, we're surrounded by forests and affordable wood, so wood stoves are often the most economical way to heat a home or a ranch shop. Oregonians also know what a real air pollution crisis looks like, as we have recently dealt with the thick smoke from several very bad wildfires across the state. Compared to that, wood stove emissions are far from a crisis, especially now that they all must comply with EPA's 2015 emissions standards. There is no reason to threaten wood heater affordability as well as industry jobs by insisting on the unworkable 2020 deadline for the next round of standards. This bill takes the sensible step of extending the deadline to 2023, thus preserving wood heater choice and affordability.

Opponents of these bills have claimed that H.R. 1917 is harmful to the environment and public health protections, but I think we need to maintain a sense of perspective.

Neither brickmakers nor wood heaters are a significant source of emissions, and both industries have already reduced emissions significantly due to earlier regulations that are not affected under this bill. For example, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the brick industry has already committed millions of dollars to install and operate controls to reduce emissions by nearly 95 percent in order to comply with previous regulations.

Perhaps most importantly, this bill does not repeal any health-based regulation—it simply makes minimal, temporal adjustments to reduce the risk of plant shutdowns, layoffs, and higher prices for consumers. We should be looking at ways to get people working, not imposing unnecessary and tough to meet regulatory timeframes that take away people's livelihoods.

We need a balanced approach. These brickmakers and wood heater manufacturers are important employers in the small communities where many are located. The data shows that there is little environmental justification for inflicting economic harm on these small businesses and their communities, and thus there is every reason to pass this bill to ensure that any such harm is avoided.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letters in the RECORD on H.R. 1917.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2018.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports H.R. 1917, the "Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns (BRICK) Act of 2017." The bill would ensure that the U.S. brick industry will not be forced to comply with the Brick Maximum

Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards for air quality issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) until after judicial challenges to the rule are resolved.

EPA issued an earlier version of the Brick MACT rule in 2003, which required the brick industry to spend millions of dollars to purchase, install, and operate control equipment. Five years later, a court threw out the 2003 rule. Now brick companies are faced with having to pay to tear out the equipment they installed and install even more costly new equipment. Brick companies are rightfully worried that they may make the investment to comply with the 2015 rule, only to have it subsequently thrown out by a court. To avoid this unfair and wasteful outcome, H.R. 1917 would set a compliance date for the final Brick MACT rule after judicial challenges to the 2015 Brick MACT rule are completed and after any subsequent final rule is promulgated.

It is important that American industries are not unfairly penalized when they are compelled to comply with costly rules that are later overturned by the courts. This wasteful and unreasonable outcome must be avoided.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2018.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, urges you to support H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2017 (BRICK Act), introduced by Representative Bill Johnson (R-OH).

In September 2015, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued final National Emissions Standards for Brick, Structural Clay Products and Clay Ceramics Manufacturing, often referred to as Brick MACT. It is estimated that this rule will collectively cost the brick industry, which is made up of predominantly small- and medium-sized manufacturers, more than \$100 million dollars per year.

Manufacturers support reasonable environmental policies, but need regulatory certainty to ensure that the investments made today match what regulations will ultimately require. When regulations stretch beyond what the law allows, manufacturers and other stakeholders must turn to the courts for relief. Often times compliance deadlines for disputed final regulations are too short for the legal process to fully run its course and manufacturers are forced to make investments to comply with rules that courts may ultimately throw out or send back to EPA for more work.

This is exactly the situation brick manufacturers find themselves in with this regulation, as EPA's rule requires millions in new regulatory costs within a three-year period, while the underlying regulation is being disputed in the courts—a process that could ultimately span several years. H.R. 1917 is a commonsense way to approach this issue, as it simply ensures that manufacturers will have the certainty that the investments they make are based on laws that the courts have determined are appropriate and legal. The NAM strongly urges you to support H.R. 1917.

Sincerely,

ROSS EISENBERG.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1917, the so-called "Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2017."

This is the first in a series of dirty air proposals on the floor this week. The BRICK Act is part of the ongoing effort by Republicans to undermine the commonsense protections found in the Clean Air Act, in order to give special breaks to polluters at the expense of public health.

We have seen this bill before. Last Congress we debated and voted on the BRICK Act: I opposed it then, and I oppose it now. Frankly, I have even more concerns with this legislation than I did in 2016.

That is because the BRICK Act was amended by the Rules Committee to include two separate attacks on clean air safeguards. Like previous versions, this version before us today would indefinitely delay standards to reduce toxic air pollution from brick and clay manufacturers. However, it now also incorporates a separate bill that would delay long-overdue pollution standards for new wood fired heaters. The only thing these bills really have in common is that they both undermine Clean Air Act protections and endanger the health of our children.

Regarding the treatment of brick and clay manufacturing facilities, the bill automatically delays implementation of EPA's final Brick and Clay rule by extending all deadlines . . . by however long it takes to complete all possible litigation. This blanket extension would be given to all facilities covered by the final rule, without regard for the merits of the legal challenges or their final outcome.

But that is not Congress' job. The courts already have the ability to issue a "stay" of any compliance dates in a final rule. Delaying a rule for legitimate reasons does not require action by Congress, but a legislative quick fix is the only remedy the proponents of this bill appear to care about.

By throwing out the existing judicial process, Republicans are giving polluters an incentive to "run the clock" on frivolous litigation, to put off ever controlling their pollution.

This is especially problematic because Administrator Pruitt has announced plans to reconsider the Brick and Clay rule, which is expected to be finalized in 2019. At that point, the pollution control standards for brick and clay facilities will be almost two decades overdue, and this bill would delay those protections even longer.

The new wood heater provision is not much better. The bill delays EPA's pollution standards for new wood-fueled heaters that have not been updated in nearly 30 years. The final rule included a gradual, five-year phase in to allow manufacturers time to adapt and develop cleaner and more efficient technologies, and the phase 2 requirements don't kick in until 2020.

These newer appliances are a win for consumers. The 2020-compliant products are both cleaner and more efficient, generating more heat per unit of wood burned and making them less expensive to operate.

But, with this provision, Republicans are picking winners and losers. They are rewarding companies that refused to clean up their dirty and inefficient products, while punishing

innovative companies that invested in developing cleaner and more efficient technologies for wood heaters.

Ultimately, the BRICK Act is really more about transferring burdens than relieving them. This so-called "relief" from regulation comes at the expense of our children's health. Moreover, it doesn't reduce costs; it merely transfers them from favored businesses to the general public who will pay for more doctor visits and lost work or school days as a result.

My Republican colleagues repeatedly claim they support clean air, and yet, they continually put forward bill after bill designed to delay, weaken, or repeal safeguards that protect public health by cleaning up the air. Passing this bill allows dirty products to remain in operation for decades into the future, resulting in tons of additional pollution, and putting the health of our children and future generations at risk.

Exempting businesses from clean air rules leads to more air pollution. It is that simple. We all want small businesses to thrive, and the history of the Clean Air Act demonstrates clearly that we can grow the economy while cleaning up the air and improving public health.

Congress should not be selling out the health and safety of American children. But that is just what a YES vote on the BRICK Act would do.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in opposing this dirty air bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 762, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1917 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of section 3 of the bill, add the following new subsection:

(c) LIMITATION ON PRIVATE PLANE TRAVEL.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to charter a flight, or travel in any class of air accommodation above coach class, to, in accordance with subsection (b), make such technical and conforming changes to rules and guidance documents as may be necessary to implement subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit is simple and should garner the support of all Members who dislike government waste and abuse of power.

My motion goes to the heart of the costly ethical violations by EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt and his penchant for flying first class in violation of Federal regulations and billing it to taxpayers.

He has done this at a time when he has supported cuts to EPA clean water and clean air initiatives in the communities we represent back home.

□ 1430

So my amendment is simple. It says: "Nothing in this act may be construed to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to charter a flight, or travel in any class of air accommodation above coach class."

See, Federal regulations right now require government officials to consider the least expensive class of travel that meets their needs. Now, agencies are allowed to travel first class in very rare instances, such as a flight of 14 hours or more, a medical disability, or for exceptional security circumstances if your life or government property is in danger.

Well, Administrator Scott Pruitt has abused these exceptions. This came to light after the House Energy and Commerce Committee asked the EPA Administrator to explain his costly travel records, which showed he repeatedly booked first class flights at taxpayer expense, and he hoped no one would notice. There is no adequate justification for this wasteful spending and abuse of power by Scott Pruitt. If he enjoys flying first class and staying in luxury hotels, then he should pay for it himself and not ask the taxpayers to foot the bill.

Here is what we know per press reports and committee research: last June 5, Pruitt settled into his \$1,641 first class seat for a short flight from D.C. to New York. The ticket cost more than 6 times that of the two media aides who traveled along with him and sat in coach. In Manhattan, Administrator Pruitt made two brief television appearances praising the White House's decision to withdraw from the 2015 Paris climate agreement. He stayed in an upscale hotel near Times Square and returned to Washington the next day. That Wednesday, after traveling on Air Force One for an infrastructure event in Cincinnati, Pruitt and several staffers raced back to New York on a military jet, at the cost of \$36,000, to then catch a plane to Rome. The transatlantic flight was

part of a round-trip ticket for the Administrator that cost over \$7,000, according to EPA records, several times what was paid for other officials who went.

In total, the taxpayer-funded travel for Pruitt and his top aides during that stretch in June cost at least \$90,000, thanks to the Environmental Integrity Project, which got the records. His travel practices are quite different from previous EPA Administrators', who very rarely traveled first class and always announced their travel schedule to the public.

But Scott Pruitt's travel is different. It is secretive, it is costly, and it is frequent. In fact, we have come to learn that this year he plans to travel to Israel, Australia, Japan, Mexico, and possibly Canada. None of those have been officially announced, but we have been digging. Pruitt rarely discloses where he plans to be.

So, at the request of congressional Democrats, the EPA's Office of Inspector General is conducting probes of Pruitt's travel. He has attempted to justify his luxury travel by noting that he has been approached by people in the airport numerous times to talk about his environmental record. However, it is unclear why this justifies purchasing first class tickets.

These new justifications also contradict previous explanations of this questionable travel as a way of providing an opportunity to hear directly from people affected by the EPA. The Administrator simply prefers to be wasteful with taxpayer dollars.

We have asked about other conflicts of interest. He has continually sided with dirty energy and chemical companies, so it is no matter that members of the public would like to discuss these pressing issues with him. According to the Environmental Integrity Project, new travel records shared with the media show Pruitt and EPA employees spent up to \$150,000 on premium commercial and chartered flights just in a 6-month period.

So, Mr. Speaker, Administrator Pruitt says he will start flying coach after all the attention it has garnered, but he hasn't promised to do so. Through this motion to recommit, we would like to make it permanent. We would like to hold him accountable.

And for anyone who would like to eliminate waste in government and make sure that our officials do not abuse their power, it is time to adopt this amendment, and I urge Congress to do so.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, a Member uses a motion to instruct or recom-

mit to change or amend the bill. I don't think we build and use bricks to make our airplanes, and I don't think we power our planes with wood heaters.

So what is the deal with this motion to instruct and recommit?

It is just purely politics, and it is not surprising.

Why?

Well, because Democrats want to distort us from our economic success of the Republican agenda. And it is built on two foundational principles. One is the very successful tax reform and bill that we passed in December. And Americans are seeing it. Fifty percent of all manufacturers around the country are going to invest in capital expansion. People have bigger paychecks now. They are getting bonuses.

In fact, I was on the floor last night with Illinoisans. We were reading stories from constituents about the benefits they are receiving, either in less money being taken out on taxes or increase in wages; trucking companies expanding. So it is an incredible success of optimism when we have been in an economic malaise for the past 8 years.

And that is the kind of society I want to live in. I want to live in a society where, when my kids enter the workforce, there is a job there. And I want them to say: If I work hard and play by the rules, man, there is an opportunity for me. And that is what is coming back.

There is another component to this economic success, and that is calling off the EPA dogs who have been attacking the job creators in our country over the past 8 years. Ease the regulatory burden, provide historic tax relief, excitement in the economy, new jobs, new energy. So I understand why my opponents on the other side would like to distort us from this record.

This motion to recommit is purely politics to do that, so that is why I ask my colleagues to reject the motion to recommit and, once we do that, support the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 1917; and

Passage of H.R. 1917, if ordered.

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

BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 1917) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 227, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—186

Adams	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Aguilar	Chu, Judy	Demings
Barragán	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Bass	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bera	Clay	Doggett
Beyer	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	F.
Blum	Cohen	Ellison
Blumenauer	Connolly	Engel
Blunt Rochester	Cooper	Eshoo
Bonamici	Correa	Española
Boyle, Brendan	Costa	Esty (CT)
F.	Courtney	Evans
Brady (PA)	Crist	Foster
Brown (MD)	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Cuellar	Fudge
Bustos	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Butterfield	Davis, Danny	Gallego
Carbajal	DeFazio	Garamendi
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Gomez
Cartwright	Delaney	Gonzalez (TX)
Castor (FL)	DeLauro	Gottheimer

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

NAYS—227

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Barr
Bridenstine
Capuano
Cárdenas
Cramer
Cummings

Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott

NOT VOTING—17

Hice, Jody B.
Lieu, Ted
Meeks
Nolan
Pearce
Poe (TX)

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Polis
Scalise
Shea-Porter
Slaughter
Smith (TX)

□ 1624

Messrs. GROTHMAN, BOST, GRIF-FITH, FRELINGHUYSEN, BARTON, HOLLINGSWORTH, ALLEN, THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, CURBELO of Florida, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. TAKANO, CORREA, DEFAZIO, HIGGINS of New York, CUELLAR, and DOGETT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 180, answered “present” 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

AYES—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black

Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney

Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham

Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)

Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)

NOES—180

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly

Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deuth
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Knight
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Love
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Mast
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Deuth
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)	Neal	Scott, David
Lawrence	Norcross	Serrano
Lawson (FL)	O'Halleran	Sherman
Lee	O'Rourke	Sires
Levin	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA)	Panetta	Soto
Lipinski	Pascrell	Speier
Loeb sack	Payne	Suo zzi
Lofgren	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Takano
Lowe y	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lujan Grisham,	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
M.	Price (NC)	Titus
Lujan, Ben Ray	Quigley	Tonko
Lynch	Raskin	Torres
Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Tsongas
Carolyn B.	Richmond	Vargas
Maloney, Sean	Rosen	Veasey
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Vela
McCollum	Ruiz	Velázquez
McEachin	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
McGovern	Rush	Walz
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Meeks	Sánchez	Schultz
Meng	Sarbanes	Waters, Maxine
Moore	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman
Moulton	Schiff	Welch
Murphy (FL)	Schneider	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Schrader	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Pingree

NOT VOTING—15

Barr	Hice, Jody B.	Polis
Bridenstine	Lieu, Ted	Scalise
Cárdenas	Nolan	Shea-Porter
Cramer	Pearce	Slaughter
Cummings	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)

□ 1632

Mr. O'HALLERAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GOWDY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 98 and "yea" on rollcall No. 99.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF THE YMCA IN COMMUNITIES NATIONWIDE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an institution that influences our Nation's culture and helps our people and communities to learn, grow, and thrive.

That organization is the YMCA. The Y engages more than 10,000 neighbor-

hoods across the United States. By nurturing the potential of every child and teen, improving the Nation's health and well-being, and supporting and serving its neighbors, the Y ensures that everyone has the opportunity to become healthier, more confident, connected, and secure.

The Y was founded in 1844 in London by George Williams. He organized the first Young Men's Christian Association meeting: a refuge of Bible study and prayer for young men seeking escape from the dangers of life on the streets. The fellowship and sense of community was compelling.

Years later, Thomas Valentine Sullivan was inspired by the stories of the Y and founded the first U.S. YMCA in Boston in 1851. Since then, the Y has been strengthening communities across the Nation. It brings people together, regardless of age, income, or background, and helps everyone reach their full potential. For that, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful.

GATEWAY PROJECT FUNDING

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao testified before the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Secretary Chao acknowledged that President Trump is personally intervening to prevent Federal funding of the Gateway Project, which is the Nation's most critical infrastructure project.

Mr. Speaker, the Gateway Project would rebuild the crumbling rail infrastructure that connects New York and New Jersey, a key point in Amtrak and the Northeast corridor's rail line between New Jersey and New York and, also, 415 trains that go through those tunnels each day. New York and New Jersey have promised billions of dollars towards the project, but President Trump is actively undermining Gateway.

As anyone who had plans to travel by Amtrak or by rail during last week's cyclone knows, the trans-Hudson track infrastructure connects not just the two States, but the entire region between Boston and Washington, D.C. Because Gateway is so important to everyone in the Northeast, a substantial Federal commitment is necessary to make this project a reality.

The Gateway Project is far too important to be left unfunded. Gateway should not be sacrificed because of President Trump's political animosity.

RECOGNIZING JESSICA MELNIK FOR HER WORK IN FIGHTING AGAINST SEX TRAFFICKING

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Jessica Melnik, a junior at Hopkins High School and the founder of a student-run nonprofit, Girls United Minnesota, for her work fighting against sex trafficking.

Jessica, along with fellow members of Girls United Minnesota, took action to spread awareness after they observed a fellow classmate who was a target of sex trafficking. They soon realized that Minnesota ranks 13th in the Nation for its prevalence of sexual exploitation and they stepped forward to do something about it.

Girls United Minnesota started by working with local law enforcement and nonprofits to organize public awareness events throughout our community. Jessica and her friends are also working with State legislators in Minnesota to expand education on sex trafficking in schools and create more resources for the victims of sexual exploitation.

Mr. Speaker, the determination and the hard work of Jessica and her classmates at Girls United Minnesota is nothing short of inspiring, and their impact is literally helping to save lives.

CONGRATULATING TRINI GARZA HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Trini Garza High School for earning the designation of National Title I Distinguished School for the 2016-2017 school year.

This exclusive designation is given to high-poverty schools that excel in either student performance or for its work to close the achievement gap. Garza, with a student body that is 86 percent economically disadvantaged, was one of 34 schools across the Nation to be praised "for its exceptional student performance for two or more consecutive years."

Garza's designation would not be possible without the strong partnerships of its educators, parents, students, and the Oak Cliff community in Dallas. Each of you have made sure that we are doing our part to empower our future leaders with the tools they need to succeed.

Congratulations, Trini Garza High School, for your well-deserved recognition.

VIETNAMESE OF LINCOLN

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to join

the Lincoln Vietnamese community in the celebration of the Vietnamese New Year, the Year of the Dog. I celebrated this special occasion at St. Andrew Dung-Lac and Companions Catholic Church in Lincoln, where I live, and I participated in the Catholic mass, followed by a community festival complete with traditional dragon dancers. I would like to thank Father Joseph Nguyen and the parish community for their generosity and hospitality.

Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 2 million persons of Vietnamese descent living in America. My hometown of Lincoln has become home for nearly 10,000 Vietnamese Americans, some of whom faced the trauma of persecution, escape, open seas, refugee camps, and, finally, resettlement in a new home.

Our vibrant, well-respected Vietnamese community has become an integral part of Lincoln's cultural traditions and adds to our capital city's vibrant tapestry. Vietnamese is the third most commonly spoken language in the Cornhusker State, and I have actively encouraged the youth to keep the great tradition alive.

Mr. Speaker, it is not advisable to try a language that you don't speak, but to my Vietnamese friends, I would like to try: "thank you," "cam o'n ban."

REMEMBERING FRANK HESS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember my neighbor and longtime friend, Frank Hess, who formerly served as special assistant to the legendary New York State Assembly member Denny Farrell, who, for many years, chaired the prestigious Ways and Means Committee.

Frank was known for his cowboy hats and brutal honesty. He devoted his life to public service and spent almost 30 years in government. He was a devoted godfather, uncle, and father figure to anyone in the community who knew him. He once called 20 stores and drove for 2 hours to try to find a pair of shoes for his niece.

Frank was a devoted person to his family and his community. Through his lifetime devotion to public service, he made sure Washington Heights was a better place for all of us. Frank could accomplish anything he set his mind to and he could unite different groups of people despite any racial, ethnic, or religious differences. He lived his life demonstrating what it means to be a contributing citizen and to serve as a role model for those, like myself, who were fortunate to know him.

I will miss Frank Hess. He will forever be missed by our community.

□ 1645

HONORING THE LIFE OF DANA GARDNER

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Dana Gardner, who attended the Route 91 music festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Dana worked for San Bernardino County, California, for 26 years in the Assessor-Recorder Office. When she went home for the day, she always made sacrifices for her three children and two grandchildren. She wanted to make sure that her kids understood the importance of loving and caring for all humans. She did this through her actions as a dedicated public servant.

Dana was an amazing cook who had just begun to travel more and spend more time with her friends. She had a contagious smile and a great sense of humor that could light up a room. She is remembered by all those who knew her as a go-to person with a lot of knowledge and a can-do attitude.

I would like to extend my condolences to Dana Gardner's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

SISTER MARY SCULLION

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a distinguished Philadelphian who will be leading our city's annual St. Patrick's Day parade as grand marshal, Sister Mary Scullion.

Sister Mary is a towering figure and a driving force for social change in Philadelphia. She belongs to the Sisters of Mercy, the third largest congregation of Sisters in Philadelphia, and is the cofounder of Project HOME, an influential nonprofit that seeks to break the cycle of homelessness.

Since 1989, Sister Mary's organization has helped provide shelter to the homeless, set up programs for at-risk youth across the city, and organized wellness and healthcare services. She has also been a leader at the city, State, and Federal level to bring about awareness and much-needed funding to address the root causes of homelessness.

As a religious and community leader, Sister Mary has become a household name in Philadelphia and a champion for the voiceless in our city. It is fitting that she has been selected to lead this year's St. Patrick's Day parade, and I rise to commend her on her lifetime of devoted service.

ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, today is the 53rd anniversary of Bloody Sunday. This is the day that our incredible colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and Dr. Martin Luther King led 600 marchers from Selma to Montgomery. They didn't get very far. At the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they were viciously attacked by Alabama State Troopers wielding clubs and were beaten and left bloodied.

Last weekend, I had the incredible honor of joining Congressman JOHN LEWIS and a bipartisan group of Members in a pilgrimage to Montgomery, Birmingham, Selma, and Memphis. I had many epiphanies on that trip, but perhaps two were most profound. First, that determined and disciplined non-violent resistance works. Back then, 53 years ago, it led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act. And, second, that we in this body have a critical responsibility to ensure that we move forward and not backward on voting rights.

Our trip was amazing. One of the best experiences of my life, actually. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join next year. We heard incredible stories of abiding love, even for adversaries that had left people without much dignity. Newer activists of all ages are reimagining these same nonviolent methods for the world that we are in today.

Today, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King on April 4, let us recommit ourselves to restoring and strengthening the Voting Rights Act and making sure that we continue to protect these critical rights in our country.

RECOGNIZING ROME ELKS LODGE #96

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Rome Elks.

Hailing from Rome Elks Lodge #96 on Liberty Street, our hometown Elks truly embody the mission the Elks National Foundation has been committed to for over 140 years. For generations, Elks around the Nation have dedicated themselves to building strong communities and lending a helping hand to their fellow neighbors.

Today I would like to recognize an outstanding group of hometown Elks who have made the journey from Oneida County to visit us here in Washington: Donna Townsend; Whitney

Cook; Mary Bielby; and retired captain of the Rome Police Department, John Bielby.

Our Elks in Rome and around the country help our youth develop lifelong skills, assist students who are attending college, support charitable work in their communities, and care for our local veterans.

However, Rome Elks are unique to all other Elks in the country. In addition to the honorable work of the Elks, Rome Elks also carry out the longstanding tradition of caring for the gravesite of a historic Rome native, Sir Francis Bellamy. Some of you may not know it, but Sir Francis Bellamy is the author of our uniquely American tradition, the Pledge of Allegiance.

Francis Bellamy was born in Mount Morris, New York, attended our Rome public schools, and graduated from Rome Free Academy, affectionately known as RFA, in 1872.

Every day throughout our country, in public and parochial schools; at Boy Scout and Girl Scout meetings; at American Legions and all fraternal and patriotic organizations; in government, including here in our Nation's Capitol, millions of Americans recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Pledge of Allegiance reminds our citizenry of the notion of what it means to be American. We pledge allegiance to this great experiment; to our constitutional Republic, a nation that reveres freedoms, individual rights, and liberty. We pledge allegiance to our country's historic Judeo-Christian values.

Bellamy wrote the Pledge of Allegiance in 1892 at the age of 37. During his time working as a writer for a magazine called "The Youth's Companion," a family magazine that, at the time, had 500,000 subscribers, Bellamy was tasked with creating a patriotic school program to honor the 400th anniversary of Christopher Columbus' arrival to America. Through this assignment, the Pledge of Allegiance, as we know it today, took shape.

At a trying time in our Nation's history, Francis Bellamy captured so elegantly and simply America's unity and loyalty. With only a sentence, Bellamy ultimately symbolized America's ability to surpass all internal differences. It is the manifestation of our patriotic conscience and it is recognized throughout our Nation.

Francis Bellamy's spirit pervades in Rome to this day, especially during patriotic holidays, like Flag Day. On Flag Day, the Rome Elks replace the two American flags that fly over Sir Francis Bellamy's gravesite. These annual ceremonies are a dedication to the patriotic principles that our flag has stood for since it was first adopted in 1777. In 2008, the Rome Elks started a significant renovation project on Bellamy's gravesite, and completed it 1 year later, just in time to rededicate it for Flag Day.

In addition to their work in honoring Sir Francis Bellamy and the American flag, the Rome Elks are also well known for their commitment to helping our local veterans.

Recently, the Rome Elks held a fundraiser to raise money for therapy dogs for veterans through a local organization called Clear Path for Vets. As part of the fundraiser, the Rome Elks took flags that had flown over Sir Francis Bellamy's gravesite and removed the stars and stripes. They then individually separated and added a slip of paper with the words "This little star is proud to say I flew over Bellamy's grave." The Rome Elks call this project "Stars Over Bellamy."

They started with 300 of these little packets, but quickly added 200 more when they realized how popular this projects was. To date, the Rome Elks have raised over \$1,000 for this fundraising effort. One of the most touching aspects is that every veteran that a Rome Elks member comes across receives one of these stars for free as a thank-you for their years of service.

I was lucky enough to be able to purchase a star for myself and a few others for my son, who is currently serving in the Marine Corps. It is a constant reminder for me of the legacy Francis Bellamy left for our country, as well as the patriotic principles I as a member of the Ilion Elks Lodge #1444—a nearby Elks Lodge down the street—have come to live by.

These are just a few examples of the hard work and devotion that the Rome Elks show for their community. The Rome Elks bring so much more to the community than just a building. Although it is a beautiful, historic building on Liberty Street—aptly named—in Rome, New York, they invest in programs that help children grow up healthy and drug-free, meet the needs of today's veterans, and improve the quality of life for our area.

As I mentioned, as a member of the nearby Ilion Elks Lodge #1444, I am proud to know and work with so many outstanding Elks and members throughout our region. I also am excited to participate in our benevolent Elks Lodge, which has a motorcycle ride each year, where we travel to each of the Elks Lodges and raise money for charities that help many of our veterans in need.

So I just want to say, if you happen to be visiting our region, take the time to stop by one of our wonderful Elks Lodges. They have weekly events. Particularly in the Rome Elks Lodge, they have Tuesday Wing Night, Wednesday Night Spaghetti Supper, Fish Fry Friday, or one of our special events on the weekends or holidays. It is really a beautiful and wonderful time to meet and have fellowship with a community that is so patriotic and so devoted to our Nation.

Today I urge all my colleagues and anyone watching at home to thank

Elks Lodges from around our Nation for the tremendous work they do for our communities, especially our veterans. Or, better yet, take the opportunity to volunteer at an Elks Lodge or consider joining an Elks Lodge. They do so much great benevolent work for our communities.

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

GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank the distinguished Congresswoman from New York for her comments about Francis Bellamy, the great Christian abolitionist and socialist who authored America's Pledge of Allegiance. He was a great patriot who wanted to unify the country in the wake of the Civil War during the Reconstruction Period. We, indeed, owe him a great debt of gratitude for everything he did for America.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a matter of pressing importance and urgency to the people of America today. It is the question of gun violence and what Congress is doing about the problem of gun violence.

I want to start by invoking something that all of the schoolchildren of America know about, which is the idea of a social contract.

You can go back and read John Locke or Thomas Hobbes, or Rousseau, but all of them began with the idea that, in the state of nature, we are all in a dangerous and perilous condition because there is no law. It is the rule of the jungle. Hobbes said that the state of nature was a condition that was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. Because of that, people enter into civil society to create a government.

The first principle of government is that we have got to protect our people. As Cicero put it, the safety and good of the people must be the highest law. That is why we have a social contract.

But, Mr. Speaker, in America today, our social contract is bruised and battered and damaged and tenuous because of the gun violence which has come to our public schools, to our universities, to our churches, to our movie theaters, to the public square.

America's high school students have woken us up to the fact that this is not a normal condition. America is an absolute outlier nation in terms of the levels of gun violence that we permit to take place in our own society. Our social contract is threatened by the gun violence that is a menace to every single American citizen.

Now, we have a social contract, we have got a social covenant, and it is the Constitution of the United States. We know that we have an amendment in there which deals specifically with the question of guns, the Second Amendment, which says: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

That is the Second Amendment.

□ 1700

Now, some people would have us believe that, because of the Second Amendment, there is nothing that we can do about the problem of gun violence. If you remember nothing else about what I am about to say, please remember this: this is demonstrably, absolutely, categorically false, and we know it is false because the Supreme Court has told us that it is false.

In its 2008 decision in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, the Supreme Court adopted the individual rights view of the Second Amendment. There was a contest between those who said, no, you only have a right to bear arms in connection with militia service versus those who said that it is an individual right. The individual right won in a 5-4 decision.

But in the course of making that 5-4 decision, the majority on the Supreme Court agreed, readily, that the right to bear arms is one that can be conditioned on all kinds of regulation by the government. That is true of all of the rights in the Bill of Rights.

Think about the First Amendment, which guarantees all of us the right to speak. You have a right to go protest across the street from the White House, but do you have the right to go protest across the street from the White House at 2 in the morning with 20,000 people without getting a permit? Of course, you do not.

The Supreme Court has said that the exercise of First Amendment rights is conditioned by reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions. And in the same sense, the Second Amendment right to keep and to bear arms is conditioned on reasonable time, place, manner, and use restrictions by the government. We know that to be the case. The Supreme Court told us that in *Heller*.

In *Heller*, the Court said everybody has a right to the possession of a handgun for purposes of self-defense; everybody's got a right to a rifle for purposes of hunting and recreation.

But nobody's got a right to possess a machine gun, even though someone might describe it as an arm; nobody's got a right to possess a sawed-off shotgun, much less does anybody have a right to access a weapon without going through a background check, without going through the government's policy for determining that you are not going to be a danger to yourself or to other people. The Supreme Court was very clear about that.

Those people who were out there saying, "We can't allow any gun safety regulation or we are going to lose the right to have guns, our guns are going to be taken away," are engaging in a knowing falsehood. There is no way that the guns of the people of America—the hundreds of millions of guns that are out there—could be confiscated. They can't be confiscated.

People have a right to them for purposes of self-defense and for purposes of hunting and recreation, but it doesn't give you a right to an AR-15. It doesn't give you a right to carry weapons of war into public schools and into movie theaters and into public places, and it does not give you the right to access guns without a background check, yet that is precisely what the law is today. We have a huge gaping loophole where terrorists can go to a gun show and simply buy a gun without any background check at all.

Now, here is the good news that people want to keep from you. We have great news, America. Mr. Speaker, we know there is good news, and here is the good news.

We have a consensus about what to do in America, starting with a universal criminal and mental background check, supported by, no longer, 95 percent of the American people. In the wake of the Parkland massacre, it is 97 percent of the people who think that you should not be able to access a weapon without first passing a background check.

That is the vast majority of the people, maybe almost a unanimous verdict by the American people. Almost everybody believes that we need to close the gun show loophole, we need to close the internet gun sale loophole, we need to close the 7-Eleven parking lot loophole, and we need to close the loophole that would allow criminals and gangsters and terrorists to go to a gun show and purchase a gun. Ninety-seven percent of the American people agree with that.

Sixty-seven percent of the American people agree with the call of the young people who survived the massacre in Parkland, which took the lives of 17 students and teachers, the call for a ban on assault weapons. Sixty-seven percent of the American people, more than two-thirds of the American people, agree with a ban on the sale of military-style assault weapons.

And 75 percent of the American people say that Congress must be acting to

reduce gun violence. So we have a consensus over what to do.

But what is happening now?

Well, I serve on the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker, and we had a vote today that had nothing to do with guns. It was about collecting data on bail policies, which is not to say that that is unimportant; but, seriously, millions of people in America are demanding action from Congress, and we can't even have a hearing on the problem of people accessing assault weapons and going to public schools and assassinating our school children at pointblank range.

Now, I had the good fortune of meeting some of the young people from Parkland who have awoken the conscience of the country. One of them was asked a question: Why, suddenly, is America waking up in the wake of the Parkland massacre, which took the lives of 17 people, but it didn't in the same way after the massacre in Newtown, Connecticut, at Sandy Hook, which took the lives of even more people, 26 people?

She had a fascinating answer. She said: Most of the people killed at Sandy Hook were first graders, and first graders can't start a revolution against the political power of the NRA; but high school students know how to do it because they understand how to contact people, and they know social media. They know Facebook and Twitter, and they have enough education so that they can speak with authority about the recklessness and the negligence of government not addressing the problem.

Congress now is the outlier. Congress will not act.

Are we a failed state such that when more than 95 percent of the American people agree that something needs to be done, Congress cannot act?

Are we abandoning our social contract?

Are we abandoning our primary commitment to defend the lives of our own people?

Well, it is a very serious moment. We are having our Special Order hour on the problem of gun violence, the failure of Congress to act, but the need for Congress to act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), with whom I serve on the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN for his leadership on the Progressive Caucus and for his leadership on the Judiciary Committee. Nobody understands the Constitution better than a constitutional law professor.

I appreciate you bringing the reality of the situation to us. Nobody is talking about trying to take guns away from everybody. We are talking about making sure that we have safety with

anybody who owns a gun and that we have the ability to check any of the dangerous contexts for which guns can be used. We have a responsibility, really, to protect our country, to protect our young people, and to do something for all of the families that have been affected by gun violence.

In addition to all of the things that he mentioned, we need to consider gun violence as a public health crisis. That is what it is. And when we look around at the millions of people who are dying from gun violence, you think about this, and you think about the way in which we treated vehicle fatalities as a public health crisis and we instituted laws around seatbelts, and the way we thought about smoking as a public health crisis and we instituted laws around smoking. But, in order to do that, we had to first do research into those areas and figure out what were the best ways for us to move forward as a country in preventing those kinds of fatalities that are preventable.

Unfortunately, what happened in this country is that Congressman Dickey, some time ago, passed an amendment called the Dickey amendment. While it didn't explicitly prohibit research into gun violence, it all but did that.

There have now been many, many calls to repeal the Dickey amendment. Interestingly, Congressman Dickey passed away last year, last April. Before he died, in 2012, he actually came out on the record and said that he wished he hadn't been so reactionary, that he wished he hadn't passed that amendment, because he realized that it did lead to a chilling effect on research into gun safety. The way that it did that is, when they passed the amendment, it essentially said that no Federal funds should be used for advocacy, but, at the same time, the amount of funds that were used for research were cut by exactly that amount.

So this is not about advocacy; this is about how do we protect our country, how do we treat this as what it is: a public health crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to say that I am really proud of my home State of Washington. Just yesterday, we became the latest State to ban bump stocks. And we also had a senate committee pass a bill to mandate that people purchasing rifles go through the same background checks required for pistol purchases and that we increase the legal age to buy rifles to 21.

So, in less than a month, my home State has finally advanced meaningful proposals to prevent gun violence. I wish I could say that we were doing that here in Congress. I truly believe that there are Members on both sides of the aisle who would like to pass sensible gun safety regulations and legislation.

Unfortunately, I feel like we are being held hostage not by the reasons that we all came to Congress to get

sensible things done that protect our constituencies, but by lobbying interests in the National Rifle Association; and every time there is a small movement towards progress, somehow they come in and, essentially, squash those efforts.

In October of last year, Congress stood by after 58 people were killed and over 500 injured at a music festival in Las Vegas. One of my constituent's, Zach Elmore, sister was shot. Luckily, she was one of the lucky ones who survived the shooting.

I read a letter on the floor that Zach had read to me—it was an incredibly moving letter—about his deep anger and frustration at Congress for not protecting his sister and millions like her, those who were not as lucky as she was.

In November, Congress failed to act, after 26 people were killed and 20 injured at a church in Sutherland Springs, Texas; and then a few weeks ago, on Valentine's Day, as we all know, 14 students and 3 teachers were killed, and 15 injured, at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Florida.

Already, in 2018 alone, there have been 2,581 deaths because of gun violence, including those precious lives that were lost at Parkland; 105 of those deaths were children ages 11 and under.

Let me just say that one more time: 105 of the 2,581 deaths, this year alone, were children ages 11 and under.

As Members of Congress, we need to make sure our kids are safe.

I am so grateful to the energy and the commitment and the passion and the smarts and the organizing strength of the Parkland students, because, as you say, they were not first graders who couldn't organize for themselves. They are students who are soon going to be voters. And they understand that they can't vote right now, but they also understand that they do have a voice, their parents' vote, and they can make sure that people across the country understand that we have a responsibility to them, to our children, to the people across the country who are afraid of sending their kids to school.

That should be our number one priority is keeping our kids safe. Our kids should be able to walk into schools knowing that they can fully focus on learning. Our parents shouldn't have to wonder whether their kids will come home from school.

My heart goes out to the families that lost someone in the Parkland shooting and all of the shootings across the country. I am proud to stand alongside incredible young people who wasted no time to demand action and justice for their friends and teachers. They are determined, they are brave, they are unafraid, and they are depending on us to pass meaningful legislation to end gun violence.

One of the interesting things that I heard them say when I met with them

is: We are not looking for the whole package. We just want to see steps along the way that show us that it is possible for us, on a bipartisan basis, to make some progress on this critical issue, to make sure that no child, no parent, no community, ever again, has to experience the unspeakable tragedy of another school shooting.

I am tired of seeing men, women, and children die because the gun lobby puts profit over people. That is not, as Mr. RASKIN so eloquently said, what our Founders intended by the right to bear arms. Support for stricter measures to prevent gun violence is at an all-time high, on a bipartisan basis. Eighty-seven percent of gun owners and 74 percent of NRA members support commonsense solutions like criminal background checks.

I have a plea for gun owners across the country. My husband used to be a hunter. We had guns at home. And I understand the need for people to have guns for recreational purposes, to ensure their own safety. But this is not about that. It is not about taking guns away from people, who legitimately exercise responsible behavior. It is about making sure that we have the protections in place so that no more children, no more people die.

□ 1715

So here is my plea for gun owners: urge the NRA to represent your views, show them that you mean business, maybe even consider terminating your NRA membership if the organization continues to advocate against these kinds of sensible gun reforms.

Here in Congress, I hope that we act now. I really truly believe—and I have talked to some of my Republican colleagues who also want to do something about this. They don't want to be hamstrung. They want to move legislation forward, but not by attaching legislation that actually loosens gun restrictions into legislation that helps us.

We need just one or two pieces of commonsense gun reform legislation so that we can show these young people that we are responding to their pleas: no more shootings in schools, no more shootings in places of worship, no more shootings in our streets, no more mass shootings, period.

Let's show these students and students at schools across the country that we are not afraid to protect them. Let's show them that we can choose our country over the gun lobby. Let's stand with our kids. Let's pass commonsense gun violence prevention legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I join Mr. RASKIN in hoping that in the Judiciary Committee, which is the committee of record for this issue, that we can at least have some hearings on this.

What is so problematic about having a hearing on public health research

into gun violence? What is so problematic about having a hearing on multiple pieces of legislation that have bipartisan support? Isn't that what we are supposed to do? I know that is why I came here.

I am a first term Member, and I know our speaker is as well, and I believe that we have much more in common than we do that divides us.

We don't have to necessarily tackle every piece of this, but let's make some substantial progress forward together, and let's show our students that we will protect them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his leadership.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are so grateful for Congresswoman PRAMILA JAYAPAL from Washington, for her powerful leadership and her lucid discussion today of the gun violence problem.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for placing emphasis on the fact that we have had no hearings in our Congress since we arrived here more than a year ago on the problem of gun violence in the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for placing emphasis on the Dickey amendment, which forbids the expenditure of any public money even to research the epidemiology of gun violence and gun violence epidemics in the way that certain outbreaks of gun violence and mass shootings will trigger others.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman also for placing emphasis on the fact that the Newtown families who come to lobby in Washington, the families from Parkland, just want to see us break the logjam; they just want to see us end the paralysis and do something. And why not start with the thing that is backed by more than 9 out of 10 Americans, a universal criminal and mental background check so that people who are carrying guns in America are the lawful gun owners who can do it responsibly? That is something that the overwhelming majority of American people believe in, yet this Congress seems to be completely stuck, totally hamstrung.

Mr. Speaker, please help us dislodge this legislation.

Now, Congresswoman JAYAPAL praised her home State of Washington, rightfully, for the actions they have taken recently to ban the bump stocks and to pass other commonsense gun safety reforms.

I would like to talk about what has happened in my home State, the great State of Maryland, which is touching Washington, D.C., where we all are right now.

In 2013, after the catastrophe took place in Newtown, Connecticut, at Sandy Hook, where an AR-15 was used to assassinate 26 people at pointblank range, we acted in Maryland. We passed

a ban on the sale of military-style assault weapons. We passed a ban on high-capacity magazines.

We gave our State police the right to engage in frequent and unannounced inspections of the gun dealers so that bad apple gun dealers couldn't be dealing firearms directly into the underground.

Then we said if a firearm is lost or stolen, it has got to be reported within 48 hours, and if not, that is a misdemeanor, because what was happening was they were selling guns to criminals, they would surface in a homicide investigation 10 months later, we would trace it back to the gun dealers, and the dealers would say: Oh, yeah. That was stolen. We forgot to report it.

Or they would say: We lost that, but, yeah, we never filed a report.

So now, in our State, you have got to file a report—commonsense gun safety supported by people across the spectrum—so we don't have a leaky system where guns are getting into the wrong hands.

Now, our opponents on this, of course, marched and protested and said they were opposed to all of it. They said this was an attempt to confiscate everybody's guns, which, of course, it was not. And responsible law-abiding gun owners have all the guns that they had before, they have still got them, but it was challenged in court. They said it violated the Second Amendment.

I raise it because I want America to notice this. They sued in the United States District Court in Maryland, and they lost. And the court said, reading the *District of Columbia v. Heller* decision in 2008, that the Second Amendment permits reasonable gun safety regulation that does not infringe on the fundamental right to bear arms for self-defense or to have rifles for hunting or recreation, but there is no right for civilians to be carrying military-style hardware and weaponry in public.

They appealed it to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Fourth Circuit affirmed the ruling of the district court.

Then they brought it to the United States Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court let that ruling stand.

So there is a perfect example of how you can enact reasonable gun safety regulation and it doesn't infringe anybody's Second Amendment rights and it doesn't impinge on the right of reasonable, law-abiding gun owners to have guns for lawful purposes.

So why are we involved in this terrible, atrocious situation where we have rates of death and fatality and injury greater than six times higher than any other modern industrialized country on Earth?

In the U.K., it is less than 50 people a year who die by gun; in Japan, it is less than 50 or 60 people a year. We are losing tens of thousands of Americans every year.

Is it because we have mental illness and they don't? No. They have got mental illness, too. Is it because Americans are more violent than other people? I don't think so.

It is simply because of the ready access to firearms wherever you go, and anybody can get them almost anywhere. Okay? So we need to follow the rest of the world in terms of enacting reasonable gun safety legislation.

Now, we have got our Second Amendment, so nobody's handguns are going to get taken away. The Supreme Court said it in the *Heller* decision and reaffirmed that 2 years later, that it applies not just in the District of Columbia directly against Congress, but it applies in the States, in a case that came out of Chicago.

So we know that nobody's handguns are going to be taken away and nobody's rifles are going to be taken away.

All we are talking about is keeping our children and our grandchildren safe; keeping people safe at concerts, like in Las Vegas; keeping people safe in church, like in South Carolina; keeping people safe in their public schools, like in Parkland, Florida; keeping college students safe, like at Virginia Tech. That is what we are talking about doing.

Now, we don't know why Congress won't act. Some people are starting to hypothesize that America has become a failed state, that we can't respond to an almost unanimous demand by our own people to legislate in the interests of public safety, which is the most elementary requirement of a civilized society under a social contract.

Some people say we have become a failed state, like failed states we see around the world. You know that authoritarianism is on the march all over the world, whether it is in Putin's Russia or Duterte's Philippines or Orban's Hungary or Erdogan's Turkey, where it is all about enriching the people in power—ignoring the needs of the people, ignoring the rights of the people, but instead, using government as a money-making operation for a tiny group of people.

Have we become a failed state? Is that what we are? I don't think we are a failed state.

We have had other periods in American history where Congress has refused to deal with pressing public policy problems. One of the most famous ones, beginning in the 1830s, was when a proslavery faction within Congress said it would refuse to have any hearings at all and would refuse to entertain any petitions against slavery from anywhere in the country. It was a direct assault on the right to petition Congress for redress of grievances, it was a direct assault on the freedom of speech, but they imposed this stranglehold on Congress so there could be no debate on the most pressing issue of the day.

Now, I am not likening slavery to gun violence. Okay? I want to be clear about that. But I am saying that there are other times in American history where Congress has acted as a chokehold against the ventilation of serious public concerns and grievances. There have been times when Congress has refused to engage in debate, discussion, and analysis of the most pressing problems of the day, and that is where we are right now on gun violence.

All we are saying, Mr. Speaker, to the majority in Congress, is let's have some hearings on this, let's have some hearings on a universal criminal and mental background check being demanded by nearly every American right now. Let's start with that. Is that one thing we can all agree on, that there should be a background check before people go out and obtain weapons of war that they then carry into the hallways and the schoolrooms of our country? Can we have a hearing on that?

If you don't want to vote for it, you can stand up with the 1 or 2 percent of the people who are against it, but allow those of us who want to represent the 97 or 98 percent of the people who are for it to have a vote, because we don't think that terrorists and criminals should be able to go to a gun show and purchase firearms, including AR-15s, without a criminal background check. We don't think that.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have got a consensus in America on this. Let's not stifle the consensus. Let's not choke off the ability of the American people and their representatives to govern. That is why we were sent here, to legislate.

The essence of legislation is hearings. We have to hear the American people, we have to hear the experts, we have to collect the evidence. We have got to overturn the ban on the collection of statistics about gun violence that was imposed a few decades ago on the CDC. We have got to collect the information, and we have to act.

The time for just prayers and meditation about the problem is long gone, as the young people from Parkland, Florida, have told us.

They were told in the wake of the massacre: It is too early to start debating gun policy.

They turned around, and they said: No. It is too late to be debating gun policy. This should have been done after Las Vegas. It should have been done after San Bernardino County. It should have been done after the Sandy Hook massacre. It should have been done after Virginia Tech.

How many more massacres do we have to await before this Congress decides something really must be done? How many more massacres? That is what America is asking us, Mr. Speaker.

Please, let's do our job. We have sworn an oath to the American people.

Let's go and represent the public will, let's make it consistent with the Second Amendment, because it is very easy to do so. We proved it in the State of Maryland, and the Supreme Court has told us we can pass reasonable commonsense gun safety measures without violating anyone's rights.

We have got a consensus in America. In Congress, we have got to do our job and let that consensus become the law.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to act without delay and pass legislation to prevent gun violence and mass casualties from shootings.

The community of Parkland, Florida—along with the rest of the country—is still reeling from the horrific tragedy that took place at the Marjorie Stoneman Douglass High School on Valentine's Day, February 14, 2018.

Our hearts still ache with sadness and disbelief for the families and loved ones of the 17 students—sons and daughters, brothers and sisters—who lost their lives in this senseless, horrific act of domestic terrorism.

It is safe to say that America is sick and tired of being sick and tired of gun violence.

That is why we must act now to stop gun violence, protect citizens, and save lives.

Here are the top 6 actions the President and the Congress can and must take now to protect our communities:

Require universal background checks to keep guns out of dangerous hands;

Extend the waiting period to purchase or transfer dangerous—weapons like the AR-15 pending completion of a background checks to 7 days;

Raise the minimum age to purchase or transfer dangerous weapons like the AR-15, high-capacity magazines, ammunitions, and silencers from 18 to 21 years of age;

Ban military-style assault weapons;

Limit high-capacity magazines; and

Increase access to mental health services.

We can take action without infringing on the 2nd Amendment rights of Americans.

We need to make it harder for criminals to obtain guns by strengthening the background check system.

We need to ensure that mental health professionals know their options for reporting threats of violence—even as we acknowledge that someone with a mental illness is far more likely to be the victim of a violent crime than the perpetrator.

We must also make safe gun storage a priority.

As the founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, a senior Member of the Judiciary Committee, and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I have listened far too often to the testimony of individuals who have survived tragedies or lost loved ones as a result of gun violence.

In the words of President Obama after the 2013 Sandy Hook Elementary shooting, "We're going to have to come together and take meaningful action to prevent more tragedies like this, regardless of the politics."

While it is certainly true that violent crime and homicide rates in this country have been

declining in recent years, they are still far above those in other industrialized nations.

There exists a culture of violence in America; a subculture that with today's technologically advanced weaponry is far more dangerous to public safety than ever before.

At no point in our nation's history has a single human been more capable of inflicting massive death and our society is producing more individuals who seek to employ such means to carry out their ill intentions.

Far too often, the tool of choice for would-be killers are military-style assault weapons with high-capacity magazines.

Every day, on average, 92 Americans are victims of gun violence, resulting in more than 33,000 deaths annually.

In raising this issue, we recognize and respect other cultures that exist in America; law-abiding citizens who are responsible in their ownership of firearms.

Many of these citizens are responsible with respect to the lethal capacity of their firearms, opting not to obtain assault weapons or to equip assault weapons with 30, 50, 75, or 100-round magazines.

Here is what I think the Congress can and must do to reduce gun violence without abridging the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Americans.

Extend the waiting period to purchase or transfer dangerous weapons like the AR-15 pending completion of a background checks to 7 days.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 4268, the "Gun Safety, Not Sorry Act."

Raise the minimum age to purchase or transfer dangerous weapons like the AR-15, high-capacity magazines, ammunitions, and silencers from 18 to 21 years of age.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 5088, the "No Mass Atrocities With Guns Act" ('No MAGA Act').

Reinstate and strengthen the federal ban on assault weapons.

I am an original co-sponsor of H.R. 3947, legislation that will reinstates the assault weapons ban that has been introduced by my colleague, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Reinstate a federal ban on bump stocks and high-capacity magazines holding more than ten rounds and allowing a shooter to inflict mass damage in a short period of time without reloading will save lives.

I will soon be introducing the "Stop Abuse, Violence, and Ending Lives Act of 2018," legislation to ban the sale and possession of bump stocks.

Require a background check for every gun sale, while respecting reasonable exceptions for cases such as gifts between family members and temporary loans for sporting purposes.

I am an original co-sponsor of H.R. 4240, the "Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2017," legislation that requires universal background checks and closes the gun show loophole that has been introduced by my colleague, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON of California.

It is estimated that four out of ten gun buyers do not go through a background check when purchasing a firearm because federal law only requires these checks when someone buys a gun from a federally licensed dealer.

That would be like allowing four out of ten people to choose if they would like to go through airport security.

This loophole allows felons, domestic abusers, and those prohibited because of mental illness to easily bypass the criminal background check system and buy firearms at gun shows, through private sellers, over the internet or out of the trunks of cars.

Strengthen the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) database to ensure it is up to date by requiring federal and state agencies to transfer important records to the database expeditiously since without the information, the reliability of a background check is questionable.

Pass legislation aimed specifically at cracking down on illegal gun trafficking and straw-purchasing which often puts guns in the hands of people who are prohibited from having them.

Straw-purchasing is when a prohibited buyer has someone with no criminal history walk into a gun store, pass a background check and purchase a gun with the purpose of giving it to the prohibited buyer.

Restore funding for public safety and law enforcement initiatives aimed at reducing gun violence.

Congress should fund law enforcement's efforts to reduce gun violence, while supporting federal research into causes of gun violence.

There is no reason the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) or the National Institute of Health (NIH) should be prohibited from researching the causes of gun violence.

That is why I have co-sponsored H.R. 1832, legislation that authorizes the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

I have also co-sponsored H.R. 1478, the Gun Violence Research Act, which repeals the provision that in practice prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from sponsoring research on gun violence.

And there is no reason for the restrictions federal law places on our law enforcement officers' ability to track and combat the spread of illegal guns.

Close the holes in our mental-health system and make sure that care is available for those who need it.

Congress must improve prevention, early intervention, and treatment of mental illness while working to eliminate the stigma associated with mental illness.

Access to mental health services should be improved, the shortage of mental health professionals should be addressed, and funding should be made available for those programs that have proven to be effective.

That is why I have co-sponsored H.R. 1982, the "Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act," legislation that authorizes the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Social Security Administration to: (1) increase access to mental health care treatment and services, and (2) promote reporting of mental health information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Help local communities get unwanted and illegal guns out of the hands of those who should not have them.

Congress should help support and develop local programs that get unwanted guns off our streets, such as gun buy-back programs that proved so effective in Australia.

Finally, we must address our culture's glorification of violence seen and heard through our movie screens, television shows, music and video games.

Congress should fund scientific research on the relationship between popular culture and gun violence, while ensuring that parents have access to the information they need to make informed decisions about what their families watch, listen to, and play.

Here is what I think neither the President, the Congress, nor state and local governments should not do to reduce gun violence.

We Should Not Arm Teachers because they are not trained to handle weapons; this is not what they signed up for.

We Must Not Surrender to NRA even though the gun lobby has long enjoyed tremendous influence over congressional Republicans and some Democrats.

Persons who live in fear of gun violence and mass shootings at schools, theaters, places of worship and work, and public spaces are not afraid of the NRA.

What they are afraid of is an AR-15 in the hands of a mentally unstable person. Americans are a can-do people; we do not bemoan our problems and accept terrible outcomes.

We act to solve them.

We have made our cars and trucks and roads safer and reduced traffic fatalities.

We have virtually eradicated polio, small pox, and other debilitating and life-threatening diseases.

We respond immediately to natural disasters caused by hurricanes, earthquakes, tornados, floods, and man-made disasters caused by acts of terrorism.

When it comes to reducing or preventing gun violence, we must summon that same spirit of American resolve and know-how and get the job done.

We can do it; after all, we are Americans.

WE MUST PROTECT THE SOVEREIGNTY OF OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address the House and people across the country.

I am joined today by two of my friends, JARED HUFFMAN, Congressman from northern California; and DAN KILDEE, Congressman from Flint, Michigan.

We are here on another very important topic. We just heard our friend, JAMIE RASKIN from Maryland, talking about gun violence and the need to try to limit that and bring it under control, but today we have another very important topic, a very troubling topic, and it has to do with the sovereignty of our Nation.

□ 1730

It has to do with our freedom, and it is really as pretty simple as that.

This country separated from England so that we could be a sovereign nation, so that we could rule ourselves, and right now that is a real big question as to whether or not that is happening, because it is clear that the Russians interfered with our elections last year.

The investigation into that interference now has resulted in at least 13 indictments of Russians, coupled with indictments of 5 or 6 people, 5 of whom have pled guilty to some crime or another based upon the investigation conducted by Robert Mueller. There seems to be something going on between the Trump administration and Russia, and we want to know what it is. The investigation is directed at that.

Mr. Speaker, it starts with something that we asked for last year. We asked to see the President's tax returns. We asked for it on a number of occasions. But unlike anybody else who has run for President or who has been President, our President has refused to turn over his tax returns.

So the question we ask is: Why? What is in there that would stop him from producing his tax returns? Is it a relationship that shows some kind of financial connection to Russia or the like? What is in there? Is he hiding something? What is it?

As time has gone on, starting with that question, we have some more questions. There has been this effort, beginning last summer, to question the integrity of the FBI and to question Mr. Mueller and this investigation to the point there was word that Mr. Mueller was going to be fired from his job last summer, and that question seems to percolate to the surface every so often.

And the question is: Why? What are they afraid of that he might find? What connections are they worried about that Mr. Mueller may uncover that really are hurting our Nation? So what is it that they are hiding? What are they afraid of?

These are very simple questions that need to be answered. This is important because this goes back to the heart of why our Nation was founded and the heart of all of us as Americans. It is our sovereignty, and it is our freedom. And if, in fact, we are being directed, our government is being directed by a foreign entity, by Vladimir Putin or Russia, generally, then this country has been undermined to a degree none of us could have ever seen coming.

Now, hopefully, that is not the case, but let's get this investigation going. Let's keep it going. Let's not impugn the integrity of our detectives, the FBI, or the prosecutors who are trying to just find out what the truth is. And any kinds of actions to really undermine that, whether it is from here in the Congress or from the executive

branch, it is like: What are you afraid of? What are you hiding?

So just to kind of connect a couple more dots, something that I am concerned about, and I know my friends are, too, is you go back to our sovereignty, our freedom—and this Congress, Mr. Speaker—particularly concerned about the interference by the Russians in our elections. There is not any question that there has been some interference.

We know that the Russians are flexing their muscle around the world. In fact, Putin, the other day, said: I have got nuclear weapons you can't detect.

So they are flexing their muscles.

We as a Congress—419-3 in this House, and 98-2 in the Senate, virtually unanimously—said: We want you to be imposing sanctions against this Russian interference, against some things that they have been doing around the world.

Not one sanction has been added by the Trump administration. Why not?

Even more perplexing, the State Department has been appropriated, Mr. Speaker, \$120 million to prevent further espionage and interference by the Russians in our elections. Do you know how much money has been spent by them, by the State Department under this White House, to stop this interference, to stop this espionage? Not one dollar.

These departments generally say we need more money to do X, Y, or Z. Here, something so important as to the integrity of our elections, not \$1 spent by the State Department, despite the fact that this Congress appropriated \$120 million. Why not?

So a lot of questions are out there. I think it is time, and I think my friends will make some comments and statements similar to mine: What are you afraid of? What are you hiding? Let the detectives in the FBI, let the prosecutors do their job.

Why aren't sanctions being imposed? And why aren't we using the money we have appropriated to spend against this espionage and interference? Why aren't you spending it?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) to see if he has any answers or if he only has questions about what is going on.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado because I have all of the same questions and all of the same concerns, and so it is very appropriate that we are coming together to ask what are they afraid of, what are they hiding, because there are a lot of red flags.

Last night, Mr. PERLMUTTER, I was at the Washington Press Club event, which is a fun event to celebrate the free press. The best joke of the night—and there is a lot of humorous material. The best joke of the night was when someone said, for a guy that

claims he doesn't drink, President Trump sure loves a lot of White Russians. That brought the house down.

Unfortunately, though, it is not really funny because, when you have got a President who won't impose the sanctions that we authorize him to impose, who won't direct his State Department to spend the funds to protect our election system that we authorize and appropriate, when you have all of these other problems, it is not clear that he is able to do his job without fear or favor, and that is a big problem for our democracy and for the interests of our country.

If Congress were doing its job right now, we would be asking the hard questions to bring forward the transparency that the people need, to give this country the assurance that their government officials, including their President, can perform their job without fear or favor. But, unfortunately, this body is not doing a very good job of asking those hard questions, so that is, in part, why we are here trying to raise some of these issues.

One of the very important questions that I think we have to ask involves the ties between the NRA, yes, the National Rifle Association, and this Trump Russia scandal. Specifically, we need to know whether Russia worked through the NRA to illegally move funds in support of the Trump campaign.

Here is what we do know. We know that McClatchy and others have reported that the FBI is actually investigating whether Aleksandr Torshin, deputy governor of Russia's central bank and NRA's main liaison in Russia, used the NRA to funnel millions of dollars to support Donald Trump's candidacy in 2016.

We know that in 2016 Donald Trump, Jr., had dinner with Torshin, who is a close ally of Vladimir Putin—also someone accused of money laundering—and they had that dinner at the NRA convention.

We know that the NRA spent tens of millions of dollars on the 2016 elections, including \$30 million to support Donald Trump. That is three times what the NRA spent to support Mitt Romney when he was the Republican nominee just 4 years prior.

So we need to think about and ask this question: Where did all that money come from? We have asked the NRA. The NRA won't tell us.

Now, we know that in testimony to the House Intelligence Committee, there are indications that Russians made a very concerted effort to work through the NRA, and that is why Senator RON WYDEN has asked the Treasury Department—again, because the NRA won't answer these questions, but he has asked the Treasury Department for more information about suspicious Russian funding of the NRA.

So just to recap a few of these things that we need to be asking about: We

know how close President Trump is to the NRA. We know how close the Russian banker Alex Torshin is to the NRA. We know how close the NRA is becoming, closer and closer, to Russia.

In fact, I have a piece here that explains how, in 2015, a series of top NRA officials—including one of their top donors, past presidents, a delegation that included Donald Trump's high-profile surrogate, Sheriff David Clarke—all went on a so-called fact-finding mission involving gun rights in Russia.

Now, there aren't a lot of gun rights in Russia. Russia has very restrictive gun laws, and there is no serious effort in the country of Russia to change that. But, nevertheless, apparently this group felt they needed to go to Russia for this fact-finding trip to cozy up with some of these same folks that we are talking about. So that is one of the things we know and we need to ask questions about.

We know that the NRA spent this huge cache of money on the 2016 campaign to support Donald Trump, and we know that we have more questions that need to be answered. So we need to follow this money, and we need to find out, again, as you have asked here on the floor: What are they hiding? What are they afraid of?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and he will make some comments about how he perceives all of this, and then I am going to open it up to a little conversation among the three of us.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, like my friend Mr. PERLMUTTER and my friend Mr. HUFFMAN and others, we didn't come to the Congress with the idea that we were going to spend our time talking about Russian collusion with a campaign to try to undermine our electoral system. We came here to solve problems that Americans want us to take on, to deal with the big problems that we face, whether it is infrastructure or education or the environment or all the things that people actually worry about, financial security for families.

But we do have an obligation to uphold the oath that we took. We swore an oath to the Constitution of the United States. So while it is not my preference, and I know from my friends it is not our preference to have to deal with this question, we can't avoid it. We can't just look the other way, particularly when it is very clear that not just this President, but, sadly, some around him; and I think we have to acknowledge some of our Republican colleagues seem willing to try to interfere with or obfuscate what is a really important investigation.

Let's remind ourselves, Mr. Mueller, who is leading this investigation, the special counsel, was appointed by the Republican Attorney General, appointed by the President of the United

States, both Republicans. Bob Mueller was appointed head of the FBI by a Republican President.

This is not a partisan question, certainly not a partisan witch hunt. This is a question as to whether or not we are going to let this investigation go to completion.

The President keeps saying no collusion. The truth of the matter is, so far, there has been no conclusion. There is no conclusion to be drawn yet from this investigation, other than 17 individuals have been indicted. Several have pled guilty to very serious crimes, some people who have been very close to the President of the United States, the closest you can be, literally engaged in his campaign, side by side with him every day.

So it begs the question and, really, the most important question: What are they afraid of? What do they have to worry about?

If there is nothing to find, if there is no collusion, then let's let the process complete itself. Let's let the process come to conclusion and accept the result.

So this is really a fundamental question to our democracy: Are we going to adhere to the rule of law, or are we going to allow a President to rule by fiat and, essentially, dismiss or diminish or discredit anyone who raises any question about his conduct coming into or performing his duties?

□ 1745

That is not the America that we know, and that is not a standard that we ought to allow: 17 people indicted, people at the top of his campaign, including a whole group of Russians who clearly were engaged in trying to affect our election.

You know, don't you remember the good ol' days? I think about some of our friends on the other side, when the biggest scandal that they could come up with was that the President of the United States wore a tan suit. The outrage. Where is the outrage now when a special counsel has been appointed and, at every moment, there is an attempt to try to discredit the work that this individual is doing?

So I ask my Republican colleagues to stand up, adhere to the oath that they swore, support this process, allow for your own good and the good of the country, allow the investigation to be completed without interference. Push back when the President tries to discredit this process. There is just too much at stake. What are they afraid of? What are they worried about?

This guy is a professional. When he was appointed, remember the chorus of praise left, right, and center for Bob Mueller and the integrity with which he has conducted himself in public life. He didn't change. He is still doing that. Let's let him do his work.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan for his

comments. And he was talking about the 17 indictments. We have a poster here. Starting over on the far side of this poster to my right is Paul Manafort, the campaign chairman. Then we have 13 Russians who have been indicted, plus three Russian companies that interfered with our elections, and we will see how these indictments and the cases unfold, but Bob Mueller and the team have said those people should be indicted.

This side, we have guilty pleas by Michael Flynn, National Security Advisor; Rick Gates, assistant campaign manager; George Papadopoulos, campaign adviser; Richard Pinedo, apparently he did some kind of—stole identity from somebody; and a lawyer, Alex van der Zwaan, from—he is a foreign lawyer who worked for a firm here in the United States. We have five guilty pleas. We have 14, 15, 16 indictments. There is a lot of smoke. Where there is smoke, there is fire.

Mr. KILDEE talked about sort of the bread-and-butter issues: Do I have a good job? Am I ready as the economy changes and innovation kicks in; am I going to be ready for the next job? You know, do we have the proper infrastructure for this country so that for the next 50 years we can compete with anybody at any time?

I mean, those are the conversations we really want to have. But when you get down to it, at the very heart of why we are America, why we are the United States of America, it is about our freedom. It is about the sovereignty of this Nation to conduct its own affairs without interference by another entity: Russia, England, Japan, North Korea, it doesn't matter. We want to take care of ourselves and not be told what to do by others.

That interference from outside of this country, despite these big questions we have as to our infrastructure, our future of our workplace, our education, when it comes to freedom, you don't step away. You don't ignore attacks on our freedom.

And we are not going to let that happen. I am just very pleased that these two men joining me today, and Democrats, really, throughout this Chamber, and I know some Republicans, are very concerned about what is unfolding. And all of us are asking: What is the problem here? What are you hiding? What are you afraid of? Why won't you let the detectives do their work?

Sam Nunberg, he was going to—last night, he was on all the TV stations: I am not going to honor that subpoena. What is he afraid of?

We have been joined by our friend JAMIE RASKIN, but, first, let me give him a second to catch his breath.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from northern California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for a comment or two, and then I will yield to Mr. RASKIN.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman PERLMUTTER is asking all the

right questions, and it seems to me, in the short time we have been on the floor here, in some ways, we are asking harder questions than what we are seeing from the committees that should be conducting oversight and investigations if Congress were functioning and taking this issue as seriously as it should.

Those questions would include very disturbing reporting, just in the last few days in *The New Yorker*, that suggests that the Steele dossier may just be the tip of the iceberg; that, in fact, you have senior Russian officials who claim that they had something of a veto power over our choice for Secretary of State.

We should be looking into that right now in a very intense way, and the American people should know that we take those matters very seriously. But so much of this simply flies by these days with the constantly moving media cycle, and I think more and more people are beginning to wonder if Congress is interested in even asking hard questions or if we just have to sit back and either wait for Special Counsel Mueller to catch these folks in crimes or wait for the media. Thank God for the free press, but the media is unearthing far more information than the oversight actions of this Congress, and that is disappointing.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, you know, we have got to say to the Speaker and to the other Republicans in this Chamber, you know, they need to do their job on this thing. This isn't just something that is peanuts. This goes to the heart of what America is all about: our freedom and our sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PERLMUTTER very much for yielding for just a moment. I was very moved by his comments. We know that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and I want to salute him for his vigilance and his zealotry in defending American freedom and our democratic process against foreign and potentially domestic enemies, those who would subvert and undermine our political processes.

It seems to me that, in Congress, we have two jobs that we need to do now. One is to defend the Mueller investigation and the Department of Justice against unfair attacks and attempts to subvert and undermine investigation; and two, and perhaps more importantly now, is we have got to work to fortify our election systems against a repeat in 2018.

The U.S. intelligence agencies, they told us, in January of 2017, that there had been a campaign of cyber espionage and cyber sabotage and cyber propaganda against the American elections. They have told us that the Russians are very likely to be doing the

same thing with respect to the 2018 election. And, by the way, it is not just the Russians now. They may have just set the template for other bad actors who want to stick their nose into American elections, too.

You know, James Q. Wilson wrote this book called, "Broken Windows," where he said if somebody throws a rock into a window and you have got a broken window and nobody does anything about it, it is an invitation for more people to come along and break some more windows. Well, right now, the U.S. Government has done nothing.

As you have said, we have not spent the money in the State Department to try to defend ourselves against the foreign subversion of our elections and cyber espionage and sabotage. And when we had the Attorney General come to the Judiciary Committee, we asked him what had he engaged in to try to defend our elections across the country against another attack, and he said basically nothing. And followup efforts by members of the committee to get the Attorney General to meet with us have resulted in nothing.

So, this week, we have asked for \$14 million from the appropriators to go to the Election Assistance Commission, which is the only Federal body we have got that is charged with trying to help State election administrators defend themselves against cyber attack. That \$14 million is urgent and necessary, and it is obviously a very small sum of money, given the amount of money we spend on defense in America, but this is defense of our elections.

We are also asking for \$400 million to help update outmoded and weak election technology in the States today. That is another badly needed infusion of cash to the States so we can fortify our elections. We know that at least 22 States suffered attempted electronic probes by foreign actors in 2016, and they are coming back in 2018, and everybody wants to know what are we doing about it, and we have no coordinated plan. At the very least, we should get this money to the Election Assistance Commission so we can help the States harden themselves.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for participating with us. We are going to be doing this because we want people asking this question all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my friend from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to let him close us out.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PERLMUTTER for yielding, and I want to just underscore a point he made in his opening remarks.

This is fundamentally about a principle that we hold pretty dear in this country, and, that is, our freedom. Our freedom is rooted in the assumption that our democratic systems actually work, that the process of democracy

has integrity, and that the choices that people make are not the subject of interference by some foreign power.

We know that Russia interfered in our elections. There are only two people I can think of who have denied that repeatedly. One of them is President Trump; the other one is Vladimir Putin. Everyone else, including our Republican colleagues and our intelligence community, acknowledges that the Russians interfered with our elections.

Five people have acknowledged that they committed crimes as a result of the investigations taking place; 12 other—15 others indicted. Why on Earth would we not allow the investigation that is taking place right now to determine the extent of that interference in order to prevent it from ever happening again? Why would we not insist that we protect that principle of democracy and that foundational principle of freedom by letting this process complete? What are they afraid of? That is the question: What are they afraid of?

That is why I am glad Mr. PERLMUTTER initiated this effort, and I will continue to stand with him as he does it.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, I thank Mr. HUFFMAN, and I thank Mr. RASKIN for their comments.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 35. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources; in addition, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 6, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3656. To amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a consistent eligibility date for provision of Department of Veterans Affairs memorial headstones and markers for eligible spouses and dependent children of veterans whose remains are unavailable.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4183. A letter from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Annual Stress Test — Technical and Conforming Changes [Docket ID: OCC-2017-0021] (RIN: 1557-AE28) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4184. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination and certification that the top five exporting and importing countries of ephedrine and pseudoephedrine have cooperated fully with the United States or have taken adequate steps on their own to achieve full compliance with the goals established by the 1988 United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2291j(b)(1)(A); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 490(b)(1)(A) (as added by Public Law 102-583, Sec. 5(a)); (106 Stat. 4924); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4185. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5190. A bill to provide a temporary safe harbor for the publishers of online content to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which their content may be distributed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 5191. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish Alzheimer's Disease research, education, and clinical centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 5192. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Social Security to provide confirmation of fraud protection data to certain permitted entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 5193. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 5194. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 5195. A bill to improve diversity and inclusion in the workforce of national security agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), the Judiciary, Homeland Security, Agriculture, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 5196. A bill to require the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere to carry out a program on coordinating the assessment and acquisition by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of unmanned maritime systems, to make available to the public data collected by the Administration using such systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 5197. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a demonstration program to test alternative pain management protocols to limit the use of opioids in emergency departments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 5198. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to improve metropolitan planning; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MESSE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BUCK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. ESTES of Kansas):

H.R. 5199. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow parents of eligible military dependent children to establish Military Education Savings Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Work-

force, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 5200. A bill to provide additional funding for the public housing Capital Fund for large public housing agencies, for mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance, and for incremental rental assistance vouchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 5201. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish, develop, improve, operate, and maintain the Claude Moore Colonial Farm at Turkey Run in Fairfax County, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 5202. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the delivery of a controlled substance by a pharmacy to an administering practitioner; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 5203. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to require producers to elect to receive price loss coverage or agriculture risk coverage under that Act or Federal crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESTES of Kansas:

H.R. 5204. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to penalize false communications to cause an emergency response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIHUEN (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 5205. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 6th Street in Hawthorne, Nevada, as the "Sergeant Kenneth Eric Bostic Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. BACON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 5206. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office of Biometric Identity Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 5207. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the immigration advisory program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 5208. A bill to amend the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act and the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to further plant cultivar research, development, and commercialization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5209. A bill to conduct a special resource study of Fort Pillow Historic State

Park in Henning, Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 5210. A bill to establish the National Park Restoration Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 5211. A bill to change the calendar period of the Federal fiscal year; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H. Res. 766. A resolution recognizing the contributions of American Viticultural Areas and winegrowing regions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H. Res. 767. A resolution directing the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives to enter into contracts with nationally- or regionally-known franchises for the provision of food services in the cafeteria of the Longworth House Office Building in a food court setting; to the Committee on House Administration.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to regulate commerce among the several states. The purpose of the bill is to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 5195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 5196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 5198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 7 grants Congress the power to establish Post Offices and post Roads.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 5200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 5201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 5203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV,

Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. ESTES of Kansas:

H.R. 5204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Subsections 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KIHUEN:

H.R. 5205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish post offices and post roads

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 5206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the

Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 5207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare of the United, States . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 5210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 5211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 51: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 159: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 173: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 237: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 389: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 411: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 504: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 644: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 667: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 721: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 754: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 757: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 788: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 809: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 842: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 911: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 930: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 947: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 959: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 964: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1057: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 1111: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1221: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1239: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1267: Mr. EVANS and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1357: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1378: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1406: Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 1424: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1437: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1456: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1478: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1480: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1496: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1519: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1563: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1661: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1802: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1828: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2050: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2232: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2259: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2267: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2293: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2315: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2566: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2567: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2598: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2599: Mr. REED.

H.R. 2881: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2899: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2925: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2942: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2987: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3010: Ms. STEFANK.

H.R. 3030: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 3174: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3207: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 3274: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 3314: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3349: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3600: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. YOHO.

- H.R. 3605: Mr. KEATING, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 3613: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3635: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3641: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3642: Mr. BUCK, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3714: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3738: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3988: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 4022: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HECK, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 4057: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4114: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4115: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 4207: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4229: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 4238: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 4240: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4241: Mr. MESSER and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4253: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4256: Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4267: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4287: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 4311: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 4426: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4525: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 4536: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. FASO.
H.R. 4655: Mr. BOST and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 4657: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4673: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4706: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 4733: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 4747: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4751: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4775: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 4809: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4811: Mr. COHEN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 4815: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4819: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4846: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4854: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 4857: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 4884: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 4909: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BOST, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4915: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 4916: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4929: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 4932: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4940: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4949: Mr. MACARTHUR and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4957: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 4963: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4973: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 5058: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5061: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 5062: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5075: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 5085: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 5090: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5102: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 5112: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 5114: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 5126: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 5127: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 5133: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 5135: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 5136: Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 5171: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 5182: Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 89: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 356: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. GRIMALVA.
H. Res. 401: Mr. YARMUTH.
-
- PETITIONS, ETC.
- Under clause 3 of rule XII,
83. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Representative Arthur J. O'Neill, House of Representatives, Connecticut, relative to urging the Congress to consider adopting legislation based on section 29-38c Connecticut General Statutes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Wednesday, March 7, 2018

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, help our lawmakers to honor Your Name. Demonstrate Your great power by filling them with Your Spirit and giving them a desire to cultivate spiritual discernment. Lord, sustain them through the power of Your prevailing providence until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream. As our Senators draw near to You, experiencing Your Divine guidance, may they be motivated to follow Your precepts as they face difficult challenges.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2155, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, community banks, credit unions, and other small-scale lenders play a vital role in the U.S. economy.

Research from Harvard indicates that community banks provide more than half of all small business loans. Let me repeat that. A majority of small business loans is handled by community banks. This is even more pronounced in rural areas and farming communities, like those I represent in Kentucky. A whopping 77 percent of agricultural loans come from community banks—77 percent.

In this era of online banking and multinational corporations, smaller institutions remain uniquely able to build community connections. Community bankers get to know their residents and business owners on a personal level. That perspective lets them extend credit to small-scale entrepreneurs, farmers, ranchers, and other Americans who might not have access otherwise. So when small lenders close their doors, the effects on communities are very real.

In 2014, an economist at MIT found that, on average, the closing of a single bank cut the number of new small business loans in the immediate area by more than 10 percent for several years. The problem was extremely pronounced in low-income areas, where a local perspective and personal relationships matter even more. In low-income America, a physical bank closure cuts lending to local small businesses by nearly 40 percent.

Long story short, the more vulnerable a community, the more they need local lenders, but since the Federal Government implemented massive new regulations under the 2010 Dodd-Frank Act, our community banks and credit unions have been getting squeezed. Dodd-Frank's imprecise, inefficient, one-size-fits-all framework dropped

these small institutions into the regulatory maze that was intended for Wall Street. For 8 years, they have faced a staggering compliance burden that now consumes, on average, 24 percent of their net income. This has forced many to pare down their offerings or close their doors for good. That leaves out to dry would-be entrepreneurs, job creators, and existing small businesses that want to expand.

Fortunately, we have an opportunity this week to begin putting things right. Today, the Senate continues considering a sensible solution that would streamline regulations and give smaller lenders a fighting chance. Senator CRAPO's Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act is the product of thorough committee work. It is an important step toward unwinding the harm caused by the Obama administration's knee-jerk reaction to the 2008 financial crisis.

Importantly, this bill has strong bipartisan support. On both sides of the aisle, Members with a diversity of views on Dodd-Frank itself have recognized that this set of commonsense fixes deserves all of our support. I encourage all Senators to join them.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on another matter, just 2 months in, the effects of tax reform are percolating through every corner of our economy. It has made bonuses, raises, and benefits for working families daily news in communities all across our country.

Thanks to tax reform, automakers are planting deeper roots in America. Innovators like Apple are bringing billions back to invest here at home. Retailers, from corner stores to national chains, are rewarding their hard-working teams. There is another sector in which the benefits of tax reform are flowing freely—America's growing craft beverage industry. That is because the new 21st-century Tax Code included a provision known as the Craft Beverage Modernization and Tax Reform Act, spearheaded by Senator PORTMAN and Senator BLUNT. Among other achievements, that piece of tax reform significantly cut the excise taxes the Federal Government imposes on beer, wine, and spirits.

This was originally a bipartisan bill, with early support from my friend, the senior Senator from Oregon. It is too bad he and every other Democrat in Congress ended up voting against this historic tax reform that included that measure, because it is proving to be good news for a host of American small businesses, including the fine distilleries that contribute thousands of jobs and tourism in Kentucky.

One recent wave of headlines has detailed how tax reform is helping entrepreneurs in the craft brewing industry as well. Across the country, job creators in this popular and growing line of business are making big plans for their savings under this new 21st-century Tax Code.

Matt Matthiesen, a brewery owner in West Okoboji, IA, said: "I am very excited. . . . As a small local business, those breaks help us tremendously."

Donn Martens, who owns another brewery just down the road, said: "We hope to expand with this money. We would like to double our production."

Remember Matt and Donn when my colleagues across the aisle tell you tax reform is only helping the big guys. Together, their two businesses employ 15 people. They expect tax reform will save them about \$15,000 this year. Just try telling any small business owner that is no big deal.

Larry Horwitz owns Four String Brewing Company in Columbus, OH. He expects tax reform will save his business \$40,000 this year. "We invest where we live and work," he said. "We are the blue collar workers in the neighborhood."

In Kentucky, tax reform has a number of craft breweries excited about the year ahead. At Country Boy Brewing in Georgetown, production manager Daniel Sinkhorn says the new law is helping them plan a new canning line, which will "add jobs, add equipment . . . and keep Country Boy growing."

It has been reported that later today my friends across the aisle will unveil a \$1 trillion spending plan and propose repealing tax reform to pay for it.

Repeal all these bonuses, pay raises, new jobs, and new investments? Talk about a nonstarter.

At the same time, Vice President PENCE will be in Central Kentucky today to hear from small business owners and community leaders about how tax reform is helping them. Daniel Harrison, the cofounder of Country Boy Brewing, will be on hand to meet with the Vice President. I am glad he will be able to share how his business, like so many around the country, is tapping into tax reform savings.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

TARIFFS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, President Trump's instincts on China are correct, but his execution is poor. He should stick with those instincts and

not those who label anything we do to protect America against China's rapacious policies as protectionist. At the same time, he should fix his plan so it really does what he intends it to do or wants it to do.

I have been one of the chief critics of the status quo on trade. Americans—and I share this view—resent all those academics who any time we try to do anything with China say: protectionist, trade war.

The bottom line is simple. China is eating our lunch. China is rapacious. China, day by day, gnaws away at our economy by manipulating currency. They sometimes do it, they sometimes don't, but they will again when they can.

By having no reciprocity, they don't let good American industries in, but they want to come here—and do, easily—buying our family jewels, our intellectual property, our leading companies in robotics, artificial intelligence, chips, and pharmaceuticals.

China has a plan to take advantage of America, to surpass us economically by not being fair. They keep their huge market protected, steal our stuff, learn how to do it, then try to come sell it here and gain an advantage when they can by manipulating currency.

The President should not be deterred by all of those business interests that are only interested in their profits, not in what is good for America. That is their job, their shareholders—I get it—but he should not be deterred by them. At the same time, he has to back off this plan which doesn't do what it is supposed to do. Major harm is done to allies like Canada and Europe, not to China.

That is the tightrope we need to walk on. If the President walks on that tightrope carefully and well, we will support him.

The President's instincts to go after China are correct, but the policy he proposes doesn't fit the bill. It is not well targeted, it is not precise and, as a result, it could cause a mess of collateral damage that hurts America more than it helps.

The sweeping nature of the tariffs has already justifiably angered key allies in Canada and Europe and could draw reciprocal tariffs on American goods, raising costs on average consumers from coast-to-coast. A country such as Canada, with which we have a trade surplus, could retaliate.

Mr. President, focus on China. Go after China and do it in a smart, focused but sharp-edged way. Don't create a policy that hurts our allies more than it hurts China and causes China to sort of giggle at our ineffectiveness.

A trade war is not what we want. Making China play by the rules is what all Americans want, except for a handful of businesses that just see their interests and raising their profits no matter where the jobs go or where they sell goods.

China dumps counterfeit and artificially cheap goods into our market, denies productive U.S. companies fair access to their markets, and steals the intellectual property of American companies. I am pained, actually pained, because I love this country, and I want to see us stay economically No. 1. I am pained when I go over in my mind the statement of retired four-star GEN Keith Alexander, who is in charge of cyber security in America. He called China's theft of our intellectual property the "greatest transfer of wealth in history." American wealth is actually being stolen by China, and we sit here and shrug our shoulders or do things that are not effective.

The Trump administration should rethink its approach to sweeping tariffs while there is still time and focus attention on China. China is our No. 1 trade problem—not Canada, not Europe. President Trump could do a much better job of tailoring his trade policy to address the real problems instead of creating new ones.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. President, on infrastructure, a year ago last January, guided by what President Trump had said, wanting to work with Democrats on infrastructure, Senate Democrats unveiled our \$1 trillion infrastructure plan. It was an outline.

We sent it to the President. We said it was one of the areas where we could work with the President to get something done. Then we waited and we waited and we waited. A full year after we made our proposal, the Trump administration finally released one of its own. Frankly, President Trump's plan on infrastructure, to put it kindly, was underwhelming. It is going over like a lead balloon, and it is very simple why. After a year of bold promises about trillion-dollar infrastructure, a plan to build "gleaming new roads, bridges, highways, railways, and waterways all across our land," President Trump's infrastructure plan proposes no new net increase in infrastructure funding. He put in \$200 billion and then took it away by cutting the existing programs on infrastructure. It will not get the job done. Robbing Peter to pay Paul a pittance will not do nearly enough to rebuild our infrastructure.

Because so much of the funding is not from the Federal Government, which has traditionally funded the lion's share of infrastructure—highways, water and sewer—the money is going to have to come from two places, neither of which is a good option: localities, which are starved for cash already—they are not going to build much—or the private sector, which will, of course, quite naturally want a payback. That is how the private sector works. They are not going to put money up unless they are paid back. They are not going to lend money without being paid back. We know

what that will mean—tolls, tolls, and more tolls. Trump tolls from one end of the Nation to the other. That is not what America wants. Trump's plan is already a huge flop. Hardly anyone is paying attention to it.

We Democrats have a better deal to offer the American people. Rather than cutting existing infrastructure projects to pay for a paltry program that will not work, we want to roll back the Republican tax giveaways to big corporations and the very wealthy and invest that money instead in job-creating infrastructure. The overwhelming majority of Americans would say, they would rather see millions of jobs created than give tax breaks to the wealthiest. Our plan could create up to 15 million good-paying jobs for the middle class.

We have already seen, by the way, that those tax breaks are not creating many jobs. Instead, they are going to stock buybacks, which is a way for corporate executives to take that money, raise their own salaries and raise the salaries of shareholders, the vast majority of whom are in the top 10 percent of America.

We are proposing something new and different. We propose to put the top rate back to 39.6 percent. The wealthy are doing great in America; they didn't need a tax cut. It is the middle class that needed more of one.

We propose restoring the AMT. That AMT prevented the wealthiest of Americans from evading taxes. It is a tax expert's way of restoring the Buffet rule, which says that a rich corporate executive shouldn't pay a lower rate of taxes than his or her secretary.

We restore the estate tax. After all, that benefits 5,000 wealthy families. We also close the carried interest loophole.

We raise the corporate tax rate to 25 percent, which is what the Business Roundtable called for. But our Republican friends and President Trump were in a mania to just cut, cut, cut corporate taxes—even at a time that corporations are doing well—and moved it to 21 percent. We go back up to the 25 percent that the Business Roundtable suggested.

With all that money, what do we invest it in? A modern infrastructure plan that would build everything from roads and bridges to schools and airports, to high-speed internet and more, with a focus, by the way, on rural internet because one-third of rural America doesn't have it.

In addition to the traditional types of projects we have long built in this country, we are building 21st century infrastructure—as I mentioned, rural internet, high speed. In the thirties, Franklin Roosevelt said that every home in America should have electricity. It was aimed at rural homes that didn't have it. Today, we Democrats believe that every home should have high-speed internet, and that, too, is aimed at rural America—where close

to one-third of the homes don't have high-speed internet—and at our inner cities as well.

Only with real, direct investment of Federal dollars will we build the kinds of transformational projects that need to be built. Only with real investment will rural America see the projects it needs built. Only with real investment will we create millions of good-paying jobs.

You say: Where is the money going to come from? We don't want to increase our deficit. The tax bill has done that enough.

We say: Take some of those tax breaks from the wealthiest of Americans and put them into middle-class jobs, plain and simple.

Americans are realizing now where that money is going. The tax bill, before it came out, was unpopular. It had an initial splurge of popularity, and now, as Americans learn what it is actually doing, it is becoming less popular again. It will go back to where it was, I believe. More Americans will dislike it than like it, but when they hear we can take some of that money and put it into infrastructure and create millions of middle-class jobs, I think Americans of all stripes will embrace that policy.

We Democrats want to work with the President and our Republican colleagues on infrastructure, but we want to do it in a way that produces real results, not the chimerical proposal the President made that will produce very little infrastructure, almost no jobs, and put Trump tolls all across America. We hope the President will move away from his plan and come much further in our direction so that we can get something done for the American people, particularly the American working and middle classes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, listening to my friend from New York—and he is my friend—we have worked together on a number of projects, even though we have diametrically opposed views on many policy prescriptions. To listen to him talk, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was a bad thing because it took money from the Federal Government and let the people who have earned it keep it and spend it the way they see fit.

I know they made a bad bet. They bet that it would fail. They bet that we would not get the votes to pass the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, but we did, and the American people and American families are the beneficiaries of that.

I have come to this floor time and again, telling those stories, most recently about a plumbing company in Cleburne, TX, that has seen the benefits in terms of bonuses and increased pay, more take-home pay, along with the lowest claims for jobless benefits

since 1969—the lowest claims for jobless benefits since 1969. But when we come to the floor, our Democratic colleagues, who bet against the American economy and this resurgence, the reawakening of this great economic engine known as the American economy—they bet against it. They are still sticking with the same old story, regardless of the facts.

I know the American people know better. They have noticed in their paychecks starting in February—because the tax tables were rewritten by the IRS—that they actually have more take-home pay. I have family members who are ecstatic about that. One of my daughters called and just couldn't be more excited, and I know that is happening to families all across the country.

I guess it is just one reason we have two political parties—Democrats and Republicans—because while we may agree in some sense on the outcome, we certainly don't agree on the means to achieve that outcome. They are the party of Big Government, higher taxes, and more spending. We are the party of smaller government, effective government, one that provides essential services to the American people, like defending our Nation and maintaining peace around the world, but we believe in the individual. We believe the people who earn the money ought to be able to keep more of it and spend it as they see fit, and they believe that government ought to keep more of that and spend it as Washington sees fit. That is the reason we have two political parties, and people have to make their choices, and they do each election.

Yesterday, though, Mr. President, we voted to proceed to a very important bipartisan bill that would provide relief for small and midsized banks and credit unions across the country. This was an important step in what has been a long time coming.

You might ask: Why do we care about providing regulatory relief for banks and credit unions, especially the smaller ones that are in our communities? Well, that is where people go when they want to buy a house and they need a mortgage, when they need some startup money for a new business, where they need to go borrow money, for example, to buy seed and equipment to plant a crop. If you are in the agriculture sector, that is where they get access to credit, and that is why it is so important.

Unfortunately, since the Dodd-Frank law passed in 2010, we have seen a lot of that access to credit, particularly among small and medium-sized banks and credit unions, dry up because what they had to do was hire more people, but not for the purpose of making more loans. They hired more people because they needed to comply with the red-tape and regulatory burden imposed by Washington.

We are peeling that back; we are reversing that—not for the big banks. The regulations stay in place, but for community banks and small credit unions, we are peeling that back so that it is a more rational and reasonable regulatory regime.

Ever since the law known as Dodd-Frank was passed in 2010, community and regional banks have been trying to get their voices heard. They have been clamoring to get lawmakers to understand that their businesses are much different from the titans of Wall Street that Dodd-Frank went after, following the financial crisis. Usually, when I am talking to the community bankers and the credit unions from my State, I say: You didn't cause the great recession of 2008. You didn't cause the great financial crisis, but you are the collateral damage. And they nod their heads sadly.

These banks want us to know they are from Main Street, not from Wall Street, and they want the rules to reflect that fact. After yesterday's vote, we finally started on a pathway not only to listening to their concerns but also to acting on them.

Dodd-Frank, the regulatory legislation that was passed in 2010, was almost 250 pages long. It required more than 10 Federal agencies to write more than 400 new rules, imposing some 27,000 mandates on financial institutions of every size, from large to small. In doing so, Dodd-Frank's rules imposed billions of dollars in new costs. Much of the weight fell on the backs of banks and credit unions that posed little systemic risk to the overall economy, and they have had a much harder time than Wall Street firms complying with excessive and complex reporting requirements.

Here is the irony. It is actually the big banks and big financial institutions that have the heft and the money to be able to comply with all of this new spider's web of regulations. It is the smaller community banks and credit unions that can't afford it, so they have been going out of business or being gobbled up in mergers by the big banks. This isn't what Congress intended in 2010. That wasn't the focus, but that is the consequence.

As the Senate majority leader said yesterday, based on one survey, compliance costs—those are the costs of dealing with the redtape in the financial sector—have gone up by 24 percent. What has happened as compliance costs have increased? Well, banks have closed in small towns in rural America, for one, which has led to a growing number of places with no bank branches at all.

In Texas, for example, we lost about 165 bank charters, a 26-percent reduction. In smaller rural areas that lacked multiple options to access credit, this is a serious problem. It is one of the many issues this bill we are voting on this week attempts to solve.

As the Wall Street Journal noted, the bill mainly “eases administrative burdens” on community banks. These banks incredibly “make up about 98 percent of financial institutions, but [hold] only 15 percent of [U.S. banks' total] assets.”

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho, the chairman of the Banking Committee, has spearheaded this effort, which is called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. I heard him say yesterday that it does all three of those things. It helps stimulate economic growth; it provides regulatory relief; and it protects consumers. We all appreciate the tremendous amount of hard work he has poured into the difficult and elaborate negotiations. His leadership has been indispensable.

As Senator CRAPO has pointed out, the reforms in the bill will rightsize existing regulations on community and regional banks and credit unions while ensuring consumer safety at the same time. Anyone who lives and works in the real world knows that a one-size-fits-all approach just about never works, and banking and the financial sectors are no exception.

Dodd-Frank never worked as intended, but it was especially disastrous for smaller financial institutions that shouldn't be subject to many of its provisions, which weren't meant for them in the first place. The bill, therefore, will relieve the burden on small and midsized businesses that are being treated unfairly. Again, it is not so much the banks and the credit unions that we are worried about; it is the people they lend money to, who need access to credit to live their lives, to build their business. That is who we are mainly concerned about.

Surprisingly and gratefully, this bill is supported by Democrats who passed Dodd-Frank in the first place. This bill is supported by Democrats and Republicans, as well as the Trump administration and top Federal Reserve officials. This is actually a little bit of a bright light in an otherwise, sometimes, dark atmosphere here in Washington, DC, when it comes to dealing with some of these problems. This actually will help solve some real-world problems, and it is supported by Republicans and Democrats.

One specific objective is to raise the threshold at which banks face the stricter Dodd-Frank oversight, but it will also—and I want to emphasize this—keep in place requirements for much larger financial institutions, like rigorous stress testing, for example.

As I said, negotiations have been going on for this legislation for years; I think it is 4 years to be exact. But because of the resistance of the former administration, the Obama administration, as well as the former Senate majority leader, Senator Reid, we couldn't get these reforms passed before this

week—and next week, if necessary. This is a new day, a new administration, a new leadership, and we are making progress.

In the meantime, though, American families and businesses lost out. Some farmers and ranchers, looking to actually buy what they needed to bring in the crops so that they could earn a living, couldn't get the loans they needed. Young people couldn't find a mortgage at a price they could afford and purchase their starter home.

In Texas, bankers confirmed that these reported difficulties are real. They recently signed a letter that urged the Senate to seize this opportunity and to pass this bill as quickly as possible. As the Independent Bankers Association of Texas has pointed out, community banks neither participated in nor profited from the excesses and bad behavior that precipitated the financial crisis, yet they are paying a disproportionately high price in attempting to deal with the aftermath. That just about sums it up.

Another group from my State, the Texas Bankers Association, has said that they are pleased to see this bill has finally been brought to the floor for a vote. That group represents about 450 banking institutions in my State. Sometimes we see the credit unions and the banks as rivals. They often see themselves as rivals for the same line of business. But the banks and credit unions agree. The credit unions in my State say that passing this bill would allow them to more fully serve their members' needs, whether that be providing mortgages or small business loans, instead of spending so many hours and so much money trying to deal with the redtape—and to what purpose? It doesn't help grow the economy. It doesn't help access to credit.

It is really regulatory overkill that we are trying to deal with here. As the majority leader said yesterday, there are a “wide diversity of views on Dodd-Frank. But there is widespread agreement that we should not continue allowing” unintended consequences to wreak havoc on community banks and small credit unions.

I hope all of our colleagues will join me in supporting the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. It is good for American families. It is good for communities across our country that are underserved and for people who lack access to credit. It just makes sense.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 2507 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REED. Madam President, when we passed the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, we did so in response to a financial crisis that shook the foundations of our economy and devastated so many of our hard-working constituents. For example, the Dow Jones dropped from an average of 13,677.89 in July of 2007 to an average of 7,235.47 in March of 2009, resulting in a 47.1 percent loss. Nationally, the unemployment rate increased from 5 percent in January 2008 to 10 percent in October 2009, and in Rhode Island, the unemployment rate was even higher, increasing from 6.2 percent in January 2008 to 11.9 percent in December 2009.

In short, we had to do something to respond and avoid another financial crisis because behind each of these harrowing numbers were our constituents and their families, who saw their life savings, their jobs, and their homes evaporate in a flash. That something was the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, also known as the Dodd-Frank Act.

I am proud to have drafted and supported several of its provisions, such as the creation of a consumer watchdog—the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB—whose primary focus has been on protecting consumers from unscrupulous financial activities; my bipartisan language calling for a dedicated Office of Servicemember Affairs at the CFPB, which helps ensure that our servicemembers and their families are protected in the consumer finance space in the same way these service men and women protect us. That is now a part of the CFPB, and it has done remarkable work protecting the men and women of our armed services, who do remarkable work protecting us.

Also, I was able to provide an additional \$1 billion in funding through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which provided targeted emergency assistance to help local communities acquire, redevelop, or demolish foreclosed properties.

Frankly, in the wake of the crisis, every city and many rural areas were seeing foreclosed properties sitting there, reminding us all of the devastation. With these resources, they could

be repurposed for families to live in, or if they were decrepit, they could be demolished for urban development and economic development in rural areas.

These are just a handful of the many good and worthwhile provisions in the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, but, like any other major piece of legislation, it was not perfect.

Years ago, the custom here was that we would come together and agree on technical fixes to comprehensive legislation. It was almost predictable that after we had a complex piece of legislation, we would discover unintended consequences, and we would come together on a bipartisan basis to fix those technical issues without having to relitigate the entire bill.

Unfortunately, that moment to make needed fixes never happened, and while the legislation before us today makes changes to the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, I am concerned that this legislation may actually go too far and go beyond the needed technical fixes. For example, I worry that this legislation may actually make it tougher for community banks and credit unions to compete against the larger financial institutions despite the regulatory relief provisions in this bill for smaller financial institutions. This is because the legislation encourages large financial institutions to grow even larger—from \$50 billion up to \$250 billion. It does so, in part, by removing some of the extra oversight provisions we put in place with the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, such as making sure large banks undergo strong and robust stress tests to ensure that they have their own sufficient rainy day fund and that any type of problem is not funded by taxpayer bailouts.

In addition, this legislation may further encourage larger financial institutions to grow by increasing their competitive edge for the kinds of businesses and customers currently served by community banks and credit unions, which should be concerning to all who support our smaller local financial institutions. Larger institutions can absorb more costs than smaller institutions. They can have programs that cost them a lot in the short run but drive out the competition in the medium and long run. Because they can stretch costs over bigger institutions, they can provide services that might be better provided or more personally provided by smaller institutions, but these will be pushed out of the marketplace. So the potential net result of this bill, ironically, may make it more difficult for regulators to spot a threat to financial stability from a larger bank while increasing competitive pressures on community banks and credit unions.

To address some of these concerns, I have filed several amendments to improve the bill and add needed protec-

tions for consumers. Let me describe some of these amendments in greater detail.

One amendment seeks to prioritize regulatory relief for institutions with a strong history of doing right by their customers. In the legislation before us, Federal financial regulators are given the discretion to provide regulatory relief to certain financial institutions, and in so doing, to consider factors they deem appropriate. My amendment simply directs the regulators, when exercising this discretion, to also consider whether the financial institution, in the preceding 24-month period, paid any Federal fines or penalties and to consider whether there was any violation or settlement related to an alleged violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act—the SCRA—or the Military Lending Act and if these violations could have been avoided. Again, that is a strong emphasis on protecting the men and women who protect us—our servicemembers. These two pieces of legislation, the SCRA—the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act—and the Military Lending Act, are the strongest protections our servicemen and women have against financial abuse by institutions.

In short, how well an institution serves its customers, including our servicemembers, should help determine whether certain financial institutions deserve the regulatory relief provided under the bill.

On a very strong bipartisan basis, I hope we can adopt this amendment. It just seems so clear to me that when we are giving relief, we should give it to those who have earned it—those institutions that have treated our service men and women well and have treated their customers well.

Another amendment I filed would empower the CFPB and its Office of Servicemember Affairs to enforce existing SCRA safeguards—the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act safeguards—such as those that protect our servicemembers from being overcharged. This amendment is needed because, despite the importance of the SCRA's protections to our servicemembers, enforcement of this critical law has been inconsistent and subject to the discretion of our financial regulators, which can change with each Administration.

According to a July 2012 report from the Government Accountability Office, the estimated percentage of depository institutions that serviced mortgages that were examined for SCRA compliance varied widely, ranging from rates of 4 percent in 2007, 17 percent in 2008, 18 percent in 2009, 26 percent in 2010, and then dropping down to 15 percent in 2011. You can see that sort of tracked with the financial crisis, where at a point after 2007 and 2008, the regulators understood the threats that were being posed to service men and women in terms of their mortgage obligations.

But that seems to be fading. We can't lose focus on protecting the men and women who serve us.

As someone who has had the experience and privilege of leading soldiers as an executive officer of a paratrooper company, I spent a lot of time trying to explain to people who were trying to collect from men and women in uniform that they couldn't because the law had set certain interest rates that they exceeded and that they couldn't because they were violating—back then it was called the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. We need an agency of the government, not individual members of the Armed Forces, to protect these men and women. I think that is what we are trying to do with this legislation.

Simply put, prioritizing the consumer protection of our service men and women should not be discretionary; it should be mandatory. This amendment ensures that the SCRA enforcement will be permanently a priority of the CFPB and the Office of Servicemember Affairs. It is supported by more than 30 organizations, including the National Military Family Association, Military Officers Association of America, Veterans Education Success, Student Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

We also need to do more to protect student loan borrowers. There is a growing private market to refinance student loans, including Federal student loans. I filed an amendment to require lenders to disclose the benefits that borrowers might forfeit, such as income-driven repayment plans, loan forgiveness, and deferment options, when they refinance a Federal loan into a private loan.

I have also filed an amendment to clarify that the Education Loan Ombudsman at the CFPB should monitor and report student loan complaints for all education loans, including Federal student loans.

Additionally, I support Senator DURBIN's amendment to strengthen student loan servicing and protections for private student loan borrowers and to provide greater transparency and accountability for campus-based banking products beyond just credit cards. We have all read about the many abuses that have taken place, and we owe it to consumers everywhere to ensure that these abuses are detected and prevented.

Continuing this focus on consumer protections, another of my amendments responds to the difficulties that Rhode Islanders face when trying to secure a loan modification by taking greater advantage of bank branches. If you are able to walk into a bank branch and get a mortgage, then you should also be able to walk into the same branch and get help to avoid preventable foreclosures. What we found

in the crisis was that often this was not the case. They could get a loan at the branch, but if they needed any type of assistance, they had to call a servicer or go someplace else. My amendment, which is supported by the National Consumer Law Center and the National Association of REALTORS, establishes a pilot program to see whether this would be feasible—whether we could get bank branches not only to make loans but also to help borrowers when they come into difficult circumstances.

I have also filed an amendment that would direct GAO to conduct a retrospective study of the impact of the provisions of this legislation on economic growth and consumer protection. Specifically, my amendment asks GAO to evaluate the bill's impact on non-managerial wages, senior executive pay, stock buybacks, the interest paid on savings or money market accounts, jobs being moved abroad, foreclosure rates, and enforcement actions.

In so doing, we will be able to determine whether the legislation actually delivers on the claims by its sponsors of economic growth and consumer protection. I think we always have to go back and check our work, and this provision would allow us, in a formal and systematic way, to check our work. I hope we can do that.

Finally, I have filed an amendment supported by the former Federal Reserve Chairman, Paul Volcker, to retain and strengthen the Federal Reserve's emergency safety and soundness powers. To quote Chairman Volcker: "It's clear that circumstances can arise where the activities of some banks with less than \$250 billion in assets would pose a grave threat to financial stability. To address such a threat, regulators have certain tools in their arsenal that we wish they will never have to use. Senator REED's amendment wisely restores and strengthens one such tool, allowing it to be deployed under limited circumstances and only upon approval of a supermajority of the [Financial Stability Oversight] Council."

Surely, at the very least, we should agree to preserve and strengthen the ability of our financial regulators to avoid grave threats and another financial crisis.

Before I conclude, I would like to make one further observation. Ten years ago today, few of us knew ahead of time that we would see an economy that would collapse into depths that we did not anticipate, that our Nation would literally recoil due to the recklessness and unchecked greed of too many on Wall Street. We should not forget that, nationally, over 8.6 million jobs were lost between January 2008 and January 2010, with over 33,000 jobs lost in Rhode Island alone. If anything, the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act was a sensible and long

overdue response to the reality that people are nowhere near perfect and cannot always be trusted to do the right thing.

We learned in the hardest and most painful ways that certain safeguards are necessary. Unfortunately, the bill before us today removes some of those safeguards. Absent any serious changes made to the bill during this week's debate and for all the reasons I have stated, I cannot support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Madam President.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2509 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Illinois.

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on September 5 of last year, President Trump's Attorney General made an announcement. It was an announcement that affected the lives of about 800,000 people living in America. The announcement was that the President was going to abolish the DACA Program.

DACA was a program created by President Obama by Executive order. Under that Executive order, if you were brought to the United States as an infant, a toddler, a child, if you grew up in this country, were educated in this country, and had no criminal record of any consequence, President Obama said that you have a chance to apply to stay in this country on a temporary, renewable basis—2 years at a time—and that you won't be deported and you can take a job.

Eight hundred thousand young people came forward under President Obama's Executive order, under this DACA order. What have they done with their lives? Many of them went to school and had to work at the same time because, being undocumented, they didn't qualify for any Federal student assistance. A lot of them took jobs all across the country—about 20,000 of them as teachers in schools, and 900 of them volunteered for the U.S. military, taking the same oath as everyone else, saying that they are willing to risk their lives for America.

The success stories of these DACA recipients are boundless. I have told a number on the floor in the course of discussing this issue over the years. Today, I will tell another one. I am so proud of what they have done. They are amazing young people. Can you imagine growing up in America with all the challenges of youth and all the demands from your parents and peers and superiors but also knowing something that you can't say publicly: that at any

moment, you could be deported from this country because you don't have the necessary legal status? That is the story of these DACA young people, the Dreamers.

President Trump, if you will remember, talked about immigration a lot in his last campaign. Some of the things he said were very harsh. He talked about building this big, beautiful wall, from sea to shining sea, across the Mexican border, and, of course, told us the Mexicans would pay for it. Then he referred to those in Mexico who came to the United States as Mexican rapists and criminals. It was pretty harsh language. But interestingly, toward the end of the campaign and after he was elected, he started saying conciliatory, good things about these DACA Dreamers. He told me personally, when I first met him on the day he was inaugurated: We will take care of those kids, Senator.

Well, on September 5 of last year, he announced that the program protecting those young people would expire as of Monday of this week, 2 days ago. As of that date, he said, if Congress hasn't replaced the DACA Program with something new, something legal, something statutory, there would be no protection for these DACA recipients as their protected status expired. For 800,000 in limbo, uncertainty is their future.

Well, the President challenged Congress, and a number of us took him up on the challenge. Six of us—three Democrats and three Republicans—Senators sat down for months. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina was part of that group, a Republican; JEFF FLAKE of Arizona was part of that group, a Republican; and CORY GARDNER of Colorado, a Republican. On our side, MICHAEL BENNET of Colorado, a Democrat; BOB MENENDEZ of New Jersey, a Democrat. We worked out a bipartisan agreement among us that not one of us would have written. It was a compromise in trying to meet the President's challenge of replacing DACA with something that could be the law of the land and work.

I reflect on that effort and believe it was a good one. It was certainly in good faith, and it was bipartisan. When we presented it to President Trump on January 11 at 12 noon—I remember the time very specifically—he rejected it. He not only rejected that bipartisan solution to the crisis he had created, he rejected five other bipartisan proposals to try to resolve the crisis he had created in eliminating the DACA Program.

So here we are, just 2 days after his March 5 deadline, and where do we stand? Well, the situation has been complicated by three Federal courts that have been asked to review President Trump's decision abolishing DACA. Two of those courts have issued injunctions and said to the Trump ad-

ministration: Stop what you are doing. You have to prove to us that you have the legal authority to end this program the way you ended it.

There is an injunction stopping the Trump administration from doing what the President said he would do. The President's administration didn't think much of those courts and decided to file an extraordinary appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, which is across the street, to knock down this injunction and to go forward with closing down DACA. Last week, the Supreme Court rejected the Solicitor General's petition.

So here we stand. The President has abolished the DACA Program. The protection for 800,000 young people from being deported, the protection that allowed them to work, is officially—President Trump's point of view—abolished. It has not been replaced, the deadline has been reached, and it is being argued in court.

So how much protection does that buy for the 800,000? We don't know. We know it is a court-based protection, an injunction that could last for weeks or months or even longer, but that uncertainty is what is hanging over this whole debate.

So this morning I called the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Kirstjen Nielsen, and I asked her: Explain to me what your Department is doing because of these court injunctions and President Trump's decision to abolish this program.

She gave me a partial explanation. In fairness to her, she promised to get back to me and even promised to come up here to Capitol Hill next week and try to explain in more detail how the Department of Homeland Security is handling this.

For example, if you were protected by DACA—a young person—and if the President's abolition of DACA did not allow you to renew your DACA application when it expired, what is your status? Can you be deported?

Secretary Nielsen told me point blank: No, we will not deport those who have pending DACA applications.

I then asked the next question: Do you have the authority to allow these same people to continue legally working, as they did under DACA?

She didn't know the answer, and in fairness to her, she said she would look into it and get back to me. I look forward to that happening.

It is a sad situation that this Congress can't pass a law to deal with this kind of emergency. Ask the American people what they think about Dreamers, what they think about young people who were brought to the United States as children, infants, and babies, and who are asking for a chance to be legal in America, to become citizens. Ask Americans what they think. Overwhelmingly, they say: Of course. Why would you punish these children who

grew up in this country? They didn't break a law or commit a crime. They didn't make a decision; it was a decision made by others. They should have a chance.

Overwhelmingly, the American people say that, 85 percent or more, including more than 60 percent of people who say they voted for President Trump. Can you find an issue with that kind of public support? For those who follow the news, there is another one called universal background checks for guns, which has an even higher level of support. But going back to the DACA issue, 85 percent of the American people believe Congress should pass a law to give these young people a chance—not punish them, not deport them. Give them a chance. Give them a chance to earn their way to legal status. Despite that, this Senate has failed to pass a measure to do that.

Two weeks ago, we made it to the floor. We had four different versions of the bill. I won't go into detail other than to tell you that the most popular version of the bill got 54 votes. You would think that in a Chamber of 100 Senators, that would be enough, but not under our rules—you need 60 votes.

The President had a plan, incidentally. President Trump brought his immigration plan to the floor of the Senate the same week we debated this. Now, understand, there are 51 Republican Senators and 49 Democrats in this Chamber. On the day of the vote, one Senator, Senator MCCAIN, was missing, so 50 to 49. How many votes did President Trump get for his immigration policy presented on the floor of the Republican-controlled Senate? Thirty-nine. Sixty Senators voted against it, including a substantial number of Republicans. So the President's approach to this has been rejected by even his own party.

What has the House of Representatives, the other Chamber, done about this? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Sadly, that is a commentary on many major issues facing our country. The Congress has not even taken up a serious debate, let alone found a solution, and here we sit. It is easy for us to sit here in the Senate Chamber, confident of our own citizenship status, but for 800,000, the uncertainty makes a wreck of their lives. I have met many of them. I have talked to them. They are outstanding people. They have succeeded when others failed. They have been determined and resilient when others gave up. They are running out of time.

President Trump created this crisis for DACA on September 5. He has been unable to agree to any of six different bipartisan measures to solve it—not one—and today the fate and future of these young people rest in the hands of the courts.

It is easy to speak of these young people in gross numbers—800,000, 1.8

million—but over the years, I have decided it is better to get to know them personally. As they have had the courage to come forward and identify themselves, I have come to the floor to tell their stories. This is the 110th time I am bringing a story to the floor.

This man is Alejandro Fuentes. Alejandro was brought to the United States at the age of 4 from Chile and grew up in San Diego. He was an extraordinary high school student—honor roll, AP scholar with distinction, and a member of the National Honor Society. He was involved in a lot of activities—high school cross-country and lacrosse, a member of the choir—and volunteered as a worship leader at his church.

He was accepted at Whitman College in the State of Washington, and when he was there, he was a member of the campus Christian fellowship group. He volunteered with the local Humane Society and was the philanthropy chair of his fraternity. He was a student government representative and a mentor to other students.

After graduation, he was accepted into Teach For America. We know that program, don't we? That is where some of our best and brightest college graduates say: I will give you 2 years of my life and work in a school that needs me as a teacher. Send me to a tough area to work. Thousands have done it. Alejandro—not a citizen of the United States—said: I will do it. I will do it for my country.

Today, he is a sixth grade math teacher at a middle school in Denver, CO. He volunteers as a mentor after school for students who need help with math.

What is going to happen to this man? What is going to happen to him if Congress fails to replace DACA? What is going to happen if he is deported? And it could happen. There are 20,000 just like him, teachers across America who are DACA-protected and have no protection now, no protection in the law. Their only protection is a court order, which could be changed in a moment.

If he leaves, of course, the students will pay a price, and certainly America will pay a price. Will we be better off as a nation? Of course not. This young man grew up in America. He was brought here at the age of 4, went to his classrooms in San Diego and pledged allegiance to the flag every day. This is his country. It is the only country he has ever known. Why would we want to throw him out of this country after he has gone through all of these things in life and achieved an amazing record of success? To me, it would be a horrible waste.

There is a larger issue at stake here than just DACA. The issue is immigration in America. Are we a nation of immigrants? I think so. But 2 weeks ago, at the immigration Federal agency, they decided to strike those words

from their mission statement, that America was a nation of immigrants. They can strike all the words they want, but they can't strike the facts. The facts tell us that with the exception of Native Americans, who preceded us, we are all immigrants—some voluntary, some forced, but we are all immigrants in this country. We come from every corner of the Earth. We are as diverse as any nation could be. That is our history, that is our strength, and that is our legacy. That diversity makes us an extraordinary nation in the world.

Those people who came here from far-reaching shores came here for a lot of reasons. My grandmother was one of them. She brought my mom. My mom was an immigrant to this country. I don't know all the reasons that my grandmother came here, but I know there was one reason she came. She had three little kids, and she carried a bag and had with her a Catholic prayer book from the country of Lithuania. It was written in Lithuanian. The Russians were in control of Lithuania at the time, and they had prohibited prayer books written in Lithuanian. My grandmother, whom I never knew, was one tough lady. She was willing to pick up this prayer book—this contraband in Lithuania—and bring it to the United States of America. I don't know if she ever took a constitutional law course, but she knew there was freedom in this country. Nobody was going to stop her from praying from her prayer book when she got to the United States. I am sure economics had more to do with her coming, but that was part of the reason my family made it to this country. It is something I have never forgotten, and I have told the story many times.

All these people who have come to this country—every single one of us brings a story, a family story. Now we are being told it is a mistake—it is a mistake to continue legal immigration to America.

The President's proposal on immigration would cut legal immigration to this country almost in half. Currently, our Nation of 320, 330 million people brings in approximately 1.1 million legal immigrants a year—1 million legal immigrants; 320 million Americans. It is not an overwhelming number in comparison. On average more than sixty percent of the 1.1 million people are members of families of those already here.

Do you just ask to come in, and we let you come to America if you have a family member here? Of course not. You wait and you wait. For example, in the Philippines, you may wait 20 years for a member of the family to be reunited with someone who is already an American citizen—20 years waiting in line. The President's proposal—the one that has come to the floor of the Senate that got 39 votes—said we ought to

cut the number of legal immigrants almost in half, tell those people to wait longer or stay where they are.

In most cultures, in the American culture, the family unit is our strength—flag, family, God. How many times have we heard those speeches from politicians? Yet these families who are trying to be reunited and to be strong are being told: You are not wanted. That is a mistake. The last time we did that was in 1924 on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We decided—the Senate then—there were certain people we didn't need in America. Asians were excluded. People from Africa and Eastern Europe and other regions were severely restricted. That could have included my mother's family. They restricted Italians. We had enough Italians—that is what Congress said. They restricted Jewish people.

That shameful chapter in American immigration history prevailed for over 40 years, until we passed a new immigration law. Now this administration wants to take us back to that debate. This administration wants to change the face of immigration in America. The President has been explicit about that in terms of what he would like to see America look like in the future—not as diverse, excluding people from certain places. I think that is a mistake.

If there is one thing that has made us strong, it is the fact that this diversity, when it comes together under that flag, can conquer everyone and everything on Earth. Why would we walk away from that legacy? Why would we walk away from Alejandro? Why would we walk away from 800,000 protected by DACA? Why? Is that the legacy we want to leave, that we have excluded these talented, high-achieving, energetic, fearless young people? Alejandro's story is certainly not unique. There are 20,000 teachers like him who are DACA recipients and DACA-protected.

Teach For America, the program that pays these young college graduates a limited amount of money to go to challenging schools—190 of them were protected by DACA. They are officially not citizens of the United States, but they are willing to teach kids in the toughest schools in America. They teach in 11 different States.

There is a question now about what happens next, and I don't know. Right now, the President created this crisis, and only the President can solve this crisis. There are Republican Members of the House and Senate who will not vote for anything unless it has the Trump stamp of approval on it, and I don't know what that can be. Six different times we have gone to him, and six times he has rejected bipartisan approaches. We need the President to help us work toward a solution. It is up to the Republican leaders in Congress—

they control the House and the Senate—to take yes for an answer and accept one of these bipartisan approaches, to save these young people, and to resolve this crisis that faces us.

Congress needs to do its job. We should make the Dream Act the law of the land, or we will be responsible for hundreds of thousands of talented young immigrants leaving our workforce and put them at risk of immediate deportation. It would be a chapter in American immigration history even sadder than 1924.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I filed an amendment yesterday that, I hope, will be included in this banking bill that the Senate is considering today and tomorrow.

My amendment was inspired by a bill I introduced last July, which is a simple bill, bipartisan, and should be non-controversial. Here is what the amendment would do: It would exempt trust-preferred securities from a bank's capital requirements.

Now, you ask: What is a trust-preferred security?

It is an investment vehicle that looks a little bit like equity and, at the same time, looks a little bit like debt.

How did these come about?

Actually, the FDIC asked many banks to invest in such securities in previous decades. A company creates trust-preferred securities by creating a trust, issuing debt to it, and then having it issue preferred stock to investors—trust, debt, and preferred stock to investors. The FDIC used to like trust-preferred securities. It considered them sound investments before 2010. May I repeat: The FDIC asked many banks to invest in these securities. However, through its interpretation of the Basel III regulations, the FDIC is now counting these securities against the banks' capital holdings.

Who is affected by this?

It happens to be 20 small banks in the heartland of America.

My amendment would exempt these banks from having to consider trust-preferred securities as part of their capital requirements; therefore, it would promote growth in rural communities around the country as well as provide regulatory relief for our small banks.

That is really what this bill is about. The Dodd-Frank legislation took a broad-brush approach and punished many medium and small banks when they had nothing to do with the finan-

cial crisis of 2007 and 2008. Dodd-Frank has done harm to Main Street. My amendment would alleviate some of that harm. If we want to help banks grow the economy, we need to be mindful of the ways in which Dodd-Frank's excessive regulations are hurting small banks. This goes right in hand with the major thrust of this overwhelmingly bipartisan bill on which we are about to proceed today or tomorrow.

These 20 small banks nationwide inject needed capital and access to credit in our communities—capital and credit to launch new local businesses or create jobs. When these small banks struggle, communities struggle. For one to comply with the one-size-fits-all Dodd-Frank regulations demands resources that some of our community banks do not have. Here I am arguing for my amendment and for the entire bill. Unlike big banks, these small banks in rural communities might be forced to close because of the demands that are too high or they might have to pass along extra costs to consumers. Neither option helps our local communities and the people who live there.

These 20 small rural banks were not in the least bit responsible for the financial crisis. So my amendment, based on a bipartisan bill, recognizes, along with the base bill, the fact that the small banks are not part of the problem and never were part of the problem. It would alleviate the burdens that these banks have shouldered since Dodd-Frank has become law.

I commend the chairman of the Banking Committee and the overwhelming bipartisan majority on the Banking Committee for working on this legislation. This is a red-letter achievement in a body that has become overly partisan, regrettably so, in the last few years, but we can work together to offer relief to our small credit unions and small community banks. In doing so, we need to take the added step of relieving these 20 smalltown banks from an onerous requirement.

I urge the chairman and the ranking member and Members of the Democratic and Republican leadership to consider making this part of an overall managers' amendment or accepting this amendment and moving forward because it has everything to do with following the thrust of this entire bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I rise in support of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act which is being

considered on the Senate floor for this week. As a member of the Senate Banking Committee, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this important legislation which will provide much needed regulatory relief to our community banks and credit unions whose ability to serve their customers has been made more difficult since the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Enacted in 2010, Dodd-Frank was an overreaction to the 2008 financial crisis. Rather than actually addressing the underlying issues that caused the financial crisis, Dodd-Frank created a massive new bureaucracy and saddled our financial institutions with burdensome and onerous new regulations. It is 2,300 pages in length and created more than 400 new rulemakings, which led to 27,000 new Federal mandates on American businesses. This limits the ability of our financial institutions to grow and serve their customers, especially for smaller banks in rural areas such as in my home State of South Dakota.

Just last summer, the U.S. Department of Treasury reported that the regulatory burdens of Dodd-Frank have reduced economic growth and "undermined the ability of banks to deliver attractively priced credit in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of the economy."

Without question, no one wants to repeat the events that contributed to the economic recession that began in 2008. We are only now beginning to lift out of that nearly decade-long economic slump, thanks to the tax relief law and President Trump's focus on regulatory reform.

Just in the last year, we have enacted historic tax reform, we have undone burdensome and unnecessary regulations at a record pace, and we are restoring the American people's confidence at levels not seen in decades, but we must do more, which is why our bipartisan legislation is so important.

Making sure American families and businesses have access to credit when they need it is critical as we work to grow our economy and create jobs. The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act will strengthen America's financial system and expand economic opportunities across the entire country, especially in rural areas which are often the most underserved.

Of the many fatal flaws of Dodd-Frank, perhaps most damaging was its one-size-fits-all approach. By taking a one-size-fits-all approach, Dodd-Frank imposed disproportionate compliance costs on our smaller community banks and credit unions, especially given the improbability that these smaller institutions pose a significant risk to our financial system. This type of approach is particularly harmful to our smaller financial institutions which are so vital to our communities.

With more than 6,500 community banks throughout the country supporting even the remotest areas, we must make certain we are helping and not hindering their ability to serve their communities.

Almost half of small businesses, which we all know are the drivers of job creation and economic growth in America, are supported by small community banks. Providing these institutions with regulatory relief is critical, which is what our legislation does.

Let me go through some of the highlights, which include seven provisions or bills I introduced. It includes the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, which I introduced with Senator HEITKAMP earlier this year, and will provide small banks and credit unions with data reporting relief.

We also provide relief from Dodd-Frank capital rules that allow banks to count high-quality municipal bonds toward capital requirements, providing help to both banks and local units of government that issue that debt. In other words, those banks can now make a market for those municipal bonds once again.

Our legislation also streamlines Federal rules to help small, local Federal savings associations, known as FSA's or thrifts, expand their ability to offer loans to more families and businesses without going through a costly charter conversion process.

It also includes parts of the Community Bank Access to Capital Act, which would free small banks from having to complete arduous and expensive tests which are already mandated by Dodd-Frank, and it makes it easier for banks with less than \$3 billion in assets to raise capital and grow.

I am also pleased it includes my provision to protect the credit of our Nation's veterans, so veterans waiting on delayed payments from the VA Choice Program cannot lose their credit ratings because of it. It is a sad commentary when you have to make a law in the financial institutions section of the code to take care of veterans because the VA cannot pay their bills on time.

It also protects seniors by removing liability for financial services institutions and professionals reporting suspected fraud of senior citizens to the authorities. We also provide relief to small public housing agencies by reducing regulatory burdens on and increasing flexibility for these entities.

This bill also provides rural appraisal relief for cases when buyers have trouble finding a qualified appraiser. The reason for this is because if you want to get a home loan, one of the requirements under Dodd-Frank is that you have to have a qualified appraiser actually appraise the home, regardless of where you live. What this provision does is it relaxes some of those rules with regard to where the amounts on a

mortgage can be, less than a particular amount as specified in our bill, and still be a qualified mortgage so banks can move them on to the secondary market. That helps to create a market for those mortgages, making it easier for a consumer to actually access that credit.

Our bill also gives the Federal Reserve flexibility in designating banks as systemically important, exempting banks with less than \$100 billion in assets from several Dodd-Frank provisions that apply to systemically important financial institutions, or SIFIs, including reporting requirements, limits on lending, and limits on mergers and acquisitions.

Also banks with assets between \$100 billion and \$250 billion would receive relief from tighter oversight applied by Dodd-Frank. This would exempt 15 regional and midsized banks from these more stringent rules. Meanwhile, more than a dozen of our country's largest banks will still have to comply with the SIFI requirements. These are the largest financial institutions.

We also eliminate barriers to jobs by allowing mortgage loan originators to work temporarily in a new State or for a new financial institution while their applications for new licenses are pending. Our bill also requires the Treasury to study and report on the risks of cyber threats to our financial institutions and capital markets.

Finally, our bill provides regulatory relief from enhanced supplementary leverage ratio for certain banks that service organizations like mutual funds and State and local pension plans. It doesn't hardly seem appropriate that we would make our banks less competitive than foreign banks for providing that same service. Let's keep that opportunity and that market within our own borders as well. Let's allow them to be competitive, which saves on costs for mutual fund purchasers.

This benefits countless local governments across the country that do business with these banks. In my home State alone, this includes the State of South Dakota, the South Dakota Retirement System, the Rapid City Regional Hospital, the city of Vermillion, and the Watertown School District, just to name a few of them. While this provision will not help all banks, it will affect some banks, which benefits consumers, and in the future perhaps we can give the same relief to all banks that offer these important services.

These provisions, along with the many others of our bill, will strengthen our financial system in the United States and reduce the unnecessary burdens on small or midsized banks so they can focus on serving their communities, not complying with layers of bureaucracy.

Making sure families and businesses have access to credit when they need it

is critical as we work to grow a healthy American economy. Every step we can take to provide relief to our lenders is a win for families and businesses that rely on them to run their businesses, to buy a home, or to save for college.

Small community banks don't think of banking in terms of derivatives and default swaps like they do on Wall Street. They think of banking in terms of how they can best serve their communities, their friends, neighbors, store owners, and job providers. Our bipartisan Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act will help these lenders focus on doing just exactly that.

I thank Chairman CRAPO and the other 24 cosponsors of this legislation for their commitment to working together to provide much needed relief that will enhance our ability to grow our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the bill we have in front of us, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. That is a mouthful right there, but what it is, is a culmination and reaction to the Dodd-Frank bill that was passed in 2010 as a result of the crisis of 2008 and 2009.

I think it is important for us to note where this is directed. In Dodd-Frank, so much of the focus was placed on large banks and larger institutions, but what has been lost in the debate and what really is an unintended consequence, I think, is that the massive and burdensome regulatory legislation would affect the smaller banks, the community banks, and the credit unions.

Senator ROUNDS of South Dakota and Senator BLUNT of Missouri and my State of West Virginia have more rural areas for the most part, and these community banks and credit unions are absolutely critical to our individuals but also to our businesses. They have been bearing the brunt of Washington's response to that in the form of Dodd-Frank.

We know that larger financial institutions have the capital, resources, staff, and expertise to handle a lot of these regulatory requirements that are placed on them, but smaller institutions have really struggled under the weight of Dodd-Frank. We didn't come to this point today without a lot of discussion, compromise, and thoughtful input from a lot of different entities to figure out the best way to serve all our States. These smaller institutions play a critical role in a State like West Virginia. Our small businesses rely on them to open and succeed, our communities rely on them to expand, and our economy relies on them to grow, especially in our rural areas.

Our community banks and credit unions really had to shift their attention away from what they know best, which is relationship-based lending and borrowing, and put it more into this regulatory environment to devote bank resources, time, energy, effort, and legal resources to make sure they are complying with regulations that were really intended for larger financial institutions. It has been tough.

From 2010, which was the year Dodd-Frank was enacted, until 2016, the number of community banks in our country has decreased by 1,600. That is a significant decrease in the number of community banks. With little or no access to community banks, our Main Street borrowers have been forced to turn to larger institutions for loans. That is fine, but a lot of times our Main Street businesses and individuals get lost in the shuffle. Sometimes it is stiffer terms, and sometimes it could mean rejection.

We are talking about farmers, families looking to buy a home, and of course our small businesses. We are really talking about the hard-working men and women trying to live that American dream.

With smaller institutions constantly forced to merge with larger ones to help shoulder the cost of regulation, that relationship-based model that has served our communities for decades is disappearing.

I think it is time now, after much thought, to ease that burden and rightsize those regulations on our smaller financial institutions, and that is exactly what the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act does. It is a balanced approach to regulation. It takes into account the differences—some of them vast differences—between larger and smaller financial institutions.

It improves access to mortgages, which is something I have been interested in since my service in the House when I was on Financial Services and I chaired the Financial Institutions Subcommittee. The mortgage issue was something that I introduced, and we worked on many, many pieces of legislation to provide rural areas with greater access to mortgages.

Let's just talk about what happens. If a young couple is trying to get a mortgage or maybe it is even a med student coming out of medical school, trying to get a mortgage for a loan with no real income yet but in a relationship banking situation, that small community banker knows that is going to be a safe bet at the end of the day. A lot of our mortgages have been so constructed by Dodd-Frank that people haven't been able to get mortgages. Let's face it. The ones who face the biggest challenges are the ones we were supposed to be trying to help with Dodd-Frank, and those were in the mid to lower income range who maybe had a credit

issue or some other extraneous issue. In a cookie-cutter environment, one-size-fits-all doesn't fit their size, and they end up without the opportunity to own a home.

There are also very critical consumer protections in this bill—protections for our seniors. I am going to go out on a limb here and say that this is probably one area in which we haven't, as a Congress, joined together with financial institutions and other consumer advocates to protect our seniors from being preyed upon financially. It is rampant. Sometimes you are preyed upon by your own family. So the Senior Safe Act, which is Senator COLLINS and Senator McCASKILL's bill, protects our seniors from financial exploitation—this is part of the bill—and fraud. This has been a consistent priority of mine.

It also works to protect our veterans, who can be very vulnerable when seeking financial assistance, and also for individuals who have gone through tough times financially. The legislation clarifies a lot of the CFPB regulations to help benefit those consumers.

Student borrowers and student loans—we talk a lot about the increasing debt that our students are incurring, the difficulty that students, after they graduate, have in paying down these debts, but a bill that I helped to introduce with Senator PETERS is included in this agreement. It says that when student borrowers from private loans have the opportunity, they can rehabilitate their credit following a default. They can't do that now. If you have a government loan, you can do that, but if you have a student loan through a private institution, you can't do that. So we are seeking parity between a government loan and a private loan, and we think this will help those students repay and relook at their finances.

Finally, in light of recent data breaches that have put many at risk, this legislation puts in place important cyber security standards and safeguards. Every committee we are on talks about cyber security. The financial institutions, I think, have been on the leading edge of trying to detect cyber invasions into information or into their financial institutions. We have to stay one step ahead here because this is very fast-moving.

These are all priorities and solutions on which I have worked hard, both as a leader on the House Financial Services Committee and now, as I chair the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee.

For community financial institutions, regulatory relief and economic growth go hand in hand. We just passed the tax relief bill, and a lot of our small businesses are able to increase their bottom lines, grow their businesses, grow jobs and wages. We want to see those financial institutions grow alongside that.

Working men and women and small business owners deserve a fair shot at mortgages. Owning a home is the American Dream. They also deserve a process that takes into consideration the kind of community where they live.

We deserve relief from these burdensome and unbalanced regulations we have been forced to contend with for too long. The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act does just this. It gives us an opportunity to send a clear message to Main Street, and that is: We support you. We support you.

I encourage all of my colleagues to stand with me. I want to thank Chairman CRAPO for his dedicated insistence that this come to the floor of the U.S. Senate and that we have bipartisan support. It is very well thought-out. It doesn't have the whole kitchen sink in it. It has the provisions that I think are the top priority for our financial institutions but also for all of us who represent Main Street here in the U.S. Senate.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to join my colleague from West Virginia, as well as our friend from South Dakota, to say how much I appreciate the effort that Senator CRAPO has made to put this bill together. It is exactly how the Congress is supposed to work and how the Senate is supposed to work—a bipartisan bill. Frankly, I am sure it is a bill that everyone who will vote for it would have changed at least one thing in it, but if we were to change all of those things that all of us would have changed, suddenly we wouldn't have a bill that could pass, a bill that would do what this bill does, a bill that will roll back the Dodd-Frank regulations, which are one more attempt by the Federal Government to make one size fit all. If you have ever tried on any one-size-fits-all things, you know that one size almost never fits anybody, and that has been the case that we have seen now.

Credit unions and community banks provide critical financial services for families and for small businesses across Missouri and across the country. When the Dodd-Frank bill became law, small and medium-sized banks and credit unions were faced with huge regulatory burdens. Big banks got bigger, and small banks got bought and went out of business way too often. There was negative impact on their ability to maintain service on Main Street in a small community. You couldn't put together a group that would just be the compliance group, and if you did, that had to come out of their ability to do the kind of business that you wanted to do and always had been doing.

According to the Independent Community Bankers of America, despite

holding less than 20 percent of the Nation's banking assets, community banks fund more than 60 percent of small business loans and more than 80 percent of U.S. agricultural loans—all in that 20 percent of the banking assets of the country. Furthermore, they operate in many areas where other banks don't, where they are the only physical banking presence, frankly. One out of every five U.S. counties has only one bank, and that one bank is a community bank, a small bank. The more time, the more money, the more staff that community lenders have to dedicate to complying with needless regulations, the less ability they have to provide the kind of service they would like to provide.

In talking about the bill that I am pleased to be a cosponsor of, the president of the Missouri Bankers Association, Max Cook, said: "This common-sense legislation will allow banks to better serve the needs of customers and businesses in our communities."

He went on to say "that financial regulatory reform will unleash America's economic potential." That is the end of his quote, but I think you could add to it that lots of good things are happening in our economy right now—the tax bill, the regulatory, common-sense regulations that are overcoming regulations that didn't make much sense. Access to capital is a critically important part of what you have to have to have a growing economy—access to capital in small communities, as well as access in big communities. That means you have to have banks that can serve the communities those banks are in.

This bill contains a number of bipartisan priorities. One of the priorities in here is a bill that I sponsored, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act. Senator ROUNDS mentioned part of what that means to rural Americans, but it also means a lot to Americans who are living under public housing programs of one kind or another. This was a bill that I introduced. It was cosponsored by Senator REED from Rhode Island, Senator SCOTT from South Carolina, Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, and it is another bipartisan statement that this bill will make when we pass it. It simply makes commonsense changes in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Family Self-Sufficiency Program. That program happens to be under the Banking Committee, so it fits right in this bill.

What this addition to the bill would do—and it is in the bill to start with now—is expand the ability of people, under the new way to define these programs, to improve their education, to save money for the future, to reach their goal of becoming more financially independent.

The first thing the legislation does is streamline two public housing family self-sufficiency programs into one.

There is no reason to have two family self-sufficiency programs, no reason to have two definitions, no reason to have one category of people in those programs who qualify for things and a second category who don't, just because they happen to qualify under the definitions of a needlessly duplicative program. So it eliminates that.

This bill expands the scope of support services. It allows people who are in these programs to attain a GED if they don't have one, to pursue a postsecondary degree or a postsecondary certification, and it gives training for financial literacy.

Lastly, this bill would expand the reach of the Family Self-Sufficiency Program to families that may otherwise be technically excluded from the program today.

I would like to share some of the statements from housing organizations in my State and around the country, such as a group called Beyond Housing, which is interested in more than just a place to live, but how you use that as a way to improve your life. Beyond Housing in St. Louis, which provides more than 400 affordable housing rental units for families throughout the St. Louis region, endorsed the bill because they said it would "empower families across the country to achieve self-sufficiency." The Missouri chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials supports the change this bill has because they say "it provides the Tool Box the residents can use to better life for them as individuals and as a family."

The National NeighborWorks Association says that the legislation would "improve the existing self-sufficiency program to help more individuals and families achieve more in life for themselves and their families."

Providing families in need with affordable housing is critical, but it is also important that we figure out ways to move them beyond government support to self-sufficiency. These changes in this bill help make that happen. A companion bill of that part of the bill in the House passed in January by a vote of 412 to 5, so I hope it is a helpful addition to the bill. I know it is going to be helpful to the families that it opens new doors for.

I am glad to be here supporting this bill and to have Senator ROUNDS, Senator CAPITO, Senator ENZI, and Senator FISCHER here, as well, to talk about the importance of this bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, when we debated the Dodd-Frank bill in 2010, I concentrated most of my effort on talking about the third portion—the third third of the bill; it is one of those several-hundred page bills again—but this was kind of hidden at the end,

something called the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, known as the CFPB.

I opposed its creation during the debate. I opposed it because it is not a government agency under any way, shape, form, or rule that we have. There is no control whatsoever over this group. The makeup of the Bureau is quite unique in that a sole Director, rather than a bipartisan commission, is the singular decision maker of the agency, and it doesn't even require approval by Congress for who that person is or the length of their term. Furthermore, the Bureau is not subjected to the congressional appropriations process, having guaranteed money from the Federal Reserve to fund the agency's existence.

How does that work? Well, they get a percentage of the revenue of the Federal Reserve that would normally come to the Federal Government and then be allocated. They get it before it comes to the Federal Government, so they are outside the control of an appropriations process. They have guaranteed money. Not only do they have guaranteed money, they have a guaranteed inflation factor built into their money. It is feasible that with enough inflation, they could control the entire revenue from the Federal Reserve. That funding source is more assured than Social Security. And if the agency is running amuck, Congress has no ability to use the appropriations process to bring oversight to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. That is a great name. It seems to protect it, even if that is not primarily what it seems to be doing. I am only picking on a very small portion of that with this bill.

You may be familiar with something called the transparent General Schedule for Federal employees, often referred to as the "GS scale." It is the primary way that the government ensures that Federal employee salaries are appropriate and reasonable. This pay scale, however, doesn't apply to the least accountable agency in the Federal Government—you guessed it, the CFPB.

At the CFPB, the Director has the sole discretion to determine employees' salaries. Government employees at the CFPB—if you want to call them government employees, because they are really outside any control by the government, either the executive branch or legislative branch, and it takes a court case to get it to the judicial branch—government employees at the CFPB receive some of the highest paychecks of all Federal workers. According to data my office obtained from the Office of Personnel Management and the CFPB itself, there were over 170 employees at the CFPB who were paid salaries in 2017 that ranged from \$180,000 to \$259,000. To put this in perspective, in 2017, the highest paid appointees in the White House were

paid salaries of \$179,000—\$1,000 less than the minimum of these 170 employees at the CFPB. Over 170 employees at the CFPB receive more pay than the highest paid White House staffers, and 102 employees of the CFPB make more in annual salary than any of our State Governors. A Supreme Court Justice is paid an annual salary of \$251,000. Six staff members at the CFPB were paid more than that, and there is no control, so it can go higher. It is based on what the Director approves. In 2017, approximately 47 employees had a salary higher than the Vice President's.

It is true that top executives at the big banks can make a hefty penny in their industry, but the whole of the American banking industry doesn't see this type of wealth. These are our community bankers and our credit unions and institutions that support Main Street America. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average bank employee salary is \$63,000. And guess who makes more than these bankers. Their regulators, like the CFPB.

Last year, Congressman SEAN DUFFY of Wisconsin and I introduced the CFPB Pay Fairness Act to rein in the CFPB's rates of pay. I am offering this bill as an amendment to the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. The amendment requires the Director of the CFPB to set the basic rate of pay in accordance with the GS scale—the same fairness scale that everybody else works under. The GS scale provides information to the public on the credentials of Federal employees, with each level requiring qualification standards, such as education and years of experience.

As it stands, the CFPB does not provide any qualification standards for its employees' pay, nor is it transparent to the American people or even the CFPB's own employees. This proved to be an issue when in 2016 the Government Accountability Office investigated allegations of discrimination at the CFPB. Thirty-three percent of the CFPB employee respondents to the GAO—Government Accountability Office—indicated they believed their pay was not commensurate with their skills, work experience, and education.

Because of the way the CFPB was created in the Dodd-Frank legislation that we are working on right now, Congress failed to impose the usual constitutional checks to rein in this behavior. Congress needs to bring accountability to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and we should start with the Bureau's lavish spending on employee salaries. This commonsense amendment would ensure that the Bureau is keeping employees' salaries in line with the regular government pay scale, which promotes transparency and equity in pay across the Federal Government.

There is a lot more that I could say about this Consumer Financial Protec-

tion Bureau, but I want to concentrate on the fact that they are paid substantially more than anybody else in government, and we have no control over it. There is only one person who does, and that is the one who gets the job as Director—which was taken to court since even the President can't fire that person, no matter which President it is. So this is just one of the things that make it an unusual organization.

From my experience, they aren't doing what they said they would do at the time that they said it needed to be created. Instead, they are harassing different businesses until these businesses pay a fine, and that fine goes into a slush fund for them that they can give out to ones that we would never approve for any money from the Federal Government.

They have this guaranteed revenue. In checking, I find out they are supposed to spend all of it. The Director can set the salaries and has very little firing capability to go along with that. But they are paid an inordinate amount compared to everybody else in government, including Supreme Court Justices, the Vice President, and other people who work around here. The highest paid people at the White House make \$1,000 less than the lowest paid of these 170 workers.

I hope people consider this amendment to bring a degree of fairness and transparency so we know what the agency is doing. It is only in the way of salaries, but that is a good starting place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the bill before us, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. This bill is a product of a multiyear, bipartisan process. It is the result of stakeholder input, multiple legislative hearings, a committee markup, and a committee report.

There are a lot of great provisions in this bill, but what I would like to focus on today is what this bill will accomplish for smaller financial institutions—our community banks and our credit unions—especially in the State of Nebraska. I also want to touch on the important regulatory relief included for small public housing agencies that are in Nebraska and all across this country.

Over the course of the past year, I received an overwhelming amount of positive feedback from people and businesses across Nebraska about this bill, but the outpouring of support from community banks and credit unions has been particularly notable. These institutions are the pillars of our local communities. They sponsor local Little League sports teams. They provide scholarship funds. They award grants to students.

The prosperity of America's small financial institutions is directly tied to the success of the communities they serve. These institutions, from Eastern Nebraska to the Panhandle, have shared with me their support for this bill we have before us today. For example, Lee Potts from Security Bank in Laurel, NE, wrote:

The bill is a step in the right direction to remove ill-fitting regulations on community banks. As a lender in my community, I am not against regulations in general, as there is a need for certain regulations. However, the regulatory spectrum has become so burdensome that it often has affected otherwise creditworthy borrowers in my community.

Brandon Luetkenhause from the Nebraska Credit Union League cited the positive effect this legislation will have on seniors in America's communities. He wrote:

This bipartisan, commonsense reform legislation will protect seniors from elder abuse, make mortgage processing easier and quicker, increase affordable rental housing in our communities, and help my credit union provide better service to members.

Under this legislation, well-managed, well-capitalized community banks with less than \$3 billion in total assets would qualify for an 18-month exam cycle that is currently only available for banks with less than \$1 billion in total assets.

Furthermore, the legislation allows banks with less than \$5 billion in total assets to use short form call reports in the first and the third quarters of the year. The quarterly call report community banks currently have to file comprises 80 pages of forms and 670 pages of instructions. Only a fraction of the information that is collected is actually useful to regulators in ensuring safety and soundness of these institutions. The minimal impact is far outweighed by the expense incurred and the staff hours dedicated to collecting it.

The legislation also increases the appraisal requirement exemption for rural mortgage portfolio loans from \$250,000 to \$400,000. This provision of the bill reflects that in rural markets, it can be hard to find an independent appraiser. They may live hours away, and it could take weeks for them to come and appraise a property. This slows down and adds cost to the transaction, where a bank has 100 percent of the risk associated with that loan.

Simply put, provisions like these in the bill help provide relief to Main Street lenders who did nothing to cause the financial crisis and have been unfairly burdened under Dodd-Frank.

For example, Alan Emshoff from Generations Bank in Exeter, NE, told me:

This bill is a solid step towards right-sizing regulations. As one of the smallest banks in Nebraska, reducing the regulatory burden will allow us to do what we do best, to serve our community through the making of loans to help start new businesses, finance agriculture, and put people in homes more efficiently and at a lower cost to the consumer.

... Even with reduced regulation, we will continue to respect the safety of our customers and provide all of our customers a safe and sound banking environment, just as we have for the past 80 plus years.

Steve Edgerton from Centrist Federal Credit Union in Omaha wrote me:

The increasing trend of regulation ultimately reduces the availability of products and services to credit union members, as well as increases the cost.

Clearly, any claims that this bill only provides relief to big banks are not true.

In addition to the great regulatory relief provisions for community banks and credit unions, I was very pleased to see provisions from my bill with Senator TESTER, the Small Public Housing Agency Opportunity Act, included in this legislation. Our bill would address the overwhelming administrative burden that has been placed on the roughly 3,800 small and rural housing authorities across the country, including the approximately 100 public housing agencies in the State of Nebraska. The provisions included from our bill will simplify the inspection and compliance requirements facing public housing agencies with fewer than 550 units.

Specifically, it would limit HUD inspections of housing and voucher units to once every 3 years unless a small PHA is classified as troubled. The less time Directors and employees of small public housing agencies are required to spend complying with unnecessary reporting and oversight demands, the more time they can spend improving the lives of their residents.

The bill we are considering today is good policy. It is a major step in the right direction, but there is more we can do.

Since 2013, I have called for Congress to consider changing the CFPB's leadership structure. For the past three Congresses, I have introduced legislation to change the leadership structure of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from a single Director to a multimember, bipartisan board or commission.

Although consumers and the industry have experienced some relief under Director Mulvaney, a problem remains—the Bureau's unaccountable leadership structure. A bipartisan board of directors would increase transparency, provide regulatory certainty, and guarantee input from multiple stakeholders with various points of view.

I do not view this as a partisan issue and neither do Americans. A poll in March of 2017 found that 58 percent of those surveyed support a bipartisan commission, including a majority of Republicans, a majority of Democrats, and a majority of Independents who were surveyed.

Given our success working together on this bill before us today, I hope some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle will consider joining

my bill so we can reform that structure of the CFPB.

I would like to close by thanking Chairman CRAPO and the other cosponsors of the bill for their hard work on this legislation. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. It is what our communities need to grow and to prosper.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the first three words of our Constitution are, "We the People." This is the mission statement of the United States of America. Our government was set up not to create a government by and for the powerful and the privileged but by and for the people of the United States and, as Jefferson put it, the government would reflect the will of the people. It is quite a different concept from many of the European governments that operated directly for the benefit of the best-off or the wealthy and well connected.

We have seen a corruption of the American Constitution. We have seen it turned on its head, with government implemented by and for the rich and powerful, time after time over this last year.

What did we see in 2017? We saw much of the year spent destroying healthcare for 22 million to 30 million Americans and increasing the cost of healthcare for everyone else—certainly not reflecting the will of the people—and then we saw a tax bill taking \$1.5 trillion from our children and our grandchildren and giving it to the richest of Americans, the largest bank heist in world history.

Well, now we have another assault on "we the people" government. S. 2155 undoes a lot of the work to create a financial system for America to thrive, for families to thrive, and restores the lack of regulation and high-leveraged bets that brought the economy down in 2007 and 2008.

When the economy came down, the wealthy and well-off did quite well. They picked up properties at pennies on the dollar, but who was hurt? The American people were hurt. The American workers were hurt. They lost their jobs. They lost their retirements. Certainly, they lost so much in terms of the financial foundation for their families. Yet here we are again. We seem to have forgotten that when you let the big banks rampage through our econ-

omy, you are setting the stage for another big mess—high-risk gambling on Wall Street, destroying Americans' financial lives, lost homes, lost jobs, and lost retirement savings.

When we passed Dodd-Frank, the principle was, never again will we let the Wall Street casino crash our economy. Well, "never" hasn't lasted very long.

In the bill before us, section 203 exempts financial institutions—smaller banks with assets under \$10 billion—from the Volcker rule. What was the Volcker rule? The Volcker rule was a firewall that said: Take deposits to make loans but don't engage in high-risk, high-leverage bets on the future price of stocks or the future price of currencies. Those are called derivatives, those bets on those future prices. Those are appropriate in a hedge fund. If somebody wants to compile money for millionaires and billionaires and make bets on the future prices, then go ahead and gamble in your hedge fund, but don't do it in our banks.

So now we have this bill that says: Well, let's open the door to reestablishing the Wall Street casino but just not on Wall Street; let's do it on our small banks. Well, what was bad and risky for big banks is bad for small banks. Should they put their money into loans to help the rural economy thrive or should they make big bets on future prices casino-style? This bill opens up small banks to being casinos. It is the wrong way to go.

Then there is section 401 on capital requirements. It takes enormously large banks up to \$250 billion in size and repeals the requirement for living wills. It repeals the requirement for annual stress tests to make sure the capital is truly being set aside and the bank is being operated in an appropriate fashion for a depository institution.

Former Deputy Treasury Secretary and Federal Reserve Governor Sarah Bloom Raskin said granting the Fed control for the stress test, rather than having them annually, is "legislative fool's gold." That is the expert talking about the foolishness of eliminating stress tests.

In addition, it lowers capital standards. So often I have heard folks come to this floor saying, "We don't need so much regulation. Let's just increase the capital standards," but this bill does the opposite. It impacts 25 of the 38 largest U.S. banks, which together hold \$3.5 trillion in assets. This is clearly a situation that creates enormous risks for our economy. Who will pay the price? Working America will pay the price. Build the bubble, burst the bubble, and the boom goes down on middle-class America.

Then there is section 402. Section 402 is related to globally systemically important banks. They are referred to by the initials GSIBs—globally systemically important banks. Then there are

custodial banks. Those banks received \$5 billion in Federal bailout money during the financial crisis. They want to escape the supplemental leverage ratio that was designed to decrease the risk. Each megabank has to have enough tier 1 capital to satisfy an SLR—a supplemental leverage ratio—but custody banks want relief so they don't have to hold as much common stock—common stock, which is tier 1 capital, but shoehorned into this are Citi and JPMorgan. CBO says the following: "There is a 50% chance that regulators would allow two other financial institutions—JPMorgan and Citibank, with combined assets of \$4.4 trillion—to adjust their SLRs under the terms in this bill." In other words, higher leverage ratios, lower capital, exactly the kinds of things that imperiled our economy previously, and yet that is right in the heart of this bill.

What about consumer protection? Let's turn to section 107, which grants exemption from key mortgage lending protections for the buyers of manufactured homes. Manufactured homes are put on a foundation and sold as regular homes. Then you have modular homes. This provision expands it to modular homes. It would reduce consumer protections of the part of the market that disproportionately serves low- and very low-income Americans and rural America. Do we really want to strip the consumer protections for lower income Americans and rural Americans when buying a home? No, we don't, which is why this provision should not be in this bill. It is why this provision is a bad idea.

One more section of the bill; that is, HMDA reporting—Home Mortgage Disclosure Act reporting.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau required expanded data reporting because it allows you to see where the rules might be being broken on predatory lending. It allows you to see where there might be an engagement in discriminatory lending. But this bill says that we are not going to get that data anymore. We are not going to get the data that would help us identify illegal redlining, for example, and that this exemption would apply to 85 percent of the reporting institutions that are covered by the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act.

Most of this information is data that is already collected. Reporting it provides an understanding about redlining, about discrimination, about discriminatory practices. If you don't have the information, those things get hidden. That is damaging to America's families.

That is quite a list of things that are wrong with this bill. This bill has been presented as remedies for small banks, but, as my colleagues just noticed from these items, what we see are the ripping aside of consumer protections and a whole lot that is being demanded by

the big banks that want less capital and higher leverage.

Let's do a bill for smaller banks. Let's understand that more flexibility is appropriate in rural areas. Let's observe that more flexibility in the types of mortgages might be appropriate in small banks in small communities where those loans are portfolioed. Democrats came forward with a whole list of these things to help small banks, but what do we have from our Republican leadership? A bill designed for Wall Street. A bill designed for Wall Street, for the wealthy and the well-connected. It is not designed to help ordinary Americans.

Ordinary Americans are plagued by the challenges of discrimination, and this makes it worse; or redlining, and this makes it worse; or predatory practices, and this makes it worse. They are also plagued by high-interest payday loans. What does this bill do to take on the 500-percent interest rates that every society across the globe has recognized are incredibly destructive, sucking people into a vortex of debt and destroying families? This body right here said that they are so destructive, we cannot allow these high-interest loans to be given to our servicemembers because they destroy our service families. Shouldn't we stand up for all of our families in America? If something is so predatory and so destructive to our service families that we say it is illegal, shouldn't we make those same loans illegal for everybody?

Do you see anything in this bill related to "we the people"? Very little. The "we the people" bill the Democrats put forward was rejected, and what we have is this Wall Street bill for lower capital, more leverage, more predatory practices. That is just not right.

I hold a lot of townhalls. I hold 36 townhalls a year, 32 of them in very red counties. Not one person in over 300 townhalls has come up to me and said: Get rid of the regulations on Wall Street because we want them to be able to do more low-capital, high-leverage bets and put our economy at risk. Nobody in America advocates building another bubble on high-risk leverage.

So what are we doing with this bill? What we are doing is making a mistake. We should defeat this assault on the effort to have a financial system in America that is designed to serve the mission of the United States, the "we the people" mission of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION CAPABILITIES ACT OF 2017

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for the happy task of moving a piece of bipartisan legislation that

has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. I am particularly pleased to be doing it in front of the Presiding Officer because the Presiding Officer and I and Senator HEITKAMP and others worked so hard on the Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage Act, which provides a means of encouraging carbon capture technologies to develop. This is a related bill that I joined with Senator CRAPO on to advance. Senator CRAPO has been our lead on this bill. The bill will encourage innovation in the nuclear industry. So it is a great pleasure for me to be here, and I am very honored that my distinguished colleague Senator CRAPO has joined me on the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 153, S. 97.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 97) to enable civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies by private and public institutions, to expand theoretical and practical knowledge of nuclear physics, chemistry, and materials science, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Crapo amendment at the desk be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 2104) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To modify provisions relating to the advanced nuclear energy licensing cost-share grant program)

On page 20, line 3, insert "in accordance with section 988 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352)" before the period at the end.

On page 20, strike lines 15 through 17.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 97), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 97

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION CAPABILITIES.

(a) NUCLEAR ENERGY.—Section 951 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 951. NUCLEAR ENERGY.

“(a) MISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out programs of civilian nuclear research, development, demonstration, and commercial application, including activities under this subtitle.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The programs carried out under paragraph (1) shall take into consideration the following objectives:

“(A) Providing research infrastructure to promote scientific progress and enable users from academia, the National Laboratories, and the private sector to make scientific discoveries relevant for nuclear, chemical, and materials science engineering.

“(B) Maintaining nuclear energy research and development programs at the National Laboratories and institutions of higher education, including infrastructure at the National Laboratories and institutions of higher education.

“(C) Providing the technical means to reduce the likelihood of nuclear proliferation.

“(D) Increasing confidence margins for public safety of nuclear energy systems.

“(E) Reducing the environmental impact of activities relating to nuclear energy.

“(F) Supporting technology transfer from the National Laboratories to the private sector.

“(G) Enabling the private sector to partner with the National Laboratories to demonstrate novel reactor concepts for the purpose of resolving technical uncertainty associated with the objectives described in subparagraphs (A) through (F).

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this subtitle:

“(1) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR.—The term ‘advanced nuclear reactor’ means—

“(A) a nuclear fission reactor with significant improvements over the most recent generation of nuclear fission reactors, which may include—

“(i) inherent safety features;

“(ii) lower waste yields;

“(iii) greater fuel utilization;

“(iv) superior reliability;

“(v) resistance to proliferation;

“(vi) increased thermal efficiency; and

“(vii) the ability to integrate into electric and nonelectric applications; or

“(B) a nuclear fusion reactor.

“(2) COMMISSION.—The term ‘Commission’ means the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

“(3) FAST NEUTRON.—The term ‘fast neutron’ means a neutron with kinetic energy above 100 kiloelectron volts.

“(4) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘National Laboratory’ has the meaning given the term in section 2.

“(B) LIMITATION.—With respect to the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the Sandia National Laboratories, the term ‘National Laboratory’ means only the civilian activities of the laboratory.

“(5) NEUTRON FLUX.—The term ‘neutron flux’ means the intensity of neutron radiation measured as a rate of flow of neutrons applied over an area.

“(6) NEUTRON SOURCE.—The term ‘neutron source’ means a research machine that provides neutron irradiation services for—

“(A) research on materials sciences and nuclear physics; and

“(B) testing of advanced materials, nuclear fuels, and other related components for reactor systems.”.

(b) NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 952 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16272) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 641(b)(1) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16021(b)(1)) is amended by striking “section 942(d)” and inserting “section 952(c)”.

(c) ADVANCED FUEL CYCLE INITIATIVE.—Section 953(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16273(a)) is amended by striking “, acting through the Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.”.

(d) UNIVERSITY NUCLEAR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING SUPPORT.—Section 954(d)(4) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16274(d)(4)) is amended by striking “as part of a taking into consideration effort that emphasizes” and inserting “that emphasize”.

(e) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CIVILIAN NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES.—Section 955 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16275) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (c) and (d); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) VERSATILE NEUTRON SOURCE.—

“(1) MISSION NEED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary shall determine the mission need for a versatile reactor-based fast neutron source, which shall operate as a national user facility.

“(B) CONSULTATIONS REQUIRED.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with the private sector, institutions of higher education, the National Laboratories, and relevant Federal agencies to ensure that the user facility described in subparagraph (A) will meet the research needs of the largest practicable majority of prospective users.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—As soon as practicable after determining the mission need under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed plan for the establishment of the user facility.

“(3) FACILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that the user facility will provide, at a minimum, the following capabilities:

“(i) Fast neutron spectrum irradiation capability.

“(ii) Capacity for upgrades to accommodate new or expanded research needs.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the plan submitted under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall consider the following:

“(i) Capabilities that support experimental high-temperature testing.

“(ii) Providing a source of fast neutrons at a neutron flux, higher than that at which current research facilities operate, sufficient to enable research for an optimal base of prospective users.

“(iii) Maximizing irradiation flexibility and irradiation volume to accommodate as many concurrent users as possible.

“(iv) Capabilities for irradiation with neutrons of a lower energy spectrum.

“(v) Multiple loops for fuels and materials testing in different coolants.

“(vi) Additional pre-irradiation and post-irradiation examination capabilities.

“(vii) Lifetime operating costs and lifecycle costs.

“(4) DEADLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, complete construction of, and approve the start of operations for, the user facility by not later than December 31, 2025.

“(5) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall include in the annual budget request of the Department an explanation for any delay in the progress of the Department in completing the user facility by the deadline described in paragraph (4).

“(6) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall leverage the best practices for management, construction, and operation of national user facilities from the Office of Science.”.

(f) SECURITY OF NUCLEAR FACILITIES.—Section 956 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16276) is amended by striking “, acting through the Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.”.

(g) HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTATION AND SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH.—Section 957 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16277) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 957. HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTATION AND SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH.

“(a) MODELING AND SIMULATION.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to enhance the capabilities of the United States to develop new reactor technologies through high-performance computation modeling and simulation techniques.

“(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall coordinate with relevant Federal agencies as described by the National Strategic Computing Initiative established by Executive Order 13702 (80 Fed. Reg. 46177 (July 29, 2015)), while taking into account the following objectives:

“(1) Using expertise from the private sector, institutions of higher education, and the National Laboratories to develop computational software and capabilities that prospective users may access to accelerate research and development of advanced nuclear reactor systems and reactor systems for space exploration.

“(2) Developing computational tools to simulate and predict nuclear phenomena that may be validated through physical experimentation.

“(3) Increasing the utility of the research infrastructure of the Department by coordinating with the Advanced Scientific Computing Research program within the Office of Science.

“(4) Leveraging experience from the Energy Innovation Hub for Modeling and Simulation.

“(5) Ensuring that new experimental and computational tools are accessible to relevant research communities, including private sector entities engaged in nuclear energy technology development.

“(c) SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall consider support for additional research activities to maximize the utility of the research facilities of the Department, including physical processes—

“(1) to simulate degradation of materials and behavior of fuel forms; and

“(2) for validation of computational tools.”.

(h) ENABLING NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION.—Subtitle E of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 958. ENABLING NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION.

“(a) NATIONAL REACTOR INNOVATION CENTER.—There is authorized a program to enable the testing and demonstration of reactor concepts to be proposed and funded, in whole or in part, by the private sector.

“(b) TECHNICAL EXPERTISE.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall leverage the technical expertise of relevant Federal agencies and the National Laboratories in order to minimize the time required to enable construction and operation of privately funded experimental reactors at National Laboratories or other Department-owned sites.

“(c) OBJECTIVES.—The reactors described in subsection (b) shall operate to meet the following objectives:

“(1) Enabling physical validation of advanced nuclear reactor concepts.

“(2) Resolving technical uncertainty and increasing practical knowledge relevant to safety, resilience, security, and functionality of advanced nuclear reactor concepts.

“(3) General research and development to improve nascent technologies.

“(d) SHARING TECHNICAL EXPERTISE.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary may enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Chairman of the Commission in order to share technical expertise and knowledge through—

“(1) enabling the testing and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactor concepts to be proposed and funded, in whole or in part, by the private sector;

“(2) operating a database to store and share data and knowledge relevant to nuclear science and engineering between Federal agencies and the private sector;

“(3) developing and testing electric and nonelectric integration and energy conversion systems relevant to advanced nuclear reactors;

“(4) leveraging expertise from the Commission with respect to safety analysis; and

“(5) enabling technical staff of the Commission to actively observe and learn about technologies developed under the program.

“(e) AGENCY COORDINATION.—The Chairman of the Commission and the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the following:

“(1) Ensuring that—

“(A) the Department has sufficient technical expertise to support the timely research, development, demonstration, and commercial application by the civilian nuclear industry of safe and innovative advanced nuclear reactor technology; and

“(B) the Commission has sufficient technical expertise to support the evaluation of applications for licenses, permits, and design certifications and other requests for regulatory approval for advanced nuclear reactors.

“(2) The use of computers and software codes to calculate the behavior and performance of advanced nuclear reactors based on mathematical models of the physical behavior of advanced nuclear reactors.

“(3) Ensuring that—

“(A) the Department maintains and develops the facilities necessary to enable the timely research, development, demonstration, and commercial application by the civilian nuclear industry of safe and innovative reactor technology; and

“(B) the Commission has access to the facilities described in subparagraph (A), as needed.

“(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Laboratories, relevant Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the capabilities of the Depart-

ment to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded experimental advanced nuclear reactors as described in subsection (b).

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall address—

“(A) the safety review and oversight capabilities of the Department, including options to leverage expertise from the Commission and the National Laboratories;

“(B) options to regulate privately proposed and funded experimental reactors hosted by the Department;

“(C) potential sites capable of hosting privately funded experimental advanced nuclear reactors;

“(D) the efficacy of the available contractual mechanisms of the Department to partner with the private sector and Federal agencies, including cooperative research and development agreements, strategic partnership projects, and agreements for commercializing technology;

“(E) the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the disposal of low-level radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, or high-level radioactive waste (as those terms are defined in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101));

“(F) the impact on the aggregate inventory in the United States of low-level radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, or high-level radioactive waste (as those terms are defined in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101));

“(G) potential cost structures relating to physical security, decommissioning, liability, and other long-term project costs; and

“(H) other challenges or considerations identified by the Secretary.

“(3) UPDATES.—Once every 2 years, the Secretary shall update relevant provisions of the report submitted under paragraph (1) and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the update.

“(g) SAVINGS CLAUSES.—

“(1) LICENSING REQUIREMENT.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary or any person to construct or operate a nuclear reactor for the purpose of demonstrating the suitability for commercial application of the nuclear reactor unless licensed by the Commission in accordance with section 202 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5842).

“(2) FINANCIAL PROTECTION.—Any activity carried out under this section that involves the risk of public liability shall be subject to the financial protection or indemnification requirements of section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210) (commonly known as the ‘Price-Anderson Act’).”

(i) BUDGET PLAN.—Subtitle E of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271 et seq.) (as amended by subsection (h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 959. BUDGET PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives 2 alternative 10-year budget plans for civilian nuclear energy research and development by the Secretary, as described in subsections (b) through (d).

“(b) BUDGET PLAN ALTERNATIVE 1.—One of the budget plans submitted under subsection (a) shall assume constant annual funding for 10 years at the appropriated level for the civilian nuclear energy research and development of the Department for fiscal year 2016.

“(c) BUDGET PLAN ALTERNATIVE 2.—One of the budget plans submitted under subsection (a) shall be an unconstrained budget.

“(d) INCLUSIONS.—Each alternative budget plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

“(1) a prioritized list of the programs, projects, and activities of the Department to best support the development of advanced nuclear reactor technologies;

“(2) realistic budget requirements for the Department to implement sections 955(c), 957, and 958; and

“(3) the justification of the Department for continuing or terminating existing civilian nuclear energy research and development programs.”

(j) REPORT ON FUSION INNOVATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report identifying engineering designs for innovative fusion energy systems that have the potential to demonstrate net energy production not later than 15 years after the start of construction.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall identify budgetary requirements that would be necessary for the Department of Energy to carry out a fusion innovation initiative to accelerate research and development of the engineering designs identified in the report.

(k) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 957 and inserting the following:

“957. High-performance computation and supportive research.

“958. Enabling nuclear energy innovation.

“959. Budget plan.”

SEC. 3. ADVANCED NUCLEAR ENERGY LICENSING COST-SHARE GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

(2) PROGRAM.—The term “program” means the Advanced Nuclear Energy Cost-Share Grant Program established under subsection (b).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a grant program, to be known as the “Advanced Nuclear Energy Cost-Share Grant Program”, under which the Secretary shall make cost-share grants to applicants for the purpose of funding a portion of the Commission fees of the applicant for pre-application review activities and application review activities.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall seek out technology diversity in making grants under the program.

(d) COST-SHARE AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall determine the cost-share amount for each grant under the program in accordance with section 988 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352).

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—A recipient of a grant under the program may use the grant funds to cover Commission fees, including those fees associated with—

(1) developing a licensing project plan;

(2) obtaining a statement of licensing feasibility;

(3) reviewing topical reports; and

(4) other—

(A) pre-application review activities;

(B) application review activities; and

(C) interactions with the Commission.

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

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to speak today on the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, or NEICA. This measure is the result of a strong bipartisan partnership among many Senators, including Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator RISCH, Senator BOOKER, Senator HATCH, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator DURBIN, along with myself and a number of other Senators who have worked with us on this legislation.

I want to give special thanks to Senator WHITEHOUSE, who is here with us today. He has been my tireless partner in this effort. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his hard work and the assistance of his staff. Sometimes, even on the easiest of legislation—and this is not in that category; this is a critical, strong piece that has taken a lot of attention—but sometimes it just takes a lot of work and effort and time. I appreciate Senator WHITEHOUSE's efforts to stick with us, as he actually helped move this ball forward as we have tried to get this across the finish line.

I also want to express strong thanks to Senator RISCH, who also deserves strong recognition for his tireless work to get this bill advanced.

This is a Senate companion to a House measure of the very same name, introduced by Representatives WEBER, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and LAMAR SMITH. We have been working together to get this bill passed for some time, and I am eager to work with my House colleagues to make sure that NEICA is enacted as soon as possible.

We all recognize that innovation within the nuclear industry must continue and must build on American preeminence in nuclear research and development. Having grown up in Idaho Falls, ID, I am a strong supporter of nuclear energy and the Idaho National Lab, which is a world leader in R&D and a key partner in sustaining our Nation's commercial nuclear power sector. The INL has been home to more than 50 one-of-a-kind nuclear test reactors. It has led innovation after innovation and breakthrough after breakthrough. The imagination, ingenuity, and hard work of the scientists at the Lab, along with the scientists at Argonne and Oak Ridge, ensure that the United States remains the leader in development and commercialization of nuclear power.

Today, many in the industry are focusing on what it takes to keep the current fleet of reactors alive and operational. Industry leaders are worried about the waste issues, the economics of operation, and navigating the requirements of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Understandably, many

are not focused on the future of nuclear power and what lies beyond the current generation of reactors.

Congress must find a way to help industry deal with the very real challenges that the current fleet faces. Congress must address the waste issue, and we must evaluate the costs and benefits of regulations that the government has placed on this industry. Many of the burdens on the nuclear industry are government-created, and so they must be government-solved. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee to provide sound solutions.

Congress can't ignore the challenges of the current fleet, but we must not allow these challenges to keep us from looking forward. The nuclear power industry in America is, for better or worse, increasingly paralyzed by government redtape.

Congress must lead in focusing government agencies toward preparing for the next generation of nuclear reactors. We should create an environment in which industry can grow and advance. If we don't, we will lose to foreign competitors as companies take their technologies and business overseas. This is happening already. Companies are increasingly going to places like China, Russia, South Korea, and India. These countries want to export nuclear technology and are investing heavily toward that goal. If we continue down our current path, these countries will take the lead in setting the rules on proliferation and safety in the advanced nuclear industry. I would prefer that America continue to lead in this area.

The Senate version of NEICA does four very important things to encourage innovation in advanced nuclear power.

No. 1, it directs the Department of Energy to carry out a modeling and simulation program that aids in the development of new reactor technologies.

This is an important first step in allowing the private sector to have access to the capabilities of our National Laboratories to test reactor designs and concepts.

No. 2, it requires the Department of Energy to report its plan to establish a user facility for a versatile reactor-based fast neutron source.

This is a critical step that will allow private companies the ability to test principles of nuclear science and prove the science behind their work.

No. 3, NEICA directs the Department of Energy to carry out a program to enable the testing and demonstration of reactor concepts proposed and funded by the private sector.

This site is to be called the National Nuclear Innovation Center, and it will function as a database to store and share knowledge on nuclear science between Federal agencies and the private

sector. The Senate version of NEICA encourages the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to work together in this effort. We would like to see the Department of Energy lead the effort to establish and operate the National Nuclear Innovation Center while consulting with the NRC regarding safety issues. We would also like the NRC to have access to the work done by the center in order to provide its staff with the knowledge it will need to eventually license any new reactors coming out of the center. If these reactors are ever to get to the market, the NRC must be able to understand the ins and outs of the science and work behind their development. The NRC needs the data in order to make data-driven licensing requirements.

No. 4, finally, it requires the NRC to report on its ability to license advanced reactors within 4 years of receiving an application.

The NRC must explain any institutional or organizational barriers it faces in moving forward with the licensing of advanced reactors.

NEICA is an important step in maintaining U.S. leadership in nuclear energy. It will enable the private sector and our National Labs to work together to create cutting-edge achievements in nuclear science. NEICA encourages the smartest, most innovative and creative minds in nuclear science to partner together to move the industry forward. This is a very exciting piece of legislation, and I look forward to working with my congressional colleagues to help American nuclear energy thrive today and prepare for the future.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it has been the Senator from Idaho whose leadership has driven this bill forward more than anything else, and I express my great appreciation to him for the opportunity to work with him to accomplish this success.

Like Senator CRAPO, I want to recognize our colleagues in this effort, Senators RISCH, BOOKER, DURBIN, and MURKOWSKI. I particularly thank Senator MURKOWSKI because she is the chair of the Senate Energy Committee, and she and Senator CANTWELL together cleared this bill, so we could bring it to the floor, and gave it the blessing of their committee.

I also thank Senator INHOFE from Oklahoma, who has been a strong supporter of our efforts at nuclear modernization, and I ask unanimous consent that a U.S. News & World Report editorial, which Senator CRAPO wrote with Senator INHOFE, Senator BOOKER, and me, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I thank Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee—the home of Oak Ridge, the

other National Lab that focuses so much in this area—who has been a constant advocate and has been very interested in all things nuclear for a very long time.

This bill, the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, has been so well summarized by Senator CRAPO that I will not go back and resummairize it, but I will emphasize that it is our intention that it provide an opening for nuclear innovation into next-generation, third-generation, even fourth-generation nuclear technologies, with the goal that we can compete effectively internationally to be the producers of clean and safe nuclear energy, with the hope—and at this point I think it is somewhere between a hope and a prospect—that this technology will develop to the point where we can begin to look at our existing nuclear waste stockpile and use these new technologies to turn hazardous and dangerous nuclear waste, for which we have no present plan, into something that is valuable and can help create energy. We need to work on how to price that because, at present, there is no mechanism that provides any value to someone who might have a solution to that problem for lifting this cost off of our books. But that is something Senator CRAPO, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator INHOFE, Senator BOOKER, Senator MURKOWSKI, and I can continue to work on. That, I think, is a really valuable prospect in all of this, and it is one of the things that moves me to do this.

Let me close by thanking Senator CRAPO for also working with me on NEIMA, the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act, which we are still working to get passed but which we hope will get passed. It parallels very nicely with this legislation because what that would do is get the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to update its permitting process to accommodate new technologies.

When I am asked what I mean by that, I use a very rough example, which is that the current light water reactor permitting process makes about as much sense as the test for these new technologies as taking a Tesla and having it pass the DMV carburetor requirements. It is a new technology; it requires a different testing regime. Our other bill would authorize and require the NRC to update and work with the innovation community to make sure that when these things are ready for permitting, permitting is, in fact, ready for them.

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

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 11, 2016]

THE NEW NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE

(By Jim Inhofe, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mike Crapo and Cory Booker)

There has been a groundswell of activity and investment in recent years surrounding

advanced nuclear reactors. A dynamic group of nuclear engineers and scientists are chasing the future—and racing against China and Russia—to develop innovative reactor designs. These technologies hold enormous promise to provide clean, safe, affordable, and reliable energy, not just for our country, but for the world. These innovators have a vision for the future, and they charge ahead backed by more than \$1 billion in private capital. The future of nuclear energy is bright.

Some would argue that we have been here before. In 2005, Congress passed incentives to encourage a “nuclear renaissance” amid high natural gas prices. The industry stood ready to build a large number of modern light-water reactors, improved versions of existing nuclear technology.

But reality fell short of expectations and the result was only five new nuclear plants, with a price tag of \$8 billion to \$10 billion each. Now, in an age of low-cost natural gas, it is becoming harder for the nearly 100 existing reactors to compete. The Energy Information Administration calculates that electricity generation from a new nuclear plant would cost about 25 percent more than electricity from a new gas-fired combined-cycle power plant. This is causing some nuclear energy companies to scale back their operations. For instance, Chicago-based Exelon Corporation announced just a few weeks ago that it would shutter two of its nuclear plants in Illinois in the coming years, citing pressure from natural gas as a major factor.

So this begs the question: Will this new wave of innovative reactors live up to its promise? Investors think so, and so do we. For starters, these advanced reactors differ significantly from their predecessors. Rather than water, they use materials like molten salt or noble gasses as coolants. Most are considered “walk away safe,” since they are designed to use the laws of physics, rather than equipment, to prevent accidents. If a natural disaster strikes, for instance, these reactors would simply shut down, substantially reducing the threat of a meltdown. Many are designed to be small and modular, so they could be built in factories with construction costs that are a fraction of their big, custom-built forerunners. Small reactors could also be plugged into future micro-grid systems without requiring extensive transmission infrastructure. Some of these new reactor technologies could actually help to reduce the amount of nuclear waste we’ve accumulated through the years by using that waste as fuel. That could alleviate a major challenge facing the industry. And of course, all of this would be achieved without any air pollution.

Nuclear energy used to be just another partisan issue. Thankfully, that is changing. The four of us represent opposite ends of the political spectrum in the Senate, but we are all pulling in the same direction, backing various pieces of legislation to promote advanced nuclear innovation and development. One bill would open the doors of our national laboratories to entrepreneurs and their innovative new companies to develop public-private partnerships with the potential to bring new ideas to market. Another bill looks to build a sensible regulatory framework to allow diverse advanced reactor concepts to go from the drawing board to reality.

These bills have been moving through Congress and are garnering broad bipartisan support. The Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act recently passed the Senate as part of a bipartisan energy bill, on an 87-4

vote. The Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act was approved by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on a 17-3 vote.

Though we may come to this issue for different reasons, our end goal is the same. We want to promote new technologies that provide cleaner energy and get them built by and for Americans. We can’t take a back seat as China and Russia build test reactors and lure away American innovators. This new nuclear renaissance is primed for success. It has broad bipartisan support in Congress, serious private capital investment and the ability to help address environmental challenges—all while encouraging American innovation. The world is heading into a new age of nuclear energy, and the United States must lead the way.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, with great appreciation to Senator CRAPO, the distinguished Senator from Idaho who has been my leader and partner in all this, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I have been very encouraged by the reaction of my colleagues and their support for the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act over the last few days.

We have heard many stories about how the regulatory burden on our financial institutions has had a direct impact on Main Street. Yesterday, Senator MORAN talked about the ranchers who couldn’t get a loan because they lacked collateral in an emergency. Senators HETTKAMP and PERDUE explained the benefits of relationship banking and the advantage of lending based on a personal knowledge of the customer. Senator CORKER talked about Dodd-Frank’s unintended consequences for small financial institutions. Senator TESTER discussed bank consolidation and the real impact it has had on communities in Montana. Senator DONNELLY went through the various important consumer protection items included in this bill. Senator KENNEDY also talked about some of the important consumer protection provisions and about the lack of access to credit for small businesses in Louisiana. Senator WARNER spent a good amount of time defending this robust bipartisan bill against its critics and some of the false information being shared about the bill.

Today, we have heard even more Senators come to the floor with similar

stories and expressions of similar sentiments about the need to help free up our small community banks and credit unions around this country from the overpowering burdens they are facing right now in the regulatory world.

Many of my colleagues who are not on the Banking Committee have asked if they could have the time and opportunity to speak about the bill, as well, and we will see them coming to the floor, as we have started to see today, to discuss these kinds of issues. Senators MCCONNELL, CORNYN, PORTMAN, LANKFORD, and others have been very supportive of these efforts to enact pro-growth, pro-jobs legislation.

We also heard from the bill's critics yesterday. But the resounding message from Congress was that our constituents have asked for regulatory relief and consumer protection and economic growth, and we stand ready to deliver it.

We and our neighbors have noticed that many of our community financial institutions have closed their doors over the last decade. In fact, we have seen almost no new community financial institutions chartered or new branches being opened over the last few years.

These financial institutions, of all sizes and forms, provide critical services in our communities. They help businesses manage operations, help entrepreneurs get funding to start their businesses, help families buy a home, help all of us save for our kids' educations, and help us deal with financial emergencies.

Community financial institutions are the pillars of towns and communities across America, particularly in rural States like my own, Idaho. They have certain advantages compared with their larger counterparts, operating with an understanding and history of their customers and, therefore, a willingness to be flexible.

Unfortunately, increased regulatory burdens and one-size-fits-all regulations have limited their ability to help customers. The operating landscape of these institutions has changed dramatically over the last few years, and community banks and credit unions across the country have struggled to keep up with the ever-increasing regulatory compliance and examiner demands coming out of Washington.

I regularly hear from small banks and credit unions in Idaho about how one-size-fits-all regulatory approaches are impacting their businesses and product offerings and hindering their ability to serve their communities.

For example, Koreen Dursteler from the Bank of Commerce in Idaho Falls, a small bank with just over \$1 billion in assets, has written about the avalanche of regulation over the past 8 to 10 years. Due to excessive regulations related to qualified mortgage loans and the cost of hiring extra compliance

staff to help keep up with additional regulation, her bank has had to stop offering consumer mortgages and real estate loans. That is a big deal. This is not an isolated incident. I hear stories like that all the time.

Another example: Val Brooks works at Simplot Employees Credit Union, which serves Canyon County, ID. She noted that Simplot has long been proud to serve this area, where some folks come from lower income households and may be underserved. Simplot worked to obtain the necessary education, compliance certification, and licensing standards to better serve its customers and the community. However, after the CFPB increased already burdensome mortgage regulations, such as the qualified mortgage and HMDA, Simplot credit union had to make the very difficult business decision to stop offering mortgage loans altogether. It was just too cost prohibitive and resource-draining.

When these small financial institutions are not able to offer certain products within the communities they serve, it is a direct hit to the citizens of Idaho and to all of our States.

To be absolutely clear, it is not that folks are against all regulation, but rather, to the people outside of Washington, it seems as if regulatory changes are made without much thought as to how they will truly affect customers and financial providers. As policymakers, we have a responsibility to diligently and frequently study the state of our economy, our regulatory framework, and how these things are impacting our communities and citizens, including people's access to financial services.

We must encourage regulations that not only ensure proper behavior and safety for our markets but also are tailored appropriately to the size and risk type that is being regulated. This means making sure the burden on financial institutions is not so large that consumers, businesses, and our communities are deprived of financial services and suffer as a result.

This has been an important issue to Members on both sides of the aisle. Congress has held numerous hearings in prior years exploring many of these issues, including a series of hearings in the Banking Committee in 2015. Then, in March of last year, the Banking Committee issued a request for legislative proposals that would promote economic growth. We held bipartisan hearings and briefings and meetings with stakeholders across the spectrum, vetting potential ideas for right-sizing the regulatory dynamics. We began the process by holding a hearing on the role of financial companies in fostering economic growth, which included former regulators, stakeholders, and the chief economist of the AFL-CIO.

At our next two hearings, we examined proposals that would tailor exist-

ing laws and regulations to ensure that they are proportionate and appropriate for small financial institutions and midsized regional banks. Then, in June, the financial regulators provided feedback on their Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, or EGRPA, report and the proposals discussed in previous hearings. As a result of this process, we introduced the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, which is now S. 2155.

I repeat that often there are those who say we are dismantling the regulatory system. This legislation focuses on the smallest financial institutions in our country. The legislative system that was put into place was marketed as being aimed at Wall Street excesses, but I held a townhall meeting when we were debating this legislation on Main Street in Boise, ID, and said then that although the justification for some of these regulations was focused on Wall Street, the crosshairs were on Main Street. Unfortunately, that has turned out to be all too true. Large banks have profited tremendously in the last 6 to 10 years. Small banks and credit unions have suffered dramatically. We have lost many of our banks and credit unions across this country. As I indicated earlier, very few new ones have started up because they simply cannot meet the compliance burdens of being required to meet regulatory requirements that are designed, in the first instance, for huge banks.

What we need is a regulatory system that recognizes there is a difference between a community bank or a credit union in a small community and a megabank on Wall Street that is doing its business globally. We need to have our regulatory system tailored so the risk posed by a particular financial institution is taken into consideration in the regulations applied. That is what this legislation seeks to accomplish. Like I said at the outset, I am very glad we have had broad support for this.

I would like to take a minute and go over some of the specific provisions in the bill. The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act is aimed at rightsizing regulation for financial institutions, including community banks and credit unions, making it easier for consumers to get mortgages and to obtain credit.

As I have often said, the real victims of what I am talking about are not really the community banks and the credit unions but the people, the small businesses—those who need to have access to credit and need to have the ability to get a loan to purchase a house or to start a small business or to expand a small business or other important needs.

This bill also increases important consumer protections for veterans, for senior citizens, victims of fraud, and

those who fall on tough financial times. The provisions in this bill will directly address some of the problems I frequently hear about from the financial institutions in Idaho. Community banks and credit unions are simple institutions focused on relationship lending and have a special relationship providing credit to traditionally underserved and rural communities where it may be harder to access banking products and services or to get a loan.

Dodd-Frank instituted numerous new mortgage rules and complex capital requirements on community banks and credit unions that have hindered consumers' access to mortgage credit and lending more broadly. On July 20, 2016, the American Action Forum attempted to estimate the number of paperwork hours and final costs associated with the Dodd-Frank rules. In total, the forum estimated that the bill had imposed more than \$36 billion in final rule costs and 73 million paperwork hours as of July 2016.

To put those figures into perspective, the costs are nearly \$112 per person, or \$310 per household. Additionally, it would take 36,950 employees working full time to complete a single year of the law's paperwork based on agency calculations.

Our bill is focused on providing meaningful relief to community banks and credit unions, helping them to prudently lend to consumers, home buyers, and small businesses.

I have more I want to say. I want to take a brief break right now, and I will come back in a few minutes.

At this point, I yield back my time until I return.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

The legislation we are considering today has been portrayed as modest, not that big of a deal, that it doesn't matter that much, that it is something narrow to help community banks and credit unions and regional lenders like the three institutions in my State—Huntington, Key, and Fifth Third—all pretty much things I support. Unfortunately, that is really not the only thing this bill does.

I tried for months to work with Chairman CRAPO, whom I respect and admire—and I mean that. People say those things on the floor, but I actually mean that. I tried for months to work with Chairman CRAPO on a commonsense package of reforms aimed at community banks and credit unions and small and mid-sized financial insti-

tutions. We had a lot of agreement on that. Then the creep began. Then the expansion began. Then leaking into this process were all kinds of help for all kinds of bigger banks.

These are the local lenders that we want to help to fuel home ownership and small business in our community. I get that. These are the community banks in Lakeview, Cleveland, Milford, Parma, and West Chester, the banks that we lost when the big banks crashed the economy a decade ago.

I know people in this institution—especially those who get lots of money from Wall Street—like to blame Dodd-Frank for so many community banks going out of business, but it was really what led up to the crash, including the crash, that caused so many community banks to go out of business.

Here is how this place works. I think most Senators understand this. If they don't understand it, they don't want to understand it. When the big banks and when Wall Street and the lobbyists—and there are hundreds of them for big banks in this town—when the big banks spot some legislation crawling through this body, when they see a bill in front of the Senate or the House that might help some small institutions, do you know what they do? They see an opportunity. They see an opportunity to grab more for themselves. It is the history of this country. We know what happens whenever Congress listens to Wall Street and listens to the big banks and Wall Street and the big banks get their way. Inevitably, the economy stumbles or, worse, crashes because we have given too much to the big banks. They put too much risk on the system, and in places like my ZIP Code in Cleveland, OH—ZIP Code 44105—my ZIP Code in 2007 had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States of America. That is not because people in my ZIP Code have anything about them that they deserved this; that is just what happens in an economy when the big banks get too powerful, when Wall Street runs Congress, and we see what happens.

Now we see Wall Street moving in, trying to grab more for themselves despite the fact that some of these big banks wouldn't exist today without taxpayer bailouts of a decade ago. We remember what happened. This body bailed out the biggest Wall Street banks, which didn't deserve it, to be sure. But we didn't bail out the big banks—at least most of us didn't—to help the big banks, we bailed out the big banks to help Main Street, to help the economy.

So these Wall Street lobbyists have swarmed into this institution to grab more for themselves despite the fact that they wouldn't exist today without taxpayer bailouts, despite the fact that Wall Street banks are now making record profits, and despite the fact that the tax cut this body just jammed

through Congress—81 percent of the recent tax cuts from the end of last year, 81 percent of that bill over time will go to the richest 1 percent of the people in this country.

You have taxpayers bailing out the big banks, then you have this huge tax cut go to the big banks, and now they want more. They want this legislation that will weaken rules and make the big banks even more profitable. They always want more. Understand, it is American history. It is what we have seen in the last 10 years. It is what we have seen since the Great Depression seven decades ago. The big banks always want more, and it is always at the expense of everyone else. This legislation gives them exactly what they want.

Listen to this. Not long ago, a bank lobbyist—one of the top bank lobbyists working for the American Bankers Association—said: We don't want a seat at the table, we want the whole table. They are about to get it under this bill—the whole table.

This bill weakens stress tests for the 38 biggest banks in the country, including Wells Fargo, Bank of America, JPMorgan Chase, HSBC, Citigroup. You know these banks. These banks in the aggregate are almost half of the assets of banks in our country—banks that together took \$239 billion in taxpayer bailouts. Now, \$239 billion—that is 239 thousand million dollars. That is a whole lot of money.

Stress tests are the best tool we have to make sure another bailout never happens again. This bill weakens these tests. It changes the requirement from present law—semi-annual stress tests. So instead of having these tests twice a year, they are now going to be periodic. What does periodic mean? Well, we don't know. The bill doesn't define it. Former Fed Governor Dan Tarullo, the architect of many of these post-crisis reforms, has called this provision “quite vague, with little indication of what kind of test is contemplated for these banks.”

We also know something else. When Congress writes vague laws using words like “periodic”—vague, versus specific—“semi-annual”—when Congress writes vague laws, bank lawyers, who are really good, very smart, and very well paid, can drive a truck right through those loopholes. We know that.

Do we really want to give the current crowd in charge more leeway—a White House that looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives? We are talking about an administration stocked with former bank executives. Are these really the people we want to give the opportunity—are these the people we want to trust to interpret vague words like “periodic”?

This legislation weakens oversight of foreign banks operating in the United States, many of which have a track

record of breaking U.S. laws. Think about that. We are not only deregulating a number of these large banks in this country, we have singled out that we are going to give a break to foreign banks.

Let me talk about the rap sheet of some of these foreign banks. Santander, a Spanish bank, illegally repossessed cars from members of the military who were serving our country overseas. Think about that. We have somebody from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base who is serving overseas. Santander repossessed her car or his car when he or she was serving overseas. Yet we are going to give a break to that Spanish bank?

Deutsche Bank, the President's favorite—President Trump, the businessman Trump's favorite bank—Deutsche Bank manipulated the benchmark interest rates used to set borrowers' mortgages. So we are going to give Deutsche Bank a break? We are going to deregulate part of Deutsche Bank?

Barclays, a British bank, manipulated electric energy prices in Western U.S. markets. My constituents don't live in those areas that were hurt by that, but a whole lot of people do in this country.

Credit Suisse, a Swiss bank, illegally did business with Iran. I know what the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Arkansas, thinks about Iran. Yet we are going to vote—he is going to vote—all of us are going to vote for a bill that rewards a Swiss bank that illegally did business with Iran? Is that the message we want to send? I guess it is.

UBS, another Swiss bank, sold toxic mortgage-backed securities. It goes on and on and on. We are rewarding these foreign banks that have defrauded our constituents and our government and clearly don't have much regard for U.S. law, and we are going to give them breaks.

Again, we have heard from Governor Tarullo, we have heard from former Fed Chair Volcker, we have heard from former Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Sarah Bloom Raskin on this. They don't want to loosen foreign bank oversight, and they are joined by Republican former regulators, like Sheila Bair, Tom Hoenig, and others, who think this bill doesn't make sense.

The bill also requires the Fed to further weaken the rules just for the dozen or so banks with \$250 billion in assets. It subverts the Fed's independence; it subjects the Fed to pressure from FSOC and the Treasury Secretary—the same Treasury Secretary who foreclosed on 40,000 Americans at OneWest. We are giving more power to help the banks to a Treasury Secretary who, before he became Treasury Secretary, played a major role in foreclosing 40,000 homes, including hundreds of homes in my State of Ohio. It opens the door for more lawsuits when banks try to avoid the rules they don't like.

The former Commodities Futures Trading Commission Chair, Gary Gensler, wrote to the Senate last week that this change “may subject the government to additional lobbying and possible litigation from individual banks seeking specially tailored rules.”

Back about 10 years ago, when President Obama signed the Dodd-Frank law, that same day, the top financial service lobbyists in this town—the day Obama signed the bill, the day the President signed Dodd-Frank, the head of the top financial services lobbyists in this town said: Well, folks, now it is halftime.

What did he mean? He meant, OK, we lost the first half, but we are going to go to work to do everything we can to block and misinterpret and reinterpret and eventually scale back and repeal as much of this law as we can. They went to work on the agencies. This is the culmination of their efforts. They now have a pro-Wall Street majority in the Senate, a pro-Wall Street majority in the House, a President whose office looks as if it is a retreat for Wall Street executives, and they are ready to go to help Wall Street, even though—I don't know when; maybe the Senator from Massachusetts knows—1 year, 2 years, 5 years, 10 years, 20 years from now, it makes a bailout more likely.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office recently said that this bill will make a bailout more likely and that it is a \$672 million giveaway to Wall Street.

This bill makes another change to big bank rules that now stops them from borrowing more money than they can afford. The New York Times described this provision as weakening rules “aimed at keeping banks from being able to take big risks without properly preparing for a disaster.” Just let that sink in, because Ohio families know how bad a disaster can be; “aimed at keeping banks from being able to take big risks without properly preparing for a disaster,” isn't that what we want?

Don't we want bank regulators, don't we want bank rules to stop the big banks from taking risks that could end up in a disaster? As I said, my neighborhood knows what disaster is. As I said, in 2007, there were more foreclosures in my ZIP Code in the first half of that year than in any other ZIP Code in America.

Families in my State were hurt by this. People lost retirement accounts, people lost their homes, people lost their jobs, plants closed—all of that.

Wall Street lobbyists came out of that last disaster just fine. I am thinking that probably none of them had their houses foreclosed on. I know that nobody who tanked the economy went to jail. So folks in New York and Washington, most of them are doing fine.

They might not appreciate what disaster means when we talk about the economy, but Ohio families who lost their homes and their life savings know what that means.

Do you know what else? For 14 years in a row, there were more foreclosures in my State each year than there were the previous year. OK, that is a statistic, and maybe you don't know any of those people. Well, the fact is that every time that happened, people lost their possessions. Their lives were turned upside down. Their kids may have had to go to a different school. They probably lost their family pet because they couldn't afford it. It was one thing after another for those families. We don't think much about them.

Here is how to think about this rollback. Bank capital requirements are like a dam that keeps the risks inside the bank. It keeps the risks from flooding out into the rest of the economy. So if the banks are going to take risks, you want to keep them contained in the bank so that only the bank gets hurt, but this bill punches a hole in that dam by loosening the rules on five of the biggest banks. Once the dam starts to leak, it is more likely that bad decisions by those banks could spill out and harm taxpayers and retirees and bank customers.

These banks have \$5 trillion in combined assets. Should we feel safer with a weaker dam around a potential \$5 trillion flood of banking assets? If that weren't bad enough, we have a team of lapdogs at our financial agencies who think this bill is just a starting point. Think about who they are. I don't come to this floor and attack individual people, but I do come to this floor and point out the history of some of these regulators.

Secretary of the Treasury Mnuchin was a bank executive who ran a bank that foreclosed on thousands of customers, many of them unfairly or possibly illegally. One of his top people, Mr. Otting, is the new Comptroller of the Currency. Mulvaney is the new Director of the Consumer Bureau, and he thinks the Consumer Bureau shouldn't even exist. Those are the kinds of regulators we see. Randal Quarles is the head of supervision at the Federal Reserve, and he said as late as 2006 or 2007 in the Bush Treasury Department that things were fine in our country. These are the people we have entrusted to do the regulations, to hold back this dam that they have weakened legislatively. They are the ones who are charged with holding it back.

If we want to help community banks, let's help community banks. Let's not try to sell it the same way this majority sold the tax cut bill. They said that it was a tax cut for the middle class, but 81 percent of the benefits over time went to the wealthiest 1 percent, so it wasn't a tax cut for the middle class any more than this was a bill for community bankers.

The community bankers will get some help. I want to do that. I know Senator WARREN wants to, and I know all of us on the floor want to do that, but that is not what this bill really does. If we want to help community banks, let's help community banks. If we want to help credit unions, let's help credit unions. If we want to help regionals like Fifth Third and Huntington and KeyBank in my State, let's help the regionals like that.

Why do the biggest banks have to say: Give me more; give me more; give me more.

Let's take Wells Fargo. What has Wells Fargo done to deserve an ounce of leniency? This is a bank that created more than 3.5 million fake accounts, including hundreds in my State. It is a bank that illegally forced unwanted auto insurance on its customers and charged homeowners improper fees to lock in their mortgage rates. So why would we want to help them with this bill? Just last week, the bank disclosed yet more problems with its money management unit. So why do we want to help Wells Fargo with this bill? It is a bank that outsources jobs. Six hundred call center jobs have been sent overseas by Wells Fargo just in the last year. So why do we want to help that bank in this bill? For those lucky enough to keep their jobs, it is a bank that mistreats its workers, punishing them with a high-pressure sales culture, and some of them lost their jobs as a result. Yet this bank, like the other big banks—they want more, more, more. I don't know why, but this Congress wants to give it to them, apparently.

What has the Senate done to respond to Wells Fargo's misbehavior? Well, first of all, Republicans a couple of months ago passed a \$1.5 trillion—that is 1,000 billion—tax cut, and one of the biggest beneficiaries was Wells Fargo. What did they do with that money? They say that they gave a little bit to employees. They say that maybe they will invest a little more. What they really did—they announced that they are going to buy back \$22 billion of stock this year. When they buy back stock, the price of the stock goes up, and executives and shareholders are enriched. So the stock buyback investment—the \$22 billion they are spending to buy back stock—is 288 times what Wells Fargo will spend on pay raises for its workers. So it gives a little bit to its workers. Whatever it gave to its workers, multiplied by almost 300—that is what the executives and the shareholders are going to get. So why are we doing favors for Wells Fargo in this bill?

I don't mean to pick only on them. It is not just Wells Fargo.

What has HSBC done to deserve special treatment? Since the crisis, the Department of Justice prosecuted the bank for laundering money on behalf of

the Sinaloa drug cartel. In the midst of an addiction crisis, we are going to reward a bank that illegally laundered money for a drug cartel?

Why are we doing any favors for Citigroup? Last month, Citigroup announced it had systematically overcharged almost 2 million of its customers on their credit cards.

Why are we giving a single ounce of help to these big banks? They are repeat offenders. Not only are they repeat offenders—and as we help these big banks in this bill, we say we want to help the community banks—these repeat offender big banks are banks that compete with our local lenders and probably will put more and more of them out of business as these bigger banks get more and more powerful.

The four biggest banks held 6 percent of industry assets in 1984. In 1984, 33 years ago, 34 years ago, the four largest banks in the country held 6 percent of industry assets. Today, the four largest banks hold 51 percent of industry assets. So what we are doing is giving them more—what we are doing is giving them more. Think about that. Thirty-plus years ago, the biggest banks held \$1 of every \$16 of banking assets. Now they hold \$1 out of every \$2. Think about how many community banks these big banks have been able to gobble up. This bill will lead to more consolidation, more concentration, fewer customer choices, less investor choice.

One article from American Banker talking about this bill said it could “kick-start bank mergers and acquisitions.” What that means in plain English is that big banks will get bigger. So we are helping the big banks get bigger, and we are falling over ourselves this week to help these banks because they just don't have enough. But we are doing nothing for consumers this week. We are doing nothing for workers, nothing for those tipped employees that the Department of Labor is cheating out of their tips and basically legalizing wage theft. We are doing nothing for middle-class workers. We are doing nothing for those supervisors making \$30,000, \$40,000 a year, who are having their overtime taken from them. We are doing nothing for them.

If we are trying to help our community banks and credit unions, why give favors to their big competitors—to the big banks?

This isn't the weather. We can do something about the challenges Ohio faces. We can stop these crises that tear apart families and entire communities. We can do that by stopping this bill, to begin with.

Don't take my word for it. The Congressional Budget Office says that the risk of another financial crisis is very low right now because of the rules we passed in Dodd-Frank. Just dwell on that for a moment. They said that the

risk of another financial crisis right now is very low because of the rules we passed in Dodd-Frank, but they went on and said that this bill increases the risk of another bank failure and another bank bailout.

All of my particularly conservative friends in this body always talk about how they hate bailouts. They are always against bailouts. They are against bailouts for middle-class families. Their voting record doesn't really show that they are against bailouts for the rich, but that is a whole other subject.

This bill that we are about to vote on this week, this bill that the banking industry is salivating over, this bill that they just can't wait to pass and get to the President's desk—and we know all the advisers sitting around the President, all the people in the Oval Office, all the people in the Cabinet room are all whispering in the President's ear: Mr. President, you are going to sign this bill, and this is going to be great.

The President said in his campaign: We have to go after Dodd-Frank. All the big bankers in the country know this is going to be a great thing.

We are spending all this time doing this to help the big banks but, again, nothing for workers, nothing for middle-class employees, nothing for consumers, nothing for infrastructure—all the things we ought to be doing.

I am just not willing to ask taxpayers to take that gamble of increasing the chances of another bank bailout. We don't have to. We could amend this bill just to help the small community banks and credit unions that we all agree should be helped. We could amend this bill in a modest way to help the regional banks that have generally been good actors in this equation. I am offering amendments this week that would do just that.

We don't have to give the big banks more just because they come here, just because they have the best lobbyists, just because they ask for it. We don't have to be at their beck and call. Let's do this right this week.

I yield the floor.

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

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to commend Senator BROWN for leading the fight to oppose rollbacks for Wall Street banks. He has been tireless in the fight on behalf of Ohio families and on behalf of families all across this country, and I thank him very much for his work.

This is a tough fight. This week, nearly 10 years to the day after we first discovered that big banks crashed our economy, Washington is about to take many of those same giant banks off the government watch list. I doubt that this makes any sense to any of the millions of Americans who experienced

firsthand the economic horrors of the financial collapse. Oh, but it makes perfect sense in Washington, where swarms of lobbyists seem to have the power to erase politicians' memories.

The Senate is debating a bill that would roll back the rules designed to protect consumers and prevent another economic meltdown. Yesterday I talked about how this bill scraps a lot of important consumer protections for American families buying homes. In addition to squeezing consumers, this bill also loosens our hold on some of the very same giant banks that wrecked our economy.

Ten years ago, a bunch of enormous banks got giant bailouts, while American consumers got a punch in the gut. The excuse in Washington was, well, these banks were so interconnected with one another and with the overall economy that the failure of one could bring down the rest of the system too. Too bad, they said, we have to bail them out. Individual families, however, could be crushed underfoot; they weren't big enough to be worth saving by Congress.

Congress passed a huge bailout, but to keep this from ever happening again, Congress decided to put the small number of American banks that control more than \$50 billion in assets—this is about 40 of the largest banks in the country—on a watch list. Those banks would be subject to tougher Federal oversight and would be subject to some stronger rules to stop them from bringing down the economy again. A small bank in Adams, MA, would be regulated one way, and a giant bank, with offices around the country and around the globe, would get a much closer look. That makes real sense.

If this bill passes, Washington will scrap those rules for 25 of those enormous banks. Under this bill, a bank that controls up to a quarter of a trillion dollars in assets and has offices around the country and around the globe will follow the same rules and regulations and have the same oversight as a tiny little bank in Adams, MA. That is great if you are a quarter-of-a-trillion-dollar bank but not so great for anyone else.

This bill isn't about restrictions on asset measures and investments. It is not about appropriate leverage ratios and proprietary trading. It is about keeping hard-working American families from getting crushed by another financial crisis. It is about a Congress that isn't here to do the bidding of quarter-trillion-dollar banks. It is about a Congress that is supposed to be working for the American people.

Right after the financial crisis, before I ever thought about running for the Senate, Congress put me in charge of an independent panel that was supposed to police the bailout money. We held hearings around the country to

talk to people who had been punched in the gut by the financial crisis.

I will never forget one witness I met at a hearing in Las Vegas. His name was Mr. Estrada. He was a father of two little girls, and he wore a jacket over his T-shirt. He had on a red U.S. Marine Corps baseball cap. He and his wife both worked. They stretched their budget to buy a home that would get their girls into a good school, and the house was right across the street from their school. He was very proud of his house. When payments on their mortgage jumped, Mr. and Mrs. Estrada fell behind. He tried to negotiate with the bank, thought that the bank had arranged a settlement, and then, poof, the house was sold at auction.

"So at the end," he said, the bankers "tell me that I have fourteen days to get my children out of the house."

Mr. Estrada explained what happened next:

My six-year-old came home the other day with a full sheet of paper with all of her friends' names on it. And she told me that these were the people that were going to miss her because we were going to have to be moving. And I told my daughter, I says, "I don't care if I have to live in a van. You're still going to be able to go to this school." I'm trusting in God that we're going to be able to be back into this home again.

Several times while he testified, Mr. Estrada paused to try to get control of himself, and his pain and desperation seemed to push all the air out of the room.

I am here today to ask who in the U.S. Senate will fight for Mr. Estrada? Who will fight for the millions of other Americans who paid the price because big banks gambled with the economy and lost? I am here to fight for everyone who in 2008 had to tell their children: Pack up your toys because we have to move. I am here to fight for every American who worked a lifetime, did everything right, saved for retirement, only to watch their savings go up in smoke. I am here to fight for every small business owner who had to shut their doors after years of long hours and sweat and hope and tell their employees not to come back the next day. I am here to fight for those hard-working employees who lost their jobs. I am here to fight for all those Americans who kept fighting through the crisis, no matter how hard it was, who kept pushing, and who, years after corporate profits rebounded and the banks were riding high on Wall Street again, finally got their families back on their feet. They are who I am fighting for.

On the other side, there is an army of bank lobbyists who are fighting for some of the biggest banks in this country. Now, that is not what they are telling you. They will tell you: Oh, this isn't about big banks at all. The lobbyists swear up and down that they are fighting for small banks—banks that aren't risky and didn't cause the financial crisis—and they will make up all

sorts of false claims about how the banks are struggling under these new rules, never mind that banks of all sizes are literally making record-breaking profits. Give me a break.

This bill is about goosing the bottom line and executive bonuses at the banks that make up the top one-half of 1 percent of banks in this country by size—the very tippy, tippy top. Your local community bank doesn't have a quarter of a trillion dollars in assets. Your local community bank doesn't own the naming rights to a stadium or a ballpark. This bill is designed to help a handful of giant banks that together control more money than the nominal GDP of more than 100 independent nations on planet Earth. These are not small banks, and the idea that these wealthy and powerful banks need Congress to step in and protect them from having to follow some commonsense rules would be downright laughable if it weren't so dangerous.

How big and important are these banks to the financial system? Just look at what happened in 2008. During the financial crisis, some of the very same big banks that will be deregulated by this bill sucked down nearly \$50 billion in taxpayer bailout money. That is taxpayer money—money that could have gone to building roads or building bridges or building schools or medical research, but that money instead went to propping up big, failing banks. Now the Senate wants to turn loose those big banks again.

It is not just the bailouts. Banks with less than a quarter of a trillion dollars in assets helped cause the financial crisis in the first place. Remember Countrywide? In its 2006 annual report, right in the heart of the housing boom, Countrywide reported that it had \$199 billion in assets, which would put it right smack in the middle of the pack of banks that would be taken off the watch list.

Countrywide made billions of dollars by scamming consumers. At its peak, it was the biggest mortgage lender in the country. It was also a subprime specialist—an expert on trapping people into tricky loans that they didn't understand and couldn't afford. Countrywide was obsessed with making as many loans as possible and squeezing out the competition. They gobbled up fees and downpayments and then sold those risky loans before they blew up. Wall Street gobbled up those loans, packaged them, and sold them on down the line just as quickly as Countrywide could make them.

How could this happen? How could it happen? One reason is the Fed had been really easy on Countrywide. In fact, Countrywide was allowed to pick its own regulator—the Office of Thrift Supervision, which cuddled up so close to these banks that it was supposed to be policing that after the financial crisis, Congress actually abolished the regulator.

Eventually, Bank of America bought the bank at a bargain price, and its owners lost money on the Countrywide deal. Poor Bank of America. Of course, that was nothing—nothing—compared to what people with retirement accounts lost when their investments tanked. It was certainly nothing like what Mr. Estrada and his little girls suffered because banks like Countrywide pushed off mortgages with hidden fees or exploding payments on their little family.

Countrywide's scam mortgages were one of the main causes of this financial crisis. If Countrywide were still around today, this bill would make it easier for them to escape government oversight, and that is just plain reckless.

We know banks of this size can help bring down the financial system. We know banks of this size demand billions of dollars in taxpayer bailouts when things go wrong. That should be the end of the conversation, but it isn't, not here in Washington.

Consider this: The banks that are being deregulated under this bill have done nothing—nothing—to earn our trust and deference since the financial crisis. Instead, these banks have engaged in breaking the law left and right. Let's talk about a few of them.

Take SunTrust. SunTrust has \$208 billion in assets and so would be deregulated under this bill. They would be cut loose. In 2014, SunTrust agreed to pay \$320 million to settle claims that it misused bailout money that was supposed to help distressed homeowners. The law enforcement agency that led this investigation said that the bank literally took homeowners' applications to modify their mortgages, tossed them in a room, and ignored them. There were so many applications that the floor in that room buckled under the weight of the documents. Think about that. They got almost \$5 billion in taxpayer bailout money, they promised to help homeowners, and then they just tossed application forms for that help onto a pile that was so big that it made the floor buckle. And now this Congress is offering to help loosen the oversight on that bank.

How about Santander Bank. Santander has \$132 billion in assets. They could be cut loose by this bill. Less than a year ago, Santander was nabbed by the attorneys general of Massachusetts and Delaware for funding auto loans it knew its customers couldn't repay, using paperwork they knew was doctored—pretty brazen fraud. Now this Congress is offering to help loosen oversight on Santander as well.

Then there are the financial institutions that have been caught discriminating against customers.

Ally Financial has \$164 billion in assets. They would be cut loose by this bill. In 2013, Ally Financial paid \$98

million to settle charges that it discriminated against minority borrowers in providing auto loans. The scam was actually pretty straightforward: Charge African Americans and Latinos more than White people. The scale was huge—235,000 non-White borrowers on average paid 200 to 300 bucks more than White borrowers with similar credit profiles. Now this Congress is offering to help loosen oversight of this bank as well.

Then there are the banks that cheated investors. Barclays U.S. has \$175 billion in assets. They could be cut loose by this bill. In 2015, Barclays was among the handful of banks that were charged record fines by the Federal Reserve for manipulating foreign exchange markets. Barclays traders colluded with traders from other banks to share intel and to push the market up or down in whatever direction profited them, and now this Congress is offering to help loosen oversight on Barclays.

Last year, the Fed caught BNP Paribas USA in the same game. BNP Paribas has \$146 billion in assets, and they could be cut loose by this bill. Now Congress is offering to help loosen oversight on BNP Paribas.

Finally, there are the banks that got caught violating sanctions. The Bank of Tokyo Mitsubishi has \$155 billion in assets. They could be cut loose by this bill. In 2013, the Bank of Tokyo Mitsubishi settled with the New York Department of Financial Services for \$250 million over charges that it cleared tens of thousands of transactions. DSF estimated that the bank wired more than \$100 billion to countries that were under U.S. sanctions, including Iran, Sudan, and Burma. The bank specifically tried to evade sanctions by telling employees to leave destination information out of the wire instructions of money going to those countries so they could fool the regulators. Now this Congress is offering to help loosen oversight on the Bank of Tokyo Mitsubishi.

Let's pause on this one. Washington thinks this bank needs less oversight. A year after it got caught funneling money to dangerous regimes and then trying to cheat rather than fix the problem, a State banking regulator was so alarmed by this that they actually put an independent monitor inside the bank to keep an eye on them. Now Republicans and Democrats have decided this is a bank we can trust.

This is nuts. These are banks that taxpayers bailed out 10 years ago. They have cheated customers, cheated communities, cheated markets, and endangered our national security, and still Republicans and Democrats are joining together to loosen oversight over these banks.

So what is this all about? What is it really all about? You will not hear this coming from the supporters of this bill,

but it is the truth. It is about letting these banks snap up smaller banks. It is about more consolidation in the banking industry. It is about goosing banking profits and expanding executive bonuses.

It sure as heck is not about increased lending. These banks are sitting on mountains of cash that they could lend at any time. Just look at their profits. BB&T made more than \$2.25 billion. SunTrust pocketed a cool \$2.3 billion. M&T clocked in at \$1.3 billion. I could go on and on.

In fact, instead of lending more money, these banks have been plowing their massive earnings into stock buybacks. Just last month, M&T Bank announced it was spending an additional \$745 million to repurchase stock. A few weeks later, Fifth Third authorized buying back \$3 billion in stock. Every single one of those dollars could have been put to new small business loans or it could have been put to home mortgages. Instead, they went to goosing the banks' stock price and putting bigger bonuses in executives' pockets. Does anyone really think that if the banks have even more money to burn they will completely change course and pour that money into lending? To ask the question is to answer the question.

These banks aren't exactly acting like they are starving for cash, at least not when they send their executives' paychecks. In 2016, the head of Regions made \$14 million all in. The CEO of Huntington, almost \$9 million, not including almost another quarter of a million dollars that the company spent to cover the CEO's personal use of its jet. The CEO of Keycorp made \$7.1 million. The CEO of CIT Group made the same—up from \$3.2 million the previous year.

That is not all. The good times are rolling at these banks. Zions Bank held a swanky party to kick off the Sundance Film Festival this year with a cute little hot chocolate bar. American Express just opened a shiny new regional headquarters building which cost \$200 million.

If this law passes and if these bankers, sitting around a shiny new table in their gorgeous new headquarters, decide to gamble just a little bit more, just like they did in the lead-up to the financial crisis, regulators may not even know it. If lying back in their plush seats of their corporate jets they cook up some kind of risky, complicated investment that nobody understands until after it goes bad, regulators probably will not catch it in time. If their bets fail, these more dangerous banks are more likely to crumble and more likely to bring the rest of the economy with them.

This is madness. This is greed run wild. These rules have kept us safe for almost a decade, even as the same banks have chomped at every regulation and tried to evade every rule. Now

Washington is about to make it easier for the banks to run up risk, make it easier to put our constituents at risk, and make it easier to put American families in danger, just so the CEOs of these banks can get a new corporate jet and add another new floor to their shiny corporate headquarters.

Despite everything they have already done to cheat their customers and endanger the financial system, those big banks will always have their advocates here in Washington. What about Mr. Estrada, and what about the millions of working Americans like him who want Washington to think about them for a change? Mr. Estrada can't afford to hire a lobbyist and he can't cut a \$1,000 campaign check and he can't host a fundraiser at a DC steakhouse. The result, it seems, is that every Republican in this Chamber—and far too many Democrats—will lie down with the banks and ignore Mr. Estrada and his two little girls.

We should be working for people like Mr. Estrada and not for the big banks. Mr. Estrada earned it; the big banks did not.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the reason “I came to speak on the floor [right now is to talk] about an issue that many in Washington would prefer to ignore; that is, [the] climate changes that are being caused by our carbon pollution.”

That is how I began these speeches, with that sentence, on April 18, 2012, from this desk. I have returned week after week to try to make sure there would not be silence in the Senate on the climate crisis. This is my 199th weekly foray; next week will make it an even 200.

Back on that April Wednesday in 2012, debate about climate change had all but died in Congress. Just a few years prior, the House of Representatives had passed the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill, led by our colleague, now the Senator from Massachusetts. In this body, Republican colleagues had openly acknowledged the existence of climate change and called for legislative action to cut carbon emissions. Since John Chafee, climate change had been a bipartisan concern.

In 2010, came the Supreme Court's disastrous *Citizens United* decision, which allowed the fossil fuel industry to unleash limitless dark money on our elections. The polluters' money and threats cast a shadow across any Re-

publican who might work on carbon pollution, and it ended that bipartisanship.

When I gave that first speech, even the White House had thrown in the towel on climate change, after letting Waxman-Markey die on the vine. You couldn't get them to put the words “climate” and “change” in the same paragraph, at least not until the President engaged on this issue in his speech in June of 2013. Washington had gone dark on climate.

I knew I couldn't match the financial muscle of the big polluters, but I believed if anything was going to change around here, we would need to shine a little light on the facts and on the sophisticated scheme of denial being perpetrated by the polluters. I decided to put at least my little light to work, and I started these speeches.

The last 6 years, unfortunately, have offered no shortage of bad climate news and dubious milestones. This chart shows the 4 hottest years ever recorded have occurred since I began giving these speeches. Global warming is, of course, driven by the buildup of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.

When I gave the first “Time to Wake Up” speech in April 2012, the concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere was 396 parts per million. Today, it is at 408. It has never been so high in the history of the human species. It is not just the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere that has been rising. So has the sea, as warming seawater expands and glaciers melt, making our coasts—particularly in my Ocean State—ever more vulnerable to flooding and storms. The oceans are becoming more acid, as ocean water reacts chemically with the heightened carbon concentration in the atmosphere.

During the 6 years I have been giving these speeches, the United States has experienced more and more extreme weather events, many of which scientists tell us are linked to climate change: from deadly storms, including 2012's Hurricane Sandy and 2017's Harvey, Irma, and Maria, to California's record drought and wildfires, to temperatures so warm in the Alaskan Arctic that the computer algorithms thought the thermometer had broken.

In 2017 alone, the string of U.S. extreme weather disasters—six major hurricanes, wildfires in the West, catastrophic mudslides, temperature records breaking all over the country—caused well north of \$300 billion in damage and killed more than 300 people. The last 6 years provide us with a menacing preview of things to come.

Scientists, including scientists at all of our home State universities, say these changes are driven by carbon pollution. Our national security leaders warn of the increasing danger of international strife caused by climate change, as well as the threat to U.S. military facilities and force readiness.

Faith leaders urge us to protect creation and those less fortunate than we are, led by Pope Francis, who, on this, has been magnificent. The insurance and credit rating industries, whose business models depend on accurate and responsible assessment of risk, warn us, as do major American corporations and leading investors—folks who can't let climate politics interfere with their bottom lines. I have spoken about them all.

I also visited States across the country to see for myself and to talk to people firsthand—folks who know climate change is real because they see it where they live, because they study it. In North Carolina, business leaders were organizing to protect the local coastal economy from climate change and associated sea level rise. In South Carolina, tide gauges in Charleston were up over 10 inches since the 1920s. In Georgia, I went out on the water with a clammer who showed me how changes in climate are hurting his livelihood. In Florida, the Army Corps of Engineers officials in Jacksonville gave a dire presentation of what the sea level rise portends for the Sunshine State. In Ohio, I saw the ice cores from faraway glaciers that record our looming climate catastrophe.

In Utah, the ski resorts fear climate change will ruin their “greatest snow on Earth.” I know the Presiding Officer takes pride in Utah's greatest snow on Earth. In Pennsylvania, child health specialists from the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia see climate change worsening children's asthma. In Iowa, Des Moines Water Works was busy preparing the city for more frequent and severe climate-driven flooding. In Arizona, they are changing the staffing for emergency responders facing summer temperatures the human body cannot sustain. New Hampshire is forecasting that its State bird may no longer be seen as its range moves ever northward out of New Hampshire on our warming planet.

I traveled on to Texas, Iowa, Nebraska, Delaware, and more. I brought stories to this floor from every corner of the country, hoping colleagues would heed the warnings from their own home States, to match what I was hearing from Rhode Island, from Rhode Island's coastal towns and scientists and fishermen: “Sheldon, it's getting weird out there,” I was told. “It's not my grandfather's ocean.”

Many Democratic colleagues joined me to discuss the changes they see in their home States, including 30 colleagues who held the floor all night long in 2014.

In July of 2016, 18 Senators and I took to the Senate floor for days to expose the fossil fuel-funded front groups that were behind the campaign to deny climate science and stymie legislative action. There is a whole carefully built apparatus: phony-baloney front groups

that are designed to look and sound like they are real; messages honed by public relations experts to sound like they are truthful; scientists on the fossil fuel payroll whom polluters can trot out as needed.

This industry-fueled misinformation campaign has been a theme of these speeches. I relayed the findings of researchers who study the flow of money through the climate denial network and the journalists who uncovered Exxon's coverup of what they knew of the climate dangers. I compared the fossil fuel polluter playbook to the fraudulent tactics of the tobacco industry to bury the truth about the health effects of cigarettes.

I listened to conservative economists and offered market-based solutions. Back in March 2013, I described the market failure of carbon pollution's not being baked into the price of the product. Market economics doesn't work when corporations can just offload their costs onto the general public. It is called a negative externality in economics jargon, and we see it all around us in storm-damaged homes and flooded cities, in drought-stricken farms and raging wildfires. The big oil companies and the coal barons have offloaded those costs onto society.

Virtually every Republican who has thought the climate change problem through to a solution comes to the same place: put a price on carbon emissions; let the market work; and return the revenues to the American public. This concept is supported by a who's who of former Republican Cabinet officials and Presidential economic advisers. I listened, and, in November 2014, I introduced with Senator SCHATZ the American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act to establish an economywide fee on carbon dioxide, return all of the revenue to the American public, correct the market failure, promote energy innovation, and, of course, dramatically reduce carbon pollution.

I have seen over the years of these speeches that the landscape is shifting. The Senate has actually held votes that show that a majority here believes climate change is real, not a hoax, and is driven by human activity. It took years, but I guess that counts for progress around here.

Outside of Congress, the Paris Agreement in 2015 committed the nations of the world to keep global warming below 2 degrees Celsius by reducing carbon emissions. America's part was the Clean Power Plan—to reduce carbon emissions from the power sector by one-third by 2030 from 2005 levels.

Automakers adopted new fuel economy standards for cars and light trucks in 2012. Vehicles would get nearly 55 miles per gallon by 2025, saving consumers billions of dollars while eliminating billions of tons of carbon emissions.

The EPA issued new rules in 2016 to limit the flaring of methane—a much

more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide—at oil and gas wells, and the Obama administration helped negotiate the Kigali Amendment to phase out the use of hydrofluorocarbons, which have powerful greenhouse gas heat-trapping properties in the atmosphere. Secretary Kerry convened wildly successful international oceans conferences, which are still ongoing and are scheduled for years ahead, to address the warming and the acidification of the seas.

In sum, up through 2016, even if Congress had been trapped in fossil fuel muck, the United States had still been making slow but steady progress on climate policy. Then Trump was elected President, and he decided to see if he could reverse all of this.

He announced that he would withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement. He put the three stooges of fossil fuel—Scott Pruitt, Ryan Zinke, and Rick Perry—in charge of climate policy. Trump completely forgot his and his family's own words from a full-page New York Times advertisement in 2009, calling climate change “irrefutable” and portending “catastrophic and irreversible consequences.” That was Donald Trump and his family in 2009.

As bad as the news became coming out of Washington, we saw action around the country to give us some reason for optimism. The leadership void left by the Trump administration was filled by State and local governments, businesses, academic institutions, and faith organizations which pledged to honor the Paris Agreement. California and Washington State joined with Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico to announce a plan to put a price on carbon that would reach virtually up and down the entire west coast of the Americas.

Over management opposition, BlackRock, the great investment firm, helped force ExxonMobil to report its climate risk to its shareholders. Moody's announced it will start using climate risk in rating the bonds of coastal communities. Companies like Microsoft and Unilever adopted an internal carbon price to help them reduce the carbon intensity of their operations.

At heart, this is a battle of truth versus lies, and courts are a good forum for the truth. California municipalities as well as New York City have sued fossil fuel companies, under State law, over the huge adaptation costs they will have to bear from sea level rise and extreme weather. The State attorneys general in Massachusetts and New York are pursuing a fraud investigation into what ExxonMobil has been covering up about its fossil fuels.

So there you have it. Over the last 6 years, we are ever more aware of the accelerating pace of climate change and ever more aware of the terrible

threat that rising seas, increased temperatures, and more frequent extreme weather events pose. It has become harder and harder for the fossil fuel industry and the web of front groups and Trump administration officials who do its bidding to claim there is nothing to see here, folks, that it is all a hoax, and to move along.

Yet, despite all of the information and all of the evidence, this great institution—the U.S. Senate—continues to sit silent, paralyzed by the threats of retribution that come from the fossil fuel lobby. When this started, I had hoped we would never get to 100—let alone 199—of these speeches. We ought to have solved this years ago. It is a disgrace that we haven't, and it is a disgrace as to why we haven't. If we remain as ineffective as we have been during the last 6 years, we will have failed ourselves and all future generations.

America deserves better than this. A city on a hill, with the eyes of the world upon it, can ill afford to ignore such a problem—worse still when the reason is one all-powerful industry that demands obedience. America deserves better. The countries and people around the world who rely on and look to American leadership deserve better. At long last, it is time for us to wake up here and meet our responsibilities.

NUCLEAR INNOVATION BILL

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee has come to the floor. While she is here, may I thank her for her work in clearing the nuclear innovation bill that Senator CRAPO and I passed into law this afternoon by unanimous consent. The chairman's work, along with the ranking member's, in clearing that bill was essential to getting it passed, and she was a cosponsor and a critical force in getting it done. I am grateful to her.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and congratulate him. I recognize him and Senator CRAPO, as well, for their efforts.

I think, as we look to those energy solutions that can take our country and our planet to a place that is better, that demonstrate a truly greater environmental stewardship through the uses of clean energy, one should almost immediately look to the benefits that nuclear is able to provide for us.

In my coming from a fossil-producing State like Alaska, people often ask, if I were not someone in Congress, would I be a supporter of nuclear. I truly believe that when it comes to our energy portfolio and those that will allow us to have a balanced approach to our energy and our energy solutions and when we are talking about the affordability, the accessibility, the diversity of supply, and the security of supply,

you must also include and emphasize the clean energy supply.

What the Senator from Rhode Island continues to repeat is worth repeating. Focusing on how we move ourselves to a cleaner energy environment is something we have had opportunities to visit and is something to which I am committed. So I look forward to finding those areas of balance.

REMEMBERING JIM BALAMACI

Mr. President, I am here this afternoon for a brief few moments to pay tribute to an Alaskan whom we lost just within the past 2 weeks.

My State is a State that is well known for the strength of its nonprofit sector, and we lost one of our leaders of that sector—a very special person who was beloved by many. He was a gentleman, a friend, by the name of Jim Balamaci. Jim was the president and chief executive officer of Alaska's Special Olympics. He unexpectedly passed away at the age of 63.

This Sunday, I will be going home and will join with thousands who will fill the Alaska Airlines Arena on the University of Alaska Anchorage campus to pay tribute to Jim and to celebrate his contributions to the Special Olympics. Jim was really a giant in the Special Olympics, both at the local level and at the national level.

I think it is most fitting that the celebration of Jim's life will occur during the weekend of the Special Olympics Alaska Winter Games. This will provide an opportunity for the many Special Olympians, the coaches, the volunteers—I am actually going to be there to help pass out awards—and for so many of us whose lives have been touched by Jim's inspiration to gather together to show our love and our admiration for, again, a truly great man.

Being born in Alaska affords one a certain quantum of bragging rights when it comes to leadership, but truth be told, when the history of Alaska post-statehood is written, it is people like Jim who came from somewhere else and chose to make Alaska their home—their lives will be remembered for making Alaska the extraordinary and very special place that it is. Jim really fit that bill.

Our NBC affiliate in Anchorage, KTUU, said: "If there was ever an Alaskan who wore his heart on his sleeve, it was Balamaci."

In a 2017 interview with KTUU, Jim explained what makes Alaska so special in words that show how significant a figure he will be remembered as. He said: "We build our communities, we build our state, and we build our friendships." That in a nutshell really explains the DNA of post-statehood Alaska. Jim absolutely got it, and I think that is one of the reasons he has earned a place in history, as well as in our hearts.

Jim was born in Bridgeport, CT. He was active in sports. He was active in

church. He entered a pretheology program at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary in Yonkers, NY. He was concurrently a student at Iona College in nearby New Rochelle. He graduated from Iona in 1976.

A year after graduation, Jim left the suburbs of New York City to pursue his Alaskan adventure, his Alaskan dream. He moved north. He settled in Kodiak—pretty remote, not on anybody's road system. He worked in commercial fisheries there. He was a carpenter and teacher, and he kind of did it all. That is when he began his career, his lifetime of volunteer service.

He began volunteering in the Special Olympics in 1979, and shortly thereafter, he moved into coaching. He was selected as president and CEO of Special Olympics in Alaska in 1996. Back in 1996, there were about 400 athletes around the State. Jim grew that universe of athletes of Special Olympians. Alaska's Special Olympics community today includes some 2,000 athletes, and I can tell you, they are all friends of Jim's.

In a career as rich as Jim's, it might be difficult to identify just one or two experiences that were truly exceptional, but I would bet that Jim would probably say that he was most proud of the 2001 Special Olympics World Winter Games that were hosted in Alaska. We had over 3,000 athletes from 80 countries who participated in the event. Eunice Kennedy Shriver, who, of course, is the founder of the Special Olympics, reportedly told Jim that it was the best World Winter Games in Special Olympics' history. That was substantial praise from the founder of the Special Olympics.

Up until the last visit I had with Jim here in Washington, DC, Tim Shriver, who is also an extraordinary individual working within the Special Olympics, has been there with Jim when they come to Washington to visit with me.

Another capstone experience occurred in 2014 with the completion of the Special Olympics Alaska Athlete Training Center and Campus. I will tell you, this is a phenomenal facility. It is really a one-of-a-kind facility. It is 28,000 square feet. It has a facility center, an indoor track, and a multipurpose sports court. It has a kitchen where the athletes learn about nutrition. It was built at a cost of about \$7 million. It remains one of the world's only dedicated training centers for developmentally disabled athletes. I have had occasion several times a year to be able to go out to their games. They have field hockey inside. The games they are able to participate in year-round in a place like Alaska—to have this training facility is absolutely exceptional and unparalleled.

When we think of the Special Olympians, we typically tend to think of younger athletes, but as young Special Olympians age, they still remain Special

Olympians. Jim saw this. We had so many conversations where he was talked about just the demographic, the aging population that we are seeing among our Special Olympians and those who are developmentally disabled. He said that we cannot not be thinking about their future as well.

Jim was truly a pioneer. He worked in developing the Aging Unified Athlete Program with Special Olympics leaders across the country to ensure that developmentally disabled athletes live long and healthy lives, focusing on lifetime learning but really making sure that at all ages, there is engagement.

Jim had an extraordinary heart, a big heart, a warm personality. He was just so loved. I cannot convey it enough. He was loved by not only those within the community of the Special Olympics but within the broader Alaskan community at large. I certainly saw that this fall when the torch run was being put on, which is a partnership with our law enforcement, along with our Special Olympians—again, a coming together of a community to provide support for one another.

Jim could motivate and charm with the best of them. You need look no further for evidence of that than to be out at a place called Goose Lake in Anchorage, AK, the third week of December. Jim Balamaci is a guy who could get thousands of Alaskans—literally thousands of Alaskans—to jump into a hole in a frozen lake in December to raise money for the Special Olympics.

If you have never dressed up in costume to jump into a hole—this is not something where you can wade out to get your feet wet and say: I have done the polar plunge. This is a polar plunge where you go into that hole and you are swimming in a frozen lake, and it is December. I was out there in December. Jim Balamaci reminded us that we were all there "freezin' for a reason," and that reason was to help the Special Olympics and Special Olympians. He was an extraordinarily special person to so many of us.

On behalf of my Senate colleagues, I send my condolences to Jim's mother Frusina. She visited him often during his 40-year Alaskan adventure. We send our condolences to his sister and brother and to all those who were touched by Jim's kindness and generosity.

Alaska and our Special Olympians across the country are better because of Jim Balamaci.

With that, Mr. President, I thank you, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

All postcloture time has expired.
The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.
The motion was agreed to.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2155) to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

S. 2155

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—IMPROVING CONSUMER ACCESS TO MORTGAGE CREDIT

Sec. 101. Minimum standards for residential mortgage loans.

Sec. 102. Safeguarding access to habitat for humanity homes.

Sec. 103. Exemption from appraisals of real property located in rural areas.

Sec. 104. Home Mortgage Disclosure Act adjustment and study.

Sec. 105. Credit union residential loans.

Sec. 106. Eliminating barriers to jobs for loan originators.

Sec. 107. Protecting access to manufactured homes.

Sec. 108. Property Assessed Clean Energy financing.

Sec. 109. Escrow requirements relating to certain consumer credit transactions.

Sec. 110. No wait for lower mortgage rates.

TITLE II—REGULATORY RELIEF AND PROTECTING CONSUMER ACCESS TO CREDIT

Sec. 201. Capital simplification for qualifying community banks.

Sec. 202. Limited exception for reciprocal deposits.

Sec. 203. Community bank relief.

Sec. 204. Removing naming restrictions.

Sec. 205. Short form call reports.

Sec. 206. Option for Federal savings associations to operate as covered savings associations.

Sec. 207. Small bank holding company policy statement.

Sec. 208. Application of the Expedited Funds Availability Act.

[Sec. 209. Mutual holding company dividend waivers.]

Sec. 2[10]09. Small public housing agencies.

Sec. 21[1]10. Examination cycle.

Sec. 21[2]11. National securities exchange regulatory parity.

Sec. 212. *International insurance capital standards accountability.*

Sec. 213. *Budget transparency for the NCUA.*

Sec. 214. *Making online banking initiation legal and easy.*

TITLE III—PROTECTIONS FOR VETERANS, CONSUMERS, AND HOMEOWNERS

Sec. 301. Protecting consumers’ credit.

Sec. 302. Protecting veterans’ credit.

Sec. 303. Immunity from suit for disclosure of financial exploitation of senior citizens.

Sec. 304. Restoration of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009.

Sec. 305. Remediating lead and asbestos hazards.

Sec. 306. *Family self-sufficiency program.*

Sec. 307. *Rehabilitation of qualified education loans.*

TITLE IV—TAILORING REGULATIONS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Sec. 401. Enhanced supervision and prudential standards for certain bank holding companies.

Sec. 402. Supplementary leverage ratio for custodial banks.

Sec. 403. Treatment of certain municipal obligations.

TITLE V—STUDIES

Sec. 501. Treasury report on risks of cyber threats.

Sec. 502. SEC study on algorithmic trading.

Sec. 503. GAO report on consumer reporting agencies.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY; COMPANY; DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION; DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION HOLDING COMPANY.—The terms “appropriate Federal banking agency”, “company”, “depository institution”, and “depository institution holding company” have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(2) BANK HOLDING COMPANY.—The term “bank holding company” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).

TITLE I—IMPROVING CONSUMER ACCESS TO MORTGAGE CREDIT

SEC. 101. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.

Section 129C(b)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) SAFE HARBOR.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘covered institution’ means an insured depository institution or an insured credit union that, together with its affiliates, has less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets;

“(II) the term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

“(III) the term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

“(IV) the term ‘interest-only’ means that, under the terms of the legal obligation, one or more of the periodic payments may be applied solely to accrued interest and not to loan principal; and

“(V) the term ‘negative amortization’ means payment of periodic payments that

will result in an increase in the principal balance under the terms of the legal obligation.

“(ii) SAFE HARBOR.—In this section—

“(I) the term ‘qualified mortgage’ includes any residential mortgage loan—

“(aa) that is originated and retained in portfolio by a covered institution;

“(bb) that is in compliance with the limitations with respect to prepayment penalties described in subsections (c)(1) and (c)(3);

“(cc) that is in compliance with the requirements of clause (vii) of subparagraph (A);

“(dd) that does not have negative amortization or interest-only features; and

“(ee) for which the covered institution considers and documents the debt, income, and financial resources of the consumer in accordance with clause (iv); and

“(II) a residential mortgage loan described in subclause (I) shall be deemed to meet the requirements of subsection (a).

“(iii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—

A residential mortgage loan described in clause (ii)(I) shall not qualify for the safe harbor under clause (ii) if the legal title to the residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person unless the residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred—

“(I) to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of a covered institution;

“(II) to a covered institution so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the covered institution to which the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred; [or]

“(III) pursuant to a merger of a covered institution with another person or the acquisition of a covered institution by another person or of another person by a covered institution, so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the person to whom the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred[.]; or

“(IV) to a wholly owned subsidiary of a covered institution, provided that, after the sale, assignment, or transfer, the residential mortgage loan is considered to be an asset of the covered institution for regulatory accounting purposes.

“(iv) CONSIDERATION AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—The consideration and documentation requirements described in clause (ii)(I)(ee) shall—

“(I) not be construed to require compliance with, or documentation in accordance with, appendix Q to part 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

“(II) be construed to permit multiple methods of documentation.”.

SEC. 102. SAFEGUARDING ACCESS TO HABITAT FOR HUMANITY HOMES.

Section 129E(i)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639e(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking “For purposes of” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO APPRAISAL DONATIONS.—If a fee appraiser voluntarily donates appraisal services to an organization eligible to receive tax-deductible charitable contributions, such voluntary donation shall be considered customary and reasonable for the purposes of paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 103. EXEMPTION FROM APPRAISALS OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED IN RURAL AREAS.

Title XI of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1127. EXEMPTION FROM APPRAISALS OF REAL ESTATE LOCATED IN RURAL AREAS.

“(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term ‘mortgage originator’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602).

“(b) **APPRAISAL NOT REQUIRED.**—Except as provided in subsection (d), notwithstanding any other provision of law, an appraisal in connection with a federally related transaction involving real property or an interest in real property is not required if—

“(1) the real property or interest in real property is located in a rural area, as described in section 1026.35(b)(2)(iv)(A) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(2) not later than 3 days after the date on which the Closing Disclosure Form, made in accordance with the final rule of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection entitled ‘Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)’ (78 Fed. Reg. 79730 (December 31, 2013)), relating to the federally related transaction is given to the consumer, the mortgage originator or its agent, directly or indirectly—

“(A) has contacted not fewer than 3 State certified appraisers or State licensed appraisers, as applicable; and

“(B) has documented that no State certified appraiser or State licensed appraiser, as applicable, was available within a reasonable amount of time, as determined by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency with oversight of the mortgage originator, to perform the appraisal in connection with the federally related transaction;

“(3) the [balance of the loan] *transaction value* is less than \$400,000; and

“(4) the mortgage originator is subject to oversight by a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency.

“(c) **SALE, ASSIGNMENT, OR TRANSFER.**—A mortgage originator that makes a loan without an appraisal under the terms of subsection (b) shall not sell, assign, or otherwise transfer legal title to the loan unless—

“(1) the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of the mortgage originator;

“(2) the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person regulated by a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency, so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the person; or

“(3) the sale, assignment, or transfer is pursuant to a merger of the mortgage originator with another person or the acquisition of the mortgage originator by another person or of another person by the mortgage originator[.]; or

“(4) *the sale, loan, or transfer is to a wholly owned subsidiary of the mortgage originator, provided that, after the sale, assignment, or transfer, the loan is considered to be an asset of the mortgage originator for regulatory accounting purposes.*

“(d) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (b) shall not apply if—

“(1) a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency requires an appraisal under section 225.63(c), 323.3(c), 34.43(c), or 722.3(e) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(2) the loan is a high-cost mortgage, as defined in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602).

“(e) **ANTI-EVASION.**—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall ensure that any mortgage originator that the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency oversees that makes a significant amount of loans under subsection (b) is complying with the requirements of subsection (b)(2) with respect to each loan.”.

SEC. 104. HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT ADJUSTMENT AND STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 304 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (i) as paragraph (3) and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following:

“(i) **EXEMPTIONS.**—

“(1) **CLOSED-END MORTGAGE LOANS.**—With respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to closed-end mortgage loans if the insured depository institution or insured credit union originated fewer than 500 closed-end mortgage loans in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.

“(2) **OPEN-END LINES OF CREDIT.**—With respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to open-end lines of credit if the insured depository institution or insured credit union originated fewer than 500 open-end lines of credit in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(o) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752); and

“(2) the term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).”.

(b) **LOOKBACK STUDY.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—Not earlier than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to evaluate the impact of the amendments made by subsection (a) on the amount of data available under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) at the national and local level.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that includes the findings and conclusions of the Comptroller General with respect to the study required under paragraph (1).

(c) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Section 304(i)(3) of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, as so redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking “section 303(2)(A)” and inserting “section 303(3)(A)”.

SEC. 105. CREDIT UNION RESIDENTIAL LOANS.

(a) **REMOVAL FROM MEMBER BUSINESS LOAN LIMITATION.**—Section 107A(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “that is the primary residence of a member”.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section or the amendment made by this section shall preclude the National Credit

Union Administration from treating an extension of credit that is fully secured by a lien on a 1- to 4-family dwelling that is not the primary residence of a member as a member business loan for purposes other than the member business loan limitation requirements under section 107A of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a).

SEC. 106. ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO JOBS FOR LOAN ORIGINATORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1518. EMPLOYMENT TRANSITION OF LOAN ORIGINATORS.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **APPLICATION STATE.**—The term ‘application State’ means a State in which a registered loan originator or a State-licensed loan originator seeks to be licensed.

“(2) **STATE-LICENSED MORTGAGE COMPANY.**—The term ‘State-licensed mortgage company’ means an entity that is licensed or registered under the law of any State to engage in residential mortgage loan origination and processing activities.

“(b) **TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ORIGINATE LOANS FOR LOAN ORIGINATORS MOVING FROM A DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION TO A NON-DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon becoming employed by a State-licensed mortgage company, an individual who is a registered loan originator shall be deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State for the period described in paragraph (2) if the individual—

“(A) has not had—

“(i) an application for a loan originator license denied; or

“(ii) a loan originator license revoked or suspended in any governmental jurisdiction; “(B) has not been subject to, or served with, a cease and desist order—

“(i) in any governmental jurisdiction; or

“(ii) under section 1514(c);

“(C) has not been convicted of a felony that would preclude licensure under the law of the application State;

“(D) has submitted an application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State; and

“(E) was registered in the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as a loan originator during the 1-year period preceding the date on which the information required under section 1505(a) is submitted.

“(2) **PERIOD.**—The period described in this paragraph shall begin on the date on which an individual described in paragraph (1) submits the information required under section 1505(a) and shall end on the earliest of the date—

“(A) on which the individual withdraws the application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State;

“(B) on which the application State denies, or issues a notice of intent to deny, the application;

“(C) on which the application State grants a State license; or

“(D) that is 120 days after the date on which the individual submits the application, if the application is listed on the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as incomplete.

“(c) **TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ORIGINATE LOANS FOR STATE-LICENSED LOAN ORIGINATORS MOVING INTERSTATE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A State-licensed loan originator shall be deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator

in an application State for the period described in paragraph (2) if the State-licensed loan originator—

“(A) meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (b)(1);

“(B) is employed by a State-licensed mortgage company in the application State; and

“(C) was licensed in a State that is not the application State during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the information required under section 1505(a) was submitted in connection with the application submitted to the application State.

“(2) PERIOD.—The period described in this paragraph shall begin on the date on which the State-licensed loan originator submits the information required under section 1505(a) in connection with the application submitted to the application State and end on the earliest of the date—

“(A) on which the State-licensed loan originator withdraws the application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State;

“(B) on which the application State denies, or issues a notice of intent to deny, the application;

“(C) on which the application State grants a State license; or

“(D) that is 120 days after the date on which the State-licensed loan originator submits the application, if the application is listed on the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as incomplete.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) EMPLOYER OF LOAN ORIGINATORS.—Any person employing an individual who is deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State under this section shall be subject to the requirements of this title and to applicable State law to the same extent as if that individual was a State-licensed loan originator licensed by the application State.

“(2) ENGAGING IN MORTGAGE LOAN ACTIVITIES.—Any individual who is deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State under this section and who engages in residential mortgage loan origination activities shall be subject to the requirements of this title and to applicable State law to the same extent as if that individual was a State-licensed loan originator licensed by the application State.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 4501 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1517 the following:

“Sec. 1518. Employment transition of loan originators.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. PROTECTING ACCESS TO MANUFACTURED HOMES.

Section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (cc) (relating to definitions relating to mortgage origination and residential mortgage loans) and subsection (dd) as subsections (dd) and (ee), respectively; and

(2) in paragraph (2) of subsection (dd), as so redesignated, by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) does not include any person who is—

“(i) not otherwise described in subparagraph (A) or (B) and who performs purely administrative or clerical tasks on behalf of a person who is described in any such subparagraph; or

“(ii) a retailer of manufactured or modular homes or an employee of the retailer if the retailer or employee, as applicable—

“(I) does not receive compensation or gain for engaging in activities described in subparagraph (A) that is in excess of any compensation or gain received in a comparable cash transaction;

“(II) discloses to the consumer—

“(aa) in writing any corporate affiliation with any [lender] creditor; and

“(bb) if the retailer has a corporate affiliation with any [lender] creditor, at least 1 unaffiliated [lender] creditor; and

“(III) does not directly negotiate with the consumer or lender on loan terms (including rates, fees, and other costs).”.

SEC. 108. PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY FINANCING.

Section 129C(b)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) CONSIDERATION OF UNDERWRITING REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY FINANCING.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘Property Assessed Clean Energy financing’ means financing to cover the costs of home improvements that results in a tax assessment on the real property of the consumer.

“(ii) REGULATIONS.—The Bureau shall prescribe regulations that carry out the purposes of subsection (a) and apply section 130 with respect to violations under subsection (a) of this section with respect to Property Assessed Clean Energy financing, which shall account for the unique nature of Property Assessed Clean Energy financing.

“(iii) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION AND CONSULTATION.—In prescribing the regulations under this subparagraph, the Bureau—

“(I) may collect such information and data that the Bureau determines is necessary; and

“(II) shall consult with State and local governments and bond-issuing authorities.”.

SEC. 109. ESCROW REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS.

Section [129D(c)] 129D of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. [1639d(c)] 1639d) is amended—

(1) [by] in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

[(2)](B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking “The Board” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Bureau”;

[(3)](C) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking “the Board” each place that term appears and inserting “the Bureau”; and

[(4)](D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) TREATMENT OF LOANS HELD BY SMALLER INSTITUTIONS.—The Bureau shall, by regulation, exempt from the requirements of subsection (a) any loan made by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union secured by a first lien on the principal dwelling of a consumer if—

“(A) the insured depository institution or insured credit union has assets of \$10,000,000,000 or less;

“(B) during the preceding calendar year, the insured depository institution or insured credit union and its affiliates originated 1,000 or fewer loans secured by a first lien on a principal dwelling; and

“(C) the transaction [otherwise] satisfies the criteria in sections [1026.35(b)(2)(iii)] 1026.35(b)(2)(iii)(A), 1026.35(b)(2)(iii)(D), and

1026.35(b)(2)(v) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.”[.] and

(2) in subsection (i), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

“(4) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).”.

SEC. 110. NO WAIT FOR LOWER MORTGAGE RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 129(b) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) NO WAIT FOR LOWER RATE.—If a creditor extends to a consumer a second offer of credit with a lower annual percentage rate, the transaction may be consummated without regard to the period specified in paragraph (1) with respect to the second offer.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, whereas the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection issued a final rule entitled “Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)” (78 Fed. Reg. 79730 (December 31, 2013)) (in this subsection referred to as the “TRID Rule”) to combine the disclosures a consumer receives in connection with applying for and closing on a mortgage loan, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection should endeavor to provide clearer, authoritative guidance on—

(1) the applicability of the TRID Rule to mortgage assumption transactions;

(2) the applicability of the TRID Rule to construction-to-permanent home loans, and the conditions under which those loans can be properly originated; and

(3) the extent to which lenders can rely on model disclosures published by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection without liability if recent changes to regulations are not reflected in the sample TRID Rule forms published by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

TITLE II—REGULATORY RELIEF AND PROTECTING CONSUMER ACCESS TO CREDIT

SEC. 201. CAPITAL SIMPLIFICATION FOR QUALIFYING COMMUNITY BANKS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNITY BANK LEVERAGE RATIO.—The term “Community Bank Leverage Ratio” means the ratio of the tangible equity capital of a qualifying community bank, as reported on the qualifying community bank’s applicable regulatory filing with the qualifying community bank’s appropriate Federal banking agency, to the average total consolidated assets of the qualifying community bank, as reported on the qualifying community bank’s applicable regulatory filing with the qualifying community bank’s appropriate Federal banking agency.

(2) GENERALLY APPLICABLE LEVERAGE CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS; GENERALLY APPLICABLE RISK-BASED CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.—The terms “generally applicable leverage capital requirements” and “generally applicable risk-based capital requirements” have the meanings given those terms in section 171(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5371(a)).

(3) QUALIFYING COMMUNITY BANK.—

(A) **ASSET THRESHOLD.**—The term “qualifying community bank” means a depository institution or depository institution holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$10,000,000,000.

(B) **RISK PROFILE.**—The appropriate Federal banking agencies may determine that a depository institution or depository institution holding company (or a class of depository institutions or depository institution holding companies) described in subparagraph (A) is not a qualifying community bank based on the depository institution’s or depository institution holding company’s risk profile, which shall be based on consideration of—

- (i) off-balance sheet exposures;
- (ii) trading assets and liabilities;
- (iii) total notional derivatives exposures; and
- (iv) such other factors as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate.

(b) **COMMUNITY BANK LEVERAGE RATIO.**—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall, through notice and comment rule making under section 553 of title 5, United States Code—

(1) develop a Community Bank Leverage Ratio of not less than 8 percent and not more than 10 percent for qualifying community banks; and

(2) establish procedures for treatment of a [qualified] *qualifying* community bank that has a Community Bank Leverage Ratio that is *falls* below the percentage developed under paragraph (1) *after exceeding the percentage developed under paragraph (1).*

(c) **CAPITAL COMPLIANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any qualifying community bank that [meets] *exceeds* the Community Bank Leverage Ratio developed under subsection (b)(1) shall be considered to have met—

(A) the generally applicable leverage capital requirements and the generally applicable risk-based capital requirements;

(B) in the case of a qualifying community bank that is a depository institution, the capital ratio requirements that are required in order to be considered well capitalized under section 38 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831o) and any regulation implementing that section; and

(C) any other capital or leverage requirements to which the qualifying community bank is subject.

(2) **EXISTING AUTHORITIES.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall limit the authority of the appropriate Federal banking agencies as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) **CONSULTATION.**—*The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall—*

(1) consult with the applicable State bank supervisors in carrying out this section; and

(2) notify the applicable State bank supervisor of any qualifying community bank that it supervises that exceeds, or does not exceed after previously exceeding, the Community Bank Leverage ratio developed under subsection (b)(1).

SEC. 202. LIMITED EXCEPTION FOR RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 29 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **LIMITED EXCEPTION FOR RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Reciprocal deposits of an agent institution shall not be considered to be funds obtained, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker to the extent that the total amount of such reciprocal deposits does not exceed the lesser of—

“(A) \$5,000,000,000; or

“(B) an amount equal to 20 percent of the total liabilities of the agent institution.

“(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(A) **AGENT INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘agent institution’ means an insured depository institution that places a covered deposit through a deposit placement network at other insured depository institutions in amounts that are less than or equal to the standard maximum deposit insurance amount, specifying the interest rate to be paid for such amounts, if the insured depository institution—

“(i)(I) when most recently examined under section 10(d) was found to have a composite condition of outstanding or good; and

“(II) is well capitalized;

“(ii) has obtained a waiver pursuant to subsection (c); or

“(iii) does not receive an amount of reciprocal deposits that causes the total amount of reciprocal deposits held by the agent institution to be greater than the average of the total amount of reciprocal deposits held by the agent institution on the last day of each of the 4 calendar quarters preceding the calendar quarter in which the agent institution was found not to have a composite condition of outstanding or good or was determined to be not well capitalized.

“(B) **COVERED DEPOSIT.**—The term ‘covered deposit’ means a deposit that—

“(i) is submitted for placement through a deposit placement network by an agent institution; and

“(ii) does not consist of funds that were obtained for the agent institution, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker before submission for placement through a deposit placement network.

“(C) **DEPOSIT PLACEMENT NETWORK.**—The term ‘deposit placement network’ means a network in which an insured depository institution participates, together with other insured depository institutions, for the processing and receipt of reciprocal deposits.

“(D) **NETWORK MEMBER BANK.**—The term ‘network member bank’ means an insured depository institution that is a member of a deposit placement network.

“(E) **RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.**—The term ‘reciprocal deposits’ means deposits received by an agent institution through a deposit placement network with the same maturity (if any) and in the same aggregate amount as covered deposits placed by the agent institution in other network member banks.

“(F) **WELL CAPITALIZED.**—The term ‘well capitalized’ has the meaning given the term in section 38(b)(1).”

(b) **INTEREST RATE RESTRICTION.**—Section 29 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831f) is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) **RESTRICTION ON INTEREST RATE PAID.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘agent institution’, ‘reciprocal deposits’, and ‘well capitalized’ have the meanings given those terms in subsection (i); and

“(B) the term ‘covered insured depository institution’ means an insured depository institution that—

“(i) under subsection (c) or (d), accepts funds obtained, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker; or

“(ii) while acting as an agent institution under subsection (i), accepts reciprocal deposits while not well capitalized.

“(2) **PROHIBITION.**—A covered insured depository institution may not pay a rate of interest on funds or reciprocal deposits described in paragraph (1) that, at the time that the funds or reciprocal deposits are ac-

cepted, significantly exceeds the limit set forth in paragraph (3).

“(3) **LIMIT ON INTEREST RATES.**—The limit on the rate of interest referred to in paragraph (2) shall be—

“(A) the rate paid on deposits of similar maturity in the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution for deposits accepted in the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution; or

“(B) the national rate paid on deposits of comparable maturity, as established by the Corporation, for deposits accepted outside the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution.”

SEC. 203. COMMUNITY BANK RELIEF.

Section 13(h) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(C) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, in the second sentence, by striking “institution that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity, if—” and inserting the following: “institution—

“(A) that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity, if—”;

(D) in clause (iv)(II), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) with—

“(i) not more than \$10,000,000,000 of total consolidated assets; and

“(B) that does not have and is not controlled by a company that has—

“(i) more than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

“(ii) total trading assets and trading liabilities, as reported on the most recent applicable regulatory filing filed by the institution, that are not more than 5 percent of total consolidated assets.”

SEC. 204. REMOVING NAMING RESTRICTIONS.

Section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(G)(vi), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, except that the hedge fund or private equity fund may share the same name or a variation of the same name as a banking entity that is an investment adviser to the hedge fund or private equity fund, if—

“(I) such investment adviser is not an insured depository institution, a company that controls an insured depository institution, or a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3106);

“(II) such investment adviser does not share the same name or a variation of the same name as an insured depository institution, any company that controls an insured depository institution, or any company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3106); and

“(III) such name does not contain the word ‘bank’”; and

(2) in subsection (h)(5)(C), by inserting before the period the following: “, except as permitted under subsection (d)(1)(G)(vi)”.

SEC. 205. SHORT FORM CALL REPORTS.

Section 7(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) SHORT FORM REPORTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall issue regulations that allow for a reduced reporting requirement for a covered depository institution when the institution makes the first and third report of condition for a year, as required under paragraph (3).

“(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered depository institution’ means an insured depository institution that—

“(i) has less than \$5,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

“(ii) satisfies such other criteria as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate.”.

SEC. 206. OPTION FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS TO OPERATE AS COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.

The Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 (12 U.S.C. 1464) the following:

“SEC. 5A. ELECTION TO OPERATE AS A COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATION.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘covered savings association’ means a Federal savings association that makes an election that is approved under subsection (b).

“(b) ELECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon issuance of rules under subsection (f), and in accordance with those rules, a Federal savings association with total consolidated assets equal to or less than \$15,000,000,000 may elect to operate as a covered savings association by submitting a notice to the Comptroller of that election.

“(2) APPROVAL.—A Federal savings association shall be deemed to be approved to operate as a covered savings association beginning on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Comptroller receives the notice submitted under paragraph (1), unless the Comptroller notifies the Federal savings association that the Federal savings association is not eligible.

“(c) RIGHTS AND DUTIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this section, a covered savings association shall—

“(1) have the same rights and privileges as a national bank that has the main office of the national bank situated in the same location as the home office of the covered savings association; and

“(2) be subject to the same duties, restrictions, penalties, liabilities, conditions, and limitations that would apply to a national bank described in paragraph (1).

“(d) TREATMENT OF COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—A covered savings association shall be treated as a Federal savings association for the purposes—

“(1) of governance of the covered savings association, including incorporation, bylaws, boards of directors, shareholders, and distribution of dividends;

“(2) of consolidation, merger, dissolution, conversion (including conversion to a stock bank or to another charter), conservatorship, and receivership; and

“(3) determined by regulation of the Comptroller.

“(e) EXISTING BRANCHES.—A covered savings association may continue to operate any branch or agency that the covered savings association operated on the date on which an election under subsection (b) is approved.

“(f) RULE MAKING.—The Comptroller shall issue rules to carry out this section—

“(1) that establish streamlined standards and procedures that clearly identify required documentation [or] and timelines for an election under subsection (b);

“(2) that require a Federal savings association that makes an election under subsection (b) to identify specific assets and subsidiaries that—

“(A) do not conform to the requirements for assets and subsidiaries of a national bank; and

“(B) are held by the Federal savings association on the date on which the Federal savings association submits a notice of the election;

“(3) that establish—

“(A) a transition process for bringing the assets and subsidiaries described in paragraph (2) into conformance with the requirements for a national bank; and

“(B) procedures for allowing the Federal savings association to submit to the Comptroller an application to continue to hold assets and subsidiaries described in paragraph (2) after electing to operate as a covered savings association;

“(4) that establish standards and procedures to allow a covered savings association to—

“(A) terminate an election under subsection (b) after an appropriate period of time; and

“(B) make a subsequent election under subsection (b) after terminating an election under subparagraph (A);

“(5) that clarify requirements for the treatment of covered savings associations, including the provisions of law that apply to covered savings associations; and

“(6) as the Comptroller determines necessary in the interests of safety and soundness.

“(g) GRANDFATHERED COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—Subject to the rules issued under subsection (f), a covered savings association may continue to operate as a covered savings association if, after the date on which the election is made under subsection (b), the covered savings association has total consolidated assets greater than \$15,000,000,000.”.

SEC. 207. SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD.—The term “Board” means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(2) SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY.—The term “savings and loan holding company” has the meaning given the term in section 10(a) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(a)).

(b) CHANGES REQUIRED TO SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT ON ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL AND MANAGERIAL FACTORS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall revise appendix C to part 225 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the “Small Bank Holding Company and Savings and Loan Holding Company Policy Statement”), to raise the consolidated asset threshold under that appendix from \$1,000,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000 for any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company that—

(1) is not engaged in significant non-banking activities either directly or through a nonbank subsidiary;

(2) does not conduct significant off-balance sheet activities (including securitization and asset management or administration) either directly or through a nonbank subsidiary; and

(3) does not have a material amount of debt or equity securities outstanding (other than trust preferred securities) that are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(c) EXCLUSIONS.—The Board may exclude any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company, regardless of asset size, from the revision under subsection (b) if the Board determines that such action is warranted for supervisory purposes.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 171(b)(5) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5371(b)(5)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company that is subject to the application of appendix C to part 225 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the ‘Small Bank Holding Company and Savings and Loan Holding Company Policy Statement’).”.

SEC. 208. APPLICATION OF THE EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 602 (12 U.S.C. 4001)—

(A) in paragraph (20), by inserting “, located in the United States,” after “ATM”; and

(B) in paragraph (21), by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Puerto Rico,”; and

(C) in paragraph (23), by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Puerto Rico,”; and

(2) in section 603(d)(2)(A) (12 U.S.C. 4002(d)(2)(A)), by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Puerto Rico.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

[SEC. 209. MUTUAL HOLDING COMPANY DIVIDEND WAIVERS.

[Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall amend section 239.8(d)(2)(iv) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, by striking “12 months” each place that term appears and inserting “24 months”.]

SEC. 210109. SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.

(a) SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.—Title I of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 38. SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—The term ‘housing voucher program’ means a program for tenant-based assistance under section 8.

“(2) SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The term ‘small public housing agency’ means a public housing agency—

“(A) for which the sum of the number of public housing dwelling units administered by the agency and the number of vouchers under section 8(o) administered by the agency is 550 or fewer; and

“(B) that predominantly operates in a rural area, as described in section 1026.35(b)(2)(iv)(A) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(3) TROUBLED SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The term ‘troubled small public housing agency’ means a small public housing agency designated by the Secretary as a troubled small public housing agency under subsection (c)(3).

“(b) APPLICABILITY.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, a small public housing agency shall be subject to the same requirements as a public housing agency.

“(c) PROGRAM INSPECTIONS AND EVALUATIONS.—

“(1) PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS.—

“(A) FREQUENCY OF INSPECTIONS BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall carry out an inspection of the physical condition of a small public housing agency’s public housing projects not more frequently than once every 3 years, unless the agency has been designated by the Secretary as a troubled small public housing agency based on deficiencies in the physical condition of its public housing projects. *Nothing contained in this subparagraph relieves the Secretary from conducting lead safety inspections or assessments in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary under section 302 of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4822).*

“(B) STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall apply to small public housing agencies the same standards for the acceptable condition of public housing projects that apply to projects assisted under section 8.

“(2) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—[A small] *Except as required by section 8(o)(8)(F), a small public housing agency administering assistance under section 8(o) shall make periodic physical inspections of each assisted dwelling unit not less frequently than once every 3 years to determine whether the unit is maintained in accordance with the requirements under section 8(o)(8)(A). Nothing contained in this paragraph relieves a small public housing agency from conducting lead safety inspections or assessments in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary under section 302 of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4822).*

“(3) TROUBLED SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.—

“(A) PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency with respect to the public housing program of the small public housing agency if the Secretary determines that the agency has failed to maintain the public housing units of the small public housing agency in a satisfactory physical condition, based upon an inspection conducted by the Secretary.

“(B) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency with respect to the housing voucher program of the small public housing agency if the Secretary determines that the agency has failed to comply with the inspection requirements under paragraph (2).

“(C) APPEALS.—

“(i) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an appeals process under which a small public housing agency may dispute a designation as a troubled small public housing agency.

“(ii) OFFICIAL.—The appeals process established under clause (i) shall provide for a decision by an official who has not been involved, and is not subordinate to a person who has been involved, in the original determination to designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency.

“(D) CORRECTIVE ACTION AGREEMENT.—

“(i) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a small public housing agency is designated as a troubled public housing agency under subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary and the small

public housing agency shall enter into a corrective action agreement under which the small public housing agency shall undertake actions to correct the deficiencies upon which the designation is based.

“(ii) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—A corrective action agreement entered into under clause (i) shall—

“(I) have a term of 1 year, and shall be renewable at the option of the Secretary;

“(II) provide, where feasible, for technical assistance to assist the public housing agency in curing its deficiencies;

“(III) provide for—

“(aa) reconsideration of the designation of the small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency not less frequently than annually; and

“(bb) termination of the agreement when the Secretary determines that the small public housing agency is no longer a troubled small public housing agency; and

“(IV) provide that in the event of substantial noncompliance by the small public housing agency under the agreement, the Secretary may—

“(aa) contract with another public housing agency or a private entity to manage the public housing of the troubled small public housing agency;

“(bb) withhold funds otherwise distributable to the troubled small public housing agency;

“(cc) assume possession of, and direct responsibility for, managing the public housing of the troubled small public housing agency;

“(dd) petition for the appointment of a receiver, in accordance with section 6(j)(3)(A)(ii); and

“(ee) exercise any other remedy available to the Secretary in the event of default under the public housing annual contributions contract entered into by the small public housing agency under section 5.

“(E) EMERGENCY ACTIONS.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prohibit the Secretary from taking any emergency action necessary to protect Federal financial resources or the health or safety of residents of public housing projects.

“(d) REDUCTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGETS.—

“(1) EXEMPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a small public housing agency shall be exempt from any environmental review requirements with respect to a development or modernization project having a total cost of not more than \$100,000.

“(2) STREAMLINED PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, by rule, establish streamlined procedures for environmental reviews of small public housing agency development and modernization projects having a total cost of more than \$100,000.”

(b) ENERGY CONSERVATION.—Section 9(e)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) FREEZE OF CONSUMPTION LEVELS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A small public housing agency, as defined in section 38(a), may elect to be paid for its utility and waste management costs under the formula for a period, at the discretion of the small public housing agency, of not more than 20 years based on the small public housing agency’s average annual consumption during the 3-year period preceding the year in which the election is made (in this subparagraph referred to as the ‘consumption base level’).

“(ii) INITIAL ADJUSTMENT IN CONSUMPTION BASE LEVEL.—The Secretary shall make an initial one-time adjustment in the consump-

tion base level to account for differences in the heating degree day average over the most recent 20-year period compared to the average in the consumption base level.

“(iii) ADJUSTMENTS IN CONSUMPTION BASE LEVEL.—The Secretary shall make adjustments in the consumption base level to account for an increase or reduction in units, a change in fuel source, a change in resident controlled electricity consumption, or for other reasons.

“(iv) SAVINGS.—All cost savings resulting from an election made by a small public housing agency under this subparagraph—

“(I) shall accrue to the small public housing agency; and

“(II) may be used for any public housing purpose at the discretion of the small public housing agency.

“(v) THIRD PARTIES.—A small public housing agency making an election under this subparagraph—

“(I) may use, but shall not be required to use, the services of a third party in its energy conservation program; and

“(II) shall have the sole discretion to determine the source, and terms and conditions, of any financing used for its energy conservation program.”

(c) REPORTING BY AGENCIES OPERATING IN CONSORTIA.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop and deploy all electronic information systems necessary to accommodate full consolidated reporting by public housing agencies, as defined in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)), electing to operate in consortia under section 13(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437k(a)).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) SHARED WAITING LISTS.—*Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make available to interested public housing agencies and owners of multifamily properties receiving assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development 1 or more software programs that will facilitate the voluntary use of a shared waiting list by multiple public housing agencies or owners receiving assistance, and shall publish on the website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development procedural guidance for implementing shared waiting lists that includes information on how to obtain the software.*

SEC. 2110. EXAMINATION CYCLE.

Section 10(d) [(4)(A)] of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(d) [(4)(A)]) is [amended by] amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000,000” [.] and

(2) in paragraph (10), by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000,000”.

SEC. 2121. NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGE REGULATORY PARITY.

Section 18(b)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A);

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting “a security designated as qualified for trading in the national market system pursuant to section 11A(a)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k-1(a)(2)) that is” before “listed”; and

(B) by striking “that has listing standards that the Commission determines by rule (on its own initiative or on the basis of a petition) are substantially similar to the listing

standards applicable to securities described in subparagraph (A)";

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking "or (B)"; and

(4) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

SEC. 212. INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall support increasing transparency at any global insurance or international standard-setting regulatory or supervisory forum in which they participate, including supporting and advocating for greater public observer access to working groups and committee meetings of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors; and

(2) to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office take a position or reasonably intend to take a position with respect to an insurance proposal by a global insurance regulatory or supervisory forum, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall achieve consensus positions with State insurance regulators through the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, when they are United States participants in negotiations on insurance issues before the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, Financial Stability Board, or any other international forum of financial regulators or supervisors that considers such issues.

(b) INSURANCE POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Insurance Policy Advisory Committee on International Capital Standards and Other Insurance Issues at the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of not more than 21 members, all of whom represent a diverse set of expert perspectives from the various sectors of the United States insurance industry, including life insurance, property and casualty insurance and reinsurance, agents and brokers, academics, consumer advocates, or experts on issues facing underserved insurance communities and consumers.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS AND TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or their designee, shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, an annual report and provide annual testimony to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives on the efforts of the Secretary and the Chairman with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners with respect to global insurance regulatory or supervisory forums, including—

(i) a description of the insurance regulatory or supervisory standard-setting issues under discussion at international standard-setting bodies, including the Financial Stability Board and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors;

(ii) a description of the effects that proposals discussed at international insurance regulatory or supervisory forums of insurance could have

on consumer and insurance markets in the United States;

(iii) a description of any position taken by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office in international insurance discussions; and

(iv) a description of the efforts by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office to increase transparency at the Financial Stability Board with respect to insurance proposals and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, including efforts to provide additional public access to working groups and committees of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors.

(B) TERMINATION.—This paragraph shall terminate on December 31, 2022.

(2) REPORTS AND TESTIMONY BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—The National Association of Insurance Commissioners may provide testimony to Congress on the issues described in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) JOINT REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL INSURANCE OFFICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall, in consultation with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, complete a study on, and submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, the impact on consumers and markets in the United States before supporting or consenting to the adoption of any key elements in any international insurance proposal or international insurance capital standard.

(B) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—

(i) NOTICE.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall provide public notice before the date on which drafting a report required under subparagraph (A) is commenced and after the date on which the draft of the report is completed.

(ii) OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT.—There shall be an opportunity for public comment for a period beginning on the date on which the report is submitted under subparagraph (A) and ending on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the report is submitted.

(C) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall submit to the Comptroller General of the United States the report described in subparagraph (A) for review.

(4) REPORT ON INCREASE IN TRANSPARENCY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Secretary of the Treasury, or their designees, shall submit to Congress a report and provide testimony to Congress on the efforts of the Chairman and the Secretary to increase transparency at meetings of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors.

SEC. 213. BUDGET TRANSPARENCY FOR THE NCUA.

Section 209(b) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1789(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) on an annual basis and prior to the submission of the detailed business-type budget required under paragraph (2)—

“(A) make publicly available and publish in the Federal Register a draft of the detailed business-type budget; and

“(B) hold a public hearing, with public notice provided of the hearing, during which the public may submit comments on the draft of the detailed business-type budget;”;

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting “detailed” after “submit a”; and

(B) by inserting “, which shall address any comment submitted by the public under paragraph (1)(B)” after “Control Act”.

SEC. 214. MAKING ONLINE BANKING INITIATION LEGAL AND EASY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFILIATE.—The term “affiliate” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).

(2) DRIVER'S LICENSE.—The term “driver's license” means a license issued by a State to an individual that authorizes the individual to operate a motor vehicle on public streets, roads, or highways.

(3) FEDERAL BANK SECRECY LAWS.—The term “Federal bank secrecy laws” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) section 123 of Public Law 91–508 (12 U.S.C. 1953); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” means—

(A) an insured depository institution;

(B) an insured credit union; or

(C) any affiliate of an insured depository institution or insured credit union.

(5) FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE.—The term “financial product or service” has the meaning given the term in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(6) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(7) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “insured depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(8) ONLINE SERVICE.—The term “online service” means any Internet-based service, such as a website or mobile application.

(9) PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.—The term “personal identification card” means an identification document issued by a State or local government to an individual solely for the purpose of identification of that individual.

(10) PERSONAL INFORMATION.—The term “personal information” means the information displayed on or electronically encoded on a driver's license or personal identification card that is reasonably necessary to fulfill the purpose and uses permitted by subsection (b).

(11) SCAN.—The term “scan” means the act of using a device or software to decipher, in an electronically readable format, personal information displayed on or electronically encoded on a driver's license or personal identification card.

(12) STATE.—The term “State” means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other commonwealth, possession, or territory of the United States.

(b) USE OF A DRIVER'S LICENSE OR PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When an individual initiates a request through an online service to open an account with a financial institution or obtain a financial product or service from a financial institution, the financial institution may record personal information from a scan of the driver's license or personal identification card of the individual, or make a copy or receive an image of the driver's license or personal identification

card of the individual, and store or retain such information in any electronic format for the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(2) **USES OF INFORMATION.**—Except as required to comply with Federal bank secrecy laws, a financial institution may only use the information obtained under paragraph (1)—

(A) to verify the authenticity of the driver's license or personal identification card;

(B) to verify the identity of the individual; and

(C) to comply with a legal requirement to record, retain, or transmit the personal information in connection with opening an account or obtaining a financial product or service.

(3) **DELETION OF IMAGE.**—A financial institution that makes a copy or receives an image of a driver's license or personal identification card of an individual in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, after using the image for the purposes described in paragraph (2), permanently delete—

(A) any image of the driver's license or personal identification card, as applicable; and

(B) any copy of any such image.

(4) **DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend, modify, or otherwise affect any State or Federal law that governs a financial institution's disclosure and security of personal information that is not publicly available.

(c) **RELATION TO STATE LAW.**—The provisions of this section shall preempt and supersede any State law that conflicts with a provision of this section, but only to the extent of such conflict.

TITLE III—PROTECTIONS FOR VETERANS, CONSUMERS, AND HOMEOWNERS

ISEC. 301. PROTECTING CONSUMERS' CREDIT.

[Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1) is amended—

[(a) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “90 days” and inserting “1 year”]; and

[(b) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **FREE ANNUAL FREEZE ALERTS; ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR CREDIT REPORTS OF MINOR CONSUMERS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘freeze alert’ means a restriction placed on the file of a consumer, prohibiting the ability of a consumer reporting agency to furnish to any person, for the purpose of opening a new account involving the extension of credit, the consumer report of the consumer.

“(2) **FREE ANNUAL FREEZE ALERT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of State law, once every calendar year, free of charge, upon the direct request of a consumer, or an individual acting on behalf of or as a personal representative of the consumer, a consumer reporting agency that maintains a file on the consumer and has received appropriate proof of the identity of the requester shall provide 1 freeze alert in the file of that consumer that shall remain in effect until the consumer or requester requests that such freeze alert be removed.

“(B) **REMOVAL OF ALERT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of State law, once every calendar year, free of charge, upon the direct request of a consumer, or an individual acting on behalf of or as a personal representative of the consumer, a consumer reporting agency that receives a request to remove a freeze alert provided under paragraph (1) shall remove such a freeze alert.

“(C) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the authority of a State to require consumer reporting agencies to require freeze alerts free of charge.

“(3) **ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR CREDIT REPORTS OF MINOR CONSUMERS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the direct request of an individual acting on behalf of or as a personal representative of a minor, a consumer reporting agency that maintains a file on the minor and has received appropriate proof of the identity of the requester shall include a freeze alert, free of charge, in the file of that minor that shall remain in effect until an individual acting on behalf of or as a personal representative of the minor, or in the case of a minor who is no longer a minor, the minor, requests that such freeze alert be removed.

“(B) **BLOCK OF INFORMATION.**—While a freeze alert under subparagraph (A) is in place, a consumer reporting agency may not release—

“(i) the consumer report of the minor;

“(ii) any information derived from the consumer report of the minor; or

“(iii) any record created for the minor.

“(C) **REMOVAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of State law, a consumer reporting agency that receives a request for a freeze alert for a minor or a request to remove a freeze alert for a minor shall provide or remove the freeze alert, as applicable, free of charge.”.]

SEC. 301. PROTECTING CONSUMERS' CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “90 days” and inserting “1 year”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **NATIONAL SECURITY FREEZE.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘consumer reporting agency’ means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p).

“(B) The term ‘proper identification’ has the meaning of such term as used under section 610.

“(C) The term ‘security freeze’ means a restriction that prohibits a consumer reporting agency from disclosing the contents of a consumer report that is subject to such security freeze to any person requesting the consumer report for the purpose of opening a new account involving the extension of credit.

“(2) **PLACEMENT OF SECURITY FREEZE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer that a consumer reporting agency place a security freeze, and upon receiving proper identification from the consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, place the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by telephone or electronic means, 1 business day after receiving the request directly from the consumer; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request directly from the consumer.

“(B) **CONFIRMATION AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.**—Not later than 5 business days after placing a security freeze under subparagraph (A), a consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) send confirmation of the placement to the consumer; and

“(ii) inform the consumer of—

“(I) the process by which the consumer may remove the security freeze, including a mechanism to authenticate the consumer; and

“(II) the consumer's right described in section 615(d)(1)(D).

“(C) **NOTICE TO THIRD PARTIES.**—A consumer reporting agency may advise a third party that a security freeze has been placed with respect to a consumer under subparagraph (A).

“(3) **REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A consumer reporting agency shall remove a security freeze placed on

the consumer report of a consumer only in the following cases:

“(i) Upon the direct request of the consumer.

“(ii) The security freeze was placed due to a material misrepresentation of fact by the consumer.

“(B) **NOTICE IF REMOVAL NOT BY REQUEST.**—If a consumer reporting agency removes a security freeze under subparagraph (A)(ii), the consumer reporting agency shall notify the consumer in writing prior to removing the security freeze.

“(C) **REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE BY CONSUMER REQUEST.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (A)(ii), a security freeze shall remain in place until the consumer directly requests that the security freeze be removed. Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer that a consumer reporting agency remove a security freeze, and upon receiving proper identification from the consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, remove the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by telephone or electronic means, 1 hour after receiving the request for removal; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request for removal.

“(D) **THIRD-PARTY REQUESTS.**—If a third party requests access to a consumer report of a consumer with respect to which a security freeze is in effect, where such request is in connection with an application for credit, and the consumer does not allow such consumer report to be accessed, the third party may treat the application as incomplete.

“(4) **EXCEPTIONS.**—A security freeze shall not apply to the making of a consumer report for use of the following:

“(A) A person or entity, or a subsidiary, affiliate, or agent of that person or entity, or an assignee of a financial obligation owed by the consumer to that person or entity, or a prospective assignee of a financial obligation owed by the consumer to that person or entity in conjunction with the proposed purchase of the financial obligation, with which the consumer has or had prior to assignment an account or contract including a demand deposit account, or to whom the consumer issued a negotiable instrument, for the purposes of reviewing the account or collecting the financial obligation owed for the account, contract, or negotiable instrument. For purposes of this subparagraph, ‘reviewing the account’ includes activities related to account maintenance, monitoring, credit line increases, and account upgrades and enhancements.

“(B) A subsidiary, affiliate, agent, assignee, or prospective assignee of a person to whom access has been granted for purposes of facilitating the extension of credit or other permissible use.

“(C) Any Federal, State, or local agency, law enforcement agency, trial court, or private collection agency acting pursuant to a court order, warrant, or subpoena.

“(D) A child support agency acting pursuant to part D of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 651 et seq.).

“(E) A State or its agents or assigns acting to investigate fraud or acting to investigate or collect delinquent taxes or unpaid court orders or to fulfill any of its other statutory responsibilities, provided such responsibilities are consistent with a permissible purpose under section 604.

“(F) By a person using credit information for the purposes described under section 604(c).

“(G) Any person or entity administering a credit file monitoring subscription or similar service to which the consumer has subscribed.

“(H) Any person or entity for the purpose of providing a consumer with a copy of the consumer's consumer report or credit score, upon the request of the consumer.

“(I) Any person using the information in connection with the underwriting of insurance.

“(J) Any person using the information for employment, tenant, or background screening purposes.

“(5) NOTICE OF RIGHTS.—At any time a consumer is required to receive a summary of rights required under section 609, the following notice shall be included:

“‘CONSUMERS HAVE THE RIGHT TO OBTAIN A SECURITY FREEZE

“‘You have a right to place a ‘security freeze’ on your credit report, which will prohibit a consumer reporting agency from releasing information in your credit report without your express authorization. The security freeze is designed to prevent credit, loans, and services from being approved in your name without your consent. However, you should be aware that using a security freeze to take control over who gets access to the personal and financial information in your credit report may delay, interfere with, or prohibit the timely approval of any subsequent request or application you make regarding a new loan, credit, mortgage, or any other account involving the extension of credit.

“‘As an alternative to a security freeze, you have the right to place an initial or extended fraud alert on your credit file at no cost. An initial fraud alert is a 1-year alert that is placed on a consumer’s credit file. Upon seeing a fraud alert display on a consumer’s credit file, a business is required to take steps to verify the consumer’s identity before extending new credit. If you are a victim of identity theft, you are entitled to an extended fraud alert, which is a fraud alert lasting 7 years.

“‘A security freeze does not apply to a person or entity, or its affiliates, or collection agencies acting on behalf of the person or entity, with which you have an existing account that requests information in your credit report for the purposes of reviewing or collecting the account. Reviewing the account includes activities related to account maintenance, monitoring, credit line increases, and account upgrades and enhancements.”

“(6) WEBPAGE.—

“(A) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—A consumer reporting agency shall establish a webpage that—

“(i) allows a consumer to request a security freeze;

“(ii) allows a consumer to request an initial fraud alert;

“(iii) allows a consumer to request an extended fraud alert;

“(iv) allows a consumer to request an active duty fraud alert;

“(v) allows a consumer to opt-out of the use of information in a consumer report to send the consumer a solicitation of credit or insurance, in accordance with section 615(d); and

“(vi) shall not be the only mechanism by which a consumer may request a security freeze.

“(B) FTC.—The Federal Trade Commission shall establish a single webpage that includes a link to each webpage established under subparagraph (A) within the Federal Trade Commission’s website www.Identitytheft.gov, or a successor website.

“(j) NATIONAL PROTECTION FOR FILES AND CREDIT RECORDS OF MINORS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection: “(A) The term ‘consumer reporting agency’ means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p).

“(B) The term ‘minor’ means an individual who is under the age of 16 years at the time a request for the placement of a security freeze is made.

“(C) The term ‘minor’s representative’ means a person who provides to a consumer reporting agency sufficient proof of authority to act on behalf of a minor.

“(D) The term ‘record’ means a compilation of information that—

“(i) identifies a minor;

“(ii) is created by a consumer reporting agency solely for the purpose of complying with this subsection; and

“(iii) may not be created or used to consider the minor’s credit worthiness, credit standing, credit capacity, character, general reputation, personal characteristics, or mode of living.

“(E) The term ‘security freeze’ means a restriction that prohibits a consumer reporting agency from disclosing the contents of a consumer report that is the subject of such security freeze or, in the case of a minor for whom the consumer reporting agency does not have a file, a record that is subject to such security freeze to any person requesting the consumer report for the purpose of opening a new account involving the extension of credit.

“(F) The term ‘sufficient proof of authority’ means documentation that shows a minor’s representative has authority to act on behalf of a minor and includes—

“(i) an order issued by a court of law;

“(ii) a lawfully executed and valid power of attorney;

“(iii) a document issued by a Federal, State, or local government agency in the United States showing proof of parentage, including a birth certificate; or

“(iv) with respect to a minor who has been placed in a foster care setting, a written communication from a county welfare department or its agent or designee, or a county probation department or its agent or designee, certifying that the minor is in a foster care setting under its jurisdiction.

“(G) The term ‘sufficient proof of identification’ means information or documentation that identifies a minor and a minor’s representative and includes—

“(i) a social security number or a copy of a social security card issued by the Social Security Administration;

“(ii) a certified or official copy of a birth certificate issued by the entity authorized to issue the birth certificate; or

“(iii) a copy of a driver’s license, an identification card issued by the motor vehicle administration, or any other government issued identification.

“(2) PLACEMENT OF SECURITY FREEZE FOR A MINOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving a direct request from a minor’s representative that a consumer reporting agency place a security freeze, and upon receiving sufficient proof of identification and sufficient proof of authority, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, place the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by telephone or electronic means, 1 business day after receiving the request directly from the minor’s representative; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request directly from the minor’s representative.

“(B) CONFIRMATION AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Not later than 5 business days after placing a security freeze under subparagraph (A), a consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) send confirmation of the placement to the minor’s representative; and

“(ii) inform the minor’s representative of the process by which the minor may remove the security freeze, including a mechanism to authenticate the minor’s representative.

“(C) CREATION OF FILE.—If a consumer reporting agency does not have a file pertaining to a minor when the consumer reporting agency receives a direct request under subparagraph (A), the consumer reporting agency shall create a record for the minor.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON RELEASE OF RECORD OR FILE OF MINOR.—After a security freeze has been placed under paragraph (2)(A), and unless the security freeze is removed in accordance with this subsection, a consumer reporting agency may not release the minor’s consumer report, any information derived from the minor’s consumer report, or any record created for the minor.

“(4) REMOVAL OF A MINOR SECURITY FREEZE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency shall remove a security freeze placed on the consumer report of a minor only in the following cases:

“(i) Upon the direct request of the minor’s representative.

“(ii) Upon the direct request of the minor, if the minor is not under the age of 16 years at the time of the request.

“(iii) The security freeze was placed due to a material misrepresentation of fact by the minor’s representative.

“(B) NOTICE IF REMOVAL NOT BY REQUEST.—If a consumer reporting agency removes a security freeze under subparagraph (A)(iii), the consumer reporting agency shall notify the minor’s representative in writing prior to removing the security freeze.

“(C) REMOVAL OF FREEZE BY REQUEST.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A)(iii), a security freeze shall remain in place until a minor’s representative or minor described in subparagraph (A)(ii) directly requests that the security freeze be removed. Upon receiving a direct request from the minor’s representative or minor described in subparagraph (A)(ii) that a consumer reporting agency remove a security freeze, and upon receiving sufficient proof of identification and sufficient proof of authority, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, remove the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by telephone or electronic means, 1 hour after receiving the request for removal; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request for removal.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 625(b)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681t(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by adding “or” at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) subsections (i) and (j) of section 605A relating to security freezes.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. PROTECTING VETERANS’ CREDIT.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to rectify problematic reporting of medical debt included in a consumer report of a veteran due to inappropriate or delayed payment for hospital care or medical services provided in a non-Department of Veterans Affairs facility under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(2) to clarify the process of debt collection for such medical debt.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—

(1) VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT DEFINED.—Section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(z) VETERAN.—The term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

“(aa) VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—The term ‘veteran’s medical debt’—

“(1) means a debt of a veteran arising from health care provided in a non-Department of Veterans Affairs facility under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and]

“(1) means a medical collection debt of a veteran owed to a health care provider in a non-Department of Veterans Affairs facility that was submitted to the Department of Veterans Affairs for repayment by the Veterans Choice Fund established by section 802 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (38 U.S.C. 1701 note); and

“(2) includes medical collection debt that the Department of Veterans Affairs has wrongfully charged a veteran.”.

(2) EXCLUSION FOR VETERAN'S MEDICAL DEBT.—Section 605(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) [Any] With respect to a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p), any information related to a veteran's medical debt if the date on which the hospital care or medical services was rendered relating to the debt antedates the report by less than 1 year if the consumer reporting agency has actual knowledge that the information is related to a veteran's medical debt and the consumer reporting agency is in compliance with its obligation under section 302(c)(5) of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

“(8) [Any] With respect to a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p), any information related to a fully paid or settled veteran's medical debt that had been characterized as delinquent, charged off, or in collection if the consumer reporting agency has actual knowledge that the information is related to a veteran's medical debt and the consumer reporting agency is in compliance with its obligation under section 302(c)(5) of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.”.

(3) REMOVAL OF VETERAN'S MEDICAL DEBT FROM CONSUMER REPORT.—Section 611 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (g)” after “subsection (f)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) DISPUTE PROCESS FOR VETERAN'S MEDICAL DEBT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a veteran's medical debt [of a consumer, the consumer,] the veteran may submit a notice described in paragraph (2) [along with], proof of liability of the Department of Veterans Affairs for payment of that debt, or documentation that the Department of Veterans Affairs is in the process of making payment for authorized medical services rendered to a consumer reporting agency or a reseller to dispute the inclusion of that debt on a consumer report of the [consumer] veteran.

“(2) NOTIFICATION TO VETERAN.—The Department of Veterans Affairs shall submit to a veteran a notice that the Department of Veterans Affairs has assumed liability for part or all of a veteran's medical debt.

“(3) DELETION OF INFORMATION FROM FILE.—If a consumer reporting agency receives notice [and], proof of liability, or documentation under paragraph (1), the consumer reporting agency shall delete all information relating to the veteran's medical debt from the file of the [consumer] veteran and notify the furnisher and the [consumer] veteran of that deletion.”.

(C) VERIFICATION OF VETERAN'S MEDICAL DEBT.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) the term “consumer reporting agency” means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)); and

(B) the terms “veteran” and “veteran's medical debt” have the meanings given those terms in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a), as added by subsection (b)(1).

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a database to allow consumer reporting agencies to verify whether a debt furnished to a consumer reporting agency is a veteran's medical debt.

(3) DATABASE FEATURES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the database established under paragraph (2) provides consumer reporting agencies with—

(A) sufficiently detailed and specific information to verify whether a debt being furnished to the consumer reporting agency is a veteran's medical debt;

(B) access to verification information in a secure electronic format;

(C) timely access to verification information; and

(D) any other features that would promote the efficient, timely, and secure delivery of information that consumer reporting agencies could use to verify whether a debt is a veteran's medical debt.

(4) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—Prior to establishing the database for verification under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register a notice and request for comment that solicits input from consumer reporting agencies and other stakeholders.

(5) VERIFICATION.—Provided the database established under paragraph (2) is fully functional and the data available to consumer reporting agencies, a consumer reporting agency shall use the database as a means to identify a veteran's medical debt pursuant to paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 605(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c(a)), as added by subsection (b)(2).

[(C)] (d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is [180 days] 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. IMMUNITY FROM SUIT FOR DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL EXPLOITATION OF SENIOR CITIZENS.

(a) IMMUNITY.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(A) the term “Bank Secrecy Act officer” means an individual responsible for ensuring compliance with the requirements mandated by subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the “Bank Secrecy Act”);

(B) the term “broker-dealer” means a broker and a dealer, as those terms are defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a));

(C) the term “covered agency” means—

(i) a State financial regulatory agency, including a State securities or law enforcement authority and a State insurance regulator;

(ii) each of the [entities] Federal agencies represented in the membership of the Financial Institutions Examination Council established under section 1004 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3303);

(iii) a securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3);

(iv) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(v) a law enforcement agency; [and] or

(vi) a State or local agency responsible for administering adult protective service laws;

(D) the term “covered financial institution” means—

(i) a credit union;

(ii) a depository institution;

(iii) an investment adviser;

(iv) a broker-dealer;

(v) an insurance company;

(vi) an insurance agency; [and] or

(vii) a transfer agent;

(E) the term “credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301);

(F) the term “depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(G) the term “exploitation” means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual, including a caregiver or a fiduciary, that—

(i) uses the resources of a senior citizen for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain; or

(ii) results in depriving a senior citizen of rightful access to or use of benefits, resources, belongings, or assets;

(H) the term “insurance agency” means any business entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates insurance coverage;

(I) the term “insurance company” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a));

(J) the term “insurance producer” means an individual who is required under State law to be licensed in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance coverage;

(K) the term “investment adviser” has the meaning given the term in section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a));

(L) the term “investment adviser representative” means an individual who—

(i) is employed by, or associated with, an investment adviser; and

(ii) does not perform solely clerical or ministerial acts;

(M) the term “registered representative” means an individual who represents a broker-dealer in effecting or attempting to effect a purchase or sale of securities;

(N) the term “senior citizen” means an individual who is not younger than 65 years of age;

(O) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States;

(P) the term “State insurance regulator” has the meaning given the term in section 315 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6735);

(Q) the term “State securities or law enforcement authority” has the meaning given the term in section 24(f)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78x(f)(4)); and

(R) the term “transfer agent” has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

(2) IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.—

(A) IMMUNITY FOR INDIVIDUALS.—An individual who has received the training described in subsection (b) shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for disclosing the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen to a covered agency if the individual, at the time of the disclosure—

(i) served as a supervisor or [compliance officer] in a compliance or legal function (including as a Bank Secrecy Act officer) for,

or, in the case of a registered representative, investment adviser representative, or insurance producer, was affiliated or associated with, a covered financial institution; and

- (i) made the disclosure—
- (I) in good faith; and
- (II) with reasonable care.

(B) IMMUNITY FOR COVERED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—A covered financial institution shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for a disclosure made by an individual described in subparagraph (A) if—

(i) the individual was employed by, or, in the case of a registered representative, insurance producer, or investment adviser representative, affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution at the time of the disclosure; and

(ii) before the time of the disclosure, each individual described in subsection (b)(1) received the training described in subsection (b).

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be construed to limit the liability of an individual or a covered financial institution in a civil action for any act, omission, or fraud that is not a disclosure described in subparagraph (A).

(b) TRAINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered financial institution or a third party selected by a covered financial institution may provide the training described in paragraph (2)(A) to each officer or employee of, or registered representative, insurance producer, or investment adviser representative affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution who—

(A) is described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i);

(B) may come into contact with a senior citizen as a regular part of the professional duties of the individual; or

(C) may review or approve the financial documents, records, or transactions of a senior citizen in connection with providing financial services to a senior citizen.

(2) CONTENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The content of the training that a covered financial institution or a third party selected by the covered financial institution may provide under paragraph (1) shall—

(i) be maintained by the covered financial institution and made available to a covered agency with examination authority over the covered financial institution, upon request, except that a covered financial institution shall not be required to maintain or make available such content with respect to any individual who is no longer employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution;

(ii) instruct any individual attending the training on how to identify and report the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen internally and, as appropriate, to government officials or law enforcement authorities, including common signs that indicate the financial exploitation of a senior citizen;

(iii) discuss the need to protect the privacy and respect the integrity of each individual customer of the covered financial institution; and

(iv) be appropriate to the job responsibilities of the individual attending the training.

(B) TIMING.—The training under paragraph (1) shall be provided—

(i) as soon as reasonably practicable; and

(ii) with respect to an individual who begins employment, or becomes affiliated or associated, with a covered financial institution after the date of enactment of this Act, not later than 1 year after the date on which the individual becomes employed by, or af-

filiated or associated with, the covered financial institution in a position described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1).

(C) RECORDS.—A covered financial institution shall—

(i) maintain a record of each individual who—

(I) is employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution in a position described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1); and

(II) has completed the training under paragraph (1), regardless of whether the training was—

(aa) provided by the covered financial institution or a third party selected by the covered financial institution;

(bb) completed before the individual was employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution; and

(cc) completed before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) upon request, provide a record described in clause (i) to a covered agency with examination authority over the covered financial institution.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt or limit any provision of State law, except only to the extent that subsection (a) provides a greater level of protection against liability to an individual described in subsection (a)(2)(A) or to a covered financial institution described in subsection (a)(2)(B) than is provided under State law.

SEC. 304. RESTORATION OF THE PROTECTING TENANTS AT FORECLOSURE ACT OF 2009.

(a) REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISION.—Section 704 of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009 (12 U.S.C. 5201 note; 12 U.S.C. 5220 note; 42 U.S.C. 1437f note) is repealed.

(b) RESTORATION.—Sections 701 through 703 of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009, the provisions of law amended [or repealed] by such sections, and any regulations promulgated pursuant to such sections, as were in effect on December 30, 2014, are restored and revived.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. REMEDIATING LEAD AND ASBESTOS HAZARDS.

Section 109(a)(1) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5219(a)(1)) is amended, in the second sentence, by inserting “and to remediate lead and asbestos hazards in residential properties” before the period at the end.

SEC. 306. FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437u) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “public housing and”; and

(B) by striking “the certificate and voucher programs under section 8” and inserting “sections 8 and 9”; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) CONTINUATION OF PRIOR REQUIRED PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each public housing agency that was required to administer a local Family Self-Sufficiency program on the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act shall operate such local program for, at a minimum, the number of families the agency was required to serve on the date of enactment of such Act, subject only to the availability under appropriations Acts of sufficient amounts for housing assistance and the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(2) REDUCTION.—The number of families for which a public housing agency is required to operate such local program under paragraph (1) shall be decreased by 1 for each family from any supported rental housing program administered by such agency that, after October 21, 1998, fulfills its obligations under the contract of participation.”

“(3) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary shall not require a public housing agency to carry out a mandatory program for a period of time upon the request of the public housing agency and upon a determination by the Secretary that implementation is not feasible because of local circumstances, which may include—

“(A) lack of supportive services accessible to eligible families, which shall include insufficient availability of resources for programs under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.);

“(B) lack of funding for reasonable administrative costs;

“(C) lack of cooperation by other units of State or local government; or

“(D) any other circumstances that the Secretary may consider appropriate.”;

(3) by striking subsection (i);

(4) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (b), as amended, the following:

“(c) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE FAMILIES.—A family is eligible to participate in a local Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section if—

“(A) at least 1 household member seeks to become and remain employed in suitable employment or to increase earnings; and

“(B) the household member receives direct assistance under section 8 or resides in a unit assisted under section 8 or 9.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The following entities are eligible to administer a local Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section:

“(A) A public housing agency administering housing assistance to or on behalf of an eligible family under section 8 or 9.

“(B) The owner or sponsor of a multifamily property receiving project-based rental assistance under section 8, in accordance with the requirements under subsection (1).”;

(6) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” the first time it appears and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) in the first sentence, by striking “each leaseholder receiving assistance under the certificate and voucher programs of the public housing agency under section 8 or residing in public housing administered by the agency” and inserting “a household member of an eligible family”; and

(iii) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “Housing assistance may not be terminated as a consequence of either successful completion of the contract of participation or failure to complete such contract. A contract of participation shall remain in effect until the participating family exits the Family Self-Sufficiency program upon successful graduation or expiration of the contract of participation, or for other good cause.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the first sentence—

(aa) by striking “A local program under this section” and inserting “An eligible entity”;

(bb) by striking “provide” and inserting “coordinate”; and

(cc) by striking “to” and inserting “for”; and

(II) in the second sentence—

(aa) by striking “provided during” and inserting “coordinated for”;

(bb) by striking “under section 8 or residing in public housing” and inserting “pursuant to section 8 or 9 and for the duration of the contract of participation”; and

(cc) by inserting “, but are not limited to” after “may include”;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “or attainment of a high school equivalency certificate” after “high school”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (G);

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (J) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (K) respectively;

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) education in pursuit of a post-secondary degree or certification.”;

(vi) in subparagraph (H), by inserting “financial literacy, such as training in financial management, financial coaching, and asset building, and” after “training in”;

(vii) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” at the end; and

(viii) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

“(J) homeownership education and assistance; and”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting “the first recertification of income after” after “not later than 5 years after”; and

(ii) in the second sentence—

(I) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”; and

(II) by striking “of the agency”;

(D) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) EMPLOYMENT.—The contract of participation shall require 1 household member of the participating family to seek and maintain suitable employment.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) NONPARTICIPATION.—Assistance under section 8 or 9 for a family that elects not to participate in a Family Self-Sufficiency program shall not be delayed by reason of such election.”;

(7) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “whose monthly adjusted income does not exceed 50 percent” and all that follows through the period at the end of the third sentence and inserting “shall be calculated under the rental provisions of section 3 or section 8(o), as applicable.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “For each participating family, an amount equal to any increase in the amount of rent paid by the family in accordance with the provisions of section 3 or 8(o), as applicable, that is attributable to increases in earned income by the participating family, shall be placed in an interest-bearing escrow account established by the eligible entity on behalf of the participating family. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity may use funds it controls under section 8 or 9 for purposes of making the escrow deposit for participating families assisted under, or residing in units assisted under, section 8 or 9, respectively, provided such funds are offset by the increase in the amount of rent paid by the participating family.”;

(ii) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “All Family Self-Sufficiency programs administered under this section shall include an escrow account.”;

(iii) in the fourth sentence, by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (d)”;

(iv) in the last sentence—

(I) by striking “A public housing agency” and inserting “An eligible entity”;

(II) by striking “the public housing agency” and inserting “such eligible entity”; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) FORFEITED ESCROW.—Any amount placed in an escrow account established by an eligible entity for a participating family as required under paragraph (2), that exists after the end of a contract of participation by a household member of a participating family that does not qualify to receive the escrow, shall be used by the eligible entity for the benefit of participating families in good standing.”;

(8) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by striking “, unless the income of the family equals or exceeds 80 percent of the median income of the area (as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families)”;

(9) in subsection (g), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) by striking “the public housing agency” and inserting “such eligible entity”; and

(iii) by striking “subsection (g)” and inserting “subsection (h)”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity” each place that term appears;

(ii) by striking “or the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act”;

(iii) by inserting “primary, secondary, and post-secondary” after “public and private”; and

(iv) in the second sentence, by inserting “and tenants served by the program” after “the unit of general local government”;

(10) in subsection (h), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) by striking “participating in the” and inserting “carrying out a”;

(iii) by striking “to the Secretary”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) by striking “subsection (f)” and inserting “subsection (g)”;

(iii) by striking “residents of the public housing” and inserting “the current and prospective participants of the program”; and

(iv) by striking “or the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking “subsection (c)(2)” and inserting “subsection (d)(2)”;

(II) by striking “provided to” and inserting “coordinated on behalf of participating”;

(III) by inserting “direct” before “assistance”; and

(IV) by striking “the section 8 and public housing programs” and inserting “sections 8 and 9”;

(ii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (e)”;

(II) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “deliver” and inserting “coordinate”;

(iv) in subparagraph (H), by striking “the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act and”;

(v) in subparagraph (I), by striking “public housing or section 8 assistance” and inserting “assistance under section 8 or 9”;

(II) by amending subsection (i), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(i) FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY AWARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to appropriations, the Secretary shall establish a formula by which annual funds shall be awarded or as otherwise determined by the Secretary for the costs incurred by an eligible entity in administering the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

“(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.—The award established under paragraph (1) shall provide funding for family self-sufficiency coordinators as follows:

“(A) BASE AWARD.—An eligible entity serving 25 or more participants in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section is eligible to receive an award equal to the costs, as determined by the Secretary, of 1 full-time family self-sufficiency coordinator position. The Secretary may, by regulation or notice, determine the policy concerning the award for an eligible entity serving fewer than 25 such participants, including providing prorated awards or allowing such entities to combine their programs under this section for purposes of employing a coordinator.

“(B) ADDITIONAL AWARD.—An eligible entity that meets performance standards set by the Secretary is eligible to receive an additional award sufficient to cover the costs of filling an additional family self-sufficiency coordinator position if such entity has 75 or more participating families, and an additional coordinator for each additional 50 participating families, or such other ratio as may be established by the Secretary based on the award allocation evaluation under subparagraph (E).

“(C) STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES.—For purposes of calculating the award under this paragraph, each administratively distinct part of a State or regional eligible entity may be treated as a separate agency.

“(D) DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF COORDINATORS.—In determining whether an eligible entity meets a specific threshold for funding pursuant to this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider the number of participants enrolled by the eligible entity in its Family Self-Sufficiency program as well as other criteria determined by the Secretary.

“(E) AWARD ALLOCATION EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report evaluating the award allocation under this subsection, and make recommendations based on this evaluation and other related findings to modify such allocation, within 4 years after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, and not less frequently than every 4 years thereafter. The report requirement under this subparagraph shall terminate after the Secretary has submitted 2 such reports to Congress.

“(3) RENEWALS AND ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds allocated by the Secretary under this subsection shall be allocated in the following order of priority:

“(i) FIRST PRIORITY.—Renewal of the full cost of all coordinators in the previous year at each eligible entity with an existing Family Self-Sufficiency program that meets applicable performance standards set by the Secretary.

“(ii) SECOND PRIORITY.—New or incremental coordinator funding authorized under this section.

“(B) GUIDANCE.—If the first priority, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), cannot be fully satisfied, the Secretary may prorate the funding for each eligible entity, as long as—

“(i) each eligible entity that has received funding for at least 1 part-time coordinator in the prior fiscal year is provided sufficient funding for at least 1 part-time coordinator as part of any such proration; and

“(ii) each eligible entity that has received funding for at least 1 full-time coordinator in

the prior fiscal year is provided sufficient funding for at least 1 full-time coordinator as part of any such proration.

“(4) **RECAPTURE OR OFFSET.**—Any awards allocated under this subsection by the Secretary in a fiscal year that have not been spent by the end of the subsequent fiscal year or such other time period as determined by the Secretary may be recaptured by the Secretary and shall be available for providing additional awards pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), or may be offset as determined by the Secretary. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available for 3 years in order to facilitate the reuse of any recaptured funds for this purpose.

“(5) **PERFORMANCE REPORTING.**—Programs under this section shall be required to report the number of families enrolled and graduated, the number of established escrow accounts and positive escrow balances, and any other information that the Secretary may require. Program performance shall be reviewed periodically as determined by the Secretary.

“(6) **INCENTIVES FOR INNOVATION AND HIGH PERFORMANCE.**—The Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the amounts made available under this subsection to provide support to or reward Family Self-Sufficiency programs based on the rate of successful completion, increased earned income, or other factors as may be established by the Secretary.”;

(12) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(B) by striking “public housing” before “units”;

(C) by striking “in public housing projects administered by the agency”;

(D) by inserting “or coordination” after “provision”;

(E) by striking the last sentence;

(13) in subsection (k), by striking “public housing agencies” and inserting “eligible entities”;

(14) by striking subsection (n);

(15) by striking subsection (o);

(16) by redesignating subsections (l) and (m) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively;

(17) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

“(1) **PROGRAMS FOR TENANTS IN PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTIES WITH PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE.**—

“(1) **VOLUNTARY AVAILABILITY OF FSS PROGRAM.**—The owner of a privately owned property may voluntarily make a Family Self-Sufficiency program available to the tenants of such property in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. Such procedures shall permit the owner to enter into a cooperative agreement with a local public housing agency that administers a Family Self-Sufficiency program or, at the owner's option, operate a Family Self-Sufficiency program on its own or in partnership with another owner. An owner, who voluntarily makes a Family Self-Sufficiency program available pursuant to this subsection, may access funding from any residual receipt accounts for the property to hire a family self-sufficiency coordinator or coordinators for their program.

“(2) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.**—Any cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall require the public housing agency to open its Family Self-Sufficiency program waiting list to any eligible family residing in the owner's property who resides in a unit assisted under project-based rental assistance.

“(3) **TREATMENT OF FAMILIES ASSISTED UNDER THIS SUBSECTION.**—A public housing agency that enters into a cooperative agreement pursuant to paragraph (1) may count any family participating in its Family Self-Sufficiency program as a result of such agreement as part of the calculation of the award under subsection (i).

“(4) **ESCROW.**—

“(A) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.**—A cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide for the calculation and tracking of the escrow for participating residents and for the owner to make available, upon request of the public housing agency, escrow for participating residents, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (e), residing in units assisted under section 8.

“(B) **CALCULATION AND TRACKING BY OWNER.**—The owner of a privately owned property who voluntarily makes a Family Self-Sufficiency program available pursuant to paragraph (1) shall calculate and track the escrow for participating residents and make escrow for participating residents available in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (e).

“(5) **EXCEPTION.**—This subsection shall not apply to properties assisted under section 8(o)(13).

“(6) **SUSPENSION OF ENROLLMENT.**—In any year, the Secretary may suspend the enrollment of new families in Family Self-Sufficiency programs under this subsection based on a determination that insufficient funding is available for this purpose.”;

(18) in subsection (m), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “Each public housing agency” and inserting “Each eligible entity”;

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “The report shall include” and inserting “The contents of the report shall include”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”; and

(II) by striking “local”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and describing any additional research needs of the Secretary to evaluate the effectiveness of the program” after “under paragraph (1)”; and

(19) in subsection (n), as so redesignated, by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(20) by adding at the end the following:

“(o) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that meets the requirements under subsection (c)(2) to administer a Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

“(2) **ELIGIBLE FAMILY.**—The term ‘eligible family’ means a family that meets the requirements under subsection (c)(1) to participate in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

“(3) **PARTICIPATING FAMILY.**—The term ‘participating family’ means an eligible family that is participating in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue regulations to implement this section and any amendments made by this section, and this section and any amendments made by this section shall take effect upon such issuance.

SEC. 307. REHABILITATION OF QUALIFIED EDUCATION LOANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 623(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) **REHABILITATION OF QUALIFIED EDUCATION LOANS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a consumer may request a financial institution to remove from a consumer report a reported default regarding a qualified education loan, and such information shall not be considered inaccurate, if—

“(I) the financial institution chooses to offer a loan rehabilitation program which includes, without limitation, a requirement of the consumer to make consecutive on-time monthly

payments in a number that demonstrates, in the assessment of the financial institution offering the loan rehabilitation program, a renewed ability and willingness to repay the loan; and

“(II) the requirements of the loan rehabilitation program described in subclause (I) are successfully met.

“(ii) **BANKING AGENCIES.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—If a financial institution is supervised by a Federal banking agency, the financial institution shall seek written approval concerning the terms and conditions of the loan rehabilitation program described in clause (i) from the appropriate Federal banking agency.

“(II) **FEEDBACK.**—An appropriate Federal banking agency shall provide feedback to a financial institution within 120 days of a request for approval under subclause (I).

“(iii) **LIMITATION.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—A consumer may obtain the benefits available under this subsection with respect to rehabilitating a loan only 1 time per loan.

“(II) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to require a financial institution to offer a loan rehabilitation program or to remove any reported default from a consumer report as a consideration of a loan rehabilitation program, except as described in clause (i).

“(iv) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘appropriate Federal banking agency’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

“(II) the term ‘qualified education loan’ has the meaning given the term in section 221(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”.

(b) **GAO STUDY.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study, in consultation with the appropriate Federal banking agencies, regarding—

(A) the implementation of subparagraph (E) of section 623(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(1)) (referred to in this paragraph as “the provision”), as added by subsection (a);

(B) the estimated operational, compliance, and reporting costs associated with the requirements of the provision;

(C) the effects of the requirements of the provision on the accuracy of credit reporting;

(D) the risks to safety and soundness, if any, created by the loan rehabilitation programs described in the provision; and

(E) a review of the effectiveness and impact on the credit of participants in any loan rehabilitation programs described in the provision and whether such programs improved the ability of participants in the programs to access credit products.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that contains all findings and determinations made in conducting the study required under paragraph (1).

TITLE IV—TAILORING REGULATIONS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

SEC. 401. ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “the applicable threshold”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) RISKS TO FINANCIAL STABILITY AND SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS.—The Board of Governors may by order or rule promulgated pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, apply any prudential standard established under this section to any bank holding company or bank holding companies with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000 to which the prudential standard does not otherwise apply provided that the Board of Governors—

“(i) determines that application of the prudential standard is appropriate—

“(I) to prevent or mitigate risks to the financial stability of the United States, as described in paragraph (1); or

“(II) to promote the safety and soundness of the bank holding company or bank holding companies; and

“(ii) takes into consideration the bank holding company’s or bank holding companies’ capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking “and credit exposure report”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting “, including credit exposure reports” before the semicolon at the end;

(3) in subsection (d)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”; and

(4) in subsection (h)(2), by striking “\$10,000,000,000” each place that term appears and inserting “\$50,000,000,000”;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i)—

(i) by striking “3” and inserting “2”; and

(ii) by striking “, adverse,”; and

(B) in paragraph (2) [(A)]—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

[(i)](I) in the first sentence, by striking “semiannual” and inserting “periodic”; and

[(i)](II) in the second sentence—

[(I)](aa) by striking “\$10,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

[(II)](bb) by striking “annual” and inserting “periodic”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(ii)—

(I) by striking “3” and inserting “2”; and

(II) by striking “, adverse,”; and

(6) in subsection (j)(1), in the first sentence, by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to limit—

(1) the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in prescribing prudential standards under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) or any other law, to tailor or differentiate among companies on an individual basis or by category, taking into consideration their capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of their subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate; or

(2) the supervisory, regulatory, or enforcement authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency to further the safe and sound operation of an institution under the supervision of the appropriate Federal banking agency.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010.—The Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5311 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 115(a)(2)(B) (12 U.S.C. 5325(a)(2)(B)), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “the applicable threshold”;

(B) in section 116(a) (12 U.S.C. 5326(a)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(C) in section 121(a) (12 U.S.C. [5311(a)] 5331(a)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(D) in section 155(d) (12 U.S.C. 5345(d)), by striking “50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(E) in section 163(b) (12 U.S.C. 5363(b)), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” each place that term appears and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(F) in section 164 (12 U.S.C. 5364), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”.

(2) FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—Paragraph (2) of the second subsection (s) (relating to assessments) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(s)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(ii) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to any bank holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$100,000,000,000.

(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—Before the effective date described in paragraph (1), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may by order exempt any bank holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$250,000,000,000 from any prudential standard under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365).

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from issuing an order or rule making under section 165(a)(2)(C) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365(a)(2)(C)), as added by this section, before the effective date described in paragraph (1).

(e) SUPERVISORY STRESS TEST.—Beginning on the effective date described in subsection (d)(1), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall, on a periodic basis, conduct supervisory stress tests of bank holding companies with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000 and total consolidated assets of [not more] less than \$250,000,000,000 to evaluate whether such bank holding companies have the capital, on a total consolidated basis, necessary to absorb losses as a result of adverse economic conditions.

(f) GLOBAL SYSTEMICALLY IMPORTANT BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.—Any bank holding company, regardless of asset size, that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be considered a bank holding company with total con-

solidated assets equal to or greater than \$250,000,000,000 with respect to the application of standards or requirements under—

(1) this section;

(2) sections 116(a), 121(a), 155(d), 163(b), 164, and 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5326(a), 5331(a), 5345(d), 5363(b), 5364, 5365); and

(3) paragraph (2)(A) of the second subsection (s) (relating to assessments) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(s)(2)).

SEC. 402. SUPPLEMENTARY LEVERAGE RATIO FOR CUSTODIAL BANKS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “custodial bank” means any depository institution [for depository institution holding company for which the level of assets under custody is not less than 30 times the total consolidated assets of the depository institution or depository institution holding company, as applicable.] *holding company predominantly engaged in custody, safekeeping, and asset servicing activities, including any insured depository institution subsidiary of such a holding company.*

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “central bank” means—

(A) the Federal Reserve System;

(B) the European Central Bank; and

(C) central banks of member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, if—

(i) the [central bank of such] member country has been assigned a zero percent risk weight under [the final rule of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System entitled “Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule” (78 Fed. Reg. 62018 (October 11, 2013)) and the final rule of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation entitled “Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule” (79 Fed. Reg. 20754 (April 14, 2014))] sections 3.32, 217.32, and 324.32 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

(ii) the sovereign debt of such member country is not in default or has not been in default during the previous 5 years.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall promulgate regulations to amend sections 3.10, 217.10, and 324.10 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, to specify that—

(A) subject to subparagraph (B), funds of a custodial bank that are deposited with a central bank shall not be taken into account when calculating the supplementary leverage ratio as applied to the custodial bank; and

(B) with respect to the funds described in subparagraph (A), any amount that exceeds the total value of deposits of the custodial bank that are linked to fiduciary or custodial and safekeeping accounts shall be taken into account when calculating the supplementary leverage ratio as applied to the custodial bank.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed to limit the

authority of the appropriate Federal banking agencies to tailor or adjust the supplementary leverage ratio or any other leverage ratio for any company that is not a custodial bank.

SEC. 403. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended—

(1) by moving subsection (z) so that it appears after subsection (y); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(aa) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘investment grade’, with respect to an obligation, has the meaning given the term in section 1.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto;

“(B) the term ‘liquid and readily-marketable’ has the meaning given the term in section 249.3 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto; and

“(C) the term ‘municipal obligation’ means an obligation of—

“(i) a State or any political subdivision thereof; or

“(ii) any agency or instrumentality of a State or any political subdivision thereof.

“(2) MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.—For purposes of the final rule entitled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards’ (79 Fed. Reg. 61439 (October 10, 2014)), the final rule entitled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Treatment of U.S. Municipal Securities as High-Quality Liquid Assets’ (81 Fed. Reg. 21223 (April 11, 2016)), and any other regulation that incorporates a definition of the term ‘high-quality liquid asset’ or another substantially similar term, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall treat a municipal obligation as a high-quality liquid asset that is a level 2B liquid asset if that obligation is, as of the date of calculation—

“(A) liquid and readily-marketable; and

“(B) investment grade.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO LIQUIDITY COVERAGE RATIO REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall amend the final rule entitled “Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards” (79 Fed. Reg. 61439 (October 10, 2014)) and the final rule entitled “Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Treatment of U.S. Municipal Securities as High-Quality Liquid Assets” (81 Fed. Reg. 21223 (April 11, 2016)) to implement the amendments made by this [Act] section.

TITLE V—STUDIES

SEC. 501. TREASURY REPORT ON RISKS OF CYBER THREATS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the risks of cyber threats to financial institutions and capital markets in the United States, including—

(1) an assessment of the material risks of cyber threats to financial institutions and capital markets in the United States;

(2) the impact and potential effects of material cyber attacks on financial institutions and capital markets in the United States;

(3) an analysis of how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are addressing the

material risks of cyber threats described in paragraph (1), including—

(A) how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are assessing those threats;

(B) how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are assessing the cyber vulnerabilities and preparedness of financial institutions;

(C) coordination amongst the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and their coordination with other government agencies (including with respect to regulations, examinations, lexicon, duplication, and other regulatory tools); and

(D) areas for improvement; and

(4) a recommendation of whether any appropriate Federal banking agency or the Securities and Exchange Commission needs additional legal authorities or resources to adequately assess and address the material risks of cyber threats described in paragraph (1), given the analysis required by paragraph (3).

SEC. 502. SEC STUDY ON ALGORITHMIC TRADING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the risks and benefits of algorithmic trading in capital markets in the United States.

(b) MATTERS REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED.—The matters covered by the report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the effect of algorithmic trading in equity and debt markets in the United States on the provision of liquidity in stressed and normal market conditions.

(2) An assessment of the benefits and risks to equity and debt markets in the United States by algorithmic trading.

(3) An analysis of whether the activity of algorithmic trading and entities that engage in algorithmic trading are subject to appropriate Federal supervision and regulation.

(4) A recommendation of whether—

(A) based on the analysis described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), any changes should be made to regulations; and

(B) the Securities and Exchange Commission needs additional legal authorities or resources to effect the changes described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 503. GAO REPORT ON CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “consumer”, “consumer report”, and “consumer reporting agency” have the meanings given those terms in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report that includes—

(1) a review of the current legal and regulatory structure for consumer reporting agencies and an analysis of any gaps in that structure, including, in particular, the rulemaking, supervisory, and enforcement authority of State and Federal agencies under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Public Law 106–102; 113 Stat. 1338), and any other relevant statutes;

(2) a review of the process by which consumers can appeal and expunge errors on their consumer reports;

(3) a review of the causes of consumer reporting errors;

(4) a review of the responsibilities of data furnishers to ensure that accurate information is initially reported to consumer reporting agencies and to ensure that such information continues to be accurate;

(5) a review of data security relating to consumer reporting agencies and their efforts to safeguard consumer data;

(6) a review of who has access to, and may use, consumer reports;

(7) a review of who has control or ownership of a consumer’s credit data;

(8) an analysis of—

(A) which Federal and State regulatory agencies supervise and enforce laws relating to how consumer reporting agencies protect consumer data; and

(B) all laws relating to data security applicable to consumer reporting agencies; and

(9) recommendations to Congress on how to improve the consumer reporting system, including legislative, regulatory, and industry-specific recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

COMMITTEE-REPORTED AMENDMENTS WITHDRAWN

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I have polled the committee, and on behalf of the committee, I withdraw the committee-reported amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee-reported amendments are withdrawn.

The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2151

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I call up the Crapo substitute amendment No. 2151.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL], for Mr. CRAPO, proposes an amendment numbered 2151.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 2152 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2151

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2152.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] proposes an amendment numbered 2152 to amendment No. 2151.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 192, line 13, strike "1 year" and insert "15 months".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 688 and 689.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The bill clerk read the nominations of Michael Rigas, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management; and Jeff Tien Han Pon, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rigas and Pon nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 695, 696, 716, 717, 718, and 719.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The bill clerk read the nominations of McGregor W. Scott, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California for the term of four years; Gary G. Schofield, of Nevada, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada for the term of four years; Billy J. Williams, of Oregon, to be United States Attorney for the District of Oregon for the term of four years; Mark S. James, of Missouri, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Missouri for the

term of four years; Daniel C. Mosteller, of South Dakota, to be United States Marshal for the District of South Dakota for the term of four years; and Jesse Seroyer, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Alabama for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Scott, Schofield, Williams, James, Mosteller, and Seroyer nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-20, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Arab Emirates for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$270.4 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-20

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) *Prospective Purchaser:* Government of the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

(ii) *Total Estimated Value:*

Major Defense Equipment* \$240.0 million.

Other \$30.4 million.

Total \$270.4 million.

(iii) *Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:*

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Three hundred (300) AIM-9X-2 Sidewinder Block II Missiles.

Forty (40) AIM-9X-2 Sidewinder Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs).

Thirty (30) AIM-9X-2 Sidewinder Block II Tactical Guidance Units.

Fifteen (15) AIM-9X-2 CATM Guidance Units.

Non-MDE includes: Also includes containers, spares, support equipment and missile support, U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance and other related logistics support, and other associated support equipment and services.

(iv) *Military Department:* Navy (ABJ).

(v) *Prior Related Cases, if any:* AE-P-AAL (AIM-9M); and AE-P-ABA (AIM-9-X2 (previously notified and offered but the customer allowed the LOA to expire)).

(vi) *Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid:* None.

(vii) *Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold:* See Attached Annex.

(viii) *Date Report Delivered to Congress:* March 7, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of the United Arab Emirates (UAE)—AIM-9X-2 Sidewinder Block II Missiles

The UAE has requested the possible sale of three hundred (300) AIM-9X-2 Sidewinder Block II missiles, forty (40) AIM-9X-2 Sidewinder Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs), thirty (30) AIM-9X-2 Block II Tactical guidance units, fifteen (15) AIM-9X-2 CATM guidance units, containers, spares, support equipment and missile support, U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance and other related logistics support, and other associated support equipment and services. The total estimated cost is \$270.4 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of

the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country which has been, and continues to be, an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Middle East.

This potential sale will improve the UAE's capability to meet current and future threats and provide an enhanced capability for its Air Force. The UAE will use the enhanced capability to strengthen its homeland defense. The UAE will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support does not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems Company, Tucson, AZ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require U.S. Government or contractor representatives to travel to the UAE on a temporary basis for program technical support and management oversight.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-20

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM-9X-2 Sidewinder Block II missile represents a substantial increase in missile acquisition and kinematics performance over the AIM-9M and replaces the AIM-9X Block I missile configuration. The missile includes a high off-boresight seeker, enhanced countermeasure rejection capability, low drag/high angle of attack airframe and the ability to integrate the Helmet Mounted Cueing System. The software algorithms are the most sensitive portion of the AIM-9X-2 missile. The software continues to be modified via a Pre-Planned Product Improvement (P³I) program in order to improve its counter-countermeasure capabilities. No software source code or algorithms will be released. The missile is classified as CONFIDENTIAL.

2. The AIM-9X-2 Sidewinder Block II missile will result in the transfer of sensitive technology and information. The equipment, hardware, and documentation are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The software and operational performance are classified SECRET. The seeker/guidance control section and the target detector are CONFIDENTIAL and contain sensitive state-of-the-art technology. Manuals and technical documentation that are necessary or support operational use and organizational management are classified up to SECRET. Performance and operating logic of the counter-countermeasures circuits are classified SECRET. The hardware, software, and data identified are classified to protect vulnerabilities, design and performance parameters and similar critical information.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar advanced capabilities.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-41, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Qatar for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$197 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREG M. KAUSNER,
(For Charles W. Hooper, Lieutenant
General, USA Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-41

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Qatar.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment:* \$1 million.

Other: \$196 million.

Total: \$197 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Qatar has requested to purchase equipment and support to upgrade the Qatari Emiri Air Force's (QEAF) Air Operation Center (AOC), to include Link 16 network and classified networks integration, to enhance the performance of integrated air defense planning and provide US-Qatari systems interoperability.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): One (1) Multifunctional Information Distribution System (MIDS) Low Volume Terminal (LVT).

Non-MDE: Also included are Global Positioning System (GPS) Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) Chips, Simple Key Loaders (SKL), High Assurance Internet Protocol Encryptors (HAiPE), Ground Support System (GSS) components for Link-16, as well as the necessary infrastructure construction, integration, installation, and sustainment services, cybersecurity services, technical and support facilities, COMSEC support, secure communications equipment, encryption devices, software development, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, publications and technical documentation, security certification and accreditation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (QA-D-DAG)

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: N/A

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 7, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Qatar—Upgrade of Qatar Air Operations Center (AOC)

The Government of Qatar has requested to purchase equipment and support to upgrade

the Qatari Emiri Air Force's (QEAF) Air Operation Center (AOC) to enhance the performance of integrated air defense planning and provide US-Qatari systems interoperability. This sale includes: one (1) Multifunctional Information Distribution System (MIDS) Low Volume Terminal (LVT), Global Positioning System (GPS) Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) chips, Simple Key Loaders (SKL), High Assurance Internet Protocol Encryptors (HAiPE), Ground Support System (GSS) components for Link-16 as well as the necessary infrastructure construction, integration, installation, and sustainment services, cybersecurity services, technical and support facilities, COMSEC support, secure communications equipment, encryption devices, software development, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, publications and technical documentation, security certification and accreditation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated cost is \$197 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country that has been, and continues to be, an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Persian Gulf region. Our mutual defense interests anchor our relationship and the Qatar Emiri Air Force (QEAF) plays a predominant role in Qatar's defense.

The upgrade of the AOC will support the defensive capability of Qatar. The proposed sale will help strengthen Qatar's capability to counter current and future threats in the region and reduce dependence on U.S. forces. Qatar will have no difficulty absorbing the required equipment and capability into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon, Waltham, MA. Qatar typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between Qatar and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of approximately five (5) additional U.S. Government and approximately fifteen (15) contractor representatives to Qatar.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-41

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Multifunctional Information Distribution System-Low Volume Terminal (MIDS-LVT) is an advanced Link-16 command, control, communications, and intelligence (C3I) system incorporating high-capacity, jam-resistant, digital communication links is used for exchange of near real-time tactical information, including both data and voice, among air, ground, and sea elements. The terminal hardware, publications, performance specifications, operational capability, parameters, vulnerabilities to countermeasures, and software documentation are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The classified information to be provided consists of

that which is necessary for the operation, maintenance, and repair (through intermediate level) of the data link terminal, installed systems, and related software.

2. A Global Positioning System (GPS) Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) deploys anti-spoofing measures using cryptography to protect authorized users from false satellite signals generated by an enemy. Information revealing SAASM implementation details such as number or length of keying variables, circuit diagrams, specific quantitative measures, functions, and capabilities are classified SECRET.

3. Software, hardware, and other data/information, which is classified or sensitive, is reviewed prior to release to protect system vulnerabilities, design data, and performance parameters. Some end-item hardware, software, and other data identified above are classified at the CONFIDENTIAL and SECRET/RELEASABLE TO QATAR level. Potential compromise of these systems is controlled through management of the basic software programs of highly sensitive systems and software-controlled weapon systems on a case-by-case basis.

4. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

5. A determination has been made that Qatar can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to further the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

6. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Qatar.

UNITED STATES-GUATEMALA BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to affirm the partnership between the United States and Guatemala. I also rise to speak to the crucial role the Guatemalan attorney general has in efforts to strengthen the rule of law and the importance of the selection of the country's next attorney general.

In addition to the important contributions that more than 1 million Guatemalan Americans make to the United States, our two countries share a wide range of economic, social, and cultural linkages. In the past 2 years, Guatemalan President Jimmy Morales has emerged as a partner on U.S. foreign policy priorities. He has supported U.S. efforts to increase diplomatic pressure against Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro in the face of the humanitarian, economic, and political crisis in Venezuela. President Morales is also working to align Guatemalan foreign policy with the U.S. approach to the Middle East, both at the United Nations and by recently announcing that Guatemala will move its embassy to Jerusalem.

Since 2014, I have supported increased U.S. assistance for Guatemala and the

other Northern Triangle countries in order to address levels of violence and poverty that drive migration in the region. I believe that continued U.S. engagement can be transformative for efforts to increase security, strengthen democratic governance, support civil society, improve protections for human rights, and foster economic development. However, we must recognize that these efforts would be futile without the work of Guatemala's attorney general.

While President Morales made the commendable decision to increase the budget for Guatemala's Public Ministry, which is overseen by the attorney general, I am troubled by recent actions that run counter to the Ministry's work. For the past 11 years, Guatemala has become an example in the fight against impunity. This is due, in no small part, to the work, commitment, and determination of Guatemala's attorneys general and the efforts of the United Nations International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala—known by its Spanish acronym, CICIG—an independent investigative body that works closely with the Public Ministry.

Since its creation in 2006, CICIG has worked with the Public Ministry to investigate and dismantle the criminal networks that seek to influence the Guatemalan state, while also helping increase the capacity of local judicial institutions. Such efforts have contributed to reducing Guatemala's overall impunity rate for homicides from 95 percent to 72 percent. These institutions deserve our steadfast support so they can continue their progress building a safer and more prosperous Guatemala, which in turn contributes to a more stable hemisphere. The success of this model has served as a model for similar efforts in other countries.

Although there has been tangible progress, much work remains, and Guatemala will continue to benefit from a sustained commitment to good governance and accountability. I worry recent actions signal a move in the wrong direction, including the recent removal of Interior Minister, including Francisco Rivas and the chief of Guatemala's Internal Revenue Service, Juan Solorzano Foppa—both were key partners of the Public Ministry and the CICIG. I was equally concerned about attempts last year to reform the Guatemalan penal code in a way that may complicate the prosecution of cases involving illicit financing and commuted sentences for crimes such as extortion, trafficking, and sexual assault. I was truly shocked by President Morales' attempt to expel CICIG commissioner, Ivan Velasquez, from Guatemala. The work of Commissioner Velasquez is highly regarded and attempting to remove him simply sends the wrong message to those interested in Guatemala's fight against impunity.

These developments are deeply concerning as Guatemala is in the process of selecting its next attorney general. It is imperative that the Morales administration ensures a credible and efficient process in which all Guatemalans can have faith. It is equally necessary that the nominating commission responsible for selecting candidates conduct a transparent, merit-based process, guided by international standards. Most importantly, it is essential that President Morales select a person with the best qualifications, professionalism, and impeccable ethical standards to continue advancing an agenda that upholds the independence and impartiality of the institution. Here in the U.S. Senate, we will be following this process closely.

During her visit to Guatemala, Ambassador Nikki Haley reaffirmed U.S. support for CICIG and Commissioner Velasquez, noting that it would be in President Morales' best interest to continue support for the UN body and the commissioner. Ambassador Haley's message builds on ongoing bipartisan efforts, including continued U.S. engagement in Central America's Northern Triangle, steadfast support for CICIG, and ensuring accountability for human rights abuses, when necessary, through the implementation of the Global Magnitsky Act.

Yesterday, I had the chance to meet with Commissioner Velasquez and reaffirm my support for him and CICIG as they carry out their critical work. I remain committed to ensuring that the State Department, U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Treasury Department use all of our foreign policy tools to help strengthen democratic governance and the rule of law as we continue our support for the Guatemalan government and CICIG.

Guatemala's next attorney general must continue the courageous work of current Attorney General Thelma Aldana and former Attorney General Claudia Paz y Paz, whose efforts have been invaluable in the fight against impunity. Failure to do so would undercut the commitment of prosecutors and judges who have done their work with professionalism and adherence to the law and whose efforts have produced tangible results.

Promoting good governance and the rule of law in Guatemala is critical to building a resilient, secure, and prosperous nation for all Guatemalans. Guatemala has taken commendable steps in establishing itself as a leader on these and other critical issues in the hemisphere. It is my sincere belief that committing to these efforts will greatly contribute to overall stability and success to the region, including the United States.

In closing, I urge President Morales to support the work of the Public Ministry and CICIG, so they are able to move forward with their important

work without interference. I also encourage President Morales to continue his commitment to transparency and accountability, and to advancing his statement that, “the rule of law should always prevail.”

LITHUANIAN AND ESTONIAN CENTENNIALS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Senate Baltic Freedom Caucus has been without a Republican cochair.

This is a critical time to show solidarity with our Baltic allies, given Russian aggression against Ukraine starting in 2014, following on Russian military intervention in the Republic of Georgia in 2008.

It is also a significant milestone year for all three Baltic countries as they celebrate the 100th anniversary of their statehood. As such, it is important that the Baltic Freedom Caucus have its leadership in place. I have been a member of the Baltic Freedom Caucus for some time, and I have now agreed to be the Republican cochair, along with Senator DURBIN, who is the long-time Democrat cochair.

So, in my new capacity as cochair of the Senate Baltic Freedom Caucus, I would like to offer congratulations first to the Republic of Lithuania, which celebrated 100 years since the establishment of the modern Lithuanian state on February 16.

I say the modern state because Lithuanians trace their country's history to 1253. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania controlled a large amount of territory from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea during medieval times. It later joined with Poland as the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Then, with the partitions of Poland starting in the 18th century, it came under the control of the Russian empire.

In the wake of World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution, on February 16, 1918, representatives of the Lithuanian nation signed the Act of Independence of Lithuania “reestablishing an independent state, based on democratic principles.” Lithuania today holds true to those principles. This makes it a natural and close ally of the United States and other freedom-loving nations. In fact, the Lithuanian Government has become a particularly outspoken defender of democratic principles in the face of attacks on those principles by its large neighbor, Russia.

I would also like to recognize the Republic of Estonia, which marked 100 years of statehood on February 24. Like the United States, Estonia counts its statehood starting with its declaration of independence. Also like the United States, Estonia had to fight a war against an empire with a much larger army to secure its independence. Actually, Estonia had to fight both the German empire and Bolshevik Russia.

Germany gave up when it lost World War I, and Soviet Russia was pushed back by the new Estonian army, ultimately signing the Treaty of Tartu that recognized the independence of Estonia in perpetuity. More recently, the Estonian army has fought side by side with the United States in Iraq and Afghanistan, and Estonia is one of the few NATO allies that meets its commitment to spend 2 percent of GDP on defense.

I should add that Latvians will celebrate their 100th anniversary of statehood in November, so there will be time to congratulate them in due course, but I should mention that there are many connections between Latvia and Iowa.

Iowa was partnered with Latvia in a civic education exchange program a number of years ago; a prominent Iowan, Chuck Larson, served as Ambassador to Latvia from 2008 to 2009; and we have a Latvian-American community in Iowa.

Some people may have a vague notion that the Baltics are breakaway Soviet republics, but that is not accurate if you know your history. On the eve of World War II, the Soviets and the Nazis signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which contained a secret protocol agreeing to divide up several sovereign countries between them. The Nazis were to get western Poland, and the Soviets claimed the Baltic countries and Finland, eastern Poland, and the part of Romania that is now the Republic of Moldova. Then both totalitarian governments proceeded to take those territories by force, although the Finns only lost part of the Karelia region after repelling the Soviet invasion in the Winter War.

The Soviets organized rigged elections and claimed that the Baltic countries voluntarily joined the Soviet Union. However, the United States never recognized the annexation of these countries, and we continued to maintain diplomatic relations with the three Baltic countries throughout the Cold War.

The Lithuanian Embassy is still in its original location, and during the Soviet occupation, the Estonian representative to the United States became the longest serving member of the Washington diplomatic corps.

In 1989, on the 50th anniversary of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, citizens of the three Baltic countries formed a human chain connecting the capital cities protesting the continued occupation and highlighting the history of how it came about, which was officially denied by the Soviet regime.

Vladimir Putin's regime continues to deny that the Baltic countries were illegally occupied and to insist that they ceased to be independent states when they were annexed in 1940.

In 2015, a member of the ruling party in Russia even initiated an inquiry

with the Russian Prosecutor General as to the legality of the decision allowing the independence of the Baltic states from the Soviet Union in 1991. That decision was declared illegal. Since the entire 50-year occupation of the Baltic countries was illegal, the legality of a decision by a defunct evil empire is hardly relevant. What is relevant is that the current regime in Russia is continuing the Soviet legacy of rewriting history to fit its agenda. That is a form of political warfare.

Many Americans are now waking up to the fact that the Putin regime is bent on undermining Western democracies.

Well, the Baltic countries have been warning about that for years while leaders of our government were cozying up to Putin and playing around with reset buttons.

Estonia was the subject of a massive propaganda campaign combined with a cyber attack back in 2007 when it moved a Soviet war memorial to a less conspicuous location.

Estonia's experience of weathering a cyber attack and its strong IT sector have made it a cybersecurity expert, and it now hosts the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence.

What Russia is doing now is out of the same KGB playbook it used throughout the Cold War. For instance, the Soviets planted articles in newspapers in the 1980s claiming that the United States created AIDS. They then got other papers to pick it up and echoed the story via its own news agencies. This is exactly what Russia is still doing, only with more modern technology.

We have a lot to learn from all three Baltic countries, where the governments, the media, and the citizens are more sophisticated about identifying and exposing propaganda campaigns. The best response to propaganda is education and exposure—in other words, truth.

The citizens of the three Baltic countries fought back against Soviet distortion of history with historical truth and were able to reclaim their independence.

So today I want to recognize historical truth on the Senate floor and congratulate Lithuania and Estonia on their recent statehood centennials. I look forward to celebrating the upcoming centennial of Latvia in November.

These bastions of Western civilization and Western values in a tough neighborhood are valuable partners in advancing our shared goals of securing democracy and the blessings of liberty for our people.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO EMORY SCHWALL

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege today to pay tribute to a great Georgian who has dedicated a lifetime of service to our State ahead of his 90th birthday on April 11, 2018.

Mr. Emory Schwall is an outstanding Georgia attorney who has practiced law in our State for 68 years. In 1950, at the age of 21, he was admitted to the Georgia Bar after attending the Emory School of Law and graduating from the Woodrow Wilson Law School in Atlanta.

Emory Schwall has served as special assistant attorney general for the State of Georgia representing the insurance commissioner. He is a certified estate planner and mediator, a member of Atlanta Estate Planning Council, the Atlanta Bar Association, the Georgia Bar Association, and the American Bar Association. He also is a member of the Emory Law School Council.

As impressive as Emory Schwall's professional legal career has been, his impact on one of Georgia's finest not-for-profit hospitals is probably one of the areas of work of which he is most proud. The Shepherd Center in Atlanta specializes in medical treatment, research, and rehabilitation for people with spinal cord injury, brain injury, multiple sclerosis, spine and chronic pain, and other neuromuscular conditions. Founded in 1975, the Shepherd Center is ranked by U.S. News & World Report as among the top 10 rehabilitation hospitals in the Nation, and it has grown from a six-bed rehabilitation unit to a world-renowned, 152-bed hospital that treats more than 8,500 patients each year.

Emory Schwall has been active with the Shepherd Center since its inception, helping it obtain grants and bequests, and he has led capital campaigns and other initiatives that have helped its growth. He served on the original board of directors for the Shepherd Center Foundation. He has also served as vice president and as a director of Shepherd Center, Inc., from 1987 until 2017.

Emory Schwall has also served his church Trinity Presbyterian Church since 1956, not only as a parishioner, but also as a deacon, an elder, and as chair of its finance committee.

An appreciation for the preservation of history led him, as president of the Atlanta Medical Heritage, to donate the Academy of Medicine building, a designated historical landmark in Atlanta, to the Georgia Tech Foundation to ensure funds for the restoration and preservation of the building.

Further, Atlanta's Piedmont Hospital has benefitted from Emory Schwall's generosity and service, including serving as an active member of

the Friends of Piedmont Hospital charitable arm.

Emory Schwall also is active with national charitable and civic organizations such as the American Heart Association and the Arthritis Foundation.

His dedication to service earned him the "Greater Good Award" from the Georgia Planned Giving Council in 2009. This annual award is presented to an individual whose career is currently focused on advising individuals, attorneys, financial planners, insurance counselors, trust officers, accountants, and other financial advisers for obtaining charitable contributions, and a "Greater Good Award" recipient must have served to increase the quantity and quality of planned gifts to charities in Georgia.

Emory Schwall is truly a great Georgian, and I am fortunate to call him my friend. He, along with his wife, the late Peggy McCready Schwall, shared a love of service to others. Their three sons and four grandsons are proud to have such wonderful examples to follow, and as we celebrate his 90th birthday, I hope Emory enjoys many more years in our State and with his family.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF
BIDDEFORD SAVINGS BANK

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary of Biddeford Savings Bank, a financial leader supporting the success and growth of the communities it serves with six locations spanning Biddeford, Waterboro, Scarborough, and Kennebunk, ME. The bank has been recognized for the support of its employees and exceptional customer service, emphasizing the importance of local involvement through volunteerism and support of charities.

Founded in 1867, Biddeford Savings Bank has promoted teamwork, personal growth, and good performance amongst its employees for 150 years. In addition to supporting their employees, Biddeford Savings Bank values its customers as if they are owners. Biddeford Savings Bank assists first-time homebuyers and works with small businesses to ensure growth and success for local owners. The bank also improves its business practices by developing new banking services for customers.

Biddeford Savings Bank is not only committed to its customers, but also to its neighbors including schools, businesses, and organizations that share their desire to improve the community around them. Over the years, the bank has hosted holiday food and gift drives, as well as musical events to raise money for organizations such as the Community Bicycle Center in Biddeford, ME, and United Way. In January of 2017, the bank sponsored the Atlantic Plunge, a fundraiser hosted by Caring Unlimited, in which partici-

pants jumped into the ocean to raise awareness for and support the end of domestic violence in York County. Through local events and sponsorships, Biddeford Savings Bank promotes community engagement for individuals in all financial stages of life. For local students, the bank sponsors two programs focused on financial education. These programs allow for second-graders to learn the basics of money and banking and for high school students to explore money management and gain tools for future financial success. Employees of the bank have also spent time volunteering for local organizations such as the Scarborough Land Trust. In celebration of 150 years in business, Biddeford Savings Bank gave each of its employees \$150 to donate to any nonprofit of their choice, including Biddeford Food Pantry and the Maine Cancer Foundation. These volunteer opportunities have allowed for employees to better understand the local economic culture and recognize concerns, which allows for them to better serve their customers.

With 150 years of banking experience, Biddeford Savings Bank offers a variety of banking options for individuals and businesses with varying financial needs. The bank continues to promote the financial stability and prosperity of its customers, supporting the success of Mainers across generations. I join with its customers in congratulating Biddeford Savings Bank for improving its longstanding leadership in the communities it serves throughout Southern Maine.●

250TH ANNIVERSARY OF
MADBURY, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, the town of Madbury, NH, is celebrating its 250th anniversary this year. Madbury is a classic New England community, proud of its rich history, its tradition of direct town meeting democracy, and its family-friendly quality of life. Admittedly, I am not an entirely objective observer, as Madbury has been my home for nearly four decades. It is where I raised my family and have so many dear friends, and it is where I first got involved in local politics, serving on the town's zoning board. The roughly 1,800 residents of Madbury look forward to a nearly yearlong celebration of the anniversary, beginning with a special observance at our annual town meeting on March 13.

Of course, the human history of what is now Madbury—located today in Strafford County in southeast New Hampshire—goes back many centuries prior to the arrival of the first English explorers and settlers. In the 17th century, the Native American Chief Moharimet convened counsels in this area, and today our elementary school is named in his honor.

Madbury was originally a part of the settlements of Dover and Durham

called Barbadoes, named after the West Indies island of Barbados, where local settlers sent lumber in exchange for sugar and molasses. It was named for the English town of Modbury, the ancestral home of Sir Francis Champernowne, who immigrated to what is now Madbury in the 1640s. Madbury was incorporated as a parish in 1755 and as a town in 1768.

One of our early residents was Major John Demeritt, who in 1774 joined with other New Hampshire patriots in storming the King's Fort William and Mary in New Castle, seizing its armory of weapons and gunpower. The "Powder Major," as he came to be known, stored a portion of this armory at his farm, which still sits on Cherry Lane. It was later used by revolutionaries at the Battle of Bunker Hill.

Our Madbury town flag—thought to be the first town flag in New England—features an ax, a plow, and a rose. The ax represents forestry, which first attracted settlers to Madbury to supply shipbuilders at Dover, Durham, and Portsmouth. The plow symbolizes our agricultural past. The rose symbolizes the former Elliot rose nursery, which in the mid-20th century boasted the longest greenhouse in the world at 1,400 feet in length.

Madbury is proud of its long and rich history, and we entered the 21st century as a forward-thinking community with a vibrant economy. Though surrounded by industrial areas, Madbury has remained largely rural in character, proud of its small town charm, hospitality, and lifestyle.

I look forward to celebrations of Madbury's 250th anniversary later this year, including a parade and other festivities on Madbury Day in June and a Revolutionary War reenactment in the fall. I salute my fellow residents of Madbury on this landmark anniversary of our beloved town.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment and an amendment to the title, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 188. An act to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1132. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a 2-year prohibition on employment in a career civil service position for any former political appointee, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2226. An act to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from

certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution's portfolio, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3737. An act to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations.

H.R. 4043. An act to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4607. An act to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4725. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require short form call reports for certain depository institutions.

H.R. 4768. An act to require the President to develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4986. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reauthorize appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1132. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a 2-year prohibition on employment in a career civil service position for any former political appointee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2226. An act to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution's portfolio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3737. An act to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4607. An act to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4725. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require short form call reports for certain depository institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4768. An act to require the President to develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4986. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reauthorize appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4043. An act to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 2193, An original bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve health care for veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-212).

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2434. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2506. A bill to establish an aviation maintenance workforce development pilot program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 2507. A bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such coverage at the option of the enrollees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KING, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2508. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to promote regional economic and infrastructure development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2509. A bill to establish the National Park Restoration Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2510. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure Internet openness, to prohibit blocking of lawful content, applications, services, and non-harmful devices, to prohibit impairment or degradation of lawful Internet traffic, to limit the authority of the Federal Communications Commission and to preempt State law with respect to Internet openness obligations, to provide that broadband Internet access service shall be considered to be an information service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2511. A bill to require the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere to carry out a program on coordinating the assessment and acquisition by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of unmanned maritime systems, to make available to the public data collected by the Administration using such systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 2512. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to require producers to elect to receive price loss coverage or agriculture risk coverage under that Act or Federal crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CORKER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2513. A bill to improve school safety and mental health services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 2514. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide that a patent owner may not assert sovereign immunity as a defense in certain actions before the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BARRASSO, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2515. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 2516. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a demonstration program to test alternative pain management protocols to limit the use of opioids in emergency departments; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. LEE):

S. 2517. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow parents of eligible military dependent children to establish Military Education Savings Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2518. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 425. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2018 as "National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 188

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 188, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

S. 207

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 223

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 223, a bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research and surveillance efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 677

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary

of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1730

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1730, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1764

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1764, a bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana.

S. 1767

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1767, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 1864

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1864, a bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students.

S. 1916

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1916, a bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes.

S. 2127

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2127, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively,

to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2146

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2146, a bill to extend the full Federal medical assistance percentage to urban Indian organizations.

S. 2235

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. 2278

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2278, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve health care in rural areas.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2378

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2378, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for interest on certain small business loans.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2470

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2470, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the purchase

of certain firearms by individuals under 21 years of age, and for other purposes.

S. 2471

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2471, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the compassionate release process of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 2490

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2490, a bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures.

S. 2495

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2495, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2498

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2498, a bill to reduce identity fraud.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 407

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 407, a resolution recognizing the critical work of human rights defenders in promoting human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and good governance.

AMENDMENT NO. 2045

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2045 in-

tended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2046

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2046 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2047

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2047 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2065

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2065 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 2507. A bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such coverage at the option of the enrollees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, over the next couple of weeks, Congress is going to need to finalize government appropriations for the remainder of this year. Among the things that some people are talking about is including money for a couple of ObamaCare programs. One of them is money for the so-called cost-sharing reduction payments. Funding for these payments was never appropriated by Congress. The Obama administration paid the insurance companies anyway. President Trump stopped these illegal payments last October. Now, some people in Congress are talking about funding them again.

We all know that ObamaCare has been a disaster for millions and millions of families all across the country. We know that for the people who live in States that use the Federal healthcare.gov exchange, average premiums have doubled since the law took effect. Certainly Wyoming is one of those States that experienced it; I heard about it in Clark County just last week. We know it. We hear about it in letters from the people who write to us. No matter where they are from in the State of Wyoming, we continue

to hear about the costs going up. I am sure there is a similar situation in the State of Arkansas, the Presiding Officer's State, as well.

According to Gallup, the number of uninsured people actually increased last year by 3 million. Many people are finding that they just can't afford to have ObamaCare insurance. It is especially hard for hard-working families who don't qualify for subsidies under the healthcare law. So we know there is a problem, and we know we have to do something to help people who are struggling in ObamaCare markets.

If people are going to discuss using this government spending law to spend more money on the collapsing ObamaCare markets, there are other things we should be discussing as well. We should discuss finding a real solution to rising healthcare costs—one that doesn't just continue the unworkable, unaffordable, and, frankly, unfair system that ObamaCare created. We should discuss actually giving people more freedom and more flexibility to choose a healthcare plan that is right for them.

I am introducing a bill today to do just that. My legislation will build on a step that President Trump and the Trump administration took last month. The administration reversed a last-minute Obama-era policy that had all but killed short-term health plans. These are less expensive health plans that are free from the expensive and intrusive and burdensome regulations that ObamaCare placed on other insurers, so they are a much more affordable option for many Americans who have been priced out of ObamaCare.

President Trump is on the right path with this new rule. It is absolutely the right decision. He is giving people back an option so they can decide for themselves if it is a right choice for them. I think we should go a step further, and that is why I am introducing this legislation. We should go a step further in the omnibus spending bill. We should make this more affordable choice permanent. Making it permanent protects people. It protects people so a future administration doesn't do what President Obama did and try to wipe out choices for Americans.

This legislation I am introducing today gives people a choice to have these plans for not just 90 days—which was allowed at the end of the Obama administration—but for a full 364 days. So it is up to a year.

It also makes sure people can then renew these plans, if they want to, so it can become their permanent insurance, free from the mandates of the Obama healthcare law. It protects them from being dropped if they are sick. Remember, that was one of the biggest promises of ObamaCare that was broken. President Obama said: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. Almost immediately, people found out it

wasn't true at all. In fact, it was called by some of the press the "Lie of the Year."

In 2013 alone, there were 4.7 million Americans who got letters from their insurance companies telling them that their insurance plan had been canceled. Under my proposal, people with these short-term plans wouldn't have to worry about getting a cancellation letter. They would be protected from their insurance company, and they would be protected from Washington, DC.

States are much better suited than Washington to regulate their insurance markets in ways that work best for the citizens of their State. These simple changes in my legislation will help give people back—help give to them—the freedom ObamaCare took away. That is what we are looking at, the need for freedom for the American people. We can essentially give people an escape hatch to get out of the ObamaCare plan entirely. We can give them the freedom to choose the coverage that works for them and works best for their families.

That is the right way to bring down healthcare costs for Americans: Give them options, give them choices, give them freedom, not make them buy a one-size-fits-all government plan.

People living in more than half of America's counties have only one choice of insurance in the ObamaCare exchange—only one—half of the counties in the country. It is not a choice. They don't have options. It is a monopoly.

The left-leaning Urban Institute estimates that 4.2 million Americans would enroll in short-term plans next year if we just let them keep their plan as long as a year. That is the kind of pent-up demand that is out there for these more affordable, more flexible plans with much more freedom.

Just the one change could make a difference in the lives of 4 million Americans. My legislation does just that, and it has other benefits as well.

I think it would be an attractive option for many more Americans, but a lot of Democrats in Washington don't want to talk about options. No. They know ObamaCare markets are collapsing; they don't seem to care. They know costs are soaring out of control; it doesn't seem to concern as many as it should. They know middle-class families are being squeezed the hardest by these rising ObamaCare premiums. Their answer? We have heard it. We have heard it on the floor of the Senate: Try to push everyone—everyone in America, want it or not, everyone in America—into a single, government-run insurance plan that looks a lot like Medicaid. That is exactly the opposite of what we should be doing and what I am proposing today.

What the Democrats are proposing is more of the same failed idea that

caused Americans so many problems under ObamaCare: government control.

If there is going to be talk of proping up the ObamaCare markets during the omnibus spending bill, then we should also be talking about helping people get out of the ObamaCare markets. Give them the freedom, give them the escape hatch.

We should protect people who want health insurance but who don't want ObamaCare health insurance. They know what works best for them and their families, and we should trust the American people to know what is best for them and their families. We should give people the freedom and the flexibility to make those decisions for themselves, and we should give them more opportunities to escape from the disastrous, destructive, and extremely expensive ObamaCare markets.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2509. A bill to establish the National Park Restoration Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, probably every single one of us in the Senate would agree that it is hard to get here, it is hard to stay here, and it is wonderful to be able to accomplish something worthwhile while you are here. That is why I am here today—because I want to call attention to an announcement that was made this morning by a bipartisan group of U.S. Senators and the Secretary of the Interior, Ryan Zinke, which could take away the \$11.6 billion of national park maintenance backlog in the 417 national parks that we have. The proposal we made this morning could eliminate that backlog over the next 10 years.

I want to give Secretary Zinke and the President a lot of credit for this because they have agreed to do something that no other President and no other Secretary of the Interior have ever agreed to do, as far as I know, and that is to allow us to use revenues from energy development on Federal lands as mandatory spending to pay for the maintenance backlog in our National Park System.

Ken Burns called our national parks "America's Best Idea." I would say that the best idea to support America's best idea is the proposal that Secretary Zinke has made to take care of the maintenance backlog in our national parks.

Half of that maintenance backlog is our roads. Of course, when we pay for the roads this way, that means all the money that is now being taken away from all the other purposes at our national parks—I am talking about the National Mall, where I get up in the morning and walk every day, or the

Great Smoky Mountains National Park, where I walk when I go home on the weekends—could be used for other purposes there, in all 417 of those parks.

If we don't do this, we will never catch up because this backlog—this \$11.6 billion backlog—is four times the annual appropriations for the National Park Service. Everyone who cares about our national parks—and that should be almost every American—should welcome this proposal.

As I said, our use of Federal dollars in this way is unprecedented, but the principle is not unprecedented. The principle is a very simple principle, and that is this: If we create an environmental burden, which energy exploration does, whether it is wind turbines or whether it is spreading solar panels all over hundreds and hundreds of acres or whether it is oil and gas exploration. If we create an environmental burden, we should create a corresponding environmental benefit. That principle is well established in our laws and has been supported by almost every major environmental and conservation group I know of.

Let's start with the 1962 Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission that Laurance Rockefeller chaired. That Commission, which took a look at America for the next generation to see what we should do to protect the outdoors so we could all enjoy it, recommended, and the Congress adopted, the idea of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. There was a Federal side and a State side. Over all of the years since 1964, \$18 billion has been spent in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. That is the environmental benefit. Where did the money come from? It came from drilling on Federal offshore properties.

In 1986, I chaired President Reagan's Commission on Americans Outdoors. We reaffirmed our support for the idea that an environmental burden means we should have an environmental benefit. We urged Congress to make permanent the funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. So we reaffirmed that again for the next generation.

Then, in 2006, with the leadership of Senator Domenici, Senator Bingaman, and others—many of us worked on it—Congress decided we would take some of the revenues from new drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and apply those to the State side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund—again, an environmental burden and a corresponding environmental benefit.

That is why this proposal is so exciting to me. That is why this proposal has such strong bipartisan support.

In the Senate, the supporters include Senator KING of Maine, Senator DAINES of Montana, and Senator HEINRICH of New Mexico. It is a bipartisan group. Supporters also include Senator CAPITO

and Senator MANCHIN, Senator GARDNER and Senator TILLIS; all of us support and are cosponsoring this legislation we are introducing today.

In the House of Representatives, we also have two cosponsors. Congressman MIKE SIMPSON of Idaho, who is chairman of the House Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, and Congressman KURT SCHRADER from Oregon is also a cosponsor in the House of Representatives.

So I believe this is an unprecedented day; for all of those who care about and love our national parks and who have struggled to imagine how we can deal with this \$11.6 billion maintenance backlog—a backlog that is four times the annual appropriation—we can pay this all off with this proposal, which is supported by the President and his Office of Management and Budget, a bipartisan group of Senators, and a bipartisan group in the House.

I look forward to working with Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Hopefully, it can be moved promptly through that committee. There are other important things we would like to do, but I can't think of anything much more important than our National Park System.

I mentioned a little earlier that we have 417 national parks in the country. I grew up camping and hiking in one of those, and I live within 2 miles of that park. It is the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. It has more visitors than any other national park—nearly twice as many as the closest one. Eleven million people a year come to the park.

Many of my best memories are from that park. I remember, when I was 15 years old, my dad dropped me and a couple of other boys at the highest point of the park, Clingmans Dome, one day around Christmastime. There was 3 feet of snow. He said: I will pick you up in Gatlinburg. Well, he did, and that was about 8 or 9 hours later.

Later that same year in the summertime we were camping on Spence Field. That is at about 5,000 or 6,000 feet as well. We had taken blueberry pancake mix up there. We picked the blueberries. We had all of the materials for a good breakfast, but we made one mistake. We left the breakfast in our packs in the tent, and during the night a bear crawled in there with us, took it out, and we ended up on top of the trail shelter banging the pans together trying to run the bear off. That was the last time we left our breakfast materials nearby the sleeping area when we were camping in the park.

The park is a good place for lessons and learning and appreciating beauty. It is a good place for the rich. It is a good place for the poor. Parents bring their children out of a digital diet to feast on a world of natural splendor. We learn our history in a place where

history comes alive; not just the history of the world but the history of East Tennessee, the history of Wyoming, the history of Maine, the history of Montana.

Let me give my colleagues a sense of just what this \$11 billion backlog means. I have already said it is nearly four times what the National Park Service receives in annual appropriations. We can talk about the Smokies alone. Between Tennessee and North Carolina, there is about a \$215 million backlog of projects; 75 percent of that is roads. We get nearly twice as many visitors as any other park. These visitors come to see our majestic views. They spend 400,000 nights camping in 9 frontcountry campgrounds and 100 backcountry camp sites.

In 2013, the park had to close Look Rock Campground and the picnic area due to funding shortfalls in replacing the water treatment facilities. In order to open this recreation area for visitors, the park needs \$3 million to replace the water treatment facility, repair the road infrastructure, and replace aging picnic tables and campground pads. This proposal could do that.

The funding provided in the National Park Restoration Act, which is what we call our legislation, could help reopen this campground for the enjoyment of the over 11 million visitors to the Smokies.

The Smokies also supports a vast trail system, with almost 850 miles of maintained trails for hikers, backpackers, and visitors. The current deferred maintenance backlog for trails in the Smokies is \$18.5 million. This proposal would take care of that.

In August 2017, I visited the Smokies with Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, and I saw firsthand with him the work that is needed on the trails. We hiked the Rainbow Falls Trail, where a 2-year project is underway to rehabilitate the trail.

Crews from Trails Forever, a partnership between the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Friends of the Smokies, and the American Conservation Experience are working to build a rock staircase along the trail to reduce erosion and improve visitor safety and enjoyment.

Crews use rigging systems to move large rocks, split them using drills and chisels, and then set them into place to provide long-lasting trail structures for those hoping to see the rainbow formed by mist from the 80-foot waterfall along the Rainbow Falls Trail.

Secretary Zinke and I worked to split and place one of those rock steps. It is not very easy to do. Volunteer crews will work to rehabilitate over 6 miles of that trail.

In addition to the crews, every Wednesday volunteers head up the trail to help restore it for future visitors. In 2017, volunteers donated 900 hours of work on that trail.

The Smokies is full of wonderful volunteers like those working on the Rainbow Falls Trail. Over 2,800 volunteers donated over 115,000 hours last year alone, but we must do more to get the funding to our parks to help address the maintenance needs and support the countless volunteers.

In the Smokies, 75 percent of that maintenance work is roads, which isn't surprising, since millions of visitors to the park each year experience it behind the wheel. The park maintains and operates nearly 400 miles of roads, including 6 tunnels and 146 bridges, which allow visitors to traverse the park's mountainous landscape.

The Smokies is working hard to address these maintenance needs, and later this year they will open 16 miles of the Foothills Parkway. We are all looking forward to that in East Tennessee. Driving the Foothills Parkway will give you a spectacular view of the highest mountains in the Eastern United States. Tennesseans are excited that these new 16 miles of the parkway will soon be open to the public. It is scheduled for this fall.

Due to funding shortfalls, building and repairing the 16-mile stretch of the Foothills Parkway took over 50 years and will be completed nearly 75 years after Congress first authorized the Foothills Parkway. Completing just 1.6 miles of the parkway took nearly 30 years.

In 1944, Congress authorized the Foothills Parkway but prohibited Federal funds from being used to purchase and acquire the land, so the State of Tennessee purchased the land and gave it to the Federal Government to create a scenic parkway to provide views of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

For 75 years, Tennesseans and visitors have been waiting to enjoy the majestic views of the Foothills Parkway because there hasn't been sufficient Federal funding to address the maintenance needs of our national parks. Other roadways in the Smokies, including Newfound Gap Road and Clingmans Dome Road, remain on this backlog list.

Clingmans Dome Road takes visitors to Clingmans Dome—the highest point in Tennessee and the third highest mountain east of the Mississippi. At 6,643 feet, Clingmans Dome offers panoramic views of the Smoky Mountains.

Additional funding is desperately needed for the Smokies and all of our National Parks to help repair and rebuild campgrounds, trails, and roads. Doing that will bring more visitors, more tourists, and more jobs to Tennessee and to national park communities throughout our country.

According to the Outdoor Industry Association, the outdoor recreation economy generates 7.6 million direct jobs and \$887 billion in consumer spending. In Tennessee, the outdoor recre-

ation economy generates 188,000 direct jobs and over \$21 billion in consumer spending.

In 2016, the visitors to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park alone spent nearly \$950 million in communities surrounding the park. The over 11 million visitors to the park supported nearly 15,000 jobs and \$1.3 billion in economic output in these communities.

Restoring our parks not only helps to preserve our land for generations but helps to grow our economy.

Now, here is what our bill does. I see the Senator from North Carolina is coming to preside, and he is one of the principal cosponsors of the bill. The National Park Restoration Act will use revenues from energy production on Federal lands to help pay for the \$11 billion maintenance backlog at our national parks. It will provide mandatory funding on top of annual appropriations for the National Park Service—for the priority-deferred maintenance needs that support critical infrastructure and visitor services at our parks.

The National Park Restoration Fund created by the legislation will receive 50 percent of revenues from energy production on Federal lands over the 2018 projections that are not already allocated to other purposes.

This legislation includes revenues from all sources of energy production on Federal land: oil, gas, coal, renewables, and alternative energy.

The legislation protects all existing obligations for revenues from energy production on Federal land, including payments to States, payments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and payments to the Reclamation Fund.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the work that Senators Portman and Warner have done. They have introduced similar legislation. They have many of the same objectives. I know there are many other Senators who care deeply about this issue, other than the bipartisan group of us who introduced the legislation today. We can all work together in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee where this bill will be referred. We will put our heads together with Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL. We will come out with the best possible bill—something that President Trump can continue to support and that the full Senate and then the House of Representatives can pass. Then, we can get on with it and begin to deal with the deferred maintenance backlog in our national parks.

Theodore Roosevelt once said that nothing short of defending this country in wartime “compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us.” We must all work together to restore our national treasures so future generations have the same opportunity to enjoy them, as we have.

In conclusion, let me reiterate something personal about this. In 1985, the Secretary of the Interior called and asked me, when I was Governor of Tennessee, to chair the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. I did that, along with Gil Grosvenor, the chairman of the National Geographic Society, and a variety of people. One of our major recommendations was to pick up the recommendation of the Rockefeller Commission from 1964, which said, if there is an environmental burden, there should be an environmental benefit. They are the ones who recommended, to begin with, that we take land from energy exploration and use it to pay for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

We reaffirmed that in 1986. We reaffirmed that principle in 2006 when we used revenues from drilling for the State side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

So while this proposal is unprecedented in the sense that it is the first time that I know of that a President and his Office of Management and Budget have approved mandatory funding using revenues from energy production on Federal lands to deal with national park maintenance needs, the principle of matching an environmental burden with an environmental benefit is well established.

I am grateful to the President, and I am especially grateful to Secretary Zinke for his initiative. I look forward to working with a bipartisan group of Senators in the Energy Committee to develop a bill, pass it, and get started on the work of America's best idea for restoring America's best idea—our National Park System.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2518. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 2518

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Employees and Retirees in Business Bankruptcies Act of 2018”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

TITLE I—IMPROVING RECOVERIES FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

Sec. 101. Increased wage priority.

Sec. 102. Claim for stock value losses in defined contribution plans.

Sec. 103. Priority for severance pay.

Sec. 104. Financial returns for employees and retirees.

Sec. 105. Priority for WARN Act damages.

TITLE II—REDUCING EMPLOYEES' AND RETIREES' LOSSES

Sec. 201. Rejection of collective bargaining agreements.

Sec. 202. Payment of insurance benefits to retired employees.

Sec. 203. Protection of employee benefits in a sale of assets.

Sec. 204. Claim for pension losses.

Sec. 205. Payments by secured lender.

Sec. 206. Preservation of jobs and benefits.

Sec. 207. Termination of exclusivity.

Sec. 208. Claim for withdrawal liability.

TITLE III—RESTRICTING EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Executive compensation upon exit from bankruptcy.

Sec. 302. Limitations on executive compensation enhancements.

Sec. 303. Assumption of executive benefit plans.

Sec. 304. Recovery of executive compensation.

Sec. 305. Preferential compensation transfer.

TITLE IV—OTHER PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Union proof of claim.

Sec. 402. Exception from automatic stay.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Business bankruptcies have increased sharply in recent years and remain at high levels. These bankruptcies include several of the largest business bankruptcy filings in history. As the use of bankruptcy has expanded, job preservation and retirement security are placed at greater risk.

(2) Laws enacted to improve recoveries for employees and retirees and limit their losses in bankruptcy cases have not kept pace with the increasing and broader use of bankruptcy by businesses in all sectors of the economy. However, while protections for employees and retirees in bankruptcy cases have eroded, management compensation plans devised for those in charge of troubled businesses have become more prevalent and are escaping adequate scrutiny.

(3) Changes in the law regarding these matters are urgently needed as bankruptcy is used to address increasingly more complex and diverse conditions affecting troubled businesses and industries.

TITLE I—IMPROVING RECOVERIES FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

SEC. 101. INCREASED WAGE PRIORITY.

Section 507(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$20,000”;

(B) by striking “within 180 days”; and

(C) by striking “or the date of the cessation of the debtor’s business, whichever occurs first.”;

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “within 180 days”; and

(ii) by striking “or the date of the cessation of the debtor’s business, whichever occurs first.”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) for each such plan, to the extent of the number of employees covered by each such plan, multiplied by \$20,000.”

SEC. 102. CLAIM FOR STOCK VALUE LOSSES IN DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLANS.

Section 101(5) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) right or interest in equity securities of the debtor, or an affiliate of the debtor, if—

“(i) the equity securities are held in a defined contribution plan (within the meaning of section 3(34) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(34))) for the benefit of an individual who is not an insider, a senior executive officer, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor (if 1 or more are not insiders);

“(ii) the equity securities were attributable to either employer contributions by the debtor or an affiliate of the debtor, or elective deferrals (within the meaning of section 402(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), and any earnings thereon; and

“(iii) an employer or plan sponsor who has commenced a case under this title has committed fraud with respect to such plan or has otherwise breached a duty to the participant that has proximately caused the loss of value.”.

SEC. 103. PRIORITY FOR SEVERANCE PAY.

Section 503(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)(B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) severance pay owed to employees of the debtor (other than to an insider, other senior management, or a consultant retained to provide services to the debtor), under a plan, program, or policy generally applicable to employees of the debtor (but not under an individual contract of employment), or owed pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, for layoff or termination on or after the date of the filing of the petition, which pay shall be deemed earned in full upon such layoff or termination of employment; and”.

SEC. 104. FINANCIAL RETURNS FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES.

Section 1129(a) of title 11, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (13) and inserting the following:

“(13) With respect to retiree benefits, as that term is defined in section 1114(a), the plan—

“(A) provides for the continuation after the effective date of the plan of payment of all retiree benefits at the level established pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B) or (g) of section 1114 at any time before the date of confirmation of the plan, for the duration of the period for which the debtor has obligated itself to provide such benefits, or if no modifications are made before confirmation of the plan, the continuation of all such retiree benefits maintained or established in whole or in part by the debtor before the date of the filing of the petition; and

“(B) provides for recovery of claims arising from the modification of retiree benefits or for other financial returns, as negotiated by the debtor and the authorized representative (to the extent that such returns are paid under, rather than outside of, a plan).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(17) The plan provides for recovery of damages payable for the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement, or for other financial returns as negotiated by the debtor and the authorized representative under section 1113 (to the extent that such returns are paid under, rather than outside of, a plan).”.

SEC. 105. PRIORITY FOR WARN ACT DAMAGES.

Section 503(b)(1)(A)(ii) of title 11, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) wages and benefits awarded pursuant to a judicial proceeding or a proceeding of the National Labor Relations Board as back pay or damages attributable to any period of time occurring after the date of commencement of the case under this title, as a result of a violation of Federal or State law by the debtor, without regard to the time of the occurrence of unlawful conduct on which the award is based or to whether any services were rendered on or after the commencement of the case, including an award by a court under section 5 of the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. 2104) of up to 60 days’ pay and benefits following a layoff that occurred or commenced at a time when such award period includes a period on or after the commencement of the case, if the court determines that payment of wages and benefits by reason of the operation of this clause will not substantially increase the probability of layoff or termination of current employees or of nonpayment of domestic support obligations during the case under this title.”.

TITLE II—REDUCING EMPLOYEES' AND RETIREES' LOSSES

SEC. 201. REJECTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.

Section 1113 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (a) through (f) and inserting the following:

“(a) The debtor in possession, or the trustee if one has been appointed under this chapter, other than a trustee in a case covered by subchapter IV of this chapter and by title I of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.), may reject a collective bargaining agreement only in accordance with this section. In this section, a reference to the trustee includes the debtor in possession.

“(b) No provision of this title shall be construed to permit the trustee to unilaterally terminate or alter any provision of a collective bargaining agreement before complying with this section. The trustee shall timely pay all monetary obligations arising under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement. Any such payment required to be made before a plan confirmed under section 1129 is effective has the status of an allowed administrative expense under section 503.

“(c)(1) If the trustee seeks modification of a collective bargaining agreement, the trustee shall provide notice to the labor organization representing the employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement that modifications are being proposed under this section, and shall promptly provide an initial proposal for modifications to the collective bargaining agreement. Thereafter, the trustee shall confer in good faith with the labor organization, at reasonable times and for a reasonable period in light of the complexity of the case, in attempting to reach mutually acceptable modifications of the collective bargaining agreement.

“(2) The initial proposal and subsequent proposals by the trustee for modification of a collective bargaining agreement shall be based upon a business plan for the reorganization of the debtor, and shall reflect the most complete and reliable information available. The trustee shall provide to the labor organization all information that is relevant for negotiations. The court may enter a protective order to prevent the disclosure of information if disclosure could compromise the position of the debtor with respect to the competitors in the industry of the debtor, subject to the needs of the labor

organization to evaluate the proposals of the trustee and any application for rejection of the collective bargaining agreement or for interim relief pursuant to this section.

“(3) In consideration of Federal policy encouraging the practice and process of collective bargaining and in recognition of the bargained-for expectations of the employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement, modifications proposed by the trustee—

“(A) shall be proposed only as part of a program of workforce and nonworkforce cost savings devised for the reorganization of the debtor, including savings in management personnel costs;

“(B) shall be limited to modifications designed to achieve a specified aggregate financial contribution for the employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement (taking into consideration any labor cost savings negotiated within the 12-month period before the filing of the petition), and shall be not more than the minimum savings essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by the liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term; and

“(C) shall not be disproportionate or overly burden the employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement, either in the amount of the cost savings sought from such employees or the nature of the modifications.

“(d)(1) If, after a period of negotiations, the trustee and the labor organization have not reached an agreement over mutually satisfactory modifications, and further negotiations are not likely to produce mutually satisfactory modifications, the trustee may file a motion seeking rejection of the collective bargaining agreement after notice and a hearing. Absent agreement of the parties, no such hearing shall be held before the expiration of the 21-day period beginning on the date on which notice of the hearing is provided to the labor organization representing the employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement. Only the debtor and the labor organization may appear and be heard at such hearing. An application for rejection shall seek rejection effective upon the entry of an order granting the relief.

“(2) In consideration of Federal policy encouraging the practice and process of collective bargaining and in recognition of the bargained-for expectations of the employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement, the court may grant a motion seeking rejection of a collective bargaining agreement only if, based on clear and convincing evidence—

“(A) the court finds that the trustee has complied with the requirements of subsection (c);

“(B) the court has considered alternative proposals by the labor organization and has concluded that such proposals do not meet the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(B);

“(C) the court finds that further negotiations regarding the proposal of the trustee or an alternative proposal by the labor organization are not likely to produce an agreement;

“(D) the court finds that implementation of the proposal of the trustee shall not—

“(i) cause a material diminution in the purchasing power of the employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement;

“(ii) adversely affect the ability of the debtor to retain an experienced and qualified workforce; or

“(iii) impair the labor relations of the debtor such that the ability to achieve a feasible reorganization would be compromised; and

“(E) the court concludes that rejection of the collective bargaining agreement and immediate implementation of the proposal of the trustee is essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term.

“(3) If the trustee has implemented a program of incentive pay, bonuses, or other financial returns for insiders, senior executive officers, or the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor during the bankruptcy, or such a program was implemented within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition, the court shall presume that the trustee has failed to satisfy the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(C).

“(4) In no case shall the court enter an order rejecting a collective bargaining agreement that would result in modifications to a level lower than the level proposed by the trustee in the proposal found by the court to have complied with the requirements of this section.

“(5) At any time after the date on which an order rejecting a collective bargaining agreement is entered, or in the case of a collective bargaining agreement entered into between the trustee and the labor organization providing mutually satisfactory modifications, at any time after that collective bargaining agreement has been entered into, the labor organization may apply to the court for an order seeking an increase in the level of wages or benefits, or relief from working conditions, based upon changed circumstances. The court shall grant the request only if the increase or other relief is not inconsistent with the standard set forth in paragraph (2)(E).

“(e) During a period during which a collective bargaining agreement at issue under this section continues in effect, and if essential to the continuation of the business of the debtor or in order to avoid irreparable damage to the estate, the court, after notice and a hearing, may authorize the trustee to implement interim changes in the terms, conditions, wages, benefits, or work rules provided by the collective bargaining agreement. Any hearing under this subsection shall be scheduled in accordance with the needs of the trustee. The implementation of such interim changes shall not render the application for rejection moot.

“(f)(1) Rejection of a collective bargaining agreement constitutes a breach of the collective bargaining agreement, and shall be effective no earlier than the entry of an order granting such relief.

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), solely for purposes of determining and allowing a claim arising from the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement, rejection shall be treated as rejection of an executory contract under section 365(g) and shall be allowed or disallowed in accordance with section 502(g)(1). No claim for rejection damages shall be limited by section 502(b)(7). Economic self-help by a labor organization shall be permitted upon a court order granting a motion to reject a collective bargaining agreement under subsection (d) or pursuant to subsection (e), and no provision of this title or of any other provision of Federal or State law may be construed to the contrary.

“(g) The trustee shall provide for the reasonable fees and costs incurred by a labor organization under this section, upon request and after notice and a hearing.

“(h) A collective bargaining agreement that is assumed shall be assumed in accordance with section 365.”

SEC. 202. PAYMENT OF INSURANCE BENEFITS TO RETIRED EMPLOYEES.

Section 1114 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “, without regard to whether the debtor asserts a right to unilaterally modify such payments under such plan, fund, or program” before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting “, and a labor organization serving as the authorized representative under subsection (c)(1),” after “section”;

(3) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f)(1) If a trustee seeks modification of retiree benefits, the trustee shall provide a notice to the authorized representative that modifications are being proposed pursuant to this section, and shall promptly provide an initial proposal. Thereafter, the trustee shall confer in good faith with the authorized representative at reasonable times and for a reasonable period in light of the complexity of the case in attempting to reach mutually satisfactory modifications.

“(2) The initial proposal and subsequent proposals by the trustee shall be based upon a business plan for the reorganization of the debtor and shall reflect the most complete and reliable information available. The trustee shall provide to the authorized representative all information that is relevant for the negotiations. The court may enter a protective order to prevent the disclosure of information if disclosure could compromise the position of the debtor with respect to the competitors in the industry of the debtor, subject to the needs of the authorized representative to evaluate the proposals of the trustee and an application pursuant to subsection (g) or (h).

“(3) Modifications proposed by the trustee—

“(A) shall be proposed only as part of a program of workforce and nonworkforce cost savings devised for the reorganization of the debtor, including savings in management personnel costs;

“(B) shall be limited to modifications that are designed to achieve a specified aggregate financial contribution for the retiree group represented by the authorized representative (taking into consideration any cost savings implemented within the 12-month period before the date of filing of the petition with respect to the retiree group), and shall be no more than the minimum savings essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by the liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term; and

“(C) shall not be disproportionate or overly burden the retiree group, either in the amount of the cost savings sought from such group or the nature of the modifications.”;

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(g)(1) If, after a period of negotiations, the trustee and the authorized representative have not reached agreement over mutually satisfactory modifications and further

negotiations are not likely to produce mutually satisfactory modifications, the trustee may file a motion seeking modifications in the payment of retiree benefits after notice and a hearing. Absent agreement of the parties, no such hearing shall be held before the expiration of the 21-day period beginning on the date on which notice of the hearing is provided to the authorized representative. Only the debtor and the authorized representative may appear and be heard at such hearing.

“(2) The court may grant a motion to modify the payment of retiree benefits only if, based on clear and convincing evidence—

“(A) the court finds that the trustee has complied with the requirements of subsection (f);

“(B) the court has considered alternative proposals by the authorized representative and has determined that such proposals do not meet the requirements of subsection (f)(3)(B);

“(C) the court finds that further negotiations regarding the proposal of the trustee or an alternative proposal by the authorized representative are not likely to produce a mutually satisfactory agreement;

“(D) the court finds that implementation of the proposal shall not cause irreparable harm to the affected retirees; and

“(E) the court concludes that an order granting the motion and immediate implementation of the proposal of the trustee is essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or a successor to the debtor) in the short term.

“(3) If a trustee has implemented a program of incentive pay, bonuses, or other financial returns for insiders, senior executive officers, or the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor during the bankruptcy, or such a program was implemented within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition, the court shall presume that the trustee has failed to satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (f)(3)(C).”; and

(B) in the matter following paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “except that in no case” and inserting the following:

“(4) In no case”; and

(ii) by striking “is consistent with the standard set forth in paragraph (3)” and inserting “assures that all creditors, the debtor, and all of the affected parties are treated fairly and equitably, and is clearly favored by the balance of the equities”; and

(5) by striking subsection (k) and redesignating subsections (l) and (m) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively.

SEC. 203. PROTECTION OF EMPLOYEE BENEFITS IN A SALE OF ASSETS.

Section 363(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In approving a sale under this subsection, the court shall consider the extent to which a bidder has offered to maintain existing jobs, preserve terms and conditions of employment, and assume or match pension and retiree health benefit obligations in determining whether an offer constitutes the highest or best offer for such property.”.

SEC. 204. CLAIM FOR PENSION LOSSES.

Section 502 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) The court shall allow a claim asserted by an active or retired participant, or by a labor organization representing such partici-

pants, in a defined benefit plan terminated under section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1341, 1342), for any shortfall in pension benefits accrued as of the effective date of the termination of such pension plan as a result of the termination of the plan and limitations upon the payment of benefits imposed pursuant to section 4022 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 1342), notwithstanding any claim asserted and collected by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation with respect to such termination.

“(m) The court shall allow a claim of a kind described in section 101(5)(C) by an active or retired participant in a defined contribution plan (within the meaning of section 3(34) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(34))), or by a labor organization representing such participants. The amount of such claim shall be measured by the market value of the stock at the time of contribution to, or purchase by, the plan and the value as of the commencement of the case.”.

SEC. 205. PAYMENTS BY SECURED LENDER.

Section 506(c) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “If employees have not received wages, accrued vacation, severance, or other benefits owed under the policies and practices of the debtor, or pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement, for services rendered on and after the date of the commencement of the case, such unpaid obligations shall be deemed necessary costs and expenses of preserving, or disposing of, property securing an allowed secured claim and shall be recovered even if the trustee has otherwise waived the provisions of this subsection under an agreement with the holder of the allowed secured claim or a successor or predecessor in interest.”.

SEC. 206. PRESERVATION OF JOBS AND BENEFITS.

Chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting before section 1101 the following:

“§ 1100. Statement of purpose

“A debtor commencing a case under this chapter shall have as its principal purpose the reorganization of its business to preserve going concern value to the maximum extent possible through the productive use of its assets and the preservation of jobs that will sustain productive economic activity.”;

(2) in section 1129—

(A) in subsection (a), as amended by section 104, by adding at the end the following:

“(18) The debtor has demonstrated that the reorganization preserves going concern value to the maximum extent possible through the productive use of the assets of the debtor and preserves jobs that sustain productive economic activity.”; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) by inserting “(1)” after “(c)”; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:

“(2) If the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) are met with respect to more than 1 plan, the court shall, in determining which plan to confirm—

“(A) consider the extent to which each plan would preserve going concern value through the productive use of the assets of the debtor and the preservation of jobs that sustain productive economic activity; and

“(B) confirm the plan that better serves such interests.

“(3) A plan that incorporates the terms of a settlement with a labor organization representing employees of the debtor shall pre-

sumptively constitute the plan that satisfies this subsection.”; and

(3) in the table of sections, by inserting before the item relating to section 1101 the following:

“1100. Statement of purpose.”.

SEC. 207. TERMINATION OF EXCLUSIVITY.

Section 1121(d) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) For purposes of this subsection, cause for reducing the 120-day period or the 180-day period includes—

“(A) the filing of a motion pursuant to section 1113 seeking rejection of a collective bargaining agreement if a plan based upon an alternative proposal by the labor organization is reasonably likely to be confirmed within a reasonable time; and

“(B) the proposed filing of a plan by a proponent other than the debtor, which incorporates the terms of a settlement with a labor organization if such plan is reasonably likely to be confirmed within a reasonable time.”.

SEC. 208. CLAIM FOR WITHDRAWAL LIABILITY.

Section 503(b) of title 11, United States Code, as amended by section 103 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) with respect to withdrawal liability owed to a multiemployer pension plan for a complete or partial withdrawal pursuant to section 4201 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1381) where such withdrawal occurs on or after the commencement of the case, an amount equal to the amount of vested benefits payable from such pension plan that accrued as a result of employees’ services rendered to the debtor during the period beginning on the date of commencement of the case and ending on the date of the withdrawal from the plan.”.

TITLE III—RESTRICTING EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION UPON EXIT FROM BANKRUPTCY.

Section 1129(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: “Except for compensation subject to review under paragraph (5), payments or other distributions under the plan to or for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, and any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor, shall not be approved except as part of a program of payments or distributions generally applicable to employees of the debtor, and only to the extent that the court determines that such payments are not excessive or disproportionate compared to distributions to the nonmanagement workforce of the debtor.”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the compensation disclosed pursuant to subparagraph (B) has been approved by, or is subject to the approval of, the court as—

“(i) reasonable when compared to individuals holding comparable positions at comparable companies in the same industry; and

“(ii) not disproportionate in light of economic concessions by the nonmanagement workforce of the debtor during the case.”.

SEC. 302. LIMITATIONS ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION ENHANCEMENTS.

Section 503(c) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting “, a senior executive officer, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants” after “an insider”;

(B) by inserting “or for the payment of performance or incentive compensation, or a bonus of any kind, or other financial returns designed to replace or enhance incentive, stock, or other compensation in effect before the date of the commencement of the case,” after “remain with the debtor’s business,”; and

(C) by inserting “clear and convincing” before “evidence in the record”;

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) other transfers or obligations to or for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, managers, or consultants providing services to the debtor, in the absence of a finding by the court, based upon clear and convincing evidence, and without deference to the request of the debtor for such payments, that such transfers or obligations are essential to the survival of the business of the debtor or (in the case of a liquidation of some or all of the assets of the debtor) essential to the orderly liquidation and maximization of value of the assets of the debtor, in either case, because of the essential nature of the services provided, and then only to the extent that the court finds such transfers or obligations are reasonable compared to individuals holding comparable positions at comparable companies in the same industry and not disproportionate in light of economic concessions by the nonmanagement workforce of the debtor during the case.”

SEC. 303. ASSUMPTION OF EXECUTIVE BENEFIT PLANS.

Section 365 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “and (d)” and inserting “(d), (q), and (r)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(q) No deferred compensation arrangement for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor shall be assumed if a defined benefit plan for employees of the debtor has been terminated pursuant to section 401 or 402 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1341, 1342), on or after the date of the commencement of the case or within 180 days before the date of the commencement of the case.

“(r) No plan, fund, program, or contract to provide retiree benefits for insiders, senior executive officers, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor shall be assumed if the debtor has obtained relief under subsection (g) or (h) of section 1114 to impose reductions in retiree benefits or under subsection (d) or (e) of section 1113 to impose reductions in the health benefits of active employees of the debtor, or reduced or eliminated health benefits for active or retired employees within 180 days before the date of the commencement of the case.”

SEC. 304. RECOVERY OF EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 562 the following:

“§ 563. Recovery of executive compensation

“(a) If a debtor has obtained relief under section 1113(d) or section 1114(g), by which

the debtor reduces the cost of its obligations under a collective bargaining agreement or a plan, fund, or program for retiree benefits (as defined in section 1114(a)), the court, in granting relief, shall determine the percentage diminution in the value of the obligations when compared to the obligations of the debtor under the collective bargaining agreement, or with respect to retiree benefits, as of the date of the commencement of the case under this title before granting such relief. In making its determination, the court shall include reductions in benefits, if any, as a result of the termination pursuant to section 401 or 402 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1341, 1342), of a defined benefit plan administered by the debtor, or for which the debtor is a contributing employer, effective at any time on or after 180 days before the date of the commencement of a case under this title. The court shall not take into account pension benefits paid or payable under that Act as a result of any such termination.

“(b) If a defined benefit pension plan administered by the debtor, or for which the debtor is a contributing employer, has been terminated pursuant to section 401 or 402 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1341, 1342), effective at any time on or after 180 days before the date of the commencement of a case under this title, but a debtor has not obtained relief under section 1113(d), or section 1114(g), the court, upon motion of a party in interest, shall determine the percentage diminution in the value of benefit obligations when compared to the total benefit liabilities before such termination. The court shall not take into account pension benefits paid or payable under title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) as a result of any such termination.

“(c) Upon the determination of the percentage diminution in value under subsection (a) or (b), the estate shall have a claim for the return of the same percentage of the compensation paid, directly or indirectly (including any transfer to a self-settled trust or similar device, or to a non-qualified deferred compensation plan under section 409A(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) to any officer of the debtor serving as member of the board of directors of the debtor within the year before the date of the commencement of the case, and any individual serving as chairman or lead director of the board of directors at the time of the granting of relief under section 1113 or 1114 or, if no such relief has been granted, the termination of the defined benefit plan.

“(d) The trustee or a committee appointed pursuant to section 1102 may commence an action to recover such claims, except that if neither the trustee nor such committee commences an action to recover such claim by the first date set for the hearing on the confirmation of plan under section 1129, any party in interest may apply to the court for authority to recover such claim for the benefit of the estate. The costs of recovery shall be borne by the estate.

“(e) The court shall not award postpetition compensation under section 503(c) or otherwise to any person subject to subsection (c) of this section if there is a reasonable likelihood that such compensation is intended to reimburse or replace compensation recovered by the estate under this section.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 562 the following:

“563. Recovery of executive compensation.”

SEC. 305. PREFERENTIAL COMPENSATION TRANSFER.

Section 547 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j)(1) The trustee may avoid a transfer—

“(A) made—

“(i) to or for the benefit of an insider (including an obligation incurred for the benefit of an insider under an employment contract) made in anticipation of bankruptcy; or

“(ii) in anticipation of bankruptcy to a consultant who is formerly an insider and who is retained to provide services to an entity that becomes a debtor (including an obligation under a contract to provide services to such entity or to a debtor); and

“(B) made or incurred on or within 1 year before the filing of the petition.

“(2) No provision of subsection (c) shall constitute a defense against the recovery of a transfer described in paragraph (1).

“(3) The trustee or a committee appointed pursuant to section 1102 may commence an action to recover a transfer described in paragraph (1), except that, if neither the trustee nor such committee commences an action to recover the transfer by the time of the commencement of a hearing on the confirmation of a plan under section 1129, any party in interest may apply to the court for authority to recover the claims for the benefit of the estate. The costs of recovery shall be borne by the estate.”

TITLE IV—OTHER PROVISIONS**SEC. 401. UNION PROOF OF CLAIM.**

Section 501(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, including a labor organization,” after “A creditor”.

SEC. 402. EXCEPTION FROM AUTOMATIC STAY.

Section 362(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (28) the following:

“(29) of the commencement or continuation of a grievance, arbitration, or similar dispute resolution proceeding established by a collective bargaining agreement that was or could have been commenced against the debtor before the filing of a case under this title, or the payment or enforcement of an award or settlement under such proceeding.”

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS**SENATE RESOLUTION 425—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 2018 AS “NATIONAL COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”**

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

S. RES. 425

Whereas colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among men and women combined in the United States;

Whereas, in 2018, it is estimated that more than 140,250 individuals in the United States will be diagnosed with colorectal cancer and approximately 50,630 more will die from it;

Whereas colorectal cancer is one of the most preventable forms of cancer because screening tests can find polyps that can be removed before becoming cancerous;

Whereas screening tests can detect colorectal cancer early, which is when the disease is most treatable;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that if every individual who is 50 years of age or older had regular screening tests, as many as 60 percent of deaths from colorectal cancer could be prevented;

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for patients with localized colorectal cancer is 90 percent, but only 39 percent of all diagnoses occur at that stage;

Whereas colorectal cancer screenings can effectively reduce the incidence of colorectal cancer and mortality, but 1 in 3 adults between 50 and 75 years of age are not up to date with recommended colorectal cancer screening;

Whereas public awareness and education campaigns on colorectal cancer prevention, screening, and symptoms are held during the month of March each year; and

Whereas educational efforts can help provide to the public information on methods of prevention and screening as well as symptoms for early detection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports—

(A) the designation of March 2018 as “National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month”; and

(B) the goals and ideals of National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate awareness and educational activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2071. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2072. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2073. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2074. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2075. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2076. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2077. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2078. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2079. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2080. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2081. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2082. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2083. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2084. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2085. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2086. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2087. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2088. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2089. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2090. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2091. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2092. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2093. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2094. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2095. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2096. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2097. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. REED, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2098. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2099. Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2100. Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2101. Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2102. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2103. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2104. Mr. CRAPO proposed an amendment to the bill S. 97, to enable civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies by private and public institutions, to expand theoretical and practical knowledge of nuclear physics, chemistry, and materials science, and for other purposes.

SA 2105. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2106. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2107. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2108. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2109. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2110. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2111. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2112. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2113. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2114. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2115. Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2116. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2117. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2118. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2119. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2120. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2121. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2122. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2123. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2124. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2125. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2126. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2127. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2128. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2129. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2130. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2131. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2132. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2133. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2134. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2135. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2136. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2137. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2138. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2139. Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2140. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2141. Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2142. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2143. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2144. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2145. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2146. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2147. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2148. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2149. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2150. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2151. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2155, supra.

SA 2152. Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra.

SA 2153. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2154. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2155. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2071. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ FARM LOAN FUNDING REFORM.

(a) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF FARM OWNERSHIP LOANS.—Section 305(a)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1925(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$300,000” and inserting “\$600,000”;

(2) by striking “\$700,000” and inserting “\$2,500,000”; and

(3) by striking “2000” and inserting “2018”.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF OPERATING LOANS.—Section 313(a)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1943(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$300,000” and inserting “\$600,000”;

(2) by striking “\$700,000” and inserting “\$2,500,000”; and

(3) by striking “2000” and inserting “2018”.

SA 2072. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 106.

SA 2073. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ COMMUNITY ADVANTAGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(35) COMMUNITY ADVANTAGE PROGRAM.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘covered institution’ means—

“(I) a development company (as defined in section 103 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 662)) that is eligible to participate in the program established under title V of such Act (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

“(II) a nonprofit intermediary (as defined in subsection (m)(11));

“(III) a non-Federally regulated entity certified as a community development financial

institution by the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund established under section 104(a) of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4703(a)); or

“(IV) any other nonprofit organization approved by the Small Business Administration;

“(ii) the term ‘program’ means the Community Advantage Program established under subparagraph (B);

“(iii) the term ‘Reservist’ means a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces named in section 10101 of title 10, United States Code;

“(iv) the term ‘service-connected’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(16) of title 38, United States Code; and

“(v) the term ‘small business concern in an underserved market’ means a small business concern—

“(I) that is located in—

“(aa) a low- or moderate-income community;

“(bb) a HUBZone; or

“(cc) a community that has been designated as an empowerment zone or an enterprise community under section 1391 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

“(II) that has more than 50 percent of employees residing in a low- or moderate-income community;

“(III) that has been in existence for not more than 2 years on the date on which a loan is made to the small business concern under the Community Advantage Program established under subparagraph (B);

“(IV) owned and controlled by veterans;

“(V) owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans; or

“(VI) not less than 51 percent of which is owned and controlled by 1 or more—

“(aa) members of the Armed Forces participating in the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense;

“(bb) Reservists;

“(cc) spouses of veterans, members of the Armed Forces, or Reservists; or

“(dd) surviving spouses of veterans who died on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability.

“(B) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Community Advantage Program under which the Administration may guarantee loans made by covered institutions under this subsection, including loans made to small business concerns in underserved markets.

“(C) REQUIREMENTS.—Not less than 60 percent of loans made by a covered institution under the program shall consist of loans made to small business concerns in underserved markets.

“(D) MAXIMUM LOAN AMOUNT.—The maximum loan amount under the program is \$350,000.

“(E) REGULATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations to carry out the program, which shall be substantially similar to the Community Advantage Pilot Program of the Administration, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this paragraph.

“(ii) PILOT PROGRAM.—Beginning on the date on which the regulations promulgated by the Administrator under clause (i) take effect, the Administrator may not carry out the Community Advantage Pilot Program of the Administration.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(r) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(r)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, but does not include a covered institution, as defined in section 7(a)(35)(A)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “The term ‘non-Federally regulated SBA lender’ means a business concern if—” and inserting the following: “The term ‘non-Federally regulated SBA lender’—

“(A) means a business concern if—”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(C) in subparagraph (A)(iii), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) does not include a covered institution, as defined in section 7(a)(35)(A).”.

SA 2074. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES.

(a) EXPANDING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 61(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-60(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the asset coverage requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 18(a)(1) (and any related rule promulgated under this Act) applicable to business development companies shall be 200 percent.

“(2) The asset coverage requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 18(a)(1) and of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 18(a)(2) (and any related rule promulgated under this Act) applicable to a business development company shall be 150 percent if—

“(A) not later than 5 business days after the date on which those asset coverage requirements are approved under subparagraph (D) of this paragraph, the business development company discloses that the requirements were approved, and the effective date of the approval, in—

“(i) any filing submitted to the Commission under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a); 78o(d)); and

“(ii) a notice on the website of the business development company;

“(B) the business development company discloses, in each periodic filing required under section 13(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a))—

“(i) the aggregate outstanding principal amount or liquidation preference, as applicable, of the senior securities issued by the business development company and the asset coverage percentage as of the date of the business development company’s most recent financial statements included in that filing;

“(ii) that the business development company, under subparagraph (D), has approved

the asset coverage requirements under this paragraph; and

“(iii) the effective date of the approval described in clause (ii);

“(C) with respect to a business development company that is an issuer of common equity securities, each periodic filing of the company required under section 13(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a)) includes disclosures that are reasonably designed to ensure that shareholders are informed of—

“(i) the amount of senior securities (and the associated asset coverage ratios) of the company, determined as of the date of the most recent financial statements of the company included in that filing; and

“(ii) the principal risk factors associated with the senior securities described in clause (i), to the extent that risk is incurred by the company; and

“(D) the company—

“(i)(I) through a vote of the required majority (as defined in section 57(o)), approves the application of this paragraph to the company, to become effective on the date that is 1 year after the date of the approval; or

“(II) obtains, at a special or annual meeting of shareholders or partners at which a quorum is present, the approval of more than 50 percent of the votes cast for the application of this paragraph to the company, to become effective on the first day after the date of the approval; and

“(ii) if the company is not an issuer of common equity securities that are listed on a national securities exchange, extends, to each person that is a shareholder as of the date of an approval described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i), as applicable, the opportunity (which may include a tender offer) to sell the securities held by that shareholder as of that applicable approval date, with 25 percent of those securities to be repurchased in each of the 4 calendar quarters following the calendar quarter in which that applicable approval date takes place.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—Section 205(b)(3) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-5(b)(3)) is amended—

(i) by striking “section 61(a)(3)(B)(iii)” and inserting “section 61(a)(4)(B)(iii)”;

(ii) by striking “section 61(a)(3)(B)” and inserting “section 61(a)(4)(B)”.

(B) INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—The Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 57 (15 U.S.C. 80a-56)—

(I) in subsection (j)(1), by striking “section 61(a)(3)(B)” and inserting “section 61(a)(4)(B)”;

(II) in subsection (n)(2), by striking “section 61(a)(3)(B)” and inserting “section 61(a)(4)(B)”;

(ii) in section 63(3) (15 U.S.C. 80a-62(3)), by striking “section 61(a)(3)” and inserting “section 61(a)(4)”.

(b) PARITY FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES REGARDING OFFERING AND PROXY RULES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “business development company” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a));

(B) the term “Commission” means the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(C) the term “Form N-2” means the form described in section 239.14 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations;

(D) the term “Form S-3” means the form described in section 239.13 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(E) the term "Schedule 14A" means the information required under section 240.14a-101 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) REVISION TO RULES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall make the revisions described in subparagraph (B) to allow a business development company that has filed an election under section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-53) to use the securities offering and proxy rules that are available to other issuers that are required to file reports under section 13(a) or section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a); 78o(d)).

(B) REQUIRED REVISIONS.—The revisions described in this subparagraph are revisions to—

(i) section 230.405 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations—

(I) to remove the exclusion of a business development company from the definition of the term "well-known seasoned issuer" under that section; and

(II) to add a registration statement filed on Form N-2 to the definition of the term "automatic shelf registration statement" under that section;

(ii) sections 230.168 and 230.169 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the exclusion of a business development company from an issuer that is eligible for the exemptions under those sections;

(iii) section 230.163 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove a business development company from the list of issuers that are ineligible for the exemption under that section;

(iv) section 230.163A of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the communications made by a business development company from the list of communications that are ineligible for the exemption under that section;

(v) section 230.134 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the exclusion of a communication relating to a business development company from the application of that section;

(vi) sections 230.138 and 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to specifically include a business development company as an issuer to which those sections apply;

(vii) section 230.156 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that nothing in that section may be construed to prevent a business development company from qualifying for an exemption under section 230.168 or 230.169 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended by the Commission in accordance with the requirements of this subsection;

(viii) section 230.164 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove a business development company from the list of issuers that are excluded under that section;

(ix) section 230.433 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to specifically include a business development company that is a well-known seasoned issuer as an issuer to which that section applies;

(x) section 230.415 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations to state that the registration for securities under section 230.415(a)(1)(x) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, includes securities registered on Form N-2 by a business development company that would otherwise meet the eligibility requirements of Form S-3;

(xi) section 230.497 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to include a process for a business development company to file a form of prospectus in the same manner as the

process for filing a form of prospectus under section 230.424(b) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations;

(xii) sections 230.172 and 230.173 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the exclusion of an offering of a business development company from the application of those sections;

(xiii) section 230.418 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that a business development company that would otherwise meet the eligibility requirements of Form S-3 shall be exempt from paragraph (a)(3) of that section;

(xiv) Schedule 14A to revise item 13(b)(1) of that Schedule to include a business development company that would otherwise meet the requirements of note E of that Schedule as an issuer to which that item applies;

(xv) section 243.103 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that paragraph (a) of that section applies for the purposes of Form N-2; and

(xvi) item 34 on Form N-2 to require a business development company to provide undertakings that are no more restrictive than the undertakings that are required of a registrant under section 229.512 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) REVISION TO FORM N-2.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise Form N-2—

(A) to include an item or instruction that is similar to item 12 on Form S-3 to provide that a business development company that would otherwise meet the requirements of Form S-3 shall incorporate by reference the reports and documents filed by the business development company under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) into the registration statement of the business development company filed on Form N-2; and

(B) to include an item or instruction that is similar to the instruction regarding automatic shelf offerings by well-known seasoned issuers on Form S-3 to provide that a business development company that is a well-known seasoned issuer may file automatic shelf offerings on Form N-2.

(4) TREATMENT IF REVISIONS NOT COMPLETED IN TIMELY MANNER.—If the Commission fails to complete the revisions required under paragraphs (2) and (3) by the dates described in those paragraphs, a business development company, during the period beginning on the date that is 1 day after 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date that the Commission completes those revisions, may deem those revisions to have been completed in accordance with the actions required to be taken by the Commission under those paragraphs.

(5) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) TREATMENT OF SUCCESSOR REGULATIONS AND FORMS.—Any reference in this subsection to a regulation or form shall be construed as a reference to—

(i) that regulation or form, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) any successor to that regulation or form.

(B) DISTRIBUTION OF SALES MATERIAL.—Nothing in this subsection, or in the amendments made pursuant to the requirements of this subsection, may be construed to prevent a business development company from distributing sales material under section 230.482 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations.

SA 2075. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote eco-

nomic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REFUNDING OR CREDITING OVERPAYMENT OF SECTION 31 FEES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "Commission" means the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(2) the term "national securities association" means an association that is registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3); and

(3) the term "national securities exchange" means an exchange that is registered as a national securities exchange under section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f).

(b) CREDIT FOR OVERPAYMENT OF FEES.—Notwithstanding section 31(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee(j)), and subject to subsection (c) of this section, if a national securities exchange or a national securities association has paid fees and assessments to the Commission in an amount that is more than the amount that the exchange or association was required to pay under section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) and, not later than 10 years after the date of such payment, the exchange or association informs the Commission about the payment of such excess amount, the Commission shall offset future fees and assessments due by that exchange or association in an amount that is equal to the difference between the amount that the exchange or association paid and the amount that the exchange or association was required to pay under such section 31.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (b) shall apply only to fees and assessments that a national securities exchange or a national securities association was required to pay to the Commission before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2076. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 1012. OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Council an Office of Independent Examination Review.

"(b) HEAD OF OFFICE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the position of the Ombudsman as the head of the Office of Independent Examination Review, who shall be appointed by the Council for a term of 5 years.

"(2) REMOVAL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may remove the Ombudsman from office.

"(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which

the Ombudsman is removed from office under subparagraph (A), the President shall submit to Congress a written notification describing the reasons for the removal.

“(c) STAFFING.—The Ombudsman may hire staff to support the activities of the Office of Independent Examination Review.

“(d) DUTIES.—The Ombudsman shall—

“(1) receive and, at the discretion of the Ombudsman, investigate complaints from financial institutions, representatives of financial institutions, or any other entity acting on behalf of financial institutions, concerning examinations, examination practices, or examination reports;

“(2) hold meetings, not less than once every 90 days and in locations designed to encourage participation from all regions of the United States, with financial institutions, representatives of financial institutions, or any other entity acting on behalf of financial institutions, to discuss examination procedures, examination practices, or examination policies;

“(3) review examination procedures of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to ensure that the written examination policies of the agencies are being followed in practice and adhere to the standards for consistency established by the Council;

“(4) conduct a continuing and regular program of examination quality assurance for all types of examinations conducted by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies; and

“(5) submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and the Council an annual report on the reviews carried out pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4), including recommendations for improvements in examination procedures, practices, and policies.

“(e) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Ombudsman shall keep confidential—

“(1) all meetings, discussions, and information provided by financial institutions; and

“(2) any confidential or privileged information provided by a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency.

“(f) FUNDING; BUDGET.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—One-fifth of the costs and expenses of the Office of Independent Examination Review, including the salaries of its employees, shall be paid by each of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies, which shall be based on the budget submitted under paragraph (2).

“(2) BUDGET.—Not later than April 15 of each fiscal year, the Ombudsman shall submit to the Council a projected budget for the Office of Independent Examination Review for the following fiscal year.”

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1003 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3302) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) the term ‘Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies’ means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection;”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) the term ‘Ombudsman’ means the Ombudsman established under section 1012.”

(c) FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY OMBUDSMAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 309 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4806) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by inserting “, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,” after “Federal banking agency”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking “In establishing” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In establishing”; and

(iii) in paragraph (1)(B), as so redesignated, by striking “the appellant from retaliation by agency examiners” and inserting “the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by an agency referred to in subsection (a)”;;

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(II) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ensure that appropriate safeguards exist for protecting the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by any appropriate Federal banking agency for exercising the rights of the insured depository institution or insured credit union under this subsection.”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) EFFECT.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency or the National Credit Union Administration Board to take enforcement or other supervisory action.”; and

(2) in subsection (f), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) RETALIATION.—The term ‘retaliation’ includes delaying consideration of, or withholding approval of, any request, notice, or application that otherwise would have been approved, but for the exercise of the rights of the insured depository institution or insured credit union under this section.”

(d) FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT.—Section 205(j) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1785(j)) is amended by inserting “the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,” before “the Administration” each place that term appears.

(e) FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL ACT OF 1978.—Section 1005 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3304) is amended by striking “One-fifth” and inserting “One-fourth”.

SA 2077. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. PROHIBITING THE USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

(a) DEFINITION.—The term “guarantee fee”—

(1) means a fee in connection with any guarantee of the timely payment of principal and interest on securities, notes, and other obligations based on or backed by mortgages on residential real properties designed principally for occupancy of from 1 to 4 families; and

(2) includes—

(A) the guarantee fee charged by the Federal National Mortgage Association with respect to mortgage-backed securities; and

(B) the management and guarantee fee charged by the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation with respect to participation certificates.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (c), in the Senate and the House of Representatives, for purposes of determining points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) or any concurrent resolution on the budget, any provision that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fee of an enterprise shall not be counted in estimating the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues—

(1) in the Senate, for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, conference report, or motion; and

(2) in the House of Representatives, for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment there-to or conference report thereon.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (b) shall not apply to any legislation that—

(1) includes a specific instruction to the Secretary of the Treasury on the sale, transfer, relinquishment, liquidation, divestiture, or other disposition of senior preferred stock acquired pursuant to the Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement; and

(2) provides for an increase, or extension of an increase, of any guarantee fee of an enterprise to be used for the purpose of financing reforms to the secondary mortgage market.

SA 2078. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 8G—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”;;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “For the purposes of implementing this section” and all that follows through the end of the subsection; and

(C) in subsection (g)(3), by striking “and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,” after “the President of the Export-Import Bank;”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,” after “the Export-Import Bank.”

SA 2079. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike sections 401 and 402 and insert the following:

SEC. 401. ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) RISKS TO FINANCIAL STABILITY AND SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS.—The Board of Governors may by order or rule promulgated pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, apply any prudential standard established under this section to any bank holding company or bank holding companies with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000 to which the prudential standard does not otherwise apply provided that the Board of Governors—

“(i) determines that application of the prudential standard is appropriate—

“(I) to prevent or mitigate risks to the financial stability of the United States, as described in paragraph (1); or

“(II) to promote the safety and soundness of the bank holding company or bank holding companies; and

“(ii) takes into consideration the bank holding company’s or bank holding companies’ capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate.”;

(2) in subsection (h)(2), by striking “\$10,000,000,000” each place that term appears and inserting “\$50,000,000,000”; and

(3) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “described in subsection (a)” and inserting “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PUBLICATION.—The Board of Governors shall each year, as part of the summary of results of tests required under this paragraph, publish a report detailing the changes the Board of Governors has made to the elements and assumptions used in the stress tests for that year.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “described in subsection (a)” and inserting “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000”;

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “\$10,000,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000,000”; and

(iii) by inserting “Nothing in this section shall limit the ability of Federal financial regulatory agencies to require annual stress tests under this subparagraph for a financial company that has total consolidated assets of more than \$10,000,000,000 and is regulated by a primary Federal financial regulatory agency if the Federal financial regulatory agency finds that the stress tests are warranted by the risk profile or condition of the

financial company.” after the end of the second sentence.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to limit—

(1) the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in prescribing prudential standards under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) or any other law, to tailor or differentiate among companies on an individual basis or by category, taking into consideration their capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of their subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate; or

(2) the supervisory, regulatory, or enforcement authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency to further the safe and sound operation of an institution under the supervision of the appropriate Federal banking agency.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 115(a)(2) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5325(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “may—” and all that follows through “differentiate” and inserting “may differentiate”; and

(2) by striking “; or” and all that follows through “(g)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to any bank holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$100,000,000,000.

(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—Before the effective date described in paragraph (1), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may by order exempt any bank holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$250,000,000,000 from any prudential standard under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365).

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from issuing an order or rule making under section 165(a)(2)(C) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365(a)(2)(C)), as added by this section, before the effective date described in paragraph (1).

(e) GLOBAL SYSTEMICALLY IMPORTANT BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.—Any bank holding company, regardless of asset size, that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be considered a bank holding company with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$250,000,000,000 with respect to the application of standards or requirements under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365).

SA 2080. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401(f), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), insert after “Regulations,” the following: “or any intermediate holding

company that meets the requirements under section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to a foreign banking organization (as defined in section 211.21 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations) that has been identified as a global systemically important bank by the Financial Stability Board.”.

SA 2081. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FAIR AND ACCURATE INFORMATION REPORTING FOR CONSUMERS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Fair and Accurate Information Reporting for Consumers Act” or the “FAIR for Consumers Act”.

(b) FREE AND EASY ACCESS TO PERSONAL DATA.—Section 612(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ONLINE CONSUMER PORTAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall develop an online consumer portal that gives each consumer—

“(I) unlimited free access to—

“(aa) the consumer report of the consumer;

“(bb) the means by which the consumer may exercise the rights of the consumer under subparagraph (E) and section 604(e)(2)(B);

“(cc) the ability to initiate a dispute with the consumer reporting agency regarding the accuracy or completeness of any information in a report in accordance with section 623(a)(3);

“(dd) the ability to freeze a consumer report for free;

“(ee) if the consumer reporting agency offers a product to consumers to prevent access to the consumer report of the consumer for the purpose of preventing identity theft, a disclosure to the consumer regarding the differences between that product and a credit freeze; and

“(ff) information on who has accessed the consumer report of the consumer and for what permissible purpose the consumer report was furnished in accordance with section 604 and section 609; and

“(II) access to a free, annual credit score of the consumer in accordance with section 609(f)(7)(A).

“(ii) NO WAIVER.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) may not require a consumer to waive any legal or privacy rights to access—

“(I) a portal established under this subparagraph; or

“(II) any of the services described in subclauses (I) or (II) of clause (i) that are provided through a portal established under this subparagraph.

“(iii) NO ADVERTISING OR SOLICITATIONS.—A portal established under this subparagraph may not contain any advertising, marketing offers, or other solicitations.

“(E) OPT-OUT OPTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a consumer reporting agency sells or shares consumer information

in a manner that is not a consumer report, the consumer reporting agency shall provide each consumer with a clear, free method, through a website, by phone, or in writing, by which the consumer may elect not to have the information of the consumer so sold or shared.

“(ii) NO EXPIRATION.—An election made by a consumer under regulations promulgated under clause (i) shall expire on the date on which the consumer expressly revokes the election through a website, by phone, or in writing.”.

(c) ACCURACY IN CREDIT REPORTS.—

(1) COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES.—Section 607 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681e) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) ENSURING ACCURACY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever a consumer reporting agency prepares a consumer report it shall follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of the information concerning the individual about whom the report relates.

“(2) MATCHING.—In assuring the maximum possible accuracy under paragraph (1), each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall ensure that, when including information in the file of a consumer, the consumer reporting agency matches all 9 digits of the social security number of the consumer with the information that the consumer reporting agency is including in the file.

“(3) PERIODIC AUDITS.—Each consumer reporting agency shall perform periodic audits on a representative sample of consumer reports to check for accuracy.”.

(d) IMPROVED DISPUTE PROCESS FOR CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—

(1) RESPONSIBILITIES OF FURNISHERS OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—Section 623(a)(8)(F)(i)(II) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(8)(F)(i)(II)) is amended by inserting “, and does not include any new or additional information that would be relevant to a reinvestigation” before the period at the end.

(2) FTC OMBUDSPERSON.—Section 611(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) FTC OMBUDSPERSON.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Federal Trade Commission shall create the position of ombudsperson for the purpose of resolving persistent errors that are not resolved in a timely manner by a consumer reporting agency or addressing violations of paragraph (5).

“(B) CIVIL FINES.—The ombudsperson described in subparagraph (A) may levy a civil fine of not more than \$3,500 per violation on a consumer reporting agency if the consumer reporting agency repeatedly fails to resolve disputes in a timely manner or to comply with paragraph (5).”.

(3) PROVISION AND CONSIDERATION OF DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY CONSUMERS.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 611 (15 U.S.C. 1681i)—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) OBLIGATIONS OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES RELATING TO REINVESTIGATIONS.—Commensurate with the volume and complexity of disputes about which a consumer reporting agency receives notice, or reasonably anticipates to receive notice, under this paragraph, each consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) maintain sufficient personnel to conduct reinvestigations of those disputes; and

“(ii) provide training with respect to the personnel described in clause (i).”;

(II) in paragraph (2)—

(aa) in subparagraph (A), in the second sentence, by inserting “, including all documentation provided by the consumer” after “received from the consumer or reseller”; and

(bb) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, including all documentation provided by the consumer,” after “from the consumer or the reseller”;

(III) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, including all documentation,” after “relevant information”; and

(IV) in paragraph (6)(B)—

(aa) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) a description of the actions taken by the consumer reporting agency regarding the dispute;

“(iv) if applicable, contact information for any furnisher involved in responding to the dispute and a description of the role played by the furnisher in the reinvestigation process;

“(v) a description of the results of the dispute, including if applicable the specific modification or deletion of information that was made to the file of the consumer following the reinvestigation; and

“(vi) the options available to the consumer if the consumer is dissatisfied with the result, including—

“(I) submitting documents in support of the dispute;

“(II) adding a consumer statement to the file;

“(III) filing a dispute with the furnisher; and

“(IV) submitting a complaint against the consumer reporting agency or furnishers through the consumer complaint database of the Bureau, the ombudsperson of the Federal Trade Commission, or the State attorney general for the State in which the consumer resides.”;

(i) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) NOTIFICATION OF DELETION OF INFORMATION.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall communicate with other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p) to ensure that a dispute initiated with one consumer reporting agency is reflected in a file maintained by the other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p).”;

(iii) in subsection (f)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting “, including all documentation,” after “relevant information”; and

(B) in section 623 (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2)—

(i) in subsection (a)(8)(E), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) review and consider all relevant information, including all documentation, provided by the consumer with the notice;”;

and

(ii) in subsection (b)(1), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) review and consider all relevant information, including all documentation, provided by the consumer reporting agency under section 611(a)(2).”.

(4) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 616 (15 U.S.C. 1681n)—

(i) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting “(a) DAMAGES.—”;

(ii) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

“(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party costs and reasonable attorney’s fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.”; and

(B) in section 617 (15 U.S.C. 1681o)—

(i) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting “(a) DAMAGES.—”;

(ii) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(iii) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

“(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party costs and reasonable attorney’s fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.”.

(5) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 615(h)(8) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)(8)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section” and inserting “subsection”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “This section” and inserting “This subsection”.

(e) INCREASED TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) DISCLOSURES TO CONSUMERS.—Section 609 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end; and

(ii) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) the address and telephone number of the person; and

“(iii) the permissible purpose of the person for obtaining the consumer report, including the specific type of credit product that is extended, reviewed, or collected, as described in section 604(a)(3)(A).”;

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) by amending paragraph (7)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) supply the consumer with a credit score through the portal established under section 612(a)(1)(D) or as requested by the consumer, as applicable, that—

“(i) is derived from a credit scoring model that is widely distributed to users by the consumer reporting agency for the purpose of any extension of credit or other transaction designated by the consumer who is requesting the credit score; or

“(ii) is widely distributed to lenders of common consumer loan products and predicts the future credit behavior of the consumer; and”;

(ii) in paragraph (8), by inserting “, except that a credit score shall be provided free of charge to the consumer if requested in connection with a free annual consumer report described in section 612(a)” before the period at the end; and

(C) in subsection (g)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “subparagraph (D)” and inserting “subparagraph (C)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “consistent with subparagraph (C)”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively.

(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) ADVERSE INFORMATION NOTIFICATION.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 612 (15 U.S.C. 1681j), by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) FREE DISCLOSURE AFTER NOTICE OF ADVERSE ACTION OR OFFER OF CREDIT ON MATERIALLY LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which a consumer reporting agency receives a notification under subsection (a)(2) or (h)(6) of section 615, or from a debt collection agency affiliated with the consumer reporting agency, the consumer reporting agency shall make, without charge to the consumer, all disclosures required in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Bureau.”; and

(ii) in section 615(a) (15 U.S.C. 1681m(a))—

(I) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(II) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report that was used in the decision to take the adverse action to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b);”;

(III) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—

(aa) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “of the consumer’s right”;

(bb) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) that the consumer shall receive a copy of the consumer report with respect to the consumer, free of charge, from the consumer reporting agency that furnished the consumer report; and”;

(cc) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “of the right of the consumer” before “to dispute”.

(B) NOTIFICATION IN CASES OF LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—Section 615(h) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;

(iii) in paragraph (5)(C), by striking “may obtain” and inserting “shall receive”;

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (7), (8), and (9), respectively; and

(v) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) REPORTS PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS.—A person who uses a consumer report as described in paragraph (1) shall notify and direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b).”.

(C) NOTIFICATION OF SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS OF NEGATIVE INFORMATION.—Section 623(a)(7)(A)(ii) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(7)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking “account, or customer” and inserting “or account”.

(3) REGULATORY REFORM.—Section 621 of the Federal Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY REGISTRY.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Federal Trade Commission shall establish a publicly available registry of consumer reporting agencies that includes—

“(A) each consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis;

“(B) each nationwide specialty consumer reporting agency;

“(C) all other consumer reporting agencies that are not included under section 603(p) or 603(x); and

“(D) links to any relevant websites.

“(2) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—Each consumer reporting agency shall register with a registry established by the Federal Trade Commission under this subsection in a timeframe established by the Commission.”.

SA 2082. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 107.

SA 2083. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SMALL BUSINESS LOAN DATA COLLECTION.

Not later than December 31, 2018, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall ensure that financial institutions subject to 704B of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691c-2) are complying with the requirements of that section.

SA 2084. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE ____—PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN FORGIVENESS

SEC. ____ . PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN FORGIVENESS.

Section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, except as provided in paragraph (5),” after “on any eligible Federal Direct Loan not in default”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) LOAN CANCELLATION FOR NEW LOANS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, after the conclusion of each employment period in a public service job, as described in

subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall cancel the percent specified in such subparagraph of the total amount due on any eligible Federal Direct Loan made after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act for a borrower who is employed in such public service job and submits an employment certification form described in subparagraph (C).

“(B) PERCENT AMOUNT.—The percent of a loan that shall be canceled under subparagraph (A) is as follows:

“(i) In the case of a borrower who completes 2 years of employment in a public service job, 15 percent of the total amount due on the eligible Federal Direct Loan on the date the borrower commenced employment in such public service job.

“(ii) In the case of a borrower who completes 4 years of employment in a public service job, 15 percent of the total amount due on the eligible Federal Direct Loan on the date the borrower commenced employment in such public service job.

“(iii) In the case of a borrower who completes 6 years of employment in a public service job, 20 percent of the total amount due on the eligible Federal Direct Loan on the date the borrower commenced employment in such public service job.

“(iv) In the case of a borrower who completes 8 years of employment in a public service job, 20 percent of the total amount due on the eligible Federal Direct Loan on the date the borrower commenced employment in such public service job.

“(v) In the case of a borrower who completes 10 years of employment in a public service job, 30 percent of the total amount due on the eligible Federal Direct Loan on the date the borrower commenced employment in such public service job.

“(C) EMPLOYMENT CERTIFICATION FORM.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In order to receive loan cancellation under this paragraph, a borrower shall submit to the Secretary an employment certification form that is developed by the Secretary and includes self-certification of employment and a separate part for employer certification that indicates the dates of employment.

“(ii) DEFERMENT.—If a borrower submits to the Secretary the employment certification form described in clause (i), during the period in which the borrower is employed in a public service job for which loan cancellation is eligible under this paragraph, the borrower’s eligible Federal Direct Loan shall be placed in deferment.

“(D) INTEREST CANCELED.—If a portion of a loan is canceled under this paragraph for any year, the entire amount of interest on such loan that accrues for such year shall be canceled.”.

SA 2085. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AUTO LENDING RULES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall promulgate rules that—

(1) prohibit auto dealer interest rate mark-ups;

(2) end yo-yo scams;

(3) curb loan packing;

(4) implement steps to ensure that dealers do not fail to pay off liens on trade-in vehicles or cause other harm to consumers when the dealer closes; and

(5) eliminates predispute arbitration agreements in contracts for the sale, servicing, financing, and leasing of motor vehicles.

SA 2086. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CLARIFICATIONS REGARDING SCOPE OF EMPLOYMENT AND REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) CLARIFICATION REGARDING DEFINITION OF RIGHTS AND BENEFITS.—Section 4303(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” before “The term”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) Any procedural protections or provisions set forth in this chapter shall also be considered a right or benefit subject to the protection of this chapter.”.

(b) CLARIFICATION REGARDING RELATION TO OTHER LAW AND PLANS FOR AGREEMENTS.—Section 4302 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) Pursuant to this section and the procedural rights afforded by subchapter III of this chapter, any agreement to arbitrate a claim under this chapter is unenforceable, unless all parties consent to arbitration after a complaint on the specific claim has been filed in court or with the Merit Systems Protection Board and all parties knowingly and voluntarily consent to have that particular claim subjected to arbitration.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, consent shall not be considered voluntary when a person is required to agree to arbitrate an action, complaint, or claim alleging a violation of this chapter as a condition of future or continued employment, advancement in employment, or receipt of any right or benefit of employment.”.

SA 2087. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 109.

SA 2088. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXCESSIVE EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR PAYMENTS OF EXCESSIVE COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (s) as subsection (u); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (r) the following:

“(s) EXCESSIVE COMPENSATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No deduction shall be allowed under this chapter for any excessive compensation for any employee of the taxpayer.

“(2) EXCESSIVE COMPENSATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘excessive compensation’ means, with respect to any employee, the amount by which the compensation for services performed by such employee during the taxable year exceeds the lesser of—

“(A) the median of the compensation paid for services performed by all employees of the taxpayer during the taxable year, multiplied by 25, or

“(B) \$1,000,000.

“(3) OTHER DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) COMPENSATION.—The term ‘compensation’ includes wages, salary, fees, commissions, fringe benefits, deferred compensation, retirement contributions, options, bonuses, property, and any other form of remuneration that the Secretary determines is appropriate.

“(B) EMPLOYER.—All persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 shall be treated as a single taxpayer for purposes of this subsection.

“(C) EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘employee’ includes full-time, part-time, and seasonal employees.

“(4) REPORTING.—Each employer which provides any excessive compensation to any employee during a taxable year shall file a report with the Secretary with respect to such taxable year including—

“(A) the amount of compensation of the employee of the taxpayer receiving the lowest amount of compensation during such taxable year,

“(B) the amount of compensation of the employee of the taxpayer receiving the highest amount of compensation during such taxable year,

“(C) the median compensation of all employees of the taxpayer during such taxable year,

“(D) the number of employees of the taxpayer who are receiving excessive compensation during such taxable year, and

“(E) the amount of compensation of each employee described in subparagraph (D) during such taxable year.

Such report shall be filed at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.

“(t) FINES RELATING TO EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION.—No deduction shall be allowed under this chapter for any fine paid to the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 16(h)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78p) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) SHAREHOLDER APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION.—

“(1) CALCULATION OF COMPENSATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘compensation’ includes wages, salary, fees, com-

missions, fringe benefits, deferred compensation, retirement contributions, options, bonuses, property, and any other form of remuneration that the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, determines is appropriate.

“(2) LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the compensation paid to an employee of an issuer in any taxable year may not exceed the lesser of—

“(i) \$1,000,000; or

“(ii) an amount that is 25 times the median amount of compensation paid to all employees of that issuer during that taxable year.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—An issuer may pay compensation described in subparagraph (A) to an employee of the issuer if, not more than 18 months before the last day of the taxable year in which the compensation is paid, not less than 50 percent of the shareholders of the issuer vote to approve the compensation through a proxy or consent or authorization for an annual or other meeting of the shareholders of the issuer.

“(3) PROXY CONTENTS.—Proxy materials for a vote described in paragraph (2)(B) by shareholders of an issuer shall include, with respect to the most recent taxable year ending before the date on which the vote takes place—

“(A) the amount of compensation paid to the lowest paid employee of the issuer;

“(B) the amount of compensation paid to the highest paid employee of the issuer;

“(C) the median amount of compensation paid to all employees of the issuer;

“(D) the number of employees of the issuer who are paid compensation in an amount that is more than 25 times the amount described in subparagraph (C); and

“(E) the total amount of compensation paid to the employees described in subparagraph (D).

“(4) MONEY PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may impose a civil penalty against an issuer if—

“(i) the issuer, in a taxable year, pays compensation to an employee of the issuer in an amount that exceeds the lesser of—

“(I) \$1,000,000; or

“(II) 25 times the median amount of compensation paid to all employees of that issuer during that taxable year; and

“(ii)(I) the issuer does not conduct a vote described in paragraph (2)(B) with respect to the compensation described in clause (i); or

“(II) less than 50 percent of the shareholders of the issuer vote to approve the compensation described in clause (i), in contravention of the requirement under paragraph (2)(B).

“(B) AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—The amount of the penalty imposed under subparagraph (A) shall be equal to the excess of—

“(i) the compensation described in subparagraph (A)(i); over

“(ii) the lesser of—

“(I) \$1,000,000; or

“(II) the amount that is 25 times the median amount of compensation paid to all employees of the issuer during the taxable year in which that compensation is paid to that employee.”.

(2) DEADLINE FOR RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue any final rules and regulations required to carry out subsection (h) of section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78p), as added by paragraph (1) of this subsection.

SA 2089. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr.

BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. VISITORIAL POWERS.

The sixth undesignated paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 484) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)—

“(i) lawfully authorized State auditors and examiners may, at reasonable times and upon reasonable notice to a bank, review its records solely to ensure compliance with applicable State unclaimed property or escheat laws upon reasonable cause to believe that the bank has failed to comply with such laws;

“(ii) an attorney general (or other chief law enforcement officer) of a State may issue subpoenas or administer oversight and examination to national banks or officers of national banks based upon reasonable cause to believe that the national bank or an officer of a national bank has failed to comply with applicable State laws; and

“(iii) national banks shall submit to an attorney general (or other chief law enforcement officer) of a State aggregate loan data, types of products, any other information that the national bank determines is appropriate for each State.”.

SA 2090. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—PROTECTING VETERANS FROM PREDATORY LENDING

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Protecting Veterans from Predatory Lending Act of 2018”.

SEC. 602. PROTECTING VETERANS FROM PREDATORY LENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 3709. Refinancing of housing loans

“(a) FEE RECOUPMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is being refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter unless—

“(1) the issuer of the refinanced loan provides the Secretary with a certification of the recoupment period for fees, closing costs, and any expenses (other than taxes, amounts held in escrow, and fees paid under this chapter) that would be incurred by the borrower in the refinancing of the loan;

“(2) all of the fees and incurred costs are scheduled to be recouped on or before the date that is 36 months after the date of loan issuance; and

“(3) the recoupment is calculated through lower regular monthly payments (other than taxes, amounts held in escrow, and fees paid under this chapter) as a result of the refinanced loan.

“(b) NET TANGIBLE BENEFIT TEST.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter unless—

“(1) the issuer of the refinanced loan provides the borrower with a net tangible benefit test;

“(2) in a case in which the original loan had a fixed rate mortgage interest rate and the refinanced loan will have a fixed rate mortgage interest rate, the refinanced loan has a mortgage interest rate that is not less than 50 basis points less than the previous loan;

“(3) in a case in which the original loan had a fixed rate mortgage interest rate and the refinanced loan will have an adjustable rate mortgage interest rate, the refinanced loan has a mortgage interest rate that is not less than 200 basis points less than the previous loan; and

“(4) the lower interest rate is not produced solely from discount points, unless—

“(A) such points are paid at closing; and

“(B) such points are not added to the principal loan amount, unless—

“(i) for discount point amounts that are less than or equal to one discount point, the resulting loan balance after any fees and expenses allows the property with respect to which the loan was issued to maintain a loan to value ratio of 100 percent or less; and

“(ii) for discount point amounts that are greater than one discount point, the resulting loan balance after any fees and expenses allows the property with respect to which the loan was issued to maintain a loan to value ratio of 90 percent or less.

“(c) LOAN SEASONING.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter until the date that is the later of—

“(1) the date that is 210 days after the date on which the first monthly payment is made on the loan; and

“(2) the date on which the sixth monthly payment is made on the loan.

“(d) CASH-OUT REFINANCES.—(1) Subsections (a) through (c) shall not apply in a case of a loan refinancing in which the amount of the principal for the new loan to be guaranteed or insured under this chapter is larger than the payoff amount of the refinanced loan.

“(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Veterans from Predatory Lending Act of 2018, the Secretary shall promulgate such rules as the Secretary considers appropriate with respect to refinancing described in paragraph (1) to ensure that such refinancing is in the financial interest of the borrower, including rules relating to recoupment, seasoning, and net tangible benefits.”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In prescribing any regulation to carry out section 3709 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may waive the requirements of sections 551 through 559 of title 5, United States Code, if—

(A) the Secretary determines that urgent or compelling circumstances make compliance with such requirements impracticable or contrary to the public interest;

(B) the Secretary submits to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, and publishes in the Federal Register, notice of such waiver, including a description of the determination made under subparagraph (A); and

(C) a period of 10 days elapses following the notification under subparagraph (B).

(2) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—If a regulation prescribed pursuant to a waiver made under paragraph (1) is in effect for a period exceeding one year, the Secretary shall provide the public an opportunity for notice and comment regarding such regulation.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) TERMINATION DATE.—The authorities under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT ON CASH-OUT REFINANCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the President of the Ginnie Mae, submit to Congress a report on refinancing—

(A) of loans—

(i) made to veterans for purposes specified in section 3710 of title 38, United States Code; and

(ii) that were guaranteed or insured under chapter 37 of such title; and

(B) in which the amount of the principal for the new loan to be guaranteed or insured under such chapter is larger than the payoff amount of the refinanced loan.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of whether additional requirements, including a net tangible benefit test, fee recoupment period, and loan seasoning requirement, are necessary to ensure that the refinancing described in paragraph (1) is in the financial interest of the borrower.

(B) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for additional legislative or administrative action to ensure that refinancing described in paragraph (1) is carried out in the financial interest of the borrower.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3709 the following new item:

“3709. Refinancing of housing loans.”.

SEC. 603. LOAN SEASONING FOR GINNIE MAE MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES.

Section 306(g)(1) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)(1)) is amended by inserting “The Association may not guarantee the timely payment of principal and interest on a security that is backed by a mortgage insured or guaranteed under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, and that was refinanced until the later of the date that is 210 days after the date on which the first monthly payment is made on the mortgage being refinanced and the date on which 6 full monthly payments have been made on the mortgage being refinanced.” after “Act of 1992.”.

SEC. 604. REPORT ON LIQUIDITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the President of the Ginnie Mae

shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the liquidity of the housing loan program under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in the secondary mortgage market, which shall—

(1) assess the loans provided under that chapter that collateralize mortgage-backed securities that are guaranteed by Ginnie Mae; and

(2) include recommendations for actions that Ginnie Mae should take to ensure that the liquidity of that housing loan program is maintained.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) **GINNIE MAE.**—The term “Ginnie Mae” means the Government National Mortgage Association.

SEC. 605. ANNUAL REPORT ON DOCUMENT DISCLOSURE AND CONSUMER EDUCATION.

Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall issue a publicly available report that—

(1) examines, with respect to loans provided to veterans under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code—

(A) the refinancing of fixed-rate mortgage loans to adjustable rate mortgage loans;

(B) whether veterans are informed of the risks and disclosures associated with that refinancing; and

(C) whether advertising materials for that refinancing are clear and do not contain misleading statements or assertions; and

(2) includes findings based on any complaints received by veterans and on an ongoing assessment of the refinancing market by the Secretary.

SA 2091. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXPANDING TESTING THE WATERS AND CONFIDENTIAL SUBMISSIONS.

The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5(d)—

(A) by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding”;

(B) by striking “an emerging growth company or any person authorized to act on behalf of an emerging growth company” and inserting “an issuer or any person authorized to act on behalf of an issuer”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may issue regulations, subject to public notice and comment, to impose such other terms, conditions, or requirements on the engaging in oral or written communications described under paragraph (1) by an issuer other than an emerging growth company as the Commission determines appropriate.

“(B) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Prior to any rulemaking described under subparagraph

(A), the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing a list of the findings supporting the basis of such rulemaking.”; and

(2) in section 6(e)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES” and inserting “DRAFT REGISTRATION STATEMENTS”;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) **PRIOR TO INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING.**—Any issuer, prior to its initial public offering date, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission not later than 15 days before the date on which the issuer conducts a road show (as defined under section 230.433(h)(4) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) or, in the absence of a road show, at least 15 days prior to the requested effective date of the registration statement.

“(2) **WITHIN 1 YEAR AFTER INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING OR EXCHANGE REGISTRATION.**—Any issuer, within the 1-year period following the effective date of its initial public offering or its registration of a security under section 12(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission not later than the time the issuer makes a request for acceleration of the effective date.

“(3) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may issue regulations, subject to public notice and comment, to impose such other terms, conditions, or requirements on the submission of draft registration statements described under this subsection by an issuer other than an emerging growth company as the Commission determines appropriate.

“(B) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Prior to any rulemaking described under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing a list of the findings supporting the basis of such rulemaking.”.

SA 2092. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FOR LOW-REVENUE ISSUERS.

Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7262) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FOR LOW-REVENUE ISSUERS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘average annual gross revenues’ means the total gross revenues of an issuer over its most recently completed 3 fiscal years divided by 3;

“(B) the term ‘emerging growth company’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c); and

“(C) the term ‘large accelerated filer’ has the meaning given the term in section 240.12b-2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

“(2) **LOW-REVENUE EXEMPTION.**—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to an audit report prepared for an issuer that—

“(A) ceased to be an emerging growth company on the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer following the 5-year period beginning on the date of the first sale of common equity securities of the issuer pursuant to an effective registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.);

“(B) had average annual gross revenues of less than \$50,000,000 as of its most recently completed fiscal year; and

“(C) is not a large accelerated filer.

“(3) **EXPIRATION OF TEMPORARY EXEMPTION.**—An issuer ceases to be eligible for the exemption described under paragraph (1) on the earlier of—

“(A) the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer following the 10-year period beginning on the date of the first sale of common equity securities of the issuer pursuant to an effective registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.);

“(B) the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer during which the average annual gross revenues of the issuer exceed \$50,000,000; or

“(C) the date on which the issuer becomes a large accelerated filer.”.

SA 2093. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE ENTREPRENEURSHIP SUPPORTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “National Guard and Reserve Entrepreneurship Support Act”.

(b) **EXTENSION OF LOAN ASSISTANCE AND DEFERRAL ELIGIBILITY TO RESERVISTS BEYOND PERIODS OF MILITARY CONFLICT.**—

(1) **SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS.**—Section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking clause (ii);

(II) by redesignating clause (i) as clause (ii);

(III) by inserting before clause (ii), as so redesignated, the following:

“(i) the term ‘active service’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(d)(3) of title 10, United States Code;”;

(IV) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “being ordered to active military duty during a period of military conflict” and inserting “being ordered to perform active service for a period of more than 30 consecutive days”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “active duty” each place it appears and inserting “active service”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (G)(ii)(II), by striking “active duty” and inserting “active service”; and

(B) in subsection (n)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “ACTIVE DUTY” and inserting “ACTIVE SERVICE”;

(ii) in paragraph (1)—
(I) by striking subparagraph (C);
(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively;

(III) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following:

“(A) ACTIVE SERVICE.—The term ‘active service’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(d)(3) of title 10, United States Code.”;

(IV) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by striking “ordered to active duty during a period of military conflict” and inserting “ordered to perform active service for a period of more than 30 consecutive days”; and

(V) in subparagraph (D), by striking “active duty” each place it appears and inserting “active service”; and

(iii) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “active duty” each place it appears and inserting “active service”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by paragraph (1)(A) shall apply to an economic injury suffered or likely to be suffered as the result of an essential employee being ordered to perform active service (as defined in section 101(d)(3) of title 10, United States Code) for a period of more than 30 consecutive days who is discharged or released from such active service on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and semiannually thereafter, the President shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the number of loans made under the Military Reservist Economic Injury Disaster Loan program and the dollar volume of those loans. The report shall contain the subsidy rate of the disaster loan program as authorized under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) with the loans made under the Military Reservist Economic Injury Disaster Loan program and without those loans included.

(4) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking “The Administration” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administration”;

(B) by striking “(as defined in section 7(n)(1))”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DEFINITION OF PERIOD OF MILITARY CONFLICT.—In this subsection, the term ‘period of military conflict’ means—

“(A) a period of war declared by the Congress;

“(B) a period of national emergency declared by the Congress or by the President; or

“(C) a period of a contingency operation, as defined in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.”.

(c) NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE DEPLOYMENT SUPPORT AND BUSINESS TRAINING PROGRAM.—

(1) EXPANSION OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION OUTREACH PROGRAMS.—Section 8(b)(17) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(17)) is amended by striking “and members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces” and inserting “members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and the spouses of veterans and members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces”.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Section 32 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE DEPLOYMENT SUPPORT AND BUSINESS TRAINING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In making grants carried out under section 8(b)(17), the Associate Administrator shall establish a program, to be known as the ‘National Guard and Reserve Deployment Support and Business Training Program’, to provide training, counseling and other assistance to support members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces and their spouses.

“(2) AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out this subsection, the Associate Administrator may—

“(A) modify programs and resources made available through section 8(b)(17) to provide pre-deployment and other information specific to members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces and their spouses;

“(B) collaborate with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau or the Chief’s designee, State Adjunct Generals or their designees, and other public and private partners; and

“(C) provide training, information and other resources to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau or the Chief’s designee and State Adjunct Generals or their designees for the purpose of supporting members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces and the spouses of veterans and members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces.”.

SA 2094. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REINSTATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE SURVEY OF SMALL BUSINESS FINANCES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reinstate the Survey of Small Business Finances, which was conducted every 5 years from 1997 to 2003, in order to provide Congress and the public with data essential to identify where the inequities lie in access to credit for small business concerns in the United States, especially in underserved markets, including small business concerns owned and controlled by women and small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Board of Governors” means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

(2) the terms “small business concern” and “small business concern owned and controlled by women” have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

(3) the term “small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals” has the meaning given the term in section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)).

(c) SURVEY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Board of Governors shall collect, compile, analyze, prepare, and publish data for a survey of small business finances using the same or

similar questions included in the 2003 Survey of Small Business Finances, as conducted by the Board of Governors.

(2) SCOPE.—The Board of Governors shall collect comprehensive financial information from a representative sample of small business concerns in the United States for the survey described in paragraph (1).

(3) ADDITIONAL DATA COLLECTION.—The Board of Governors may add questions to the survey described in paragraph (1), including questions that provide more data about the financing and credit sources and the proportion of those sources to small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

(4) ACCESSIBILITY OF DATA.—All data, the questionnaires, and technical documentation for the survey described in paragraph (1) shall be accessible to the public on an Internet website and free of charge.

SA 2095. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CREDIT MONITORING.

Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c–1), as amended by section 301(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) CREDIT MONITORING.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) COVERED BREACH.—The term ‘covered breach’ means any instance in which at least 1 piece of personally identifying information is exposed or is reasonably likely to have been exposed to an unauthorized party.

“(B) COVERED CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY.—The term ‘covered consumer reporting agency’ means—

“(i) a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)); or

“(ii) a consumer reporting agency that earns not less than \$7,000,000 in annual revenue from the sales of consumer reports.

“(2) CREDIT MONITORING.—A covered consumer reporting agency shall provide a free electronic credit monitoring service that, at a minimum, notifies a consumer of a covered breach at the covered consumer reporting agency to any consumer who provides to the covered consumer reporting agency—

“(A) appropriate proof of the identity of the consumer; and

“(B) contact information of the consumer.

“(3) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Federal Trade Commission shall promulgate regulations regarding the requirements of this subsection, which shall at a minimum include—

“(A) a definition of an electronic credit monitoring service; and

“(B) what constitutes appropriate proof of the identity of the consumer.”.

SA 2096. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:
SEC. 308. SIMPLIFYING ACCESS TO STUDENT LOAN INFORMATION.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) NATIONAL STUDENT LOAN DATA SYSTEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each private educational lender shall, in accordance with title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.)—

“(i) submit to the Secretary of Education for inclusion in the National Student Loan Data System established under section 485B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092b) information regarding each private education loan made by such lender that will allow for the electronic exchange of data between borrowers of private education loans and the System; and

“(ii) in carrying out clause (i), ensure the privacy of private education loan borrowers.

“(B) INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED.—The information regarding private education loans required under subparagraph (A) to be included in the National Student Loan Data System shall include the following if determined appropriate by the Secretary of Education:

“(i) The total amount and type of each such loan made, including outstanding interest and outstanding principal on such loan.

“(ii) The interest rate of each such loan made.

“(iii) Information regarding the borrower that the Secretary of Education determines is necessary to ensure the electronic exchange of data between borrowers of private education loans and the System.

“(iv) Information, including contact information, regarding the lender that owns the loan.

“(v) Information, including contact information, regarding the servicer that is handling the loan.

“(vi) Information concerning the date of any failure to repay a loan according to the terms agreed to in the promissory note, such as a default on the loan, and the collection of the loan, including any information concerning the repayment status of that loan.

“(vii) Information regarding any instance in which the borrower has been allowed to temporarily stop making payments or to temporarily reduce monthly payment amounts for a specified period, such as a deferment or forbearance granted on the loan.

“(viii) The date of the completion of repayment by the borrower of the loan.

“(ix) Any other information determined by the Secretary of Education to be necessary for the operation of the National Student Loan Data System.

“(C) UPDATE.—Each private educational lender shall update the information regarding private education loans required under subparagraph (A) to be included in the National Student Loan Data System on the same schedule as information is updated under the System under section 485B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092b).”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to private education loans that are made for the 2018-2019 academic year or later.

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Section 485B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) ensuring that the data system—

“(A) displays for borrowers the date the borrower's information was last updated;

“(B) includes a statement that the most accurate and up-to-date information can be found by contacting the borrower's loan servicer; and

“(C) includes contact information for each loan servicer;”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the National Student Loan Data System established pursuant to subsection (a) shall contain the information required to be included under section 128(e)(12) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(12)).

“(2) COSIGNER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall ensure that any cosigner of a private education loan for which information is included in the National Student Loan Data System—

“(A) is able to access the information in such System with respect to such private education loan in a separate account for such cosigner; and

“(B) does not have access to any information in such System with respect to any loan for which the cosigner has not cosigned.

“(3) PRIVACY.—The Secretary shall ensure that a private educational lender—

“(A) has access to the National Student Loan Data System only to submit information for such System regarding the private education loans of such lender; and

“(B) may not see information in the System regarding the loans of any other lender.

“(j) ADDITIONAL NSLDS FUNCTIONALITIES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall establish—

“(1) a functionality within the National Student Loan Data System established pursuant to subsection (a) that enables a student borrower of a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under this title to input information necessary for the estimation of repayment amounts under the various repayment plans available to the borrower of such loan to compare such repayment plans; and

“(2) a functionality within the National Student Loan Data System established pursuant to subsection (a) that facilitates the reporting of student enrollment status information to private educational lenders who have reported open loans for such students.”.

SA 2097. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. REED, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITS ON ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATES.

Chapter 2 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1631 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 140B. LIMITS ON ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATES.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the annual percentage rate applicable to

any consumer credit transaction (other than a residential mortgage transaction), including any fees associated with such a transaction, may not exceed the maximum rate permitted by the laws of the State in which the consumer resides.”.

SA 2098. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SMALL BUSINESS LENDING ENHANCEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Board” means the National Credit Union Administration Board;

(2) the term “insured credit union” has the same meaning as in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

(3) the term “member business loan” has the same meaning as in section 107A(c)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(1));

(4) the term “net worth” has the same meaning as in section 107A(c)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(2)); and

(5) the term “well capitalized” has the same meaning as in section 216(c)(1)(A) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1790d(c)(1)(A)).

(b) LIMITS ON MEMBER BUSINESS LOANS.—Effective 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, section 107A(a) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an insured credit union may not make any member business loan that would result in the total amount of such loans outstanding at that credit union at any one time to be equal to more than the lesser of—

“(A) 1.75 times the actual net worth of the credit union; or

“(B) 12.25 percent of the total assets of the credit union.

“(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—The Board may approve an application by an insured credit union upon a finding that the credit union meets the criteria under this paragraph to make 1 or more member business loans that would result in a total amount of such loans outstanding at any one time of not more than 27.5 percent of the total assets of the credit union, if the credit union—

“(A) had member business loans outstanding at the end of each of the 4 consecutive quarters immediately preceding the date of the application, in a total amount of not less than 80 percent of the applicable limitation under paragraph (1);

“(B) is well capitalized, as defined in section 216(c)(1)(A);

“(C) can demonstrate at least 5 years of experience of sound underwriting and servicing of member business loans;

“(D) has the requisite policies and experience in managing member business loans; and

“(E) has satisfied other standards that the Board determines are necessary to maintain the safety and soundness of the insured credit union.

“(3) EFFECT OF NOT BEING WELL CAPITALIZED.—An insured credit union that has made

member business loans under an authorization under paragraph (2) and that is not, as of its most recent quarterly call report, well capitalized, may not make any member business loans, until such time as the credit union becomes well capitalized (as defined in section 216(c)(1)(A)), as reflected in a subsequent quarterly call report, and obtains the approval of the Board.”.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) TIERED APPROVAL PROCESS.—The Board shall develop a tiered approval process, under which an insured credit union gradually increases the amount of member business lending in a manner that is consistent with safe and sound operations, subject to the limits established under section 107A(a)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(a)(2)), as amended by this section. The rate of increase under the process established under this paragraph may not exceed 30 percent per year.

(2) RULEMAKING REQUIRED.—The Board shall issue proposed rules, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, to establish the tiered approval process required under paragraph (1). The tiered approval process shall establish standards designed to ensure that the new business lending capacity authorized under section 107A(a) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(a)), as amended by this section, is being used only by insured credit unions that are well-managed and well capitalized, as required under section 107A(a) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(a)), as amended by this section, and as defined by the rules issued by the Board under this paragraph.

(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In issuing rules required under this subsection, the Board shall consider—

(A) the experience level of the institutions, including a demonstrated history of sound member business lending;

(B) the criteria under section 107A(a)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(a)(2)), as amended by this section; and

(C) such other factors as the Board determines necessary or appropriate.

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON MEMBER BUSINESS LENDING.—

(1) REPORT OF THE BOARD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall submit a report to Congress on member business lending by insured credit unions.

(B) REPORT.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the types and asset size of insured credit unions making member business loans and the member business loan limitations applicable to the insured credit unions;

(ii) the overall amount and average size of member business loans by each insured credit union;

(iii) the ratio of member business loans by insured credit unions to total assets and net worth;

(iv) the performance of the member business loans, including delinquencies and net charge offs;

(v) the effect of this section and the amendments made by this section on the number of insured credit unions engaged in member business lending, any change in the amount of member business lending, and the extent to which any increase is attributed to the change in the limitation in section 107A(a) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(a)), as amended by this section;

(vi) the number, types, and asset size of insured credit unions that were denied or ap-

proved by the Board for increased member business loans under section 107A(a)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(a)(2)), as amended by this section, including denials and approvals under the tiered approval process;

(vii) the types and sizes of businesses that receive member business loans, the duration of the credit union membership of the businesses at the time of the loan, the types of collateral used to secure member business loans, and the income level of members receiving member business loans; and

(viii) the effect of any increases in member business loans on the risk to the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund and the assessments on insured credit unions.

(2) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—

(A) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the status of member business lending by insured credit unions, including—

(i) trends in such lending;

(ii) types and amounts of member business loans;

(iii) the effectiveness of this section in enhancing small business lending;

(iv) recommendations for legislative action, if any, with respect to such lending; and

(v) any other information that the Comptroller General considers relevant with respect to such lending.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress on the study required under subparagraph (A).

SA 2099. Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____ . REDUCING IDENTITY FRAUD.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reduce the prevalence of synthetic identity fraud, which disproportionately affects vulnerable populations, such as minors and recent immigrants, by facilitating the validation by permitted entities of fraud protection data, pursuant to electronically received consumer consent, through use of a database maintained by the Commissioner.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSIONER.—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration.

(2) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given the term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(3) FRAUD PROTECTION DATA.—The term “fraud protection data” means a combination of the following information with respect to an individual:

(A) The name of the individual (including the first name and any family forename or surname of the individual).

(B) The social security number of the individual.

(C) The date of birth (including the month, day, and year) of the individual.

(4) PERMITTED ENTITY.—The term “permitted entity” means a financial institution or a service provider, subsidiary, affiliate,

agent, subcontractor, or assignee of a financial institution.

(c) EFFICIENCY.—

(1) RELIANCE ON EXISTING METHODS.—The Commissioner shall evaluate the feasibility of making modifications to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or a similar resource such that the database or resource—

(A) is reasonably designed to effectuate the purpose of this section; and

(B) meets the requirements of subsection (d).

(2) EXECUTION.—The Commissioner shall make the modifications necessary to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or similar resource, or develop a database or similar resource, to effectuate the requirements described in paragraph (1).

(d) PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE CONSUMERS.—The database or similar resource described in subsection (c) shall—

(1) compare fraud protection data provided in an inquiry by a permitted entity against such information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided;

(2) be scalable and accommodate reasonably anticipated volumes of verification requests from permitted entities with commercially reasonable uptime and availability;

(3) allow permitted entities to submit—

(A) 1 or more individual requests electronically for real-time machine-to-machine (or similar functionality) accurate responses; and

(B) multiple requests electronically, such as those provided in a batch format, for accurate electronic responses within a reasonable period of time from submission, not to exceed 24 hours;

(4) be funded, including any appropriate upgrades, maintenance, and associated direct and indirect administrative costs, by users of the database or similar resource, in a manner consistent with that described in section 1106(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1306(b)); and

(5) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, be fully operational.

(e) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Before providing confirmation of fraud protection data to a permitted entity, the Commissioner shall ensure that the Commissioner has a certification from the permitted entity that is dated not more than 2 years before the date on which that confirmation is provided that includes the following declarations:

(1) The entity is a permitted entity.

(2) The entity is in compliance with this section.

(3) The entity is, and will remain, in compliance with its privacy and data security requirements, as described in title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.), with respect to information the entity receives from the Commissioner pursuant to this section.

(4) The entity will retain sufficient records to demonstrate its compliance with its certification and this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(f) CONSUMER CONSENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) only—

(A) pursuant to the written, including electronic, consent received by a permitted entity from the individual who is the subject of the request; and

(B) in connection with a credit transaction or any circumstance described in section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b).

(2) **ELECTRONIC CONSENT REQUIREMENTS.**—For a permitted entity to use the consent of an individual received electronically pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the permitted entity must obtain the individual's electronic signature, as defined in section 106 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7006).

(3) **EFFECTUATING ELECTRONIC CONSENT.**—No provision of law or requirement, including section 552a of title 5, United States Code, shall prevent the use of electronic consent for purposes of this subsection or for use in any other consent based verification under the discretion of the Commissioner.

(g) **COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **AUDITS AND MONITORING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner may—

(i) conduct audits and monitoring to—

(I) ensure proper use by permitted entities of the database or similar resource described in subsection (c); and

(II) deter fraud and misuse by permitted entities with respect to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c); and

(ii) terminate services for any permitted entity that prevents or refuses to allow the Commissioner to carry out the activities described in clause (i).

(2) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 505(a) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6805(a)), any violation of this section and any certification made under this section shall be enforced in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (7) of such section 505(a) by the agencies described in those paragraphs.

(B) **RELEVANT INFORMATION.**—Upon discovery by the Commissioner, pursuant to an audit described in paragraph (1)(A), of any violation of this section or any certification made under this section, the Commissioner shall forward any relevant information pertaining to that violation to the appropriate agency described in subparagraph (A) for evaluation by the agency for purposes of enforcing this section.

SA 2100. Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . CREDIT SCORE COMPETITION.

(a) **CREDIT SCORE VALIDATION; VALIDATION PROCESS.**—

(1) **USE OF CREDIT SCORES BY FANNIE MAE IN PURCHASING RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGES.**—Section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7)(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘credit score’ means a numerical value or a categorization derived from a statistical tool or modeling system used by a person who makes or arranges a loan to predict the likelihood of certain credit behaviors, including default.

“(B) **USE OF CREDIT SCORES.**—The corporation may condition purchase of a residential

mortgage by the corporation under this subsection on the provision of a credit score for the borrower only if—

“(i) the credit score is derived from any credit scoring model that has been validated and approved by the corporation under this paragraph;

“(ii) the corporation has established and made publicly available a description of the process the corporation will use to validate and approve credit scoring models, which process shall comply with any standards and criteria established by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency pursuant to section 1328 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992; and

“(iii) the corporation provides for the use of the credit score by all of the automated underwriting systems of the corporation and any other procedures and systems used by the corporation to purchase residential mortgages.

“(C) **VALIDATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.**—The process described in subparagraph (B)(ii) shall include an evaluation of—

“(i) the criteria used to validate and approve a credit scoring model, including measures of the integrity, reliability, and accuracy of that model, and an assurance that the model is consistent with the safe and sound operation of the corporation; and

“(ii) the data necessary for the validation of the credit scoring model.

“(D) **APPLICATION.**—If the corporation elects to use a credit score under this paragraph, the corporation shall solicit applications from developers of credit scoring models for the validation and approval of those models under the process described in subparagraph (B)(ii).

“(E) **TIMEFRAME FOR DETERMINATION; NOTICE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The corporation shall make a determination with respect to any application submitted under subparagraph (D), and provide notice of that determination to the applicant, before a date established by the corporation that is not later than 180 days after the date on which an application is submitted to the corporation.

“(ii) **EXTENSIONS.**—The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency may authorize up to 2 extensions of the date established under clause (i), each of which shall not exceed 30 days, upon a written request and a showing of good cause by the corporation.

“(iii) **STATUS NOTICE.**—The corporation shall provide notice to an applicant regarding the status of an application submitted under subparagraph (D) not later than 60 days after the date on which the application was submitted to the corporation.

“(iv) **REASONS FOR DISAPPROVAL.**—If an application submitted under subparagraph (D) is disapproved, the corporation shall provide to the applicant the reasons for the disapproval not later than 30 days after a determination is made under this subparagraph.

“(F) **AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR.**—If the corporation elects to use a credit score under this paragraph, the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency shall require the corporation to routinely update the validation and approval process described in subparagraph (B)(ii) as the Director determines necessary to ensure that the process remains appropriate, adequate, and complies with any standards and criteria established pursuant to section 1328 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992.”

(2) **USE OF CREDIT SCORES BY FREDDIE MAC IN PURCHASING RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGES.**—Sec-

tion 305 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘credit score’ means a numerical value or a categorization derived from a statistical tool or modeling system used by a person who makes or arranges a loan to predict the likelihood of certain credit behaviors, including default.

“(2) **USE OF CREDIT SCORES.**—The Corporation may condition purchase of a residential mortgage by the Corporation under this section on the provision of a credit score for the borrower only if—

“(A) the credit score is derived from any credit scoring model that has been validated and approved by the Corporation under this subsection;

“(B) the Corporation has established and made publicly available a description of the process the Corporation will use to validate and approve credit scoring models, which shall comply with any standards and criteria established by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency pursuant to section 1328 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992; and

“(C) the Corporation provides for use of the credit score by all of the automated underwriting systems of the Corporation and any other procedures and systems used by the Corporation to purchase residential mortgages.

“(3) **VALIDATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.**—The process described in paragraph (2)(B) shall include an evaluation of—

“(A) the criteria used to validate and approve a credit scoring model, including measures of the integrity, reliability, and accuracy of that model and an assurance that the model is consistent with the safe and sound operation of the Corporation; and

“(B) the data necessary for the validation of the credit scoring model.

“(4) **APPLICATION.**—If the Corporation elects to use a credit score under this subsection, the Corporation shall solicit applications from developers of credit scoring models for the validation and approval of those models under the process described in paragraph (2)(B).

“(5) **TIMEFRAME FOR DETERMINATION; NOTICE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Corporation shall make a determination with respect to any application submitted under paragraph (4), and provide notice of that determination to the applicant, before a date established by the Corporation that is not later than 180 days after the date on which an application is submitted to the Corporation.

“(B) **EXTENSIONS.**—The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency may authorize up to 2 extensions of the date established under subparagraph (A), each of which shall not exceed 30 days, upon the written request and a showing of good cause by the Corporation.

“(C) **STATUS NOTICE.**—The Corporation shall provide notice to an applicant regarding the status of an application submitted under paragraph (4) not later than 60 days after the date on which the application was submitted to the Corporation.

“(D) **REASONS FOR DISAPPROVAL.**—If an application submitted under paragraph (4) is disapproved, the Corporation shall provide to the applicant the reasons for the disapproval not later than 30 days after a determination is made under this paragraph.

“(6) **AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR.**—If the Corporation elects to use a credit score under

this subsection, the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency shall require the Corporation to routinely update the validation and approval process described in paragraph (2)(B) as the Director determines necessary to ensure that the process remains appropriate, adequate, and complies with any standards and criteria established pursuant to section 1328 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992.”.

(b) **AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY.**—Subpart A of part 2 of subtitle A of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4541 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1328. REGULATIONS FOR USE OF CREDIT SCORES.

“The Director may, by regulation, establish standards and criteria for any process used by an enterprise to validate and approve credit scoring models pursuant to section 302(b)(7) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and section 305(d) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2101. Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AMENDMENTS TO MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 4(a) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2603(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “itemize all charges” and inserting “itemize all actual charges”;

(2) by striking “and all charges imposed upon the seller in connection with the settlement and” and inserting “and the seller in connection with the settlement. Such forms”; and

(3) by inserting after “or both.” the following: “Charges for any title insurance premium disclosed on such forms shall be equal to the amount charged for each individual title insurance policy, subject to any discounts as required by State regulation or the title company rate filings.”.

SA 2102. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REGULATORY RELIEF FOR BANKS DURING DISASTERS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the terms “appropriate Federal banking agency” and “depository institution” have the meanings given those terms in section 3

of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(2) the term “major disaster” has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the President declares a major disaster under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), or not later than 15 days after a state of disaster is declared by a Governor of a State for all or part of that State, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall issue guidance to depository institutions located in the area for which the President declared the major disaster or the Governor declared a state of disaster, as applicable, for reducing regulatory burdens for borrowers and communities in order to facilitate recovery from the disaster.

(c) **CONTENTS.**—Guidance issued under subsection (b) shall include instructions from the appropriate Federal banking agency regarding—

(1) extending repayment terms, adjusting existing loans, and easing terms for new loans, in accordance with prudent banking practices that involve appropriate monitoring;

(2) providing relief from reporting and publishing requirements, including by accepting delayed filing and publishing of reports by depository institutions in areas affected by the major disaster or covered by the state of disaster, as applicable;

(3) taking appropriate actions to stabilize investments in local government projects affected by the major disaster or covered by the state of disaster, as applicable;

(4) promoting awareness of the eligibility of depository institutions for loans or investments made in areas affected by the major disaster or covered by the state of disaster, as applicable, under the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.); and

(5) such other issues as determined appropriate by the appropriate Federal banking agency.

SA 2103. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 307(a) and insert the following:

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) **REHABILITATION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.**—If a borrower of a private education loan successfully and voluntarily makes 9 payments within 20 days of the due date during 10 consecutive months of amounts owed on the private education loan, or otherwise brings the private education loan current after the loan is charged-off, the loan shall be considered rehabilitated, and the lender or servicer shall request that any consumer reporting agency to which the charge-off was reported remove the delinquency that led to the charge-off and the charge-off from the borrower’s credit history.”.

On page 127, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

(A) the implementation of paragraph (12) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) (referred to in this paragraph as “the provision”), as added by subsection (a);

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE VI—STUDENT PROTECTIONS

SEC. 601. STUDENT LOAN BORROWER BILL OF RIGHTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights”.

(b) **TRUTH IN LENDING ACT AMENDMENTS.**—The Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in section 128—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “PRIVATE”;

(ii) in paragraph (1)(O), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (9)”;

(iii) in paragraph (2)(L), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (9)”;

(iv) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking “paragraph (7)” and inserting “paragraph (10)”;

(v) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (12) as paragraphs (8) through (15), respectively;

(vi) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) **DISCLOSURES BEFORE FIRST FULLY AMORTIZED PAYMENT.**—Not fewer than 30 days and not more than 150 days before the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due from the borrower, the postsecondary educational lender shall disclose to the borrower, clearly and conspicuously—

“(A) the information described in—

“(i) paragraph (2)(A) (adjusted, as necessary, for the rate of interest in effect on the date the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due);

“(ii) subparagraphs (B) through (G) of paragraph (2);

“(iii) paragraph (2)(H) (adjusted, as necessary, for the rate of interest in effect on the date the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due);

“(iv) paragraph (2)(K); and

“(v) subparagraphs (O) and (P) of paragraph (2);

“(B) the scheduled date upon which the first fully amortized payment is due;

“(C) the name of the lender and servicer, and the address to which communications and payments should be sent including a telephone number and website where the borrower may obtain additional information;

“(D) a description of alternative repayment plans, including loan consolidation or refinancing, and servicemember or veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) or other Federal or State law related to postsecondary education loans; and

“(E) a statement that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under paragraph (16)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (16)(I).

“(6) **DISCLOSURES WHEN BORROWER IS 30 DAYS DELINQUENT.**—Not fewer than 5 days after a borrower becomes 30 days delinquent on a postsecondary education loan, the postsecondary educational lender shall disclose to the borrower, clearly and conspicuously—

“(A) the date on which the loan will be charged-off (as defined in paragraph (16)(A)) or assigned to collections, including the consequences of such charge-off or assignment to collections, if no payment is made;

“(B) the minimum payment that the borrower must make to avoid the loan being charged off (as defined in paragraph (16)(A)) or assigned to collection, and the minimum payment that the borrower must make to bring the loan current;

“(C) a statement informing the borrower that a payment of less than the minimum payment described in subparagraph (B) could result in the loan being charged off (as defined in paragraph (16)(A)) or assigned to collection; and

“(D) a statement that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under paragraph (16)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (16)(I).

“(7) DISCLOSURES WHEN BORROWER IS HAVING DIFFICULTY MAKING PAYMENT OR IS 60 DAYS DELINQUENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not fewer than 5 days after a borrower notifies a postsecondary educational lender that the borrower is having difficulty making payment or a borrower becomes 60 days delinquent on a postsecondary education loan, the postsecondary educational lender shall—

“(i) complete a full review of the borrower's postsecondary education loan and make a reasonable effort to obtain the information necessary to determine—

“(I) if the borrower is eligible for an alternative repayment plan, including loan consolidation or refinancing; and

“(II) if the borrower is eligible for servicemember or veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) or other Federal or State law related to postsecondary education loans;

“(ii) provide the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about alternative repayment plans and benefits for which the borrower is eligible, including all terms, conditions, and fees or costs associated with such repayment plan, pursuant to paragraph (8)(D);

“(iii) allow the borrower not less than 30 days to apply for an alternative repayment plan or benefits, if eligible; and

“(iv) notify the borrower that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under paragraph (16)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (16)(I).

“(B) FORBEARANCE OR DEFERMENT.—If a borrower notifies the postsecondary educational lender that a long-term alternative repayment plan is not appropriate, the postsecondary educational lender may comply with this paragraph by providing the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about short-term options to address an anticipated short-term difficulty in making payments, such as forbearance or deferment options, including all terms, conditions, and fees or costs associated with such options pursuant to paragraph (8)(D).

“(C) NOTIFICATION PROCESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each postsecondary educational lender shall establish a process, in accordance subparagraph (A), for a borrower to notify the lender that—

“(I) the borrower is having difficulty making payments on a postsecondary education loan; and

“(II) a long-term alternative repayment plan is not needed.

“(ii) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall promulgate rules establishing minimum standards for postsecondary educational lenders in carrying out the requirements of this paragraph and a model form for borrowers to notify postsecondary educational lenders of the information under this paragraph.”;

(vii) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by clause (v), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) MODEL DISCLOSURE FORM FOR ALTERNATIVE REPAYMENT PLANS, FORBEARANCE, AND DEFERMENT OPTIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall develop and issue model forms to allow borrowers to compare alternative repayment plans, forbearance, and deferment options with the borrower's existing repayment plan with respect to a postsecondary education loan. Such forms shall include the following:

“(i) The total amount to be paid over the life of the loan.

“(ii) The total amount in interest to be paid over the life of the loan.

“(iii) The monthly payment amount.

“(iv) The expected pay-off date.

“(v) Related fees and costs.

“(vi) Eligibility requirements, and how the borrower can apply for the alternative repayment plan, forbearance, or deferment option.

“(vii) Any relevant consequences due to action or inaction, such as default, including any actions that would result in the loss of eligibility for alternative repayment plans, forbearance, or deferment options.”;

(viii) in paragraph (11), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking “paragraph (7)” and inserting “paragraph (10)”;

(ix) by striking paragraph (13), as redesignated by clause (v), and inserting the following:

“(13) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘covered educational institution’, ‘private educational lender’, and ‘private education loan’ have the same meanings as in section 140; and

“(B) the term ‘postsecondary education loan’ means

“(i) a private education loan; or

“(ii) a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 1087a et seq., and 1087aa et seq.)”;

(x) in paragraph (14), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (8)”;

(xi) by adding at the end the following:

“(16) STUDENT LOAN BORROWER BILL OF RIGHTS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) BORROWER.—The term ‘borrower’ means the person to whom a postsecondary education loan is extended.

“(ii) CHARGE OFF.—The term ‘charge off’ means charge to profit and loss, or subject to any similar action.

“(iii) QUALIFIED WRITTEN REQUEST.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified written request’ means a written correspondence of a borrower (other than notice on a payment medium supplied by the student loan

servicer) transmitted by mail, facsimile, or electronically through an email address or website designated by the student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers that—

“(aa) includes, or otherwise enables the student loan servicer to identify, the name and account of the borrower; and

“(bb) includes, to the extent applicable—

“(AA) sufficient detail regarding the information sought by the borrower; or

“(BB) a statement of the reasons for the belief of the borrower that there is an error regarding the account of the borrower.

“(II) CORRESPONDENCE DELIVERED TO OTHER ADDRESSES.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—A written correspondence of a borrower is a qualified written request if the written correspondence is transmitted to and received by a student loan servicer at a mailing address, facsimile number, email address, or website address other than the address or number designated by that student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers but the written correspondence meets the requirements under items (aa) and (bb) of subclause (I).

“(bb) DUTY TO TRANSFER.—A student loan servicer shall, within a reasonable period of time, transfer a written correspondence of a borrower received by the student loan servicer at a mailing address, facsimile number, email address, or website address other than the address or number designated by that student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers to the correct address or appropriate office or other unit of the student loan servicer.

“(cc) DATE OF RECEIPT.—A written correspondence of a borrower transferred in accordance with item (bb) shall be deemed to be received by the student loan servicer on the date on which the written correspondence is transferred to the correct address or appropriate office or other unit of the student loan servicer.

“(iv) SERVICER.—The term ‘servicer’ means the person responsible for the servicing of a postsecondary education loan, including any agent of such person or the person who makes, owns, or holds a loan if such person also services the loan.

“(v) SERVICING.—The term ‘servicing’ means—

“(I) receiving any scheduled periodic payments from a borrower pursuant to the terms of a postsecondary education loan;

“(II) making the payments of principal and interest and such other payments with respect to the amounts received from the borrower, as may be required pursuant to the terms of the loan; and

“(III) performing other administrative services with respect to the loan.

“(B) SALE, TRANSFER, OR ASSIGNMENT.—If the sale, other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations of a postsecondary education loan results in a change in the identity of the party to whom the borrower must send subsequent payments or direct any communications concerning the loan—

“(i) the transferor shall—

“(I) notify the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, not fewer than 45 days before transferring a legally enforceable right to receive payment from the borrower on such loan, of—

“(aa) the sale or other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(bb) the identity of the transferee;

“(cc) the name and address of the party to whom subsequent payments or communications must be sent;

“(dd) the telephone numbers and websites of both the transferor and the transferee;

“(ee) the effective date of the sale, transfer, or assignment;

“(ff) the date on which the transferor will stop accepting payment; and

“(gg) the date on which the transferee will begin accepting payment; and

“(II) forward any payment from a borrower with respect to such postsecondary education loan to the transferee, immediately upon receiving such payment, during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the transferor stops accepting payment of such postsecondary education loan; and

“(ii) the transferee shall—

“(I) notify the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, not fewer than 45 days before acquiring a legally enforceable right to receive payment from the borrower on such loan, of—

“(aa) the sale or other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(bb) the identity of the transferor;

“(cc) the name and address of the party to whom subsequent payments or communications must be sent;

“(dd) the telephone numbers and websites of both the transferor and the transferee;

“(ee) the effective date of the sale, transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(ff) the date on which the transferor will stop accepting payment; and

“(gg) the date on which the transferee will begin accepting payment;

“(II) accept as on-time and may not impose any late fee or finance charge for any payment from a borrower with respect to such postsecondary education loan that is forwarded from the transferor during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the transferor stops accepting payment, if the transferor receives such payment on or before the applicable due date, including any grace period;

“(III) provide borrowers a simple, online process for transferring existing electronic fund transfer authority; and

“(IV) honor any promotion or benefit offered to the borrower or advertised by the previous owner or transferor of such postsecondary education loan.

“(C) MATERIAL CHANGE IN MAILING ADDRESS OR PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING PAYMENTS.—If a servicer makes a change in the mailing address, office, or procedures for handling payments with respect to any postsecondary education loan, and such change causes a delay in the crediting of the account of the borrower made during the 60-day period following the date on which such change took effect, the servicer may not impose any late fee or finance charge for a late payment on such postsecondary education loan.

“(D) INTEREST RATE AND TERM CHANGES FOR CERTAIN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(i) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), a student loan servicer shall provide written notice to a borrower of any material change in the terms of the postsecondary education loan, including an increase in the interest rate, not later than 45 days before the effective date of the change or increase.

“(II) MATERIAL CHANGES IN TERMS.—The Bureau shall, by regulation, establish guidelines for determining which changes in terms are material under subclause (I).

“(ii) LIMITS ON INTEREST RATE AND FEE INCREASES APPLICABLE TO OUTSTANDING BALANCE.—Except as provided in clause (iii), a loan holder or student loan servicer may not

increase the interest rate or other fee applicable to an outstanding balance on a postsecondary education loan.

“(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—The requirements under clauses (i) and (ii) shall not apply to—

“(I) an increase in any applicable variable interest rate incorporated in the terms of a postsecondary education loan that provides for changes in the interest rate according to operation of an index that is not under the control of the loan holder or student loan servicer and is published for viewing by the general public;

“(II) an increase in interest rate due to the completion of a workout or temporary hardship arrangement by the borrower or the failure of the borrower to comply with the terms of a workout or temporary hardship arrangement if—

“(aa) the interest rate applicable to a category of transactions following any such increase does not exceed the rate or fee that applied to that category of transactions prior to commencement of the arrangement; and

“(bb) the loan holder or student loan servicer has provided the borrower, prior to the commencement of such arrangement, with clear and conspicuous disclosure of the terms of the arrangement (including any increases due to such completion or failure); and

“(III) an increase in interest rate due to a provision included within the terms of a postsecondary education loan that provides for a lower interest rate based on the borrower's agreement to a prearranged plan that authorizes recurring electronic funds transfers if—

“(aa) the borrower withdraws the borrower's authorization of the prearranged recurring electronic funds transfer plan; and

“(bb) after withdrawal of the borrower's authorization and prior to increasing the interest rate, the loan holder or student loan servicer has provided the borrower with clear and conspicuous disclosure of the impending change in borrower's interest rate and a reasonable opportunity to reauthorize the prearranged electronic funds transfers plan.

“(E) APPLICATION OF PAYMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, upon receipt of a payment, the servicer shall apply amounts first to the interest and fees owed on the payment due date, and then to the principal balance of the postsecondary education loan bearing the highest annual percentage rate, and then to each successive interest and fees and then principal balance bearing the next highest annual percentage rate, until the payment is exhausted. A borrower may instruct or expressly authorize the servicer to apply payments in a different manner.

“(ii) APPLICATION OF EXCESS AMOUNTS.—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, upon receipt of a payment, the servicer shall apply amounts in excess of the minimum payment amount first to the interest and fees owed on the payment due date, and then to the principal balance of the postsecondary education loan bearing the highest annual percentage rate, and then to each successive interest and fees and principal balance bearing the next highest annual percentage rate, until the payment is exhausted. A borrower may instruct or expressly authorize the servicer to apply such excess payments in a different manner. A borrower may also voluntarily increase the periodic payment amount, including by increasing their recurring electronic payment, with the right to

return to their original amortization schedule at any time. Servicers shall provide a simple, online method to allow borrowers to make voluntary one-time additional payments, voluntarily increase the amount of their periodic payment, and return to their original amortization schedule.

“(iii) APPLY PAYMENT ON DATE RECEIVED.—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, a servicer shall apply payments to a borrower's account on the date the payment is received.

“(iv) PROMULGATION OF RULES.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, may promulgate rules for the application of postsecondary education loan payments that—

“(I) implements the requirements in this section;

“(II) minimizes the amount of fees and interest incurred by the borrower and the total loan amount paid by the borrower;

“(III) minimizes delinquencies, assignments to collection, and charge-offs;

“(IV) requires servicers to apply payments on the date received; and

“(V) allows the borrower to instruct the servicer to apply payments in a manner preferred by the borrower, including excess payments.

“(v) METHOD THAT BEST BENEFITS BORROWER.—In promulgating the rules under clause (iv), the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall choose the application method that best benefits the borrower and is compatible with existing repayment options.

“(F) PAYMENTS AND FEES.—

“(i) PROHIBITION ON RECOMMENDING DEFAULT.—A loan holder or student loan servicer may not recommend or encourage default or delinquency on an existing postsecondary education loan prior to and in connection with the process of qualifying for or enrolling in an alternative repayment arrangement, including the origination of a new postsecondary education loan that refinances all or any portion of such existing loan or debt.

“(ii) LATE FEES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A late fee may not be charged to a borrower for a postsecondary education loan under any of the following circumstances, either individually or in combination:

“(aa) On a per-loan basis when a borrower has multiple postsecondary education loans in a billing group.

“(bb) In an amount greater than 4 percent of the amount of the payment past due.

“(cc) Before the end of the 15-day period beginning on the date the payment is due.

“(dd) More than once with respect to a single late payment.

“(ee) The borrower fails to make a singular, non-successive regularly-scheduled payment on the postsecondary education loan.

“(ff) The student loan servicer has failed to adopt reasonable procedures designed to ensure that each billing statement required under subparagraph (K) is mailed or delivered to the consumer not later than 21 days before the payment due date.

“(iii) COORDINATION WITH SUBSEQUENT LATE FEES.—No late fee may be charged to a borrower for a postsecondary education loan relating to an insufficient payment if the payment is made on or before the due date of the payment, or within any applicable grace period for the payment, if the insufficiency is attributable only to a late fee relating to an earlier payment, and the payment is otherwise a full payment for the applicable period.

“(iv) PAYMENTS AT LOCAL BRANCHES.—If the loan holder, in the case of a postsecondary education loan account referred to in subparagraph (A), is a financial institution that maintains a branch or office at which payments on any such account are accepted from the borrower in person, the date on which the borrower makes a payment on the account at such branch or office shall be considered to be the date on which the payment is made for purposes of determining whether a late fee may be imposed due to the failure of the borrower to make payment on or before the due date for such payment.

“(G) BORROWER INQUIRIES.—

“(i) DUTY OF STUDENT LOAN SERVICERS TO RESPOND TO BORROWER INQUIRIES.—

“(I) NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF REQUEST.—If a borrower of a postsecondary education loan submits a qualified written request to the student loan servicer for information relating to the student loan servicing of the postsecondary education loan, the student loan servicer shall provide a written response acknowledging receipt of the qualified written request within 5 business days unless any action requested by the borrower is taken within such period.

“(II) ACTION WITH RESPECT TO INQUIRY.—Not later than 30 business days after the receipt from a borrower of a qualified written request under subclause (I) and, if applicable, before taking any action with respect to the qualified written request of the borrower, the student loan servicer shall—

“(aa) make appropriate corrections in the account of the borrower, including the crediting of any late fees, and transmit to the borrower a written notification of such correction (which shall include the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of a representative of the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower);

“(bb) after conducting an investigation, provide the borrower with a written explanation or clarification that includes—

“(AA) to the extent applicable, a statement of the reasons for which the student loan servicer believes the account of the borrower is correct as determined by the student loan servicer; and

“(BB) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of an individual employed by, or the office or department of, the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower; or

“(cc) after conducting an investigation, provide the borrower with a written explanation or clarification that includes—

“(AA) information requested by the borrower or explanation of why the information requested is unavailable or cannot be obtained by the student loan servicer; and

“(BB) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of an individual employed by, or the office or department of, the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower.

“(III) LIMITED EXTENSION OF RESPONSE TIME.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—There may be 1 extension of the 30-day period described in subclause (II) of not more than 15 days if, before the end of such 30-day period, the student loan servicer notifies the borrower of the extension and the reasons for the delay in responding.

“(bb) REPORTS TO BUREAU.—Each student loan servicer shall, on an annual basis, report to the Bureau the aggregate number of extensions sought by the student loan servicer under item (aa).

“(ii) PROTECTION OF CREDIT INFORMATION.—During the 60-day period beginning on the

date on which a student loan servicer receives a qualified written request from a borrower relating to a dispute regarding payments by the borrower, a student loan servicer may not provide negative credit information to any consumer reporting agency (as defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a)) relating to the subject of the qualified written request or to such period, including any information relating to a late payment or payment owed by the borrower on the borrower's postsecondary education loan.

“(H) SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR CERTAIN BORROWERS.—A student loan servicer shall designate an office or other unit of the student loan servicer to act as a point of contact regarding postsecondary education loans for borrowers considered to be at risk of default, including—

“(i) any borrower who requests information related to options to reduce or suspend his or her monthly payment, or otherwise indicates that he or she is experiencing or is about to experience financial hardship or distress;

“(ii) any borrower who becomes 60 calendar days delinquent on any loan;

“(iii) any borrower who has not completed the program of study for which the borrower received the loan;

“(iv) any borrower who is enrolled in discretionary forbearance for more than 9 months of the previous 12 months;

“(v) any borrower who has rehabilitated or consolidated one or more student loans out of default within the prior 12 months;

“(vi) a borrower under a private education loan who is seeking to modify the terms of the repayment of the postsecondary education loan because of hardship; and

“(vii) any borrower or segment of borrowers determined by the Director of the Bureau to be at risk of default.

“(I) SERVICEMEMBERS, VETERANS, AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(i) SERVICEMEMBER AND VETERANS LIAISON.—Each servicer shall designate an employee to act as the servicemember and veterans liaison who is responsible for answering inquiries from servicemembers and veterans, and is specially trained on servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws related to postsecondary education loans.

“(ii) TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE NUMBER.—Each servicer shall maintain a toll-free telephone number that shall—

“(I) connect directly to the servicemember and veterans liaison designated under clause (i); and

“(II) be made available on the primary internet website of the servicer and on monthly billing statements.

“(iii) PROHIBITION ON CHARGE OFFS AND DEFAULT.—A lender or servicer may not charge off or report a postsecondary education loan as delinquent, assigned to collection (internally or by referral to a third party), in default, or charged-off to a credit reporting agency if the borrower is on active duty in the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code) serving in a combat zone (as designated by the President under section 112(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

“(iv) ADDITIONAL LIAISONS.—The Secretary shall determine additional entities with whom borrowers interact, including guaranty agencies, that shall designate an employee to act as the servicemember and veterans liaison who is responsible for answer-

ing inquiries from servicemembers and veterans and is specially trained on servicemembers and veteran benefits and option under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.).

“(J) BORROWER'S LOAN HISTORY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A servicer shall make available through a secure website, or in writing upon request, the loan history of each borrower for each postsecondary education loan, separately designating—

“(I) payment history;

“(II) loan history, including any forbearances, deferrals, delinquencies, assignment to collection, and charge offs;

“(III) annual percentage rate history;

“(IV) key loan terms, including application of payments to interest, principal, and fees, origination date, principal, capitalized interest, annual percentage rate, including any cap, loan term, and any contractual incentives; and

“(V) balance due to pay off the outstanding balance.

“(ii) ORIGINAL DOCUMENTATION.—A servicer shall make available to the borrower, if requested, at no charge, copies of the original loan documents and the promissory note for each postsecondary education loan.

“(iii) PROMPT DELIVERY.—A loan holder or a student loan servicer that has received a request by a borrower or a person authorized by a borrower for the information described in clause (i) shall provide such information to the borrower or person authorized by the borrower not later than 5 business days after receiving such request.

“(K) ADDITIONAL SERVICING STANDARDS.—

“(i) STATEMENT REQUIRED WITH EACH BILLING CYCLE.—A student loan servicer for each borrower's account that is being serviced by that student loan servicer and that includes a postsecondary education loan shall transmit to the borrower, for each billing cycle at the end of which there is an outstanding balance in that account, a statement that includes—

“(I) the outstanding balance in the account at the beginning of the billing cycle;

“(II) the total amount credited to the account during the billing cycle;

“(III) the amount of any fee added to the account during the billing cycle, itemized to show the amounts, if any, due to the application of an increased interest rate, and the amount, if any, imposed as a minimum or fixed charge;

“(IV) the balance on which the fee described in subclause (III) was computed and a statement of how the balance was determined;

“(V) whether the balance described in subclause (IV) was determined without first deducting all payments and other credits during the billing cycle, and the amount of any such payments and credits;

“(VI) the outstanding balance in the account at the end of the billing cycle;

“(VII) the date by which, or the period within which, payment must be made to avoid late fees, if any;

“(VIII) the address of the student loan servicer to which the borrower may direct billing inquiries;

“(IX) the amount of any payments or other credits during the billing cycle that was applied to pay down principal, and the amount applied to interest;

“(X) in the case of a billing group, the allocation of any payments or other credits during the billing cycle to each of the postsecondary education loans in the billing group;

“(XI) information on how to file a complaint with the Bureau and with the ombudsman designated pursuant to section 1035 of

the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5535); and

“(XII) any other information determined by the Bureau, which may include information in the Bureau’s Student Loan Payback Playbook.

“(ii) DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENT DEADLINES.—In the case of a postsecondary education loan account under which a late fee or charge may be imposed due to the failure of the borrower to make payment on or before the due date for such payment, the billing statement required under clause (i) with respect to the account shall include, in a conspicuous location on the billing statement, the date on which the payment is due or, if different, the date on which a late fee will be charged, together with the amount of the late fee to be imposed if payment is made after that date.

“(L) ARBITRATION.—

“(i) WAIVER OF RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—Any rights and remedies available to borrowers against servicers may not be waived by any agreement, policy, or form, including by a predispute arbitration agreement.

“(ii) PREDISPUTE ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS.—No predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable by a servicer, including as a third-party beneficiary or by estoppel, if the agreement requires arbitration of a dispute with respect to a postsecondary education loan. This clause applies to predispute arbitration agreements entered into before the date of enactment of the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights, as well as on and after such date of enactment, if the violation that is the subject of the dispute occurred on or after such date of enactment.

“(M) ENFORCEMENT.—The provisions of this paragraph shall be enforced by the agencies specified in subsections (a) through (d) of section 108, in the manner set forth in that section or under any other applicable authorities available to such agencies by law, and by State Attorneys General.

“(N) PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to preempt any provision of State law regarding postsecondary education loans where the State law provides stronger consumer protections.

“(O) CIVIL LIABILITY.—A servicer that fails to comply with any requirement imposed under this paragraph shall be deemed a creditor that has failed to comply with a requirement under this chapter for purposes of liability under section 130 and such servicer shall be subject to the liability provisions under such section, including the provisions under paragraphs (1), (2)(A)(i), (2)(B), and (3) of section 130(a).

“(P) ELIGIBILITY FOR DISCHARGE.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall promulgate rules requiring lenders and servicers of loans described in paragraph (13)(B)(ii) to—

“(i) identify and contact borrowers who may be eligible for student loan discharge by the Secretary;

“(ii) provide the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about obtaining such discharge; and

“(iii) create a streamlined process for eligible borrowers to apply for and receive such discharge.

“(Q) STUDENT LOAN SERVICER REQUIREMENTS.—A student loan servicer may not—

“(i) charge a fee for responding to a qualified written request under this chapter;

“(ii) fail to take timely action to respond to a qualified written request from a bor-

rower to correct an error relating to an allocation of payment or the payoff amount of the postsecondary education loan;

“(iii) fail to take reasonable steps to avail the borrower of all possible alternative repayment arrangements to avoid default;

“(iv) fail to perform the obligations required under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

“(v) fail to respond within 10 business days to a request from a borrower to provide the name, address, and other relevant contact information of the loan holder of the borrower’s postsecondary education loan or, for a Federal Direct Loan or a Federal Perkins Loan, the Secretary of Education or the institution of higher education who made the loan, respectively;

“(vi) fail to comply with any applicable requirement of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.);

“(vii) fail to comply with any other obligation that the Bureau, by regulation, has determined to be appropriate to carry out the consumer protection purposes of this chapter; or

“(viii) fail to perform other standard servicer’s duties.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) INFORMATION TO BE AVAILABLE AT NO CHARGE.—The information required to be disclosed under this section shall be made available at no charge to the borrower.”; and

(2) in section 130(a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “128(e)(7)” and inserting “128(e)(10)”;

(B) in the flush matter at the end, by striking “or paragraph (4)(C), (6), (7), or (8) of section 128(e),” and inserting “or paragraph (4)(C), (9), (10), or (11) of section 128(e),”.

(c) STUDENT LOAN INFORMATION BY ELIGIBLE LENDERS.—Section 433 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1083) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (12), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) a statement that—

“(A) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(B) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(16)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(16)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) A statement that—

“(i) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(ii) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(16)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(16)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(F) A statement that—

“(i) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(ii) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(16)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(16)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”.

SEC. 602. WAGE GARNISHMENT.

The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 812 (15 U.S.C. 1692j) the following:

“SEC. 812A. LIMITS ON SEIZURES OF INCOME FOR DEBT RELATING TO EDUCATION LOANS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘adjusted gross income’ has the meaning given the term in section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(2) the term ‘poverty line’ means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

“(b) LIMITATION ON COLLECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a debt collector that is engaged in the collection of debts relating to education loans may not take any action to cause, or seek to cause, the collection of such a debt that is taken from the wages, Federal benefits, or other amounts due to a consumer through garnishment, deduction, offset, or seizure in an amount that is more than the amount described in paragraph (2).

“(2) CALCULATION.—The amount described in this paragraph is the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) 10 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the consumer exceeds 185 percent of the poverty line; by

“(B) 12.

“(3) PRESUMPTION.—For purposes of this section, if a debt collector described in paragraph (1) is unable to determine the family size of a consumer, that person shall presume that the family size of the consumer is 3 individuals.

“(c) COMMUNICATIONS.—Any communication by a debt collector described in subsection (b)(1) that is for the purpose of seizing income of a consumer for debt that relates an education loan shall be considered—

“(1) an attempt to collect a debt; and

“(2) conduct in connection with the collection of a debt for the purposes of this title.”.

SEC. 603. IMPROVED CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.

Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

“(17) DISCHARGE OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS IN THE EVENT OF DEATH OR DISABILITY OF THE BORROWER.—Each private education loan shall include terms that provide that the liability to repay the loan shall be cancelled—

“(A) upon the death of the borrower;

“(B) if the borrower becomes permanently and totally disabled, as determined under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 437(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a)) and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Education under that section; and

“(C) if the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of Defense determines that the borrower is unemployable due to a service-connected condition or disability, in accordance with the requirements of section 437(a)(2) of that Act and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Education under that section; and

“(18) TERMS FOR CO-BORROWERS.—Each private education loan shall include terms that clearly define the requirements to release a co-borrower from the obligation.

“(19) PROHIBITION OF ACCELERATION OF PAYMENTS ON PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a private education loan executed after the date of enactment of this paragraph may not include a provision that permits the loan holder or student loan servicer to accelerate, in whole or in part, payments on the private education loan.

“(B) ACCELERATION CAUSED BY A PAYMENT DEFAULT.—A private education loan may include a provision that permits acceleration of the loan in cases of payment default.

“(20) PROHIBITION ON DENIAL OF CREDIT DUE TO ELIGIBILITY FOR PROTECTION UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.—A private educational lender may not deny or refuse credit to an individual who is entitled to any right or protection provided under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) or subject, solely by reason of such entitlement, such individual to any other action described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 108 of such Act.”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) requirements for a co-borrower, including—

“(i) any changes in the applicable interest rates without a co-borrower; and

“(ii) any conditions the borrower is required meet in order to release a co-borrower from the private education loan obligation.”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (O), (P), (Q), and (R) as subparagraphs (P), (Q), (R), and (S), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (N) the following:

“(O) in the case of a refinancing of education loans that include a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.)—

“(i) a list containing each loan to be refinanced, which shall identify whether the loan is a private education loan or a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

“(ii) benefits that the borrower may be forfeiting, including income-driven repayment options, opportunities for loan forgiveness, forbearance or deferment options, interest subsidies, and tax benefits.”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (O) and (P) as subparagraphs (P) and (Q), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (N) the following:

“(O) in the case of a refinancing of education loans that include a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.)—

“(i) a list containing each loan to be refinanced, which shall identify whether the loan is a private education loan or a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

“(ii) benefits that the borrower may be forfeiting, including income-driven repayment options, opportunities for loan forgiveness, forbearance or deferment options, interest subsidies, and tax benefits.”.

SEC. 604. KNOW BEFORE YOU OWE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Know Before You Owe Private Education Loan Act”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), before a creditor may issue any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall obtain from the relevant institution of higher education where such loan is to be used for a student, such institution’s certification of—

“(i) the enrollment status of the student;

“(ii) the student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined by the institution under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

“(iii) the difference between—

“(I) such cost of attendance; and

“(II) the student’s estimated financial assistance, including such assistance received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other financial assistance known to the institution, as applicable.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a creditor may issue funds, not to exceed the amount described in subparagraph (A)(iii), with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection without obtaining from the relevant institution of higher education such institution’s certification if such institution fails to provide within 15 business days of the creditor’s request for such certification—

“(i) notification of the institution’s refusal to certify the request; or

“(ii) notification that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request.

“(C) LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—If a creditor issues funds without obtaining a certification, as described in subparagraph (B), such creditor shall report the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(21) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

“(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS.—

“(i) LOAN STATEMENT.—A creditor that issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall send loan statements, where such loan is to be used for a student, to borrowers of such funds not less than once every 3 months during the time that such student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

“(ii) CONTENTS OF LOAN STATEMENT.—Each statement described in clause (i) shall—

“(I) report the borrower’s total remaining debt to the creditor, including accrued but unpaid interest and capitalized interest;

“(II) report any debt increases since the last statement; and

“(III) list the current interest rate for each loan.

“(B) NOTIFICATION OF LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—On or before the

date a creditor issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall notify the relevant institution of higher education, in writing, of the amount of the extension of credit and the student on whose behalf credit is extended. The form of such written notification shall be subject to the regulations of the Bureau.

“(C) ANNUAL REPORT.—A creditor that issues funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Bureau containing the required information about private student loans to be determined by the Bureau, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.”.

(2) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—Section 140(a)(7)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(7)(A)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);

(B) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(C) by adding after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and”.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue regulations in final form to implement paragraphs (3) and (21) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by paragraph (1). Such regulations shall become effective not later than 6 months after their date of issuance.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—

(1) PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AGREEMENTS.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) and inserting the following:

“(28)(A) Upon the request of a private educational lender, acting in connection with an application initiated by a borrower for a private education loan in accordance with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act, the institution shall, not later than 15 days after the date of receipt of the request—

“(i) provide such certification to such private educational lender—

“(I) that the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, is enrolled or is scheduled to enroll at the institution;

“(II) of such student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

“(III) of the difference between—

“(aa) the cost of attendance at the institution; and

“(bb) the student’s estimated financial assistance received under this title and other assistance known to the institution, as applicable;

“(ii) notify the creditor that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request; or

“(iii) provide notice to the private educational lender of the institution’s refusal to certify the private education loan under subparagraph (D).

“(B) With respect to a certification request described in subparagraph (A), and prior to providing such certification under subparagraph (A)(i) or providing notice of the refusal to provide certification under subparagraph (A)(iii), the institution shall—

“(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, has applied for and exhausted the Federal financial assistance available to such student under this title and inform the student accordingly; and

“(ii) provide the borrower whose loan application has prompted the certification request by a private education lender, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), with the following information and disclosures:

“(I) The availability of, and the borrower’s potential eligibility for, Federal financial assistance under this title, including disclosing the terms, conditions, interest rates, and repayment options and programs of Federal student loans.

“(II) The borrower’s ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower’s choice.

“(III) The impact of a proposed private education loan on the borrower’s potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.

“(IV) The borrower’s right to accept or reject a private education loan within the 30-day period following a private educational lender’s approval of a borrower’s application and about a borrower’s 3-day right to cancel period.

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms ‘private educational lender’ and ‘private education loan’ have the meanings given such terms in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).

“(D)(i) An institution shall not provide a certification with respect to a private education loan under this paragraph unless the private education loan includes terms that provide—

“(I) the borrower alternative repayment plans, including loan consolidation or refinancing; and

“(II) that the liability to repay the loan shall be cancelled upon the death or disability of the borrower or co-borrower.

“(ii) In this paragraph, the term ‘disability’ means a permanent and total disability, as determined in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary of Education, or a determination by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that the borrower is unemployable due to a service connected-disability.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the effective date of the regulations described in subsection (b)(3).

(3) **PREFERRED LENDER ARRANGEMENT.**—Section 151(8)(A)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1019(8)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting “certifying,” after “promoting.”.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 24 months after the issuance of regulations under subsection (b)(3), the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection and the Secretary of Education shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the compliance of institutions of higher education and private educational lenders with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by subsection (b), and section 487(a)(28) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)), as amended by subsection (c). Such report shall include information about the degree to which specific institutions utilize certifications in effectively encouraging the exhaustion of Federal student loan eligibility and lowering student private education loan debt.

SEC. 605. BANKRUPTCY PROTECTIONS.

(a) **EXCEPTIONS TO DISCHARGE.**—Section 523(a)(8) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking “dependents, for” and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “dependents, for an educational benefit overpayment or loan made, insured, or guaranteed by a governmental unit or made under any program funded in whole or in part by a governmental unit or an obligation to repay funds received from a governmental unit as an educational benefit, scholarship, or stipend;”.

(b) **UNDUE HARDSHIP.**—Section 523 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **UNDUE HARDSHIP.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For the purpose of subsection (a)(8), there shall be a rebuttable presumption that excepting such debt from discharge under this section would impose an undue hardship on the debtor or the debtor’s dependents if the debtor demonstrates that, on the date of filing of the petition, the debtor—

“(A) is receiving benefits under title II or XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq., 1381 et seq.) on the basis of disability;

“(B) has been determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to be unemployable due to a service-connected disability;

“(C) is a family caregiver of an eligible veteran pursuant to section 1720G of title 38;

“(D) is a member of a household that has a gross income that is less than 200 percent of the poverty line, and provides for the care and support of an elderly, disabled, or chronically ill member of the household of the debtor or member of the immediate family of the debtor;

“(E) is a member of a household that has a gross income that is less than 200 percent of the poverty line, and the income of the debtor or is solely derived from benefit payments under section 202 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402); or

“(F) during the 5-year period preceding the filing of the petition (exclusive of any applicable suspension of the repayment period), was not enrolled in an education program and had a gross income that was less than 200 percent of the poverty line during each year during that period.

“(2) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘poverty line’ means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a household of the size involved.”.

SEC. 606. EDUCATION LOAN OMBUDSMAN.

Section 1035 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5535) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “PRIVATE”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “a Private” and inserting “an”; and

(B) by striking “private”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “private education student loan” and inserting “education loan”;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “private”;

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) coordinate with the unit of the Bureau established under section 1013(b)(3), in order to monitor complaints by education loan borrowers and responses to those complaints

by the Bureau or other appropriate Federal or State agency;”;

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking “private”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “on the same day annually”; and

(ii) by inserting “and be made available to the public” after “Representatives”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include information on the number, nature, and resolution of complaints received, disaggregated by lender, servicer, region, State, and institution of higher education.”; and

(6) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **EDUCATION LOAN.**—The term ‘education loan’ means—

“(A) a private education loan, as defined in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650); and

“(B) a student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“(2) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).”.

SEC. 607. SERVICEMEMBERS AND STUDENT LOANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title II of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 209. CONTINUAL MONITORING BY PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL LENDERS OF STATUS OF SERVICEMEMBERS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each private educational lender shall continuously monitor the Defense Manpower Data Center, or any successor database, for the purpose of continuously monitoring the duty status of any borrower of a private education loan who is a servicemember and complying with the requirements of this Act.

“(b) **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—Monitoring conducted under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with such policies and procedures as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe for purposes of this section.

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL LENDER.**—The term ‘private educational lender’ has the meaning given such term in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).

“(2) **PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.**—The term ‘private education loan’ has the meaning given such term in such section.

“SEC. 210. FORGIVENESS OF STUDENT DEBT.

“(a) **FORGIVENESS OF STUDENT DEBT OF SERVICEMEMBERS WHO DIE IN LINE OF DUTY WHILE SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY.**—Upon the death of a servicemember who dies in line of duty while serving on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces, each student loan of the servicemember is forgiven.

“(b) **FORGIVENESS OF FEDERAL STUDENT DEBT UPON SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH.**—Upon the service-connected death of a servicemember, the balance of each student loan of the servicemember guaranteed or issued by the Federal Government is forgiven.

“(c) **SERVICE-CONNECTED DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘service-connected’ has the meaning given such term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 208 the following new items:

“Sec. 209. Continual monitoring by private educational lenders of status of servicemembers.

“Sec. 210. Forgiveness of student debt.”.

SA 2104. Mr. CRAPO proposed an amendment to the bill S. 97, to enable civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies by private and public institutions, to expand theoretical and practical knowledge of nuclear physics, chemistry, and materials science, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 20, line 3, insert “in accordance with section 988 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352)” before the period at the end.

On page 20, strike lines 15 through 17.

SA 2105. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . MEDICAL DEBT RELIEF.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—

(1) MEDICAL DEBT DEFINED.—Section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a), as amended by section 302(b) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(bb) MEDICAL DEBT.—The term ‘medical debt’ means a debt described in section 604(g)(1)(C).”.

(2) EXCLUSION FOR PAID OR SETTLED MEDICAL DEBT.—Section 605(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c(a)), as amended by section 302(b) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) Any information related to a medical debt if the date on which such debt was placed for collection, charged to profit or loss, or subjected to any similar action antedates the report by less than 180 days.

“(10) Any information related to a fully paid or settled medical debt that had been characterized as delinquent, charged off, or in collection which, from the date of payment or settlement, antedates the report by more than 45 days.”.

(b) VALIDATION OF MEDICAL DEBT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 809 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) VALIDATION OF MEDICAL DEBT.—For purposes of medical debt, the following shall apply:

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY.—The term ‘consumer reporting agency’ has the meaning given such term under section 603(f) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

“(B) MEDICAL DEBT.—The term ‘medical debt’ means a debt arising from the receipt of medical services, products, or devices.

“(2) NOTICE OF SPECIFIC DEADLINE.—Prior to furnishing information regarding a medical debt to a consumer reporting agency, a statement described under subsection (a)(3) shall include the following information:

“(A) That the debt collector could report to a consumer reporting agency regarding the debt at the end of the 180-day period be-

ginning on the date that the debt collector sends the statement.

“(B) The specific date that is the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date that the debt collector sends the statement.

“(C) That, if the debt is settled or paid by the consumer or an insurance company during the 180-day period beginning on the date that the debt collector sends the statement—

“(i) the debt will not be reported to a consumer reporting agency; and

“(ii) the consumer may, during the 180-day period—

“(I) communicate with an insurance company to determine coverage for the debt; or

“(II) apply for financial assistance.

“(3) COMMUNICATIONS BY DEBT COLLECTOR.—The debt collector may not, during the 180-day period beginning on the date that the debt collector sends the statement described under paragraph (2), communicate with, or report any information to, any consumer reporting agency regarding such debt. This paragraph shall have no effect on when a debt collector may or may not engage in activities to collect or attempt to collect any debt owed or due or asserted to be owed.

“(4) REPORTING AFTER THE 180-DAY PERIOD.—Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the debt collector from communicating with, or reporting any information to, any consumer reporting agency regarding such debt after the end of such 180-day period.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect after the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2106. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATIONS ON COMMODITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843) is amended —

(1) in subsection (k)—

(a) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (H); and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (I) as subparagraph (H); and

(B) by striking paragraph (7); and

(2) by striking subsection (o) and inserting the following:

“(o) LIMITATIONS ON COMMODITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of subsection (k), a financial holding company, or any affiliate or subsidiary of a financial holding company, may not engage in the trading, sale, or investment in any current or future ownership interest, whether direct or indirect, in commodities (including copper) that are to be physically settled or the underlying physical properties related to such commodities, if an insured depository institution is not otherwise permitted to engage in such trading, selling, or investment.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to—

“(A) prohibit the exercise of any right of a financial holding company, or any affiliate or subsidiary of a financial holding company, as creditor of any loan collateralized by a commodity subject to the limitation set forth under paragraph (1); or

“(B) preempt or otherwise supercede any provision of section 716 of the Wall Street

Transparency and Accountability Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 8305).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on December 31, 2016.

(2) CONFORMANCE PERIOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a financial holding company, or any affiliate or subsidiary of a financial holding company, shall comply with the amendment made by subsection (a) not later than the effective date described in paragraph (1).

(B) EXTENSION.—To ensure an orderly implementation of the limitations set forth in the amendment made by subsection (a), upon the application of a financial holding company, or any affiliate or subsidiary of the financial holding company, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may, by rule or order, provide to the financial holding company, or any affiliate or subsidiary of the financial holding company, a one-time extension of the conformance period set forth under subparagraph (A) for a period not to exceed more than 2 years.

SA 2107. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SECURE AND FAIR ENFORCEMENT BANKING.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Secure and Fair Enforcement Banking Act” or the “SAFE Banking Act”.

(b) SAFE HARBOR FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—A Federal banking regulator may not—

(1) terminate or limit the deposit insurance or share insurance of a depository institution under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) or the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) solely because the depository institution provides or has provided financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business;

(2) prohibit, penalize, or otherwise discourage a depository institution from providing financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or to a State or Indian tribe that exercises jurisdiction over cannabis-related legitimate businesses;

(3) recommend, incentivize, or encourage a depository institution not to offer financial services to the owner, operator, or an individual that is an account holder of a cannabis-related legitimate business, or downgrade or cancel financial services offered to an account holder of a cannabis-related legitimate business solely because—

(A) the account holder later becomes a cannabis-related legitimate business; or

(B) the depository institution was not aware that the account holder is the owner or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business; and

(4) take any adverse or corrective supervisory action on a loan to an owner or operator of—

(A) a cannabis-related legitimate business solely because the business owner or operator is a cannabis-related business without

express statutory authority, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) real estate or equipment that is leased or sold to a cannabis-related legitimate business solely because the owner or operator of the real estate or equipment leased or sold the equipment or real estate to a cannabis-related legitimate business.

(C) PROTECTIONS UNDER FEDERAL LAW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacturing, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, sale, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to a law (including regulations) of the State, political subdivision of the State, or the Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country, as applicable, a depository institution and the officers, director, and employees of the depository institution that provides financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business may not be held liable pursuant to any Federal law (including regulations)—

(A) solely for providing the financial services pursuant to the law (including regulations) of the State, political subdivision of the State, or Indian tribe; or

(B) for further investing any income derived from the financial services.

(2) FORFEITURE.—A depository institution that has a legal interest in the collateral for a loan made to an owner or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business, or to an owner or operator of real estate or equipment that is leased or sold to a cannabis-related legitimate business, shall not be subject to criminal, civil, or administrative forfeiture of that legal interest pursuant to any Federal law for providing the loan or other financial services solely because the collateral is owned by a cannabis-related business.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall require a depository institution to provide financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business.

(e) REQUIREMENTS FOR FILING SUSPICIOUS ACTIVITY REPORTS.—Section 5318(g) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR CANNABIS-RELATED BUSINESSES.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘cannabis’ has the meaning given the term ‘marihuana’ in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802);

“(ii) the term ‘cannabis-related legitimate business’ has the meaning given the term in section 6 of the SAFE Banking Act;

“(iii) the term ‘financial service’ means a financial product or service, as defined in section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481);

“(iv) the term ‘Indian country’ has the meaning given the term in section 1151 of title 18; and

“(v) the term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

“(B) REPORTING OF SUSPICIOUS TRANSACTIONS.—A financial institution or any director, officer, employee, or agent of a financial institution that reports a suspicious activity related to a transaction by a cannabis-related legitimate business shall comply with appropriate guidance issued by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. The Secretary shall ensure that the guidance is consistent with the purpose and intent of the SAFE Banking Act and does not inhibit the

provision of financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business in a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that has allowed the cultivation, production, manufacturing, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, sale, or purchase of cannabis, or any other conduct relating to cannabis, pursuant to law or regulation of the State, the political subdivision of the State, or Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country.”

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CANNABIS.—The term “cannabis” has the meaning given the term “marihuana” in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(2) CANNABIS PRODUCT.—The term “cannabis product” means any article which contains cannabis, including an article which is a concentrate, an edible, a tincture, a cannabis-infused product, or a topical.

(3) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term “cannabis-related legitimate business” means a manufacturer, producer, or any person or company that—

(A) engages in any activity described in subparagraph (B) pursuant to a law established by a State or a political subdivision of a State; and

(B)(i) participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products; or

(ii) provides—

(I) any financial service, including retirement plans or exchange traded funds, relating to cannabis; or

(II) any business services, including the sale or lease of real or any other property, legal or other licensed services, or any other ancillary service, relating to cannabis.

(4) COMPANY.—The term “company” means a partnership, corporation, association, (incorporated or unincorporated), trust, estate, cooperative organization, State, or any other entity.

(5) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “depository institution” means—

(A) a depository institution as defined in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(B) a Federal credit union as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752); or

(C) a State credit union as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(6) FEDERAL BANKING REGULATOR.—The term “Federal banking regulator” means each of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the National Credit Union Administration, or any Federal agency or department that regulates banking or financial services, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(7) FINANCIAL SERVICE.—The term “financial service” means a financial product or service, as defined in section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(8) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term “Indian country” has the meaning given the term in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code.

(9) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

(10) MANUFACTURER.—The term “manufacturer” means a person or company who man-

ufactures, compounds, converts, processes, prepares, or packages cannabis or cannabis products.

(11) PRODUCER.—The term “producer” means a person or company who plants, cultivates, harvests, or in any way facilitates the natural growth of cannabis.

(12) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States.

SA 2108. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 308. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST RELATING TO CERTAIN SECURITIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 621(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 15 U.S.C. 77z-2a note) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 27B of the Securities Act of 1933, as added by this section, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.”

(b) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Section 27B of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77z-2a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—An investor aggrieved by a violation of subsection (a) may bring an action in an appropriate district court of the United States to recover damages related to the material conflict of interest that resulted from the transaction of the underwriter, placement agent, initial purchaser, or sponsor, or any affiliate or subsidiary of any such entity, of an asset-backed security, as applicable.”

SA 2109. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 203 and insert the following:

SEC. 203. ATTESTATION.

Section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) ATTESTATION.—The requirements to comply with regulations implementing this section shall be considered to have been satisfied for a banking entity that does not have, and is not controlled by a company that has, more than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets if the chief executive officer of the banking entity submits to the appropriate Federal banking agency a signed attestation that the banking entity, during the examination period covered by the attestation, has not been and, as of the date on which the attestation is submitted, is not engaging in covered activities, other than trading in certain government, agency, State, and municipal obligations, as such concepts are set forth in ‘simplified program for less active banking entities’ of the regulations implementing this section.”

SA 2110. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 204.

Redesignate sections 205 through 214 as sections 204 through 213, respectively.

SA 2111. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 203.

Redesignate sections 204 through 214 as sections 203 through 213, respectively.

SA 2112. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 6, insert “the lowest cost loan (including rates, fees, and other costs) as determined by the State housing finance agency from” after “creditor,”.

SA 2113. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 21, lines 14 and 15, strike “or modular”.

SA 2114. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TOO BIG TO FAIL, TOO BIG TO EXIST.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered entity” means a financial institution, as defined in section 803 of the Payment, Clearing, and Settlement Supervision Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5462); and

(2) the term “gross domestic product” means gross domestic product as calculated by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

(b) TOTAL EXPOSURE.—

(1) TOTAL EXPOSURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On February 1 of each year, no covered entity may have a total exposure, as reported by the covered entity on Form FR Y-15 for the previous year, equal to or greater than 2 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States for the previous calendar year.

(B) OTHER REPORTING.—If a covered entity is not required to complete a Form FR Y-15, the Financial Stability Oversight Council shall design and assign a reporting form as appropriate for each covered entity with

total assets greater than \$50,000,000,000 that reflects the total risk exposures of the financial institution, including off-balance sheet exposures within 18 months of the date of enactment of this Act. Once designated a reporting form, no covered entity may have a total exposure, as reported by the covered entity for the previous year, equal to or greater than 2 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States for the previous calendar year.

(2) RESTRUCTURING.—Any covered entity that violates paragraph (1) shall be designated as a “Too Big to Exist Institution” by the Financial Stability Oversight Council. The Vice Chair for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall require and supervise a “Too Big to Exist Institution” to restructure to comply with paragraph (1) not later than 2 years after the date on which the violation arises.

(c) PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE FINANCING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), any “Too Big to Exist Institution” may not use or otherwise have access to advances from any Federal Reserve credit facility, the Federal Reserve discount window, or any other program or facility made available under the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 221 et seq.), including any asset purchases, temporary or bridge loans, government investments in debt or equity, or capital injections from any Federal institution.

(d) PROHIBITION ON USE OF INSURED DEPOSITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any “Too Big to Exist Institution” that is an insured depository institution, or owns such an institution, may not use any insured deposit amounts to fund—

(A) any activity relating to hedging that is not directly related to commercial banking activity at the insured bank;

(B) any use of derivatives for speculative purposes;

(C) any activity related to the dealing of derivatives; or

(D) any other form of speculative activity that regulators specify.

(2) RISK OF LOSS.—A “Too Big to Exist Institution” not conduct any activity listed in paragraph (1) in such a manner that—

(A) puts insured deposits at risk; or

(B) creates a risk of loss to the Deposit Insurance Fund.

(e) REPORT; TESTIMONY.—The Vice Chair for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Chair of the Financial Stability Oversight Council shall annually testify before the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and submit to those committees an annual report the restructuring and designation under subsection (b)(2).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (c) and (d) shall apply to a covered entity 90 days after the date on which a covered entity is designated as a “Too Big to Exist Institution”.

SA 2115. Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 56, after line 24, insert the following:

(f) ASSESSMENTS OF POORLY PERFORMING PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “poorly performing”, with respect to a public housing agency, means a public housing agency that is designated as troubled;

(B) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(C) the term “small public housing agency” has the meaning given the term in section 38(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as added by subsection (a); and

(D) the term “troubled”, with respect to a public housing agency, means—

(i) any public housing agency designated as a troubled public housing agency under section 6(j) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d(j)); or

(ii) any small public housing agency designated as a troubled small public housing agency under section 38(c)(3) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as added by subsection (a).

(2) ASSESSING FEASIBILITY OF CONSOLIDATING AGENCIES IN RECEIVERSHIP.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall assess the feasibility of using the authority under section 6(j)(3)(D)(i)(IV) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d(j)(3)(D)(i)(IV)) (relating to consolidation of agencies) for any public housing agency that was placed into receivership during the 5-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act, where use of the authority would not harm families who are currently assisted or eligible for assistance in the community that the public housing agency serves.

(3) REPORT ON TROUBLED AGENCIES.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(A) the number of small public housing agencies that have been designated as troubled for more than 1 year, and the duration of that designation;

(B) the number of small public housing agencies designated as troubled that have been placed into administrative or judicial receivership, and the duration of that receivership;

(C) the number of small public housing agencies described in subparagraph (A) or (B) that are in the same county as, or a contiguous county to, another public housing agency that administers the same program or programs with respect to which the small public housing agency has been designated as troubled;

(D) the number of small public housing agencies described in subparagraph (A) or (B) that serve an area that is also served by a regional or statewide public housing agency that administers the same program or programs with respect to which the small public housing agency has been designated as troubled;

(E) for each small public housing agency described in subparagraph (C) or (D)—

(i) whether the Secretary has assessed the feasibility of consolidating the small public housing agency with another public housing agency; and

(ii) the outcome of each assessment described in clause (i); and

(F) a comparison of the number of poorly performing public housing agencies during the 5-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act with the number of poorly performing public housing agencies during the period beginning on such date of enactment and ending on the date of submission of

the report, including an analysis of the impact of the new designation of “troubled small public housing agency” under section 38(c)(3) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as added by subsection (a).

SA 2116. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 401. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the effective date of the final regulations or guidelines described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 956 of the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5641).

SA 2117. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 401, add the following:

(g) **PERFORMANCE GOALS OR QUOTAS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision in this title, a bank holding company with total consolidated assets greater than \$50,000,000,000 shall be subject to standards or requirements under sections 116(a), 121(a), 155(d), 163(b), 164, and 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5326(a), 5331(a), 5345(d), 5363(b), 5364, 5365) that are no less stringent than the standards or requirements applicable to the bank holding company on December 1, 2017 if, during the 5-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act, the bank holding company used, or presently uses, individual sales performance goals or quotas as a compensation metric for employees at a branch.

SA 2118. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DISCLOSURE AND CERTIFICATION REGARDING INVESTMENTS IN FIREARMS MANUFACTURERS AND IMPORTERS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—
(1) the term “Commission” means the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(2) the term “covered entity” means an importer or a manufacturer, as those terms are defined in section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code;

(3) the term “held entity” means an entity, the securities of which a registered management company is invested in;

(4) the term “management company” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-4);

(5) the term “registered management company” means a management company that has registered with the Commission under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.); and

(6) the term “security” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)).

(b) **DISCLOSURE AND CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise section 270.30e-1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, to require each registered management company, in each transmission to stockholders of the company that is required under that section, or any successor regulation, as applicable, to—

(1) disclose whether any held entity with respect to the company is a covered entity; and

(2) certify that, in making the disclosure required under paragraph (1), the company exercised due diligence to determine whether any held entity with respect to the company is a covered entity, including whether any such held entity exercises control over—

(A) a covered entity; or

(B) a subsidiary of a covered entity.

SA 2119. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—FORECLOSURE PROCEEDINGS AND ABANDONED FORECLOSURES

SEC. 601. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SERVICERS THAT INITIATE FORECLOSURE PROCEEDINGS.

The Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3 (12 U.S.C. 2602)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) the term ‘enterprise’ has the meaning given the term in section 1303 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4502).”; and

(2) in section 6 (12 U.S.C. 2605), by adding at the end the following:

“(n) **NOTICES RELATING TO FORECLOSURE.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘covered loan’ means—

“(A) a federally related mortgage loan; or

“(B) a non-performing loan purchased from a Federal agency or an enterprise.

“(2) **INITIAL NOTICE REQUIREMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A servicer of a covered loan that makes the first notice or filing required by applicable State law for a judicial or non-judicial foreclosure process against a borrower and any other record owners shall notify the borrower and any other record owners in writing that, until the date on which the deed and title for the property for which the covered loan was made are transferred to another person, the borrower and any other record owners—

“(i) may remain in the property until such time as the borrower and any other record owners are required to vacate the property under State law; and

“(ii) shall, to the extent required under State law, be responsible for the payment of

any taxes, assessments, and other fees associated with the property.

“(B) **STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS.**—A servicer of a covered loan is not required to provide the written notice described in subparagraph (A) if the servicer provides notice to the borrower and any other record owners, under applicable State law, of the information described in subparagraph (A).

“(3) **NOTICE OF CHARGE-OFF AND RELEASE OF LIEN.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If a servicer of a covered loan makes the first notice or filing required by applicable State law for a judicial or non-judicial foreclosure process against a borrower and any other record owners and subsequently charges off the covered loan and releases the lien on the property for which the covered loan was made, the servicer shall provide prompt notice, in writing, of the charge-off and release to—

“(i) the borrower and any other record owners, which shall include a statement that—

“(I) the title to the property is no longer encumbered by the lien;

“(II) the covered loan has been discharged;

“(III) the borrower and any other record owners may face income tax consequences related to the discharged covered loan; and

“(IV) the borrower and any other record owners may want to consult a tax advisor; and

“(ii) the taxing district in which the property is located.

“(B) **REQUIRED ATTEMPTS.**—A servicer that is required to provide notice to a borrower and any other record owners under subparagraph (A)(i)—

“(i) shall make not less than 3 attempts to provide the notice, where the servicer makes—

“(I) not less than 2 attempts to provide the notice by telephone; and

“(II) not less than 1 attempt to provide the notice in writing; and

“(ii) shall attempt to locate the borrower and any other record owners and provide the notice if the servicer has information that the borrower and any other record owners no longer reside at the property.

“(C) **LANGUAGE.**—A servicer shall provide the notice under subparagraph (A)(i) in the preferred language of the borrower if the servicer has information that the borrower has indicated a preferred language other than English.

“(4) **STANDARD NOTIFICATION FORMS.**—The Bureau may develop and issue standard forms, which may be submitted in paper or electronic format, for the provision of the notices required under paragraphs (2) and (3).

“(5) **DATABASE OF ABANDONED FORECLOSURES.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘abandoned foreclosure’ means a covered loan—

“(i) that is secured by a property that was the principal residence of the borrower—

“(I) at the time of the origination of the covered loan; or

“(II) when the servicer of the covered loan made the first notice or filing required by applicable State law for a judicial or non-judicial foreclosure process;

“(ii) that is not an open-end credit or reverse mortgage loan; and

“(iii) where the servicer of the covered loan—

“(I) has made the first notice or filing required by applicable State law for a judicial or non-judicial foreclosure process; and

“(II) has—

“(aa) ceased to pursue additional action in the foreclosure process; or

“(bb) charged off the covered loan and released the lien on the property for which the covered loan was made.

“(B) DATABASE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall establish, maintain, and periodically update a database of abandoned foreclosures.

“(C) CONTENTS.—The database established under subparagraph (B) shall include, for each abandoned foreclosure—

“(i) the address information for the property;

“(ii) the status of the deed or title to the property;

“(iii) the number of days the borrower was delinquent before the servicer initiated the foreclosure;

“(iv) the outstanding amount of the covered loan at the time the servicer initiated the foreclosure;

“(v) the date on which the servicer initiated the foreclosure;

“(vi) the date on which the servicer charged off the covered loan and released the lien; and

“(vii) the amount of the covered loan charged off by the servicer.

“(D) ACCESSIBILITY.—The Bureau may, at the discretion of the Director of the Bureau, provide access to the database established under subparagraph (B) to taxing districts.

“(E) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—The Bureau shall take appropriate and necessary steps to ensure the protection of personally identifiable information in the database established under subparagraph (B).

“(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt or prohibit any provision of State law with respect to notice provided to borrowers relating to a foreclosure, except to the extent that the requirements of this section provide greater notice to such a borrower.”.

SEC. 602. SELLER AND SERVICER ELIGIBILITY.

(a) ENTERPRISES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Housing Finance Agency shall promulgate a rule that provides that a seller or servicer of a mortgage loan held by the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (or an affiliate thereof)—

(A) may not, with respect to the mortgage loan—

(i) make the first notice or filing required by applicable State law for a judicial or non-judicial foreclosure process; and

(ii) following the notice or filing, cease to pursue additional action in the foreclosure process or charge off the mortgage loan unless the seller or servicer contemporaneously records a release of the mortgage loan in the registry of deeds in which the mortgage is recorded, which release shall include a discharge of the debt secured by the mortgage loan; and

(B) with respect to the servicer of the mortgage loan, is required to comply with the notice requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 6(n) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974, as added by section 601.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to inhibit or preclude a seller or servicer of a mortgage loan described in paragraph (1) from continuing or initiating loss mitigation during the foreclosure process, including participating in any available mediation program or process under State law.

(b) FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION.—Section 203 of the National Housing Act (12

U.S.C. 1709) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(z) PROHIBITION ON ABANDONED FORECLOSURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to service a mortgage insured under this section, a servicer may not, with respect to the mortgage—

“(A) make the first notice or filing required by applicable State law for a judicial or non-judicial foreclosure process; and

“(B) following the notice or filing, cease to pursue additional action in the foreclosure process or charge off the mortgage unless the servicer contemporaneously records a release of the mortgage in the registry of deeds in which the mortgage is recorded, which release shall include a discharge of the debt secured by the mortgage.

“(2) REQUIRED NOTICE.—A servicer of a mortgage insured under this section shall comply with the notice requirements under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 6(n) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to inhibit or preclude a servicer of a mortgage from continuing or initiating loss mitigation during the foreclosure process, including participating in any available mediation program or process under State law.”.

SEC. 603. GAO STUDY ON ABANDONED FORECLOSURES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ABANDONED FORECLOSURE.—The term “abandoned foreclosure” means a covered loan—

(A) that is secured by a property that was the principal residence of the borrower—

(i) at the time of the origination of the covered loan; or

(ii) when the servicer of the covered loan made the first notice or filing required by applicable State law for a judicial or non-judicial foreclosure process;

(B) that is not an open-end credit or reverse mortgage loan; and

(C) where the servicer of the covered loan—

(i) has made the first notice or filing required by applicable State law for a judicial or non-judicial foreclosure process; and

(ii) has—

(I) ceased to pursue additional action in the foreclosure process; or

(II) charged off the covered loan and released the lien on the property for which the covered loan was made.

(2) COVERED LOAN.—The term “covered loan” means—

(A) a federally related mortgage loan; or

(B) a non-performing loan purchased from a Federal agency or an enterprise.

(3) ENTERPRISE.—The term “enterprise” has the meaning given the term in section 1303 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4502).

(4) FEDERALLY RELATED MORTGAGE LOAN.—The term “federally related mortgage loan” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2602).

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the incidence and concentration of abandoned foreclosures;

(2) the impact of abandoned foreclosures on neighborhood and community property val-

ues, including the propensity of abandoned foreclosures to lead to foreclosures on neighboring properties; and

(3) the best available methods to collect information on abandoned foreclosures, taking into account the cost of collecting that information.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report submitted under subsection (b) may include recommendations for additional requirements or conditions for servicers with respect to charging off covered loans or releasing liens on abandoned foreclosures.

SEC. 604. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to limit the rights of a tenant to remain in a property during a foreclosure process that are in effect under Federal or State law as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2120. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NOTICE OF STATUS AS AN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMER.

The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 605 (15 U.S.C. 1681c), by adding at the end the following:

“(i) NOTICE OF STATUS AS AN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an item of adverse information about a consumer that arises from the failure of the consumer to make any required payment on a debt or other obligation, if the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred while the consumer was an active duty military consumer—

“(A) the consumer may provide appropriate proof, including official orders, to a consumer reporting agency that the consumer was an active duty military consumer at the time the action or inaction occurred; and

“(B) any consumer report provided by the consumer reporting agency that includes the item shall clearly and conspicuously disclose that the consumer was an active duty military consumer when the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred.

“(2) MODEL FORM.—The Bureau shall prepare a model form, which shall be made publicly available, including in an electronic format, by which a consumer may—

“(A) notify, and provide appropriate proof to, a consumer reporting agency in a simple and easy manner, including electronically, that the consumer is or was an active duty military consumer; and

“(B) provide contact information of the consumer for the purpose of communicating with the consumer while the consumer is an active duty military consumer.

“(3) NO ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES.—Notice, whether provided by the model form described in paragraph (2) or otherwise, that a consumer is or was an active duty military consumer may not provide the sole basis for—

“(A) with respect to a credit transaction between the consumer and a creditor, a creditor—

“(i) denying an application for credit submitted by the consumer;

“(ii) revoking an offer of credit made to the consumer by the creditor;

“(iii) changing the terms of an existing credit arrangement with the consumer; or

“(iv) refusing to grant credit to the consumer in a substantially similar amount or on substantially similar terms requested by the consumer;

“(B) furnishing negative information relating to the creditworthiness of the consumer by or to a consumer reporting agency; or

“(C) except as otherwise provided in this title, a creditor or consumer reporting agency noting in the file of the consumer that the consumer is or was an active duty military consumer.”;

(2) in section 605A (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1)—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking “Upon” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon”; and

“(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) NEGATIVE INFORMATION NOTIFICATION.—If a consumer reporting agency receives an item of adverse information about a consumer who has provided appropriate proof that the consumer is an active duty military consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall promptly notify the consumer, with a frequency, in a manner, and according to a timeline determined by the Bureau or specified by the consumer—

“(A) that the consumer reporting agency has received the item of adverse information, along with a description of the item; and

“(B) the method by which the consumer may dispute the validity of the item.

“(3) CONTACT INFORMATION FOR ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a consumer who has provided appropriate proof to a consumer reporting agency that the consumer is an active duty military consumer provides the consumer reporting agency with contact information for the purpose of communicating with the consumer while the consumer is an active duty military consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall use that contact information for all communications with the consumer while the consumer is an active duty military consumer.

“(B) DIRECT REQUEST.—Unless a consumer directs otherwise, the provision of contact information by the consumer under subparagraph (A) shall be deemed to be a request for the consumer to receive an active duty alert under paragraph (1).

“(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any person making use of a consumer report that contains an item of adverse information with respect to a consumer should, if the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred while the consumer was an active duty military consumer, take that fact into account when evaluating the creditworthiness of the consumer.”; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(1), in the case of a referral under subsection (c)(1)(C).”; and

(3) in section 611(a)(1) (15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)(1)), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) NOTICE OF DISPUTE RELATED TO ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMERS.—With respect to an item of information described in subparagraph (A) that is under dispute, if the con-

sumer to whom the item relates has notified the consumer reporting agency conducting the investigation described in that subparagraph, and has provided appropriate proof, that the consumer was an active duty military consumer at the time the action or inaction that gave rise to the disputed item occurred, the consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) include that fact in the file of the consumer; and

“(ii) indicate that fact in each consumer report that includes the disputed item.”.

SA 2121. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. STUDENT LOAN PROTECTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (referred to in this subsection as the “CFPB”) Student Loan Ombudsman stated the following:

(A) “The CFPB received more than 7,700 private student loan complaints and approximately 2,300 debt collection complaints related to student loans between September 1, 2016, and August 31, 2017.”.

(B) “Co-signers complain that information about discharge or alternative arrangements in the case of death of the primary borrower is not readily available and that decisions are made on a case-by-case basis, giving co-signers little understanding of how the process works, or if they will be successful.”.

(C) “The complaints and input received by the CFPB resemble many of the same issues experienced by mortgage borrowers, such as improper application of payments, untimeliness in error resolution, and inability to contact appropriate personnel in times of hardship.”.

(D) “The difference between federal and private student loans in periods of disability was not well-understood.”.

(2) An estimated 2,500,000 individuals sustain a traumatic brain injury each year and older adolescents between 15 and 19 years of age are more likely to sustain a traumatic brain injury than individuals in other age groups.

(3) It has been estimated that the annual incidence of spinal cord injury, not including those individuals who die at the scene of an accident, is approximately 54 cases per 1,000,000 individuals in the United States, or approximately 17,000 new cases each year. These injuries can lead to permanent disability or loss of movement and can prohibit the victim from engaging in any substantial gainful activity.

(4) According to the CFPB, more than 90 percent of new private student loans are co-signed.

(5) According to the CFPB, private student loan companies provide co-signer release to less than 1 percent of eligible borrowers.

(b) ADDITIONAL STUDENT LOAN PROTECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 128(e) (15 U.S.C. 1638(e))—

(i) by striking paragraph (10);

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (10); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) DISCHARGE OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS IN THE EVENT OF DEATH OR DISABILITY OF A BORROWER.—Each private education loan shall include terms that provide that any liability to repay the loan, including the liability of any co-signer (as defined in section 140(a)) with respect to the loan, shall be cancelled—

“(A) upon the death of the borrower;

“(B) if the borrower becomes permanently and totally disabled, as determined under section 437(a)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a)(1)) and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Education under that section; or

“(C) if, under section 437(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a)(2)), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines that the borrower is unemployable due to a service-connected condition.

“(12) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ‘covered educational institution’, ‘private educational lender’, and ‘private education loan’ have the same meanings as in section 140.”; and

(B) in section 140 (15 U.S.C. 1650), by adding at the end the following:

“(g) ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS RELATING TO BORROWER OR CO-SIGNER OF A PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—

“(1) CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS DESCRIPTION OF OBLIGATION OF BORROWER AND CO-SIGNER.—In the case of any private educational lender that provides a private education loan, the lender shall clearly and conspicuously describe, in writing, the obligations of a co-signer with respect to the loan, including the effect that the death, disability, or inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity of the borrower (as provided in the terms required under section 128(e)(11)) or any co-signer would have on any such obligation, in language that the Bureau determines would give a reasonable person a reasonable understanding of the obligation being assumed by becoming a co-signer for the loan.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON AUTOMATIC DEFAULT WITH RESPECT TO A PERFORMING LOAN.—

“(A) DEATH, DISABILITY, OR BANKRUPTCY OF CO-SIGNER.—If a private education loan includes a co-signer, a private educational lender may not take any adverse action (including declaring a default, accelerating any loan obligation, increasing the interest rate, or altering any obligations under the private education loan in a way that is adverse to the borrower) against the borrower based on—

“(i) the death, disability, or inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity of the co-signer; or

“(ii) the bankruptcy of the co-signer.

“(B) BANKRUPTCY OF BORROWER.—If a private education loan includes a co-signer, a private educational lender may not take any adverse action (including declaring a default, accelerating any loan obligation, increasing the interest rate, or altering any obligations under the private education loan in a way that is adverse to any co-signer) against the co-signer based on the bankruptcy of the borrower.

“(3) CO-SIGNER RELEASE.—

“(A) REQUIREMENTS FOR AUTOMATIC RELEASE OF CO-SIGNER.—

“(i) CRITERIA ESTABLISHED BY THE BUREAU.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall establish criteria, which, if met by the borrower of a private education loan, shall require the private educational lender with respect to, or servicer of, the private education loan, as applicable, to promptly release any co-signer from the obligations of

the co-signer under the loan without requiring any action on behalf of the borrower.

“(ii) CRITERIA ESTABLISHED BY LENDER.—A private educational lender may establish criteria for automatic release that are different from the criteria described in clause (i) if the criteria established by the lender are not more restrictive with respect to the borrower or any co-signer of the private education loan than the criteria established under clause (i).

“(B) DISCLOSURE OF CRITERIA FOR CO-SIGNER RELEASE.—A private educational lender shall—

“(i) include in the promissory note of a private education loan the criteria under which a co-signer may be released from the obligation of the co-signer under a private education loan under this paragraph; and

“(ii) disclose to the borrower and any co-signer at the time the private education loan is consummated, clearly and conspicuously, the criteria under which a co-signer may be released from the obligation of the co-signer under a private education loan.

“(C) MODIFICATIONS TO CRITERIA.—If a private education loan has a co-signer, the private educational lender with respect to, or servicer of, the private education loan, as applicable, may not modify the criteria under which the co-signer may be released from the obligation of the co-signer under the private education loan without the consent of the borrower and the co-signer if the modification would be adverse to the borrower.

“(D) NOTIFICATION ON RELEASE.—A private educational lender with respect to, or servicer of, a private education loan, as applicable, shall promptly notify the borrower and any co-signers for the private education loan if a co-signer is released from the obligations of the co-signer under the private education loan under this paragraph.

“(E) MODIFICATION OF EVALUATION OF CREDITWORTHINESS, CREDIT STANDING, OR CREDIT CAPACITY.—In determining whether the criteria for a co-signer release are met, a private educational lender with respect to, or servicer of, a private education loan, as applicable, may not evaluate the creditworthiness, credit standing, or credit capacity of the borrower or a co-signer of the private education loan using a standard that would be more adverse to the borrower or co-signer, as applicable, than the standard the private educational lender used to evaluate the creditworthiness, credit standing, or credit capacity of the borrower or co-signer on the date on which the private education loan was consummated.

“(4) DESIGNATION OF INDIVIDUAL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE BORROWER.—In the case of any private educational lender that extends a private education loan, the lender shall provide the borrower an option to designate an individual to have the legal authority to act on behalf of the borrower with respect to the private education loan in the event of the death, disability, or inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity of the borrower.

“(5) COUNSELING.—In the case of any private educational lender that extends a private education loan, the lender shall ensure that the borrower, and any co-signer, receives comprehensive information on the terms and conditions of the loan and of the responsibilities the borrower has with respect to the loan, including—

“(A) the information required under subparagraphs (H), (I), and (K) of section 485(1)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(1)(2)); and

“(B) the terms required under section 128(e)(11).

“(6) MODEL FORM.—The Bureau shall publish a model form under section 105 for describing the obligation of a co-signer for the purposes of paragraph (1).

“(7) DEFINITION OF DEATH, DISABILITY, OR INABILITY TO ENGAGE IN ANY SUBSTANTIAL GAINFUL ACTIVITY.—For the purposes of this subsection with respect to a borrower or co-signer, the term ‘death, disability, or inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity’—

“(A) means any condition described in section 437(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a)); and

“(B) shall be interpreted by the Bureau in such a manner as to conform with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Education under section 437(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a)) to the fullest extent practicable, including safeguards to prevent fraud and abuse.”.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (8) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:—

“(1) the term ‘co-signer’—

“(A) means any individual who is liable for the obligation of another without compensation, regardless of how designated in the contract or instrument with respect to that obligation;

“(B) includes any person the signature of which is requested as a condition to grant credit or to forbear on collection; and

“(C) does not include a spouse of an individual described in subparagraph (A), the signature of whom is needed to perfect the security interest in a loan;”.

(3) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 108(f)(5)(B)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “section 140(7) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(7))” and inserting “section 140(a)(8) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(8))”.

(4) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue regulations to carry out subsection (g) of section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650), as added by paragraph (1)(B).

SA 2122. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 101 and insert the following:
SEC. 101. COMMUNITY BANK AND CREDIT UNION PORTFOLIO LENDING.

Section 129C(b)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) SAFE HARBOR.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:

“(I) COVERED INSTITUTION.—The term ‘covered institution’ means—

“(aa) an insured depository institution or an insured credit union that—

“(AA) at the time of origination of the residential mortgage loan, together with its affiliates, has less than \$2,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

“(BB) during the calendar year preceding the time of origination of the residential

mortgage loan, originated not more than 2,000 residential mortgage loans that were sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person or subject to, at the time of consummation, a commitment to be acquired by another person; or

“(bb) an insured depository institution or insured credit union that, at the time of origination of the residential mortgage loan—

“(AA) together with its affiliates, has more than \$2,000,000,000 and less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets;

“(BB) is not considered a specialty bank, such as a bank that offers only a narrow product line (including credit card or motor vehicle loans) to a regional or broader market;

“(CC) engages in the basic activities of lending and deposit taking as a significant percentage of total assets;

“(DD) has a limited geographic scope; and

“(EE) meets any other criteria as determined by the Bureau, including restrictions on the volume of residential mortgage loans sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person or subject to, at the time of consummation, a commitment to be acquired by another person.

“(II) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

“(III) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

“(ii) SAFE HARBOR.—In this section—

“(I) the term ‘qualified mortgage’, as defined in subparagraph (A), includes any residential mortgage loan—

“(aa) that is originated by a covered institution and continuously retained in portfolio by the covered institution;

“(bb) that, except as provided in subparagraph (E), fully amortizes over a term of not longer than 30 years;

“(cc) that complies with—

“(AA) the requirements of clauses (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vii) of subparagraph (A); and

“(BB) any requirements consistent with the purposes described in paragraph (3)(B)(i);

“(dd) for which the covered institution, at or before consummation of the residential mortgage loan, takes into account and verifies the monthly debt and income of the consumer; and

“(ee) that is not considered a high-cost mortgage; and

“(II) a residential mortgage loan that meets the requirements of subclause (I) shall be deemed to meet the requirements of subsection (a) until the residential mortgage loan no longer meets the requirements of subclause (I).”.

SA 2123. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DATA SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 605B (15 U.S.C. 1681c-2) the following:

“SEC. 605C. DATA SECURITY AT CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘affected individual’ means a consumer, the sensitive personal information of whom is lost, stolen, or accessed without authorization because of a data breach;

“(2) the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

“(B) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

“(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(D) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

“(3) the term ‘data breach’ means the loss, theft, or other unauthorized access, other than access that is incidental to the scope of employment, of data containing sensitive personal information, in electronic or printed form, that results in the potential compromise of the confidentiality or integrity of the data; and

“(4) the term ‘sensitive personal information’ means, with respect to a consumer, information—

“(A) about the consumer relating to the education, financial transactions, medical history, criminal history, or employment history of the consumer; and

“(B) that can be used to distinguish or trace the identity of the consumer, including the name, social security number, date and place of birth, mother’s maiden name, and biometric records of the consumer.

“(b) DATA BREACHES AT CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—With respect to a data breach at a consumer reporting agency, the consumer reporting agency—

“(1) shall notify—

“(A) not later than 2 days after the date on which the consumer reporting agency discovers the data breach—

“(i) the Federal Trade Commission;

“(ii) the Bureau; and

“(iii) appropriate law enforcement and intelligence agencies, as identified by the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

“(B) subject to paragraph (2), not later than 3 days after the date on which the consumer reporting agency discovers the data breach, and as quickly and efficiently as is practicable, each affected individual with respect to the data breach; and

“(2) may receive an extension of the deadline described in paragraph (1)(B) if the Federal Trade Commission and the intelligence agencies identified under paragraph (1)(A)(iii) determine that there is a national security concern that requires granting such an extension.

“(c) ANNUAL STUDY AND REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first full year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Bureau and the Federal Trade Commission, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall conduct a study regarding the costs to affected individuals from data breaches at consumer reporting agencies, including—

“(A) the economic costs to those affected individuals;

“(B) the effects on—

“(i) the ability of those affected individuals to obtain credit and housing; and

“(ii) the reputations of those affected individuals; and

“(C) the costs relating to the emotional and psychological stress of those affected individuals from having the sensitive personal information of those affected individuals

lost, stolen, or accessed without authorization.

“(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which each study conducted under paragraph (1) is completed, the Bureau and the Federal Trade Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains the results of the study.

“(3) CONTENTS.—Each study conducted under paragraph (1) and each report submitted under paragraph (2) shall contain a survey of affected individuals who were contacted for the purposes of conducting the study.

“(4) AUTHORITY.—In conducting any study under paragraph (1), the Bureau, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Attorney General may compel a consumer reporting agency to disclose nonproprietary information.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as modifying, limiting, or superseding any provision of State law if the protection that the provision of State law provides to consumers is greater than the protection provided to consumers under this section.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 605B the following:

“605C. Data security at consumer reporting agencies.”.

SA 2124. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ STOCK BUYBACKS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) public corporations have spent significant corporate profits on stock buybacks;

(2) following the passage of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018”, approved December 22, 2017 (Public Law 115-466), corporations diverted the vast majority of expected tax savings on stock buybacks;

(3) more generally, corporate spending on buybacks has been at the expense of research and development spending and increases in worker pay;

(4) stock buybacks disproportionately benefit senior executives of corporations and shareholders, furthering income inequality and stagnant wages for the middle class; and

(5) corporations should evaluate how corporate profits are allocated and invest in employees, training, and business productivity improvements.

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

(1) stock buybacks have not been properly regulated or reviewed by the securities regulators;

(2) corporations’ stock buybacks should receive thorough review and details of stock buyback plans should be disclosed to the public; and

(3) increases in corporate investment and higher worker pay should benefit the economy and shareholders and workers will both benefit.

(c) REMOVAL OF SAFE HARBOR.—Section 240.10b-18 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, shall have no force or effect.

(d) DISCLOSURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 9 (15 U.S.C. 78i) the following:

“SEC. 9A. ISSUER EQUITY SECURITIES REPURCHASES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any issuer that seeks to implement a repurchase plan for an equity security shall submit to the Commission a disclosure filing at least 15 days before executing the plan that provides detailed information addressing each of the following:

“(1) The number of equity securities to be repurchased, time period for repurchase, and current number of outstanding equity securities.

“(2) Worker wages, compared to prior years and compared to the size of the proposed repurchase.

“(3) Whether and to what extent the issuer has engaged in layoffs, or has materially reduced the size of its workforce (other than through the sale of business lines or assets) in the past 3 years.

“(4) A description of the issuer’s pension plans, if any, including whether the issuer has any unfunded pension liability, other employee compensation plans, and the amount the issuer contributes, including to 401(k)s and matching programs.

“(5) How the repurchase plan serves the long-term interests of all the issuer’s stakeholders, including the issuer’s employees, customers, and shareholders.

“(6) Whether the issuer has considered alternative investments, including research and development, worker training or retaining programs, investment in the issuer’s facilities, expansion of the workforce, and the amount of investment in each of these areas in the past year.

“(7) A description of—

“(A) how the repurchase plan will be executed, including steps that the issuer, or any agent or broker the issuer, uses or will take to prevent manipulation of—

“(i) the issuer’s equity securities; and

“(ii) any contract or trading arrangement that has been or will be entered into; and

“(B) the counterparty to the contract or trading arrangement described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

“(8) A description of any expected tax or accounting benefit from the repurchase and the amount of the benefit and the time period for it to be recognized.

“(9) Why the repurchase plan is in the financial best interest of the issuer, beyond the interests of executives or shareholders, including whether the stock repurchase plan will be funded in whole, or in part, by debt.

“(10) The impact that the repurchase plan will have on the compensation, or elements used to determine the compensation, of executives, including any compensation required to be disclosed by the issuer under section 229.402 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor thereto).

“(11) A certification by the issuer’s chief executive officer and board of directors regarding the accuracy of the information contained in the repurchase plan disclosure and an affirmation that the repurchase plan is in the long-term financial best interest of the issuer.

“(b) REVIEW.—The Commission shall complete a review of the disclosure not later than 15 days after the date on which the disclosure is submitted and, after reviewing the information required to be disclosed by the

issuer under this section and other existing disclosure requirements, the Commission shall determine whether to approve the repurchase plan.

“(c) **CONSIDERATION.**—In considering whether to allow the repurchase plan, the Commission shall take into consideration—

“(1) the information pertaining to each of the items described in subsection (a); and

“(2) the potential for manipulation of the equity security based on the disclosed repurchase plan.

“(d) **DETAILS.**—After the date on which a plan is approved under this section, the issuer shall submit to the Commission, not later than 10 days after the end of each calendar month in which equity security repurchases are effected, the full details of the repurchases in that month, including the date, quantity, and price paid for equity securities under the plan.”.

SA 2125. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTING STUDENT LOAN BORROWERS.

(a) **EXEMPTED TRANSACTIONS.**—Section 104 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1603) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “This title” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—This title”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subsection (a) shall prevent or be construed to prevent the provisions of section 128(g) from applying to any postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer (as those terms are defined in section 128(g)(3)).”.

(b) **TERMS AND DISCLOSURES FOR PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 128 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) requirements for a co-borrower, including—

“(i) any changes in the applicable interest rates without a co-borrower; and

“(ii) any conditions the borrower is required meet in order to release a co-borrower from the private education loan obligation.”;

(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (O), (P), (Q), and (R) as subparagraphs (P), (Q), (R), and (S), respectively; and

(III) by inserting after subparagraph (N) the following:

“(O) in the case of a refinancing of education loans that include a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.)—

“(i) a list containing each loan to be refinanced, which shall identify whether the loan is a private education loan or a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

“(ii) benefits that the borrower may be forfeiting, including income-driven repayment options, opportunities for loan forgiveness,

forbearance or deferment options, interest subsidies, and tax benefits.”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by redesignating subparagraphs (O) and (P) as subparagraphs (P) and (Q), respectively; and

(II) by inserting after subparagraph (N) the following:

“(O) in the case of a refinancing of education loans that include a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.)—

“(i) a list containing each loan to be refinanced, which shall identify whether the loan is a private education loan or a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

“(ii) benefits that the borrower may be forfeiting, including income-driven repayment options, opportunities for loan forgiveness, forbearance or deferment options, interest subsidies, and tax benefits.”;

(iii) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “(P)” and inserting “(Q)”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) **REQUIREMENT FOR PROMPT CREDITING OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN PAYMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in connection with a private education loan, no lender, loan holder, or servicer shall fail to credit a payment to the loan account of a borrower as of the date of receipt, except when a delay in crediting does not result in any charge to the borrower or in the reporting of negative information to a consumer reporting agency (as defined in section 603(f)).

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—If a servicer specifies in writing requirements for a borrower to follow in making payments, and accepts a payment that does not conform to those requirements, the servicer shall credit the payment not later than 5 days after the date on which the servicer received the payment.

“(13) **REQUEST FOR PAYOFF AMOUNTS OF A PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.**—A creditor or servicer of a private education loan shall make an accurate payoff balance for the private education loan, and the information necessary to calculate the payoff balance as of a certain date, available to a borrower within a reasonable time, but in no case more than 7 business days after the date on which the creditor or servicer receives a written request for the payoff balance from or on behalf of the borrower.

“(14) **TERMS FOR CO-BORROWERS.**—Each private education loan shall include terms that clearly define the requirements to release a co-borrower from the obligation.”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.**—

“(1) **REQUIREMENT FOR PROMPT CREDITING OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOAN PAYMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer shall, in connection with a postsecondary education loan, credit a payment to the loan account of the borrower as of the date of receipt of the payment, except—

“(i) when a delay in crediting does not result in any charge to the borrower or in the reporting of negative information to a consumer reporting agency (as defined in section 603(f)); and

“(ii) as provided in subparagraph (B).

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—In any case where a student loan servicer specifies to the borrower, in writing, the requirements to follow in making payment on a postsecondary education loan and accepts a payment from the

borrower that does not conform to those requirements, the student loan servicer shall credit such payment not later than 5 days after the date on which the servicer received the payment.

“(2) **REQUEST FOR PAYOFF AMOUNTS OF A POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOAN.**—A postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer shall make available an accurate payoff balance for a postsecondary education loan, and the information necessary to calculate the payoff balance as of a certain date, to a borrower within a reasonable time, but in no case more than 7 business days after the date on which the postsecondary education lender, loan holder, or student loan servicer receives a written request for the payoff balance from or on behalf of the borrower.

“(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘loan holder’ means a person who owns the title to, or promissory note for, a postsecondary education loan (except for a loan made under part D or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq., 20 U.S.C. 1087aa et seq.));

“(B) the term ‘postsecondary education lender’—

“(i) means an entity that—

“(I) is—

“(aa) a financial institution, as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

“(bb) a Federal credit union, as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752); or

“(cc) any other person engaged in the business of soliciting, making, or extending education loans; and

“(II) solicits, makes, or extends postsecondary education loans; and

“(ii) does not include—

“(I) the Secretary of Education; or

“(II) an institution of higher education with respect to any loans made by the institution under part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087aa et seq.);

“(C) the term ‘postsecondary education loan’—

“(i) means a loan that is—

“(I) made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 1087a et seq., 1087aa et seq.); or

“(II) issued or made by a lender described in subparagraph (B)(i)(I) and—

“(aa) extended to a borrower with the expectation that the amounts extended will be used in whole or in part to pay postsecondary education expenses; or

“(bb) extended for the purpose of refinancing or consolidating 1 or more loans described in subclause (aa) or subclause (I);

“(ii) includes a private education loan (as defined in section 140(a)); and

“(iii) does not include a loan—

“(I) made under an open-end credit plan; or

“(II) that is secured by real property;

“(D) the term ‘student loan servicer’—

“(i) means a person who performs student loan servicing;

“(ii) includes a person performing student loan servicing for a postsecondary education loan on behalf of an institution of higher education or the Secretary of Education under a contract or other agreement;

“(iii) does not include the Secretary of Education to the extent the Secretary directly performs student loan servicing for a postsecondary education loan; and

“(iv) does not include an institution of higher education, to the extent that the institution directly performs student loan

servicing for a Federal Perkins Loan made by the institution; and

“(E) the term ‘student loan servicing’ includes any of the following activities:

“(i) Receiving any scheduled periodic payments from a borrower under a postsecondary education loan (or notification of such payments).

“(ii) Applying payments described in clause (i) to an account of the borrower pursuant to the terms of the postsecondary education loan or of the contract governing the servicing of the postsecondary education loan.

“(iii) During a period in which no payment is required on the postsecondary education loan—

“(I) maintaining account records for the postsecondary education loan; and

“(II) communicating with the borrower on behalf of the loan holder or, with respect to a loan made under part D or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq., 20 U.S.C. 1087aa et seq.), the Secretary of Education or the institution of higher education that made the loan, respectively.

“(iv) Interacting with a borrower to facilitate the activities described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), including activities to help prevent default by the borrower of the obligations arising from the postsecondary education loan.”.

(2) REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue final regulations to implement paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (12), and (13) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as added and amended by this section.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection issues the final regulations required under subparagraph (A), the regulations shall become effective.

SA 2126. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5. STUDY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CONSUMER PROTECTION.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to evaluate the impact of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, on economic growth and consumer protection, including whether—

(1) any additional revenues generated by financial institutions as a result of this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, directly led to any changes in the wages of the employees of those financial institutions who are not in managerial roles;

(2) any revenues described in paragraph (1) with respect to a financial institution described in that paragraph were used—

(A) to buy back the securities of that financial institution; or

(B) to provide higher rates of interest for consumers with respect to savings accounts or money market accounts;

(3) any positions of employment at any financial institution affected by this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, were

moved outside of the United States after the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) a buy back of securities described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) with respect to a financial institution described in that paragraph had a direct impact on the compensation paid to the top 5 highest paid senior executives of that financial institution;

(5) this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, has had any material impact on, on a State-by-State basis, the rates of—

(A) the delinquency of residential mortgages; and

(B) foreclosures; and

(6) during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, any settlements or enforcement actions with respect to a financial institution affected by this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, could have been avoided if this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, had not been enacted, including the costs to investors and consumers of those settlements or enforcement actions.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that includes the findings and conclusions of the Comptroller General with respect to the study required under subsection (a).

SA 2127. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 301 and insert the following:

SEC. 301. PROTECTING CONSUMERS' CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 604 (15 U.S.C. 1681b)—

(A) by striking subsections (c) through (e) and inserting the following:

“(c) CONDITIONS FOR FURNISHING CERTAIN CONSUMER REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency may furnish a consumer report for the following purposes only if the consumer provides the consumer reporting agency with affirmative written consent to furnish the consumer report, after furnishing proper identification under section 610:

“(A) An extension of credit pursuant to subsection (a)(3)(A).

“(B) The underwriting of insurance pursuant to subsection (a)(3)(C).

“(2) ADDITIONAL REPORTS; ELECTION.—After a consumer has provided affirmative written consent and furnished proper identification under paragraph (1) to a consumer reporting agency, the consumer reporting agency may continue to furnish consumer reports solely for the purposes of reviewing or collecting on an account described in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of subsection (a)(3).

“(3) FURNISHING REPORTS IN CONNECTION WITH CREDIT OR INSURANCE TRANSACTIONS THAT ARE NOT INITIATED BY CONSUMER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency may furnish a consumer report to a person in connection with any credit or insurance transaction under subparagraph (A) or (C) of subsection (a)(3) that is not initiated by the consumer only if—

“(i) the consumer provides the consumer reporting agency affirmative written con-

sent to furnish the consumer report, after furnishing proper identification under section 610; and

“(ii) the transaction consists of a firm offer of credit or insurance.

“(B) ELECTION.—The consumer may elect to—

“(i) have the consumer's name and addresses included in lists of names and addresses provided by the consumer reporting agency pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (C) of subsection (a)(3) in connection with any credit or insurance transaction that is not initiated by the consumer only if—

“(I) the consumer provides the consumer reporting agency affirmative written consent to furnish the consumer report, after furnishing proper identification under section 610; and

“(II) the transaction consists of a firm offer of credit or insurance; and

“(ii) revoke at any time the election pursuant to clause (i) to have the consumer's name and address included in lists provided by a consumer reporting agency.

“(C) INFORMATION REGARDING INQUIRIES.—Except as provided in section 609(a)(5), a consumer reporting agency shall not furnish to any person a record of inquiries in connection with a credit or insurance transaction that is not initiated by a consumer.

“(4) DISCLOSURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A person may not procure a consumer report for any purpose pursuant to subparagraphs (D), (F), and (G) of subsection (a)(3) unless—

“(i) a clear and conspicuous disclosure has been made in writing to the consumer at any time before the report is procured or caused to be procured, in a document that consists solely of the disclosure, that a consumer report may be obtained for such purposes; and

“(ii) the consumer has authorized in writing the procurement of the consumer report by that person.

“(B) AUTHORIZATIONS.—The authorization described in subparagraph (A)(ii) may be made on the disclosure document provided under subparagraph (A)(i).

“(5) RULE MAKING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Control Your Personal Credit Information Act of 2018, the Director of the Bureau shall promulgate regulations that—

“(A) implement this subsection;

“(B) establish a model form for the disclosure document pursuant to paragraph (4) and define the term clear and conspicuous disclosure;

“(C) establish guidelines that permit consumers to provide a single written authorization as required by paragraph (1) for a specific time period for multiple users for the specified purpose during that time period;

“(D) require a consumer reporting agency to provide to each consumer a secure, convenient, accessible, and cost-free method by which a consumer may allow or disallow the furnishing of consumer reports pursuant to this subsection; and

“(E) require a consumer reporting agency not later than 2 business days after the date on which a consumer makes an election to revoke the consumer's inclusion of the consumer's name and address in lists provided by a consumer reporting agency pursuant to paragraph (3)(B) to implement that election.

“(6) PROHIBITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The method described in paragraph (5)(D) shall not be used to—

“(i) collect any information on a consumer that is not necessary for the purpose of the consumer to allow or disallow the furnishing of consumer reports; or

“(ii) advertise any product or service.

“(B) NO WAIVER.—In the offering of a method described in paragraph (5)(D), a consumer reporting agency shall not require a consumer to waive any rights nor indemnify the consumer reporting agency from any liabilities arising from the offering of such method.

“(7) REPORTS.—

“(A) CFPB.—

“(i) RECOMMENDATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Control Your Personal Credit Information Act of 2018, the Director of the Bureau shall, after consultation with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, and other Federal and State regulators as the Director of the Bureau determines are appropriate, submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives recommendations on how to provide consumers greater transparency and personal control over their consumer reports furnished for permissible purposes under subsections (a)(3)(E) and (a)(6).

“(ii) REPORT.—The Director of the Bureau shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives an annual report that includes recommendations on how this subsection may be improved, a description of enforcement actions taken to demonstrate compliance with this subsection, recommendations on how to improve oversight of consumer reporting agencies and users of consumer reports, and any other recommendations concerning how consumers may be provided greater transparency and control over their personal information.

“(B) GAO.—

“(i) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on what additional protections or restrictions may be needed to ensure that the information collected in consumer files is secure and does not adversely impact consumers.

“(ii) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Control Your Personal Credit Information Act of 2018, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study under clause (i), which shall include—

“(I) to the greatest extent possible, the presentation of unambiguous conclusions and specific recommendations for further legislative changes needed to ensure that the information collected in consumer files is secure and does not adversely impact consumers; and

“(II) if no recommendations for further legislative changes are presented, a detailed explanation of why no such changes are recommended.”;

(B) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) NO FEES.—No consumer reporting agency may charge a consumer any fee for any activity pursuant to this section.”;

(2) in section 607(a) (15 U.S.C. 1681e(a)), by inserting “Every consumer reporting agency shall use commercially reasonable efforts to avoid unauthorized access to consumer reports and information in the file of a consumer maintained by the consumer reporting agency, including complying with any appropriate standards established under section

501(b) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801(b)),” after the end of the third sentence;

(3) in section 609 (15 U.S.C. 1681g), by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) SCOPE OF DISCLOSURE.—The Director of the Bureau shall promulgate regulations to clarify that any information held by a consumer reporting agency about a consumer shall be disclosed to the consumer when a consumer makes a written request, irrespective of whether the information is held by the parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of a consumer reporting agency.”; and

(4) in section 610(a)(1) (15 U.S.C. 1681h(a)(1)), by striking “section 609” and inserting “sections 604 and 609”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 603(d)(3) (15 U.S.C. 1681a(d)(3)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “604(g)(3)” and inserting “604(e)(3)”;

(2) in section 615(d) (15 U.S.C. 1681m(d))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “604(c)(1)(B)” and inserting “604(c)(3)(A)(ii)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “604(e)” and inserting “604(c)(5)(D)”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “604(e)” and inserting “604(c)(5)(D)”;

(3) in section 625(b)(1)(A) (15 U.S.C. 1681t(b)(1)(A)), by striking “subsection (c) or (e) of section 604” and inserting “604(c)”.

SA 2128. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. PILOT PROGRAM REGARDING LOSS MITIGATION AND COMMUNICATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONTINUITY OF CONTACT PERSONNEL.—The term “continuity of contact personnel” means servicer personnel described in section 1024.40(a) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) COVERED BORROWER.—The term “covered borrower” means a borrower of a federally related mortgage loan initiating a loss mitigation application.

(3) COVERED BRANCH.—The term “covered branch” means a national bank consumer banking branch affiliated with a federally related mortgage loan servicer.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

(5) FEDERALLY RELATED MORTGAGE LOAN.—The term “federally related mortgage loan” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2602).

(6) LOSS MITIGATION APPLICATION.—The term “loss mitigation application” has the meaning given the term in section 1024.31 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(7) SERVICER.—The term “servicer” has the meaning given the term in section 1024.2(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall, subject to such conditions and procedures as the Director

shall establish, implement a pilot program to determine the feasibility of requiring servicers to use covered branches to provide to any covered borrower the information described in subsection (c).

(c) INFORMATION FOR BORROWERS.—Each borrower described in subsection (b) shall, upon request by the covered borrower at a national bank consumer banking branch affiliated with the covered borrower’s servicer, receive, within a commercially reasonable period of time but no later than 3 business days after the date of the request, at such branch—

(1) all relevant contact information for the continuity of contact personnel of the covered borrower in connection with a loss mitigation application for purposes of the pilot program established under subsection (b); and

(2) the address of a nearby location, within a reasonable distance of the current residence of the covered borrower, where the covered borrower may copy, fax, scan, transmit by overnight delivery, or mail or email documents to the covered borrower’s customer service representative or the continuity of contact personnel of the servicer.

(d) OTHER APPROPRIATE PROGRAM PROCEDURES.—In implementing a pilot program, the Director shall—

(1) determine the feasibility of other appropriate procedures, subject to such conditions as the Director shall establish, that facilitate the timely transfer of documents and information from a covered borrower to a servicer necessary to complete a loss mitigation application; and

(2) ensure that a servicer evaluates the loss mitigation application of a covered borrower within the time period set forth in section 1024.41(c)(1) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(e) DURATION AND EXTENSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the program authorized by this section shall terminate 18 months after the date on which the program is implemented.

(2) EXTENSION.—The Director may extend the program authorized by this section for an additional 12 months.

(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and on a quarterly basis thereafter until the termination of the pilot program, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Director regarding the pilot program, including a finding of whether the pilot program should be extended.

SA 2129. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . . CYBERSECURITY TRANSPARENCY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Commission” means the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(2) the term “cybersecurity threat”—

(A) means an action, not protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, on or through an information system that may result in an unauthorized effort to adversely impact the security, availability, confidentiality, or integrity of an information system or information that

is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system; and

(B) does not include any action that solely involves a violation of a consumer term of service or a consumer licensing agreement;

(3) the term “information system”—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) includes industrial control systems, such as supervisory control and data acquisition systems, distributed control systems, and programmable logic controllers;

(4) the term “issuer” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c);

(5) the term “NIST” means the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(6) the term “reporting company” means any company that is an issuer—

(A) the securities of which are registered under section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78l); or

(B) that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(d)).

(b) **REQUIREMENT TO ISSUE RULES.**—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue final rules to require each reporting company, in the annual report submitted under section 13 or section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m and 78o(d)) or the annual proxy statement submitted under section 14(a) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 78n(a))—

(1) to disclose whether any member of the governing body, such as the board of directors or general partner, of the reporting company has expertise or experience in cybersecurity and in such detail as necessary to fully describe the nature of the expertise or experience; and

(2) if no member of the governing body of the reporting company has expertise or experience in cybersecurity, to describe what other cybersecurity steps taken by the reporting company were taken into account by such persons responsible for identifying and evaluating nominees for any member of the governing body, such as a nominating committee.

(c) **CYBERSECURITY EXPERTISE OR EXPERIENCE.**—For purposes of subsection (b), the Commission, in consultation with NIST, shall define what constitutes expertise or experience in cybersecurity, such as professional qualifications to administer information security program functions or experience detecting, preventing, mitigating, or addressing cybersecurity threats, using commonly defined roles, specialties, knowledge, skills, and abilities, such as those provided in NIST Special Publication 800-181 entitled “NICE Cybersecurity Workforce Framework”, or any successor thereto.

SA 2130. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 308. EDUCATION LOAN OMBUDSMAN.

Section 1035 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5535) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “PRIVATE”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “a Private” and inserting “an”; and

(B) by striking “private”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “private education student loan” and inserting “education loan”;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “private”;

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) coordinate with the unit of the Bureau established under section 1013(b)(3), in order to monitor complaints by education loan borrowers and responses to those complaints by the Bureau or other appropriate Federal or State agency;”;

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking “private”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “on the same day annually”; and

(ii) by inserting “and be made available to the public” after “Representatives”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include information on the number, nature, and resolution of complaints received, disaggregated by lender, servicer, region, State, and institution of higher education.”;

(6) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **EDUCATION LOAN.**—The term ‘education loan’ means—

“(A) a private education loan, as defined in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650); and

“(B) a student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“(2) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).”.

SA 2131. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, line 3, insert “, which shall include a review of any Federal fine or penalty paid during the preceding 24-month period and whether any violation or settlement related to an alleged violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) or section 987 of title 10, United States Code, could have been avoided” after “appropriate”.

On page 39, line 3, insert “, which shall include a review of any Federal fine or penalty paid during the preceding 24-month period and whether any violation or settlement related to an alleged violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) or section 987 of title 10, United States Code, could have been avoided” after “appropriate”.

On page 40, line 6, insert “, including based on a review of any Federal fine or penalty paid during the preceding 24-month period and whether any violation or settlement related to an alleged violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) or section 987 of title 10, United States Code, could have been avoided” after “eligible”.

On page 44, line 18, insert “, which may include a determination by the Board that the bank holding company or savings and loan holding company, as applicable, has an unacceptable history of repeatedly paying Federal fines or penalties or has an unacceptable history of violating or settling alleged violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) or section 987 of title 10, United States Code, that could have been avoided” after “purposes”.

SA 2132. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 133, lines 16 and 17, strike “by striking ‘\$50,000,000,000’ and inserting ‘\$250,000,000,000’” and insert “by striking ‘If the Board of Governors’ and all that follows through ‘shall’ and inserting ‘If the Board of Governors determines that a bank holding company or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors poses a grave threat to the financial stability of the United States, the Board of Governors, upon an affirmative vote of not fewer than ¾ of the voting members of the Council then serving, shall’”.

SA 2133. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING SERVICEMEMBERS.

Section 1002(12) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481(12)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (Q), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (R), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(S) sections 101, 106, 107 (except with respect to bailments), 108 (except with respect to insurance), 201 (except with respect to child custody proceedings), 207, 301, 302, 303, 305, and 305A of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3911, 3917, 3918, 3919, 3931, 3937, 3951, 3952, 3953, 3955, and 3956).”.

SA 2134. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401(a)(1)(B), strike clause (i) and insert the following:

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(II) by inserting “to ensure that companies with comparable risk profiles and business models are operating under a similar set of requirements and” before “on its”;

SA 2135. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 203, insert “covered fund or bank holding” before “company”.

SA 2136. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 75, line 15, strike “telephone or electronic” and insert “toll-free telephone or secure electronic”.

On page 76, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

“(E) TEMPORARY REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE.—Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer under subparagraph (A)(i), if the consumer requests a temporary removal of a security freeze, the consumer reporting agency shall, in accordance with subparagraph (C), remove the security freeze for the period of time specified by the consumer.”.

SA 2137. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM UNREASONABLE CREDIT RATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) attempts have been made to prohibit usurious interest rates in America since colonial times;

(2) at the Federal level, in 2006, Congress enacted a Federal 36-percent annualized usury cap for servicemembers and their families for covered credit products, as defined by the Department of Defense, which curbed payday, car title, and tax refund lending around military bases;

(3) notwithstanding such attempts to curb predatory lending, high-cost lending persists in all 50 States due to loopholes in State laws, safe harbor laws for specific forms of credit, and the exportation of unregulated interest rates permitted by preemption;

(4) due to the lack of a comprehensive Federal usury cap, consumers annually pay approximately \$14,000,000,000 on high-cost overdraft loans, as much as approximately \$7,000,000,000 on storefront and online payday loans, \$3,800,000,000 on car title loans, and additional amounts in unreported revenues on high-cost online installment loans;

(5) cash-strapped consumers pay on average approximately 400 percent annual interest for payday loans, 300 percent annual interest for car title loans, up to 17,000 percent or higher for bank overdraft loans, and triple-digit rates for online installment loans;

(6) a national maximum interest rate that includes all forms of fees and closes all loop-

holes is necessary to eliminate such predatory lending; and

(7) alternatives to predatory lending that encourage small dollar loans with minimal or no fees, installment payment schedules, and affordable repayment periods should be encouraged.

(b) NATIONAL MAXIMUM INTEREST RATE.—Chapter 2 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1631 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 140B. MAXIMUM RATES OF INTEREST.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no creditor may make an extension of credit to a consumer with respect to which the fee and interest rate, as defined in subsection (b), exceeds 36 percent.

“(b) FEE AND INTEREST RATE DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the fee and interest rate includes all charges payable, directly or indirectly, incident to, ancillary to, or as a condition of the extension of credit, including—

“(A) any payment compensating a creditor or prospective creditor for—

“(i) an extension of credit or making available a line of credit, such as fees connected with credit extension or availability such as numerical periodic rates, annual fees, cash advance fees, and membership fees; or

“(ii) any fees for default or breach by a borrower of a condition upon which credit was extended, such as late fees, creditor-imposed not sufficient funds fees charged when a borrower tenders payment on a debt with a check drawn on insufficient funds, overdraft fees, and over limit fees;

“(B) all fees which constitute a finance charge, as defined by rules of the Bureau in accordance with this title;

“(C) credit insurance premiums, whether optional or required; and

“(D) all charges and costs for ancillary products sold in connection with or incidental to the credit transaction.

“(2) TOLERANCES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a credit obligation that is payable in at least 3 fully amortizing installments over at least 90 days, the term ‘fee and interest rate’ does not include—

“(i) application or participation fees that in total do not exceed the greater of \$30 or, if there is a limit to the credit line, 5 percent of the credit limit, up to \$120, if—

“(I) such fees are excludable from the finance charge pursuant to section 106 and regulations issued thereunder;

“(II) such fees cover all credit extended or renewed by the creditor for 12 months; and

“(III) the minimum amount of credit extended or available on a credit line is equal to \$300 or more;

“(ii) a late fee charged as authorized by State law and by the agreement that does not exceed either \$20 per late payment or \$20 per month; or

“(iii) a creditor-imposed not sufficient funds fee charged when a borrower tenders payment on a debt with a check drawn on insufficient funds that does not exceed \$15.

“(B) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—The Bureau may adjust the amounts of the tolerances established under this paragraph for inflation over time, consistent with the primary goals of protecting consumers and ensuring that the 36 percent fee and interest rate limitation is not circumvented.

“(c) CALCULATIONS.—

“(1) OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.—For an open end credit plan—

“(A) the fee and interest rate shall be calculated each month, based upon the sum of all fees and finance charges described in sub-

section (b) charged by the creditor during the preceding 1-year period, divided by the average daily balance; and

“(B) if the credit account has been open less than 1 year, the fee and interest rate shall be calculated based upon the total of all fees and finance charges described in subsection (b)(1) charged by the creditor since the plan was opened, divided by the average daily balance, and multiplied by the quotient of 12 divided by the number of full months that the credit plan has been in existence.

“(2) OTHER CREDIT PLANS.—For purposes of this section, in calculating the fee and interest rate, the Bureau shall require the method of calculation of annual percentage rate specified in section 107(a)(1), except that the amount referred to in that section 107(a)(1) as the ‘finance charge’ shall include all fees, charges, and payments described in subsection (b)(1) of this section.

“(3) ADJUSTMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Bureau may make adjustments to the calculations in paragraphs (1) and (2), but the primary goals of such adjustment shall be to protect consumers and to ensure that the 36-percent fee and interest rate limitation is not circumvented.

“(d) DEFINITION OF CREDITOR.—As used in this section, the term ‘creditor’ has the same meaning as in section 702(e) of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691a(e)).

“(e) NO EXEMPTIONS PERMITTED.—The exemption authority of the Bureau under section 105 shall not apply to the rates established under this section or the disclosure requirements under section 127(b)(6).

“(f) DISCLOSURE OF FEE AND INTEREST RATE FOR CREDIT OTHER THAN OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.—In addition to the disclosure requirements under section 127(b)(6), the Bureau may prescribe regulations requiring disclosure of the fee and interest rate established under this section.

“(g) RELATION TO STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt any provision of State law that provides greater protection to consumers than is provided in this section.

“(h) CIVIL LIABILITY AND ENFORCEMENT.—In addition to remedies available to the consumer under section 130(a), any payment compensating a creditor or prospective creditor, to the extent that such payment is a transaction made in violation of this section, shall be null and void, and not enforceable by any party in any court or alternative dispute resolution forum, and the creditor or any subsequent holder of the obligation shall promptly return to the consumer any principal, interest, charges, and fees, and any security interest associated with such transaction. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or repose, a violation of this section may be raised as a matter of defense by recoupment or setoff to an action to collect such debt or repossess related security at any time.

“(i) VIOLATIONS.—Any person that violates this section, or seeks to enforce an agreement made in violation of this section, shall be subject to, for each such violation, 1 year in prison and a fine in an amount equal to the greater of—

“(1) three times the amount of the total accrued debt associated with the subject transaction; or

“(2) \$50,000.

“(j) STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.—An action to enforce this section may be brought by the appropriate State attorney general in any United States district court or any other court of competent jurisdiction within 3

years from the date of the violation, and such attorney general may obtain injunctive relief.”

(C) DISCLOSURE OF FEE AND INTEREST RATE FOR OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.—Section 127(b)(6) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1637(b)(6)) is amended by striking “the total finance charge expressed” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting “the fee and interest rate, displayed as ‘FAIR’, established under section 141.”

SA 2138. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LEAD-SAFE HOUSING FOR KIDS.

(A) AMENDMENTS TO THE LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT.—Section 302(a) of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4822(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF 6.—

“(A) RISK ASSESSMENT.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘covered housing’—

“(I) means housing receiving Federal assistance described in paragraph (1) that was constructed prior to 1978; and

“(II) does not include—

“(aa) single-family housing covered by an application for mortgage insurance under the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); or

“(bb) multi-family housing that—

“(AA) is covered by an application for mortgage insurance under the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

“(BB) does not receive any other Federal housing assistance.

“(ii) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

“(I) require the owner of covered housing in which a family with a child of less than 6 years of age will reside or is expected to reside to conduct an initial risk assessment for lead-based paint hazards—

“(aa) in the case of covered housing receiving tenant-based rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), not later than 15 days after the date on which the family and the owner submit a request for approval of a tenancy;

“(bb) in the case of covered housing receiving public housing assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) or project-based rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), not later than 15 days after the date on which a physical condition inspection occurs; and

“(cc) in the case of covered housing not described in item (aa) or (bb), not later than a date established by the Secretary;

“(II) provide that a visual assessment alone is not sufficient for purposes of complying with subclause (I);

“(III) require that, if lead-based paint hazards are identified by an initial risk assessment conducted under subclause (I), the owner of the covered housing shall—

“(aa) not later than 30 days after the date on which the initial risk assessment is conducted, control the lead-based paint hazards, including achieving clearance in accordance with regulations promulgated under section 402 or 404 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2682, 2684), as applicable; and

“(bb) provide notice to all residents in the covered housing affected by the initial risk assessment, and provide notice in the common areas of the covered housing, that lead-based paint hazards were identified and will be controlled within the 30-day period described in item (aa); and

“(IV) provide that there shall be no extension of the 30-day period described in subclause (III)(aa).

“(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—The regulations promulgated under clause (ii) shall provide an exception to the requirement under subclause (I) of such clause for covered housing—

“(I) if the owner of the covered housing submits to the Secretary documentation—

“(aa) that the owner conducted a risk assessment of the covered housing for lead-based paint hazards during the 12-month period preceding the date on which the family is expected to reside in the covered housing; and

“(bb) of any clearance examinations of lead-based paint hazard control work resulting from the risk assessment described in item (aa);

“(II) from which all lead-based paint has been identified and removed and clearance has been achieved in accordance with regulations promulgated under section 402 or 404 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2682, 2684), as applicable;

“(III)(aa) if lead-based paint hazards are identified in the dwelling unit in the covered housing in which the family will reside or is expected to reside;

“(bb) the dwelling unit is unoccupied;

“(cc) the owner of the covered housing, without any further delay in occupancy or increase in rent, provides the family with another dwelling unit in the covered housing that has no lead-based paint hazards; and

“(dd) the common areas servicing the new dwelling unit have no lead-based paint hazards; and

“(IV) in accordance with any other standard or exception the Secretary deems appropriate based on health-based standards.

“(B) RELOCATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to provide that a family with a child of less than 6 years of age that occupies a dwelling unit in covered housing in which lead-based paint hazards were identified, but not controlled in accordance with regulations required under clause (ii), may relocate on an emergency basis and without placement on any waitlist, penalty (including rent payments to be made for that dwelling unit), or lapse in assistance to—

“(i) a dwelling unit that was constructed in 1978 or later; or

“(ii) another dwelling unit in covered housing that has no lead-based paint hazards.”

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the amendments made by subsection (b) such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022.

SA 2139. Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amend-

ment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, OR CONSTRUCTION LOANS.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 51. CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, OR CONSTRUCTION LOANS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies may only require a depository institution to assign a heightened risk weight to a high volatility commercial real estate (HVCRE) exposure (as such term is defined under section 324.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as of October 11, 2017, or if a successor regulation is in effect as of the date of the enactment of this section, such term or any successor term contained in such successor regulation) under any risk-based capital requirement if such exposure is an HVCRE ADC loan.

“(b) HVCRE ADC LOAN DEFINED.—For purposes of this section and with respect to a depository institution, the term ‘HVCRE ADC loan’—

“(1) means a credit facility secured by land or improved real property that, prior to being reclassified by the depository institution as a Non-HVCRE ADC loan pursuant to subsection (d)—

“(A) primarily finances, has financed, or refinances the acquisition, development, or construction of real property;

“(B) has the purpose of providing financing to acquire, develop, or improve such real property into income-producing real property; and

“(C) is dependent upon future income or sales proceeds from, or refinancing of, such real property for the repayment of such credit facility;

“(2) does not include a credit facility financing—

“(A) the acquisition, development, or construction of properties that are—

“(i) one- to four-family residential properties;

“(ii) real property that would qualify as an investment in community development; or

“(iii) agricultural land;

“(B) the acquisition or refinance of existing income-producing real property secured by a mortgage on such property, if the cash flow being generated by the real property is sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution’s applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings;

“(C) improvements to existing income-producing improved real property secured by a mortgage on such property, if the cash flow being generated by the real property is sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution’s applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings; or

“(D) commercial real property projects in which—

“(i) the loan-to-value ratio is less than or equal to the applicable maximum supervisory loan-to-value ratio as determined by the appropriate Federal banking agency; and

“(ii) the borrower has contributed capital of at least 15 percent of the real property’s

appraised, 'as completed' value to the project in the form of—

“(I) cash;
“(II) unencumbered readily marketable assets;

“(III) paid development expenses out-of-pocket; or

“(IV) contributed real property or improvements; and

“(iii) the borrower contributed the minimum amount of capital described under clause (ii) before the depository institution advances funds under the credit facility, and such minimum amount of capital contributed by the borrower is contractually required to remain in the project until the credit facility has been reclassified by the depository institution as a Non-HVCRE ADC loan under subsection (d);

“(3) does not include any loan made prior to January 1, 2015; and

“(4) does not include a credit facility reclassified as a Non-HVCRE ADC loan under subsection (d).

“(C) VALUE OF CONTRIBUTED REAL PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section, the value of any real property contributed by a borrower as a capital contribution shall be the appraised value of the property as determined under standards prescribed pursuant to section 1110 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3339), in connection with the extension of the credit facility or loan to such borrower.

“(d) RECLASSIFICATION AS A NON-HVCRE ADC LOAN.—For purposes of this section and with respect to a credit facility and a depository institution, upon—

“(1) the completion of the development or construction of the real property being financed by the credit facility; and

“(2) cash flow being generated by the real property being sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution's applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings, the credit facility may be reclassified by the depository institution as a Non-HVCRE ADC loan.

“(e) EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section shall limit the supervisory, regulatory, or enforcement authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency to further the safe and sound operation of an institution under the supervision of the appropriate Federal banking agency.”

SA 2140. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION FAIRNESS AND REFORM

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act”.

SEC. 602. TIMELINESS OF EXAMINATION REPORTS.

The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1012. TIMELINESS OF EXAMINATION REPORTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) FINAL EXAMINATION REPORT.—A Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall provide a final examination report to a financial institution not later than 60 days after the later of—

“(A) the exit interview for an examination of the institution; or

“(B) the provision of additional information by the institution relating to the examination.

“(2) EXIT INTERVIEW.—If a financial institution is not subject to a resident examiner program, the exit interview shall occur not later than the end of the 9-month period beginning on the commencement of the examination, except that such period may be extended by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency by providing written notice to the institution and the Director describing with particularity the reasons that a longer period is needed to complete the examination.

“(b) EXAMINATION MATERIALS.—Upon the request of a financial institution, the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall include with the final report an appendix listing all examination or other factual information relied upon by the agency in support of a material supervisory determination.”

SEC. 603. INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW DIRECTOR

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), as amended by section 602 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1013. OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Council an Office of Independent Examination Review.

“(b) HEAD OF OFFICE.—There is established the position of the Independent Examination Review Director, as the head of the Office of Independent Examination Review. The Director shall be appointed by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council.

“(c) STAFFING.—The Director is authorized to hire staff to support the activities of the Office of Independent Examination Review.

“(d) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

“(1) receive and, at the discretion of the Director, investigate complaints from financial institutions, their representatives, or another entity acting on behalf of such institutions, concerning examinations, examination practices, or examination reports;

“(2) hold meetings, at least once every three months and in locations designed to encourage participation from all sections of the United States, with financial institutions, their representatives, or another entity acting on behalf of such institutions, to discuss examination procedures, examination practices, or examination policies;

“(3) review examination procedures of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to ensure that the written examination policies of those agencies are being followed in practice and adhere to the standards for consistency established by the Council;

“(4) conduct a continuing and regular program of examination quality assurance for all examination types conducted by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies;

“(5) adjudicate any supervisory appeal initiated under section 1014; and

“(6) report annually to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate,

and the Council, on the reviews carried out pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4), including compliance with the requirements set forth in section 1012 regarding timeliness of examination reports, and the Council's recommendations for improvements in examination procedures, practices, and policies.

“(e) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Director shall keep confidential all meetings, discussions, and information provided by financial institutions.”

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 1003 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3302) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding “and” at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) the term ‘Director’ means the Independent Examination Review Director established under section 1013(a) and (b).”

SEC. 604. RIGHT TO INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MATERIAL SUPERVISORY DETERMINATIONS.

The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978, as amended by sections 602 and 603 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1014. RIGHT TO INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MATERIAL SUPERVISORY DETERMINATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution shall have the right to obtain an independent review of a material supervisory determination contained in a final report of examination.

“(b) NOTICE.—

“(1) TIMING.—A financial institution seeking review of a material supervisory determination under this section shall file a written notice with the Director within 60 days after receiving the final report of examination that is the subject of such review.

“(2) IDENTIFICATION OF DETERMINATION.—The written notice shall identify the material supervisory determination that is the subject of the independent examination review, and a statement of the reasons why the institution believes that the determination is incorrect or should otherwise be modified.

“(3) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO INSTITUTION.—Any information relied upon by the agency in the final report that is not in the possession of the financial institution may be requested by the financial institution and shall be delivered promptly by the agency to the financial institution.

“(c) RIGHT TO HEARING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall—

“(A) determine the merits of the appeal on the record; or

“(B) at the election of the financial institution, refer the appeal to an administrative law judge to conduct a hearing pursuant to the procedures set forth under sections 556 and 557 of title 5, United States Code, which shall take place not later than 60 days after the petition for review is received by the Director.

“(2) TIMING OF DECISION.—An administrative law judge conducting a hearing under paragraph (1)(B) shall issue a proposed decision to the Director based upon the record established at the hearing.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In any hearing under this subsection—

“(A) neither the administrative law judge nor the Director shall defer to the opinions of the examiner or agency, but shall independently determine the appropriateness of the agency's decision based upon the relevant statutes, regulations, other appropriate guidance, and evidence presented at the hearing.

“(d) FINAL DECISION.—A decision by the Director on an independent review under this section shall—

“(1) be made not later than 60 days after the record has been closed; and

“(2) be deemed final agency action and shall bind the agency whose supervisory determination was the subject of the review and the financial institution requesting the review.

“(e) RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A financial institution shall have the right to petition for review of the decision of the Director under this section by filing a petition for review not later than 60 days after the date on which the decision is made in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or the Circuit in which the financial institution is located.

“(f) REPORT.—The Director shall report annually to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on actions taken under this section, including the types of issues that the Director has reviewed and the results of those reviews. In no case shall such a report contain information about individual financial institutions or any confidential or privileged information shared by financial institutions.

“(g) RETALIATION PROHIBITED.—A Federal financial institutions regulatory agency may not—

“(1) retaliate against a financial institution, including service providers, or any institution-affiliated party, for exercising appellate rights under this section; or

“(2) delay or deny any agency action that would benefit a financial institution or any institution-affiliated party on the basis that an appeal under this section is pending under this section.”.

SEC. 605. ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) REGULATOR APPEALS PROCESS, OMBUDSMAN, AND ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 309 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4806) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting after “appropriate Federal banking agency” the following: “, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B) and indenting appropriately;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as redesignated), by striking “In establishing” and inserting “(1) IN GENERAL.—In establishing”;

(iii) in paragraph (1)(B) (as redesignated), by striking “the appellant from retaliation by agency examiners” and inserting “the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by an agency referred to in subsection (a)”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) RETALIATION.—For purposes of this subsection and subsection (e), retaliation includes delaying consideration of, or withholding approval of, any request, notice, or application that otherwise would have been approved, but for the exercise of the institution's or credit union's rights under this section.”;

(C) in subsection (e)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ensure that appropriate safeguards exist for protecting the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by any agency referred to in subsection (a) for exercising its rights under this subsection.”;

(D) in subsection (f)(1)(A)

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) any issue specifically listed in an exam report as a matter requiring attention by the institution's management or board of directors; and

“(v) any suspension or removal of an institution's status as eligible for expedited processing of applications, requests, notices, or filings on the grounds of a supervisory or compliance concern, regardless of whether that concern has been cited as a basis for a material supervisory determination or matter requiring attention in an examination report, provided that the conduct at issue did not involve violation of any criminal law; and”.

(2) EFFECT.—Nothing in this subsection affects the authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency or the National Credit Union Administration Board to take enforcement or other supervisory action.

(b) FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT.—Section 205(j) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1785(j)) is amended by inserting “the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,” before “the Administration” each place that term appears.

(c) FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL ACT.—The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), as amended by sections 602 through 604 of this Act, is further amended—

(1) in section 1003 (12 U.S.C. 3302) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) the term ‘Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies’—

“(A) means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the National Credit Union Administration; and

“(B) includes the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection for purposes of sections 1012 through 1014;”;

(2) in section 1005 (12 U.S.C. 3304), by striking “One-fifth” and inserting “One-fourth”.

SA 2141. Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN CAPTIVE INSURANCE COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1422 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 4 (12 U.S.C. 1424), by adding at the end the following:

“(d) MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN CAPTIVE INSURANCE COMPANIES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘affiliate’, ‘long-term’, and ‘residential mortgage loan’ have the mean-

ings given those terms in section 1263.1 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection; and

“(B) the term ‘covered captive insurance company’ means a captive insurance company—

“(i) the primary insurance business of which is, or was on January 19, 2016, the insurance of an affiliate;

“(ii) that was admitted to membership of a Federal Home Loan Bank before January 19, 2016; and

“(iii) that, due solely to the change in the treatment of captive insurance companies in the final rule of the Agency entitled ‘Members of Federal Home Loan Banks’ (81 Fed. Reg. 3246 (January 20, 2016))—

“(I) was required to terminate membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank; or

“(II) will have membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank terminated.

“(2) CONTINUATION OR RESTORATION OF MEMBERSHIP.—A covered captive insurance company may continue membership or have membership restored in the same Federal Home Loan Bank described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii) if—

“(A) the Federal Home Loan Bank determines, including based on information submitted by the covered captive insurance company, that—

“(i) the affiliate insured by the covered captive insurance company makes, owns, or acquires long-term residential mortgage loans; and

“(ii) the covered captive insurance company will comply with the membership eligibility requirements described in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 1263.6 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, upon restoring membership; and

“(B) the covered captive insurance company continues to be owned, or upon restoration of membership is owned and continues to be owned, including direct ownership by a controlling entity or indirect ownership through one or more holding companies, by the same entity that owned the covered captive insurance company on the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(3) BENEFITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A covered captive insurance company for which membership in a Federal Home Loan Bank is continued or restored under paragraph (2) shall have the same benefits of membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank as the covered captive insurance company had before January 19, 2016.

“(B) APPLICATION OF REGULATION.—Section 1263.6(e) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, shall not apply to a covered captive insurance company for which membership in a Federal Home Loan Bank is continued or restored under paragraph (2).

“(C) CAPTIVES TREATED AS INSURANCE COMPANIES.—Except as otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, for purposes of this Act and any regulations promulgated under this Act, a covered captive insurance company shall be treated as an insurance company.

“(4) LIMITATION ON ADVANCES.—With respect to a covered captive insurance company for which membership in a Federal Home Loan Bank is continued or restored under paragraph (2) and that is not an affiliate of a depository financial institution, the Federal Home Loan Bank may not make any advances to the covered captive insurance company in an amount that, in the aggregate, is greater than 50 percent of the total assets of the covered captive insurance company unless the Federal Home Loan Bank

has received from the affiliate of the covered captive insurance company or the controlling entity described in paragraph (2)(B) a guarantee of payment for any outstanding advances, which shall be in addition to any collateral otherwise required to secure the advances.”; and

(2) in section 6(g) (12 U.S.C. 1426(g))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN CAPTIVE INSURANCE COMPANIES.—A covered captive insurance company (as defined in section 4(d)(1)) for which membership in a Federal Home Loan Bank is restored under section 4(d)(2)—

“(A) shall not be subject to the 5-year period described in paragraph (1); and

“(B) may acquire shares of the Federal Home Loan Bank beginning after the membership is restored.”.

SA 2142. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 308. MILITARY AND VETERANS EDUCATION PROTECTION.

(a) HIGHER EDUCATION.—Section 487 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(24)—

(A) by inserting “that receives funds provided under this title” before “, such institution”;

(B) by striking “other than funds provided under this title, as calculated in accordance with subsection (d)(1)” and inserting “other than Federal educational assistance, as defined in subsection (d)(5) and calculated in accordance with subsection (d)(1)”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “NON-TITLE IV” and inserting “NON-FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “that receives funds provided under this title” before “shall”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “assistance under this title” and inserting “Federal educational assistance”;

(II) in clause (ii)(I), by inserting “, or on a military base if the administering Secretary for a program of Federal educational assistance under clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (5)(B) has authorized such location” before the semicolon;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “program under this title” and inserting “program of Federal educational assistance”;

(iv) in subparagraph (E), by striking “funds received under this title” and inserting “Federal educational assistance”;

(v) in subparagraph (F)—

(I) in clause (iii), by striking “under this title” and inserting “of Federal educational assistance”;

(II) in clause (iv), by striking “under this title” and inserting “of Federal educational assistance”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) INELIGIBILITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a proprietary institu-

tion of higher education receiving funds provided under this title that fails to meet a requirement of subsection (a)(24) for two consecutive institutional fiscal years shall be ineligible to participate in or receive funds under any program of Federal educational assistance for a period of not less than two institutional fiscal years.

“(ii) REGAINING ELIGIBILITY.—To regain eligibility to participate in or receive funds under any program of Federal educational assistance after being ineligible pursuant to clause (i), a proprietary institution of higher education shall demonstrate compliance with all eligibility and certification requirements for the program for a minimum of two consecutive institutional fiscal years after the institutional fiscal year in which the institution became ineligible. In order to regain eligibility to participate in any program of Federal educational assistance under this title, such compliance shall include meeting the requirements of section 498 for such 2-year period.

“(iii) NOTIFICATION OF INELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary of Education shall determine when a proprietary institution of higher education that receives funds under this title is ineligible under clause (i) and shall notify all other administering Secretaries of the determination.

“(iv) ENFORCEMENT.—Each administering Secretary for a program of Federal educational assistance shall enforce the requirements of this subparagraph for the program concerned upon receiving notification under clause (iii) of a proprietary institution of higher education’s ineligibility.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(aa) by striking “In addition” and all that follows through “education fails” and inserting “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in addition to such other means of enforcing the requirements of a program of Federal educational assistance as may be available to the administering Secretary, if a proprietary institution of higher education that receives funds provided under this title fails”; and

(bb) by striking “the programs authorized by this title” and inserting “all programs of Federal educational assistance”;

(II) in clause (i), by inserting “with respect to a program of Federal educational assistance under this title,” before “on the expiration date”;

(D) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “sources under this title” and inserting “Federal educational assistance”;

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) ADMINISTERING SECRETARY.—The term ‘administering Secretary’ means the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Secretary of a military department responsible for administering the Federal educational assistance concerned.

“(B) FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—The term ‘Federal educational assistance’ means funds provided under any of the following provisions of law:

“(i) This title.

“(ii) Chapter 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, or 35 of title 38, United States Code.

“(iii) Chapter 101, 105, 106A, 1606, 1607, or 1608 of title 10, United States Code.

“(iv) Section 1784a of title 10, United States Code.”.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACTIONS ON INELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN PROPRIETARY INSTI-

TUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2008 the following new section:

“§ 2008a. Ineligibility of certain proprietary institutions of higher education for participation in Department of Defense programs of educational assistance

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon receipt of a notice from the Secretary of Education under clause (iii) of section 487(d)(2)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(d)(2)(A)) that a proprietary institution of higher education is ineligible for participation in or receipt of funds under any program of Federal educational assistance by reason of such section, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that no educational assistance under the provisions of law specified in subsection (b) is available or used for education at the institution for the period of institutional fiscal years covered by such notice.

“(b) COVERED ASSISTANCE.—The provisions of law specified in this subsection are the provisions of law on educational assistance through the Department of Defense as follows:

“(1) This chapter.

“(2) Chapters 105, 106A, 1606, 1607, and 1608 of this title.

“(3) Section 1784a of this title.

“(c) NOTICE ON INELIGIBILITY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to notify persons receiving or eligible for educational assistance under the provisions of law specified in subsection (b) of the application of the limitations in section 487(d)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to particular proprietary institutions of higher education.

“(2) The actions taken under this subsection with respect to a proprietary institution shall include publication, on the Internet website of the Department of Defense that provides information to persons described in paragraph (1), of the following:

“(A) The name of the institution.

“(B) The extent to which the institution failed to meet the requirements of section 487(a)(24) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(C) The length of time the institution will be ineligible for participation in or receipt of funds under any program of Federal educational assistance by reason of section 487(d)(2)(A) of that Act.

“(D) The nonavailability of educational assistance through the Department for enrollment, attendance, or pursuit of a program of education at the institution by reason of such ineligibility.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 101 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2008 the following new item:

“2008a. Ineligibility of certain proprietary institutions of higher education for participation in Department of Defense programs of educational assistance.”.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3681 the following new section:

“§3681A. Ineligibility of certain proprietary institutions of higher education for participation in Department of Veterans Affairs programs of educational assistance

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon receipt of a notice from the Secretary of Education under clause (iii) of section 487(d)(2)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(d)(2)(A)) that a proprietary institution of higher education is ineligible for participation in or receipt of funds under any program of Federal educational assistance by reason of such section, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that no educational assistance under the provisions of law specified in subsection (b) is available or used for education at the institution for the period of institutional fiscal years covered by such notice.

“(b) COVERED ASSISTANCE.—The provisions of law specified in this subsection are the provisions of law on educational assistance through the Department under chapters 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35 of this title.

“(c) NOTICE ON INELIGIBILITY.—(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall take appropriate actions to notify persons receiving or eligible for educational assistance under the provisions of law specified in subsection (b) of the application of the limitations in section 487(d)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to particular proprietary institutions of higher education.

“(2) The actions taken under this subsection with respect to a proprietary institution shall include publication, on the Internet website of the Department that provides information to persons described in paragraph (1), of the following:

- “(A) The name of the institution.
- “(B) The extent to which the institution failed to meet the requirements of section 487(a)(24) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.
- “(C) The length of time the institution will be ineligible for participation in or receipt of funds under any program of Federal educational assistance by reason of section 487(d)(2)(A) of that Act.
- “(D) The nonavailability of educational assistance through the Department for enrollment, attendance, or pursuit of a program of education at the institution by reason of such ineligibility.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 36 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3681 the following new item:

“3681A. Ineligibility of certain proprietary institutions of higher education for participation in Department of Veterans Affairs programs of educational assistance.”.

SA 2143. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DATA SECURITY.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

- (1) to establish strong and uniform national data security and breach notification standards for electronic data; and
- (2) to expressly preempt any related State laws in order to provide the Federal Trade

Commission with authority to enforce such standards for entities covered under this section.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) AFFILIATE.—The term “affiliate” means any company that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with another company.

(2) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) BREACH OF DATA SECURITY.—The term “breach of data security”—

(A) means the unauthorized acquisition of sensitive account information or sensitive personal information; and

(B) does not include the unauthorized acquisition of sensitive account information or sensitive personal information that is encrypted, redacted, or otherwise protected by another method that renders the information unreadable and unusable if the encryption, redaction, or protection process or key is not also acquired without authorization.

(4) CARRIER.—The term “carrier” means any entity that—

(A) provides electronic data transmission, routing, intermediate, and transient storage, or connections to the system or network of the entity;

(B) does not select or modify the content of the electronic data;

(C) is not the sender or the intended recipient of the data; and

(D) does not differentiate sensitive account information or sensitive personal information from other information that the entity transmits, routes, stores in intermediate or transient storage, or for which such entity provides connections.

(5) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(6) CONSUMER.—The term “consumer” means an individual.

(7) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY THAT COMPILES AND MAINTAINS FILES ON CONSUMERS ON A NATIONWIDE BASIS.—The term “consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis” has the meaning given the term in section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)).

(8) COVERED ENTITY.—The term “covered entity”—

(A) means any individual, partnership, corporation, trust, estate, cooperative, association, or entity that accesses, maintains, communicates, or handles sensitive account information or sensitive personal information; and

(B) does not include—

- (i) an agency; or
- (ii) any other unit of Federal, State, or local government or any subdivision of such a unit.

(9) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given the term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(10) INFORMATION SECURITY PROGRAM.—The term “information security program” means the administrative, technical, or physical safeguards that a covered entity uses to access, collect, distribute, process, protect, store, use, transmit, dispose of, or otherwise handle sensitive account information and sensitive personal information.

(11) SENSITIVE ACCOUNT INFORMATION.—The term “sensitive account information” means a financial account number relating to a consumer, including a credit card number or debit card number, in combination with any

security code, access code, password, or other personal identification information required to access the financial account.

(12) SENSITIVE PERSONAL INFORMATION.—The term “sensitive personal information”—

(A) means—

- (i) a Social Security number; or
- (ii) the first and last name of a consumer in combination with—

(I) the consumer’s driver’s license number, passport number, military identification number, or other similar number issued on a government document used to verify identity;

(II) information that could be used to access a consumer’s account, such as a user name and password or e-mail and password; or

(III) biometric data of the consumer used to gain access to financial accounts of the consumer; and

(B) does not include publicly available information that is—

- (i) lawfully made available to the general public; and
- (ii) obtained from—

(I) Federal, State, or local government records; or

(II) widely distributed media.

(13) SUBSTANTIAL HARM OR INCONVENIENCE.—The term “substantial harm or inconvenience” means—

- (A) identity theft; or
- (B) fraudulent transactions on financial accounts.

(14) THIRD-PARTY SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term “third-party service provider” means any person that maintains, processes, or otherwise is permitted access to sensitive account information or sensitive personal information in connection with providing services to a covered entity.

(c) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION AND SECURITY BREACH NOTIFICATION.—

(1) SECURITY PROCEDURES REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each covered entity shall develop, implement, and maintain a comprehensive information security program that contains administrative, technical, and physical safeguards that are reasonably designed to achieve the objectives in subparagraph (B).

(B) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of this paragraph are to—

- (i) ensure the security and confidentiality of sensitive account information and sensitive personal information;
- (ii) protect against any anticipated threats or hazards to the security or integrity of such information; and

(iii) protect against unauthorized acquisition of such information that could result in substantial harm to the individuals to whom such information relates.

(C) LIMITATION.—The information security program of a covered entity under subparagraph (A) shall be appropriate to—

- (i) the size and complexity of the covered entity;
- (ii) the nature and scope of the activities of the covered entity; and

(iii) the sensitivity of the consumer information to be protected.

(D) ELEMENTS.—In order to develop, implement, and maintain an information security program required under subparagraph (A), a covered entity shall—

- (i) designate an employee or employees to coordinate the information security program;
- (ii) identify reasonably foreseeable internal and external risks to the security, confidentiality, and integrity of sensitive account information and sensitive personal information and assess the sufficiency of any

safeguards in place to control these risks, including consideration of risks in each relevant area of the operations of the covered entity, including—

- (I) employee training and management;
- (II) information systems, including network and software design and information processing, storage, transmission, and disposal; and
- (III) detecting, preventing, and responding to attacks, intrusions, or other systems failures;
- (iii) design and implement information safeguards to control the risks identified in the risk assessment of the covered entity and regularly assess the effectiveness of the key controls, systems, and procedures of those safeguards;
- (iv) oversee service providers by—
- (I) taking reasonable steps to select and retain service providers that are capable of maintaining appropriate safeguards for the sensitive account information or sensitive personal information at issue;
- (II) requiring service providers, by contract, to implement and maintain the safeguards described in clause (iii); and
- (III) reasonably oversee or obtain an assessment of the compliance by the service provider with contractual obligations, where appropriate in light of the risk assessment of the covered entity; and
- (v) evaluate and adjust the information security program in light of the results of the risk assessments and testing and monitoring required by clauses (iii) and (iv) and any material changes to the operations or business arrangements of the covered entity, or any other circumstances that the covered entity knows or has reason to know may have a material impact on the information security program of the covered entity.

(E) SECURITY CONTROLS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Each covered entity shall—

- (I) consider whether the security measures described in clause (ii) are appropriate for the covered entity and, if so, adopt those measures that the covered entity concludes are appropriate;
- (II) develop, implement, and maintain appropriate measures to properly dispose of sensitive account information and sensitive personal information; and
- (III) train staff to implement the covered entity's information security program.

(ii) SECURITY MEASURES.—The security measures described in this clause are the following:

- (I) Access controls on information systems, including controls to authenticate and permit access only to authorized individuals and controls to prevent employees from providing sensitive account information or sensitive personal information to unauthorized individuals who may seek to obtain that information through fraudulent means.
- (II) Access restrictions at physical locations containing sensitive account information or sensitive personal information, such as buildings, computer facilities, and records storage facilities, to permit access only to authorized individuals.
- (III) Encryption of electronic sensitive account information or sensitive personal information, including while in transit or in storage on networks or systems to which unauthorized individuals may have access.
- (IV) Procedures designed to ensure that information system modifications are consistent with the information security program of the covered entity.
- (V) Dual control procedures, segregation of duties, and employee background checks for

employees with responsibilities for, or access to, sensitive account information or sensitive personal information.

(VI) Monitoring systems and procedures to detect actual and attempted attacks on, or intrusions into, information systems.

(VII) Response programs that specify actions to be taken when the covered entity suspects or detects that unauthorized individuals have gained access to information systems.

(VIII) Measures to protect against destruction, loss, or damage of sensitive account information or sensitive personal information due to potential environmental hazards, such as fire and water damage, or technological failures.

(F) ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) BOARD OVERSIGHT.—If a covered entity has a board of directors, the board of directors of the covered entity, or an appropriate committee of the board of directors, shall—

- (I) approve the written information security program of the covered entity; and
- (II) oversee the development, implementation, and maintenance of the information security program of the covered entity, including assigning specific responsibility for the implementation of the program and reviewing reports from management.

(ii) REPORT TO THE BOARD.—If a covered entity has a board of directors, the covered entity shall report to the board, or an appropriate committee of the board, at least annually, including describing—

- (I) the overall status of the information security program and the compliance of the covered entity with this section; and
- (II) material matters related to the program of the covered entity, addressing issues such as risk assessment, risk management and control decisions, service provider arrangements, results of testing, security breaches or violations and management's responses, and recommendations for changes in the information security program.

(2) INVESTIGATION REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If a covered entity believes that a breach of data security has or may have occurred in relation to sensitive account information or sensitive personal information that is maintained, communicated, or otherwise handled by, or on behalf of, the covered entity, the covered entity shall conduct an investigation to—

- (i) assess the nature and scope of the incident;
- (ii) identify any sensitive account information or sensitive personal information that may have been involved in the incident;
- (iii) determine if the sensitive account information or sensitive personal information has been acquired without authorization; and
- (iv) take reasonable measures to restore the security and confidentiality of the systems compromised in the breach.

(3) NOTICE REQUIRED.—If a covered entity determines under paragraph (2)(A)(iii) that the unauthorized acquisition of sensitive account information or sensitive personal information involved in a breach of data security is reasonably likely to cause substantial harm to the consumers to whom the information relates, the covered entity, or a third party acting on behalf of the covered entity, shall—

- (A) notify, without unreasonable delay—
- (i) an appropriate Federal law enforcement agency;
- (ii) the appropriate agency or authority identified in subsection (d);
- (iii) any relevant payment card network, if the breach involves a breach of payment card numbers;

(iv) each consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis, if the breach involves sensitive personal information or sensitive account information relating to not fewer than 5,000 consumers; and

(v) all consumers to whom the sensitive account information or sensitive personal information relates;

(B) provide notice to consumers by—

(i) written notification sent to the postal address of the consumer in the records of the covered entity;

(ii) telephonic notification to the number of the consumer in the records of the covered entity;

(iii) e-mail of the consumer or other electronic means in the records of the covered entity; or

(iv) substitute notification in print and to broadcast media where the individual whose personal information was acquired resides, if providing written or e-mail notification is not feasible due to—

(I) lack of sufficient contact information for the consumers that must be notified;

(II) excessive cost to the covered entity; or

(III) exigent circumstances; and

(C) provide notice that includes—

(i) a description of the type of sensitive account information or sensitive personal information involved in the breach of data security;

(ii) a general description of the actions taken by the covered entity to restore the security and confidentiality of the sensitive account information or sensitive personal information involved in the breach of data security; and

(iii) a summary of rights of victims of identity theft prepared by the Commission under section 609(d) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g(d)), if the breach of data security involves sensitive personal information.

(4) CLARIFICATION.—A financial institution shall have no obligation under this section for a breach of security at another covered entity involving sensitive account information relating to an account owned by the financial institution.

(5) SPECIAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) THIRD-PARTY SERVICE PROVIDERS.—In the event of a breach of data security of a system maintained by a third-party entity that has been contracted to maintain, store, or process data in electronic form containing sensitive account information or sensitive personal information on behalf of a covered entity that owns or possesses that data, that third-party entity shall notify—

- (i) the covered entity; and
- (ii) consumers if it is agreed in writing that the third-party service provider will provide that notification on behalf of the covered entity.

(B) CARRIER OBLIGATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a carrier becomes aware of a breach of data security involving data in electronic form containing sensitive account information or sensitive personal information that is owned or licensed by a covered entity that connects to or uses a system or network provided by the carrier for the purpose of transmitting, routing, or providing intermediate or transient storage of that data, the carrier shall notify the covered entity that initiated such connection, transmission, routing, or storage of the data containing sensitive account information or sensitive personal information, if such covered entity can be reasonably identified. If a service provider is acting solely as a service provider for purposes of this paragraph, the

service provider has no other notification obligations under this subsection.

(ii) COVERED ENTITIES WHO RECEIVE NOTICE FROM CARRIERS.—Upon receiving notification from a service provider under subparagraph (A), a covered entity shall provide notification as required under this subsection.

(C) COMMUNICATIONS WITH ACCOUNT HOLDERS.—If a covered entity that is not a financial institution experiences a breach of data security involving sensitive account information, a financial institution that issues an account to which the sensitive account information relates may communicate with the account holder regarding the breach, including—

(i) an explanation that the financial institution was not breached, and that the breach occurred at a third-party that had access to the sensitive account information of the consumer; or

(ii) identify the covered entity that experienced the breach after the covered entity has provided notice consistent with this section.

(6) COMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity shall be deemed to be in compliance with—

(i) in the case of a financial institution—

(i) paragraph (1), if the financial institution maintains policies and procedures to protect the confidentiality and security of sensitive account information and sensitive personal information that are consistent with the policies and procedures of the financial institution that are designed to comply with the requirements of section 501(b) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801(b)) and any regulations or guidance prescribed under that section that are applicable to the financial institution; and

(ii) paragraphs (2) and (3), if the financial institution—

(aa)(AA) maintains policies and procedures to investigate and provide notice to consumers of breaches of data security that are consistent with the policies and procedures of the financial institution that are designed to comply with the investigation and notice requirements established by regulations or guidance under section 501(b) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801(b)) that are applicable to the financial institution;

(BB) is an affiliate of a bank holding company that maintains policies and procedures to investigate and provide notice to consumers of breaches of data security that are consistent with the policies and procedures of a bank that is an affiliate of the financial institution, and the policies and procedures of the bank are designed to comply with the investigation and notice requirements established by any regulations or guidance under section 501(b) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801(b)) that are applicable to the bank; or

(CC) is an affiliate of a savings and loan holding company that maintains policies and procedures to investigate and provide notice to consumers of data breaches of data security that are consistent with the policies and procedures of a savings association that is an affiliate of the financial institution and the policies and procedures of the savings association are designed to comply with the investigation and notice requirements established by any regulations or guidelines under section 501(b) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801(b)) that are applicable to savings associations; and

(bb) provides for notice to the entities described under clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (3)(A), if notice is provided to consumers pursuant to the policies and procedures of the financial institution described in item (aa); and

(ii) paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)—

(I) if the entity is a covered entity for purposes of the regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2 note), to the extent that the entity is in compliance with those regulations; or

(II) if the entity is in compliance with sections 13402 and 13407 of the HITECH Act (42 U.S.C. 17932 and 17937).

(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

(i) the terms “bank holding company” and “bank” have the meanings given those terms in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841);

(ii) the term “savings and loan holding company” has the meaning given the term in section 10(a) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(a)); and

(iii) the term “savings association” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1462).

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subsection (c) shall be enforced exclusively under—

(A) section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818), in the case of—

(i) a national bank, a Federal branch or Federal agency of a foreign bank, or any subsidiary thereof (other than a broker, dealer, person providing insurance, investment company, or investment adviser), or a savings association, the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or any subsidiary thereof (other than a broker, dealer, person providing insurance, investment company, or investment adviser), by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency;

(ii) a member bank of the Federal Reserve System (other than a national bank), a branch or agency of a foreign bank (other than a Federal branch, Federal agency, or insured State branch of a foreign bank), a commercial lending company owned or controlled by a foreign bank, an organization operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 601, 611), or a bank holding company and its nonbank subsidiary or affiliate (other than a broker, dealer, person providing insurance, investment company, or investment adviser), by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(iii) a bank, the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than a member of the Federal Reserve System), an insured State branch of a foreign bank, or any subsidiary thereof (other than a broker, dealer, person providing insurance, investment company, or investment adviser), by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(B) the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), by the National Credit Union Administration Board with respect to any federally insured credit union;

(C) the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.), by the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to any broker or dealer;

(D) the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–1 et seq.), by the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to any investment company;

(E) the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–1 et seq.), by the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to any investment adviser registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under that Act;

(F) the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission with respect to any futures commission merchant, commodity trading advisor, commodity pool operator, or introducing broker;

(G) the provisions of title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.), by the Director of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (and any successor to the functional regulatory agency) with respect to the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and any other entity or enterprise (as defined in that title) subject to the jurisdiction of the functional regulatory agency under that title, including any affiliate of any the enterprise;

(H) State insurance law, in the case of any person engaged in providing insurance, by the applicable State insurance authority of the State in which the person is domiciled; and

(I) the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.), by the Commission for any other covered entity that is not subject to the jurisdiction of any agency or authority described under subparagraphs (A) through (H), including—

(i) notwithstanding section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)), common carriers subject to the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.);

(ii) notwithstanding the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1301 et seq.), include the authority to enforce compliance by air carriers and foreign air carriers; and

(iii) notwithstanding the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), include the authority to enforce compliance by persons, partnerships, and corporations subject to the provisions of that Act.

(2) APPLICATION TO CABLE OPERATORS, SATELLITE OPERATORS, AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS.—

(A) DATA SECURITY AND BREACH NOTIFICATION.—Sections 201, 202, 222, 338, and 631 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201, 202, 222, 338, and 551), and any regulations promulgated in accordance with those sections, shall not apply with respect to the information security practices, including practices relating to the notification of unauthorized access to data in electronic form, of any covered entity otherwise subject to those sections.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph otherwise limits authority of the Federal Communication Commission with respect to sections 201, 202, 222, 338, and 631 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201, 202, 222, 338, and 551).

(3) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This section may not be construed to provide a private right of action, including a class action with respect to any Act or practice regulated under this section.

(B) EXCEPTION.—A consumer or entity that suffers financial harm as a result of the violation by a covered entity of this section may bring an action in a district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the consumer or entity suffered the harm against the covered entity to recover—

(i) in the case of a negligent violation of this section, actual financial damages, court costs allowed by the rules of the court, and reasonable attorney’s fees; and

(ii) in the case of a knowing violation of this section, the damages, costs, and attorney’s fees described in clause (i) of this subsection and punitive damages.

(e) RELATION TO STATE LAW.—No requirement or prohibition may be imposed under the laws of any State with respect to the responsibilities of any person to—

(1) protect the security of information relating to consumers that is maintained, communicated, or otherwise handled by, or on behalf of, the person;

(2) safeguard information relating to consumers from—

(A) unauthorized access; and

(B) unauthorized acquisition;

(3) investigate or provide notice of the unauthorized acquisition of, or access to, information relating to consumers, or the potential misuse of the information, for fraudulent, illegal, or other purposes; or

(4) mitigate any potential or actual loss or harm resulting from the unauthorized acquisition of, or access to, information relating to consumers.

(f) DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE FOR CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Subsections (c) and (e) shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2144. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . OFFICE OF FAIR LENDING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY OF THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION.

Section 1013 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) OFFICE OF FAIR LENDING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Division of Supervision, Enforcement, and Fair Lending of the Bureau the Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity.

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity shall have such powers and duties as the Associate Director for Supervision, Enforcement, and Fair Lending of the Bureau (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Associate Director’) may delegate to the Office, including—

“(A) providing oversight and enforcement of Federal laws intended to ensure the fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory access to credit for both individuals and communities that are enforced by the Bureau, including the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.) and the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.);

“(B) coordinating fair lending efforts of the Bureau with other Federal agencies and State regulators, as appropriate, to promote consistent, efficient, and effective enforcement of Federal fair lending laws;

“(C) working with private industry, fair lending, civil rights, consumer, and community advocates on the promotion of fair lending compliance and education; and

“(D) providing annual reports to Congress on the efforts of the Bureau to fulfill the fair lending mandate of the Bureau.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION OF OFFICE.—There is established the position of Assistant Director of the Bureau for Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity, who shall—

“(A) be appointed by the Associate Director; and

“(B) carry out such duties as the Associate Director may delegate to the Assistant Director.”.

SA 2145. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FTC CIVIL MONEY PENALTY AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS OF THE SAFEGUARDS RULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission; and

(2) the term “consumer reporting agency” has the meaning given the term in section 603(f) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(f)).

(b) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Commission may impose a civil money penalty on any consumer reporting agency that violates part 314 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulations.

SA 2146. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STOP DEBT COLLECTION ABUSE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 803 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “facilitating collection of such debt for another” and inserting “collection of such debt”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

“(5) The term ‘debt’ means—

“(A) any obligation or alleged obligation of a consumer to pay money arising out of a transaction in which the money, property, insurance, or services that are the subject of the transaction are primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, whether or not such obligation has been reduced to judgment; or

“(B) any obligation or alleged obligation of a consumer—

“(i) to pay a loan, an overpayment, a fine, penalty, a fee, or other money to a Federal agency; and

“(ii) that is not less than 180 days past due.

“(6) The term ‘debt collector’—

“(A) means any person who—

“(i) uses any instrumentality of interstate commerce or the mails in any business the principal purpose of which is the collection of any debts;

“(ii) regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, by its own means or by hiring another debt collector, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another or that have been obtained by assignment or transfer from another; or

“(iii) regularly collects debts owed or allegedly owed to a Federal agency;

“(B) includes—

“(i) any creditor who, in the process of collecting his own debts, uses any name other

than his own which would indicate that a third person is collecting or attempting to collect such debts; and

“(ii) for purposes of section 808(6), includes any person who uses any instrumentality of interstate commerce or the mails in any business the principal purpose of which is the enforcement of security interests; and

“(C) does not include—

“(i) any officer or employee of a creditor while, in the name of the creditor, collecting debts for such creditor;

“(ii) any person while acting as a debt collector for another person, both of whom are related by common ownership or affiliated by corporate control, if the person acting as a debt collector does so only for persons to whom it is so related or affiliated and if the principal business of such person is not the collection of debts;

“(iii) any officer or employee of the United States or any State to the extent that collecting or attempting to collect any debt is in the performance of his official duties;

“(iv) any person while serving or attempting to serve legal process on any other person in connection with the judicial enforcement of any debt;

“(v) any nonprofit organization which, at the request of consumers, performs bona fide consumer credit counseling and assists consumers in the liquidation of their debts by receiving payments from such consumers and distributing such amounts to creditors; and

“(vi) any person collecting or attempting to collect any debt owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another or that has been obtained by assignment or transfer from another to the extent such activity—

“(I) is incidental to a bona fide fiduciary obligation or a bona fide escrow arrangement;

“(II) concerns a debt which was originated by such person;

“(III) concerns a debt which was not in default at the time it was obtained by such person; or

“(IV) concerns a debt obtained by such person as a secured party in a commercial credit transaction involving the creditor.”.

(b) DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES FOR DEBT COLLECTORS HIRED BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 812 (15 U.S.C. 1692j) the following:

“§ 812A. Debt collection practices for debt collectors hired by Federal agencies

“(a) LIMITATION ON TIME TO TURN DEBT OVER TO DEBT COLLECTOR.—A Federal agency that is a creditor may sell or transfer a debt described in section 803(5)(B) to a debt collector not earlier than 90 days after the date on which the obligation or alleged obligation arises.

“(b) REQUIRED NOTICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before transferring or selling a debt described in section 803(5)(B) to a debt collector or contracting with a debt collector to collect such a debt, a Federal agency shall notify the consumer not fewer than 3 times that the Federal agency will take such action.

“(2) FREQUENCY OF NOTIFICATIONS.—The second and third notifications described in paragraph (1) shall be made not less than 30 days after the date on which the previous notification is made.”.

(c) UNFAIR PRACTICES.—Section 808 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692f) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) The collection of any amount (including any interest, fee, charge, or expense incidental to the principal obligation) unless—

“(A) such amount is expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law; or

“(B) in the case of any amount charged by a debt collector collecting a debt for a Federal agency, such amount is—

“(i) reasonable in relation to the actual costs of the collection;

“(ii) authorized by a contract between the debt collector and the Federal agency; and

“(iii) not greater than 10 percent of the amount collected by the debt collector.”.

(d) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall commence a study on the use of debt collectors by Federal, State, and local government agencies, including—

(A) the powers given to the debt collectors by Federal, State, and local government agencies;

(B) the contracting process that allows a Federal, State, or local government agency to award debt collection to a certain company, including the selection process;

(C) any fees charged to debtors in addition to principal and interest on the outstanding debt;

(D) how the fees described in subparagraph (C) vary from State to State;

(E) consumer protection at the State level that offer recourse to those whom debts have been wrongfully attributed;

(F) the revenues received by debt collectors from Federal, State, and local government agencies;

(G) the amount of any revenue sharing agreements between debt collectors and Federal, State, and local government agencies;

(H) the difference in debt collection procedures across geographic regions, including the extent to which debt collectors pursue court judgments to collect debts; and

(I) any legal immunity or other protections given to the debt collectors hired by State and local government agencies, including whether the debt collectors are subject to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692 et seq.).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the completed study required under paragraph (1).

SA 2147. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ACTING OFFICERS AT INDEPENDENT REGULATORY AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3345 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (d),” after “notwithstanding paragraph (1).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) The President may not exercise authority under subsection (a)(2) if the vacant office described in that subsection is at an independent regulatory agency, as defined in section 3502(5) of title 44.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “covered office” means an office—

(i) for which appointment is required to be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(ii) the functions and duties of which the President may direct an individual to perform temporarily in an acting capacity under section 3345(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(iii) that is at an independent regulatory agency; and

(B) the term “independent regulatory agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502(5) of title 44, United States Code.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, an individual who, as of the day before that date, served in a covered office pursuant to direction from the President under section 3345(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, may not continue to serve in that covered office unless, as of the date on which the President issued that direction, the individual was eligible to serve in the covered office under a provision of law other than such section 3345(a)(2).

SA 2148. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike sections 401 and 402.

SA 2149. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ENSURING FREE ACCESS TO CREDIT REPORTS FOR CONSUMERS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Free Access to Credit Reports Act”.

(b) ACCESS.—Section 612 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “ANNUAL”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “once during any 12-month period”; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “once during any 12-month period”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2150. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ACCURACY OF COLLECTED PERSONAL INFORMATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) COVERED DATA BROKER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “covered data broker” includes all data brokers except those data brokers excepted under subparagraph (B).

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Commission may except a data broker if the Commission considers, by rule, a data broker outside the scope of this section, such as a data broker who processes information collected by or on behalf of and received from or on behalf of a nonaffiliated third party concerning an individual who is a customer or an employee of that third party to enable that third party, directly or through parties acting on its behalf, to provide benefits for its employees or directly transact business with its customers.

(3) DATA BROKER.—The term “data broker” means a commercial entity that collects, assembles, or maintains personal information concerning an individual who is not a customer or an employee of that entity in order to sell the information or provide third-party access to the information.

(4) NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION.—The term “non-public information” means information about an individual that is—

(A) of a private nature;

(B) not available to the general public; and

(C) not obtained from a public record.

(5) PUBLIC RECORD INFORMATION.—The term “public record information” means information about an individual that has been obtained originally from records of a Federal, State, or local government entity that are available for public inspection.

(b) PROHIBITION ON OBTAINING OR SOLICITATION TO OBTAIN PERSONAL INFORMATION BY FALSE PRETENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered data broker may not obtain or attempt to obtain, or cause to be disclosed or attempt to cause to be disclosed to any person, personal information or any other information relating to any person by making a false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation to any person, including by providing any document to any person, that the covered data broker knows or should know—

(A) to be forged, counterfeit, lost, stolen, or fraudulently obtained; or

(B) contains a false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation.

(2) SOLICITATION.—A covered data broker may not request a person to obtain personal information, or any other information, relating to any other person if the covered data broker knows or should know that the person to whom the request is made will obtain or attempt to obtain that information in the manner described in paragraph (1).

(c) REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING ACCURACY OF AND ACCESS TO PERSONAL INFORMATION.—

(1) ACCURACY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a covered data broker shall establish procedures to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, the accuracy of—

(i) the personal information it collects, assembles, or maintains; and

(ii) any other information it collects, assembles, or maintains that specifically identifies an individual, unless the information only identifies an individual's name or address.

(B) EXCEPTION.—A covered data broker may collect or maintain information that

may be inaccurate with respect to a particular individual if that information is being collected or maintained solely for the purpose of—

(i) indicating whether there may be a discrepancy or irregularity in the personal information that is associated with an individual;

(ii) helping to identify, or to authenticate the identity of, an individual; or

(iii) helping to protect against or investigate fraud or other unlawful conduct.

(2) CONSUMER ACCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (D), a covered data broker shall provide an individual a means to review any personal information or other information that specifically identifies that individual, that the covered data broker collects, assembles, or maintains on that individual.

(B) REVIEW REQUIREMENTS.—The means for review under subparagraph (A) shall be provided—

(i) at an individual's request;

(ii) after verifying the identity of the individual;

(iii) at least 1 time per year;

(iv) at no cost to the individual; and

(v) in a format that can be readily understood by a consumer, as determined by the Commission.

(C) PERIOD OF REVIEW.—A covered data broker shall provide an individual the means required under subparagraph (A) within such period after receiving a request from such individual as the Commission shall determine, by rule, is appropriate.

(D) EXCEPTIONS.—The Commission may, by rule, establish such exceptions to subparagraph (A) as the Commission considers appropriate, such as for child protection, law enforcement, fraud prevention, or other government purposes.

(E) LIMITATION ON USE OF VERIFYING INFORMATION.—If a covered data broker collects information from an individual to verify the identity of the individual under subparagraph (B)(i) that the data broker did not have before such collection, the data broker may not use such information for any purpose other than for purposes of verifying the identity of the individual under such subparagraph.

(3) DISPUTED INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual whose personal information is maintained by a covered data broker may dispute the accuracy of any information described under paragraph (2)(A) by requesting, in writing, that the covered data broker correct the information.

(B) CORRECTION REQUIREMENTS.—A covered data broker, after verifying the identity of an individual making a request under subparagraph (A) to correct information, and unless there are reasonable grounds to believe the request is frivolous or irrelevant, shall—

(i) with regard to public record information—

(I) inform the individual of the source of the information and, if reasonably available, where to direct the individual's request for correction; or

(II) if the individual provides proof that the public record has been corrected or that the covered data broker was reporting the information incorrectly, correct the inaccuracy in the covered data broker's records; and

(ii) with regard to non-public information—

(I) note the information that is disputed, including the individual's written request;

(II) if the information can be independently verified, use the procedures established

under paragraph (1) to independently verify the information; and

(III) if the covered data broker was reporting the information incorrectly, correct the inaccuracy in the covered data broker's records.

(C) PERIOD OF CORRECTION.—In a case in which a covered data broker is subject to a requirement under subparagraph (B) due to a request made by an individual under subparagraph (A), such covered data broker shall take such action as may be required to satisfy such requirement within such period as the Commission shall determine, by rule, is appropriate.

(4) NOTICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A covered data broker shall maintain an Internet website and place a clear and conspicuous notice on that Internet website instructing an individual how—

(i) to review information under paragraph (2)(A); and

(ii) to express a preference under paragraph (5)(B).

(B) FORM.—A covered data broker shall ensure that the notice the covered data broker places under subparagraph (A) conforms to such model form as the Commission shall promulgate for purposes of this paragraph.

(5) CERTAIN MARKETING INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A covered data broker may not use, share, or sell any information for marketing purposes that is subject to an expressed preference under subparagraph (B).

(B) EXPRESSION OF PREFERENCES.—A covered data broker that maintains any information described under paragraph (1) and that uses, shares, or sells that information for marketing purposes shall provide each individual whose information the covered data broker maintains with a reasonable means of expressing a preference not to have that individual's information used for those purposes.

(6) AUDITING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), each covered data broker shall establish measures that facilitate the auditing or re-tracing of any internal or external access to, or transmission of, any data containing personal information collected, assembled, or maintained by the covered data broker.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Commission may establish, by rule, such exceptions to subparagraph (A) as the Commission considers appropriate to further or protect law enforcement or national security activities.

(7) SECURITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each covered data broker shall develop and implement a comprehensive consumer privacy and data security program to protect against harm that may be caused by—

(i) loss of personal information collected, assembled, or maintained by the covered data broker; or

(ii) unauthorized access, destruction, use, modification, or disclosure of such personal information.

(B) NOTICE.—Whenever a covered data broker determines that personal information of an individual that is collected, assembled, or maintained by the covered data broker has been lost or the subject of an unauthorized access, destruction, use, modification, or disclosure, the covered data broker shall notify such individual of such loss, access, destruction, use, modification, or disclosure.

(8) PERSONS REGULATED BY THE FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—A covered data broker shall be considered to be in compliance with paragraphs (1) through (6) of this subsection with respect to information that is subject to the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et

seq.) if the covered data broker is in compliance with sections 609, 610, and 611 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g, 1681h, 1681i).

(d) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out this section.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Such exceptions the Commission considers appropriate to promulgate under subsection (a)(2)(B).

(B) The period of review required under subsection (c)(2)(C).

(C) Such exceptions as the Commission considers appropriate to promulgate under subsection (c)(2)(D).

(D) The period of correction required under subsection (c)(3)(C).

(E) The model form required by subsection (c)(4)(B).

(F) Requirements for auditing under subparagraph (A) of subsection (c)(6) and such exceptions under subparagraph (B) of such subsection as the Commission considers appropriate.

(G) Establishment of a centralized Internet website for the benefit of consumers that—

(i) lists the covered data brokers that are subject to a requirement of subsection (c); and

(ii) provides information to consumers about their rights under this section.

(H) Such other regulations as the Commission considers appropriate to carry out this section.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(A) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—A violation of subsection (b) or (c) or a regulation promulgated under this section shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or a deceptive act or practice under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(B) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this section.

(ii) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Any person who violates a regulation prescribed under this section shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(2) ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.—

(A) CIVIL ACTION.—Except as provided under subparagraph (E), in any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of that State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by any person subject to a provision of subsection (c) or (d) or a regulation promulgated under this section in a practice that violates such provision or regulation, the attorney general of the State may, as parens patriae, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States—

(i) to enjoin further violation of such provision or regulation by such person;

(ii) to compel compliance with such provision or regulation;

(iii) to obtain damages, restitution, or other compensation on behalf of such residents;

(iv) to obtain such other relief as the court considers appropriate; or

(v) to obtain civil penalties in the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

(B) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

(i) **CALCULATION.**—For purposes of imposing a civil penalty under subparagraph (A)(v), the amount determined under this paragraph is the amount calculated by multiplying the number of separate violations of a rule by an amount not greater than \$16,000.

(ii) **ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.**—Beginning on the date that the Consumer Price Index is first published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that is after 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the amount specified in clause (i) shall be increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index published on that date from the Consumer Price Index published the previous year.

(C) RIGHTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(i) NOTICE TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subclause (III), the attorney general of a State shall notify the Commission in writing that the attorney general intends to bring a civil action under subparagraph (A) before initiating the civil action.

(II) **CONTENTS.**—The notification required by subclause (I) with respect to a civil action shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate the civil action.

(III) **EXCEPTION.**—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notification required by subclause (I) before initiating a civil action under subparagraph (A), the attorney general shall notify the Commission immediately upon instituting the civil action.

(ii) INTERVENTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The Commission may—

(I) intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general of a State under subparagraph (A); and

(II) upon intervening—

(aa) be heard on all matters arising in the civil action; and

(bb) file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.

(D) **INVESTIGATORY POWERS.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of the State to conduct investigations, to administer oaths or affirmations, or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary or other evidence.

(E) **PREEMPTIVE ACTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—If the Commission institutes a civil action or an administrative action with respect to a violation of a provision of subsection (b) or (c) or a regulation promulgated under this section, the attorney general of a State may not, during the pendency of such action, bring a civil action under subparagraph (A) against any defendant named in the complaint of the Commission for the violation with respect to which the Commission instituted such action.

(F) ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to civil actions brought by attorneys general under subparagraph (A), any other officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under subparagraph (A), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this paragraph to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(ii) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating or continuing any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.

(f) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—

(1) **PRESERVATION OF COMMISSION AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this section may be construed in any way to limit or affect the Commission's authority under any other provision of law.

(2) **PRESERVATION OF OTHER FEDERAL LAW.**—Nothing in this section may be construed in any way to supersede, restrict, or limit the application of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) or any other Federal law.

SA 2151. Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—IMPROVING CONSUMER ACCESS TO MORTGAGE CREDIT

Sec. 101. Minimum standards for residential mortgage loans.
Sec. 102. Safeguarding access to habitat for humanity homes.
Sec. 103. Exemption from appraisals of real property located in rural areas.
Sec. 104. Home Mortgage Disclosure Act adjustment and study.
Sec. 105. Credit union residential loans.
Sec. 106. Eliminating barriers to jobs for loan originators.
Sec. 107. Protecting access to manufactured homes.
Sec. 108. Escrow requirements relating to certain consumer credit transactions.
Sec. 109. No wait for lower mortgage rates.

TITLE II—REGULATORY RELIEF AND PROTECTING CONSUMER ACCESS TO CREDIT

Sec. 201. Capital simplification for qualifying community banks.
Sec. 202. Limited exception for reciprocal deposits.
Sec. 203. Community bank relief.
Sec. 204. Removing naming restrictions.
Sec. 205. Short form call reports.
Sec. 206. Option for Federal savings associations to operate as covered savings associations.
Sec. 207. Small bank holding company policy statement.
Sec. 208. Application of the Expedited Funds Availability Act.
Sec. 209. Small public housing agencies.
Sec. 210. Examination cycle.
Sec. 211. International insurance capital standards accountability.
Sec. 212. Budget transparency for the NCUA.
Sec. 213. Making online banking initiation legal and easy.
Sec. 214. Promoting construction and development.

Sec. 215. Reducing identity fraud.

Sec. 216. Treasury report on risks of cyber threats.

Sec. 217. Discretionary surplus funds.

TITLE III—PROTECTIONS FOR VETERANS, CONSUMERS, AND HOMEOWNERS

Sec. 301. Protecting consumers' credit.
Sec. 302. Protecting veterans' credit.
Sec. 303. Immunity from suit for disclosure of financial exploitation of senior citizens.
Sec. 304. Restoration of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009.
Sec. 305. Remediating lead and asbestos hazards.
Sec. 306. Family self-sufficiency program.
Sec. 307. Property Assessed Clean Energy financing.
Sec. 308. GAO report on consumer reporting agencies.
Sec. 309. Protecting veterans from predatory lending.
Sec. 310. Credit score competition.
Sec. 311. GAO report on Puerto Rico foreclosures.
Sec. 312. Report on children's lead-based paint hazard prevention and abatement.
Sec. 313. Foreclosure relief and extension for servicemembers.

TITLE IV—TAILORING REGULATIONS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Sec. 401. Enhanced supervision and prudential standards for certain bank holding companies.
Sec. 402. Supplementary leverage ratio for custodial banks.
Sec. 403. Treatment of certain municipal obligations.

TITLE V—ENCOURAGING CAPITAL FORMATION

Sec. 501. National securities exchange regulatory parity.
Sec. 502. SEC study on algorithmic trading.
Sec. 503. Annual review of government-business forum on capital formation.
Sec. 504. Supporting America's innovators.
Sec. 505. Securities and Exchange Commission overpayment credit.
Sec. 506. U.S. territories investor protection.
Sec. 507. Encouraging employee ownership.
Sec. 508. Improving access to capital.
Sec. 509. Parity for closed-end companies regarding offering and proxy rules.

TITLE VI—PROTECTIONS FOR STUDENT BORROWERS

Sec. 601. Protections in the event of death or bankruptcy.
Sec. 602. Rehabilitation of private education loans.
Sec. 603. Best practices for higher education financial literacy.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY; COMPANY; DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION; DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION HOLDING COMPANY.**—The terms “appropriate Federal banking agency”, “company”, “depository institution”, and “depository institution holding company” have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(2) **BANK HOLDING COMPANY.**—The term “bank holding company” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).

TITLE I—IMPROVING CONSUMER ACCESS TO MORTGAGE CREDIT

SEC. 101. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.

Section 129C(b)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) SAFE HARBOR.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘covered institution’ means an insured depository institution or an insured credit union that, together with its affiliates, has less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets;

“(II) the term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

“(III) the term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

“(IV) the term ‘interest-only’ means that, under the terms of the legal obligation, one or more of the periodic payments may be applied solely to accrued interest and not to loan principal; and

“(V) the term ‘negative amortization’ means payment of periodic payments that will result in an increase in the principal balance under the terms of the legal obligation.

“(ii) SAFE HARBOR.—In this section—

“(I) the term ‘qualified mortgage’ includes any residential mortgage loan—

“(aa) that is originated and retained in portfolio by a covered institution;

“(bb) that is in compliance with the limitations with respect to prepayment penalties described in subsections (c)(1) and (c)(3);

“(cc) that is in compliance with the requirements of clause (vii) of subparagraph (A);

“(dd) that does not have negative amortization or interest-only features; and

“(ee) for which the covered institution considers and documents the debt, income, and financial resources of the consumer in accordance with clause (iv); and

“(II) a residential mortgage loan described in subclause (I) shall be deemed to meet the requirements of subsection (a).

“(iii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—A residential mortgage loan described in clause (ii)(I) shall not qualify for the safe harbor under clause (ii) if the legal title to the residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person unless the residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred—

“(I) to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of a covered institution;

“(II) to a covered institution so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the covered institution to which the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred;

“(III) pursuant to a merger of a covered institution with another person or the acquisition of a covered institution by another person or of another person by a covered institution, so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the person to whom the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred; or

“(IV) to a wholly owned subsidiary of a covered institution, provided that, after the sale, assignment, or transfer, the residential mortgage loan is considered to be an asset of the covered institution for regulatory accounting purposes.

“(iv) CONSIDERATION AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—The consideration and documentation requirements described in clause (ii)(I)(ee) shall—

“(I) not be construed to require compliance with, or documentation in accordance with,

appendix Q to part 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

“(II) be construed to permit multiple methods of documentation.”.

SEC. 102. SAFEGUARDING ACCESS TO HABITAT FOR HUMANITY HOMES.

Section 129E(i)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639e(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking “For purposes of” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO APPRAISAL DONATIONS.—If a fee appraiser voluntarily donates appraisal services to an organization eligible to receive tax-deductible charitable contributions, such voluntary donation shall be considered customary and reasonable for the purposes of paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 103. EXEMPTION FROM APPRAISALS OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED IN RURAL AREAS.

Title XI of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1127. EXEMPTION FROM APPRAISALS OF REAL ESTATE LOCATED IN RURAL AREAS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘mortgage originator’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602); and

“(2) the term ‘transaction value’ means the amount of a loan or extension of credit, including a loan or extension of credit that is part of a pool of loans or extensions of credit.

“(b) APPRAISAL NOT REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subsection (d), notwithstanding any other provision of law, an appraisal in connection with a federally related transaction involving real property or an interest in real property is not required if—

“(1) the real property or interest in real property is located in a rural area, as described in section 1026.35(b)(2)(iv)(A) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(2) not later than 3 days after the date on which the Closing Disclosure Form, made in accordance with the final rule of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection entitled ‘Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)’ (78 Fed. Reg. 79730 (December 31, 2013)), relating to the federally related transaction is given to the consumer, the mortgage originator or its agent, directly or indirectly—

“(A) has contacted not fewer than 3 State certified appraisers or State licensed appraisers, as applicable, on the mortgage originator’s approved appraiser list in the market area in accordance with part 226 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(B) has documented that no State certified appraiser or State licensed appraiser, as applicable, was available within 5 business days beyond customary and reasonable fee and timeliness standards for comparable appraisal assignments, as documented by the mortgage originator or its agent;

“(3) the transaction value is less than \$400,000; and

“(4) the mortgage originator is subject to oversight by a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency.

“(c) SALE, ASSIGNMENT, OR TRANSFER.—A mortgage originator that makes a loan without an appraisal under the terms of subsection (b) shall not sell, assign, or otherwise transfer legal title to the loan unless—

“(1) the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of the mortgage originator;

“(2) the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person regulated by a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency, so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the person;

“(3) the sale, assignment, or transfer is pursuant to a merger of the mortgage originator with another person or the acquisition of the mortgage originator by another person or of another person by the mortgage originator; or

“(4) the sale, loan, or transfer is to a wholly owned subsidiary of the mortgage originator, provided that, after the sale, assignment, or transfer, the loan is considered to be an asset of the mortgage originator for regulatory accounting purposes.

“(d) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply if—

“(1) a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency requires an appraisal under section 225.63(c), 323.3(c), 34.43(c), or 722.3(e) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(2) the loan is a high-cost mortgage, as defined in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602).

“(e) ANTI-EVASION.—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall ensure that any mortgage originator that the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency oversees that makes a significant amount of loans under subsection (b) is complying with the requirements of subsection (b)(2) with respect to each loan.”.

SEC. 104. HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT ADJUSTMENT AND STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (i) as paragraph (3) and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following:

“(i) EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) CLOSED-END MORTGAGE LOANS.—With respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to closed-end mortgage loans if the insured depository institution or insured credit union originated fewer than 500 closed-end mortgage loans in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.

“(2) OPEN-END LINES OF CREDIT.—With respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to open-end lines of credit if the insured depository institution or insured credit union originated fewer than 500 open-end lines of credit in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.

“(3) REQUIRED COMPLIANCE.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), an insured depository institution shall comply with paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) if the insured depository institution has received a rating of ‘needs to improve record of meeting community credit needs’ during each of its 2 most recent examinations or a rating of ‘substantial noncompliance in meeting community credit needs’ on its most recent examination under section 807(b)(2) of the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2906(b)(2)).”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(o) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752); and

“(2) the term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).”.

(b) LOOKBACK STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—Not earlier than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to evaluate the impact of the amendments made by subsection (a) on the amount of data available under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) at the national and local level.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that includes the findings and conclusions of the Comptroller General with respect to the study required under paragraph (1).

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 304(i)(3) of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, as so redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking “section 303(2)(A)” and inserting “section 303(3)(A)”.
SEC. 105. CREDIT UNION RESIDENTIAL LOANS.

(a) REMOVAL FROM MEMBER BUSINESS LOAN LIMITATION.—Section 107A(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “that is the primary residence of a member”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendment made by this section shall preclude the National Credit Union Administration from treating an extension of credit that is fully secured by a lien on a 1- to 4-family dwelling that is not the primary residence of a member as a member business loan for purposes other than the member business loan limitation requirements under section 107A of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a).
SEC. 106. ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO JOBS FOR LOAN ORIGINATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“**SEC. 1518. EMPLOYMENT TRANSITION OF LOAN ORIGINATORS.**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPLICATION STATE.—The term ‘application State’ means a State in which a registered loan originator or a State-licensed loan originator seeks to be licensed.

“(2) STATE-LICENSED MORTGAGE COMPANY.—The term ‘State-licensed mortgage company’ means an entity that is licensed or registered under the law of any State to engage in residential mortgage loan origination and processing activities.

“(b) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ORIGINATE LOANS FOR LOAN ORIGINATORS MOVING FROM A DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION TO A NON-DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon becoming employed by a State-licensed mortgage company, an individual who is a registered loan originator shall be deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State for the period described in paragraph (2) if the individual—

“(A) has not had—

“(i) an application for a loan originator license denied; or

“(ii) a loan originator license revoked or suspended in any governmental jurisdiction;

“(B) has not been subject to, or served with, a cease and desist order—

“(i) in any governmental jurisdiction; or

“(ii) under section 1514(c);

“(C) has not been convicted of a misdemeanor or felony that would preclude licensure under the law of the application State;

“(D) has submitted an application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State; and

“(E) was registered in the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as a loan originator during the 1-year period preceding the date on which the information required under section 1505(a) is submitted.

“(2) PERIOD.—The period described in this paragraph shall begin on the date on which an individual described in paragraph (1) submits the information required under section 1505(a) and shall end on the earliest of the date—

“(A) on which the individual withdraws the application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State;

“(B) on which the application State denies, or issues a notice of intent to deny, the application;

“(C) on which the application State grants a State license; or

“(D) that is 120 days after the date on which the individual submits the application, if the application is listed on the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as incomplete.

“(c) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ORIGINATE LOANS FOR STATE-LICENSED LOAN ORIGINATORS MOVING INTERSTATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State-licensed loan originator shall be deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State for the period described in paragraph (2) if the State-licensed loan originator—

“(A) meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (b)(1);

“(B) is employed by a State-licensed mortgage company in the application State; and

“(C) was licensed in a State that is not the application State during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the information required under section 1505(a) was submitted in connection with the application submitted to the application State.

“(2) PERIOD.—The period described in this paragraph shall begin on the date on which the State-licensed loan originator submits the information required under section 1505(a) in connection with the application submitted to the application State and end on the earliest of the date—

“(A) on which the State-licensed loan originator withdraws the application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State;

“(B) on which the application State denies, or issues a notice of intent to deny, the application;

“(C) on which the application State grants a State license; or

“(D) that is 120 days after the date on which the State-licensed loan originator submits the application, if the application is listed on the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as incomplete.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) EMPLOYER OF LOAN ORIGINATORS.—Any person employing an individual who is deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State under this section shall be subject to the re-

quirements of this title and to applicable State law to the same extent as if that individual was a State-licensed loan originator licensed by the application State.

“(2) ENGAGING IN MORTGAGE LOAN ACTIVITIES.—Any individual who is deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State under this section and who engages in residential mortgage loan origination activities shall be subject to the requirements of this title and to applicable State law to the same extent as if that individual was a State-licensed loan originator licensed by the application State.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 4501 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1517 the following:

“Sec. 1518. Employment transition of loan originators.”.

(c) CIVIL LIABILITY.—Section 1513 of the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5112) is amended by striking “persons who are loan originators or are applying for licensing or registration as loan originators.” and inserting “persons who—

“(1) have applied, are applying, or are licensed or registered through the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry; and

“(2) work in an industry with respect to which persons were licensed or registered through the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry on the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. PROTECTING ACCESS TO MANUFACTURED HOMES.

Section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (cc) (relating to definitions relating to mortgage origination and residential mortgage loans) and subsection (dd) as subsections (dd) and (ee), respectively; and

(2) in paragraph (2) of subsection (dd), as so redesignated, by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) does not include any person who is—

“(i) not otherwise described in subparagraph (A) or (B) and who performs purely administrative or clerical tasks on behalf of a person who is described in any such subparagraph; or

“(ii) a retailer of manufactured or modular homes or an employee of the retailer if the retailer or employee, as applicable—

“(I) does not receive compensation or gain for engaging in activities described in subparagraph (A) that is in excess of any compensation or gain received in a comparable cash transaction;

“(II) discloses to the consumer—

“(aa) in writing any corporate affiliation with any creditor; and

“(bb) if the retailer has a corporate affiliation with any creditor, at least 1 unaffiliated creditor; and

“(III) does not directly negotiate with the consumer or lender on loan terms (including rates, fees, and other costs).”.

SEC. 108. ESCROW REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS.

Section 129D of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through

(D), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking “The Board” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Bureau”;

(C) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking “the Board” each place that term appears and inserting “the Bureau”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) TREATMENT OF LOANS HELD BY SMALLER INSTITUTIONS.—The Bureau shall, by regulation, exempt from the requirements of subsection (a) any loan made by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union secured by a first lien on the principal dwelling of a consumer if—

“(A) the insured depository institution or insured credit union has assets of \$10,000,000,000 or less;

“(B) during the preceding calendar year, the insured depository institution or insured credit union and its affiliates originated 1,000 or fewer loans secured by a first lien on a principal dwelling; and

“(C) the transaction satisfies the criteria in sections 1026.35(b)(2)(iii)(A), 1026.35(b)(2)(iii)(D), and 1026.35(b)(2)(v) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.”; and

(2) in subsection (i), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

“(4) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).”.

SEC. 109. NO WAIT FOR LOWER MORTGAGE RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 129(b) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) NO WAIT FOR LOWER RATE.—If a creditor extends to a consumer a second offer of credit with a lower annual percentage rate, the transaction may be consummated without regard to the period specified in paragraph (1) with respect to the second offer.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, whereas the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection issued a final rule entitled “Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)” (78 Fed. Reg. 79730 (December 31, 2013)) (in this subsection referred to as the “TRID Rule”) to combine the disclosures a consumer receives in connection with applying for and closing on a mortgage loan, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection should endeavor to provide clearer, authoritative guidance on—

(1) the applicability of the TRID Rule to mortgage assumption transactions;

(2) the applicability of the TRID Rule to construction-to-permanent home loans, and the conditions under which those loans can be properly originated; and

(3) the extent to which lenders can rely on model disclosures published by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection without liability if recent changes to regulations are not reflected in the sample TRID Rule forms published by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

TITLE II—REGULATORY RELIEF AND PROTECTING CONSUMER ACCESS TO CREDIT

SEC. 201. CAPITAL SIMPLIFICATION FOR QUALIFYING COMMUNITY BANKS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNITY BANK LEVERAGE RATIO.—The term “Community Bank Leverage Ratio” means the ratio of the tangible equity capital of a qualifying community bank, as reported on the qualifying community bank’s applicable regulatory filing with the qualifying community bank’s appropriate Federal banking agency, to the average total consolidated assets of the qualifying community bank, as reported on the qualifying community bank’s applicable regulatory filing with the qualifying community bank’s appropriate Federal banking agency.

(2) GENERALLY APPLICABLE LEVERAGE CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS; GENERALLY APPLICABLE RISK-BASED CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.—The terms “generally applicable leverage capital requirements” and “generally applicable risk-based capital requirements” have the meanings given those terms in section 171(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5371(a)).

(3) QUALIFYING COMMUNITY BANK.—

(A) ASSET THRESHOLD.—The term “qualifying community bank” means a depository institution or depository institution holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$10,000,000,000.

(B) RISK PROFILE.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies may determine that a depository institution or depository institution holding company (or a class of depository institutions or depository institution holding companies) described in subparagraph (A) is not a qualifying community bank based on the depository institution’s or depository institution holding company’s risk profile, which shall be based on consideration of—

- (i) off-balance sheet exposures;
- (ii) trading assets and liabilities;
- (iii) total notional derivatives exposures; and

(iv) such other factors as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate.

(b) COMMUNITY BANK LEVERAGE RATIO.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall, through notice and comment rule making under section 553 of title 5, United States Code—

(1) develop a Community Bank Leverage Ratio of not less than 8 percent and not more than 10 percent for qualifying community banks; and

(2) establish procedures for treatment of a qualifying community bank that has a Community Bank Leverage Ratio that falls below the percentage developed under paragraph (1) after exceeding the percentage developed under paragraph (1).

(c) CAPITAL COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any qualifying community bank that exceeds the Community Bank Leverage Ratio developed under subsection (b)(1) shall be considered to have met—

(A) the generally applicable leverage capital requirements and the generally applicable risk-based capital requirements;

(B) in the case of a qualifying community bank that is a depository institution, the capital ratio requirements that are required in order to be considered well capitalized under section 38 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831o) and any regulation implementing that section; and

(C) any other capital or leverage requirements to which the qualifying community bank is subject.

(2) EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall limit the authority of the appropriate Federal banking agencies as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) CONSULTATION.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall—

(1) consult with the applicable State bank supervisors in carrying out this section; and

(2) notify the applicable State bank supervisor of any qualifying community bank that it supervises that exceeds, or does not exceed after previously exceeding, the Community Bank Leverage ratio developed under subsection (b)(1).

SEC. 202. LIMITED EXCEPTION FOR RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 29 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) LIMITED EXCEPTION FOR RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Reciprocal deposits of an agent institution shall not be considered to be funds obtained, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker to the extent that the total amount of such reciprocal deposits does not exceed the lesser of—

“(A) \$5,000,000,000; or

“(B) an amount equal to 20 percent of the total liabilities of the agent institution.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) AGENT INSTITUTION.—The term ‘agent institution’ means an insured depository institution that places a covered deposit through a deposit placement network at other insured depository institutions in amounts that are less than or equal to the standard maximum deposit insurance amount, specifying the interest rate to be paid for such amounts, if the insured depository institution—

“(i)(I) when most recently examined under section 10(d) was found to have a composite condition of outstanding or good; and

“(II) is well capitalized;

“(ii) has obtained a waiver pursuant to subsection (c); or

“(iii) does not receive an amount of reciprocal deposits that causes the total amount of reciprocal deposits held by the agent institution to be greater than the average of the total amount of reciprocal deposits held by the agent institution on the last day of each of the 4 calendar quarters preceding the calendar quarter in which the agent institution was found not to have a composite condition of outstanding or good or was determined to be not well capitalized.

“(B) COVERED DEPOSIT.—The term ‘covered deposit’ means a deposit that—

“(i) is submitted for placement through a deposit placement network by an agent institution; and

“(ii) does not consist of funds that were obtained for the agent institution, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker before submission for placement through a deposit placement network.

“(C) DEPOSIT PLACEMENT NETWORK.—The term ‘deposit placement network’ means a network in which an insured depository institution participates, together with other insured depository institutions, for the processing and receipt of reciprocal deposits.

“(D) NETWORK MEMBER BANK.—The term ‘network member bank’ means an insured depository institution that is a member of a deposit placement network.

“(E) RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.—The term ‘reciprocal deposits’ means deposits received by an agent institution through a deposit placement network with the same maturity (if any) and in the same aggregate amount as covered deposits placed by the agent institution in other network member banks.

“(F) WELL CAPITALIZED.—The term ‘well capitalized’ has the meaning given the term in section 38(b)(1).”.

(b) INTEREST RATE RESTRICTION.—Section 29 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831f) is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) RESTRICTION ON INTEREST RATE PAID.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘agent institution’, ‘reciprocal deposits’, and ‘well capitalized’ have the meanings given those terms in subsection (i); and

“(B) the term ‘covered insured depository institution’ means an insured depository institution that—

“(i) under subsection (c) or (d), accepts funds obtained, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker; or

“(ii) while acting as an agent institution under subsection (i), accepts reciprocal deposits while not well capitalized.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—A covered insured depository institution may not pay a rate of interest on funds or reciprocal deposits described in paragraph (1) that, at the time that the funds or reciprocal deposits are accepted, significantly exceeds the limit set forth in paragraph (3).

“(3) LIMIT ON INTEREST RATES.—The limit on the rate of interest referred to in paragraph (2) shall be—

“(A) the rate paid on deposits of similar maturity in the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution for deposits accepted in the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution; or

“(B) the national rate paid on deposits of comparable maturity, as established by the Corporation, for deposits accepted outside the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution.”.

SEC. 203. COMMUNITY BANK RELIEF.

Section 13(h)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, in the second sentence, by striking “institution that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity, if—” and inserting the following: “institution—

“(A) that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity, if—”;

(4) in clause (iv)(II), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) that does not have and is not controlled by a company that has—

“(i) more than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

“(ii) total trading assets and trading liabilities, as reported on the most recent applicable regulatory filing filed by the institution, that are more than 5 percent of total consolidated assets.”.

SEC. 204. REMOVING NAMING RESTRICTIONS.

Section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(G)(vi), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, except that the hedge fund or private equity fund may share the same name or a variation of the same name as a banking entity that is an investment adviser to the hedge fund or private equity fund, if—

“(I) such investment adviser is not an insured depository institution, a company that controls an insured depository institution, or a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3106);

“(II) such investment adviser does not share the same name or a variation of the same name as an insured depository institution, any company that controls an insured depository institution, or any company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3106); and

“(III) such name does not contain the word ‘bank’”; and

(2) in subsection (h)(5)(C), by inserting before the period the following: “, except as permitted under subsection (d)(1)(G)(vi)”.

SEC. 205. SHORT FORM CALL REPORTS.

Section 7(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) SHORT FORM REPORTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall issue regulations that allow for a reduced reporting requirement for a covered depository institution when the institution makes the first and third report of condition for a year, as required under paragraph (3).

“(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered depository institution’ means an insured depository institution that—

“(i) has less than \$5,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

“(ii) satisfies such other criteria as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate.”.

SEC. 206. OPTION FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS TO OPERATE AS COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.

The Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 (12 U.S.C. 1464) the following:

“SEC. 5A. ELECTION TO OPERATE AS A COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATION.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘covered savings association’ means a Federal savings association that makes an election that is approved under subsection (b).

“(b) ELECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the rules issued under subsection (f), a Federal savings association with total consolidated assets equal to or less than \$20,000,000,000, as reported by the association to the Comptroller as of December 31, 2017, may elect to operate as a covered savings association by submitting a notice to the Comptroller of that election.

“(2) APPROVAL.—A Federal savings association shall be deemed to be approved to operate as a covered savings association beginning on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Comptroller receives the notice submitted under paragraph (1), unless the Comptroller notifies the Federal savings association that the Federal savings association is not eligible.

“(c) RIGHTS AND DUTIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this section, a covered savings association shall—

“(1) have the same rights and privileges as a national bank that has the main office of the national bank situated in the same location as the home office of the covered savings association; and

“(2) be subject to the same duties, restrictions, penalties, liabilities, conditions, and limitations that would apply to a national bank described in paragraph (1).

“(d) TREATMENT OF COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—A covered savings association shall be treated as a Federal savings association for the purposes—

“(1) of governance of the covered savings association, including incorporation, bylaws, boards of directors, shareholders, and distribution of dividends;

“(2) of consolidation, merger, dissolution, conversion (including conversion to a stock bank or to another charter), conservatorship, and receivership; and

“(3) determined by regulation of the Comptroller.

“(e) EXISTING BRANCHES.—A covered savings association may continue to operate any branch or agency that the covered savings association operated on the date on which an election under subsection (b) is approved.

“(f) RULE MAKING.—The Comptroller shall issue rules to carry out this section—

“(1) that establish streamlined standards and procedures that clearly identify required documentation and timelines for an election under subsection (b);

“(2) that require a Federal savings association that makes an election under subsection (b) to identify specific assets and subsidiaries that—

“(A) do not conform to the requirements for assets and subsidiaries of a national bank; and

“(B) are held by the Federal savings association on the date on which the Federal savings association submits a notice of the election;

“(3) that establish—

“(A) a transition process for bringing the assets and subsidiaries described in paragraph (2) into conformance with the requirements for a national bank; and

“(B) procedures for allowing the Federal savings association to submit to the Comptroller an application to continue to hold assets and subsidiaries described in paragraph (2) after electing to operate as a covered savings association;

“(4) that establish standards and procedures to allow a covered savings association to—

“(A) terminate an election under subsection (b) after an appropriate period of time; and

“(B) make a subsequent election under subsection (b) after terminating an election under subparagraph (A);

“(5) that clarify requirements for the treatment of covered savings associations, including the provisions of law that apply to covered savings associations; and

“(6) as the Comptroller determines necessary in the interests of safety and soundness.

“(g) GRANDFATHERED COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—Subject to the rules issued under subsection (f), a covered savings association may continue to operate as a covered savings association if, after the date on which the election is made under subsection (b), the covered savings association has total consolidated assets greater than \$20,000,000,000.”.

SEC. 207. SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD.—The term “Board” means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(2) SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY.—The term “savings and loan holding company” has the meaning given the term in section 10(a) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(a)).

(b) CHANGES REQUIRED TO SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT ON ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL AND MANAGERIAL FACTORS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall revise appendix C to part 225 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the “Small Bank Holding Company and Savings and Loan Holding Company Policy Statement”), to raise the consolidated asset threshold under that appendix from \$1,000,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000 for any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company that—

(1) is not engaged in significant non-banking activities either directly or through a nonbank subsidiary;

(2) does not conduct significant off-balance sheet activities (including securitization and asset management or administration) either directly or through a nonbank subsidiary; and

(3) does not have a material amount of debt or equity securities outstanding (other than trust preferred securities) that are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(c) EXCLUSIONS.—The Board may exclude any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company, regardless of asset size, from the revision under subsection (b) if the Board determines that such action is warranted for supervisory purposes.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 171(b)(5) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5371(b)(5)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company that is subject to the application of appendix C to part 225 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the ‘Small Bank Holding Company and Savings and Loan Holding Company Policy Statement’).”

SEC. 208. APPLICATION OF THE EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 602 (12 U.S.C. 4001)—

(A) in paragraph (20), by inserting “, located in the United States,” after “ATM”;

(B) in paragraph (21), by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam,” after “Puerto Rico,”; and

(C) in paragraph (23), by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam,” after “Puerto Rico,”; and

(2) in section 603(d)(2)(A) (12 U.S.C. 4002(d)(2)(A)), by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam,” after “Puerto Rico.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 209. SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.

(a) SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.—Title I of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 38. SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—The term ‘housing voucher program’ means a program for tenant-based assistance under section 8.

“(2) SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The term ‘small public housing agency’ means a public housing agency—

“(A) for which the sum of the number of public housing dwelling units administered

by the agency and the number of vouchers under section 8(o) administered by the agency is 550 or fewer; and

“(B) that predominantly operates in a rural area, as described in section 1026.35(b)(2)(iv)(A) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(3) TROUBLED SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The term ‘troubled small public housing agency’ means a small public housing agency designated by the Secretary as a troubled small public housing agency under subsection (c)(3).

“(b) APPLICABILITY.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, a small public housing agency shall be subject to the same requirements as a public housing agency.

“(c) PROGRAM INSPECTIONS AND EVALUATIONS.—

“(1) PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS.—

“(A) FREQUENCY OF INSPECTIONS BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall carry out an inspection of the physical condition of a small public housing agency’s public housing projects not more frequently than once every 3 years, unless the agency has been designated by the Secretary as a troubled small public housing agency based on deficiencies in the physical condition of its public housing projects. Nothing contained in this subparagraph relieves the Secretary from conducting lead safety inspections or assessments in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary under section 302 of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4822).

“(B) STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall apply to small public housing agencies the same standards for the acceptable condition of public housing projects that apply to projects assisted under section 8.

“(2) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Except as required by section 8(o)(8)(F), a small public housing agency administering assistance under section 8(o) shall make periodic physical inspections of each assisted dwelling unit not less frequently than once every 3 years to determine whether the unit is maintained in accordance with the requirements under section 8(o)(8)(A). Nothing contained in this paragraph relieves a small public housing agency from conducting lead safety inspections or assessments in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary under section 302 of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4822).

“(3) TROUBLED SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.—

“(A) PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency with respect to the public housing program of the small public housing agency if the Secretary determines that the agency has failed to maintain the public housing units of the small public housing agency in a satisfactory physical condition, based upon an inspection conducted by the Secretary.

“(B) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency with respect to the housing voucher program of the small public housing agency if the Secretary determines that the agency has failed to comply with the inspection requirements under paragraph (2).

“(C) APPEALS.—

“(i) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an appeals process under which a small public housing agency may dispute a designation as a troubled small public housing agency.

“(ii) OFFICIAL.—The appeals process established under clause (i) shall provide for a decision by an official who has not been involved, and is not subordinate to a person who has been involved, in the original determination to designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency.

“(D) CORRECTIVE ACTION AGREEMENT.—

“(i) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a small public housing agency is designated as a troubled public housing agency under subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary and the small public housing agency shall enter into a corrective action agreement under which the small public housing agency shall undertake actions to correct the deficiencies upon which the designation is based.

“(ii) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—A corrective action agreement entered into under clause (i) shall—

“(I) have a term of 1 year, and shall be renewable at the option of the Secretary;

“(II) provide, where feasible, for technical assistance to assist the public housing agency in curing its deficiencies;

“(III) provide for—

“(aa) reconsideration of the designation of the small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency not less frequently than annually; and

“(bb) termination of the agreement when the Secretary determines that the small public housing agency is no longer a troubled small public housing agency; and

“(IV) provide that in the event of substantial noncompliance by the small public housing agency under the agreement, the Secretary may—

“(aa) contract with another public housing agency or a private entity to manage the public housing of the troubled small public housing agency;

“(bb) withhold funds otherwise distributable to the troubled small public housing agency;

“(cc) assume possession of, and direct responsibility for, managing the public housing of the troubled small public housing agency;

“(dd) petition for the appointment of a receiver, in accordance with section 6(j)(3)(A)(ii); and

“(ee) exercise any other remedy available to the Secretary in the event of default under the public housing annual contributions contract entered into by the small public housing agency under section 5.

“(E) EMERGENCY ACTIONS.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prohibit the Secretary from taking any emergency action necessary to protect Federal financial resources or the health or safety of residents of public housing projects.

“(d) REDUCTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS.—

“(1) EXEMPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a small public housing agency shall be exempt from any environmental review requirements with respect to a development or modernization project having a total cost of not more than \$100,000.

“(2) STREAMLINED PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, by rule, establish streamlined procedures for environmental reviews of small public housing agency development and modernization projects having a total cost of more than \$100,000.”

(b) ENERGY CONSERVATION.—Section 9(e)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) FREEZE OF CONSUMPTION LEVELS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A small public housing agency, as defined in section 38(a), may elect to be paid for its utility and waste management costs under the formula for a period, at the discretion of the small public housing agency, of not more than 20 years based on the small public housing agency’s average annual consumption during the 3-year period preceding the year in which the election is made (in this subparagraph referred to as the ‘consumption base level’).”

“(ii) INITIAL ADJUSTMENT IN CONSUMPTION BASE LEVEL.—The Secretary shall make an initial one-time adjustment in the consumption base level to account for differences in the heating degree day average over the most recent 20-year period compared to the average in the consumption base level.”

“(iii) ADJUSTMENTS IN CONSUMPTION BASE LEVEL.—The Secretary shall make adjustments in the consumption base level to account for an increase or reduction in units, a change in fuel source, a change in resident controlled electricity consumption, or for other reasons.”

“(iv) SAVINGS.—All cost savings resulting from an election made by a small public housing agency under this subparagraph—

“(I) shall accrue to the small public housing agency; and

“(II) may be used for any public housing purpose at the discretion of the small public housing agency.”

“(v) THIRD PARTIES.—A small public housing agency making an election under this subparagraph—

“(I) may use, but shall not be required to use, the services of a third party in its energy conservation program; and

“(II) shall have the sole discretion to determine the source, and terms and conditions, of any financing used for its energy conservation program.”

(c) REPORTING BY AGENCIES OPERATING IN CONSORTIA.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop and deploy all electronic information systems necessary to accommodate full consolidated reporting by public housing agencies, as defined in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)), electing to operate in consortia under section 13(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437k(a)).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) SHARED WAITING LISTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make available to interested public housing agencies and owners of multifamily properties receiving assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development 1 or more software programs that will facilitate the voluntary use of a shared waiting list by multiple public housing agencies or owners receiving assistance, and shall publish on the website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development procedural guidance for implementing shared waiting lists that includes information on how to obtain the software.

SEC. 210. EXAMINATION CYCLE.

Section 10(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (10), by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000,000”.

SEC. 211. INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall support increasing transparency at any global insurance or international standard-setting regulatory or supervisory forum in which they participate, including supporting and advocating for greater public observer access to working groups and committee meetings of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors; and

(2) to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office take a position or reasonably intend to take a position with respect to an insurance proposal by a global insurance regulatory or supervisory forum, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall achieve consensus positions with State insurance regulators through the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, when they are United States participants in negotiations on insurance issues before the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, Financial Stability Board, or any other international forum of financial regulators or supervisors that considers such issues.

(b) INSURANCE POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Insurance Policy Advisory Committee on International Capital Standards and Other Insurance Issues at the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of not more than 21 members, all of whom represent a diverse set of expert perspectives from the various sectors of the United States insurance industry, including life insurance, property and casualty insurance and reinsurance, agents and brokers, academics, consumer advocates, or experts on issues facing underserved insurance communities and consumers.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS AND TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or their designee, shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, an annual report and provide annual testimony to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives on the efforts of the Secretary and the Chairman with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners with respect to global insurance regulatory or supervisory forums, including—

(i) a description of the insurance regulatory or supervisory standard-setting issues under discussion at international standard-setting bodies, including the Financial Stability Board and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors;

(ii) a description of the effects that proposals discussed at international insurance regulatory or supervisory forums of insurance could have on consumer and insurance markets in the United States;

(iii) a description of any position taken by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of

Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office in international insurance discussions; and

(iv) a description of the efforts by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office to increase transparency at the Financial Stability Board with respect to insurance proposals and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, including efforts to provide additional public access to working groups and committees of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors.

(B) TERMINATION.—This paragraph shall terminate on December 31, 2024.

(2) REPORTS AND TESTIMONY BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—The National Association of Insurance Commissioners may provide testimony to Congress on the issues described in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) JOINT REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL INSURANCE OFFICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall, in consultation with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, complete a study on, and submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, the impact on consumers and markets in the United States before supporting or consenting to the adoption of any final international insurance capital standard.

(B) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—

(i) NOTICE.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall provide public notice before the date on which drafting a report required under subparagraph (A) is commenced and after the date on which the draft of the report is completed.

(ii) OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT.—There shall be an opportunity for public comment for a period beginning on the date on which the report is submitted under subparagraph (A) and ending on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the report is submitted.

(C) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall submit to the Comptroller General of the United States the report described in subparagraph (A) for review.

(4) REPORT ON INCREASE IN TRANSPARENCY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Secretary of the Treasury, or their designees, shall submit to Congress a report and provide testimony to Congress on the efforts of the Chairman and the Secretary to increase transparency at meetings of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors.

SEC. 212. BUDGET TRANSPARENCY FOR THE NCUA.

Section 209(b) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1789(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) on an annual basis and prior to the submission of the detailed business-type budget required under paragraph (2)—

“(A) make publicly available and publish in the Federal Register a draft of the detailed business-type budget; and

“(B) hold a public hearing, with public notice provided of the hearing, during which the public may submit comments on the draft of the detailed business-type budget;” and

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting “detailed” after “submit a”; and

(B) by inserting “, which shall address any comment submitted by the public under paragraph (1)(B)” after “Control Act”.

SEC. 213. MAKING ONLINE BANKING INITIATION LEGAL AND EASY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AFFILIATE.**—The term “affiliate” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).

(2) **DRIVER'S LICENSE.**—The term “driver's license” means a license issued by a State to an individual that authorizes the individual to operate a motor vehicle on public streets, roads, or highways.

(3) **FEDERAL BANK SECRECY LAWS.**—The term “Federal bank secrecy laws” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) section 123 of Public Law 91-508 (12 U.S.C. 1953); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “financial institution” means—

(A) an insured depository institution;

(B) an insured credit union; or

(C) any affiliate of an insured depository institution or insured credit union.

(5) **FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE.**—The term “financial product or service” has the meaning given the term in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(6) **INSURED CREDIT UNION.**—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(7) **INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—The term “insured depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(8) **ONLINE SERVICE.**—The term “online service” means any Internet-based service, such as a website or mobile application.

(9) **PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.**—The term “personal identification card” means an identification document issued by a State or local government to an individual solely for the purpose of identification of that individual.

(10) **PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—The term “personal information” means the information displayed on or electronically encoded on a driver's license or personal identification card that is reasonably necessary to fulfill the purpose and uses permitted by subsection (b).

(11) **SCAN.**—The term “scan” means the act of using a device or software to decipher, in an electronically readable format, personal information displayed on or electronically encoded on a driver's license or personal identification card.

(12) **STATE.**—The term “State” means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other commonwealth, possession, or territory of the United States.

(b) **USE OF A DRIVER'S LICENSE OR PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When an individual initiates a request through an online service to

open an account with a financial institution or obtain a financial product or service from a financial institution, the financial institution may record personal information from a scan of the driver's license or personal identification card of the individual, or make a copy or receive an image of the driver's license or personal identification card of the individual, and store or retain such information in any electronic format for the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(2) **USES OF INFORMATION.**—Except as required to comply with Federal bank secrecy laws, a financial institution may only use the information obtained under paragraph (1)—

(A) to verify the authenticity of the driver's license or personal identification card;

(B) to verify the identity of the individual; and

(C) to comply with a legal requirement to record, retain, or transmit the personal information in connection with opening an account or obtaining a financial product or service.

(3) **DELETION OF IMAGE.**—A financial institution that makes a copy or receives an image of a driver's license or personal identification card of an individual in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, after using the image for the purposes described in paragraph (2), permanently delete—

(A) any image of the driver's license or personal identification card, as applicable; and

(B) any copy of any such image.

(4) **DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend, modify, or otherwise affect any State or Federal law that governs a financial institution's disclosure and security of personal information that is not publicly available.

(c) **RELATION TO STATE LAW.**—The provisions of this section shall preempt and supersede any State law that conflicts with a provision of this section, but only to the extent of such conflict.

SEC. 214. PROMOTING CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 51. CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, OR CONSTRUCTION LOANS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The appropriate Federal banking agencies may only require a depository institution to assign a heightened risk weight to a high volatility commercial real estate (HVCRE) exposure (as such term is defined under section 324.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as of October 11, 2017, or if a successor regulation is in effect as of the date of the enactment of this section, such term or any successor term contained in such successor regulation) under any risk-based capital requirement if such exposure is an HVCRE ADC loan.

“(b) **HVCRE ADC LOAN DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section and with respect to a depository institution, the term ‘HVCRE ADC loan’—

“(1) means a credit facility secured by land or improved real property that, prior to being reclassified by the depository institution as a non-HVCRE ADC loan pursuant to subsection (d)—

“(A) primarily finances, has financed, or refinances the acquisition, development, or construction of real property;

“(B) has the purpose of providing financing to acquire, develop, or improve such real property into income-producing real property; and

“(C) is dependent upon future income or sales proceeds from, or refinancing of, such real property for the repayment of such credit facility;

“(2) does not include a credit facility financing—

“(A) the acquisition, development, or construction of properties that are—

“(i) one- to four-family residential properties;

“(ii) real property that would qualify as an investment in community development; or

“(iii) agricultural land;

“(B) the acquisition or refinancing of existing income-producing real property secured by a mortgage on such property, if the cash flow being generated by the real property is sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution's applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings;

“(C) improvements to existing income-producing improved real property secured by a mortgage on such property, if the cash flow being generated by the real property is sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution's applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings; or

“(D) commercial real property projects in which—

“(i) the loan-to-value ratio is less than or equal to the applicable maximum supervisory loan-to-value ratio as determined by the appropriate Federal banking agency;

“(ii) the borrower has contributed capital of at least 15 percent of the real property's appraised, ‘as completed’ value to the project in the form of—

“(I) cash;

“(II) unencumbered readily marketable assets;

“(III) paid development expenses out-of-pocket; or

“(IV) contributed real property or improvements; and

“(iii) the borrower contributed the minimum amount of capital described under clause (ii) before the depository institution advances funds (other than the advance of a nominal sum made in order to secure the depository institution's lien against the real property) under the credit facility, and such minimum amount of capital contributed by the borrower is contractually required to remain in the project until the credit facility has been reclassified by the depository institution as a non-HVCRE ADC loan under subsection (d);

“(3) does not include any loan made prior to January 1, 2015; and

“(4) does not include a credit facility reclassified as a non-HVCRE ADC loan under subsection (d).

“(c) **VALUE OF CONTRIBUTED REAL PROPERTY.**—For purposes of this section, the value of any real property contributed by a borrower as a capital contribution shall be the appraised value of the property as determined under standards prescribed pursuant to section 1110 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3339), in connection with the extension of the credit facility or loan to such borrower.

“(d) **RECLASSIFICATION AS A NON-HVCRE ADC LOAN.**—For purposes of this section and with respect to a credit facility and a depository institution, upon—

“(1) the substantial completion of the development or construction of the real property being financed by the credit facility; and

“(2) cash flow being generated by the real property being sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution’s applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings, the credit facility may be reclassified by the depository institution as a Non-HVCRE ADC loan.

“(e) EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section shall limit the supervisory, regulatory, or enforcement authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency to further the safe and sound operation of an institution under the supervision of the appropriate Federal banking agency.”.

SEC. 215. REDUCING IDENTITY FRAUD.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reduce the prevalence of synthetic identity fraud, which disproportionately affects vulnerable populations, such as minors and recent immigrants, by facilitating the validation by permitted entities of fraud protection data, pursuant to electronically received consumer consent, through use of a database maintained by the Commissioner.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSIONER.—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration.

(2) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given the term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(3) FRAUD PROTECTION DATA.—The term “fraud protection data” means a combination of the following information with respect to an individual:

(A) The name of the individual (including the first name and any family forename or surname of the individual).

(B) The social security number of the individual.

(C) The date of birth (including the month, day, and year) of the individual.

(4) PERMITTED ENTITY.—The term “permitted entity” means a financial institution or a service provider, subsidiary, affiliate, agent, subcontractor, or assignee of a financial institution.

(c) EFFICIENCY.—

(1) RELIANCE ON EXISTING METHODS.—The Commissioner shall evaluate the feasibility of making modifications to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or a similar resource such that the database or resource—

(A) is reasonably designed to effectuate the purpose of this section; and

(B) meets the requirements of subsection (d).

(2) EXECUTION.—The Commissioner shall make the modifications necessary to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or similar resource, or develop a database or similar resource, to effectuate the requirements described in paragraph (1).

(d) PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE CONSUMERS.—The database or similar resource described in subsection (c) shall—

(1) compare fraud protection data provided in an inquiry by a permitted entity against such information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided;

(2) be scalable and accommodate reasonably anticipated volumes of verification requests from permitted entities with commercially reasonable uptime and availability; and

(3) allow permitted entities to submit—

(A) 1 or more individual requests electronically for real-time machine-to-machine (or

similar functionality) accurate responses; and

(B) multiple requests electronically, such as those provided in a batch format, for accurate electronic responses within a reasonable period of time from submission, not to exceed 24 hours.

(e) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Before providing confirmation of fraud protection data to a permitted entity, the Commissioner shall ensure that the Commissioner has a certification from the permitted entity that is dated not more than 2 years before the date on which that confirmation is provided that includes the following declarations:

(1) The entity is a permitted entity.

(2) The entity is in compliance with this section.

(3) The entity is, and will remain, in compliance with its privacy and data security requirements, as described in title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.), with respect to information the entity receives from the Commissioner pursuant to this section.

(4) The entity will retain sufficient records to demonstrate its compliance with its certification and this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(f) CONSUMER CONSENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) only—

(A) pursuant to the written, including electronic, consent received by a permitted entity from the individual who is the subject of the request; and

(B) in connection with a credit transaction or any circumstance described in section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b).

(2) ELECTRONIC CONSENT REQUIREMENTS.—For a permitted entity to use the consent of an individual received electronically pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the permitted entity must obtain the individual’s electronic signature, as defined in section 106 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7006).

(3) EFFECTUATING ELECTRONIC CONSENT.—No provision of law or requirement, including section 552a of title 5, United States Code, shall prevent the use of electronic consent for purposes of this subsection or for use in any other consent based verification under the discretion of the Commissioner.

(g) COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) AUDITS AND MONITORING.—The Commissioner may—

(A) conduct audits and monitoring to—

(i) ensure proper use by permitted entities of the database or similar resource described in subsection (c); and

(ii) deter fraud and misuse by permitted entities with respect to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c); and

(B) terminate services for any permitted entity that prevents or refuses to allow the Commissioner to carry out the activities described in subparagraph (A).

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 505(a) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6805(a)), any violation of this section and any certification made under this section shall be enforced in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (7) of such section 505(a) by the agencies described in those paragraphs.

(B) RELEVANT INFORMATION.—Upon discovery by the Commissioner, pursuant to an

audit described in paragraph (1), of any violation of this section or any certification made under this section, the Commissioner shall forward any relevant information pertaining to that violation to the appropriate agency described in subparagraph (A) for evaluation by the agency for purposes of enforcing this section.

(h) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts obligated to carry out this section shall be fully recovered from the users of the database or verification system by way of advances, reimbursements, user fees, or other recoveries as determined by the Commissioner. The funds recovered under this paragraph shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to the account providing appropriations for the Social Security Administration, to be used for the administration of this section without fiscal year limitation.

(B) PRICES FIXED BY COMMISSIONER.—The Commissioner shall establish the amount to be paid by the users under this paragraph, including the costs of any services or work performed, such as any appropriate upgrades, maintenance, and associated direct and indirect administrative costs, in support of carrying out the purposes described in this section, by reimbursement or in advance as determined by the Commissioner. The amount of such prices shall be periodically adjusted by the Commissioner to ensure that amounts collected are sufficient to fully offset the cost of the administration of this section.

(2) INITIAL DEVELOPMENT.—The Commissioner shall not begin development of a verification system to carry out this section until the Commissioner determines that amounts equal to at least 50 percent of program start-up costs have been collected under paragraph (1).

(3) EXISTING RESOURCES.—The Commissioner may use funds designated for information technology modernization to carry out this section.

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Commissioner shall annually submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the amount of indirect costs to the Social Security Administration arising as a result of the implementation of this section.

SEC. 216. TREASURY REPORT ON RISKS OF CYBER THREATS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the risks of cyber threats to financial institutions and capital markets in the United States, including—

(1) an assessment of the material risks of cyber threats to financial institutions and capital markets in the United States;

(2) the impact and potential effects of material cyber attacks on financial institutions and capital markets in the United States;

(3) an analysis of how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are addressing the material risks of cyber threats described in paragraph (1), including—

(A) how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are assessing those threats;

(B) how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are assessing the cyber vulnerabilities and preparedness of financial institutions;

(C) coordination amongst the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and their coordination with other government agencies (including with respect to regulations, examinations, lexicon, duplication, and other regulatory tools); and

(D) areas for improvement; and

(4) a recommendation of whether any appropriate Federal banking agency or the Securities and Exchange Commission needs additional legal authorities or resources to adequately assess and address the material risks of cyber threats described in paragraph (1), given the analysis required by paragraph (3).

SEC. 217. DISCRETIONARY SURPLUS FUNDS.

Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$7,500,000,000” and inserting “\$6,825,000,000”.

TITLE III—PROTECTIONS FOR VETERANS, CONSUMERS, AND HOMEOWNERS

SEC. 301. PROTECTING CONSUMERS' CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “90 days” and inserting “1 year”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) NATIONAL SECURITY FREEZE.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘consumer reporting agency’ means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p).

“(B) The term ‘proper identification’ has the meaning of such term as used under section 610.

“(C) The term ‘security freeze’ means a restriction that prohibits a consumer reporting agency from disclosing the contents of a consumer report that is subject to such security freeze to any person requesting the consumer report.

“(2) PLACEMENT OF SECURITY FREEZE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer that a consumer reporting agency place a security freeze, and upon receiving proper identification from the consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, place the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by toll-free telephone or secure electronic means, 1 business day after receiving the request directly from the consumer; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request directly from the consumer.

“(B) CONFIRMATION AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Not later than 5 business days after placing a security freeze under subparagraph (A), a consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) send confirmation of the placement to the consumer; and

“(ii) inform the consumer of—

“(I) the process by which the consumer may remove the security freeze, including a mechanism to authenticate the consumer; and

“(II) the consumer’s right described in section 615(d)(1)(D).

“(C) NOTICE TO THIRD PARTIES.—A consumer reporting agency may advise a third party that a security freeze has been placed with respect to a consumer under subparagraph (A).

“(3) REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency shall remove a security freeze placed on the consumer report of a consumer only in the following cases:

“(i) Upon the direct request of the consumer.

“(ii) The security freeze was placed due to a material misrepresentation of fact by the consumer.

“(B) NOTICE IF REMOVAL NOT BY REQUEST.—If a consumer reporting agency removes a security freeze under subparagraph (A)(ii), the consumer reporting agency shall notify the consumer in writing prior to removing the security freeze.

“(C) REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE BY CONSUMER REQUEST.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A)(ii), a security freeze shall remain in place until the consumer directly requests that the security freeze be removed. Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer that a consumer reporting agency remove a security freeze, and upon receiving proper identification from the consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, remove the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by toll-free telephone or secure electronic means, 1 hour after receiving the request for removal; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request for removal.

“(D) THIRD-PARTY REQUESTS.—If a third party requests access to a consumer report of a consumer with respect to which a security freeze is in effect, where such request is in connection with an application for credit, and the consumer does not allow such consumer report to be accessed, the third party may treat the application as incomplete.

“(E) TEMPORARY REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE.—Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer under subparagraph (A)(i), if the consumer requests a temporary removal of a security freeze, the consumer reporting agency shall, in accordance with subparagraph (C), remove the security freeze for the period of time specified by the consumer.

“(4) EXCEPTIONS.—A security freeze shall not apply to the making of a consumer report for use of the following:

“(A) A person or entity, or a subsidiary, affiliate, or agent of that person or entity, or an assignee of a financial obligation owed by the consumer to that person or entity, or a prospective assignee of a financial obligation owed by the consumer to that person or entity in conjunction with the proposed purchase of the financial obligation, with which the consumer has or had prior to assignment an account or contract including a demand deposit account, or to whom the consumer issued a negotiable instrument, for the purposes of reviewing the account or collecting the financial obligation owed for the account, contract, or negotiable instrument. For purposes of this subparagraph, ‘reviewing the account’ includes activities related to account maintenance, monitoring, credit line increases, and account upgrades and enhancements.

“(B) Any Federal, State, or local agency, law enforcement agency, trial court, or private collection agency acting pursuant to a court order, warrant, or subpoena.

“(C) A child support agency acting pursuant to part D of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 651 et seq.).

“(D) A Federal agency or a State or its agents or assigns acting to investigate fraud or acting to investigate or collect delinquent taxes or unpaid court orders or to fulfill any of its other statutory responsibilities, provided such responsibilities are consistent with a permissible purpose under section 604.

“(E) By a person using credit information for the purposes described under section 604(c).

“(F) Any person or entity administering a credit file monitoring subscription or similar service to which the consumer has subscribed.

“(G) Any person or entity for the purpose of providing a consumer with a copy of the consumer’s consumer report or credit score, upon the request of the consumer.

“(H) Any person using the information in connection with the underwriting of insurance.

“(I) Any person using the information for employment, tenant, or background screening purposes.

“(J) Any person using the information for assessing, verifying, or authenticating a consumer’s identity for purposes other than the granting of credit, or for investigating or preventing actual or potential fraud.

“(5) NOTICE OF RIGHTS.—At any time a consumer is required to receive a summary of rights required under section 609, the following notice shall be included:

“‘CONSUMERS HAVE THE RIGHT TO OBTAIN A SECURITY FREEZE

“‘You have a right to place a ‘security freeze’ on your credit report, which will prohibit a consumer reporting agency from releasing information in your credit report without your express authorization. The security freeze is designed to prevent credit, loans, and services from being approved in your name without your consent. However, you should be aware that using a security freeze to take control over who gets access to the personal and financial information in your credit report may delay, interfere with, or prohibit the timely approval of any subsequent request or application you make regarding a new loan, credit, mortgage, or any other account involving the extension of credit.

“‘As an alternative to a security freeze, you have the right to place an initial or extended fraud alert on your credit file at no cost. An initial fraud alert is a 1-year alert that is placed on a consumer’s credit file. Upon seeing a fraud alert display on a consumer’s credit file, a business is required to take steps to verify the consumer’s identity before extending new credit. If you are a victim of identity theft, you are entitled to an extended fraud alert, which is a fraud alert lasting 7 years.

“‘A security freeze does not apply to a person or entity, or its affiliates, or collection agencies acting on behalf of the person or entity, with which you have an existing account that requests information in your credit report for the purposes of reviewing or collecting the account. Reviewing the account includes activities related to account maintenance, monitoring, credit line increases, and account upgrades and enhancements.’.

“(6) WEBPAGE.—

“(A) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—A consumer reporting agency shall establish a webpage that—

“(i) allows a consumer to request a security freeze;

“(ii) allows a consumer to request an initial fraud alert;

“(iii) allows a consumer to request an extended fraud alert;

“(iv) allows a consumer to request an active duty fraud alert;

“(v) allows a consumer to opt-out of the use of information in a consumer report to send the consumer a solicitation of credit or insurance, in accordance with section 615(d); and

“(vi) shall not be the only mechanism by which a consumer may request a security freeze.

“(B) FTC.—The Federal Trade Commission shall establish a single webpage that includes a link to each webpage established under subparagraph (A) within the Federal Trade Commission’s website www.Identitytheft.gov, or a successor website.

“(j) NATIONAL PROTECTION FOR FILES AND CREDIT RECORDS OF PROTECTED CONSUMERS.—

“(l) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘consumer reporting agency’ means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p).

“(B) The term ‘protected consumer’ means an individual who is—

“(i) under the age of 16 years at the time a request for the placement of a security freeze is made; or

“(ii) an incapacitated person or a protected person for whom a guardian or conservator has been appointed.

“(C) The term ‘protected consumer’s representative’ means a person who provides to a consumer reporting agency sufficient proof of authority to act on behalf of a protected consumer.

“(D) The term ‘record’ means a compilation of information that—

“(i) identifies a protected consumer;

“(ii) is created by a consumer reporting agency solely for the purpose of complying with this subsection; and

“(iii) may not be created or used to consider the protected consumer’s credit worthiness, credit standing, credit capacity, character, general reputation, personal characteristics, or mode of living.

“(E) The term ‘security freeze’ means a restriction that prohibits a consumer reporting agency from disclosing the contents of a consumer report that is the subject of such security freeze or, in the case of a protected consumer for whom the consumer reporting agency does not have a file, a record that is subject to such security freeze to any person requesting the consumer report for the purpose of opening a new account involving the extension of credit.

“(F) The term ‘sufficient proof of authority’ means documentation that shows a protected consumer’s representative has authority to act on behalf of a protected consumer and includes—

“(i) an order issued by a court of law;

“(ii) a lawfully executed and valid power of attorney;

“(iii) a document issued by a Federal, State, or local government agency in the United States showing proof of parentage, including a birth certificate; or

“(iv) with respect to a protected consumer who has been placed in a foster care setting, a written communication from a county welfare department or its agent or designee, or a county probation department or its agent or designee, certifying that the protected consumer is in a foster care setting under its jurisdiction.

“(G) The term ‘sufficient proof of identification’ means information or documentation that identifies a protected consumer and a protected consumer’s representative and includes—

“(i) a social security number or a copy of a social security card issued by the Social Security Administration;

“(ii) a certified or official copy of a birth certificate issued by the entity authorized to issue the birth certificate; or

“(iii) a copy of a driver’s license, an identification card issued by the motor vehicle ad-

ministration, or any other government issued identification.

“(2) PLACEMENT OF SECURITY FREEZE FOR A PROTECTED CONSUMER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving a direct request from a protected consumer’s representative that a consumer reporting agency place a security freeze, and upon receiving sufficient proof of identification and sufficient proof of authority, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, place the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by toll-free telephone or secure electronic means, 1 business day after receiving the request directly from the protected consumer’s representative; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request directly from the protected consumer’s representative.

“(B) CONFIRMATION AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Not later than 5 business days after placing a security freeze under subparagraph (A), a consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) send confirmation of the placement to the protected consumer’s representative; and

“(ii) inform the protected consumer’s representative of the process by which the protected consumer may remove the security freeze, including a mechanism to authenticate the protected consumer’s representative.

“(C) CREATION OF FILE.—If a consumer reporting agency does not have a file pertaining to a protected consumer when the consumer reporting agency receives a direct request under subparagraph (A), the consumer reporting agency shall create a record for the protected consumer.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON RELEASE OF RECORD OR FILE OF PROTECTED CONSUMER.—After a security freeze has been placed under paragraph (2)(A), and unless the security freeze is removed in accordance with this subsection, a consumer reporting agency may not release the protected consumer’s consumer report, any information derived from the protected consumer’s consumer report, or any record created for the protected consumer.

“(4) REMOVAL OF A PROTECTED CONSUMER SECURITY FREEZE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency shall remove a security freeze placed on the consumer report of a protected consumer only in the following cases:

“(i) Upon the direct request of the protected consumer’s representative.

“(ii) Upon the direct request of the protected consumer, if the protected consumer is not under the age of 16 years at the time of the request.

“(iii) The security freeze was placed due to a material misrepresentation of fact by the protected consumer’s representative.

“(B) NOTICE IF REMOVAL NOT BY REQUEST.—If a consumer reporting agency removes a security freeze under subparagraph (A)(iii), the consumer reporting agency shall notify the protected consumer’s representative in writing prior to removing the security freeze.

“(C) REMOVAL OF FREEZE BY REQUEST.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A)(iii), a security freeze shall remain in place until a protected consumer’s representative or protected consumer described in subparagraph (A)(ii) directly requests that the security freeze be removed. Upon receiving a direct request from the protected consumer’s representative or protected consumer described in subparagraph (A)(ii) that a consumer reporting agency remove a security freeze, and upon receiving sufficient proof of identification and sufficient proof of authority, the

consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, remove the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by toll-free telephone or secure electronic means, 1 hour after receiving the request for removal; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request for removal.

“(D) TEMPORARY REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE.—Upon receiving a direct request from a protected consumer or a protected consumer’s representative under subparagraph (A)(i), if the protected consumer or protected consumer’s representative requests a temporary removal of a security freeze, the consumer reporting agency shall, in accordance with subparagraph (C), remove the security freeze for the period of time specified by the protected consumer or protected consumer’s representative.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 625(b)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681t(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “or” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) subsections (i) and (j) of section 605A relating to security freezes; or”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. PROTECTING VETERANS’ CREDIT.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to rectify problematic reporting of medical debt included in a consumer report of a veteran due to inappropriate or delayed payment for hospital care, medical services, or extended care services provided in a non-Department of Veterans Affairs facility under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(2) to clarify the process of debt collection for such medical debt.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—

(1) VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT DEFINED.—Section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(z) VETERAN.—The term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

“(aa) VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—The term ‘veteran’s medical debt’—

“(1) means a medical collection debt of a veteran owed to a non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care provider that was submitted to the Department for payment for health care authorized by the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

“(2) includes medical collection debt that the Department of Veterans Affairs has wrongfully charged a veteran.”

(2) EXCLUSION FOR VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—Section 605(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) With respect to a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p), any information related to a veteran’s medical debt if the date on which the hospital care, medical services, or extended care services was rendered relating to the debt antedates the report by less than 1 year if the consumer reporting agency has actual knowledge that the information is related to a veteran’s medical debt and the consumer reporting agency is in compliance with its obligation under section 302(c)(5) of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

“(8) With respect to a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p), any information related to a fully paid or settled veteran’s medical debt that had been characterized as delinquent, charged off, or in collection if the consumer reporting agency has actual knowledge that the information is related to a veteran’s medical debt and the consumer reporting agency is in compliance with its obligation under section 302(c)(5) of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.”.

(3) REMOVAL OF VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT FROM CONSUMER REPORT.—Section 611 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (g)” after “subsection (f)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) DISPUTE PROCESS FOR VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a veteran’s medical debt, the veteran may submit a notice described in paragraph (2), proof of liability of the Department of Veterans Affairs for payment of that debt, or documentation that the Department of Veterans Affairs is in the process of making payment for authorized hospital care, medical services, or extended care services rendered to a consumer reporting agency or a reseller to dispute the inclusion of that debt on a consumer report of the veteran.

“(2) NOTIFICATION TO VETERAN.—The Department of Veterans Affairs shall submit to a veteran a notice that the Department of Veterans Affairs has assumed liability for part or all of a veteran’s medical debt.

“(3) DELETION OF INFORMATION FROM FILE.—If a consumer reporting agency receives notice, proof of liability, or documentation under paragraph (1), the consumer reporting agency shall delete all information relating to the veteran’s medical debt from the file of the veteran and notify the furnisher and the veteran of that deletion.”.

(C) VERIFICATION OF VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) the term “consumer reporting agency” means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)); and

(B) the terms “veteran” and “veteran’s medical debt” have the meanings given those terms in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a), as added by subsection (b)(1).

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a database to allow consumer reporting agencies to verify whether a debt furnished to a consumer reporting agency is a veteran’s medical debt.

(3) DATABASE FEATURES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the database established under paragraph (2), to the extent permitted by law, provides consumer reporting agencies with—

(A) sufficiently detailed and specific information to verify whether a debt being furnished to the consumer reporting agency is a veteran’s medical debt;

(B) access to verification information in a secure electronic format;

(C) timely access to verification information; and

(D) any other features that would promote the efficient, timely, and secure delivery of information that consumer reporting agencies could use to verify whether a debt is a veteran’s medical debt.

(4) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—Prior to establishing the database for verification under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register a notice and request for comment that solicits input from consumer reporting agencies and other stakeholders.

(5) VERIFICATION.—Provided the database established under paragraph (2) is fully functional and the data available to consumer reporting agencies, a consumer reporting agency shall use the database as a means to identify a veteran’s medical debt pursuant to paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 605(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c(a)), as added by subsection (b)(2).

(d) CREDIT MONITORING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c–1), as amended by section 301(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) CREDIT MONITORING.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘active duty military consumer’ includes a member of the National Guard.

“(B) The term ‘National Guard’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(c) of title 10, United States Code.

“(2) CREDIT MONITORING.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall provide a free electronic credit monitoring service that, at a minimum, notifies a consumer of material additions or modifications to the file of the consumer at the consumer reporting agency to any consumer who provides to the consumer reporting agency—

“(A) appropriate proof that the consumer is an active duty military consumer; and

“(B) contact information of the consumer.

“(3) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Federal Trade Commission shall promulgate regulations regarding the requirements of this subsection, which shall at a minimum include—

“(A) a definition of an electronic credit monitoring service and material additions or modifications to the file of a consumer; and

“(B) what constitutes appropriate proof.

“(4) APPLICABILITY.—

“(A) Sections 616 and 617 shall not apply to any violation of this subsection.

“(B) This section shall be enforced exclusively under section 621 by the Federal agencies and Federal and State officials identified in that section.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 625(b)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681t(b)(1)), as amended by section 301(b), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(K) subsection (k) of section 605A, relating to credit monitoring for active duty military consumers, as defined in that subsection;”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. IMMUNITY FROM SUIT FOR DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL EXPLOITATION OF SENIOR CITIZENS.

(a) IMMUNITY.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(A) the term “Bank Secrecy Act officer” means an individual responsible for ensuring compliance with the requirements mandated by subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the “Bank Secrecy Act”);

(B) the term “broker-dealer” means a broker and a dealer, as those terms are de-

fined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a));

(C) the term “covered agency” means—

(i) a State financial regulatory agency, including a State securities or law enforcement authority and a State insurance regulator;

(ii) each of the Federal agencies represented in the membership of the Financial Institutions Examination Council established under section 1004 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3303);

(iii) a securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–3);

(iv) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(v) a law enforcement agency; or

(vi) a State or local agency responsible for administering adult protective service laws;

(D) the term “covered financial institution” means—

(i) a credit union;

(ii) a depository institution;

(iii) an investment adviser;

(iv) a broker-dealer;

(v) an insurance company;

(vi) an insurance agency; or

(vii) a transfer agent;

(E) the term “credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301);

(F) the term “depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(G) the term “exploitation” means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual, including a caregiver or a fiduciary, that—

(i) uses the resources of a senior citizen for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain; or

(ii) results in depriving a senior citizen of rightful access to or use of benefits, resources, belongings, or assets;

(H) the term “insurance agency” means any business entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates insurance coverage;

(I) the term “insurance company” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–2(a));

(J) the term “insurance producer” means an individual who is required under State law to be licensed in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance coverage;

(K) the term “investment adviser” has the meaning given the term in section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–2(a));

(L) the term “investment adviser representative” means an individual who—

(i) is employed by, or associated with, an investment adviser; and

(ii) does not perform solely clerical or ministerial acts;

(M) the term “registered representative” means an individual who represents a broker-dealer in effecting or attempting to effect a purchase or sale of securities;

(N) the term “senior citizen” means an individual who is not younger than 65 years of age;

(O) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States;

(P) the term “State insurance regulator” has the meaning given the term in section 315 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6735);

(Q) the term “State securities or law enforcement authority” has the meaning given the term in section 24(f)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78x(f)(4)); and

(R) the term “transfer agent” has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

(2) IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.—

(A) IMMUNITY FOR INDIVIDUALS.—An individual who has received the training described in subsection (b) shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for disclosing the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen to a covered agency if the individual, at the time of the disclosure—

(i) served as a supervisor or in a compliance or legal function (including as a Bank Secrecy Act officer) for, or, in the case of a registered representative, investment adviser representative, or insurance producer, was affiliated or associated with, a covered financial institution; and

(ii) made the disclosure—

(I) in good faith; and

(II) with reasonable care.

(B) IMMUNITY FOR COVERED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—A covered financial institution shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for a disclosure made by an individual described in subparagraph (A) if—

(i) the individual was employed by, or, in the case of a registered representative, insurance producer, or investment adviser representative, affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution at the time of the disclosure; and

(ii) before the time of the disclosure, each individual described in subsection (b)(1) received the training described in subsection (b).

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be construed to limit the liability of an individual or a covered financial institution in a civil action for any act, omission, or fraud that is not a disclosure described in subparagraph (A).

(b) TRAINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered financial institution or a third party selected by a covered financial institution may provide the training described in paragraph (2)(A) to each officer or employee of, or registered representative, insurance producer, or investment adviser representative affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution who—

(A) is described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i);

(B) may come into contact with a senior citizen as a regular part of the professional duties of the individual; or

(C) may review or approve the financial documents, records, or transactions of a senior citizen in connection with providing financial services to a senior citizen.

(2) CONTENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The content of the training that a covered financial institution or a third party selected by the covered financial institution may provide under paragraph (1) shall—

(i) be maintained by the covered financial institution and made available to a covered agency with examination authority over the covered financial institution, upon request, except that a covered financial institution shall not be required to maintain or make available such content with respect to any individual who is no longer employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution;

(ii) instruct any individual attending the training on how to identify and report the

suspected exploitation of a senior citizen internally and, as appropriate, to government officials or law enforcement authorities, including common signs that indicate the financial exploitation of a senior citizen;

(iii) discuss the need to protect the privacy and respect the integrity of each individual customer of the covered financial institution; and

(iv) be appropriate to the job responsibilities of the individual attending the training.

(B) TIMING.—The training under paragraph (1) shall be provided—

(i) as soon as reasonably practicable; and

(ii) with respect to an individual who begins employment, or becomes affiliated or associated, with a covered financial institution after the date of enactment of this Act, not later than 1 year after the date on which the individual becomes employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution in a position described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1).

(C) RECORDS.—A covered financial institution shall—

(i) maintain a record of each individual who—

(I) is employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution in a position described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1); and

(II) has completed the training under paragraph (1), regardless of whether the training was—

(aa) provided by the covered financial institution or a third party selected by the covered financial institution;

(bb) completed before the individual was employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution; and

(cc) completed before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) upon request, provide a record described in clause (i) to a covered agency with examination authority over the covered financial institution.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt or limit any provision of State law, except only to the extent that subsection (a) provides a greater level of protection against liability to an individual described in subsection (a)(2)(A) or to a covered financial institution described in subsection (a)(2)(B) than is provided under State law.

SEC. 304. RESTORATION OF THE PROTECTING TENANTS AT FORECLOSURE ACT OF 2009.

(a) REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISION.—Section 704 of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009 (12 U.S.C. 5201 note; 12 U.S.C. 5220 note; 42 U.S.C. 1437f note) is repealed.

(b) RESTORATION.—Sections 701 through 703 of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009, the provisions of law amended by such sections, and any regulations promulgated pursuant to such sections, as were in effect on December 30, 2014, are restored and revived.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. REMEDIATING LEAD AND ASBESTOS HAZARDS.

Section 109(a)(1) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5219(a)(1)) is amended, in the second sentence, by inserting “and to remediate lead and asbestos hazards in residential properties” before the period at the end.

SEC. 306. FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437u) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “public housing and”; and

(B) by striking “the certificate and voucher programs under section 8” and inserting “sections 8 and 9”;

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) CONTINUATION OF PRIOR REQUIRED PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each public housing agency that was required to administer a local Family Self-Sufficiency program on the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act shall operate such local program for, at a minimum, the number of families the agency was required to serve on the date of enactment of such Act, subject only to the availability under appropriations Acts of sufficient amounts for housing assistance and the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(2) REDUCTION.—The number of families for which a public housing agency is required to operate such local program under paragraph (1) shall be decreased by 1 for each family from any supported rental housing program administered by such agency that, after October 21, 1998, fulfills its obligations under the contract of participation.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary shall not require a public housing agency to carry out a mandatory program for a period of time upon the request of the public housing agency and upon a determination by the Secretary that implementation is not feasible because of local circumstances, which may include—

“(A) lack of supportive services accessible to eligible families, which shall include insufficient availability of resources for programs under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.);

“(B) lack of funding for reasonable administrative costs;

“(C) lack of cooperation by other units of State or local government; or

“(D) any other circumstances that the Secretary may consider appropriate.”;

(3) by striking subsection (i);

(4) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (b), as amended, the following:

“(c) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE FAMILIES.—A family is eligible to participate in a local Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section if—

“(A) at least 1 household member seeks to become and remain employed in suitable employment or to increase earnings; and

“(B) the household member receives direct assistance under section 8 or resides in a unit assisted under section 8 or 9.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The following entities are eligible to administer a local Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section:

“(A) A public housing agency administering housing assistance to or on behalf of an eligible family under section 8 or 9.

“(B) The owner or sponsor of a multifamily property receiving project-based rental assistance under section 8, in accordance with the requirements under subsection (1).”;

(6) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” the first time it appears and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) in the first sentence, by striking “each leaseholder receiving assistance under the certificate and voucher programs of the public housing agency under section 8 or residing in public housing administered by the

agency" and inserting "a household member of an eligible family"; and

(iii) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: "Housing assistance may not be terminated as a consequence of either successful completion of the contract of participation or failure to complete such contract. A contract of participation shall remain in effect until the participating family exits the Family Self-Sufficiency program upon successful graduation or expiration of the contract of participation, or for other good cause.";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the first sentence—

(aa) by striking "A local program under this section" and inserting "An eligible entity";

(bb) by striking "provide" and inserting "coordinate"; and

(cc) by striking "to" and inserting "for"; and

(II) in the second sentence—

(aa) by striking "provided during" and inserting "coordinated for";

(bb) by striking "under section 8 or residing in public housing" and inserting "pursuant to section 8 or 9 and for the duration of the contract of participation"; and

(cc) by inserting ", but are not limited to" after "may include";

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting "or attainment of a high school equivalency certificate" after "high school";

(iii) by striking subparagraph (G);

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (J) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (K) respectively;

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

"(E) education in pursuit of a post-secondary degree or certification";

(vi) in subparagraph (H), by inserting "financial literacy, such as training in financial management, financial coaching, and asset building, and" after "training in";

(vii) in subparagraph (I), by striking "and" at the end; and

(viii) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

"(J) homeownership education and assistance; and"; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting "the first recertification of income after" after "not later than 5 years after"; and

(ii) in the second sentence—

(I) by striking "public housing agency" and inserting "eligible entity"; and

(II) by striking "of the agency";

(D) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) EMPLOYMENT.—The contract of participation shall require 1 household member of the participating family to seek and maintain suitable employment."; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) NONPARTICIPATION.—Assistance under section 8 or 9 for a family that elects not to participate in a Family Self-Sufficiency program shall not be delayed by reason of such election.";

(7) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "whose monthly adjusted income does not exceed 50 percent" and all that follows through the period at the end of the third sentence and inserting "shall be calculated under the rental provisions of section 3 or section 8(o), as applicable.";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "For each partici-

pating family, an amount equal to any increase in the amount of rent paid by the family in accordance with the provisions of section 3 or 8(o), as applicable, that is attributable to increases in earned income by the participating family, shall be placed in an interest-bearing escrow account established by the eligible entity on behalf of the participating family. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity may use funds it controls under section 8 or 9 for purposes of making the escrow deposit for participating families assisted under, or residing in units assisted under, section 8 or 9, respectively, provided such funds are offset by the increase in the amount of rent paid by the participating family.";

(ii) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "All Family Self-Sufficiency programs administered under this section shall include an escrow account.";

(iii) in the fourth sentence, by striking "subsection (c)" and inserting "subsection (d)"; and

(iv) in the last sentence—

(I) by striking "A public housing agency" and inserting "An eligible entity"; and

(II) by striking "the public housing agency" and inserting "such eligible entity"; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) FORFEITED ESCROW.—Any amount placed in an escrow account established by an eligible entity for a participating family as required under paragraph (2), that exists after the end of a contract of participation by a household member of a participating family that does not qualify to receive the escrow, shall be used by the eligible entity for the benefit of participating families in good standing.";

(8) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by striking ", unless the income of the family equals or exceeds 80 percent of the median income of the area (as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families)";

(9) in subsection (g), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "public housing agency" and inserting "eligible entity";

(ii) by striking "the public housing agency" and inserting "such eligible entity"; and

(iii) by striking "subsection (g)" and inserting "subsection (h)"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "public housing agency" and inserting "eligible entity" each place that term appears;

(ii) by striking "or the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act";

(iii) by inserting "primary, secondary, and post-secondary" after "public and private"; and

(iv) in the second sentence, by inserting "and tenants served by the program" after "the unit of general local government";

(10) in subsection (h), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "public housing agency" and inserting "eligible entity";

(ii) by striking "participating in the" and inserting "carrying out a"; and

(iii) by striking "to the Secretary";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "public housing agency" and inserting "eligible entity";

(ii) by striking "subsection (f)" and inserting "subsection (g)";

(iii) by striking "residents of the public housing" and inserting "the current and prospective participants of the program"; and

(iv) by striking "or the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act"; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking "subsection (c)(2)" and inserting "subsection (d)(2)";

(II) by striking "provided to" and inserting "coordinated on behalf of participating";

(III) by inserting "direct" before "assistance"; and

(IV) by striking "the section 8 and public housing programs" and inserting "sections 8 and 9";

(ii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking "subsection (d)" and inserting "subsection (e)"; and

(II) by striking "public housing agency" and inserting "eligible entity";

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking "deliver" and inserting "coordinate";

(iv) in subparagraph (H), by striking "the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act and"; and

(v) in subparagraph (I), by striking "public housing or section 8 assistance" and inserting "assistance under section 8 or 9";

(11) by amending subsection (i), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

"(i) FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY AWARDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to appropriations, the Secretary shall establish a formula by which annual funds shall be awarded or as otherwise determined by the Secretary for the costs incurred by an eligible entity in administering the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

"(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.—The award established under paragraph (1) shall provide funding for family self-sufficiency coordinators as follows:

"(A) BASE AWARD.—An eligible entity serving 25 or more participants in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section is eligible to receive an award equal to the costs, as determined by the Secretary, of 1 full-time family self-sufficiency coordinator position. The Secretary may, by regulation or notice, determine the policy concerning the award for an eligible entity serving fewer than 25 such participants, including providing prorated awards or allowing such entities to combine their programs under this section for purposes of employing a coordinator.

"(B) ADDITIONAL AWARD.—An eligible entity that meets performance standards set by the Secretary is eligible to receive an additional award sufficient to cover the costs of filling an additional family self-sufficiency coordinator position if such entity has 75 or more participating families, and an additional coordinator for each additional 50 participating families, or such other ratio as may be established by the Secretary based on the award allocation evaluation under subparagraph (E).

"(C) STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES.—For purposes of calculating the award under this paragraph, each administratively distinct part of a State or regional eligible entity may be treated as a separate agency.

"(D) DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF COORDINATORS.—In determining whether an eligible entity meets a specific threshold for funding pursuant to this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider the number of participants enrolled by the eligible entity in its Family Self-Sufficiency program as well as other criteria determined by the Secretary.

"(E) AWARD ALLOCATION EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report

evaluating the award allocation under this subsection, and make recommendations based on this evaluation and other related findings to modify such allocation, within 4 years after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, and not less frequently than every 4 years thereafter. The report requirement under this subparagraph shall terminate after the Secretary has submitted 2 such reports to Congress.

“(3) RENEWALS AND ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds allocated by the Secretary under this subsection shall be allocated in the following order of priority:

“(i) FIRST PRIORITY.—Renewal of the full cost of all coordinators in the previous year at each eligible entity with an existing Family Self-Sufficiency program that meets applicable performance standards set by the Secretary.

“(ii) SECOND PRIORITY.—New or incremental coordinator funding authorized under this section.

“(B) GUIDANCE.—If the first priority, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), cannot be fully satisfied, the Secretary may prorate the funding for each eligible entity, as long as—

“(i) each eligible entity that has received funding for at least 1 part-time coordinator in the prior fiscal year is provided sufficient funding for at least 1 part-time coordinator as part of any such proration; and

“(ii) each eligible entity that has received funding for at least 1 full-time coordinator in the prior fiscal year is provided sufficient funding for at least 1 full-time coordinator as part of any such proration.

“(4) RECAPTURE OR OFFSET.—Any awards allocated under this subsection by the Secretary in a fiscal year that have not been spent by the end of the subsequent fiscal year or such other time period as determined by the Secretary may be recaptured by the Secretary and shall be available for providing additional awards pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), or may be offset as determined by the Secretary. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available for 3 years in order to facilitate the re-use of any recaptured funds for this purpose.

“(5) PERFORMANCE REPORTING.—Programs under this section shall be required to report the number of families enrolled and graduated, the number of established escrow accounts and positive escrow balances, and any other information that the Secretary may require. Program performance shall be reviewed periodically as determined by the Secretary.

“(6) INCENTIVES FOR INNOVATION AND HIGH PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the amounts made available under this subsection to provide support to or reward Family Self-Sufficiency programs based on the rate of successful completion, increased earned income, or other factors as may be established by the Secretary.”;

(12) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(B) by striking “public housing” before “units”;

(C) by striking “in public housing projects administered by the agency”;

(D) by inserting “or coordination” after “provision”; and

(E) by striking the last sentence;

(13) in subsection (k), by striking “public housing agencies” and inserting “eligible entities”;

(14) by striking subsection (n);

(15) by striking subsection (o);

(16) by redesignating subsections (l) and (m) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively;

(17) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

“(1) PROGRAMS FOR TENANTS IN PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTIES WITH PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) VOLUNTARY AVAILABILITY OF FSS PROGRAM.—The owner of a privately owned property may voluntarily make a Family Self-Sufficiency program available to the tenants of such property in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. Such procedures shall permit the owner to enter into a cooperative agreement with a local public housing agency that administers a Family Self-Sufficiency program or, at the owner's option, operate a Family Self-Sufficiency program on its own or in partnership with another owner. An owner, who voluntarily makes a Family Self-Sufficiency program available pursuant to this subsection, may access funding from any residual receipt accounts for the property to hire a family self-sufficiency coordinator or coordinators for their program.

“(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—Any cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall require the public housing agency to open its Family Self-Sufficiency program waiting list to any eligible family residing in the owner's property who resides in a unit assisted under project-based rental assistance.

“(3) TREATMENT OF FAMILIES ASSISTED UNDER THIS SUBSECTION.—A public housing agency that enters into a cooperative agreement pursuant to paragraph (1) may count any family participating in its Family Self-Sufficiency program as a result of such agreement as part of the calculation of the award under subsection (i).

“(4) ESCROW.—

“(A) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—A cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide for the calculation and tracking of the escrow for participating residents and for the owner to make available, upon request of the public housing agency, escrow for participating residents, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (e), residing in units assisted under section 8.

“(B) CALCULATION AND TRACKING BY OWNER.—The owner of a privately owned property who voluntarily makes a Family Self-Sufficiency program available pursuant to paragraph (1) shall calculate and track the escrow for participating residents and make escrow for participating residents available in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (e).

“(5) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to properties assisted under section 8(o)(13).

“(6) SUSPENSION OF ENROLLMENT.—In any year, the Secretary may suspend the enrollment of new families in Family Self-Sufficiency programs under this subsection based on a determination that insufficient funding is available for this purpose.”;

(18) in subsection (m), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “Each public housing agency” and inserting “Each eligible entity”;

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “The report shall include” and inserting “The contents of the report shall include”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”; and

(II) by striking “local”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and describing any additional research needs of the Secretary to evaluate the effectiveness of the program” after “under paragraph (1)”;

(19) in subsection (n), as so redesignated, by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(20) by adding at the end the following:

“(o) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that meets the requirements under subsection (c)(2) to administer a Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

“(2) ELIGIBLE FAMILY.—The term ‘eligible family’ means a family that meets the requirements under subsection (c)(1) to participate in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

“(3) PARTICIPATING FAMILY.—The term ‘participating family’ means an eligible family that is participating in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue regulations to implement this section and any amendments made by this section, and this section and any amendments made by this section shall take effect upon such issuance.

SEC. 307. PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY FINANCING.

Section 129C(b)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) CONSIDERATION OF UNDERWRITING REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY FINANCING.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘Property Assessed Clean Energy financing’ means financing to cover the costs of home improvements that results in a tax assessment on the real property of the consumer.

“(ii) REGULATIONS.—The Bureau shall prescribe regulations that carry out the purposes of subsection (a) and apply section 130 with respect to violations under subsection (a) of this section with respect to Property Assessed Clean Energy financing, which shall account for the unique nature of Property Assessed Clean Energy financing.

“(iii) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION AND CONSULTATION.—In prescribing the regulations under this subparagraph, the Bureau—

“(I) may collect such information and data that the Bureau determines is necessary; and

“(II) shall consult with State and local governments and bond-issuing authorities.”.

SEC. 308. GAO REPORT ON CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “consumer”, “consumer report”, and “consumer reporting agency” have the meanings given those terms in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report that includes—

(1) a review of the current legal and regulatory structure for consumer reporting agencies and an analysis of any gaps in that structure, including, in particular, the rule-making, supervisory, and enforcement authority of State and Federal agencies under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681

et seq.), the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Public Law 106-102; 113 Stat. 1338), and any other relevant statutes;

(2) a review of the process by which consumers can appeal and expunge errors on their consumer reports;

(3) a review of the causes of consumer reporting errors;

(4) a review of the responsibilities of data furnishers to ensure that accurate information is initially reported to consumer reporting agencies and to ensure that such information continues to be accurate;

(5) a review of data security relating to consumer reporting agencies and their efforts to safeguard consumer data;

(6) a review of who has access to, and may use, consumer reports;

(7) a review of who has control or ownership of a consumer's credit data;

(8) an analysis of—

(A) which Federal and State regulatory agencies supervise and enforce laws relating to how consumer reporting agencies protect consumer data; and

(B) all laws relating to data security applicable to consumer reporting agencies; and

(9) recommendations to Congress on how to improve the consumer reporting system, including legislative, regulatory, and industry-specific recommendations.

SEC. 309. PROTECTING VETERANS FROM PREDATORY LENDING.

(a) PROTECTING VETERANS FROM PREDATORY LENDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 3709. Refinancing of housing loans

“(a) FEE RECOUPMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is being refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter unless—

“(1) the issuer of the refinanced loan provides the Secretary with a certification of the recoupment period for fees, closing costs, and any expenses (other than taxes, amounts held in escrow, and fees paid under this chapter) that would be incurred by the borrower in the refinancing of the loan;

“(2) all of the fees and incurred costs are scheduled to be recouped on or before the date that is 36 months after the date of loan issuance; and

“(3) the recoupment is calculated through lower regular monthly payments (other than taxes, amounts held in escrow, and fees paid under this chapter) as a result of the refinanced loan.

“(b) NET TANGIBLE BENEFIT TEST.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter unless—

“(1) the issuer of the refinanced loan provides the borrower with a net tangible benefit test;

“(2) in a case in which the original loan had a fixed rate mortgage interest rate and the refinanced loan will have a fixed rate mortgage interest rate, the refinanced loan has a mortgage interest rate that is not less than 50 basis points less than the previous loan;

“(3) in a case in which the original loan had a fixed rate mortgage interest rate and the refinanced loan will have an adjustable rate mortgage interest rate, the refinanced loan has a mortgage interest rate that is not

less than 200 basis points less than the previous loan; and

“(4) the lower interest rate is not produced solely from discount points, unless—

“(A) such points are paid at closing; and

“(B) such points are not added to the principal loan amount, unless—

“(i) for discount point amounts that are less than or equal to one discount point, the resulting loan balance after any fees and expenses allows the property with respect to which the loan was issued to maintain a loan to value ratio of 100 percent or less; and

“(ii) for discount point amounts that are greater than one discount point, the resulting loan balance after any fees and expenses allows the property with respect to which the loan was issued to maintain a loan to value ratio of 90 percent or less.

“(c) LOAN SEASONING.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter until the date that is the later of—

“(1) the date that is 210 days after the date on which the first monthly payment is made on the loan; and

“(2) the date on which the sixth monthly payment is made on the loan.

“(d) CASH-OUT REFINANCES.—(1) Subsections (a) through (c) shall not apply in a case of a loan refinancing in which the amount of the principal for the new loan to be guaranteed or insured under this chapter is larger than the payoff amount of the refinanced loan.

“(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall promulgate such rules as the Secretary considers appropriate with respect to refinancing described in paragraph (1) to ensure that such refinancing is in the financial interest of the borrower, including rules relating to recoupment, seasoning, and net tangible benefits.”.

(2) REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In prescribing any regulation to carry out section 3709 of title 38, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may waive the requirements of sections 551 through 559 of title 5, United States Code, if—

(i) the Secretary determines that urgent or compelling circumstances make compliance with such requirements impracticable or contrary to the public interest;

(ii) the Secretary submits to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, and publishes in the Federal Register, notice of such waiver, including a description of the determination made under clause (i); and

(iii) a period of 10 days elapses following the notification under clause (ii).

(B) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—If a regulation prescribed pursuant to a waiver made under subparagraph (A) is in effect for a period exceeding 1 year, the Secretary shall provide the public an opportunity for notice and comment regarding such regulation.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) TERMINATION DATE.—The authorities under this paragraph shall terminate on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) REPORT ON CASH-OUT REFINANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary shall, in consultation with the President of the Ginnie Mae, submit to Congress a report on refinancing—

(i) of loans—

(I) made to veterans for purposes specified in section 3710 of title 38, United States Code; and

(II) that were guaranteed or insured under chapter 37 of such title; and

(ii) in which the amount of the principal for the new loan to be guaranteed or insured under such chapter is larger than the payoff amount of the refinanced loan.

(B) CONTENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of whether additional requirements, including a net tangible benefit test, fee recoupment period, and loan seasoning requirement, are necessary to ensure that the refinancing described in subparagraph (A) is in the financial interest of the borrower.

(ii) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for additional legislative or administrative action to ensure that refinancing described in subparagraph (A) is carried out in the financial interest of the borrower.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3709 the following new item:

“3709. Refinancing of housing loans.”.

(b) LOAN SEASONING FOR GINNIE MAE MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES.—Section 306(g)(1) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)(1)) is amended by inserting “The Association may not guarantee the timely payment of principal and interest on a security that is backed by a mortgage insured or guaranteed under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, and that was refinanced until the later of the date that is 210 days after the date on which the first monthly payment is made on the mortgage being refinanced and the date on which 6 full monthly payments have been made on the mortgage being refinanced.” after “Act of 1992.”.

(c) REPORT ON LIQUIDITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the President of the Ginnie Mae shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the liquidity of the housing loan program under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in the secondary mortgage market, which shall—

(A) assess the loans provided under that chapter that collateralize mortgage-backed securities that are guaranteed by Ginnie Mae; and

(B) include recommendations for actions that Ginnie Mae should take to ensure that the liquidity of that housing loan program is maintained.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(i) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) GINNIE MAE.—The term “Ginnie Mae” means the Government National Mortgage Association.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT ON DOCUMENT DISCLOSURE AND CONSUMER EDUCATION.—Not less

frequently than once each year, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall issue a publicly available report that—

(1) examines, with respect to loans provided to veterans under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code—

(A) the refinancing of fixed-rate mortgage loans to adjustable rate mortgage loans;

(B) whether veterans are informed of the risks and disclosures associated with that refinancing; and

(C) whether advertising materials for that refinancing are clear and do not contain misleading statements or assertions; and

(2) includes findings based on any complaints received by veterans and on an ongoing assessment of the refinancing market by the Secretary.

SEC. 310. CREDIT SCORE COMPETITION.

(a) USE OF CREDIT SCORES BY FANNIE MAE IN PURCHASING RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGES.—Section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7)(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘credit score’ means a numerical value or a categorization created by a third party derived from a statistical tool or modeling system used by a person who makes or arranges a loan to predict the likelihood of certain credit behaviors, including default; and

“(ii) the term ‘residential mortgage’ has the meaning given the term in section 302 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451).

“(B) USE OF CREDIT SCORES.—The corporation may condition purchase of a residential mortgage by the corporation under this subsection on the provision of a credit score for the borrower only if—

“(i) the credit score is derived from any credit scoring model that has been validated and approved by the corporation under this paragraph; and

“(ii) the corporation provides for the use of the credit score by all of the automated underwriting systems of the corporation and any other procedures and systems used by the corporation to purchase residential mortgages that use a credit score.

“(C) VALIDATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—The corporation shall establish a validation and approval process for the use of credit score models, under which the corporation may not validate and approve a credit score model unless the credit score model—

“(i) satisfies minimum requirements of integrity, reliability, and accuracy;

“(ii) has a historical record of measuring and predicting default rates and other credit behaviors;

“(iii) is consistent with the safe and sound operation of the corporation;

“(iv) complies with any standards and criteria established by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency under section 1328(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992; and

“(v) satisfies any other requirements, as determined by the corporation.

“(D) REPLACEMENT OF CREDIT SCORE MODEL.—If the corporation has validated and approved 1 or more credit score models under subparagraph (C) and the corporation validates and approves an additional credit score model, the corporation may determine that—

“(i) the additional credit score model has replaced the credit score model or credit score models previously validated and approved; and

“(ii) the credit score model or credit score models previously validated and approved shall no longer be considered validated and approved for the purposes of subparagraph (B).

“(E) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Upon establishing the validation and approval process required under subparagraph (C), the corporation shall make publicly available a description of the validation and approval process.

“(F) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this paragraph, the corporation shall solicit applications from developers of credit scoring models for the validation and approval of those models under the process required under subparagraph (C).

“(G) TIMEFRAME FOR DETERMINATION; NOTICE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The corporation shall make a determination with respect to any application submitted under subparagraph (F), and provide notice of that determination to the applicant, before a date established by the corporation that is not later than 180 days after the date on which an application is submitted to the corporation.

“(ii) EXTENSIONS.—The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency may authorize not more than 2 extensions of the date established under clause (i), each of which shall not exceed 30 days, upon a written request and a showing of good cause by the corporation.

“(iii) STATUS NOTICE.—The corporation shall provide notice to an applicant regarding the status of an application submitted under subparagraph (F) not later than 60 days after the date on which the application was submitted to the corporation.

“(iv) REASONS FOR DISAPPROVAL.—If an application submitted under subparagraph (F) is disapproved, the corporation shall provide to the applicant the reasons for the disapproval not later than 30 days after a determination is made under this subparagraph.

“(H) AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR.—If the corporation elects to use a credit score model under this paragraph, the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency shall require the corporation to periodically review the validation and approval process required under subparagraph (C) as the Director determines necessary to ensure that the process remains appropriate and adequate and complies with any standards and criteria established pursuant to section 1328(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992.

“(I) EXTENSION.—If, as of the effective date of this paragraph, a credit score model has not been approved under subparagraph (C), the corporation may use a credit score model that was in use before the effective date of this paragraph, if necessary to prevent substantial market disruptions, until the earlier of—

“(i) the date on which a credit score model is validated and approved under subparagraph (C); or

“(ii) the date that is 2 years after the effective date of this paragraph.”.

(b) USE OF CREDIT SCORES BY FREDDIE MAC IN PURCHASING RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGES.—Section 305 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘credit score’ means a numerical value or a categorization created by a third party derived from a statistical tool or modeling system used by a person who makes or arranges a loan to predict the likelihood of certain credit behaviors, including default.

“(2) USE OF CREDIT SCORES.—The Corporation shall condition purchase of a residential mortgage by the Corporation under this section on the provision of a credit score for the borrower only if—

“(A) the credit score is derived from any credit scoring model that has been validated and approved by the Corporation under this subsection; and

“(B) the Corporation provides for use of the credit score by all of the automated underwriting systems of the Corporation and any other procedures and systems used by the Corporation to purchase residential mortgages that use a credit score.

“(3) VALIDATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—The Corporation shall establish a validation and approval process for the use of credit score models, under which the Corporation may not validate and approve a credit score model unless the credit score model—

“(A) satisfies minimum requirements of integrity, reliability, and accuracy;

“(B) has a historical record of measuring and predicting default rates and other credit behaviors;

“(C) is consistent with the safe and sound operation of the corporation;

“(D) complies with any standards and criteria established by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency under section 1328(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992; and

“(E) satisfies any other requirements, as determined by the Corporation.

“(4) REPLACEMENT OF CREDIT SCORE MODEL.—If the Corporation has validated and approved 1 or more credit score models under paragraph (3) and if the Corporation validates and approves an additional credit score model, the Corporation may determine that—

“(A) the additional credit score model has replaced the credit score model or credit score models previously validated and approved; and

“(B) the credit score model or credit score models previously validated and approved shall no longer be considered validated and approved for purposes of paragraph (2).

“(5) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Upon establishing the validation and approval process required under paragraph (3), the Corporation shall make publicly available a description of the validation and approval process.

“(6) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this subsection, the Corporation shall solicit applications from developers of credit scoring models for the validation and approval of those models under the process required under paragraph (3).

“(7) TIMEFRAME FOR DETERMINATION; NOTICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall make a determination with respect to any application submitted under paragraph (6), and provide notice of that determination to the applicant, before a date established by the Corporation that is not later than 180 days after the date on which an application is submitted to the Corporation.

“(B) EXTENSIONS.—The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency may authorize not more than 2 extensions of the date established under subparagraph (A), each of which shall not exceed 30 days, upon a written request and a showing of good cause by the Corporation.

“(C) STATUS NOTICE.—The Corporation shall provide notice to an applicant regarding the status of an application submitted under paragraph (6) not later than 60 days

after the date on which the application was submitted to the Corporation.

“(D) REASONS FOR DISAPPROVAL.—If an application submitted under paragraph (6) is disapproved, the Corporation shall provide to the applicant the reasons for the disapproval not later than 30 days after a determination is made under this paragraph.

“(8) AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR.—If the Corporation elects to use a credit score under this subsection, the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency shall require the Corporation to periodically review the validation and approval process required under paragraph (3) as the Director determines necessary to ensure that the process remains appropriate and adequate and complies with any standards and criteria established pursuant to section 1328(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992.

“(9) EXTENSION.—If, as of the effective date of this subsection, a credit score model has not been approved under paragraph (3), the Corporation may use a credit score model that was in use before the effective date of this subsection, if necessary to prevent substantial market disruptions, until the earlier of—

“(A) the date on which a credit score model is validated and approved under paragraph (3); or

“(B) the date that is 2 years after the effective date of this subsection.”.

(c) AUTHORITY OF THE DIRECTOR.—Subpart A of part 2 of subtitle A of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4541 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1328. REGULATIONS FOR USE OF CREDIT SCORES.

“The Director shall—

“(1) by regulation, establish standards and criteria for any process used by an enterprise to validate and approve credit scoring models pursuant to section 302(b)(7) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)(7)) and section 305(d) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454(d)); and

“(2) ensure that any credit scoring model that is validated and approved by an enterprise under section 302(b)(7) (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)(7)) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act or section 305(d) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454(d)) meets the requirements of clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of section 302(b)(7)(C) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 305(d)(3) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act, respectively.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 311. GAO REPORT ON PUERTO RICO FORECLOSURES.

Not earlier than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on foreclosures in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, including—

(1) the rate of foreclosures in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(2) the rate of return for housing developers in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(3) the rate of delinquency in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(4) the rate of homeownership in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria; and

(5) the rate of defaults on federally insured mortgages in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria.

SEC. 312. REPORT ON CHILDREN'S LEAD-BASED PAINT HAZARD PREVENTION AND ABATEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Department” means the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

(2) the term “public housing agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an overview of existing policies and enforcement of the Department, including public outreach, relating to lead-based paint hazard prevention and abatement;

(2) recommendations and best practices for the Department, public housing agencies, and landlords for improving lead-based paint hazard prevention standards and Federal lead prevention and abatement policies to protect the environmental health and safety of children, including within housing receiving assistance from or occupied by families receiving housing assistance from the Department; and

(3) recommendations for legislation to improve lead-based paint hazard prevention and abatement.

SEC. 313. FORECLOSURE RELIEF AND EXTENSION FOR SERVICEMEMBERS.

Section 710(d) of the Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-154; 50 U.S.C. 3953 note) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (3).

TITLE IV—TAILORING REGULATIONS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

SEC. 401. ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “the applicable threshold”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) RISKS TO FINANCIAL STABILITY AND SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS.—The Board of Governors may by order or rule promulgated pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, apply any prudential standard established under this section to any bank holding company or bank holding companies with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000 to which the prudential standard does not otherwise apply provided that the Board of Governors—

“(i) determines that application of the prudential standard is appropriate—

“(I) to prevent or mitigate risks to the financial stability of the United States, as described in paragraph (1); or

“(II) to promote the safety and soundness of the bank holding company or bank holding companies; and

“(ii) takes into consideration the bank holding company's or bank holding companies' capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking “and credit exposure report”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting “, including credit exposure reports” before the semicolon at the end;

(3) in subsection (d)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”; and

(4) in subsection (h)(2), by striking “\$10,000,000,000” each place that term appears and inserting “\$50,000,000,000”;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i)—

(i) by striking “3” and inserting “2”; and

(ii) by striking “, adverse,”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking “semi-annual” and inserting “periodic”; and

(II) in the second sentence—

(aa) by striking “\$10,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(bb) by striking “annual” and inserting “periodic”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(ii)—

(I) by striking “3” and inserting “2”; and

(II) by striking “, adverse,”; and

(6) in subsection (j)(1), in the first sentence, by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to limit—

(1) the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in prescribing prudential standards under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) or any other law, to tailor or differentiate among companies on an individual basis or by category, taking into consideration their capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of their subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate; or

(2) the supervisory, regulatory, or enforcement authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency to further the safe and sound operation of an institution under the supervision of the appropriate Federal banking agency.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010.—The Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5311 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 115(a)(2)(B) (12 U.S.C. 5325(a)(2)(B)), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “the applicable threshold”;

(B) in section 116(a) (12 U.S.C. 5326(a)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(C) in section 121(a) (12 U.S.C. 5331(a)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(D) in section 155(d) (12 U.S.C. 5345(d)), by striking “50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(E) in section 163(b) (12 U.S.C. 5363(b)), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” each place that term appears and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(F) in section 164 (12 U.S.C. 5364), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”.

(2) FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—The second subsection (s) (relating to assessments) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(s)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—
(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000,000”; and
(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000,000”; and
(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) TAILORING ASSESSMENTS.—In collecting assessments, fees, or other charges under paragraph (1) from each company described in paragraph (2) with total consolidated assets of between \$100,000,000,000 and \$250,000,000,000, the Board shall adjust the amount charged to reflect any changes in supervisory and regulatory responsibilities resulting from the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act with respect to each such company.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to any bank holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$100,000,000,000.

(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—Before the effective date described in paragraph (1), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may by order exempt any bank holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$250,000,000,000 from any prudential standard under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365).

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from issuing an order or rule making under section 165(a)(2)(C) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365(a)(2)(C)), as added by this section, before the effective date described in paragraph (1).

(e) SUPERVISORY STRESS TEST.—Beginning on the effective date described in subsection (d)(1), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall, on a periodic basis, conduct supervisory stress tests of bank holding companies with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000 and total consolidated assets of less than \$250,000,000,000 to evaluate whether such bank holding companies have the capital, on a total consolidated basis, necessary to absorb losses as a result of adverse economic conditions.

(f) GLOBAL SYSTEMICALLY IMPORTANT BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.—Any bank holding company, regardless of asset size, that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be considered a bank holding company with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$250,000,000,000 with respect to the application of standards or requirements under—

(1) this section;

(2) sections 116(a), 121(a), 155(d), 163(b), 164, and 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5326(a), 5331(a), 5345(d), 5363(b), 5364, 5365); and

(3) paragraph (2)(A) of the second subsection (s) (relating to assessments) of sec-

tion 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(s)(2)).

(g) CLARIFICATION FOR FOREIGN BANKS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) affect the legal effect of the final rule of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System entitled “Enhanced Prudential Standards for Bank Holding Companies and Foreign Banking Organizations” (79 Fed. Reg. 17240 (March 27, 2014)) as applied to foreign banking organizations with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000; or

(2) limit the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to require the establishment of an intermediate holding company under, implement enhanced prudential standards with respect to, or tailor the regulation of a foreign banking organization with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000.

SEC. 402. SUPPLEMENTARY LEVERAGE RATIO FOR CUSTODIAL BANKS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “custodial bank” means any depository institution holding company predominantly engaged in custody, safekeeping, and asset servicing activities, including any insured depository institution subsidiary of such a holding company.

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “central bank” means—

(A) the Federal Reserve System;

(B) the European Central Bank; and

(C) central banks of member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, if—

(i) the member country has been assigned a zero percent risk weight under sections 3.32, 217.32, and 324.32 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

(ii) the sovereign debt of such member country is not in default or has not been in default during the previous 5 years.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall promulgate regulations to amend sections 3.10, 217.10, and 324.10 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, to specify that—

(A) subject to subparagraph (B), funds of a custodial bank that are deposited with a central bank shall not be taken into account when calculating the supplementary leverage ratio as applied to the custodial bank; and

(B) with respect to the funds described in subparagraph (A), any amount that exceeds the total value of deposits of the custodial bank that are linked to fiduciary or custodial and safekeeping accounts shall be taken into account when calculating the supplementary leverage ratio as applied to the custodial bank.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed to limit the authority of the appropriate Federal banking agencies to tailor or adjust the supplementary leverage ratio or any other leverage ratio for any company that is not a custodial bank.

SEC. 403. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended—

(1) by moving subsection (z) so that it appears after subsection (y); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(aa) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘investment grade’, with respect to an obligation, has the meaning given the term in section 1.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto;

“(B) the term ‘liquid and readily-marketable’ has the meaning given the term in section 249.3 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto; and

“(C) the term ‘municipal obligation’ means an obligation of—

“(i) a State or any political subdivision thereof; or

“(ii) any agency or instrumentality of a State or any political subdivision thereof.

“(2) MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.—For purposes of the final rule entitled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards’ (79 Fed. Reg. 61439 (October 10, 2014)), the final rule entitled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Treatment of U.S. Municipal Securities as High-Quality Liquid Assets’ (81 Fed. Reg. 21223 (April 11, 2016)), and any other regulation that incorporates a definition of the term ‘high-quality liquid asset’ or another substantially similar term, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall treat a municipal obligation as a high-quality liquid asset that is a level 2B liquid asset if that obligation is, as of the date of calculation—

“(A) liquid and readily-marketable; and

“(B) investment grade.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO LIQUIDITY COVERAGE RATIO REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall amend the final rule entitled “Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards” (79 Fed. Reg. 61439 (October 10, 2014)) and the final rule entitled “Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Treatment of U.S. Municipal Securities as High-Quality Liquid Assets” (81 Fed. Reg. 21223 (April 11, 2016)) to implement the amendments made by this section.

TITLE V—ENCOURAGING CAPITAL FORMATION

SEC. 501. NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGE REGULATORY PARITY.

Section 18(b)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A);

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting “a security designated as qualified for trading in the national market system pursuant to section 11A(a)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k-1(a)(2)) that is” before “listed”; and

(B) by striking “that has listing standards that the Commission determines by rule (on its own initiative or on the basis of a petition) are substantially similar to the listing standards applicable to securities described in subparagraph (A)”;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or (B)”;

(4) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

SEC. 502. SEC STUDY ON ALGORITHMIC TRADING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the risks and benefits of algorithmic trading in capital markets in the United States.

(b) MATTERS REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED.—The matters covered by the report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the effect of algorithmic trading in equity and debt markets in the United States on the provision of liquidity in stressed and normal market conditions.

(2) An assessment of the benefits and risks to equity and debt markets in the United States by algorithmic trading.

(3) An analysis of whether the activity of algorithmic trading and entities that engage in algorithmic trading are subject to appropriate Federal supervision and regulation.

(4) A recommendation of whether—

(A) based on the analysis described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), any changes should be made to regulations; and

(B) the Securities and Exchange Commission needs additional legal authorities or resources to effect the changes described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 503. ANNUAL REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT-BUSINESS FORUM ON CAPITAL FORMATION.

Section 503 of the Small Business Investment Incentive Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 80c-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) The Commission shall—

“(1) review the findings and recommendations of the forum; and

“(2) each time the forum submits a finding or recommendation to the Commission, promptly issue a public statement—

“(A) assessing the finding or recommendation of the forum; and

“(B) disclosing the action, if any, the Commission intends to take with respect to the finding or recommendation.”.

SEC. 504. SUPPORTING AMERICA'S INNOVATORS.

Section 3(c)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “(or, in the case of a qualifying venture capital fund, 250 persons)” after “one hundred persons”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C)(i) The term ‘qualifying venture capital fund’ means a venture capital fund that has not more than \$10,000,000 in aggregate capital contributions and uncalled committed capital, with such dollar amount to be indexed for inflation once every 5 years by the Commission, beginning from a measurement made by the Commission on a date selected by the Commission, rounded to the nearest \$1,000,000.

“(ii) The term ‘venture capital fund’ has the meaning given the term in section 275.203(1)-1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.”.

SEC. 505. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION OVERPAYMENT CREDIT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Commission” means the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(2) the term “national securities association” means an association that is registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3); and

(3) the term “national securities exchange” means an exchange that is registered as a national securities exchange under section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f).

(b) CREDIT FOR OVERPAYMENT OF FEES.—Notwithstanding section 31(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee(j)), and subject to subsection (c) of this section, if a national securities exchange or a national securities association has paid fees and assessments to the Commission in an amount that is more than the amount that the exchange or association was required to pay under section 31 of the Securities Ex-

change Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) and, not later than 10 years after the date of such payment, the exchange or association informs the Commission about the payment of such excess amount, the Commission shall offset future fees and assessments due by that exchange or association in an amount that is equal to the difference between the amount that the exchange or association paid and the amount that the exchange or association was required to pay under such section 31.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (b) shall apply only to fees and assessments that a national securities exchange or a national securities association was required to pay to the Commission before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 506. U.S. TERRITORIES INVESTOR PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-6(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SAFE HARBOR.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) SAFE HARBOR.—With respect to a company that is exempt under section 6(a)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-6(a)(1)) on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) EXTENSION OF SAFE HARBOR.—The Securities and Exchange Commission, by rule or regulation upon its own motion, or by order upon application, may conditionally or unconditionally, under section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-6(c)), further delay the effective date for a company described in paragraph (2) for a maximum of 3 years following the initial 3-year period if, before the end of the initial 3-year period, the Commission determines that such a rule, regulation, motion, or order is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors.

SEC. 507. ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to increase from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 the aggregate sales price or amount of securities sold during any consecutive 12-month period in excess of which the issuer is required under such section to deliver an additional disclosure to investors. The Commission shall index for inflation such aggregate sales price or amount every 5 years to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounding to the nearest \$1,000,000.

SEC. 508. IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL.

The Securities and Exchange Commission shall amend—

(1) section 230.251 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the requirement that the issuer not be subject to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) immediately before the offering; and

(2) section 230.257 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to an offering described in section 230.251(a)(2) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to deem any

issuer that is subject to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as having met the periodic and current reporting requirements of section 230.257 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, if such issuer meets the reporting requirements of section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

SEC. 509. PARITY FOR CLOSED-END COMPANIES REGARDING OFFERING AND PROXY RULES.

(a) REVISION TO RULES.—Not later than the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall propose and, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall finalize any rules, as appropriate, to allow any closed-end company, as defined in section 5(a)(2) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-5), that is registered as an investment company under such Act, and is listed on a national securities exchange or that makes periodic repurchase offers pursuant to section 270.23c-3 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to use the securities offering and proxy rules, subject to conditions the Commission determines appropriate, that are available to other issuers that are required to file reports under section 13 or section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m; 78o(d)). Any action that the Commission takes pursuant to this subsection shall consider the availability of information to investors, including what disclosures constitute adequate information to be designated as a “well-known seasoned issuer”.

(b) TREATMENT IF REVISIONS NOT COMPLETED IN A TIMELY MANNER.—If the Commission fails to complete the revisions required by subsection (a) by the time required by such subsection, any registered closed-end company that is listed on a national securities exchange or that makes periodic repurchase offers pursuant to section 270.23c-3 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be an eligible issuer under the final rule of the Commission titled “Securities Offering Reform” (70 Fed. Reg. 44722; published August 3, 2005).

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) NO EFFECT ON RULE 482.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to impair or limit in any way a registered closed-end company from using section 230.482 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to distribute sales material.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in this section to a section of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or to any form or schedule means such rule, section, form, or schedule, or any successor to any such rule, section, form, or schedule.

TITLE VI—PROTECTIONS FOR STUDENT BORROWERS

SEC. 601. PROTECTIONS IN THE EVENT OF DEATH OR BANKRUPTCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (8) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) the term ‘cosigner’—

“(A) means any individual who is liable for the obligation of another without compensation, regardless of how designated in the contract or instrument with respect to that obligation, other than an obligation under a

private education loan extended to consolidate a consumer's pre-existing private education loans;

"(B) includes any person the signature of which is requested as condition to grant credit or to forbear on collection; and

"(C) does not include a spouse of an individual described in subparagraph (A), the signature of whom is needed to perfect the security interest in a loan."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(g) ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS RELATING TO BORROWER OR COSIGNER OF A PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—

"(1) PROHIBITION ON AUTOMATIC DEFAULT IN CASE OF DEATH OR BANKRUPTCY OF NON-STUDENT OBLIGOR.—With respect to a private education loan involving a student obligor and 1 or more cosigners, the creditor shall not declare a default or accelerate the debt against the student obligor on the sole basis of a bankruptcy or death of a cosigner.

"(2) COSIGNER RELEASE IN CASE OF DEATH OF BORROWER.—

"(A) RELEASE OF COSIGNER.—The holder of a private education loan, when notified of the death of a student obligor, shall release within a reasonable timeframe any cosigner from the obligations of the cosigner under the private education loan.

"(B) NOTIFICATION OF RELEASE.—A holder or servicer of a private education loan, as applicable, shall within a reasonable timeframe notify any cosigners for the private education loan if a cosigner is released from the obligations of the cosigner for the private education loan under this paragraph.

"(C) DESIGNATION OF INDIVIDUAL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE BORROWER.—Any lender that extends a private education loan shall provide the student obligor an option to designate an individual to have the legal authority to act on behalf of the student obligor with respect to the private education loan in the event of the death of the student obligor."

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall only apply to private education loan agreements entered into on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 602. REHABILITATION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 623(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(E) REHABILITATION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a consumer may request a financial institution to remove from a consumer report a reported default regarding a private education loan, and such information shall not be considered inaccurate, if—

"(I) the financial institution chooses to offer a loan rehabilitation program which includes, without limitation, a requirement of the consumer to make consecutive on-time monthly payments in a number that demonstrates, in the assessment of the financial institution offering the loan rehabilitation program, a renewed ability and willingness to repay the loan; and

"(II) the requirements of the loan rehabilitation program described in subclause (I) are successfully met.

"(ii) BANKING AGENCIES.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—If a financial institution is supervised by a Federal banking agency, the financial institution shall seek written approval concerning the terms and conditions of the loan rehabilitation program de-

scribed in clause (i) from the appropriate Federal banking agency.

"(II) FEEDBACK.—An appropriate Federal banking agency shall provide feedback to a financial institution within 120 days of a request for approval under subclause (I).

"(iii) LIMITATION.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—A consumer may obtain the benefits available under this subsection with respect to rehabilitating a loan only 1 time per loan.

"(II) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to require a financial institution to offer a loan rehabilitation program or to remove any reported default from a consumer report as a consideration of a loan rehabilitation program, except as described in clause (i).

"(iv) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subparagraph—

"(I) the term 'appropriate Federal banking agency' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

"(II) the term 'private education loan' has the meaning given the term in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a))."

(b) GAO STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study, in consultation with the appropriate Federal banking agencies, regarding—

(A) the implementation of subparagraph (E) of section 623(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(1)) (referred to in this paragraph as "the provision"), as added by subsection (a);

(B) the estimated operational, compliance, and reporting costs associated with the requirements of the provision;

(C) the effects of the requirements of the provision on the accuracy of credit reporting;

(D) the risks to safety and soundness, if any, created by the loan rehabilitation programs described in the provision; and

(E) a review of the effectiveness and impact on the credit of participants in any loan rehabilitation programs described in the provision and whether such programs improved the ability of participants in the programs to access credit products.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that contains all findings and determinations made in conducting the study required under paragraph (1).

SEC. 603. BEST PRACTICES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCIAL LITERACY.

Section 514(a) of the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9703(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) BEST PRACTICES FOR TEACHING FINANCIAL LITERACY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—After soliciting public comments and consulting with and receiving input from relevant parties, including a diverse set of institutions of higher education and other parties, the Commission shall, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, establish best practices for institutions of higher education regarding methods to—

"(i) teach financial literacy skills; and

"(ii) provide useful and necessary information to assist students at institutions of higher education when making financial decisions related to student borrowing.

"(B) BEST PRACTICES.—The best practices described in subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

"(i) Methods to ensure that each student has a clear sense of the student's total borrowing obligations, including monthly payments, and repayment options.

"(ii) The most effective ways to engage students in financial literacy education, including frequency and timing of communication with students.

"(iii) Information on how to target different student populations, including part-time students, first-time students, and other nontraditional students.

"(iv) Ways to clearly communicate the importance of graduating on a student's ability to repay student loans.

"(C) MAINTENANCE OF BEST PRACTICES.—The Commission shall maintain and periodically update the best practices information required under this paragraph and make the best practices available to the public.

"(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require an institution of higher education to adopt the best practices required under this paragraph."

SA 2152. Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 192, line 13, strike "1 year" and insert "15 months".

SA 2153. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . APPLICABILITY OF CAPITAL AND MARGIN REQUIREMENTS TO COUNTERPARTIES.

Section 4s(e)(4) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking "counterparty qualifies" and inserting the following: "counterparty—

"(A) qualifies";

(2) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(B)(i) is a money transmitter (as defined in section 1010.100(ff)(5) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) (or any successor regulation)) that—

"(I) is regulated by a State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or possession of the United States for financial adequacy;

"(II) is registered in accordance with section 1022.380 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

"(III) enters only into swaps exclusively for the purpose of offsetting risks generated from foreign currency contracts with an entity that is not a financial end user (as defined in section 23.151 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)); and

“(ii) has total assets of \$1,000,000,000 or less on the last day of its most recent fiscal year.”.

SA 2154. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

TITLE VI—WORKER DIVIDEND ACT OF 2018

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Worker Dividend Act of 2018”.

SEC. 602. FAILURE OF EMPLOYER TO PAY WORKER DIVIDENDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after chapter 36 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 37—PROVISIONS RELATING TO WORKER DIVIDENDS

“Sec. 4501. Failure of employer to pay worker dividends.

“SEC. 4501. FAILURE OF EMPLOYER TO PAY WORKER DIVIDENDS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—If, for a taxable year in which a covered employer repurchases any securities of the employer on the open market, the covered employer fails to pay to its employees a worker dividend meeting the requirements of subsection (b), then there is hereby imposed on the covered employer a tax equal to the lesser of the amounts determined under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(1).

“(b) WORKER DIVIDEND.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘worker dividend’ means a payment made by a covered employer to employees of the employer at locations in the United States, if the total of all such payments made during the taxable year is not less than the lesser of—

“(A) the amount paid by the employer to repurchase securities of the employer on the open market during the taxable year, and

“(B) 50 percent of the amount by which the earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization of the employer during the taxable year in the United States exceed \$250,000,000.

“(2) PAYMENTS TO BE IN ADDITION TO COMPENSATION.—Such term shall not include any payment unless such payment is in addition to, and (including by election of the employee) is not included in (except as provided in paragraph (5)) or substituted for, any cash or other compensation ordinarily paid to the employee by the employer.

“(3) PAYMENTS TO BE EQUAL.—Such term shall not include any payment unless the amount of the payment made to each employee of the employer in the United States is of an equal amount. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, in the case of an employee employed at less than full time, the payment to such employee may be in a pro rata amount based on the hours worked by the employee per week.

“(4) TIMING OF PAYMENT.—Such term shall not include any payment which is not made within 60 days of the close of the taxable year to which it relates.

“(5) OPTION TO INCREASE COMPENSATION.—A covered employer may, by providing such documentation as the Secretary may require, elect to have the worker dividend paid

to employees in the form of an increase in regular compensation. In the case of a covered employer making such election—

“(A) paragraph (4) shall not apply, and

“(B) the term ‘worker dividend’ includes only increases in compensation which are so documented and which are paid within 1 calendar year of the date the increase goes into effect.

“(c) COVERED EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘covered employer’ means, for any taxable year, any entity the stock of which is publicly traded.

“(d) AGGREGATION RULE.—All persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 shall be treated as a single employer for purposes of determining whether an individual is an employee of a covered employer.

“(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall promulgate regulations or other guidance to ensure compliance with this section, including the determination of full time status and rules to prevent avoidance of the purposes of subsection (b)(2).

“(f) REPORTING.—With respect to any taxable year in which a covered employer repurchases any securities of the employer on the open market, not later than the due date for the return of tax for such taxable year such employer shall report to the Secretary and the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, in such manner as the Secretary shall determine, the amount of any worker dividend paid during such taxable year and any other information as the Secretary shall require.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 36 the following new item:

“CHAPTER 37—PROVISIONS RELATING TO WORKER DIVIDENDS”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to repurchases of employer securities in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2155. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . INTEREST RATE REDUCTION.

(a) NATIONAL CONSUMER CREDIT USURY RATE.—Section 107 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1606) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) NATIONAL CONSUMER CREDIT USURY RATE.—

“(1) LIMITATION ESTABLISHED.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) or any other provision of law, but except as provided in paragraph (2), the annual percentage rate applicable to any extension of credit may not exceed 15 percent on unpaid balances, inclusive of all finance charges. Any fees that are not considered finance charges under section 106(a) may not be used to evade the limitations of this paragraph, and the total sum of such fees may not exceed the total amount of finance charges assessed.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) BOARD AUTHORITY.—The Board may establish, after consultation with the appro-

priate committees of Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury, and any other interested Federal financial institution regulatory agency, an annual percentage rate of interest ceiling exceeding the 15 percent annual rate under paragraph (1) for periods of not to exceed 18 months, upon a determination that—

“(i) money market interest rates have risen over the preceding 6-month period; and

“(ii) prevailing interest rate levels threaten the safety and soundness of individual lenders, as evidenced by adverse trends in liquidity, capital, earnings, and growth.

“(B) TREATMENT OF CREDIT UNIONS.—The limitation in paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to any extension of credit by an insured credit union, as that term is defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

“(3) PENALTIES FOR CHARGING HIGHER RATES.—

“(A) VIOLATION.—The taking, receiving, reserving, or charging of an annual percentage rate or fee greater than that permitted by paragraph (1), when knowingly done, shall be deemed a violation of this title, and a forfeiture of the entire interest which the note, bill, or other evidence of the obligation carries with it, or which has been agreed to be paid thereon.

“(B) REFUND OF INTEREST AMOUNTS.—If an annual percentage rate or fee greater than that permitted under paragraph (1) has been paid, the person by whom it has been paid, or the legal representative thereof, may, by bringing an action not later than 2 years after the date on which the usurious collection was last made, recover back from the lender in an action in the nature of an action of debt, the entire amount of interest, finance charges, or fees paid.

“(4) CIVIL LIABILITY.—Any creditor who violates this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of section 130.

“(g) RELATION TO STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt any provision of State law that provides greater protection to consumers than is provided in this section.”.

(b) CIVIL LIABILITY CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 130(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1640(a)) is amended by inserting “section 107(f),” before “this chapter”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CAPITO. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations:

Joseph E. Macmanus, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Marie Royce, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary (Educational and Cultural Affairs), Robin S. Bernstein, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, and Edward Charles Prado, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Argentine Republic, all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSION

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, Frank T. Brogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, and Mark Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Institute of Education Science, both of the Department of Education, Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and other pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John B. Nalbandian, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kari A. Dooley, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Dominic W. Lanza, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, Jill Aiko Otake, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii, and Joseph H. Hunt, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a joint hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Open Hearing on Security Clearance Reform."

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at 1 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Stopping Senior Scams."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, AGENCY ACTION,
FEDERAL RIGHTS AND FEDERAL COURTS

The Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2018 at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Small Business Bankruptcy: Assessing the System."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Arif Hasan, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

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

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION
OF MARCH 2018 AS "NATIONAL
COLORECTAL CANCER AWARE-
NESS MONTH"

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 425, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 425) supporting the designation of March 2018 as "National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 425) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.
(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following calendar bills en bloc: Calendar Nos. 313 through 334.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment, where applicable, be agreed to, and the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time en bloc.

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

GEORGE SAKATO POST OFFICE

The bill (S. 931) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service

located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office," was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

AMELIA EARHART POST OFFICE
BUILDING

The bill (S. 2040) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621 Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, as the "Amelia Earhart Post Office Building," was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

ENDY NDDIOBONG EKPANYA POST
OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 294) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the "Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

SPECIALIST JEFFREY L. WHITE,
JR. POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 452) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

CONVERSE VETERANS POST
OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 1208) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the "Converse Veterans Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

STAFF SERGEANT RYAN SCOTT
OSTROM POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 1858) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office" was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

MERLE HAGGARD POST OFFICE
BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 1988) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the "Merle Haggard Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

JANET CAPELLO POST OFFICE
BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 2254) to designate the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

DR. JOHN F. NASH, JR. POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 2302) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 2464) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

SGT. DOUGLAS J. RINEY POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 2672) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

GUNNERY SERGEANT JOHN BASILONE POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 2815) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the "Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

STAFF SERGEANT PETER TAUB POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 2873) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

SR. CHIEF RYAN OWENS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 3109) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the "Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

HOWARD B. PATE, JR. POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 3369) to designate the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the "Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

RUTLEDGE PEARSON POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 3638) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the "Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

WALTER S. MCAFEE POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 3655) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the "Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

ZACK T. ADDINGTON POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 3821) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the "Zack T. Addington Post Office," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

ROBERT H. JENKINS, JR. POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 3893) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the "Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

BORINQUENEERS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4042) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

JAMES C. "BILLY" JOHNSON POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4285) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, as the "James C. 'Billy' Johnson Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

TILDEN VETERANS POST OFFICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1207) to designate the facility

of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, as the "Tilden Veterans Post Office," which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be deleted is shown in boldface brackets.)

H.R. 1207

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

SECTION 1. [SPECIALIST] TILDEN VETERANS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Tilden Veterans Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Tilden Veterans Post Office".

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bills en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the bills having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bills pass en bloc?

The bill (S. 931) was passed, as follows:

S. 931

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

SECTION 1. GEORGE SAKATO POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, shall be known and designated as the "George Sakato Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "George Sakato Post Office".

The bill (S. 2040) was passed, as follows:

S. 2040

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

SECTION 1. AMELIA EARHART POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621 Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the "Amelia Earhart Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Amelia Earhart Post Office Building".

The bills (H.R. 294, H.R. 452, H.R. 1208, H.R. 1858, H.R. 1988, H.R. 2254, H.R.

2302, H.R. 2464, H.R. 2672, H.R. 2815, H.R. 2873, H.R. 3109, H.R. 3369, H.R. 3638, H.R. 3655, H.R. 3821, H.R. 3893, H.R. 4042, and H.R. 4285) were passed.

The bill (H.R. 1207), as amended, was passed.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, we are now on the bill, S. 2155. We have offered a bipartisan substitute that reflects the priorities from Members on both sides of the aisle. We are ready to begin the process of voting on further amendments.

I have discussed the path forward with the majority leader, and we would like to begin alternating amendments

and setting votes on them with limited time agreements. The first two amendments on the Republican side are a Paul amendment to audit the Federal Reserve and a Moran amendment to restructure the management and funding of the CFPB. I understand there are several amendments on the Democratic side, as well, and we are willing to start setting those votes in an alternating fashion. It is my understanding, however, that there are objections on the Democratic side to setting votes at this time, but I hope we can convene tomorrow and start the process of voting on amendments and work together in cooperation to finalize the amendment process.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2018

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 8; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 7, 2018:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL RIGAS, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

JEFF TIEN HAN PON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MCGREGOR W. SCOTT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

GARY G. SCHOFIELD, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

BILLY J. WILLIAMS, OF OREGON, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

MARK S. JAMES, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DANIEL C. MOSTELLER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JESSE SEROYER, JR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING SUMMER BRITCHER OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR HER CAREER ACHIEVEMENTS AND PERFORMANCE AT THE 2018 WINTER OLYMPICS IN SOUTH KOREA

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I extend my sincere congratulations to Miss Summer Britcher of Glen Rock, Pennsylvania, for a great run at the 2018 Winter Olympics in PyeongChang, South Korea. Summer represented the United States on the Olympic Luge team, and is a true champion—of which the citizens of the 4th Congressional District couldn't be more proud.

Summer's career highlights thus far are remarkable. Her five World Cup career victories make her the all-time singles leader in USA Luge history. She won the 2012 Youth Olympic Games Gold medal in team relay, the Silver medal in team relay at Junior World Championships in Austria, earned the 2013 Norton Junior National Championship, and was named the 2017 U23 World Champion. Summer also finished 15th at the 2014 XXII Olympic Winter Games in Sochi, Russia.

Although the end result at the 2018 Winter Olympics wasn't as she'd hoped, Summer was the epitome of true grit, character and sportsmanship. She summarized the experience with the following statement: "I love my teammates, and I think the important thing that I feel (is) incredibly lucky to be a part of this team and to have them in my life." Summer set the standard—in performance, perseverance and sportsmanship—for all to follow.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I commend and congratulate Summer Britcher on her hard work and determination that has led to these exceptional achievements. We look forward to her future adventures.

RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT OF DR. LEONARD L. HAMLIN, SR.

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to officially recognize the outstanding public achievement of Dr. Leonard L. Hamlin, Sr. Since November 1996, Dr. Hamlin has served as Pastor of Macedonia Baptist Church in Arlington. Under Dr. Hamlin's leadership, Macedonia Baptist has experienced continuous growth in membership which today stands at approximately 1,300 members. During Dr. Hamlin's time at the Church, he's led the development of Annual Leadership Conferences, major renovations of the upper level of the Church, the implementation of Before and After Care School Program and the partnership with the Arlington Housing Corporation for the development of thirty-six affordable housing units which opened in May 2011.

Dr. Hamlin is a pillar of the Nauck community and Arlington is truly blessed to have had his service. Godspeed to Dr. Hamlin as he leaves Macedonia Baptist to take on a senior position at the National Cathedral.

TUOLUMNE COUNTY ALLIANCE FOR RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT FOUNDER'S DAY CELEBRATION

HON. TOM MCCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Tuolumne County Alliance for Resources & Environment, known by its acronym TuCARE, was founded in 1988 by a group of concerned citizens who believed forest regulations were dooming rural communities to economic ruin. It has grown in to an effective grassroots organization dedicated to educating the public and legislators about the wise use of our natural resources.

The group emphasizes "Multiple Use is Wise Use", meaning the public lands and resources contained therein are intended for a variety of public uses, including timber production, recreation, watershed sources, and biodiversity in habitat.

Officers and members of TuCARE make presentations before legislative bodies and present to public and private organizations on behalf of Tuolumne County natural resource issues. As part of their mission to educate, TuCARE publishes news articles and position papers on topics such as vegetation management including the use of herbicides; "No Net Loss" of private lands, wildlife protection overreach, and the development of water storage and mineral extraction on both public and private lands.

TuCARE has engaged on many important land use issues, including opposing the expansion of Yosemite National Park and working tirelessly to keep the Stanislaus National Forest a multiple use forest. The group also worked to promote the Clavey River Project that would have increased county water supplies and generated electricity through hydro projects and supported the continuation of Forest Reserve Funds that guaranteed local communities a share of the receipts from timber harvests from local public lands.

Over the years, TuCARE has continued to press for reduced restrictions on private property owners, including the elimination of severe ESA, CEPA and NEPA regulations that discourage a vibrant local economy and negatively affect the ability to manage resources.

During the past 30 years, TuCARE has held countless natural resource tours and summits for the public, including legislators, decision makers, educators and the public, both young and old. Since the tours began, TuCARE has had the privilege of educating over 30,000 individuals about the wise use and management of our natural resources. Nearly 300 dedicated men and women have volunteered untold hours to respond to the resource education needs of the public as part of TuCARE's extensive list of past (and present) Board of Directors. These individuals share a passion for

the need to educate so others can make better, informed decisions about our resources. TuCARE volunteers are working to ensure the perpetuity of our resources for future generations and to help local economies prosper despite restrictive environmental rules and regulations.

TuCARE's members have consistently supported the organization's efforts both financially and physically—attending 30 years of annual resource summits, annual dinners and responding to "boots on the ground" needs for rallies and public displays of support. It has been a true group effort, with men and women from all walks of life joining together to ensure the promise of life, liberty and prosperity.

IN HONOR OF SYLACAUGA WINNING AHSAA CLASS 5A HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL TITLE

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Sylacauga High School Varsity Boys for winning the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 5A basketball state title for the first time since 1988.

The Aggies beat the Eufaula Tigers 79-78 on March 3, 2018 at the Legacy Arena at the BJCC in Birmingham, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the students and faculty of Sylacauga High School, the coaches, the players and all the Aggies fans on this exciting achievement. Go Aggies.

H.R. 4607

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, due to flight delays, I was unable to vote on H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act. I would have voted against this legislation. Changing the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act (EGRPA) review process timeline from every ten years to every seven will drive up the deficit, and gives financial regulators little time to implement recommendations. I was especially appalled with the Rules Committee's adoption of an amendment to allow Congress to raid the Federal Reserve to pay for this legislation.

I also disagreed with the provision that includes the CFPB in the EGRPA review. This is unnecessary and duplicative, as the CFPB is already subject to a review of its rules every five years.

Most importantly, I have serious concerns with shifting the mandate that regulators identify "outdated and unnecessary" regulations to a mandate that regulators limit regulatory burdens. Directing regulators to prioritize limiting "cost, liability risk, and other burdens," would further reduce regulations for large banks,

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

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

payday lenders, and thousands of other financial services companies without consideration for how these rules safeguard consumers.

**HONORING COUNCILMAN
GLEN LARUE**

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Whitley County Councilman Glen Larue. For 11 years, Councilman Larue has represented Columbia Township. Additionally, Glen has served as dispatcher for the Whitley County Sheriff's Department and as a Columbia City volunteer fireman. I had the honor of serving with Councilman Larue in 2009 and 2010 and I saw firsthand his dedication and commitment to public service. I wish him the best as he begins the next chapter of his life. Whitley County and Columbia Township will miss his leadership and commitment to public service.

THE DARBY LIBRARY COMPANY

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the Darby Library Company, which will be celebrating its 275th birthday on March 10, 2018.

On its founding date in 1743, the Darby Library Company, located in the Village of Darby (present day Darby, PA), became the first cultural institution in the Philadelphia area. The Darby Library Company has served as a beacon of culture and intellectual curiosity throughout the development of a country and multiple wars and natural disasters, and nearly three centuries of history. Even today, after 275 years, it still provides library services for the Darby community and serves as a landmark in the neighborhood.

Generation after generation, members of the Darby Community have come to this historic establishment to read, learn, study and explore. The people of Darby have been and will continue to be the beneficiaries of this historic establishment. I am very proud that this incredible institution has such a long and illustrious history in my district.

Today, the Library boasts over 20,000 pieces of literature, including fiction, non-fiction, and reference books, in addition to a variety of audio, DVD, and video tapes. These programs and services are clearly beneficial to both Darby, as well as to the Greater Philadelphia area.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the Darby Library Company, for its 275 years of service to the Greater Philadelphia community, specifically the citizens of Darby, Pennsylvania.

**HONOR FLIGHT NORTHERN
COLORADO 2018**

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, in honor of America's heroic veterans, the Honor Flight Net-

work conducts two annual Honor Flight ceremonies to Washington, D.C. to give our nation's heroes a day to visit and reflect at their war memorials. On September 17, 2017, Honor Flight Northern Colorado held its 19th Honor Flight that gave many of our courageous veterans this extraordinary opportunity. I am pleased to recognize the September 17, 2017 Honor Flight honoring World War II, Korean War, and Vietnam War veterans of Northern Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, those who participated in this flight are as follows:

World War II: Carl Curtis, Eugene Doty, Ben Gutfelder, Fred Heinze, James Ingram, Elwood Johnsen, George Kunz, Stuart Mundt, Merwin Waterman.

Korean War: John Anderson, Ralph Ashton, William Bohn, Gerald Briggs, Joseph Carney, Dale Doty, Ernest Garcia, Charles Gustafson, Fred Hagen, Richard Hornung, Phillip Kaspar, Dixon King, George Lanes, John Lark, Don Moritz, August Roemer, Melvin Salter, Paul Salvador, Arlen Sarian, Walter Slocum Jr., Arthur Smith, Willard Unrein, Robert Wallen, William Webster, Reginald Willcox.

Vietnam War: Edward Aitken, Charles Ashbaugh, Harry Ashbaugh, Frank Atwood, Thomas Barker, Lanny Benninger, Eldredge Blain, William Bjorlin, Leslie Bums, Joel Champion, James Chopp, Willis Corcoran, William Damewood, Anson Derby, Clarence Dye, Clifford Echols, Roy Echols, David Fanning, Wesley Feeney Jr., Budd Finch Jr., Errol Ford, Michael Gail, Alonzo Garza, Dennis Gordon, Eldon Harrell, Larry Hartman, Allan Havens, John Hendrickson, Nicholas Herrera, Donald Hull, Raymond Johnson, John Kask, Paul Kommueller, Charles Kluttsch, Joseph Long, Michael Long, Edward Longhini, Joseph Maes, Loren Maes, Gary Malara, David Mathis, Michael McClure, Jerry McDaniel, Mark McKinley, Oscar Metzgar, Steven Moskowitz, Allan Nelson, Robert Nelson, Russell Ness, Paul Nobles, Sven Nylander, Max Oesterle, Dale Olson, David Painter, Thomas Parker, Raymond Patch, Rudolf Peralez, Robert Perlenfien, John Perrine, Wayne Peterson, Louis Price, Jerry Purdy, Ernie Pyle, Ronald Ramirez, Richard Reininger, Frank Ross, Joe Roybal, John Ryan, Genaro Salazar, Raymond Sautter, Robert Schawo, Rudy Schenk, Larry Schwindt, Robert Shaeffer, Dan Shaffer, Roger Smith, Daniel Sorensen, Andrew Stephenson, Marjorie Stephenson, Walter Stolpa Jr., Dwight Strandberg, Barton Thompson, Norman Toman, Richard Tompkins, Samuel Trujillo, Terrence Urista, Myron Wagner, James Wetzler, Charles Winkleman.

It is my distinct pleasure as the U.S. Representative of the 4th District of Colorado to recognize the honor, courage, and sacrifice of these heroes, along with all members of America's Armed Forces. I thank them for their dedication and service to this nation.

THOMAS CRONIN

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Thomas Cronin, a generous citizen of Southwest Florida who peacefully passed away on February 16, 2018.

After attending St. Francis Xavier Catholic School and Fort Myers High School, he proudly served his country in the United States Army. Then, he returned to Southwest Florida

and served his community as a businessman and philanthropist.

He was instrumental in the founding of the Southwest Florida Regional Hospital, now part of LeeHealth. Further serving our community, he worked on projects such as the development of Hodges University, the City of Palms Park Stadium, and the revamping of worn-down properties to increase the beauty of our paradise coast.

His leadership is shown through his active roles in local projects such as the Lee County YMCA, the Shell Factory and Nature Park in North Fort Myers, the United Way of Lee County, and the Jaycees and Octagon Wildlife Sanctuary.

The Southwest Florida community celebrates him for his cheerful Irish spirit, kind heart, and selfless service to his community. I want to extend my condolences to his wife, Pamela Cronin, his son, Thomas Cronin, Jr., his daughter Constance Martine Cronin, and the rest of his loving family and friends.

**IN RECOGNITION OF J. WARREN
STEMBRIDGE**

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and service of a dedicated public servant, Mr. J. Warren Stemberge. Mr. Stemberge will be honored at the Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA) Headquarters in Langley, Virginia on Monday, March 12, 2018. He will be awarded the Distinguished Career Intelligence Medal, which is given to an individual whose cumulative record of service reflects a pattern of increasing levels of responsibility, strategic impact, and distinctly exceptional achievements.

J. Warren Stemberge was born in Cordele, Georgia to Mr. W. Asbury Stemberge, Sr. and Mrs. Charlotte W. Stemberge as one of two sons. At the age of ten, his family moved to Macon, Georgia, where he was enrolled in the Bibb County School System. After graduating from Central High School, he went on to earn a bachelor's degree in Political Science from the University of Georgia in 1985. Shortly after receiving his degree, he began his illustrious career with the CIA.

For over three decades, Mr. Stemberge was a well-respected leader at the CIA. He built quite an impressive career, which was amplified in 2005 when he entered into the Senior Intelligence Service. During his tenure in the Senior Intelligence Service, he held several leadership roles including Deputy Director of the Office of Congressional Affairs and completed several overseas tours in areas of conflict. In December 2016, after serving for over 31 years, Mr. Stemberge retired from the CIA.

He currently serves as the Executive Vice President of Intelligence over the National Security Solutions unit of Pacific Architects and Engineers (PAE) and works directly with domestic and foreign government agencies within the intelligence community.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, "Life's most persistent and urgent question is, 'What are you doing for others?'" Mr. Stemberge undoubtedly lives by this philosophy. From his extensive work with the CIA to protect our nation's security to his efforts to provide service to the global community, his work has made a tremendous impact on the lives of many.

J. Warren Stembridge has achieved much success in his life, but none would have been possible without the enduring love and support of his wife, Laurel; and their children, Ben, Julie, and Lindsay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District, in extending our sincerest congratulations to Mr. J. Warren Stembridge for receiving the Distinguished Career Intelligence Medal, and thanking him for an outstanding career of public service.

IN RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL GEORGE, AVOCA WEST SIDE SOCIAL CLUB'S "MAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michael George, who will be receiving the Avoca West Side Social Club's "Man of the Year" Award. He will be honored on March 17, 2018 during the Club's inaugural St. Patrick's Day Celebration.

The son of the late David and Mildred George, Mike was born and raised in Avoca, Pennsylvania. He is a graduating member of Avoca High School Class of 1959. He opened his first car repair business in Avoca on South Main Street in 1961. In 1969, Mike relocated his business to 935 Main Street and expanded his operation to include a gas station. It was the only service station in Avoca Borough for over three decades. Mike remained in business for almost fifty years until he retired. Mike also shared his professional knowledge by serving as an automobile repair instructor to those looking to enter the field.

In addition to operating his business, Mike has been actively involved with local community organizations. He is a founding member of the Avoca Jolly Boys, a group that sponsors community events like children's basketball leagues and other recreational activities. He is the past president of the Avoca Lions Club and initiated the annual Lions Club Christmas Light Project along Main Street and McAlpine Street in the borough. Mike is also a regular member of the Avoca West Side Club and Rainbow Rod and Gun Club. He currently belongs to Queen of the Apostles Church in Avoca.

Today, Mike resides in Avoca with his wife of fifty-six years, Kay Sroka George. They have been blessed with three children, Janice, Christine, and the late Michael Jr.

It is an honor to recognize Mike as he accepts the Avoca West Side Social Club's "Man of the Year Award." I am grateful for his lifetime of service to people of Avoca. I wish him the best this St. Patrick's Day.

IN RECOGNITION OF SANFORD AND JOAN WEILL ON THE OCCASION OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RENAMING OF WEILL CORNELL MEDICAL SCHOOL IN THEIR HONOR

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Sanford

and Joan Weill as we mark the 20th anniversary of the renaming of Weill Cornell Medical School in their honor. The Weills are renowned for their extraordinary philanthropic contributions to culture, education and medical research.

Mr. and Ms. Weill are Brooklyn natives who grew up in modest circumstances, and worked hard to make a better life for themselves and their family. Mr. Weill started out as a \$30-a-week runner at Bear Stearns, while Ms. Weill worked as a teacher to help them make ends meet. Wanting more, in 1960, he and his partners founded their own investment firm. The firm was eventually sold to American Express and Mr. Weill became President of American Express. He left American Express and started acquiring financial services companies, until he created the financial giant now known as Citicorp.

Throughout their lives, Mr. and Ms. Weill have been incredibly generous supporters of many of the institutions and organizations that are central to New York. They founded the National Academy Foundation, a foundation that partners with schools in underserved communities to connect them with specialized training programs and internships in finance, STEM, and hospitality & tourism. Inaugurated with one pilot finance academy in the heart of Brooklyn, the foundation has now grown to 675 academies in over 36 states and serves approximately 100,000 children a year.

The Weills have played a key role in our cultural institutions. Mr. Weill served for many years on the board of Carnegie Hall, and helped shepherd it through a major renovation. Thanks to their generosity, one of the three performance halls is named the Joan and Sanford I. Weill Recital Hall. A devotee of modern dance, Ms. Weill served on the board of the Alvin Ailey Dance Theater for 20 years, 14 as Chair. At her retirement celebration, more than \$40 million was raised in her honor, capping off an eminent career and enabling the company to expand its building.

More impressive still is the enormous impact Sanford and Joan Weill have had on medical education. Mr. Weill was a longtime Trustee of Cornell University and became Chairman of their medical school. In 1998, the Weills gave \$100 million to the medical school, prompting the school leaders to rename the institution Weill Cornell Medical College. Since then, the couple has generously given over \$600 million to the school, helping to ensure its legacy as one of the premier medical institutions in the world.

In 2001, I had the pleasure of helping to midwife the creation of a medical school in Qatar. I brought Qatar's interest in having a school that offers an American medical degree to the attention of Mr. Weill and he helped make it happen. Thanks to his vision, Cornell University is the only institution to offer its MD degree outside the country. The Weills also made possible the Weill Bugando University College of Health Sciences in Tanzania. I am proud that Cornell University accepted the challenge of creating an applied sciences school on Roosevelt Island and I was pleased to join the Weills to break ground on Cornell Tech which opened its doors September 12, 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Sanford and Joan Weill, the very embodiment of the American dream.

HONORING DREWRY N. FENNELL

HON. LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, today, during Women's History Month, I rise to recognize and call attention to a woman of distinction in my state of Delaware, Drewry Nash Fennell. While she currently serves as the Chief Officer of Strategic Communication and Development for Christiana Care Health System, many in my state know Drew not for any title she has held, but for her role as a trailblazer on any number of important public policy fronts.

Drew is an attorney by trade and applied her skills as the executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Delaware. During her time at the ACLU, Drew fought for improvements to the child welfare system, the criminal justice system, and LGBT rights. She, along with her equally distinguished wife Lisa, helped spearhead the Equality Delaware campaign, which saw Delaware go from a state which legally permitted discrimination against LGBT citizens, to a state with full marriage equality in a span of less than a decade.

Drew applied her years of experience and extensive knowledge of the criminal justice system as the executive director of the Delaware Criminal Justice Council. Drew then took her work from the CJC to the Governor's Office, where she served as Deputy Chief of Staff and eventually Chief of Staff to former Delaware Governor Jack Markell.

Throughout her time in Delaware government, her colleagues came to know her as one of the most effective advocates around. She did it all with a warm smile and a reassuring hand on the shoulder. She endured bigotry and ignorance while maintaining class and composure, all the while, making remarkable progress for the people of Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great joy to rise today to recognize Drew not only as a constituent, but as a friend and confidant. Her work in Delaware has been truly transformational and I'm confident it is nowhere near complete. Drew will soon be the 2018 Girl Scouts of the Chesapeake Bay Woman of Distinction. I can't think of a more deserving recipient of that honor.

CONGRATULATING KENDALL COYNE AND THE U.S. WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY TEAM ON WINNING THE OLYMPIC GOLD MEDAL

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Kendall Coyne of Palos Heights, Illinois, for winning a gold medal as a member of the United States Women's Ice Hockey team at the 2018 Winter Olympics in PyeongChang, South Korea. This is the first Olympic gold medal won by our women's ice hockey team since 1998.

From a young age, Kendall displayed extraordinary talent and skill at ice hockey. In 157 games over three seasons with the Chicago Mission under-19 girls' team she scored 254 points and led the club to two league championships. By 2011, Kendall's dominant performance had earned her a spot on the U.S. Women's National Team. As part of the

national team, she competed in the 2014 Olympics in Sochi, Russia, where her strong work resulted in two goals and four assists. That team won the silver medal, and when I met with Kendall to congratulate her on her performance and that of the team, it was clear that she was determined to return to the Olympics in four years and finish on top of the podium. And that is what she did. Once again reaching the gold medal game against Canada, Kendall along with twenty-two amazing young women won a hard-fought 3–2 victory in a shootout to bring home the Olympic gold.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kendall Coyne and the U.S. Women's Ice Hockey team for their success. They all have represented our nation with the utmost integrity on the world stage. Hockey is a demanding sport that requires grit and perseverance. Ms. Coyne has demonstrated these qualities with true distinction. I wish her and her teammates continued success as they progress in their athletic careers and future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DAPHNE D. JOHNSON

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Daphne D. Johnson, mother of Kim and Nakia, and wife of Alex Johnson. As all of her loved ones can attest, Daphne Johnson cared deeply, loved greatly, and lived life to the fullest.

Daphne Johnson was born on August 27, 1949 in the tight knit community of Leaksville, North Carolina. Her family moved to Youngstown, Ohio in 1963 where she attended Rayen High School. As a young adult, she found a profound passion for creating art work from embroidery, porcelain, and fabrics. Daphne attended Winston-Salem State University in North Carolina and completed a degree from Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, Ohio. She carried on her love of learning throughout her life. Daphne had a gift for creating and used her talents to share the stories of the world. For the last two decades, she focused on quilting in celebration of the deep history of quilting by African-American women. She used fabrics from Ghana, Egypt, Kenya, and Senegal to share the traditions of quilting and the stories of enslaved women who used scraps of materials to hand-sew quilts. Daphne described her art as "works that encompass tradition, beauty, and practicality." Daphne's art was shared throughout the United States and undoubtedly inspired others.

Throughout her life, Daphne was bold and brought passion into all of her life's work. She was a lover of all animals and held affection for rescuing dogs. She traveled all over the world, especially to the sunny shores of Punta Cana, Cancun, the Bahamas, Hawaii, and Haiti. Her visit to Israel was especially enlightening as Daphne saw her spiritual teachings embodied at the Sea of Galilee and throughout Jerusalem. Daphne was an accomplished adventurer, even learning how to swim late in life to overcome her fear of water. Throughout her many travels and activities, Daphne spread her joy and love of life with her many friends and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize a life so fully lived. Daphne Johnson was a caring mother and wife and active servant of her community. A gifted and talented individual, Daphne truly loved exploring the world and

sharing her passions with others. She is survived by her husband, children, numerous grandchildren and a large family who will fondly remember her creative spirit and caring soul. Daphne was a great light to all who knew her. I ask my colleagues of the House to join me in paying tribute to the beloved Daphne D. Johnson.

CONGRATULATING CADET CHIEF PETTY OFFICER JAMES SMITH

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate James Smith of Kearney, Nebraska, on his promotion to Cadet Chief Petty Officer in the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps, Cornhusker Division.

This is a great accomplishment. Of the 415 cadets who have served in the Cornhusker Division, only four have been promoted to Chief Petty Officer (CPO), the highest rank a cadet can achieve in the program. The three other cadets to achieve this rank prior to CPO James Smith were CPO Dan Seaman in 1993, CPO Crystal Simmons in 2002, and CPO Vincent Lombardo in 2014.

It was also my honor to nominate James to the U.S. Naval Academy earlier this year. He has clearly demonstrated the dedication and drive necessary to succeed in our military.

On behalf of the people of Nebraska's Third District, I commend James for his leadership and commitment to serving our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF MASOOD KHATAMEE, MD

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Professor Masood Khatamee, MD as he is honored with the Lifetime Achievement Award by Banou, Inc. at their Nowruz celebration on March 16, 2018. It is truly a fitting tribute to honor Dr. Khatamee at this commemoration of the Persian New Year as he is an ardent supporter of the Iranian-American community.

A Clinical Professor at the New York University School of Medicine Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Dr. Khatamee is a leader in both the medical and Persian communities. Dr. Khatamee served as President of the Iranian American Medical Association from 1999 to 2000, is a member and a past president of the Board of Directors of the Shiraz University School of Medicine Alumni Association and is an Honorary Member of the Russian American Medical Association.

Dr. Khatamee is a renowned physician, receiving the distinction of Physician of the Year by the White House and the United States Congress as well as the selection as a Top 10 Iranian-American Physician in the United States, among other awards and accolades. Notably, Dr. Khatamee was also nominated for the 2016 Nobel Peace Prize in Medicine.

In addition to his work at the New York University School of Medicine, Dr. Khatamee is the Executive Director of the Fertility Research Foundation, Founder and Director of the Society for the Prevention of Human Infertility and a lecturer at the Columbia School of Biomedical Engineering.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Dr. Masood Khatamee on receiving the Banou, Inc. Lifetime Achievement Award. This honor is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CARLOS CURBELO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 89.

ON THE LIFE OF ANGUS MCEACHRAN

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Angus McEachran, the editor of The Commercial Appeal, the daily newspaper of my hometown of Memphis. McEachran died Monday at 78. Known as a rough and tough, no-nonsense newspaperman, McEachran started off as a copy boy at the Memphis newspaper and presided over two of its signature stories as Metro Editor—the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in 1968 and the death of Elvis Presley in 1977.

Over the years, he nurtured the careers of hundreds of reporters, editors and photographers and opened opportunities for African Americans and other minorities while broadening the scope of the newspaper's reporting to more accurately reflect the whole community. After Memphis, he was executive editor, then editor, at The Birmingham Press Herald before moving on to become editor of The Pittsburgh Press where the newspaper won back-to-back-Pulitzer Prizes for investigative journalism in 1986 and 1987. Returning to his hometown of Memphis as editor and president of The Commercial Appeal in 1993, he added a third Pulitzer.

Mr. McEachran retired in 2002 having worked his entire career in the Scripps Howard chain of newspapers. I extend my condolences to his family and friends across the country.

CELEBRATING QUEEN CITY AIRPORT'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the Queen City Airport located in Allentown, Pennsylvania. Throughout its history, the airport has served the Lehigh Valley community in a variety of ways. From its beginnings as a military base during World War II to the small business transportation hub it is today, Queen City Airport has been vital to Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District.

Originally Convair Airfield, the 325-acre airport was built by Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Incorporated in September 1943. The space functioned as the test site for the Navy's Seawolf torpedo bombers, which were built at

the nearby Mack Trucks' plant. Eighty-six bombers were tested at the Convair facility, but the war concluded before any of the planes were commissioned for duty.

The City of Allentown purchased the government land on July 10, 1947, and in addition to the land, the government parted with Convair Airfield—valued at over \$1 million—for \$1 under the condition that Allentown maintained the land for aviation purposes.

After Allentown acquired Convair Airfield, the military called upon the airfield for training exercises during the Cold War. In 1948, the Pennsylvania National Guard leased the airport for Army reserve flight training. This prevented Lehigh Valley reservists from needing to travel long distances to receive critical training. The National Guard once again used Convair in 1949 for Operation Vulture One, which was a series of simulated bombing attacks.

The lease was transferred to Air Products & Chemicals, an industrial gas business with deep Lehigh Valley roots, in 1951. The company utilized Convair for mounting oxygen generating equipment on military trailers and producing valves and gauges. Air Products & Chemicals remained at Convair for 15 years before ending its lease with Allentown in 1966.

On May 15, 1961, Allentown took over the day-to-day operations of the airfield and officially renamed it Queen City Municipal Airport. This marked the beginning of private use of the land, starting with Spirax-Sarco, a maker of steam and heat transfer systems. The city sold the airport to the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority in 2000 after fifty years of ownership.

Today, Queen City Airport is home to 90 planes that are used by small business owners in the Lehigh Valley. The airport allows these business owners to avoid long waits behind commercial flights at Lehigh Valley International Airport (LVIA) and freely conduct their business travel. Additional hangars to accommodate more planes are in the airport authority's long-term plan since Queen City has experienced increased utilization in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to join me in acknowledging Queen City Airport's history of serving our government as well as the 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. May it continue to prosper and refine its legacy in the Lehigh Valley.

IN APPRECIATION OF INDUCTEES INTO IDAHO HALL OF FAME

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bonnie Stoddard of Dubois, Robert Brown of Idaho Falls, Frank Priestly of Franklin, R.J. Smith of Tendoy, and Stan Boyle of Idaho Falls on their inductions into the Eastern Idaho Agricultural Hall of Fame.

Now 87 years old, Bonnie Stoddard has dedicated her life to documenting agricultural history. Much of her early life was spent on a cattle ranch in the Medicine Lodge area of Clark County. From these beginnings she recognized the imperative to preserve and share the history of her area, as well as the surrounding Idaho and Montana ranch and farm country. I applaud Bonnie for her agricultural service and the historical value she has added to her community.

Operating a portion of his grandfather's original homestead in Ririe, Robert Brown raises wheat, barley, and hay. Robert's hard work has not gone unnoticed, in fact, he's received the Life Achievement Award from the Idaho Grain Producers Association, the Distinguished Service Award from the Idaho Wheat Commission, and various other awards. He has served on the Farm Service Agency Board and other agricultural and land use advisory groups. From hosting delegates at his farm to representing the State of Idaho in supporting legislation that benefits Idaho Farmers in Washington, D.C., Robert has been a great asset to the farming community.

Starting at the young age of 14 with his own hay baling business, auctioneer Frank Priestly has been involved in agriculture his entire life. Frank and his wife, Susan, worked in agriculture together, establishing an 80-cow family dairy. Frank served as the President of the Idaho Farm Bureau for 18 years. One of his many accomplishments through the organization was development and implementation of the Moving Agriculture to the Classroom Program, or M.A.C., which enables educators' access to teaching modules on various agricultural topics. Frank has represented his constituent group of Farm Bureau members at the local, regional, state, and federal levels and mentored young producers.

R.J. Smith grew up working on the family ranch near Tendoy, and is a graduate from Salmon high school. R.J. competed on the rodeo team while attending the University of Utah before enlisting in the Army. During the Vietnam war, R.J.'s heroic efforts included flying helicopters. He used his flying skills while working on a bison ranch in Wyoming along with his wife, Grace. Since returning to the state of Idaho, R.J. has been honored as Lemhi County Cattle and Horse Grower of the year and Lemhi County Grassman of the year. Through his many years of service he has served as chairman of the Lemhi Irrigation District, along with various state livestock committees. He continues to be a great leader in water and irrigation policy which benefits wildlife, fish and agriculture production.

Having grown up on a farm in the Ririe, Idaho area, Stan Boyle understands the value of hard work and determination. The Eastern Idaho Agricultural Hall of Fame is an addition to the lengthy list of accolades awarded to Stan. School districts have honored him for his role as an educator, he is a member of the Idaho 4-H Hall of Fame, and the Bonneville County Cattlemen's Association honored him with their Lifetime Achievement Award. As a mentor to countless youth in the community, Stan has helped shaped the future of agriculture in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank these individuals for their service and commitment to the agriculture communities in Eastern Idaho.

CONDEMNING THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SYRIAN CIVIL WAR

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, as the Ranking Democratic Member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (U.S. Helsinki Commission), I rise today to denounce the human rights abuses taking place across the globe. In particular, I call attention to the ongoing Syrian Civil War.

Since 2011, it is estimated that almost 500,000 Syrians have been killed with millions more displaced, creating a refugee crisis across Europe and the Middle East. On March 15th, we will sadly mark the seventh anniversary of the Syrian Civil War, which is one of the bloodiest wars of the last 70 years.

I traveled to Syria in January 2010 and personally met with President Bashar al-Assad. As I pressed him on the importance of honoring the right of his people to exercise their civil liberties and fundamental freedoms, I knew immediately that he would not give in. Many others, like me, recognized this long before civil war erupted. And yet, years have passed without the necessary effort by the international community to stop the violence.

On May 28, 2013, I sent a letter to former President Barack Obama and Ambassador Susan Rice, urging them to support imposing a no-fly zone over Syria, particularly in light of the continued indiscriminate shelling of innocent civilians and the use of chemical weapons by the Assad regime. I renewed my calls for a no-fly zone to President Obama again on September 25, 2015.

Mr. Speaker, what we have witnessed since the start of this civil war is indiscriminate, brutal attacks against civilians. The international community must no longer sit idly by and let more families be torn apart and more civilians become refugees.

According to the United Nations (UN), nearly 3 million Syrian children have lived their entire lives gripped by civil war. This is absolutely outrageous, and something needs to happen, and it needs to happen now.

Mr. Speaker, it has been seven years, let me repeat myself, seven years, since this civil war began. This crisis, in which millions of innocent Syrians find themselves today, demands our full attention and fervent commitment to creating a strategy that will bring an end to the deplorable conditions facing the Syrian people. The need for immediate and strong action remains. With each passing day, the violence has grown more sectarian, militarized, and radicalized at the cost of innocent Syrian lives.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AMERICAN VITICULTURAL AREAS RESOLUTION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today Rep. LEE ZELDIN and I are introducing a resolution that celebrates America's wineries and vineyards and recognizes the importance of distinctive American winegrowing regions, including those protected by American Viticultural Area (AVA) designations.

I am particularly proud of Oregon's AVAs and the world-renown pinots they produce. Nationally, there are more than 10,000 wineries operating in all 50 states. These economic powerhouses generated, directly and indirectly, more than \$219 billion for the United States economy last year and directly employ nearly 1 million Americans. Together, they make 10 percent of global wine production.

American Viticultural Areas (AVAs) are designated wine-growing regions in the United States that have distinguishing features affecting viticulture, including climate, geology, soils, physical features, and elevation. This year marks the 40th anniversary of the creation of

the American Viticulture Area designation system. AVA designations allow vintners to describe more accurately the origin of their wines and help them build and enhance the reputation and value of the wines they produce. They also help consumers identify wines they wish to purchase.

For these reasons, we ask our colleagues to join us in recognizing the significant contributions to the economic and cultural life of the nation made by American wines and distinctive American wine-growing regions and acknowledging the value of American Viticultural Area designation in promoting American wines domestically and abroad. Together we should continue to support efforts to promote awareness of and appreciation for distinctive American winegrowing.

IN HONOR OF LANETT WINNING
AHSAA CLASS 2A HIGH SCHOOL
BASKETBALL TITLE

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Lanett High School for winning the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 2A basketball state title for the third year in a row.

This three-peat came after The Panthers beat St. Luke's Episcopal on March 2, 2018 at the Legacy Arena at the BJCC in Birmingham, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the students and faculty of Lanett High School, the coaches, the players and all the Panthers fans on this exciting achievement for the third consecutive year. Go Panthers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 2018, I was not present for votes due to a medical procedure in my District. If I had been present, I would have voted:

On Roll Call vote 92, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 3183, I would have voted Aye; and

On Roll Call vote 93, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 4406, I would have voted Aye.

On March 6, 2018, I was not present for votes due to flight delays. If I had been present, I would have voted:

On Roll Call vote 94, on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 4607, I would have voted Aye; and

On Roll Call vote 95, on Passage of H.R. 4607, I would have voted No.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 92, and Yea on Roll Call No. 93.

HONORING COMMANDER
CHRISTOPHER A. WEECH

HON. CARLOS CURBELO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Commander Christopher A. Weech of the United States Navy. Commander Weech has made a career of defending our nation's freedom on the high seas for the past 34 years. Commander Weech was born and attended school in Key West, Florida, the southernmost point of Florida's 26th District and the United States. CDR Weech's military service has taken him far and wide. He has crossed the Equator four times and was initiated into the Solemn Mysteries of the Ancient Order of Shellbacks on 9 October 1990. His commitment and dedication to serving our nation have earned Commander Weech the Meritorious Service Medal, Joint Service Commendation Medal, Navy Commendation Medal (5 Gold Stars) and the Navy Achievement Medal (1 Gold Star). CDR Weech's final assignment was as the Assistant Chief of Staff for Training and Exercises on the staff of Commander, U.S. Fleet Cyber Command/U.S. TENTH Fleet.

Now, after 34 years of service Commander Weech has decided to retire from the Navy. His leadership will certainly be missed, but we look forward to Commander Weech becoming an active part of the community as a civilian.

His wife Jennifer and two daughters Jenna and Britain have a lot to be proud of. I am honored to recognize individuals such as CDR Weech who have given so much in service to our nation.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT FIRST
CLASS SAMMY L. DAVIS

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant First Class Sammy L. Davis and congratulate him on receiving the Sachem Award. The Sachem Award, our state's highest honor, is given annually to a Hoosier with a lifetime of excellence and moral virtue that has brought credit and honor to the state of Indiana.

Sergeant First Class Davis has certainly met the criteria for this prestigious award. As a cannoner with the 4th Artillery Regiment of the 9th Infantry Division, Sammy was stationed in South Vietnam in 1967. One day, his unit fell under heavy machine gun and mortar fire from the Vietcong. Without hesitation, Sammy manned a howitzer to provide cover for his unit. The howitzer caught fire and Sammy was blown into a foxhole after being struck by an enemy rifle round. Sergeant Davis courageously returned to the burning artillery piece to continue returning fire on the enemy. Although he sustained serious injuries from an enemy mortar round, Sammy picked up an air mattress and crossed a nearby river to rescue his wounded comrades.

For his actions, President Lyndon B. Johnson awarded Sammy the Congressional Medal of Honor for extraordinary heroism at the risk of his life in 1968. Additionally, Sergeant First Class Davis was awarded the Silver Star, Purple Heart, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, Republic of Vietnam

Gallantry Cross and Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal for his actions.

I would like to congratulate Sammy and his wife, Dixie, on receiving this important award. Hoosiers are proud of the accomplishments of Sergeant First Class Sammy L. Davis and thank him for his service to our nation.

HONORING MS. MONICA MALPASS

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Philadelphia staple Monica Malpass. A leading figure in her industry and inductee to the Broadcast Pioneers Hall of Fame, Monica has been a vital contributor to the Philadelphia broadcasting world. Since 1988, the people of my district have enjoyed watching her co-anchor the Action News at 5 p.m. Throughout her time in Philadelphia, Monica has been an active citizen in her community, raising her three kids in Center City.

With a BA from UNC Chapel Hill in journalism and an MA in Political Science from Villanova, Monica brings a wealth of knowledge to her interviews and roundtables. Just as impressive, Monica was a Rotary Scholar to the University of Puerto Rico, a graduate from the Brookings Institute's "Inside Washington" program and a member of the World Affairs Council. This unique combination of education and experience has made Monica a distinguished and esteemed broadcaster.

Monica's credibility has allowed her to interview some of the most important leaders in our nation's modern history. That list includes President Barack Obama, President Gerald Ford, Vice President Joseph Biden, Vice President George H.W. Bush, Secretary Clinton, and most astoundingly every U.S. senator, congressman, governor, state senator and representative from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware for the past 30 years. Beyond interviews, Monica has been involved in conferences, panels and award shows and has emceed the PA Conference for Women numerous times.

Her leadership and skill will continue to be a crucial asset not only to the Philadelphia community, but to the entire media industry. Mr. Speaker, please join me today in recognizing Monica's years of service to the city of Philadelphia.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL
MARFAN AWARENESS MONTH

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize February as National Marfan Awareness Month with the hope that increased awareness of Marfan syndrome and related heritable connective tissue disorders will save lives.

Marfan syndrome is a rare genetic condition. About 1 in 5,000 Americans carries a mutation in a gene called fibrillin-1 which results in an overproduction of a protein called transforming growth factor beta, or TGFB. The increased TGFB impacts connective tissue and, since connective tissue is found throughout the body, Marfan syndrome features can manifest almost anywhere. Patients often have disproportionately long limbs, a protruding or

indented chest bone, curved spine, and loose joints. However, it is not the outward signs that concern Marfan syndrome patients, but the effects the condition has on the body's internal systems. Most notably, the aorta, which is the large artery that carries blood away from the heart, is weakened and prone to enlargement and potentially fatal rupture.

An early and accurate diagnosis, regular monitoring, and medical interventions are necessary to prevent cardiac events. This is why I believe it is important to develop a program to support, assist, and encourage states to incorporate Marfan syndrome testing into their sports screening criteria for at-risk young athletes. Few states include Marfan syndrome testing in their sports screening for high school athletes which leads to Marfan syndrome-related thoracic aortic aneurysm and dissection, claiming the lives of young athletes across the country each year.

I am proud to know the nation's foremost organization working to support the Marfan community, the Marfan Foundation, through their strong advocacy work on Capitol Hill. The Foundation was founded in 1981 and has worked tirelessly to improve the lives of individuals affected by Marfan syndrome and related connective tissue disorders by advancing research, raising awareness, and providing support.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me and reflect on the work that needs to be done to ensure that patients with rare conditions can expect to see sustained and meaningful improvements in their health and care over the next 30 years. I urge my colleagues to stand with me and recognize National Marfan Awareness Month.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I voted Yes on final passage of H.R. 1917, when I intended to vote No. The bill would delay compliance with an EPA regulation which would reduce toxic emissions produced in the manufacturing of brick and clay ceramic tiles until all judicial review has been completed. The manufacturing of brick and clay tiles can emit toxics such as mercury and arsenic, both of which cause severe harm to human health. There is no need for this legislation; the law already allows judges to postpone regulations from taking effect. Under the bill, companies that make brick and clay tiles could continually file law suits, regardless of the merits, in effect killing the regulation. Further delaying the regulations means continuing to expose Americans to deadly toxic air pollution.

HONORING THE CUMBERLAND VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY CHEERLEADING SQUAD ON PLACING THIRD PLACE AT THE 2018 NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL CHEERLEADING CHAMPIONSHIPS

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I extend my sincere congratulations to the Cumberland Valley High School Varsity Cheerleading squad on earning 3rd Place at the 2018 Na-

tional High School Cheerleading Championships, February 10–11, in Orlando, Florida. This is the third time that Cumberland Valley has earned a slot at the national championships.

The Team practiced four to five days a week in preparation for this event. Their work ethic continues a standard of excellence for Cumberland Valley, who's won the District Three Championship in each of the last eight years, and won the state tournament four times.

The dedication and perseverance of these students sets the standard for all to follow. I extend my congratulations to Coach Kristi Shaffner, her staff, the school officials, family and friends who supported these young women on their journey.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I commend and congratulate the Cumberland Valley High School Varsity Cheerleading squad on this well-earned accomplishment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Monday, March 5, and Tuesday, March 6, 2018, due to the Texas primary elections.

If I had been able to vote on Monday, March 5, I would have voted as follows:

On passage of H.R. 3183, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office," I would have voted "yea."

On passage of H.R. 4406, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the "Tuskegee Airman Post Office Building," I would have voted "yea."

If I had been able to vote on Tuesday, March 6, I would have voted as follows:

On the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, I would have voted "yea."

On final passage of H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, I would have voted "nay."

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 8, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 13

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States Central Command and United States Africa Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet

To hold hearings to examine rebuilding infrastructure in America, focusing on investing in next generation broadband.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of the Interior.

SD-366

10:15 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the Freedom of Information Act, focusing on the Administration's progress on reforms and looking ahead.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity

To hold hearings to examine the cyber posture of the Services in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SR-222

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security

To hold hearings to examine rebuilding infrastructure in America, focusing on state and local transportation needs.

SR-253

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine state fragility, growth, and development, focusing on designing policy approaches that work.

SD-419

MARCH 14

Time to be announced

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Business meeting to consider the nominations of David Christian Tryon, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, and Hannibal Ware, of the Virgin Islands, to be Inspector General, both of the Small Business Administration, and other pending calendar business.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Parkland shooting and legislative proposals to improve school safety.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine an original bill entitled, "the Agriculture Creates Real Employment (ACRE) Act".

SD-406

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy

To hold hearings to examine Somalia's current security and stability status.

SD-419

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine opioids in Indian country.

SD-628

MARCH 15

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for the Forest Service.

SD-366

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of State and redesign plans.

SD-419

MARCH 21

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for Indian Programs.

SD-628

SENATE—Thursday, March 8, 2018

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we find rest in the shadow of Your protection and providence. Shield our lawmakers in their labors with Your Divine favor so that they may grow in wisdom. Lord, show them how to use today's fleeting minutes for Your glory, becoming Your instruments to permit Your Kingdom to thrive on Earth. Sanctify their thoughts, words, and deeds as they remember that because of You, they live and move and breathe and have their being.

We praise You this day, O God, for You are the Alpha and Omega—the beginning and the ending.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2018.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2155, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2155) to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Crapo) amendment No. 2151, in the nature of a substitute.

Crapo amendment No. 2152 (to amendment No. 2151), of a perfecting nature.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

TRIBUTE TO GARY ENDICOTT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, first, this morning, I would like to recognize a remarkable Senate career that is drawing to a close.

Gary Endicott has served in the Office of the Legislative Counsel for 37 years. Since his appointment as the legislative counsel of the Senate in 2015, he has directed that office and has done so with distinction. Now he is embarking on a well-earned retirement. After nearly four decades of service to this body, tomorrow is Gary's last day.

Much has changed during the time Gary has been with us. Over the years, Senators and staff have asked more and more of the legislative counsel's office, but thanks in large part to Gary's hard work and then to his leadership, we can always rely on his team for meticulous professionalism and expertise.

I understand Gary is headed back to his native Midwest. He departs with our gratitude and our best wishes for him and for his family.

Mr. President, on another matter, the Dodd-Frank law became effective in 2010. It ostensibly targeted banks that were deemed too big to fail, but 7½ years later, Dodd-Frank has proven to be far too blunt an instrument. For one thing, it has imposed a crushing regulatory burden on small community banks and credit unions. Rather than fixing too big to fail, Dodd-Frank has threatened to make many of these Main Street mainstays too small to succeed.

This is especially problematic because of the central role local financial institutions play in each of their communities. Local lenders provide a majority of small business loans and nearly three-quarters of agricultural loans, and in low-income communities, when

a local bank closes, research suggests that loans to nearby small businesses plummet by 40 percent.

With farmers, ranchers, small businesses, and vulnerable communities, Americans need community banks, and they need credit unions, but Dodd-Frank is making it harder for these institutions to survive. Millions of Americans, from rural areas to inner cities, now find themselves in what researchers call banking deserts. Fortunately, help is on the way.

Thanks to the leadership of Senator CRAPO, Democrats and Republicans have joined together to cosponsor a modest but important bill that would streamline the obstacles that are tripping up these smaller institutions. It is a commonsense, compromise measure, and Senators do not need to resolve all of our differences on Dodd-Frank in order to unite behind it. I look forward to voting to pass these reforms very soon.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on a final matter, as I have discussed, a number of America's largest employers are already reinvesting their tax reform savings in bonuses, pay raises, and new benefits for their employees. Higher take-home pay and lower tax rates are helping families cover today's expenses and save for the future.

In Nebraska, the Lincoln Journal Star reports that hometown companies Nelnet and Pinnacle Bank have awarded tax reform bonuses to thousands of workers. In Iowa, the Des Moines Register reports that utilities will pass along \$147 million in tax reform savings to their customers. Acadia Healthcare, with operations in my home State of Kentucky, has announced that tax reform will enable it to build additional facilities on the frontlines of the opioid epidemic.

This week, Vice President PENCE has been on the road, hearing how tax reform is changing Americans' lives and livelihoods for the better. He visited all three of those States and listened to workers and small business owners.

It is interesting, though. The huge number of early tax reform success stories is not getting the applause it deserves from over here on the other side of the aisle. Every one of my Democratic colleagues in the House and in the Senate made the political calculation to vote along party lines and try to sink tax reform—every single one of them in the House and the Senate. Fortunately, those efforts failed.

Yet, even with tax reform now as the law of the land, it seems my Democratic friends are so unwilling to admit

their mistake that they would rather try to sabotage the law that is already helping families and making American job creators more competitive. Just yesterday, for example, Senate Democrats announced they would like to spend \$1 trillion of taxpayer money and roll back Americans' brandnew tax cuts while they are at it.

This popular, new tax bill has been in effect for a couple of months, and they want to roll it back already, take the money, and spend it. There they go again. They just can't help themselves. To tax more, spend more, take money away from American families, and give it to the Federal Government is a familiar refrain from our Democratic friends.

Even amidst this tidal wave of good news from tax reform, even in the face of higher take-home pay, new jobs, new investments, raises, worker bonuses, and foreign competitors like China getting nervous, Democrats just can't help themselves. It must be in their DNA. They can't resist turning back to their old, top-down, tax-and-spend playbook.

By lowering the tax burden on companies, large and small, America turned on a bright neon sign that is telling the world we are open for business. Democrats want to unplug it. By lowering middle-class rates and expanding deductions, we gave families all across the country more breathing room to save or pay their bills. Democrats want to claw that money back.

Fortunately, for the American people, the Republicans in the House, the Senate, and the White House will not let them take back your tax relief, your lower utility rates, your bonuses, or your new opportunities. We are proud that we took money out of Washington's pocket and put it back in the pockets of hard-working Americans, and that is exactly where it is going to stay.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

TARIFFS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, later this afternoon President Trump plans to announce sweeping steel and aluminum tariffs. Let me say once again, I believe the President's instincts on China are correct. All those who are trying to push him away from his instincts will allow China over the next decade to become the dominant economic power and greatly hurt American jobs and American prosperity as well. So I would say: Mr. President, stick to your instincts.

But while the President's instincts are correct, the execution on these tariffs is poor. That is the difference here—not the instinct, not that we shouldn't go after China, and not that we have to do more to bolster American wealth and American workers against rapacious policies of China's. China will stop at nothing, nothing, nothing, to steal our intellectual property and to manipulate its currency to exclude American companies from being there.

China has been rapacious about trade, and I have spoken about this problem for years. Early on—I think it was 2004 or 2005—Senator GRAHAM and I discovered that China was manipulating its currency. I heard it from Crucible steel up in Syracuse, NY.

The great thinkers said: They don't manipulate their currency. This is protectionist.

In the same week—I was quite proud of this—the New York Times editorial board, which is liberal, and the Wall Street Journal editorial board, which is conservative, both said: There is no such thing as currency manipulation, and SCHUMER and GRAHAM ought to back off.

Of course, we proved to be right on that and other issues.

China is rapacious. If we don't stop China, America will be a weaker place with fewer good-paying jobs, with less wealth, less strength, and we probably won't stay the greatest country in the world—although we deserve to because we play by the rules.

President Trump has identified the right opponent—China—much better than both the Obama and Bush administrations did. Both Democrats and Republicans have been blind to this issue, and Trump isn't. Good. But I would say to the President: Don't swing blindly and wildly at our foe, China. Establish a well-placed jab at China. Set them back. Let them know we mean business.

President Trump ought to rethink his plan so it actually achieves what he says he wants it to achieve.

U.S. steel and aluminum workers have been battling heavily subsidized products from China for decades. I know. I have Nucor in my State, in Auburn and in Chemung County. On aluminum, I have Alcoa in my State, in Massena. Our steel and aluminum workers deserve a more level playing field against these countries like China that heavily subsidize their products or other countries that purchase Chinese steel at artificially low prices and ship it to the United States. A targeted trade action against China would be very helpful not only in providing relief for the steel and aluminum workers in New York and around the country, but it would send a strong shot across the bow to China for the first time in decades: We mean business. We are not going to let you prey on us any longer.

Targeted trade against China and against countries that allow China to sell them steel at artificially low prices and then send it here, go after them, but instead of getting right at China, the President's across-the-board tariffs will cause more damage to key allies and other domestic industries. I not only have steelworkers in Upstate New York, I have a lot of autoworkers. For instance, we are so proud of the GM plant in Tonawanda near Buffalo and the Ford stamping plant also in Western New York. We are so proud of our agriculture.

Incidentally, the President is right, Canada has put in certain restrictions on American dairy going to Canada that has hurt companies like the Cayuga cooperative in Central New York and O-AT-KA in Genesee County.

We have to protect and help our workers in auto manufacturing and our farmers who do export and who do good things. China doesn't let our auto products in, in a fair way, but other countries do—Canada does.

So the President's proposal does more harm to Europe and other allies like Canada than it does to China. That is what is wrong with it. It is so typical of this White House. Even when they have a good idea, they mess it up because they don't think it through, and the President acts only by his instincts. You have to act by your instincts and put a thought process on top of it.

The goal of the President to go after China was not really achieved very well in his proposal. The haphazard way these tariffs were put together has caused policy to miss the mark. It seems no one is at home in the White House right now. President Trump makes up his mind one day, changes it the next, and meanwhile trade policies, foreign policies, gun policies, immigration policies are all in chaos because he says one thing one day and another thing the next. So we need the President to follow his instincts but then allow the people who know this issue to craft something smart.

The President and I may agree on trade. As I said, we are closer on this issue than I have been with either the Bush or Obama administrations, but the slapdash way these tariffs were constructed have few of us cheering, even those of us who really have wanted to go after China long before politics was a gleam in President Trump's eye. Well, maybe that is not true; it may have been a gleam in his eye but before he ran for anything.

I strongly urge the President to rethink these tariffs and focus his policy more directly at China and countries that ship cheap Chinese steel to the United States. On the flip side, I am sure some of our business interests will tell the President do nothing on trade.

The chamber of commerce—they are interested in the bottom-line profits of

their big companies, and they don't care if they make those profits at the expense of American workers. They are not a barometer here, and President Trump is right to ignore them. We have to be smart about this—not just tough, but tough and smart. We need to get tough and smart on China, and the right approach is targeted action against China's most flagrant abuses.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. President, on tax, since the Republican tax bill passed last year, nearly every day there has been a new story about a corporation choosing to pass along the savings from the tax law to wealthy shareholders and corporate executives because they buy back their stocks. They use this new tax money not to help their workers but to buy back their stocks. In January, there was an initial flurry of all these bonuses. They have been totally overwhelmed with stock buybacks. What Democrats said is proving to be true. The vast majority of this tax break is for the wealthy, by the wealthy, used by the wealthy to help themselves, not help workers. That has been the history when you give these corporations lots of money, when they have so much money already, without pointing it in the direction of helping workers.

Yesterday, Chevron joined the parade of those with stock buybacks. It was Chevron who announced that while it was making no changes to workers' compensation or benefits, it would be restarting its dormant stock repurchasing program. Do you know how much Chevron got from this tax bill? Mr. President, \$2 billion. Do you know how much they are giving their workers—or benefits—out of that \$2 billion? Nothing. Nothing as of now. Do you know what they are using it for? Stock buybacks. Let our Republican friends come to the floor and defend those stock buybacks. Let them do that.

Today, another oil company, Hess, announced it would be purchasing back \$1 billion of its stock by the end of the year. Since the start of 2018, just in the last few months, the cumulative total of share buybacks has passed \$200 billion. Let me repeat that, \$200 billion has been used for stock buybacks. The month of February set the 1-month record for share buybacks, and analysts at JPMorgan—hardly a liberal think tank—says they “expect total buybacks in 2018 to surpass \$800 billion, way up from the \$530 billion last year and demolishing 2007's all-time high that came in a bit below \$700 billion.” That is not CHUCK SCHUMER or CPAC or any of these liberal think tanks, that is JPMorgan Chase.

So our poor Republican friends had hoped this tax bill would send them on a trajectory to win elections and, by February, the numbers are starting to turn against them again. Look at the Quinnipiac poll of yesterday. Why? Because, as this tax bill plays out, what

Democrats said all along; that the vast majority of the benefits are going to the wealthy, it increases the deficit, and it increases the clarion call of many on the Republican side to cut Medicare and Social Security to pay for the deficit they created—it is not going over too well. We will match our argument against theirs now in October and November. We are confident we are going to win that argument, and that is why already the enthusiasm about this tax bill is fading.

The massive deluge of corporate share buybacks is proving to be the principal legacy of the Republican tax bill—not benefits to workers, not bonuses, not wage increases, not even new equipment or investment in R&D. I would welcome that. Nope, corporations are spending the bulk of the savings from the tax bill on themselves, their corporate executives, and their wealthy shareholders.

Guess how much of the capital companies have earned from the tax bill has been allocated to their employees, the workers who were going to get such huge benefits from this bill—6 percent. No, no, it is not 60; it is 6. Sixty is the percentage that has gone back to corporations in the form of stock buybacks—a 10-to-1 ratio. It doesn't make much sense. The American public is beginning to realize that. Those are the numbers according to Just Capital.

As I said, the American people are starting to catch wind of the truth. Three separate polls yesterday—I mentioned Quinnipiac, and there are evidently two others. Three separate polls show the popularity of the Republican tax bill was significantly underwater and has lost ground since the last round of polling. I predict those numbers will continue to slip as more Americans learn that their hard-earned taxpayer dollars were used to give a tax break to corporations who hoard the savings for themselves. It is no wonder their candidate in a hard-fought race in Southwest Pennsylvania has abandoned the tax argument. It is not going over well with his working-class constituents because they get a tiny, little bit, and everyone else gets so much more.

Mr. President, Democrats have a plan to rein in these buybacks and put the middle class first. Yesterday, Senator BALDWIN and I announced an amendment to the pending banking bill that would rein in corporate buybacks by giving the SEC the authority to reject buybacks that come at the expense of workers. Who will object to that? I hope not my colleagues. They say the buybacks will benefit workers, so they shouldn't be objecting to our bill. Senator BALDWIN's bill and my bill would require company boards and their executives to put their money where their mouth is and certify that the buyback is in the best long-term financial interest of the company.

We are going to make this one of the top amendments to the banking bill, and I hope it gains Republican support. If Republicans mean what they say about their tax bill helping workers, they should join Senator BALDWIN's amendment. The glut of corporate share buybacks highlights precisely how the corporate tax cut in the Republican bill is being put to ill use. Rather than stimulating the economy, creating jobs, or raising pay, corporations are spending the lion's share of the tax savings on goosing their stock.

Let's not forget, these buybacks are relatively new. A ruling by the SEC in the early eighties said they could start doing these. Before that, the heyday, when corporate America dominated the world, profits were great, jobs were growing, and wages went up, the safe harbor provision wasn't there. Corporations had to go through a lot of proof before they could buy back their stock, and that made sense, but once our Republican colleagues got in power, they did what the corporate leaders want them to do and look what happened.

The amendment to say no buybacks unless they can prove it is really going to benefit their workers and be in the long-term financial interest of their company, that amendment is going to be one of the top amendments to the upcoming bill. I hope it gains Republican support. I really do. If Republicans mean what they say, they should join Baldwin's amendment, as I said before, but I want to repeat it for the benefit of all my good Republican friends.

Now, the glut of corporate share buybacks highlights precisely how the corporate tax cut in the Republican bill is being put to ill use. Rather than stimulating the economy, creating jobs, raising pay, corporations spend the lion's share of the tax savings on goosing their stock. Americans are just scratching their heads, wondering why we put ourselves in deeper debt so corporations could further enrich themselves. Why do we tell our children and grandchildren they are going to pay for the pay raise of the CEO of Exxon or the increase in value because his stock is going up? That doesn't make any sense at all. There are much better uses for the money.

Yesterday, Democrats announced our plan to help build a trillion dollars of desperately needed infrastructure in America. How do we pay for it? We unwind some of these tax cuts for the biggest corporations to pay for a massive infusion of Federal funds in infrastructure—job-creating infrastructure, which is desperately needed. Just by putting the top rate on individuals where it was, reinstituting the AMT and the estate tax, which goes only to the very wealthy, and setting the corporate rate at 25 percent—you may recall it was the Business Roundtable that asked for 25 percent. Oh, no, for

our Republican colleagues and Donald Trump, that wasn't good enough. Make it lower—even though the 200 biggest businesses in America said 25 percent was certainly an adequate drop. Many on my side wouldn't even think that is good.

In any case, the BMT asked for 25 percent. We go to 25 percent, along with these other changes, and guess what we do with \$1 trillion. We create infrastructure jobs—millions. We create new roads and bridges, new water and sewer. We say that every rural home in America should get broadband just as Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1930s said every rural home should get electricity. We update our power grid so all this new energy coming from other places can go to the most populated centers. It would be a huge shot in the arm for jobs in America, for prosperity in America, far more than this slanted tax bill aimed so much at the few wealthy who are so tight with this new Republican Party.

I daresay our proposal is a much more effective use of taxpayer dollars than a handout to the biggest corporations and will create far more good-paying jobs in the process.

I hope our Republican colleagues will rethink things. Their path is a path to a cul-de-sac, to great losses in the election. Rethink that tax cut. Don't allow these buybacks. They are doing no good for anyone but a handful, and that is where 60 percent of the money is going on the corporate rate.

Join us in taking some of that money to do what the Federal Government has done since Henry Clay proposed it in the 1820s: Put that money into infrastructure, jobs, good-paying jobs, efficiency. Let's not let China or another country become the leader in infrastructure. They invest. The Chinese Government, the Japanese Government, the European Government invest in infrastructure, and so did this government, until Donald Trump became President and the hard right gained a stranglehold over the Republican Party. Let's reverse course before it is too late.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Texas.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I guess I have to give my friend, the Senator from New York, credit. Once he made his bed, he decided he had better lie in it.

Democrats made a risky gamble when they bet against the American people in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that we passed in December. No Democrat supported it—none—and now I think they are beginning to worry that it is actually working. Otherwise, I don't understand why the Democratic leader, the minority leader of the U.S. Senate, would say: We need to raise your taxes because we can spend your

money better than you can. I guess he means that we also need to eliminate the doubling of the standard deduction, which makes sure that the first \$24,000 earned by a married couple is tax-free—zero tax rate. I guess he thinks we ought to repeal the doubling of the child tax credit.

As much as he rails about corporations, the fact is, what we did on the business side with taxes has made the United States more competitive globally. It is the same argument that he, President Obama in a State of the Union speech, and the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN—it is the same argument they made that we embraced.

We got a little more aggressive than they did in terms of the rate. We lowered it, not to 25 percent, as Senator WYDEN had proposed, but to 21 percent; thus, we made ourselves roughly average in the industrialized world, making America more competitive. We were seeing people going overseas and investing because they had better tax rates than we had here in America.

Who owns the stock? You have heard the Democratic leader talk about stock buybacks. He said: Well, these corporations are using this money to buy their own stock back. Do you know who owns stock in America? I am not sure of the exact percentage, but a huge percentage of it is owned by retirement funds and pension funds of firefighters, teachers, and others who want to see that their retirement is not only safe but also grows. What they have seen since the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was passed in December is the value of their retirement funds go through the roof. The stock market is at an all-time high—or thereabouts. It has set huge records.

I know our friends on the other side of the aisle are worried because they made a dangerous gamble against the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, but the fact is, all the polling is showing that as people are seeing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act actually being implemented, they are seeing more money in their paychecks. Because the withholding tables were changed to reflect lower tax rates, people are seeing more take-home pay. And as the economy continues to grow, there is going to be more competition for workers.

Unemployment claims are the lowest they have been since 1969. As there is more competition for workers, that is going to force employers to pay more wages, so everyone is going to benefit from a growing economy.

Sometimes I think our colleagues across the aisle have settled for too little. They settled for a stagnant economy, frozen wages, and an America that could no longer compete in the world when it came to attracting business and investment. We changed that.

Every single person on this side of the aisle—all 51 of us—voted for the

Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Everyone on that side of the aisle voted against it. I think the Democratic leader now is getting pretty worried, especially leading up to the November elections, when a number of his colleagues on that side of the aisle are going to have to go to voters and say: I voted against your pay raise; I voted against take-home pay; I voted against increasing the standard deduction; I voted against an increase in the child tax credit. I think they are pretty worried about it; otherwise, I couldn't imagine the Democratic leader coming out here and saying what he said today.

He said: Well, we want to raise your taxes so we can spend it. I think the folks I represent—the 28 million Texans I represent—would say: No thank you. We want to spend our own hard-earned money the way we see fit, not send it to Washington to see it go into some black hole, and then we will not know what we actually benefited from.

I didn't necessarily intend to come to the floor to talk about that, but I couldn't resist responding briefly to my friend's comments.

Mr. President, I do want to congratulate the senior Senator from Idaho for a moment, Mr. CRAPO, the chairman of the Banking Committee, on the bill that is pending on the floor. He has done stellar work to bring this Dodd-Frank reform bill to the floor, one that will release some of those shackles on small community banks and credit unions.

They were the victims of overkill when it came to regulation under the name of Dodd-Frank, which was designed to address Wall Street and the excesses of Wall Street. But as I have told my friends who are community bankers and members of credit unions back home: You weren't the target, but you were the collateral damage. We are going to remedy that on a bipartisan basis, thanks to the Banking Committee, its chairman, Senator CRAPO, and our colleagues.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT RISK REVIEW MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. President, this morning, I want to mention another area where the Banking Committee and Senator CRAPO are showing great leadership, and that is on a bill that will improve the CFIUS review process. Let me unpack that.

CFIUS is the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. That acronym stands for the interagency body led by the Treasury Department, in this case by Secretary Mnuchin. It polices foreign investment in the United States for national security risks.

The Banking Committee has held two hearings on the bipartisan bill that I introduced with the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, which is called the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act. I hope the

committee will have a markup on that bill soon.

The House Financial Services Committee has also been holding hearings on our bill, including one last week, and has more planned in the future.

The time to act is now because this process is outdated, and the committee's jurisdiction remains too narrow. Let me explain why that is so important.

This review process was not originally designed, and is now insufficient, to address today's rapidly evolving threats to our national security. Perhaps most alarmingly, many transactions that could pose a national security risk often go unreviewed altogether.

In particular, China has proved adept at cheating the current CFIUS system. It exploits gaps and creatively structures investments in U.S. businesses to evade scrutiny. They literally have been vacuuming up startup technology firms that are going to produce the next cutting-edge technology that would give America a competitive advantage against the rest of the world when it comes to our national security, and they are thinking strategically in the long term by showing up as investors in some of these businesses and flying beneath the radar screen. They are unreviewed under the current CFIUS process.

To circumvent review, China will often pressure U.S. companies into arrangements like joint ventures and coerce them into handing over their technology and their know-how. This enables Chinese companies to acquire and then replicate U.S.-bred capabilities on their own soil, destroying jobs here in America in the process, as well as our industrial base. Many of these technologies have a direct military application, and my bill, cosponsored with Senator FEINSTEIN, addresses this problem.

As we speak, China is turning our own technology and know-how against us and seeking to erase our national security advantage little by little. They are doing it relentlessly and strategically. This massive technology transfer, which occurs out of the public eye and is achieved through China's deliberate campaign of evasion of our security safeguards, must end.

We don't have to look very far to see how technology is increasingly the realm where U.S. national security interests and China's economic and military interests lie in tension with one another or, in the worst case, they actually collide. It is happening almost every day.

Consider the widely reported news this week that CFIUS—the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States—has ordered a full investigation into a foreign bid to take over a prominent American computer chip manufacturer. That company, Qualcomm,

plays a leading role in supporting U.S. telecommunications infrastructure, especially by doing the research and investment of 5G technology, which is important for autonomous vehicles and the internet, increasing the use of cellular technology for what is transforming our lives. It supports our national security through classified work in the Federal Government.

The cause for alarm is that the deal is a hostile takeover, and the consequences of the takeover could put China in the driver's seat for the next generation of mobile technology.

Chinese companies, beholden as they are to the Chinese Communist Party, would fill any void that is left once the deal is complete, much to the detriment of our national security and our economy.

We are still gathering information, and not all the facts are known yet, but I want to stress that we need to do our due diligence. We need to have a comprehensive review of this hostile takeover. In my view, CFIUS, with Secretary Mnuchin leading at the Treasury Department, is right to be extremely cautious and to investigate this matter further.

Today there is a growing recognition that foreign investors are getting more sophisticated in accessing our technology. As this week's developments show, we can't be naive in thinking that this isn't happening or that it is not a clear and present danger or naive about State-owned enterprises in countries like China, where there is no such thing as the private and public sector. The government controls everything because that is the nature of their Communist system.

The Chinese Government has plans to dominate mobile technology, quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and other industries; that much is clear. One tactic is to force American companies to transfer high-tech industrial capabilities to China's homegrown players in exchange for the U.S. firms gaining access to the Chinese market. That, too, is well documented. But the quid pro quos don't stop there. They aren't even confined to the technology space.

Recently, there have been calls to investigate China's involvement in American college campuses through the so-called Confucius Institutes. These institutes are proxies for the Chinese Communist Party. They offer schools financial benefits in exchange to set up shop in close proximity to U.S. researchers and students whose views they attempt to influence for what are essentially manipulative propaganda campaigns—ones that conveniently whitewash over the Communist regime's less flattering attributes and their troubling history of human rights abuses and belligerence in places like the South China Sea.

I know our colleague, the junior Senator from Florida, Mr. RUBIO, who co-

chairs the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, has called on schools that host Confucius Institutes to end those partnerships, and he is right to do so. Steady and stealthy forms of information warfare should be a perpetual concern, especially when none other than Gen. Joe Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said that by 2025, China will pose the greatest threat to U.S. national security of any nation.

The bipartisan bill Senator FEINSTEIN and I have introduced is an important piece of our overall response to this threat. It has been endorsed by the administration and is supported by the current Secretaries of Defense and Treasury, as well as the Attorney General. Let's not hold this up any longer.

I congratulate the chairman of the Banking Committee for the good work on the bill that is on the floor. I thank him for his leadership and willingness to work with us on this important CFIUS reform bill. I look forward to the upcoming markup of this bill in the committee soon.

FIX NICS BILL

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that every day that goes by since the shooting in Parkland, FL, on February 14—every day that goes by, we are distracted by other concerns, and our memories dim of the terrible mass tragedy that occurred at that school, the shootings that occurred there that day.

I know the Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, was at Stoneman Douglas High School yesterday for the students' first full, normal schoolday, 3 weeks after the shooting. She said it was a sobering moment—and I am sure it was—speaking to the students and teachers, who still flinch remembering the sounds of bullets in the hallways of their school. Fourteen students died, along with one teacher, the school's athletic director, and a coach who was shielding students with his body so they would not be hit.

That is the thing about these events—these stories make us sad and angry and sometimes numb, all at the same time, but from these stories, from these tragedies, heroes do emerge.

We saw one of those heroes last fall at Sutherland Springs, TX, where people were gathered to worship at a small Baptist church just outside of San Antonio. A man who prefers not to be recognized grabbed his rifle and ran to the church that was under attack, and he saved lives in the process by preventing the gunman from continuing the carnage. That is a case of somebody taking an AR-15 out of his gun safe. He is a certified shooting instructor. He came to the aid of people who were defenseless and who were being slaughtered at that church, and he saved many lives.

The person who was shooting at that church in Sutherland Springs was a

convicted felon, and he was, under existing law, legally permitted to purchase or possess firearms. That is why, when I came back to Washington after visiting Sutherland Springs at the next Sunday service, I introduced a bill to fix the holes in the national instant background check system—to make sure that shooters like the one at Sutherland Springs could not legally purchase firearms.

Part of the reason I did that was because after I talked to Pastor Frank Pomeroy, who lost his daughter Annabelle in the massacre, I promised myself I would do everything in my power to prevent similar events from occurring in the future. I did the same after I spoke with a man by the name of Andrew Pollack, who lost his daughter Meadow in Florida last month. I met Andrew last week, along with Senator RUBIO, who I know has been similarly moved to take action.

After having these difficult conversations, I can't tell my colleagues how disappointed I am that the Senate has done nothing—nothing—to prevent them from happening in the future. We can't even tell fathers and mothers that we have taken the first step toward ending some of the violence that plagues our country, that puts bullet holes in our classrooms and spills blood inside some of our most sacred places.

The bill that I introduced to fix the National Instant Criminal Background Check System is called Fix NICS. That is what it does. It fixes the holes in the background check system so that people like Mr. Kelley, the shooter at Sutherland Springs, could not legally purchase a firearm. I am grateful to my colleagues who have cosponsored that bill. It includes the majority leader and the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, as well as Senator MURPHY and Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut and all of our close to 60 bipartisan cosponsors. They believe that what the bill tries to do, which is to fix our broken background check system, is important and will save lives and will keep guns out of the hands of convicted felons.

Recently, we saw that the bill could make a real difference in places like Ohio. There, it was reported that dozens of courts are failing to upload conviction records into the FBI National Instant Criminal Background Check System and that this failure could result in convicted felons purchasing guns. This bill would help alleviate that problem. A similar glitch is one that allowed the gunman in Sutherland Springs, of course, to purchase the firearm he used when the Air Force failed to upload his conviction records into the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, as they were obligated to do. The law requires that these convictions be uploaded, and now we need to make sure those laws are enforced.

Sixty is how many votes we need to pass this legislation in the Senate, and I am confident, were that bill to be brought to the floor and we had a vote on it, it would actually get many, many more—close to unanimity—here in the Senate. Last week we tried to get an agreement to have a debate on the bill followed by an up-or-down vote. Sadly and inexplicably, the minority leader blocked that agreement. I don't think the minority leader opposes the bill—he is actually a cosponsor of it—but he is in a bind. He is being pressured by a handful of those in his conference who say that this is not sufficient.

I know people on both sides of the aisle would like to do more, but I want to make sure we don't fail to do anything at all or that we don't end up doing nothing. Many of these Members have indicated that they want votes on other measures. Frankly, I would be fine with that, but let's make sure we don't leave here another day empty-handed by failing to take action on the one consensus piece of legislation that would be supported by an overwhelming majority of the Senate.

I would like to be able to report good news to Pastor Pomeroy and his wife Sherri. I am sure my colleagues from Florida would like to do the same for the shocked families who are still grieving in Parkland. We need to send a message to families that when they drop their children off at school and when they go to church to worship, they will be safe—or safer than they would be if we fail to act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Texas. I listened carefully to his words about gun safety, and I agree with so much of what he said. He talked about bringing his bill to the floor. I think his bill is a good bill. His bill tries to provide more information into the NICS system. We definitely need to do that. He also said he was open to amendments on the floor. I am as well. I think there are other aspects of gun safety that we may even find common ground on as well. But I might remind him that the decision about the business on the floor of the Senate is in the hands of his side of the aisle.

It is your decision to decide, through your majority leader, what we consider on the floor of the Senate. An effort to do this by unanimous consent is certainly understandable in light of the events of the last few weeks, but if Senator McCONNELL were to announce that as soon as we finish this banking bill, we are going to move to the Fix NICS bill and have it open to amendment, I think he would find support from both sides of the aisle to do that. I hope he will, because things are

changing in America, as they should. Gun violence and the terrible tragedies that occurred in Texas and in Florida and in so many States have really raised consciousness of this issue.

I am a grandfather and proud to be. I have two 6-year-old twins who are first graders in Brooklyn, NY. They are the cutest kids in the world, and I am very objective about that.

About 2 weeks ago, my little granddaughter came home from the first grade and said to her mom: Mom, they told us at school that if there is a shooter outside the school, stay away from the windows, and if a shooter comes in the classroom, get on the floor.

First grade. Is there any sane person in America who thinks that should be a normal talk in the first grade classroom? Is there any person, constitutional scholar or not, who believes the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States was designed to allow this to happen? I can't imagine.

Ninety-seven percent of the American people believe in universal, comprehensive background checks to keep guns out of the hands of those who would misuse them, including convicted felons and mentally unstable people—97 percent. The overwhelming majority of gun owners feel exactly the same way. So why in God's Name have we not taken that up since the tragedy in Florida and the tragedy in Texas? There is no explanation for it other than fear—fear of the National Rifle Association and the gun lobby. That is the only explanation.

I salute the legislators in the State of Florida who this last week defied the NRA and defied the gun lobby and passed their own measure for gun safety. I don't agree with parts of it. Giving cafeteria workers in schools the right to carry arms around the school—I don't think that is a wise thing at all. I understand that there is opposition to that from teachers' organizations and even Republican leaders in Florida. But they did stand up when it came to questions about how old you have to be to buy a firearm, a long gun, and other questions that I think are just common sense.

So I would say to my friend from Texas, the majority whip, what you said is something I can support. Bring your bill to the floor, open to amendment. Let us have our day in the Senate where we actually act as legislators, where people will come to the Galleries and not see an empty Chamber but instead will find Members of the Senate, 100 strong, Democrats and Republicans, at their desks, debating measures that make a difference in the life of America. That is why we are sent here.

I had a friend of mine years ago when I served in the House—he was a Congressman from Muskogee, OK. His

name was Mike Synar. He was a dear, close friend of mine. Mike lost his primary in Oklahoma because he was fearless. He used to come to the floor when we had votes, and he would see Members of his own caucus kind of wincing, afraid to vote for something they knew was right for fear of the political consequences. He used to get right in their faces. Mike would say: If you don't want to fight fires, don't be a firefighter. If you don't want to stand here and debate controversial issues and vote on them, don't run for Congress.

Mike was right. He was right then, and he is right now.

Let's bring gun safety to the floor of the Senate. Let's open it to amendments. Let's have a fulsome, bipartisan debate. We understand that nothing is going to pass without bipartisan support. We should do everything in our power to exercise the power and the right we are given as U.S. Senators to fix the problems facing American families. This is a problem. It is a problem when a first grader in Brooklyn, NY, has to be warned that if somebody walks into the classroom with a gun, she is supposed to get down on the floor.

DACA

This is the week, of course, of President Trump's deadline on DACA students—Dreamers—those young people who came to the United States as infants and toddlers and young people, grew up in this country, pledged allegiance to that flag just as we did this morning, and believed that they were part of America until, at some point in their teenage years, their parents pulled them aside and said: I have to tell you something. You are not legal here. You are undocumented here. You can be deported tomorrow, and we would be deported with you.

They continued their lives with the resilience that a lot of young people show. Some of them did amazing things, even with the knowledge that they weren't "legal in America." They achieved extraordinary things in education and in serving their communities. They did it against great odds because they don't qualify for Federal assistance for higher education. If you go to college and you are one of these undocumented Dreamers, you don't get Federal student loans. You don't get Pell grants. You have to go out and work. You have to save up enough money to go to school. That is the only way. They did it, and all they have asked for in return, all they have ever asked for, is a chance to earn their way into legal status in America. Brought here as kids, they want a chance to prove to America that they love this country and they can make it a better country. That is all they have asked for.

For 17 years, I have come to the floor of this Senate—I know you have to be patient as a Senator, but this is get-

ting a little crazy—for 17 years, I have come to the floor of the Senate and asked my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, will you give them a chance? Will you just give them a chance? Let them show you that they can bring something of value to this country. Let them prove to you that they are no danger to this country in any way whatsoever and, in fact—just the opposite—will make us stronger. Give them a chance.

We haven't been able to do it, and President Trump has made it worse. On September 5, he eliminated the DACA protection program. He said that as of March 5, which was Monday of this week, they will lose their protection. The only thing that protects them at this moment is court decisions, which could change in a week or a month. But if those court decisions don't come their way, those young people who have lived here their entire lives, who believe they are Americans and want to be part of America, will be subject to deportation. That is the reality.

The Senate took up this measure a few weeks ago. We gave to the President six different bipartisan solutions to this problem—Democrats and Republicans agreed on six different ways to solve it—and the President rejected every one. He rejected the bill that came before the Senate. Only 8 Republicans—only 8 out of the 51 Republicans—would stand up and vote with Democrats to solve this problem. I wish it were more. We only needed a few more.

Now we are in a position where this Senate again, like the issue of gun safety, is not taking up the issue of DACA and the Dreamers. It isn't as though we are too busy around here, is it, when you look at this empty Chamber and these empty desks? We could do a lot of things here if we were determined to use the power and opportunity that have been given to us by the American voters.

Mr. President, the one pending issue that is before us, I would like to discuss this morning.

Next week, it will be the 10th anniversary of the collapse of the company known as Bear Stearns. As we approach that anniversary, it is remarkable to me that Congress is now debating, 10 years later, an effort to undo the financial reforms we put in place after what was tantamount to a recession or depression hit America. That was the worst financial crisis of our lifetime 10 years ago. Many of us never want to see it repeated.

I am supportive of meaningful regulatory relief for smaller banks, community banks, and credit unions, but I cannot support legislation that rolls back key Wall Street reforms at the request of the same banks that started the crisis.

We know what happened the last time financial regulations were eased:

an economic collapse that rippled not just through the United States but around the world. That financial crisis of 10 years ago left our country spiraling into deep recession. It left almost 9 million Americans out of work and our unemployment rate above 10 percent. Families across America lost \$19 trillion in household wealth, retirement, and savings. Hard-fought savings that they put aside for their kids' education and their retirement evaporated on a daily basis in the midst of that recession.

In my home State of Illinois, we weren't spared. During the height of the financial crisis, almost 800,000 people in my State experienced mortgage delinquencies and 70,000 more went through personal bankruptcy. I remember going to these meetings where gymnasiums would be filled with people trying to find some way to save their homes because the mortgages they had signed up for had blown up in their faces. This was evident in my hometown of East St. Louis, in the city of Chicago, in Aurora, and many other communities. Of course, the cost of this financial crisis fell, as it always does, on the shoulders of everyday families.

In the wake of those terrible losses and the sacrifices that had to be made, we in Congress said: We are not going to let this happen again. We won't let these banks take control again. We won't let greed overcome common sense when it comes to banking policy.

President Obama signed into law commonsense financial reforms and put an end to some of the worst, inexcusable practices by banks that brought our economy to its knees. These new Wall Street reforms were intended to address the dangerous problem of too big to fail so that American taxpayers would never again be on the hook for the consequences of recklessness and greed on Wall Street.

Systemically important banks whose demise would pose serious risk to our financial system were subjected to higher capital buffers and increased leverage requirements. In other words, if the Federal Government was going to put an insurance program in place to guarantee that it would protect the savers at the bank, we were going to require the banks to do responsible things—don't put taxpayers on the hook for your stupidity and your greed.

Banks were required to report their lending data to ensure that borrowers had the ability to repay the loans they took out and to avoid abusive mortgage practices. Do you remember what happened? People would walk into a bank, and they would be lured into a mortgage they could barely afford to pay, some of them unaware of the fact that there was a balloon provision in that mortgage where the interest rate in a few years was going to dramatically increase and make their monthly

payments financially impossible for them.

Many of them said: Well, if the value of my real estate goes up dramatically, then I will just refinance the mortgage. It did not go up dramatically, it went down, and that is when people faced mortgage foreclosure.

So we said: Let's rewrite the rules. Let's not let the banks lead people into a financial obligation that is so risky and so dangerous that we never want to see it again.

The new rules and regulations provided certainty to banks and consumers. And what happened next? Our economy did very well. With this new generation of regulation on banks—it didn't stifle economic growth at all. In part due to these sensible reforms enacted in Dodd-Frank under the Obama administration, our economy now has an unemployment rate of 4.1 percent, not 10 percent. Banks are lending, and bank profits are at record peaks. They are making money hand over fist. In 2016, banks in America made their highest profits ever. This was after the regulations we enacted—the ones they have been complaining about ever since.

How about American businesses? They are thriving. Our gross domestic product grew by 2.5 percent in the fourth quarter of 2017. In fact, since the passage of this Wall Street reform, our economy has grown at twice the rate of other advanced economies, while our stock market has—until just a few weeks ago—hit record after record. You can't argue that we are regulating banks so much that it is hurting the economy when you read these numbers. Nearly all measures in the labor market have fallen below their prerecession averages. This is the result of a sensible, forceful response by Congress to illegitimate and dangerous practices by the banking industry.

We simply cannot afford to return to that thrilling time of yesteryear when banks were not carefully regulated and carefully watched so they didn't go overboard. Instead, as we approach the 10th anniversary of the worst financial crisis since 1929, we should be working to strengthen our financial system, protect families and businesses and the hard-earned money they have saved, and continue to grow our economy.

There is a room just a few steps away from this Senate Chamber on this floor of the Senate where I have been present twice at a historic moment.

The first one, with great sadness, was 9/11. I was meeting in that room as we finally tried to understand what was happening to America with the attacks on the World Trade Center, the plane crashing in Pennsylvania, and the plane crashing into the Pentagon, with black smoke billowing across the Mall. It was that room.

It was that same room where we were called together by the head of the Fed-

eral Reserve, Mr. Bernanke, and the head of the Treasury Department, Mr. Paulson. There were probably 20 or 30 Members of the Senate and House in that room when they announced to us that we were within 24 hours of seeing the economy of the United States start to collapse. You never forget those moments. They told us that the banking issues that we have discussed here this morning had led us to the point where we had to step in as a government to save the banking industry in America in order to save the economy of America and perhaps the world.

Those are sobering words, and I remember them well. They inspired us. They drove us to the point where we came up with new financial reform, serious reform, so that there would never be another repeat of that terrible day. We are on the floor of the Senate now arguing about changing those standards of reform.

If we are going into this issue to debate it, there is one part of it that I want to raise. It is one of the seven amendments that have been put forward by the Democratic side of the aisle. I think it is critically important. It deals with an issue that every single Member of the Senate understands if they have spent 15 minutes back home. It is the issue of America's student loan crisis.

For many Americans today, there is no bigger drag on their families than student loan debt. More than 44 million Americans cumulatively owe more than \$1.5 trillion in student loan debt. That is greater than the total amount of credit card debt in America.

Unlike most of us who could borrow a reasonable amount to finance our college education, this generation of college graduates starts off with an average debt of \$27,000 on day one after graduation. Many have much, much more, especially if they were duped by the notorious for-profit college industry in America.

I hear from young people who have had to forgo home ownership, starting a family, and buying a car because of student debt. I also hear from those who have gone back to school and stay in school because they can't imagine starting to pay back their debt. They dig the hole deeper every semester.

Too often, this debt involves their parents and grandparents. It was reported a couple years ago that a grandmother—who was kind and signed on as a cosigner of her granddaughter's student loan debt—after the granddaughter defaulted, was being chased by the Federal Government, which threatened to attach her Social Security benefits so they could recoup the student loan that her granddaughter signed up for with her cosignature. That is why we are bringing an amendment to the floor, and it should be part of this debate on this bill.

If we are going to talk about reform for banks, let's talk about a reform

American families really care about—student loan reform.

One of the things included in this amendment is a borrower bill of rights. Once a student graduates, their loans go into repayment with private financial institutions or, in the case of Federal student loans, servicers contracted by the Department of Education. These servicers are supposed to help the borrowers navigate the repayment process by making sure they are on the right repayment plan, processing payments correctly, and keeping borrowers informed. Well, how are they doing? Between July 2011 and August 2017, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau handled almost 51,000 complaints related to private and Federal student loans. The majority of the complaints, both private and Federal, addressed difficulties in interacting with lenders or servicers. This is unacceptable. Lenders and servicers should be making repayment easier, not more difficult.

To improve Federal and private student loan servicing, our amendment includes the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights. It requires notifications and protections for borrowers when a loan is sold or transferred to another company or when the interest rate or other key terms of the loan change. It establishes a standard for applying payments so that payments are applied in a way that most benefits the borrower. It protects borrowers from unreasonable late fees. It requires servicers to provide borrowers online access to information about their loans, such as payment history and loan terms, and requires key information to be disclosed to borrowers by servicers.

The student loan borrowers' bill of rights also prevents servicers from using predispute mandatory arbitration clauses to prevent borrowers from holding them accountable in court.

While Federal student loan borrowers often face challenges, the situation is worse for borrowers who have private student loans, not government loans. There is now an estimated \$165 billion in outstanding private student loans. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau reported that in 2012 at least 850,000 private student loans, worth \$8 billion, were in default.

Private student loans often have uncapped variable interest rates, which can spike to 20 percent and more, and hefty fees, and these loans often lack the protections that come with Federal student loans. Unfortunately, many student borrowers, and even their family members, don't understand the difference between a Federal loan and a private loan, and they end up taking out costly private loans when they are still eligible for Federal loans that are much more reasonable with lower interest rates.

Almost half of private loan borrowers in 2011 and 2012 did not max out on their more reasonable Federal loans

and ended up taking out private loans that were worse. That is why I introduced the Know Before You Owe Private Education Loan Act, included in this amendment, requiring borrowers to be notified of the difference and their eligibility.

Finally, the amendment requires private student lenders to offer student loan rehabilitation consistent with Federal student loans. It gives private student loan borrowers who default a fresh start.

My amendment also addresses the key issue of bankruptcy. Did you know that if you borrowed money to buy a second home, buy a car, or buy a boat and then lost your job and couldn't pay off those loans and went into bankruptcy court saying: I don't have any money left, and I can't pay off these loans, the court could discharge those loans for your vacation home, your car, your boat, in bankruptcy, and say: We wipe the slate clean; you filed for bankruptcy, you qualify, and the slate is wiped clean. However, if one of your loans is not for a second home, a car, or a boat but is a student loan, then, the student loan is not dischargeable from bankruptcy. Originally, this was done in the 1970s because there were some students exploiting the system—borrowing money and then declaring bankruptcy after graduation. Then, in 2005 Congress extended nondischargeability not just to Federal Government loans but to private loans, which even extended it to those loans that were given by these notorious for-profit colleges and universities.

So before 2005, private student loans were treated in bankruptcy proceedings like credit card debt and other types of private unsecured debt. They could be discharged as part of a bankruptcy plan to help a student debtor get back on his or her feet. But in 2005, when Congress passed a sweeping bankruptcy reform bill, a provision was slipped in that gave private student lenders a uniquely privileged status. Only a few types of private unsecured debt are nondischargeable in bankruptcy: child support, back taxes, alimony, criminal fines. Now private student loans are part of that list.

Since 2005, lenders have been incentivized to push expensive private student loans on students, many of whom will not be able to repay the loans. This is an enormous problem.

I cannot explain why private student loans are given special treatment in the bankruptcy code. Neither can the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jerome Powell, who told the Senate recently that he was "at a loss" to explain why we don't allow student debt to be discharged in bankruptcy. He said that the growing amount of nondischargeable student debt "absolutely could hold back growth."

We need to address this looming student debt crisis. My amendment would

help by restoring dischargeability for private student loans in bankruptcy.

The amendment also clarifies the undue hardship exception that Congress wrote into the bankruptcy code. We said: There is one provision. If you are facing undue hardship, then, perhaps you can discharge even a student loan.

Almost never does a court find undue hardship. Congress did not define the term, and most courts have interpreted the term to have such a high bar that most students don't even try to pursue the exception because of the difficulty and expense of proving undue hardship in court.

We tried to address that. This amendment would provide clarity around undue hardship by identifying situations where there should be a rebuttable presumption that a student loan debtor has an undue hardship. We tried to address it in terms of those who clearly are facing undue hardship and need a helping hand. What are the categories of those facing bankruptcy who cannot discharge current student loans who would be able to discharge them under our amendment? It will be those who have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to have a service-connected disability. Should we give disabled veterans in America a helping hand like this? I think so. How about the family caregiver of elderly or disabled family members or veterans? How about those receiving Social Security disability whose only income is Social Security? How about those who spent years at a low income? Do you think they might be facing an undue hardship and can't pay back a student loan? I think so, and this amendment would give them the opportunity to make their case.

There are other provisions, as well, but I see colleagues on the floor who want to speak as well. I have spoken for a while. I am going to stand down in just a moment.

If we can take up the issue of making it easier for banks to do business in America, can we spare a few minutes to debate whether we can make it easier for student borrowers to survive when the student debts they face are stopping them from moving forward in their lives? These are massive debts that stop them from getting married, buying a home or a car, or starting a family? That is the reality for many families across America.

I hope my colleagues will join me. A lot of us give some great speeches about student loans. It would be terrific if we could allow on the floor of the Senate those speeches and a vote on that critical issue.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, let me tell you about Farmers State Bank

of Allen, OK. I know exactly where Allen, OK, is. I bet a bunch of folks in this room do not. It is a small town, and this a small bank. There is \$43 million in total assets in that bank. That is a pretty small bank, as banks go. It is located in a town of about 900 Oklahomans in total. The town has a number of small business owners, farmers, and ranchers—folks that some people in this room fly over. There are good families who live in that great town. Many of them have great credit scores and have a good family history of repayment back to the bank when they have taken loans, because that is the bank in town. They have been longtime customers of this bank. In many instances, the bank employees and the people in the bank have grown up together. They know each other, but they also understand seasonal income.

When you are a farmer and rancher who doesn't come in with a W-2 every single week or every month—it comes in seasonally—they understand the credit restrictions there.

A banker, named Debbie, at the Farmer State Bank of Allen wrote me this and said:

Between the Ability to Repay and Global Cash Flow analysis, particularly for a bank of this size, these new rules take our time away from doing what needs to be done—caring for our customers.

We have 12 employees and we're treated the same as JPMorgan Chase, or Goldman Sachs—both of which have an entirely different business model of operating. They do not operate in towns of 900 [people]. . . . That's not their business model or their kinds of markets

One of our key employees now spends most of her time on compliance issues. Total costs for this employee, together with the cost of the annual compliance audit [and everything that goes with it is], now exceeds \$100,000 annually.

Again, folks in big towns may not think it is a big issue to have \$100,000 in appliance costs, but the total net income of this bank for the year is right at \$500,000 a year, and \$100,000 of it is now spent on compliance.

How did this happen? This happened when Congress decided in 2010 to pass something called Dodd-Frank. Dodd-Frank was a bill signed into law in July of 2010 to deal with the financial crisis that happened in 2007 and 2008, which was real. The largest banks in our country took some incredible risks. It caused a financial domino effect all over the country, and it caused great risk for our international markets.

In response to that, Congress rose up with a strong Democratic majority, and President Obama ran to it and said: We need to do something.

They looped together as many different financial restrictions as they could. They created a new thing called the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, with no oversight at all. They created a whole litany of new regulations and said: This will only be for the biggest banks because they were the violators.

They put it out there, and then the regulations started flowing after that. Guess what. Farmers State Bank of Allen, which was not the cause of the financial collapse in America, is now caught up, and they are struggling to survive as a bank. Because Congress decided they were going to do something, the something ended up being something that is devastating rural economies in my State.

Since the passage of Dodd-Frank, we have seen a 16-percent decline in the total number of Oklahoma bank charters—just in my State. There is a 35-percent decline in Oklahoma charter banks with less than \$100 million in total assets since Dodd-Frank. The effects of Dodd-Frank were felt pretty quickly in Oklahoma. It was passed in 2010. By the 2013-to-2014 reporting time, more than 40 percent of the banks in Oklahoma no longer did mortgage lending at all.

Let that soak in for a minute—banks that don't do mortgages. If you are in a rural community, that is the bread and butter of normal lending in that community—going to get a mortgage. But 40 percent of the banks in Oklahoma, starting in about the 2013, 2014 reporting cycle—just 3 or 4 years after Dodd-Frank passed—had already said the compliance costs were so high and the complexity was so great that they no longer offered mortgages and mortgage lending.

There are folks who say: We will just drive to a big city and go to a big bank and get it, and they will still take care of that. Quite frankly, that is what is happening. Dodd-Frank has done an excellent job of increasing the size, power, and strength of the biggest banks in America and has targeted the smallest banks in America. We are watching mergers all over my State, as the smallest banks struggle under the compliance costs. It almost looks like the design of Dodd-Frank was to cause biggest banks to get bigger because the smallest banks would not be able to survive under the compliance burdens that were then created for them.

What does that look like in real life? Let me tell you about a gentleman who I bumped into early Monday morning. He was flying out of Oklahoma. I was sitting next to the gentleman, and were striking up a conversation. He is a farmer and rancher in Oklahoma. He owns about 200 acres in North Central Oklahoma. He started to go through the purchase process to actually buy that acreage and couldn't get mortgage lending for it. No banks in the area would do it. Why? The Dodd-Frank requirements. Suddenly, a guy in Oklahoma trying to buy 200 acres had to find a way to scrape together \$100,000 of cash to buy a ranch.

Now, 5 years ago, 10 years ago, or 15 years ago, if you wanted to get that same ranch, you would go to the bank in town. Now the bank in town has to

tell you that you have to go somewhere else or find some other way to do it because the restrictions are so high that they can't do it anymore.

Local customers don't want to deal with someone else in another State or in another city. They would like to deal with their local bank, but they can't anymore. Oklahoma's community banks had nothing to do with the financial collapse in 2008. Yet they have been penalized all the way through this process.

In total, Dodd-Frank required more than 10 Federal agencies to write more than 400 new rules, imposing 27,000 new mandates on financial institutions of every size. Just process that. When you are Farmer State Bank of Allen and you have 12 employees, you now have to track 27,000 new mandates to keep up with it.

How are you doing with that?

That is what real life looks like. I have had folks say to me: This is some giveaway to the biggest banks.

What we are dealing with in this reform package is pretty straightforward. The Wall Street Journal wrote an editorial earlier this week saying that the bill "eases administrative burdens on 5,000 community banks that make up 98% of the financial institutions but only 15% of the assets."

Let me run that past you again. What we are dealing with deals with 98 percent of the banks, but of total banking assets in the country, it is only 15 percent of the assets. That means the top 2 percent of the banks in the country—the largest top 2 percent of the banks in the country—have 85 percent of the assets. I understand the higher regulations on those. They are significant. If they fail, they take down the global economy. For the other 98 percent of the banks in the country that have only 15 percent of the total assets in the country—these are the smallest banks in the country—why are they being dragged into this?

All we want to say is to allow local banks to be local banks again and to be able to loan to their neighbors. These are the folks with whom they go to church and are in Rotary Club, and with whom they have grown up. They know their kids, and they know their families, but they are dealing with all these arcane requirements. They are dealing with 27,000 new rules, and they just can't make it.

What does this look like in real life? Let me give you an illustration from Legacy Bank in Elk City. Damon, from Legacy Bank in Elk City, OK, said:

As a community banker, my job has become much more difficult and burdensome to our customers. Legacy has always strived to offer the best customer service a bank can offer. I used to be a lender to all. However, with the changes that have come about with this bill, along with the fines and penalties that are a potential and, at times, don't use common sense, I am now a commercial lender only.

Let that soak in for a second. At Legacy Bank in Elk City, he used to make loans to everyone, and now he is a commercial lender only. What does that look like in real life? I have folks who come to this floor and people who catch me and say: Banks are still making lots of money, and banks are doing just fine. Why is Dodd-Frank a problem?

Yes, banks are going to find a way to still do business. What has happened? The biggest banks are loaning to corporate customers, and the smallest banks that used to do small business lending and mortgages and took care of their community can't do that anymore. So the big is getting bigger and helping the biggest, and the small is not able to help the small.

I thought we were supposed to be a country that helped everyone—corporations or individual farmers and ranchers and citizens who are trying to start small businesses. Let's get back to doing that again. Let's not put 27,000 new restrictions on a small community bank and tell it that it has to abide by everything that JPMorgan Chase does and treat it as if it is the same. It is not.

There is Frazer Bank in Altus, about which my wife and I have a long-standing saying: Everywhere you go in the world, you are going to bump into somebody from Altus, OK. Try it sometime.

A local banker wrote: This past week in Altus, we had a local small business owner who applied for a home mortgage loan. The customer had a down payment and closing costs, but one of the key issues preventing our bank from making this personal loan was the time constraint of 2 years of history. This is someone to whom we would have made a home loan prior to Dodd-Frank, but now we cannot.

So a small business owner with closing cost money and with an ability to repay is now blocked out. How serious is that?

Jim Hamby from Vision Bank in Ada wrote me and was trying to describe exactly what this looks like.

He made the statement: Overly prescriptive rules on mortgage lending are the big issue. The ability to repay and the rules governing that topic are geared for people who are W-2 wage earners, not small business people. Many small business people have already been denied credit who would have otherwise qualified for a mortgage, and that is bad policy. Any mortgage bank keeps its own books and should automatically define what is a qualified mortgage. This would help alleviate the "ability to repay" rule and allow us to take better care of our customers.

Don't miss what he is saying there. The rules are written for people who get a paycheck from week to week, not

for the small business owner and certainly not for the farmers and ranchers.

Here is a statement from a banker in Northwest Oklahoma who asked a simple question: What about a \$60 million bank in the northwest corner of Oklahoma? What about other rural markets where smaller, traditional community banks have completely abandoned lines of business and products because the cost of regulation makes it so unprofitable or because the price of regulation and risk from examiners and lawyers bring so much additional scrutiny that you can't afford it?

One thing is certain. When banks are forced to leave lines of business due to government regulation, both customers and communities suffer. Even in markets in which there are other participants in the abandoned product line, the reality is, with fewer competitors, customers pay higher rates and higher fees for a simple service.

This is not a hard issue. For the 2 percent of the largest banks that have 85 percent of the banking assets, I understand there is systemic risk there. For the other 98 percent of the banks in the country that cover 15 percent total of all of the banking assets in the country, why are they considered so systemically important that 27,000 new regulations would need to come down on their 12 employees?

This is a good moment in which to get small towns in rural America working again and to allow people to go down the street to the bankers they know and went to school with rather than to have to drive to some big city and talk to the biggest banks in America and have them try to understand more about rural America.

We can fix this. I am looking forward to passing this reform and allowing our banks not just to make money—they will find a way to make money; they are businesses—but to actually get back to serving the customers they want to serve again in a fair way—farmers and ranchers and small businesses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to recognize March as Women's History Month and today, March 8, as International Women's Day.

Both at home and abroad, how a country treats its women is very much a barometer of its success. When women live without limitations on their ability to work, societies prosper. When women live without restrictions on their access to jobs, healthcare, or justice, societies prosper. When women succeed, so do their families, their communities, and their countries.

International Women's Day reminds us that America's global leadership

starts with our progress here in the United States. Unfortunately, President Trump moved the United States in the wrong direction when he decided not just to reinstate the global gag rule but to expand it. The global gag rule disqualifies international organizations from receiving U.S. family planning assistance if they use any non-U.S. funds to provide abortion services or even counseling.

What President Trump fails to realize is that access to the family planning services that these organizations provide is one of the best tools we have to prevent abortions. When enforced, the global gag rule has closed the door on some of the most effective, life-saving women's health programs in developing countries. By reinstating and expanding the global gag rule, President Trump is denying millions of women and their families access to critical healthcare services and is endangering their lives and the lives of their children.

International Women's Day is the appropriate time to remind my Senate colleagues that we must end the global gag rule once and for all.

It was also recently reported that the State Department is removing references to women's rights from this year's human rights report. I am troubled to learn that the Trump administration, apparently, doesn't feel that women's rights are important enough to include in our conversation on human rights. I was equally troubled to learn that the State Department removed gender equality integration from the Foreign Affairs Manual. The Foreign Affairs Manual is the chief document for instructing our foreign policy leadership on the ways to integrate gender considerations into our diplomatic efforts. Abandoning that signals a reversal of decades' worth of work in promoting global gender equality.

The United States should be taking the lead on fostering an open and honest dialogue about women's issues internationally, not silencing it. We are better than this.

Here at home, women have succeeded this past year in taking control of the narrative on sexual harassment, and they have forced deaf ears to listen. We are witnessing the rise of a new, more equitable social order that is built on the raw guts and courage of women who are speaking out to say, "Me too." Hearing so many of my fellow Americans—mothers, sisters, wives, daughters, friends—retell and relive some of their most traumatic experiences has been deeply troubling, but it has also been a lesson in bravery, in tenacity, and in women's unbreakable spirits.

It is that bravery which we must now meet with our own as individuals and collectively. If we witness harassment, we must be brave enough to intervene. If we are told about abuse, we must be

brave enough to take decisive action. If we hear about gender discrimination, we must be brave enough to fight it even when doing so may not be politically expedient or popular. Scores of women have proved their moral strength. It is time for us to demonstrate ours.

This Women's History Month, let us take a moment to reflect on the thousands and thousands of "Me Too" stories that go untold and unheard.

Let us recognize the single working mother making barely more than minimum wage, living paycheck to paycheck, and struggling to turn \$5 into a meal for three. When her coworker begins propositioning her, there are no cameras and cable talk shows waiting to expose him. She bears the burden alone, often feeling forced to choose between enduring disparaging behavior at work or providing for her children at home.

Let us recognize the college graduate working in an office, empowered and excited about the direction of her career. Yet, in every meeting, her boss undermines her ideas and, one day, when they are alone, questions her suggestively about her method of birth control. Weeks later, his lewd remarks evolve into inappropriate physical contact, and he tells her that if she ever complains, he will ensure she never finds another job in her chosen profession.

Let us recognize the immigrant woman working hard at her new job in her new home, motivated to become part of the American dream. Her male coworker calls her by disparaging names and suggests openly to their supervisor that she should make less than he does in the event she ever becomes pregnant and costs the company money. She begins to fear both for her job and for herself, but to quit would mean to lose the new life she has so painstakingly built.

For an untold number of women, these stories are painfully familiar. The "Me Too" movement has proven that sexual harassment and discrimination know no age and no income level. These experiences are felt by all women of all backgrounds, so it is up to all of us to combat it. Sexual harassment is about power. It is about the harassers and authority figures feeling emboldened by being able to behave the way they want, wherever they want, with impunity. So let us end the sense of impunity.

If behavior is about exerting a twisted kind of power, let us arm women with the most powerful tool in our legal system—the U.S. Constitution. Let us finally pass the Equal Rights Amendment. The Equal Rights Amendment is barely longer than a tweet, but it would finally give women full and equal protection under the Constitution. Section 1 of the ERA states, quite simply: "Equality of rights under the

law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.”

When Congress proposed the ERA in 1972, it provided that the measure had to be ratified by three-fourths of the States—38 States—within 7 years. This deadline was later extended to 10 years by a joint resolution. Ultimately, only 35 out of 38 States had ratified the ERA when the deadline expired in 1982—three short. Note that the deadline was not contained in the amendment, itself. The deadline was contained in a joint resolution.

Article V of the Constitution contains no time limits for the ratification of amendments, so the ERA deadline is arbitrary. To put the matter in context, the 27th Amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits congressional pay raises without an intervening election, was ratified in 1992—203 years after it was first proposed. The Senate should vote to remove the ERA deadline immediately, and every State in our Nation that has not yet taken up its consideration should do so without further delay.

Nevada became the 36th State to ratify the amendment last March, leaving the ERA only two States short of the required three-fourths of the State threshold under the Constitution if the deadline were to be abolished. I think many—perhaps most—Americans would be shocked to learn that our Constitution has no provision expressly prohibiting gender discrimination.

The ERA would incorporate a ban on gender-based discrimination to be explicitly written into the Constitution. It would change outcomes in unequal pay cases by requiring the Supreme Court to use the higher standard of “strict scrutiny” when assessing those cases—the same standard it uses on racial and religious discrimination cases.

Just as importantly, it would provide a constitutional basis for claims of gender-based violence and give the Congress the constitutional basis to pass laws that would give women who have been victimized by gender-based violence legal recourse in Federal courts.

In a 2011 interview, the late Justice Antonin Scalia summed up best the need for an Equal Rights Amendment. He said:

Certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex. The only issue is whether it prohibits it. It doesn't.

So I, most sincerely, ask my Senate colleagues this question: Are we willing to do what must be done to prohibit gender discrimination by including protection against it in the Constitution? Progress has no autopilot feature. We must be its agents. We must be its champions. When we wake up each day to the loud and growing chorus of women saying “me too,” how can we deny them the legal tool as

powerful and important as our own country's Constitution?

The people being affected by systemic gender inequality are our constituents. They are our wives, our daughters, and our granddaughters. They are American citizens and human beings who deserve basic respect and equality.

We are capable of so much more than lip service. We are capable of celebrating Women's History Month by making history. I call on this Senate to remove the deadline on passing the Equal Rights Amendment and show the American people we are the leaders they sent us here to be, and we will take action. Let us prove that we will use our voices when silence becomes complicity, and we will use our votes when our values need defending.

Women deserve to see that their Nation's founding document values them and treats them in a fashion equal to men. They are right to expect that gender equality should be an explicit, basic principle of our society. Let us all work together to get this done.

Women's rights are human rights, and human rights are not and never should be a partisan issue.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I stand today in support of my colleague from Maryland as the 36th State to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. I couldn't agree more. I think it is time to eradicate discrimination of any kind, so I commend my colleague for standing up today and for his comments.

Mr. President, I stand to talk about an issue that continues in our communities, and it is the issue of housing discrimination.

I recently read an article from the Center for Investigative Journalism about a young woman named Rachelle. At the time, Rachelle was in her early thirties and living in Philadelphia. She was making \$60,000 a year as a contractor at Rutgers University. She had savings, good credit, and an undergraduate degree from Northwestern.

When she first went to apply for a home loan, she thought she would be the perfect applicant. On paper, it seemed that way, but a few weeks later, she received an email informing her that her application had been denied.

In the email her broker told her that because she was a contractor and not a full-time employee, her application was too risky for the bank to approve. She was at a loss. She had been plan-

ning to purchase a home for years and thought she had done everything right. She then asked her partner, Hanako, to sign on to the application with her. At the time, Hanako was working a few hours a week at the grocery store making \$300 a month. That is about \$3,600 a year. Hanako tried calling the bank to speak to a loan officer about the application, and to Rachelle's surprise, the loan officer picked up. He was attentive, helpful, and friendly to Hanako. A few weeks later, he approved the couple's loan.

This makes no sense, right? Rachelle was making an income in the upper five figures, \$60,000 a year. She was the one with good credit, and she was the one paying for Hanako's health insurance. The difference here was that Rachelle was Black.

This story did not take place in 1930, when it was legal for housing lenders to discriminate on the basis of race. It did not take place in 1968, the year banks were formally banned from using race as a factor in deciding home loan applications. It took place less than 2 years ago, in 2016.

Today, 50 years after the passage of the Fair Housing Act, stories like Rachelle's are all too common. For any person of color who has tried to navigate the housing market, Rachelle's experience is a case of *deja vu*.

We now know that Rachelle was the victim of redlining. “Redlining” is a term that describes the practice of denying goods or services to people on the basis of the color of their skin.

The term originated in the 1930s, when redlining was the official policy of the Federal Housing Administration. Back then, Federal officials divvied up cities and assigned a color to each neighborhood. The color system was supposed to help mortgage lenders know where to invest. Green and blue neighborhoods were home to desirable borrowers with good credit. Yellow or red meant risky borrowers lived here so don't invest. The practice became known as redlining because the FHA would draw red lines on city maps to designate “bad” neighborhoods. For the FHA, a bad neighborhood was defined by the color of one's skin.

Redlining was banned in the 1960s, but as we learn from stories like Rachelle's, the practice still goes on under the radar; so much so that in 1975, Congress passed the Housing Mortgage Disclosure Act—HMDA—to help regulators identify when it was going on, but even with the new requirements, redlining continued.

Then, in the 1990s, the financial industry began selling something called the subprime loan. Subprime loans have high fees, adjustable interest rates, and payment shocks—characteristics that made them extremely dangerous. People who weren't approved for traditional loans were offered subprime loans instead.

In 2008, when the market crashed, subprime loan holders saw their interest rates skyrocket. They suddenly became unable to afford to stay in their homes. Who do you think was most likely to hold one of these so-called subprime mortgages? People living in redlined neighborhoods, people of color, people who had been denied access to traditional loans.

My home State of Nevada was one of the hardest hit States in the country by the financial crisis. We had the highest foreclosure rates for 62 straight months. We had the most number of underwater mortgages, and over 219,000 families lost their homes.

Anyone driving through parts of Las Vegas and Reno in 2009 could see boarded up houses, for sale signs, and empty lots everywhere. On many streets, you would see more houses in foreclosure than not, and while all neighborhoods suffered, African-American, Latino, and Asian-Pacific Islander communities were hit the hardest. Entire neighborhoods were hollowed out. Trillions of dollars were lost.

I was the attorney general of Nevada at this time. We did everything we could to fight for homeowners and help them stay in their homes. As this was going on, I asked myself: How could this happen? The Federal Government was supposed to regulate these banks. Where were they? Why didn't they put a stop to these practices before it all came crashing down? The Federal Government was supposed to be the watchdog, but they were letting banks write their own rules.

As attorney general of Nevada, I sued the big banks for their fraudulent practices and secured over \$1.9 billion to help homeowners in my State.

In 2010, Federal lawmakers passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to ensure that what we saw in 2008 would never happen again. The bill was not perfect, but it did a lot of things right.

It strengthened oversight of the big banks. It made the big banks undergo stress tests and develop bankruptcy plans, and it also strengthened HMDA, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. It strengthened reporting requirements to help regulators fight back against discriminatory, racist, redlining practices.

Banks say they don't treat borrowers differently, but the data shows us that is a different story. Redlining remains a major problem for communities of color.

The legislation we are now considering, S. 2155, would roll back Wall Street reform. It includes a section, section 104, that would repeal many of the reporting requirements we added after the financial crisis to prevent housing discrimination. Some rural and low-income census tracks are predominantly served by small lenders.

If this specific loan data is removed from them, government officials, researchers, and the public will not have information on the quality of loans made, nor will they know about the credit scores of the borrowers or even a way to easily track the loans after they are sold to investors.

When I was attorney general, I needed the information on the quality of the loans in the State to protect consumers. Where were the teaser rates and what was the reset? Who were the homeowners who might not be ready to pay \$20,000 more on their monthly mortgages? These were the questions I had with no data. With everything we saw 10 years ago, I cannot now believe we are considering restricting access to this kind of data—the kind of data that is important to prevent housing discrimination.

I have seen what happens when we don't have strong enough protections against housing discrimination. This is why I have submitted an amendment to strike section 104 to preserve access to data we need. With better information and protections, we could have prevented a crisis in which 12 million people lost their jobs, in which the banks took the homes of more than 7 million people.

Let's not take away access to this information. Let's not make the same mistakes we made 10 years ago. I urge my colleagues to join me. Vote for fairness, vote for equality, vote for inclusion. Vote for everyone who got burned by the big banks. Vote for folks like Rachelle who just needed a break, who just needed a fair mortgage loan so they could buy their first home. Support my amendment to prevent loan and housing discrimination, to protect the access to data and to protect the progress we made under Wall Street reform.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I had not planned on talking about the bill we have before us, S. 2155, but the other day I was listening to another Member speak, and this Member was talking about how this bill could threaten and possibly increase the predatory practices of people who had mobile home loans.

As a person who had a mobile home loan and somebody who lived in a mobile home park, I thought I would try to speak maybe about the practical easing—what we are trying to accomplish with this bill. The truth is, I would go further on regulatory tailoring than we have. We didn't because we wanted bipartisan agreement on this bill, which we have.

As a matter of fact, I thank the members on the Banking Committee who joined with me and other members to make sure we kept the bill tailored enough so we had bipartisan support.

On mobile homes—we get out here in the Senate, and we talk about facts and figures. I can talk about the fact that half of my community banks have ceased to exist in North Carolina since the crisis. I can talk about a number of people I speak with who can't get loans, but what I thought I would talk about is my own personal experience as a 16-year-old, 17-year-old kid living in a trailer park working with my father.

He would do maintenance work. If a house caught on fire or there was some sort of insurance damage, he would work with the insurance companies to actually do repair work, and I was his handyman when we would do these projects. We did not have a whole lot of money. My father didn't have a lot of cash on hand, so the way we did it is, when you had this insurance job, you bid on the insurance job. You knew how much money you would make at the end. Then you go to a bank and get what is called a 90-day note. Most of these projects were about 60- to 90-day projects, and you would go to a banker whom you had built a relationship with, and you would ask them to trust you to get this project done. You would show them the project you were doing, and he would underwrite a loan that you had to pay back in 90 days. That is why they called it a 90-day note.

Today, in the postcrisis world, that virtually never happens. Today, we don't have community banks and personal banking relationships that people can rely on to get access to capital. Even worse, with all the community banks and smaller banks consolidating, ceasing to exist, there are entire areas of North Carolina—a lot of people think North Carolina is an urban State. The fact is, about half our population, about 5 million people, live in rural areas. They have been hardest hit by the consolidation of banks and the ceasing to exist of these sort of lending institutions out in communities like the community I lived in when I was 17 years old. They are not getting the money they need to make ends meet.

What this bill is trying to do is recognize that, of course, after the financial crisis, there was a regulatory exposure we needed to address. The problem is, we simply went too far or at least with the passing of time we now know we can claw back those regulations on certain banks—particularly community and regional banks. That is all this bill is intended to do.

As a matter of fact, this bill allows the regulators to go back after those banks that are under the \$250 billion threshold if they determine that the practices they are involved in are particularly problematic or may have a systemic impact on the financial system as a whole.

What we are trying to do is make sure we start seeing community banks pop up in rural areas like the place I lived in outside of Nashville, TN, where

bankers could work with people and give them the resources they need to pay their bills. Even as late as just a couple of years ago—we have some folks who are speaking against the bill who said it was important for us to advance these sorts of changes. As a matter of fact, one Member said: “It is important we advance this conversation to ensure that prudential regulations for regional banks are crafted appropriately.” That is what this bill does.

Another Member or maybe the same Member said: “We all agree that regional banks are not systemically important.” Regional banks are the bigger banks. They would be like BB&T or Fifth Third Bank.

They are not systemically important. Well, then, I guess we can all agree that the community banks and smaller banks aren’t. That is what this bill is about, some of the midsized regional banks and community banks. We said we need to tailor it, and that is what this bipartisan bill does.

Another Member said: “I continue to believe we will not be successful in providing regulatory relief to institutions of any size if we don’t have broad, bipartisan consensus.” That is what this bill has.

We always talk about the polar environment here and how we can get nothing done. This is a bill that has had members of the Committee on Banking, on which I serve, join together to make sure that all we advanced out of the committee was a bipartisan consensus for regulatory relief that allows cash to flow to people who need it—community banks, regional banks that have a more intimate relationship with people who need access to capital. That is what this bill does. For the life of me, I can’t understand why we can’t all agree.

You have these discussions here where it sounds like we are doing some big-bank relief—not at all. I have a couple of large banking institutions in North Carolina, and they are going to have to continue to submit 60,000-page, 100,000-page stress tests and CCAR reports to make sure they don’t create a systemic threat. This bill doesn’t touch that.

What this bill touches is a part of the ecosystem that is suffering. What this bill does is reduce the regulatory burden so that guy who existed back in the midseventies who would give my dad a 90-day note can now do it and not have to say no because they simply can’t afford to do it either because it affects their portfolio or because they are spending so much money on regulatory relief that they have to go after the bigger loans. It is the people at my level at that time back in the seventies who suffer.

This is a bipartisan bill, it is a responsible bill, and it is a bill that is going to provide much needed relief.

I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle who recognize that this is a

prudent bill, that it is measured. I thank Chairman CRAPO for all the great work he has done to live up to his commitment to the Members on the other side of the aisle to keep this tailored and to do exactly what we said we were going to do. I look forward to its passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, well, not exactly. Yesterday I spoke about the big banks that have violated our banking laws time and again, banks like Wells Fargo and Citigroup. I talked about foreign banks like Santander and Deutsche Bank—the President’s personal German bank, I might add. Santander, a Spanish bank, has foreclosed on the cars of American service men and women when they are overseas serving our country, and we are rewarding that Spanish bank. We are rewarding a Swiss bank that has broken international law in support of Iran. We are rewarding these foreign banks.

I liked this bill at the beginning. I have been working on these issues with Chairman CRAPO, whom I respect—I really do—for some years, and we worked on coming up with a bill that would help community banks and the midsized regional banks, three of which are located in the Presiding Officer’s boyhood State and my State of Ohio—Fifth Third, KeyCorp, and Huntington. We wanted to do those things.

You know, in this place, when we work on something to help the small guy, the big guy thinks: Well, don’t leave me out. I want to be part of this. I want to get my things too.

So we start helping community banks, we start helping the little guy, and all of a sudden, Wall Street gets its hand out, just like on the tax bill. I guess I believed my colleagues on the tax bill when they said it was a middle-class tax cut bill. Well, it kind of didn’t end up that way. By the end, 81 percent of the tax benefits went to the richest 1 percent.

That is what we do. We start here. We go back home, and we talk about helping the middle class and helping the little guy. No matter whether she punches a time clock or works construction, we want to help middle-income people. But you know what—by the time the lobbyists swoop in, by the time they are here, and they start talking to their friends and start doing what they do, then all of a sudden, these bills help the big guy. They help Wall Street. It is no surprise; it has happened here before.

I particularly think we would learn about it when it comes to what happened 10 years ago. There are some pretty smart people in the Senate, but they have some kind of illness that I don’t entirely understand called collective amnesia. They forget. They forget what happened 10 years ago.

Where I live, Cleveland, OH, and where the Presiding Officer grew up in greater Cleveland, in my neighborhood, ZIP Code 44105, in early 2007, in the first half of that year, more people lost their homes through foreclosure than any other ZIP Code in the United States of America. The neighborhood that I live in is not a gated community. I live in an area of about 200 relatively new homes. When I drive about 500 yards in any direction, I see the blight that came because of what Wall Street and, frankly, this Congress and the regulators, the Bush regulators—I can mention names; it is all public record—did to our economy. And 10 years later, we have kind of forgotten about all that.

Well, the people who lost their homes haven’t forgotten about it. The people who lost their jobs haven’t forgotten about it. The people who lost their retirement savings haven’t forgotten about it. It is just a bunch of Members of Congress, a bunch of Republican members of the Banking Committee, a bunch of Members on that side of the aisle—almost all of whom, I believe, are supporting this bill—they seem to have forgotten what happened to the economy 10 years ago.

After starting with a relatively simple and benign, let’s help the community banks and the credit unions—which I want to do, too, and have a voting record to prove it—and help some of the smaller regionals, such as Huntington and Fifth Third and Key Corp in my State, it just sort of got out of hand.

Well, now they are coming back and saying: Well, we will make a couple of changes. Let’s talk about these couple of changes that Houdini would be proud of, sort of some sleight-of-hand kinds of changes. In fact, these changes have made the bill worse, and I will explain.

Last September, we learned that Equifax had allowed hackers to exploit a known security flaw and make off with names, birth dates, Social Security numbers, and all matter of private information of 143 millions Americans. There are probably 50 people in the Gallery. If the national averages hold out, 25 of them were wronged by Equifax. They were fraudulently or incompetently—perhaps through incompetence—attacked by Equifax. In my State, it was about 5 million people. Around the country, it was about 143 million. In fact, most of the people in the Gallery are adults, so it is more than half the adult population that was wronged by Equifax. Half the country is vulnerable to identity theft.

Americans are furious with Equifax, as they should be, but this amendment that apparently is in the substitute bill for reasons I can’t fathom includes provisions designed to help Equifax. It is not just that this body doesn’t punish Equifax and that these executives have no contrition—of course nobody went to jail.

The people we send to jail in this country—we almost never send people to jail for financial fraud. They dress well, they are sophisticated, they belong to the right country clubs, and they would never go to jail. Let me back off on that for a moment and talk again about Equifax.

Equifax and other credit reporting agencies apparently have been upset about a proposal to give men and women in the military credit monitoring. Think of that. Equifax executives didn't like that there was a proposal to give the people serving this country credit monitoring.

I understand what Santander did; they repossessed autos of men and women from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton and from other places who were overseas serving. They repossessed their cars, and we rewarded them, so I guess Equifax thought, well, there is a good trend here, a good precedent there. We don't want to give men and women in the military credit monitoring.

So we have an amendment to fix that. A small gesture to the people who serve our country, though, seemed too much for the Republicans and too much for Equifax. In exchange for this token benefit, they demanded that consumers and servicemembers give up their right to take Equifax to court. So Equifax is willing to do a little bit for people, just a little bit, but damn it, you can't sue us then. That was the deal—you can't sue us. We will give you a little bit of credit monitoring, but in return, you can't sue us for anything. I am not a lawyer, but that is called a right to action. So the next time the company's recklessness exposes sensitive financial data, sorry, you can't sue us. Sorry about that; that is the way it goes.

In the end, Equifax—shocking—got exactly what it wanted. Equifax let your data loose and ruined your credit score, but you won't be able to sue them. Sorry about that.

It gets worse. Equifax—a company that can't even safely store consumers' data—and that is their job; that is what they are hired to do, even though we don't individually choose them. The company spent nearly as much on executive salaries as it did on cyber security. So this company's job is to protect private data, but they didn't really invest that much in cyber security because, for whatever reason, they paid their executives about the same amount of money.

Now Equifax wants in on the credit-scoring business. Along with two other major credit reporting agencies, it has created a product to compete with Fair Isaac's FICO score.

The Federal Housing Finance Agency has a process in place to try to broaden the factors it looks at in determining creditworthiness, but, as Director Mel Watt testified in the Banking Com-

mittee, it is complicated and it is time-consuming. Understandably, FHFA wants to get it right, and so do the lenders that sell loans to Fannie and Freddie. But instead of allowing FHFA to take the time it needs to get it right, this bill ignores that, and it sets up its own process. We have not taken any testimony on this legislation from market participants or from the government agency. I have my hunch, though, as to who is pushing for it. Guess who is one of the biggest beneficiaries of this change. The pages would know the answer to that, if they are listening. Equifax, of course.

I know my colleagues were well-intentioned. It would be great if we had additional ways of determining whether someone is creditworthy and if we could give more Americans the opportunity to become homeowners. But determining creditworthiness and balancing access to credit with the need to make sure we don't end up with millions of foreclosures is complicated. That is why we have FHFA, and that is why we have a process in place.

We know there are problems with the current system, and more data would improve our efforts to combat discrimination in housing. The Center for Investigative Reporting just completed a valuable study of tens of millions of mortgage records and found out that across the country, people of color are far more likely to be turned down for a loan, even when you take into account factors like income and the size of the loan. I will repeat that. Holding all things equal except for race, people of color are far more likely to be turned down for a loan. We know that.

The trade associations for lenders argued that the study was flawed because more data—data like credit scores and debt-to-income ratios—was needed to prove discrimination. The good news is that Dodd-Frank did that. It required this very kind of data to be collected, and beginning in January, banks and credit unions began reporting it.

Problem solved, right? Well, once the more detailed data set is available and large enough, watchdogs can then undertake better analysis, target the bad actors, and allow the good lenders—and most of them are—to continue with their business without a regulator knocking on their door. But who are we kidding? This bill wants to do away with that too. I thought we had solved the problem. The substitute would repeal the reporting required by Dodd-Frank for 85 percent of all banks.

Backers of the substitute will claim it has addressed complaints that this effort will undermine enforcement of civil rights laws, but it hasn't. Backers will point to a provision which says that banks that flunk the Community Reinvestment Act exam and get a rating of substantial noncompliance are ineligible for the reduced reporting of mortgage data. That sounds good, but

in all of 2017, out of the thousands of Community Reinvestment Act exams, only two banks out of thousands flunked. When we have reason to believe banks all across the country are discriminating in their lending, even if it is unintentional—and sometimes it is—looking at data from two banks out of thousands isn't going to tell us a whole lot.

The substitute would maintain current laws for banks that are given a "needs to improve" rating on their CRA exam over two consecutive exam cycles. Let's say a bank is engaged in discriminatory lending. The examiner gives it a "needs to improve" rating. This amendment says: No harm, no foul; the first one is free. Really? A few years later, when the next exam rolls around, if the bank is still discriminating, only then will it have to submit to the amount of data required today. So this amendment says it is OK for a bank to engage in legally sanctioned discrimination for years before it faces any consequences. Why would we do that in this bill?

In sharp contrast to the slow-motion response to discrimination, when it is the bank that wants the data from the Federal Government, the sponsors of this bill can't move fast enough. It is like everything around here—when Wall Street says "jump," most of this Senate jumps, and frankly, straight down the hall in the House of Representatives, they jump faster and higher.

There was a bill introduced just this Monday, referred to the Finance Committee, that would allow credit card companies to tap the Social Security Administration database to verify identities. There hasn't been a hearing on it, and it hasn't gotten attention, but guess what—it is in the substitute bill. So the banking majority can move very fast when it comes to helping the banks; they can't move so fast when it comes to prohibiting discrimination against people of color. I suppose I understand why, but that is pretty outrageous. The demand on SSA would explode. Will the system be able to handle it? Will the public interfere? Will this public interface be one more way that hackers could gain access to the Social Security database? I don't know because there has been no time for the Finance Committee to look at this bill. Protecting people's Social Security numbers is the last place—the last place—where we should be rushing things to please the big banks.

Whether it is a State as conservative as Tennessee or as liberal as California, I am guessing most Americans don't want Congress to rush something through that might expose their Social Security numbers without really understanding it through congressional hearings and examination.

This would all be bad enough, but it is not just Equifax that gets goodies in

this bill. This bill is a gift to foreign megabanks. Yesterday we saw a new provision on foreign banks included in the substitute to clarify the legislation, but it doesn't fix the issue. The substitute includes a figleaf to try to convince the public that this bill doesn't do what it actually does do.

This provision provides some vague and ambiguous language that puts the question to the Fed. In this bill, we say: You can regulate the foreign banks or you don't have to regulate the foreign banks; it is up to the new Federal regulators. It is your choice. The legislation doesn't require the Fed to keep strong rules in place that are already in place. It doesn't stop the foreign banks from suing the Fed if it doesn't obey the request.

We are expected to trust Randal Quarles to be tough on foreign banks—most of you don't know Randal Quarles. I have had conversations with him. He is a smart man. He is well educated. He is a nice guy—but that is not a bet I want to make. That is not a bet Congress should make.

Just this week, Governor Quarles spoke at an international banking conference, and he promised—it was an international banking conference. That would probably not be with Wells Fargo, probably not JPMorgan Chase, probably not Bank of America; it would probably be with Santander, UBS, Swiss Bank, or Barclays—the British bank—or the President's personal bank, the German bank, Deutsche Bank. Those are who attended. He said, if we really want to fix the foreign bank issue—he said he plans to deregulate those foreign banks.

I know the supporters of this bill think they can sort of obfuscate—I don't think they are lying. I think they are just obfuscating and not really being straightforward about what this bill does for foreign banks, and I know they did this for foreign banks because I asked Treasury Secretary Mnuchin—Senator CORKER was in the room with the Banking Committee—and he said: Yes, we plan to deregulate the foreign banks.

We know that. We know that from other former regulators: Paul Volcker, former head of the Federal Reserve appointed by both President Carter and President Reagan; we know that from people like Sarah Bloom Raskin, who was a member of the Board of Governors at the Federal Reserve; we know that from professors and other regulators. I know Sheila Bair, a Republican nominee appointed by President Bush to run the FDIC, is concerned about this bill. We know that.

So if we want to fix the foreign bank issue, let's just adopt my amendment. Let's fix it. It is simple: No favors for the biggest global banks here in the United States. Don't give the regulators the option because we know whom the regulators for the banks are.

We know most of the regulators for the banks used to work on Wall Street. You go to the White House, and the White House looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives.

We want to write strong laws, clear laws. We don't need to place blind trust in the people who have failed us before—Quarles, Mick Mulvaney, Otting, and Mnuchin. We are expecting these people who have been strong in their public announcements to be right in their public actions? We are entrusting these people who have profited—I could name the names. We are entrusting these people who now have public service jobs and who have profited from Wall Street malfeasance to protect our economy and our country from Wall Street malfeasance.

I take the side of Paul Volcker, Sheila Bair, Tom Hoenig, Barney Frank, Sarah Bloom Raskin, Phil Angelides, Antonio Weiss, and Michael Barr. They are all people who have counseled us—all good public officials, all former regulators. Not quite half, but a number of them are Republicans, and some are Democrats. They are all people who counseled us to vote no on this bill and whose concerns have not been addressed by this substitute.

In addition, the substitute raises \$675 million to pay for the privilege of deregulating the banks, but all it could manage on lead poisoning in housing was a report from HUD.

Where are our priorities? The Congressional Budget Office said this bill makes it more likely they will need a bailout, more likely to lead to a bailout for the big banks. So \$675 million of taxpayer money is squandered instead of doing infrastructure, instead of dealing with lead. That is part of the issue we dealt with in our committee. That is why I supported Secretary Carson for his confirmation, because I thought he was going to do something about lead. Shame on me for believing that, when I have seen nothing so far.

Instead of those \$675 million going to Wall Street, wouldn't it be great if we could direct those hundreds of millions of dollars to prevent children from developing developmental disabilities brought on by lead?

Remember, I talked about my ZIP Code, 44105. Look at those houses. Drive through Cleveland. Drive through Memphis. Drive through Omaha. Drive through all kinds of cities in this country. You will see houses that were built in 1950 or before, and 80 or 90 percent of them have toxic levels of lead. We have sentenced millions of American children to live in those homes.

This is called the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. We have done nothing in this committee for the last 5 years—not a damn thing—about getting that lead out of those homes and stopping the poisoning of children. We could be doing that but instead we are giving more to Wall Street.

This substitute doesn't make this bill better. By papering over its fundamental problems, by treating service-members as second-class citizens—think of Santander, think of the amendment Senator REED from Rhode Island is working on—we are opening up the Social Security system to possible threats. It represents a step backward.

I urge my colleagues to reject the substitute and the underlying bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I enjoyed listening to the comments of my friend from Ohio. I think you guys are going to like the amendment I am getting ready to offer.

Today I rise to offer an amendment to S. 2155—the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act—of which I am a cosponsor.

My amendment is a simple correction that would clarify the intent of this original bill as it relates to custodial banks.

As originally introduced, section 402 was intended to provide better tailored capital requirements for true custodial banks. However, there have been concerns raised that the current definition of this section, following revisions during the committee consideration, could open this provision to a wider group of financial institutions.

I know that was not the intent of my colleagues, and this technical correction amendment makes clear that section 402 applies only when the primary focus of the banking organization is custodial activities.

Section 402 is not intended to provide relief to an organization engaged in consumer banking, investment banking, or other businesses, and that also happens to have some custodial business or a banking subsidiary that engages in custodial activities.

In conclusion, section 402 was intended as a very narrowly tailored provision, focused on true custodial banks. This technical correction amendment would clarify the scope of 402.

I am requesting a vote and urge my colleagues to support adoption of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO CAROL SEPPILU

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, as many of my colleagues know, one of my favorite parts of the week is coming down to the Senate floor to recognize somebody special in my State,

somebody we refer to as our “Alaskan of the Week.” It is one of the most fulfilling things I do all week, to get to talk about people who make my State very, very special.

I know many of you—people in the Gallery—have seen Alaska on TV or have read about it in the newspapers, but there is no substitute for being there. We want you all to come. It would be the trip of a lifetime, particularly now.

What is going on in Alaska right now, one of the highlights of the entire year, is the Iditarod—the “last great race” in the world—which is in full throttle. When you visit, Alaska will change your life—the wilderness, the wildlife, the quiet, the sense of unbridled freedom, the liberty, and the majesty. It is all there. It is all there, so come on, come on and visit.

Also, when you visit, you will realize that Alaska is home to some of the most courageous, hard-working, and tenacious people in the world, many of whom have overcome tremendous odds and are determined to inspire others to live a full and healthy life.

Madam President, I would like to take you, take everybody listening, to Nome, AK, and tell you about Carol Seppilu, someone who I believe personifies determination and perseverance and who is an inspiration to us all and is this week’s Alaskan of the Week.

Carol lives in Nome—a rugged, unique, and beautiful town in Alaska’s northwest, about 500 miles from Anchorage. You might have heard of Nome. The reality show “Gold Rush Alaska” was filmed there, and it is also the finish for the Iditarod.

Pretty soon, if you are watching on TV—our best guess is early next week—the mushers and the dozens of dogs—that, by the way, love the race. They love the race—will begin to cross the finish line. People from all over our State, but really people from all over the world, will be there to greet them as they finish this incredible race, to greet them and congratulate them. We call it the “last great race,” and it finishes at Nome.

There is no place like Nome, we like to say in Alaska. If you live in Nome, you might have seen Carol running in winter, spring, summer, and fall. Carol runs through the streets and into the mountains surrounding Nome. It is one of the ways that she has found purpose in her life, which in turn she has used to help others, to inspire others.

Like a lot of us, Carol had big dreams when she was growing up. She was interested in science and space. She was actually interested in being an astrophysicist. Then, as sometimes happens to young kids, her life took a bit of a turn. She got in with the wrong crowd and started drinking and using drugs, and her life lost meaning.

This is a difficult subject to talk about on the Senate floor, but we

must. We must. Carol wants us to. Alaska has the second highest suicide rate in the country, and it has the highest teen suicide rate in the entire Nation. The suicide rate among Alaska Native teens is also very, very high—tragically high, horribly high. When it comes to suicide, silence is deadly.

Carol knows all about this. When she was 16, she tried to end her life by shooting herself. After the gun went off, she remembers thinking: Dear God, save me. I don’t want to die anymore.

Then she described how, during this awful incident, her ancestors came to her, her elders, telling her that she was going to be OK and that she had a reason to live. She did live. Badly scarred, after having multiple operations on her face, recovery has not been easy for Carol, but she has made it through. She has toughed it out.

What she did was remarkable and incredible. She began to speak about suicide at schools. She was a member of the State’s Suicide Prevention Council. Eventually, she got a job at an elders’ home, where she is currently the cultural activities specialist. She organizes Alaska Native dances. She cooks traditional Alaska Native food for her elders. Moose and muskox soup is their favorite. I think Senator MURKOWSKI is going to let us enjoy a little muskox stew over lunch today, so Carol will be pleased about that.

But as the years went by, she again experienced depression, which is not uncommon. She didn’t feel like getting out of bed. She was unhealthy. But then again, in 2014, more inspiration—again, incredible. A high school friend who was a runner urged Carol to try it. You are not feeling healthy? You are feeling sad? Go out, try to get a run in. At first, when she did it, she could only go a few blocks. Eventually the blocks turned into miles, which is even more challenging for her because of some of her injuries. Nonetheless, she persevered.

We are seeing a theme in her life. She began to get healthy and to feel good about herself again. Again, she found her reason to live. Guess what. She has turned into an amazing athlete. She began to enter races in 2015 when she ran the local 8-mile Dexter Challenge. “I thought, if I do eight miles, I could do a half marathon,” she said. And then she did.

Carol didn’t stop there. Now she is running ultramarathons across the country—50 miles in Iowa, multiple ultramarathons in Utah, a 50K in Washington State. Early last month, she was running a 50K in Texas when, about 5 miles in, she broke her ankle, but that didn’t stop her. She finished even with a broken ankle and is recovering. We are seeing a woman, a young lady of perseverance. Her ultimate goal is to do an ultramarathon in every State in America.

Because of Carol’s scars, she wears a mask. In August she decided that it

was too cumbersome to wear the mask while running, so during a race in Alaska—the very challenging 50-mile Resurrection Pass ultramarathon—she took it off, and it was liberating for her. Here is the beautiful thing: Everybody—everybody—was so supportive, so she doesn’t run with a mask anymore.

It is not only runners who are supportive of Carol; she has gotten people in her hometown, the town of Nome, to start running themselves. Across the State, people approach her wherever she goes, and they tell her they have heard about her, they have heard about her life, and if she has made it through her challenge, they can too. In other words, she is an inspiration. She has become an inspiration throughout Alaska to so many people. She said:

I think I’m helping other people overcome difficulties. They tell me I’m inspiring them to keep going. So that’s why I believe I’m here now—to help others.

That is Carol’s quote.

So, Carol, for your inspiration to so many in our great State, for all you have done and all you continue to do, we are proud of you and thank you for being our Alaskan of the Week this week, as the Iditarod finishes up in your hometown of Nome, AK.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING CHARLEY THONE

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great public servant who passed away last night, former Member of Congress and Nebraska Governor Charley Thone.

I think the Omaha World-Herald summed up his outlook well:

Official biographies list Thone’s first name as Charles. But Nebraskans knew him better as Charley, the unpretentious farm boy who adopted “Accentuate the Positive” as his personal theme song.

Governor Thone was born near Hartington, NE. He served our country in the U.S. Army Infantry during World War II. While serving in the House of Representatives, then-Congressman Thone fought on behalf of farmers and ranchers as a member of the House Agriculture Committee. When tragedy struck with the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, he served on the Warren Commission to investigate the death of our President.

As Governor of Nebraska, his love of our State was always evident during his time in office. He guided Nebraska during a tough farm economy in the 1970s, but he always looked ahead and

supported others. Governor Thone led by example, and he empowered and encouraged others. He was a mentor to a Nebraska woman named Kay Orr, who became his chief of staff and then went on to be the first woman Governor of Nebraska. Governor Orr, herself, has said she would not have been Governor had it not been for the opportunities Governor Thone had given her along the way.

The legacy of service and the mark Governor Thone left on Nebraska will never be forgotten. The motto that he held so dear, “accentuate the positive,” was a good one. It reminds us to find the good in every person and every moment. His positivity made Nebraska a better place both while he served and afterward as he worked in his community. Governor Thone served the State of Nebraska with dignity. He was an exemplary public servant and a dear friend to my father and to me.

I join all Nebraskans in praying for his wife, Ruth, and the entire Thone family.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2151, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a modification to amendment No. 2151 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—IMPROVING CONSUMER ACCESS TO MORTGAGE CREDIT

- Sec. 101. Minimum standards for residential mortgage loans.
- Sec. 102. Safeguarding access to habitat for humanity homes.
- Sec. 103. Exemption from appraisals of real property located in rural areas.
- Sec. 104. Home Mortgage Disclosure Act adjustment and study.
- Sec. 105. Credit union residential loans.
- Sec. 106. Eliminating barriers to jobs for loan originators.
- Sec. 107. Protecting access to manufactured homes.
- Sec. 108. Escrow requirements relating to certain consumer credit transactions.
- Sec. 109. No wait for lower mortgage rates.

TITLE II—REGULATORY RELIEF AND PROTECTING CONSUMER ACCESS TO CREDIT

- Sec. 201. Capital simplification for qualifying community banks.
- Sec. 202. Limited exception for reciprocal deposits.
- Sec. 203. Community bank relief.
- Sec. 204. Removing naming restrictions.
- Sec. 205. Short form call reports.
- Sec. 206. Option for Federal savings associations to operate as covered savings associations.
- Sec. 207. Small bank holding company policy statement.
- Sec. 208. Application of the Expedited Funds Availability Act.
- Sec. 209. Small public housing agencies.
- Sec. 210. Examination cycle.
- Sec. 211. International insurance capital standards accountability.
- Sec. 212. Budget transparency for the NCUA.
- Sec. 213. Making online banking initiation legal and easy.
- Sec. 214. Promoting construction and development on Main Street.
- Sec. 215. Reducing identity fraud.
- Sec. 216. Treasury report on risks of cyber threats.
- Sec. 217. Discretionary surplus funds.

TITLE III—PROTECTIONS FOR VETERANS, CONSUMERS, AND HOMEOWNERS

- Sec. 301. Protecting consumers’ credit.
- Sec. 302. Protecting veterans’ credit.
- Sec. 303. Immunity from suit for disclosure of financial exploitation of senior citizens.
- Sec. 304. Restoration of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009.
- Sec. 305. Remediating lead and asbestos hazards.
- Sec. 306. Family self-sufficiency program.
- Sec. 307. Property Assessed Clean Energy financing.
- Sec. 308. GAO report on consumer reporting agencies.
- Sec. 309. Protecting veterans from predatory lending.
- Sec. 310. Credit score competition.
- Sec. 311. GAO report on Puerto Rico foreclosures.
- Sec. 312. Report on children’s lead-based paint hazard prevention and abatement.
- Sec. 313. Foreclosure relief and extension for servicemembers.

TITLE IV—TAILORING REGULATIONS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

- Sec. 401. Enhanced supervision and prudential standards for certain bank holding companies.
- Sec. 402. Supplementary leverage ratio for custodial banks.
- Sec. 403. Treatment of certain municipal obligations.

TITLE V—ENCOURAGING CAPITAL FORMATION

- Sec. 501. National securities exchange regulatory parity.
- Sec. 502. SEC study on algorithmic trading.
- Sec. 503. Annual review of government-business forum on capital formation.
- Sec. 504. Supporting America’s innovators.
- Sec. 505. Securities and Exchange Commission overpayment credit.
- Sec. 506. U.S. territories investor protection.
- Sec. 507. Encouraging employee ownership.
- Sec. 508. Improving access to capital.
- Sec. 509. Parity for closed-end companies regarding offering and proxy rules.

TITLE VI—PROTECTIONS FOR STUDENT BORROWERS

- Sec. 601. Protections in the event of death or bankruptcy.
- Sec. 602. Rehabilitation of private education loans.
- Sec. 603. Best practices for higher education financial literacy.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY; COMPANY; DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION; DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION HOLDING COMPANY.—The terms “appropriate Federal banking agency”, “company”, “depository institution”, and “depository institution holding company” have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(2) BANK HOLDING COMPANY.—The term “bank holding company” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).

TITLE I—IMPROVING CONSUMER ACCESS TO MORTGAGE CREDIT

SEC. 101. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.

Section 129C(b)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) SAFE HARBOR.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘covered institution’ means an insured depository institution or an insured credit union that, together with its affiliates, has less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets;

“(II) the term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

“(III) the term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

“(IV) the term ‘interest-only’ means that, under the terms of the legal obligation, one or more of the periodic payments may be applied solely to accrued interest and not to loan principal; and

“(V) the term ‘negative amortization’ means payment of periodic payments that will result in an increase in the principal balance under the terms of the legal obligation.

“(ii) SAFE HARBOR.—In this section—

“(I) the term ‘qualified mortgage’ includes any residential mortgage loan—

“(aa) that is originated and retained in portfolio by a covered institution;

“(bb) that is in compliance with the limitations with respect to prepayment penalties described in subsections (c)(1) and (c)(3);

“(cc) that is in compliance with the requirements of clause (vii) of subparagraph (A);

“(dd) that does not have negative amortization or interest-only features; and

“(ee) for which the covered institution considers and documents the debt, income, and financial resources of the consumer in accordance with clause (iv); and

“(II) a residential mortgage loan described in subclause (I) shall be deemed to meet the requirements of subsection (a).

“(iii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—A residential mortgage loan described in clause (ii)(I) shall not qualify for the safe harbor under clause (ii) if the legal title to the residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person unless the residential mortgage loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred—

“(I) to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of a covered institution;

“(II) to a covered institution so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the covered institution to which the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred;

“(III) pursuant to a merger of a covered institution with another person or the acquisition of a covered institution by another person or of another person by a covered institution, so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the person to whom the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred; or

“(IV) to a wholly owned subsidiary of a covered institution, provided that, after the sale, assignment, or transfer, the residential mortgage loan is considered to be an asset of the covered institution for regulatory accounting purposes.

“(iv) CONSIDERATION AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—The consideration and documentation requirements described in clause (ii)(I)(ee) shall—

“(I) not be construed to require compliance with, or documentation in accordance with, appendix Q to part 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

“(II) be construed to permit multiple methods of documentation.”.

SEC. 102. SAFEGUARDING ACCESS TO HABITAT FOR HUMANITY HOMES.

Section 129E(i)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639e(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking “For purposes of” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO APPRAISAL DONATIONS.—If a fee appraiser voluntarily donates appraisal services to an organization eligible to receive tax-deductible charitable contributions, such voluntary donation shall be considered customary and reasonable for the purposes of paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 103. EXEMPTION FROM APPRAISALS OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED IN RURAL AREAS.

Title XI of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1127. EXEMPTION FROM APPRAISALS OF REAL ESTATE LOCATED IN RURAL AREAS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘mortgage originator’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602); and

“(2) the term ‘transaction value’ means the amount of a loan or extension of credit, including a loan or extension of credit that is part of a pool of loans or extensions of credit.

“(b) APPRAISAL NOT REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subsection (d), notwithstanding any other provision of law, an appraisal in connection with a federally related transaction involving real property or an interest in real property is not required if—

“(1) the real property or interest in real property is located in a rural area, as described in section 1026.35(b)(2)(iv)(A) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(2) not later than 3 days after the date on which the Closing Disclosure Form, made in accordance with the final rule of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection entitled

‘Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)’ (78 Fed. Reg. 79730 (December 31, 2013)), relating to the federally related transaction is given to the consumer, the mortgage originator or its agent, directly or indirectly—

“(A) has contacted not fewer than 3 State certified appraisers or State licensed appraisers, as applicable, on the mortgage originator’s approved appraiser list in the market area in accordance with part 226 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(B) has documented that no State certified appraiser or State licensed appraiser, as applicable, was available within 5 business days beyond customary and reasonable fee and timeliness standards for comparable appraisal assignments, as documented by the mortgage originator or its agent;

“(3) the transaction value is less than \$400,000; and

“(4) the mortgage originator is subject to oversight by a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency.

“(c) SALE, ASSIGNMENT, OR TRANSFER.—A mortgage originator that makes a loan without an appraisal under the terms of subsection (b) shall not sell, assign, or otherwise transfer legal title to the loan unless—

“(1) the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person by reason of the bankruptcy or failure of the mortgage originator;

“(2) the loan is sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to another person regulated by a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency, so long as the loan is retained in portfolio by the person;

“(3) the sale, assignment, or transfer is pursuant to a merger of the mortgage originator with another person or the acquisition of the mortgage originator by another person or of another person by the mortgage originator; or

“(4) the sale, loan, or transfer is to a wholly owned subsidiary of the mortgage originator, provided that, after the sale, assignment, or transfer, the loan is considered to be an asset of the mortgage originator for regulatory accounting purposes.

“(d) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply if—

“(1) a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency requires an appraisal under section 225.63(c), 323.3(c), 34.43(c), or 722.3(e) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(2) the loan is a high-cost mortgage, as defined in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602).

“(e) ANTI-EVASION.—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall ensure that any mortgage originator that the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency oversees that makes a significant amount of loans under subsection (b) is complying with the requirements of subsection (b)(2) with respect to each loan.”.

SEC. 104. HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT ADJUSTMENT AND STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (i) as paragraph (3) and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following:

“(i) EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) CLOSED-END MORTGAGE LOANS.—With respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall

not apply with respect to closed-end mortgage loans if the insured depository institution or insured credit union originated fewer than 500 closed-end mortgage loans in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.

“(2) OPEN-END LINES OF CREDIT.—With respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to open-end lines of credit if the insured depository institution or insured credit union originated fewer than 500 open-end lines of credit in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.

“(3) REQUIRED COMPLIANCE.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), an insured depository institution shall comply with paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) if the insured depository institution has received a rating of ‘needs to improve record of meeting community credit needs’ during each of its 2 most recent examinations or a rating of ‘substantial noncompliance in meeting community credit needs’ on its most recent examination under section 807(b)(2) of the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2906(b)(2)).”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(o) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752); and

“(2) the term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).”.

(b) LOOKBACK STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—Not earlier than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to evaluate the impact of the amendments made by subsection (a) on the amount of data available under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) at the national and local level.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that includes the findings and conclusions of the Comptroller General with respect to the study required under paragraph (1).

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 304(i)(3) of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, as so redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking “section 303(2)(A)” and inserting “section 303(3)(A)”.

SEC. 105. CREDIT UNION RESIDENTIAL LOANS.

(a) REMOVAL FROM MEMBER BUSINESS LOAN LIMITATION.—Section 107A(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “that is the primary residence of a member”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendment made by this section shall preclude the National Credit Union Administration from treating an extension of credit that is fully secured by a lien on a 1- to 4-family dwelling that is not the primary residence of a member as a member business loan for purposes other than the member business loan limitation requirements under section 107A of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a).

SEC. 106. ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO JOBS FOR LOAN ORIGINATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1518. EMPLOYMENT TRANSITION OF LOAN ORIGINATORS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPLICATION STATE.—The term ‘application State’ means a State in which a registered loan originator or a State-licensed loan originator seeks to be licensed.

“(2) STATE-LICENSED MORTGAGE COMPANY.—The term ‘State-licensed mortgage company’ means an entity that is licensed or registered under the law of any State to engage in residential mortgage loan origination and processing activities.

“(b) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ORIGINATE LOANS FOR LOAN ORIGINATORS MOVING FROM A DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION TO A NON-DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon becoming employed by a State-licensed mortgage company, an individual who is a registered loan originator shall be deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State for the period described in paragraph (2) if the individual—

“(A) has not had—

“(i) an application for a loan originator license denied; or

“(ii) a loan originator license revoked or suspended in any governmental jurisdiction;

“(B) has not been subject to, or served with, a cease and desist order—

“(i) in any governmental jurisdiction; or

“(ii) under section 1514(c);

“(C) has not been convicted of a misdemeanor or felony that would preclude licensure under the law of the application State;

“(D) has submitted an application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State; and

“(E) was registered in the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as a loan originator during the 1-year period preceding the date on which the information required under section 1505(a) is submitted.

“(2) PERIOD.—The period described in this paragraph shall begin on the date on which an individual described in paragraph (1) submits the information required under section 1505(a) and shall end on the earliest of the date—

“(A) on which the individual withdraws the application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State;

“(B) on which the application State denies, or issues a notice of intent to deny, the application;

“(C) on which the application State grants a State license; or

“(D) that is 120 days after the date on which the individual submits the application, if the application is listed on the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as incomplete.

“(c) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ORIGINATE LOANS FOR STATE-LICENSED LOAN ORIGINATORS MOVING INTERSTATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State-licensed loan originator shall be deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State for the period described in paragraph (2) if the State-licensed loan originator—

“(A) meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (b)(1);

“(B) is employed by a State-licensed mortgage company in the application State; and

“(C) was licensed in a State that is not the application State during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the information required under section 1505(a) was submitted in connection with the application submitted to the application State.

“(2) PERIOD.—The period described in this paragraph shall begin on the date on which the State-licensed loan originator submits the information required under section 1505(a) in connection with the application submitted to the application State and end on the earliest of the date—

“(A) on which the State-licensed loan originator withdraws the application to be a State-licensed loan originator in the application State;

“(B) on which the application State denies, or issues a notice of intent to deny, the application;

“(C) on which the application State grants a State license; or

“(D) that is 120 days after the date on which the State-licensed loan originator submits the application, if the application is listed on the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as incomplete.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) EMPLOYER OF LOAN ORIGINATORS.—Any person employing an individual who is deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State under this section shall be subject to the requirements of this title and to applicable State law to the same extent as if that individual was a State-licensed loan originator licensed by the application State.

“(2) ENGAGING IN MORTGAGE LOAN ACTIVITIES.—Any individual who is deemed to have temporary authority to act as a loan originator in an application State under this section and who engages in residential mortgage loan origination activities shall be subject to the requirements of this title and to applicable State law to the same extent as if that individual was a State-licensed loan originator licensed by the application State.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 4501 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1517 the following:

“Sec. 1518. Employment transition of loan originators.”.

(c) CIVIL LIABILITY.—Section 1513 of the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5112) is amended by striking “persons who are loan originators or are applying for licensing or registration as loan originators.” and inserting “persons who—

“(1) have applied, are applying, or are licensed or registered through the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry; and

“(2) work in an industry with respect to which persons were licensed or registered through the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry on the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. PROTECTING ACCESS TO MANUFACTURED HOMES.

Section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (cc) (relating to definitions relating to mortgage origination and residential mortgage loans) and subsection (dd) as subsections (dd) and (ee), respectively; and

(2) in paragraph (2) of subsection (dd), as so redesignated, by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) does not include any person who is—

“(i) not otherwise described in subparagraph (A) or (B) and who performs purely ad-

ministrative or clerical tasks on behalf of a person who is described in any such subparagraph; or

“(ii) a retailer of manufactured or modular homes or an employee of the retailer if the retailer or employee, as applicable—

“(I) does not receive compensation or gain for engaging in activities described in subparagraph (A) that is in excess of any compensation or gain received in a comparable cash transaction;

“(II) discloses to the consumer—

“(aa) in writing any corporate affiliation with any creditor; and

“(bb) if the retailer has a corporate affiliation with any creditor, at least 1 unaffiliated creditor; and

“(III) does not directly negotiate with the consumer or lender on loan terms (including rates, fees, and other costs).”.

SEC. 108. ESCROW REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS.

Section 129D of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking “The Board” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Bureau”;

(C) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking “the Board” each place that term appears and inserting “the Bureau”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) TREATMENT OF LOANS HELD BY SMALLER INSTITUTIONS.—The Bureau shall, by regulation, exempt from the requirements of subsection (a) any loan made by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union secured by a first lien on the principal dwelling of a consumer if—

“(A) the insured depository institution or insured credit union has assets of \$10,000,000,000 or less;

“(B) during the preceding calendar year, the insured depository institution or insured credit union and its affiliates originated 1,000 or fewer loans secured by a first lien on a principal dwelling; and

“(C) the transaction satisfies the criteria in sections 1026.35(b)(2)(iii)(A), 1026.35(b)(2)(iii)(D), and 1026.35(b)(2)(v) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.”; and

(2) in subsection (i), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term ‘insured credit union’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

“(4) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘insured depository institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).”.

SEC. 109. NO WAIT FOR LOWER MORTGAGE RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 129(b) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) NO WAIT FOR LOWER RATE.—If a creditor extends to a consumer a second offer of credit with a lower annual percentage rate, the transaction may be consummated without regard to the period specified in paragraph (1) with respect to the second offer.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, whereas the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection issued a final rule entitled “Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)” (78 Fed. Reg. 79730 (December 31, 2013)) (in this subsection referred to as the “TRID Rule”) to combine the disclosures a consumer receives in connection with applying for and closing on a mortgage loan, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection should endeavor to provide clearer, authoritative guidance on—

(1) the applicability of the TRID Rule to mortgage assumption transactions;

(2) the applicability of the TRID Rule to construction-to-permanent home loans, and the conditions under which those loans can be properly originated; and

(3) the extent to which lenders can rely on model disclosures published by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection without liability if recent changes to regulations are not reflected in the sample TRID Rule forms published by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

TITLE II—REGULATORY RELIEF AND PROTECTING CONSUMER ACCESS TO CREDIT

SEC. 201. CAPITAL SIMPLIFICATION FOR QUALIFYING COMMUNITY BANKS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNITY BANK LEVERAGE RATIO.—The term “Community Bank Leverage Ratio” means the ratio of the tangible equity capital of a qualifying community bank, as reported on the qualifying community bank’s applicable regulatory filing with the qualifying community bank’s appropriate Federal banking agency, to the average total consolidated assets of the qualifying community bank, as reported on the qualifying community bank’s applicable regulatory filing with the qualifying community bank’s appropriate Federal banking agency.

(2) GENERALLY APPLICABLE LEVERAGE CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS; GENERALLY APPLICABLE RISK-BASED CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.—The terms “generally applicable leverage capital requirements” and “generally applicable risk-based capital requirements” have the meanings given those terms in section 171(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5371(a)).

(3) QUALIFYING COMMUNITY BANK.—

(A) ASSET THRESHOLD.—The term “qualifying community bank” means a depository institution or depository institution holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$10,000,000,000.

(B) RISK PROFILE.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies may determine that a depository institution or depository institution holding company (or a class of depository institutions or depository institution holding companies) described in subparagraph (A) is not a qualifying community bank based on the depository institution’s or depository institution holding company’s risk profile, which shall be based on consideration of—

(i) off-balance sheet exposures;

(ii) trading assets and liabilities;

(iii) total notional derivatives exposures; and

(iv) such other factors as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate.

(b) COMMUNITY BANK LEVERAGE RATIO.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall, through notice and comment rule making under section 553 of title 5, United States Code—

(1) develop a Community Bank Leverage Ratio of not less than 8 percent and not more than 10 percent for qualifying community banks; and

(2) establish procedures for treatment of a qualifying community bank that has a Community Bank Leverage Ratio that falls below the percentage developed under paragraph (1) after exceeding the percentage developed under paragraph (1).

(c) CAPITAL COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any qualifying community bank that exceeds the Community Bank Leverage Ratio developed under subsection (b)(1) shall be considered to have met—

(A) the generally applicable leverage capital requirements and the generally applicable risk-based capital requirements;

(B) in the case of a qualifying community bank that is a depository institution, the capital ratio requirements that are required in order to be considered well capitalized under section 38 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831o) and any regulation implementing that section; and

(C) any other capital or leverage requirements to which the qualifying community bank is subject.

(2) EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall limit the authority of the appropriate Federal banking agencies as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) CONSULTATION.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall—

(1) consult with the applicable State bank supervisors in carrying out this section; and

(2) notify the applicable State bank supervisor of any qualifying community bank that it supervises that exceeds, or does not exceed after previously exceeding, the Community Bank Leverage ratio developed under subsection (b)(1).

SEC. 202. LIMITED EXCEPTION FOR RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 29 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) LIMITED EXCEPTION FOR RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Reciprocal deposits of an agent institution shall not be considered to be funds obtained, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker to the extent that the total amount of such reciprocal deposits does not exceed the lesser of—

“(A) \$5,000,000,000; or

“(B) an amount equal to 20 percent of the total liabilities of the agent institution.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) AGENT INSTITUTION.—The term ‘agent institution’ means an insured depository institution that places a covered deposit through a deposit placement network at other insured depository institutions in amounts that are less than or equal to the standard maximum deposit insurance amount, specifying the interest rate to be paid for such amounts, if the insured depository institution—

“(i) when most recently examined under section 10(d) was found to have a composite condition of outstanding or good; and

“(ii) is well capitalized;

“(ii) has obtained a waiver pursuant to subsection (c); or

“(iii) does not receive an amount of reciprocal deposits that causes the total amount of reciprocal deposits held by the agent institution to be greater than the average of the total amount of reciprocal deposits held by the agent institution on the last day of each of the 4 calendar quarters preceding the calendar quarter in which the agent institution was found not to have a composite condition

of outstanding or good or was determined to be not well capitalized.

“(B) COVERED DEPOSIT.—The term ‘covered deposit’ means a deposit that—

“(i) is submitted for placement through a deposit placement network by an agent institution; and

“(ii) does not consist of funds that were obtained for the agent institution, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker before submission for placement through a deposit placement network.

“(C) DEPOSIT PLACEMENT NETWORK.—The term ‘deposit placement network’ means a network in which an insured depository institution participates, together with other insured depository institutions, for the processing and receipt of reciprocal deposits.

“(D) NETWORK MEMBER BANK.—The term ‘network member bank’ means an insured depository institution that is a member of a deposit placement network.

“(E) RECIPROCAL DEPOSITS.—The term ‘reciprocal deposits’ means deposits received by an agent institution through a deposit placement network with the same maturity (if any) and in the same aggregate amount as covered deposits placed by the agent institution in other network member banks.

“(F) WELL CAPITALIZED.—The term ‘well capitalized’ has the meaning given the term in section 38(b)(1).”

(b) INTEREST RATE RESTRICTION.—Section 29 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831f) is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) RESTRICTION ON INTEREST RATE PAID.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘agent institution’, ‘reciprocal deposits’, and ‘well capitalized’ have the meanings given those terms in subsection (i); and

“(B) the term ‘covered insured depository institution’ means an insured depository institution that—

“(i) under subsection (c) or (d), accepts funds obtained, directly or indirectly, by or through a deposit broker; or

“(ii) while acting as an agent institution under subsection (i), accepts reciprocal deposits while not well capitalized.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—A covered insured depository institution may not pay a rate of interest on funds or reciprocal deposits described in paragraph (1) that, at the time that the funds or reciprocal deposits are accepted, significantly exceeds the limit set forth in paragraph (3).

“(3) LIMIT ON INTEREST RATES.—The limit on the rate of interest referred to in paragraph (2) shall be—

“(A) the rate paid on deposits of similar maturity in the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution for deposits accepted in the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution; or

“(B) the national rate paid on deposits of comparable maturity, as established by the Corporation, for deposits accepted outside the normal market area of the covered insured depository institution.”

SEC. 203. COMMUNITY BANK RELIEF.

Section 13(h)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, in the second sentence, by striking “institution that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity, if—” and inserting the following: “institution—

“(A) that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity, if—”;

(4) in clause (iv)(II), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) that does not have and is not controlled by a company that has—

“(i) more than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

“(ii) total trading assets and trading liabilities, as reported on the most recent applicable regulatory filing filed by the institution, that are more than 5 percent of total consolidated assets.”.

SEC. 204. REMOVING NAMING RESTRICTIONS.

Section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(G)(vi), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, except that the hedge fund or private equity fund may share the same name or a variation of the same name as a banking entity that is an investment adviser to the hedge fund or private equity fund, if—

“(I) such investment adviser is not an insured depository institution, a company that controls an insured depository institution, or a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3106);

“(II) such investment adviser does not share the same name or a variation of the same name as an insured depository institution, any company that controls an insured depository institution, or any company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3106); and

“(III) such name does not contain the word ‘bank’”; and

(2) in subsection (h)(5)(C), by inserting before the period the following: “, except as permitted under subsection (d)(1)(G)(vi)”.

SEC. 205. SHORT FORM CALL REPORTS.

Section 7(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) SHORT FORM REPORTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall issue regulations that allow for a reduced reporting requirement for a covered depository institution when the institution makes the first and third report of condition for a year, as required under paragraph (3).

“(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered depository institution’ means an insured depository institution that—

“(i) has less than \$5,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

“(ii) satisfies such other criteria as the appropriate Federal banking agencies determine appropriate.”.

SEC. 206. OPTION FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS TO OPERATE AS COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.

The Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 (12 U.S.C. 1464) the following:

“SEC. 5A. ELECTION TO OPERATE AS A COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATION.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘covered savings association’ means a Federal savings association that makes an election that is approved under subsection (b).

“(b) ELECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the rules issued under subsection (f), a Federal

savings association with total consolidated assets equal to or less than \$20,000,000,000, as reported by the association to the Comptroller as of December 31, 2017, may elect to operate as a covered savings association by submitting a notice to the Comptroller of that election.

“(2) APPROVAL.—A Federal savings association shall be deemed to be approved to operate as a covered savings association beginning on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Comptroller receives the notice submitted under paragraph (1), unless the Comptroller notifies the Federal savings association that the Federal savings association is not eligible.

“(c) RIGHTS AND DUTIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this section, a covered savings association shall—

“(1) have the same rights and privileges as a national bank that has the main office of the national bank situated in the same location as the home office of the covered savings association; and

“(2) be subject to the same duties, restrictions, penalties, liabilities, conditions, and limitations that would apply to a national bank described in paragraph (1).

“(d) TREATMENT OF COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—A covered savings association shall be treated as a Federal savings association for the purposes—

“(1) of governance of the covered savings association, including incorporation, bylaws, boards of directors, shareholders, and distribution of dividends;

“(2) of consolidation, merger, dissolution, conversion (including conversion to a stock bank or to another charter), conservatorship, and receivership; and

“(3) determined by regulation of the Comptroller.

“(e) EXISTING BRANCHES.—A covered savings association may continue to operate any branch or agency that the covered savings association operated on the date on which an election under subsection (b) is approved.

“(f) RULE MAKING.—The Comptroller shall issue rules to carry out this section—

“(1) that establish streamlined standards and procedures that clearly identify required documentation and timelines for an election under subsection (b);

“(2) that require a Federal savings association that makes an election under subsection (b) to identify specific assets and subsidiaries that—

“(A) do not conform to the requirements for assets and subsidiaries of a national bank; and

“(B) are held by the Federal savings association on the date on which the Federal savings association submits a notice of the election;

“(3) that establish—

“(A) a transition process for bringing the assets and subsidiaries described in paragraph (2) into conformance with the requirements for a national bank; and

“(B) procedures for allowing the Federal savings association to submit to the Comptroller an application to continue to hold assets and subsidiaries described in paragraph (2) after electing to operate as a covered savings association;

“(4) that establish standards and procedures to allow a covered savings association to—

“(A) terminate an election under subsection (b) after an appropriate period of time; and

“(B) make a subsequent election under subsection (b) after terminating an election under subparagraph (A);

“(5) that clarify requirements for the treatment of covered savings associations, including the provisions of law that apply to covered savings associations; and

“(6) as the Comptroller determines necessary in the interests of safety and soundness.

“(g) GRANDFATHERED COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—Subject to the rules issued under subsection (f), a covered savings association may continue to operate as a covered savings association if, after the date on which the election is made under subsection (b), the covered savings association has total consolidated assets greater than \$20,000,000,000.”.

SEC. 207. SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD.—The term “Board” means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(2) SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY.—The term “savings and loan holding company” has the meaning given the term in section 10(a) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(a)).

(b) CHANGES REQUIRED TO SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT ON ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL AND MANAGERIAL FACTORS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall revise appendix C to part 225 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the “Small Bank Holding Company and Savings and Loan Holding Company Policy Statement”), to raise the consolidated asset threshold under that appendix from \$1,000,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000 for any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company that—

(1) is not engaged in significant non-banking activities either directly or through a nonbank subsidiary;

(2) does not conduct significant off-balance sheet activities (including securitization and asset management or administration) either directly or through a nonbank subsidiary; and

(3) does not have a material amount of debt or equity securities outstanding (other than trust preferred securities) that are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(c) EXCLUSIONS.—The Board may exclude any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company, regardless of asset size, from the revision under subsection (b) if the Board determines that such action is warranted for supervisory purposes.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 171(b)(5) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5371(b)(5)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company that is subject to the application of appendix C to part 225 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the ‘Small Bank Holding Company and Savings and Loan Holding Company Policy Statement’).”.

SEC. 208. APPLICATION OF THE EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 602 (12 U.S.C. 4001)—

(A) in paragraph (20), by inserting “, located in the United States,” after “ATM”; and

(B) in paragraph (21), by inserting “American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the

Northern Mariana Islands, Guam," after "Puerto Rico,"; and

(C) in paragraph (23), by inserting "American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam," after "Puerto Rico,"; and

(2) in section 603(d)(2)(A) (12 U.S.C. 4002(d)(2)(A)), by inserting "American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam," after "Puerto Rico,".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 209. SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.

(a) SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.—Title I of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 38. SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—The term 'housing voucher program' means a program for tenant-based assistance under section 8.

"(2) SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The term 'small public housing agency' means a public housing agency—

"(A) for which the sum of the number of public housing dwelling units administered by the agency and the number of vouchers under section 8(o) administered by the agency is 550 or fewer; and

"(B) that predominantly operates in a rural area, as described in section 1026.35(b)(2)(iv)(A) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

"(3) TROUBLED SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The term 'troubled small public housing agency' means a small public housing agency designated by the Secretary as a troubled small public housing agency under subsection (c)(3).

"(b) APPLICABILITY.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, a small public housing agency shall be subject to the same requirements as a public housing agency.

"(c) PROGRAM INSPECTIONS AND EVALUATIONS.—

"(1) PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS.—

"(A) FREQUENCY OF INSPECTIONS BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall carry out an inspection of the physical condition of a small public housing agency's public housing projects not more frequently than once every 3 years, unless the agency has been designated by the Secretary as a troubled small public housing agency based on deficiencies in the physical condition of its public housing projects. Nothing contained in this subparagraph relieves the Secretary from conducting lead safety inspections or assessments in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary under section 302 of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4822).

"(B) STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall apply to small public housing agencies the same standards for the acceptable condition of public housing projects that apply to projects assisted under section 8.

"(2) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Except as required by section 8(o)(8)(F), a small public housing agency administering assistance under section 8(o) shall make periodic physical inspections of each assisted dwelling unit not less frequently than once every 3 years to determine whether the unit is maintained in accordance with the requirements under section 8(o)(8)(A). Nothing contained in this paragraph relieves a small public housing agency from conducting lead safety inspections or assessments in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary

under section 302 of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4822).

"(3) TROUBLED SMALL PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.—

"(A) PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency with respect to the public housing program of the small public housing agency if the Secretary determines that the agency has failed to maintain the public housing units of the small public housing agency in a satisfactory physical condition, based upon an inspection conducted by the Secretary.

"(B) HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency with respect to the housing voucher program of the small public housing agency if the Secretary determines that the agency has failed to comply with the inspection requirements under paragraph (2).

"(C) APPEALS.—

"(i) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an appeals process under which a small public housing agency may dispute a designation as a troubled small public housing agency.

"(ii) OFFICIAL.—The appeals process established under clause (i) shall provide for a decision by an official who has not been involved, and is not subordinate to a person who has been involved, in the original determination to designate a small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency.

"(D) CORRECTIVE ACTION AGREEMENT.—

"(i) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a small public housing agency is designated as a troubled public housing agency under subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary and the small public housing agency shall enter into a corrective action agreement under which the small public housing agency shall undertake actions to correct the deficiencies upon which the designation is based.

"(ii) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—A corrective action agreement entered into under clause (i) shall—

"(I) have a term of 1 year, and shall be renewable at the option of the Secretary;

"(II) provide, where feasible, for technical assistance to assist the public housing agency in curing its deficiencies;

"(III) provide for—

"(aa) reconsideration of the designation of the small public housing agency as a troubled small public housing agency not less frequently than annually; and

"(bb) termination of the agreement when the Secretary determines that the small public housing agency is no longer a troubled small public housing agency; and

"(IV) provide that in the event of substantial noncompliance by the small public housing agency under the agreement, the Secretary may—

"(aa) contract with another public housing agency or a private entity to manage the public housing of the troubled small public housing agency;

"(bb) withhold funds otherwise distributable to the troubled small public housing agency;

"(cc) assume possession of, and direct responsibility for, managing the public housing of the troubled small public housing agency;

"(dd) petition for the appointment of a receiver, in accordance with section 6(j)(3)(A)(ii); and

"(ee) exercise any other remedy available to the Secretary in the event of default under the public housing annual contributions contract entered into by the small public housing agency under section 5.

"(E) EMERGENCY ACTIONS.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prohibit the Secretary from taking any emergency action necessary to protect Federal financial resources or the health or safety of residents of public housing projects.

"(d) REDUCTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS.—

"(1) EXEMPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a small public housing agency shall be exempt from any environmental review requirements with respect to a development or modernization project having a total cost of not more than \$100,000.

"(2) STREAMLINED PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, by rule, establish streamlined procedures for environmental reviews of small public housing agency development and modernization projects having a total cost of more than \$100,000."

(b) ENERGY CONSERVATION.—Section 9(e)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) FREEZE OF CONSUMPTION LEVELS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—A small public housing agency, as defined in section 38(a), may elect to be paid for its utility and waste management costs under the formula for a period, at the discretion of the small public housing agency, of not more than 20 years based on the small public housing agency's average annual consumption during the 3-year period preceding the year in which the election is made (in this subparagraph referred to as the 'consumption base level').

"(ii) INITIAL ADJUSTMENT IN CONSUMPTION BASE LEVEL.—The Secretary shall make an initial one-time adjustment in the consumption base level to account for differences in the heating degree day average over the most recent 20-year period compared to the average in the consumption base level.

"(iii) ADJUSTMENTS IN CONSUMPTION BASE LEVEL.—The Secretary shall make adjustments in the consumption base level to account for an increase or reduction in units, a change in fuel source, a change in resident controlled electricity consumption, or for other reasons.

"(iv) SAVINGS.—All cost savings resulting from an election made by a small public housing agency under this subparagraph—

"(I) shall accrue to the small public housing agency; and

"(II) may be used for any public housing purpose at the discretion of the small public housing agency.

"(v) THIRD PARTIES.—A small public housing agency making an election under this subparagraph—

"(I) may use, but shall not be required to use, the services of a third party in its energy conservation program; and

"(II) shall have the sole discretion to determine the source, and terms and conditions, of any financing used for its energy conservation program."

(c) REPORTING BY AGENCIES OPERATING IN CONSORTIA.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop and deploy all electronic information systems necessary to accommodate full consolidated reporting by public housing agencies, as defined in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)), electing to operate in consortia under section 13(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437k(a)).

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) **SHARED WAITING LISTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make available to interested public housing agencies and owners of multifamily properties receiving assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development 1 or more software programs that will facilitate the voluntary use of a shared waiting list by multiple public housing agencies or owners receiving assistance, and shall publish on the website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development procedural guidance for implementing shared waiting lists that includes information on how to obtain the software.

SEC. 210. EXAMINATION CYCLE.

Section 10(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (10), by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000,000”.

SEC. 211. INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall support increasing transparency at any global insurance or international standard-setting regulatory or supervisory forum in which they participate, including supporting and advocating for greater public observer access to working groups and committee meetings of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors; and

(2) to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office take a position or reasonably intend to take a position with respect to an insurance proposal by a global insurance regulatory or supervisory forum, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall achieve consensus positions with State insurance regulators through the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, when they are United States participants in negotiations on insurance issues before the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, Financial Stability Board, or any other international forum of financial regulators or supervisors that considers such issues.

(b) **INSURANCE POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the Insurance Policy Advisory Committee on International Capital Standards and Other Insurance Issues at the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Committee shall be composed of not more than 21 members, all of whom represent a diverse set of expert perspectives from the various sectors of the United States insurance industry, including life insurance, property and casualty insurance and reinsurance, agents and brokers, academics, consumer advocates, or experts on issues facing underserved insurance communities and consumers.

(c) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **REPORTS AND TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Board of

Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or their designee, shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, an annual report and provide annual testimony to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives on the efforts of the Secretary and the Chairman with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners with respect to global insurance regulatory or supervisory forums, including—

(i) a description of the insurance regulatory or supervisory standard-setting issues under discussion at international standard-setting bodies, including the Financial Stability Board and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors;

(ii) a description of the effects that proposals discussed at international insurance regulatory or supervisory forums of insurance could have on consumer and insurance markets in the United States;

(iii) a description of any position taken by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office in international insurance discussions; and

(iv) a description of the efforts by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office to increase transparency at the Financial Stability Board with respect to insurance proposals and the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, including efforts to provide additional public access to working groups and committees of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors.

(B) **TERMINATION.**—This paragraph shall terminate on December 31, 2024.

(2) **REPORTS AND TESTIMONY BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.**—The National Association of Insurance Commissioners may provide testimony to Congress on the issues described in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) **JOINT REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL INSURANCE OFFICE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall, in consultation with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, complete a study on, and submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, the impact on consumers and markets in the United States before supporting or consenting to the adoption of any final international insurance capital standard.

(B) **NOTICE AND COMMENT.**—

(i) **NOTICE.**—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall provide public notice before the date on which drafting a report required under subparagraph (A) is commenced and after the date on which the draft of the report is completed.

(ii) **OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT.**—There shall be an opportunity for public comment for a period beginning on the date on which the report is submitted under subparagraph (A) and ending on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the report is submitted.

(C) **REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of

the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Federal Insurance Office shall submit to the Comptroller General of the United States the report described in subparagraph (A) for review.

(4) **REPORT ON INCREASE IN TRANSPARENCY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Secretary of the Treasury, or their designees, shall submit to Congress a report and provide testimony to Congress on the efforts of the Chairman and the Secretary to increase transparency at meetings of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors.

SEC. 212. BUDGET TRANSPARENCY FOR THE NCUA.

Section 209(b) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1789(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) on an annual basis and prior to the submission of the detailed business-type budget required under paragraph (2)—

“(A) make publicly available and publish in the Federal Register a draft of the detailed business-type budget; and

“(B) hold a public hearing, with public notice provided of the hearing, during which the public may submit comments on the draft of the detailed business-type budget;”;

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting “detailed” after “submit a”; and

(B) by inserting “, which shall address any comment submitted by the public under paragraph (1)(B)” after “Control Act”.

SEC. 213. MAKING ONLINE BANKING INITIATION LEGAL AND EASY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AFFILIATE.**—The term “affiliate” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).

(2) **DRIVER’S LICENSE.**—The term “driver’s license” means a license issued by a State to an individual that authorizes the individual to operate a motor vehicle on public streets, roads, or highways.

(3) **FEDERAL BANK SECRECY LAWS.**—The term “Federal bank secrecy laws” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) section 123 of Public Law 91-508 (12 U.S.C. 1953); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “financial institution” means—

(A) an insured depository institution;

(B) an insured credit union; or

(C) any affiliate of an insured depository institution or insured credit union.

(5) **FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE.**—The term “financial product or service” has the meaning given the term in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(6) **INSURED CREDIT UNION.**—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(7) **INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—The term “insured depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(8) **ONLINE SERVICE.**—The term “online service” means any Internet-based service, such as a website or mobile application.

(9) **PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.**—The term “personal identification card” means an identification document issued by a State or local government to an individual solely for the purpose of identification of that individual.

(10) **PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—The term “personal information” means the information displayed on or electronically encoded on a driver’s license or personal identification card that is reasonably necessary to fulfill the purpose and uses permitted by subsection (b).

(11) **SCAN.**—The term “scan” means the act of using a device or software to decipher, in an electronically readable format, personal information displayed on or electronically encoded on a driver’s license or personal identification card.

(12) **STATE.**—The term “State” means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other commonwealth, possession, or territory of the United States.

(b) **USE OF A DRIVER’S LICENSE OR PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When an individual initiates a request through an online service to open an account with a financial institution or obtain a financial product or service from a financial institution, the financial institution may record personal information from a scan of the driver’s license or personal identification card of the individual, or make a copy or receive an image of the driver’s license or personal identification card of the individual, and store or retain such information in any electronic format for the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(2) **USES OF INFORMATION.**—Except as required to comply with Federal bank secrecy laws, a financial institution may only use the information obtained under paragraph (1)—

(A) to verify the authenticity of the driver’s license or personal identification card;

(B) to verify the identity of the individual; and

(C) to comply with a legal requirement to record, retain, or transmit the personal information in connection with opening an account or obtaining a financial product or service.

(3) **DELETION OF IMAGE.**—A financial institution that makes a copy or receives an image of a driver’s license or personal identification card of an individual in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, after using the image for the purposes described in paragraph (2), permanently delete—

(A) any image of the driver’s license or personal identification card, as applicable; and

(B) any copy of any such image.

(4) **DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend, modify, or otherwise affect any State or Federal law that governs a financial institution’s disclosure and security of personal information that is not publicly available.

(c) **RELATION TO STATE LAW.**—The provisions of this section shall preempt and supersede any State law that conflicts with a provision of this section, but only to the extent of such conflict.

SEC. 214. PROMOTING CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT ON MAIN STREET.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 51. CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, OR CONSTRUCTION LOANS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The appropriate Federal banking agencies may only require a deposi-

tory institution to assign a heightened risk weight to a high volatility commercial real estate (HVCRE) exposure (as such term is defined under section 324.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as of October 11, 2017, or if a successor regulation is in effect as of the date of the enactment of this section, such term or any successor term contained in such successor regulation) under any risk-based capital requirement if such exposure is an HVCRE ADC loan.

“(b) **HVCRE ADC LOAN DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section and with respect to a depository institution, the term ‘HVCRE ADC loan’—

“(1) means a credit facility secured by land or improved real property that, prior to being reclassified by the depository institution as a non-HVCRE ADC loan pursuant to subsection (d)—

“(A) primarily finances, has financed, or refinances the acquisition, development, or construction of real property;

“(B) has the purpose of providing financing to acquire, develop, or improve such real property into income-producing real property; and

“(C) is dependent upon future income or sales proceeds from, or refinancing of, such real property for the repayment of such credit facility;

“(2) does not include a credit facility financing—

“(A) the acquisition, development, or construction of properties that are—

“(i) one- to four-family residential properties;

“(ii) real property that would qualify as an investment in community development; or

“(iii) agricultural land;

“(B) the acquisition or refinancing of existing income-producing real property secured by a mortgage on such property, if the cash flow being generated by the real property is sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution’s applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings;

“(C) improvements to existing income-producing improved real property secured by a mortgage on such property, if the cash flow being generated by the real property is sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution’s applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings; or

“(D) commercial real property projects in which—

“(i) the loan-to-value ratio is less than or equal to the applicable maximum supervisory loan-to-value ratio as determined by the appropriate Federal banking agency;

“(ii) the borrower has contributed capital of at least 15 percent of the real property’s appraised, ‘as completed’ value to the project in the form of—

“(I) cash;

“(II) unencumbered readily marketable assets;

“(III) paid development expenses out-of-pocket; or

“(IV) contributed real property or improvements; and

“(iii) the borrower contributed the minimum amount of capital described under clause (ii) before the depository institution advances funds (other than the advance of a nominal sum made in order to secure the depository institution’s lien against the real property) under the credit facility, and such minimum amount of capital contributed by the borrower is contractually required to remain in the project until the credit facility has been reclassified by the depository insti-

tution as a non-HVCRE ADC loan under subsection (d);

“(3) does not include any loan made prior to January 1, 2015; and

“(4) does not include a credit facility reclassified as a non-HVCRE ADC loan under subsection (d).

“(c) **VALUE OF CONTRIBUTED REAL PROPERTY.**—For purposes of this section, the value of any real property contributed by a borrower as a capital contribution shall be the appraised value of the property as determined under standards prescribed pursuant to section 1110 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3339), in connection with the extension of the credit facility or loan to such borrower.

“(d) **RECLASSIFICATION AS A NON-HVCRE ADC LOAN.**—For purposes of this section and with respect to a credit facility and a depository institution, upon—

“(1) the substantial completion of the development or construction of the real property being financed by the credit facility; and

“(2) cash flow being generated by the real property being sufficient to support the debt service and expenses of the real property, in accordance with the institution’s applicable loan underwriting criteria for permanent financings, the credit facility may be reclassified by the depository institution as a Non-HVCRE ADC loan.

“(e) **EXISTING AUTHORITIES.**—Nothing in this section shall limit the supervisory, regulatory, or enforcement authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency to further the safe and sound operation of an institution under the supervision of the appropriate Federal banking agency.”.

SEC. 215. REDUCING IDENTITY FRAUD.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to reduce the prevalence of synthetic identity fraud, which disproportionately affects vulnerable populations, such as minors and recent immigrants, by facilitating the validation by permitted entities of fraud protection data, pursuant to electronically received consumer consent, through use of a database maintained by the Commissioner.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMMISSIONER.**—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration.

(2) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given the term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(3) **FRAUD PROTECTION DATA.**—The term “fraud protection data” means a combination of the following information with respect to an individual:

(A) The name of the individual (including the first name and any family forename or surname of the individual).

(B) The social security number of the individual.

(C) The date of birth (including the month, day, and year) of the individual.

(4) **PERMITTED ENTITY.**—The term “permitted entity” means a financial institution or a service provider, subsidiary, affiliate, agent, subcontractor, or assignee of a financial institution.

(c) **EFFICIENCY.**—

(1) **RELIANCE ON EXISTING METHODS.**—The Commissioner shall evaluate the feasibility of making modifications to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or a similar resource such that the database or resource—

(A) is reasonably designed to effectuate the purpose of this section; and

(B) meets the requirements of subsection (d).

(2) **EXECUTION.**—The Commissioner shall make the modifications necessary to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or similar resource, or develop a database or similar resource, to effectuate the requirements described in paragraph (1).

(d) **PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE CONSUMERS.**—The database or similar resource described in subsection (c) shall—

(1) compare fraud protection data provided in an inquiry by a permitted entity against such information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided;

(2) be scalable and accommodate reasonably anticipated volumes of verification requests from permitted entities with commercially reasonable uptime and availability; and

(3) allow permitted entities to submit—

(A) 1 or more individual requests electronically for real-time machine-to-machine (or similar functionality) accurate responses; and

(B) multiple requests electronically, such as those provided in a batch format, for accurate electronic responses within a reasonable period of time from submission, not to exceed 24 hours.

(e) **CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—Before providing confirmation of fraud protection data to a permitted entity, the Commissioner shall ensure that the Commissioner has a certification from the permitted entity that is dated not more than 2 years before the date on which that confirmation is provided that includes the following declarations:

(1) The entity is a permitted entity.

(2) The entity is in compliance with this section.

(3) The entity is, and will remain, in compliance with its privacy and data security requirements, as described in title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.), with respect to information the entity receives from the Commissioner pursuant to this section.

(4) The entity will retain sufficient records to demonstrate its compliance with its certification and this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(f) **CONSUMER CONSENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) only—

(A) pursuant to the written, including electronic, consent received by a permitted entity from the individual who is the subject of the request; and

(B) in connection with a credit transaction or any circumstance described in section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b).

(2) **ELECTRONIC CONSENT REQUIREMENTS.**—For a permitted entity to use the consent of an individual received electronically pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the permitted entity must obtain the individual's electronic signature, as defined in section 106 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7006).

(3) **EFFECTUATING ELECTRONIC CONSENT.**—No provision of law or requirement, including section 552a of title 5, United States Code, shall prevent the use of electronic consent for purposes of this subsection or for use in any other consent based verification under the discretion of the Commissioner.

(g) **COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **AUDITS AND MONITORING.**—The Commissioner may—

(A) conduct audits and monitoring to—

(i) ensure proper use by permitted entities of the database or similar resource described in subsection (c); and

(ii) deter fraud and misuse by permitted entities with respect to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c); and

(B) terminate services for any permitted entity that prevents or refuses to allow the Commissioner to carry out the activities described in subparagraph (A).

(2) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 505(a) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6805(a)), any violation of this section and any certification made under this section shall be enforced in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (7) of such section 505(a) by the agencies described in those paragraphs.

(B) **RELEVANT INFORMATION.**—Upon discovery by the Commissioner, pursuant to an audit described in paragraph (1), of any violation of this section or any certification made under this section, the Commissioner shall forward any relevant information pertaining to that violation to the appropriate agency described in subparagraph (A) for evaluation by the agency for purposes of enforcing this section.

(h) **RECOVERY OF COSTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts obligated to carry out this section shall be fully recovered from the users of the database or verification system by way of advances, reimbursements, user fees, or other recoveries as determined by the Commissioner. The funds recovered under this paragraph shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to the account providing appropriations for the Social Security Administration, to be used for the administration of this section without fiscal year limitation.

(B) **PRICES FIXED BY COMMISSIONER.**—The Commissioner shall establish the amount to be paid by the users under this paragraph, including the costs of any services or work performed, such as any appropriate upgrades, maintenance, and associated direct and indirect administrative costs, in support of carrying out the purposes described in this section, by reimbursement or in advance as determined by the Commissioner. The amount of such prices shall be periodically adjusted by the Commissioner to ensure that amounts collected are sufficient to fully offset the cost of the administration of this section.

(2) **INITIAL DEVELOPMENT.**—The Commissioner shall not begin development of a verification system to carry out this section until the Commissioner determines that amounts equal to at least 50 percent of program start-up costs have been collected under paragraph (1).

(3) **EXISTING RESOURCES.**—The Commissioner may use funds designated for information technology modernization to carry out this section.

(4) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The Commissioner shall annually submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the amount of indirect costs to the Social Security Administration arising as a result of the implementation of this section.

SEC. 216. TREASURY REPORT ON RISKS OF CYBER THREATS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the

Treasury shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the risks of cyber threats to financial institutions and capital markets in the United States, including—

(1) an assessment of the material risks of cyber threats to financial institutions and capital markets in the United States;

(2) the impact and potential effects of material cyber attacks on financial institutions and capital markets in the United States;

(3) an analysis of how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are addressing the material risks of cyber threats described in paragraph (1), including—

(A) how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are assessing those threats;

(B) how the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission are assessing the cyber vulnerabilities and preparedness of financial institutions;

(C) coordination amongst the appropriate Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and their coordination with other government agencies (including with respect to regulations, examinations, lexicon, duplication, and other regulatory tools); and

(D) areas for improvement; and

(4) a recommendation of whether any appropriate Federal banking agency or the Securities and Exchange Commission needs additional legal authorities or resources to adequately assess and address the material risks of cyber threats described in paragraph (1), given the analysis required by paragraph (3).

SEC. 217. DISCRETIONARY SURPLUS FUNDS.

Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$7,500,000,000” and inserting “\$6,825,000,000”.

TITLE III—PROTECTIONS FOR VETERANS, CONSUMERS, AND HOMEOWNERS

SEC. 301. PROTECTING CONSUMERS' CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “90 days” and inserting “1 year”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **NATIONAL SECURITY FREEZE.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘consumer reporting agency’ means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p).

“(B) The term ‘proper identification’ has the meaning of such term as used under section 610.

“(C) The term ‘security freeze’ means a restriction that prohibits a consumer reporting agency from disclosing the contents of a consumer report that is subject to such security freeze to any person requesting the consumer report.

“(2) **PLACEMENT OF SECURITY FREEZE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer that a consumer reporting agency place a security freeze, and upon receiving proper identification from the consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, place the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by toll-free telephone or secure electronic means, 1 business day after receiving the request directly from the consumer; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request directly from the consumer.

“(B) CONFIRMATION AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Not later than 5 business days after placing a security freeze under subparagraph (A), a consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) send confirmation of the placement to the consumer; and

“(ii) inform the consumer of—

“(I) the process by which the consumer may remove the security freeze, including a mechanism to authenticate the consumer; and

“(II) the consumer’s right described in section 615(d)(1)(D).

“(C) NOTICE TO THIRD PARTIES.—A consumer reporting agency may advise a third party that a security freeze has been placed with respect to a consumer under subparagraph (A).

“(3) REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency shall remove a security freeze placed on the consumer report of a consumer only in the following cases:

“(i) Upon the direct request of the consumer.

“(ii) The security freeze was placed due to a material misrepresentation of fact by the consumer.

“(B) NOTICE IF REMOVAL NOT BY REQUEST.—If a consumer reporting agency removes a security freeze under subparagraph (A)(ii), the consumer reporting agency shall notify the consumer in writing prior to removing the security freeze.

“(C) REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE BY CONSUMER REQUEST.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A)(ii), a security freeze shall remain in place until the consumer directly requests that the security freeze be removed. Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer that a consumer reporting agency remove a security freeze, and upon receiving proper identification from the consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, remove the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by toll-free telephone or secure electronic means, 1 hour after receiving the request for removal; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request for removal.

“(D) THIRD-PARTY REQUESTS.—If a third party requests access to a consumer report of a consumer with respect to which a security freeze is in effect, where such request is in connection with an application for credit, and the consumer does not allow such consumer report to be accessed, the third party may treat the application as incomplete.

“(E) TEMPORARY REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE.—Upon receiving a direct request from a consumer under subparagraph (A)(i), if the consumer requests a temporary removal of a security freeze, the consumer reporting agency shall, in accordance with subparagraph (C), remove the security freeze for the period of time specified by the consumer.

“(4) EXCEPTIONS.—A security freeze shall not apply to the making of a consumer report for use of the following:

“(A) A person or entity, or a subsidiary, affiliate, or agent of that person or entity, or an assignee of a financial obligation owed by the consumer to that person or entity in conjunction with the proposed purchase of the financial obligation, with which the consumer has or had prior to assignment an

account or contract including a demand deposit account, or to whom the consumer issued a negotiable instrument, for the purposes of reviewing the account or collecting the financial obligation owed for the account, contract, or negotiable instrument. For purposes of this subparagraph, ‘reviewing the account’ includes activities related to account maintenance, monitoring, credit line increases, and account upgrades and enhancements.

“(B) Any Federal, State, or local agency, law enforcement agency, trial court, or private collection agency acting pursuant to a court order, warrant, or subpoena.

“(C) A child support agency acting pursuant to part D of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 651 et seq.).

“(D) A Federal agency or a State or its agents or assigns acting to investigate fraud or acting to investigate or collect delinquent taxes or unpaid court orders or to fulfill any of its other statutory responsibilities, provided such responsibilities are consistent with a permissible purpose under section 604.

“(E) By a person using credit information for the purposes described under section 604(c).

“(F) Any person or entity administering a credit file monitoring subscription or similar service to which the consumer has subscribed.

“(G) Any person or entity for the purpose of providing a consumer with a copy of the consumer’s consumer report or credit score, upon the request of the consumer.

“(H) Any person using the information in connection with the underwriting of insurance.

“(I) Any person using the information for employment, tenant, or background screening purposes.

“(J) Any person using the information for assessing, verifying, or authenticating a consumer’s identity for purposes other than the granting of credit, or for investigating or preventing actual or potential fraud.

“(5) NOTICE OF RIGHTS.—At any time a consumer is required to receive a summary of rights required under section 609, the following notice shall be included:

“‘CONSUMERS HAVE THE RIGHT TO OBTAIN A SECURITY FREEZE

“‘You have a right to place a ‘security freeze’ on your credit report, which will prohibit a consumer reporting agency from releasing information in your credit report without your express authorization. The security freeze is designed to prevent credit, loans, and services from being approved in your name without your consent. However, you should be aware that using a security freeze to take control over who gets access to the personal and financial information in your credit report may delay, interfere with, or prohibit the timely approval of any subsequent request or application you make regarding a new loan, credit, mortgage, or any other account involving the extension of credit.

“‘As an alternative to a security freeze, you have the right to place an initial or extended fraud alert on your credit file at no cost. An initial fraud alert is a 1-year alert that is placed on a consumer’s credit file. Upon seeing a fraud alert display on a consumer’s credit file, a business is required to take steps to verify the consumer’s identity before extending new credit. If you are a victim of identity theft, you are entitled to an extended fraud alert, which is a fraud alert lasting 7 years.

“‘A security freeze does not apply to a person or entity, or its affiliates, or collection

agencies acting on behalf of the person or entity, with which you have an existing account that requests information in your credit report for the purposes of reviewing or collecting the account. Reviewing the account includes activities related to account maintenance, monitoring, credit line increases, and account upgrades and enhancements.’.

“(6) WEBPAGE.—

“(A) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—A consumer reporting agency shall establish a webpage that—

“(i) allows a consumer to request a security freeze;

“(ii) allows a consumer to request an initial fraud alert;

“(iii) allows a consumer to request an extended fraud alert;

“(iv) allows a consumer to request an active duty fraud alert;

“(v) allows a consumer to opt-out of the use of information in a consumer report to send the consumer a solicitation of credit or insurance, in accordance with section 615(d); and

“(vi) shall not be the only mechanism by which a consumer may request a security freeze.

“(B) FTC.—The Federal Trade Commission shall establish a single webpage that includes a link to each webpage established under subparagraph (A) within the Federal Trade Commission’s website www.Identitytheft.gov, or a successor website.

“(j) NATIONAL PROTECTION FOR FILES AND CREDIT RECORDS OF PROTECTED CONSUMERS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘consumer reporting agency’ means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p).

“(B) The term ‘protected consumer’ means an individual who is—

“(i) under the age of 16 years at the time a request for the placement of a security freeze is made; or

“(ii) an incapacitated person or a protected person for whom a guardian or conservator has been appointed.

“(C) The term ‘protected consumer’s representative’ means a person who provides to a consumer reporting agency sufficient proof of authority to act on behalf of a protected consumer.

“(D) The term ‘record’ means a compilation of information that—

“(i) identifies a protected consumer;

“(ii) is created by a consumer reporting agency solely for the purpose of complying with this subsection; and

“(iii) may not be created or used to consider the protected consumer’s credit worthiness, credit standing, credit capacity, character, general reputation, personal characteristics, or mode of living.

“(E) The term ‘security freeze’ means a restriction that prohibits a consumer reporting agency from disclosing the contents of a consumer report that is the subject of such security freeze or, in the case of a protected consumer for whom the consumer reporting agency does not have a file, a record that is subject to such security freeze to any person requesting the consumer report for the purpose of opening a new account involving the extension of credit.

“(F) The term ‘sufficient proof of authority’ means documentation that shows a protected consumer’s representative has authority to act on behalf of a protected consumer and includes—

“(i) an order issued by a court of law;

“(ii) a lawfully executed and valid power of attorney;

“(iii) a document issued by a Federal, State, or local government agency in the United States showing proof of parentage, including a birth certificate; or

“(iv) with respect to a protected consumer who has been placed in a foster care setting, a written communication from a county welfare department or its agent or designee, or a county probation department or its agent or designee, certifying that the protected consumer is in a foster care setting under its jurisdiction.

“(G) The term ‘sufficient proof of identification’ means information or documentation that identifies a protected consumer and a protected consumer’s representative and includes—

“(i) a social security number or a copy of a social security card issued by the Social Security Administration;

“(ii) a certified or official copy of a birth certificate issued by the entity authorized to issue the birth certificate; or

“(iii) a copy of a driver’s license, an identification card issued by the motor vehicle administration, or any other government issued identification.

“(2) PLACEMENT OF SECURITY FREEZE FOR A PROTECTED CONSUMER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving a direct request from a protected consumer’s representative that a consumer reporting agency place a security freeze, and upon receiving sufficient proof of identification and sufficient proof of authority, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, place the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by toll-free telephone or secure electronic means, 1 business day after receiving the request directly from the protected consumer’s representative; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request directly from the protected consumer’s representative.

“(B) CONFIRMATION AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Not later than 5 business days after placing a security freeze under subparagraph (A), a consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) send confirmation of the placement to the protected consumer’s representative; and

“(ii) inform the protected consumer’s representative of the process by which the protected consumer may remove the security freeze, including a mechanism to authenticate the protected consumer’s representative.

“(C) CREATION OF FILE.—If a consumer reporting agency does not have a file pertaining to a protected consumer when the consumer reporting agency receives a direct request under subparagraph (A), the consumer reporting agency shall create a record for the protected consumer.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON RELEASE OF RECORD OR FILE OF PROTECTED CONSUMER.—After a security freeze has been placed under paragraph (2)(A), and unless the security freeze is removed in accordance with this subsection, a consumer reporting agency may not release the protected consumer’s consumer report, any information derived from the protected consumer’s consumer report, or any record created for the protected consumer.

“(4) REMOVAL OF A PROTECTED CONSUMER SECURITY FREEZE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency shall remove a security freeze placed on the consumer report of a protected consumer only in the following cases:

“(i) Upon the direct request of the protected consumer’s representative.

“(ii) Upon the direct request of the protected consumer, if the protected consumer is not under the age of 16 years at the time of the request.

“(iii) The security freeze was placed due to a material misrepresentation of fact by the protected consumer’s representative.

“(B) NOTICE IF REMOVAL NOT BY REQUEST.—If a consumer reporting agency removes a security freeze under subparagraph (A)(iii), the consumer reporting agency shall notify the protected consumer’s representative in writing prior to removing the security freeze.

“(C) REMOVAL OF FREEZE BY REQUEST.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A)(iii), a security freeze shall remain in place until a protected consumer’s representative or protected consumer described in subparagraph (A)(ii) directly requests that the security freeze be removed. Upon receiving a direct request from the protected consumer’s representative or protected consumer described in subparagraph (A)(ii) that a consumer reporting agency remove a security freeze, and upon receiving sufficient proof of identification and sufficient proof of authority, the consumer reporting agency shall, free of charge, remove the security freeze not later than—

“(i) in the case of a request that is by toll-free telephone or secure electronic means, 1 hour after receiving the request for removal; or

“(ii) in the case of a request that is by mail, 3 business days after receiving the request for removal.

“(D) TEMPORARY REMOVAL OF SECURITY FREEZE.—Upon receiving a direct request from a protected consumer or a protected consumer’s representative under subparagraph (A)(i), if the protected consumer or protected consumer’s representative requests a temporary removal of a security freeze, the consumer reporting agency shall, in accordance with subparagraph (C), remove the security freeze for the period of time specified by the protected consumer or protected consumer’s representative.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 625(b)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681t(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “or” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) subsections (i) and (j) of section 605A relating to security freezes; or”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. PROTECTING VETERANS’ CREDIT.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to rectify problematic reporting of medical debt included in a consumer report of a veteran due to inappropriate or delayed payment for hospital care, medical services, or extended care services provided in a non-Department of Veterans Affairs facility under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(2) to clarify the process of debt collection for such medical debt.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—

(1) VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT DEFINED.—Section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(z) VETERAN.—The term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

“(aa) VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—The term ‘veteran’s medical debt’—

“(1) means a medical collection debt of a veteran owed to a non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care provider that was submitted to the Department for payment for health care authorized by the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

“(2) includes medical collection debt that the Department of Veterans Affairs has wrongfully charged a veteran.”.

(2) EXCLUSION FOR VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—Section 605(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) With respect to a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p), any information related to a veteran’s medical debt if the date on which the hospital care, medical services, or extended care services was rendered relating to the debt antedates the report by less than 1 year if the consumer reporting agency has actual knowledge that the information is related to a veteran’s medical debt and the consumer reporting agency is in compliance with its obligation under section 302(c)(5) of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

“(8) With respect to a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p), any information related to a fully paid or settled veteran’s medical debt that had been characterized as delinquent, charged off, or in collection if the consumer reporting agency has actual knowledge that the information is related to a veteran’s medical debt and the consumer reporting agency is in compliance with its obligation under section 302(c)(5) of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.”.

(3) REMOVAL OF VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT FROM CONSUMER REPORT.—Section 611 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (g)” after “subsection (f)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) DISPUTE PROCESS FOR VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a veteran’s medical debt, the veteran may submit a notice described in paragraph (2), proof of liability of the Department of Veterans Affairs for payment of that debt, or documentation that the Department of Veterans Affairs is in the process of making payment for authorized hospital care, medical services, or extended care services rendered to a consumer reporting agency or a reseller to dispute the inclusion of that debt on a consumer report of the veteran.

“(2) NOTIFICATION TO VETERAN.—The Department of Veterans Affairs shall submit to a veteran a notice that the Department of Veterans Affairs has assumed liability for part or all of a veteran’s medical debt.

“(3) DELETION OF INFORMATION FROM FILE.—If a consumer reporting agency receives notice, proof of liability, or documentation under paragraph (1), the consumer reporting agency shall delete all information relating to the veteran’s medical debt from the file of the veteran and notify the furnisher and the veteran of that deletion.”.

(c) VERIFICATION OF VETERAN’S MEDICAL DEBT.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) the term “consumer reporting agency” means a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)); and

(B) the terms “veteran” and “veteran’s medical debt” have the meanings given

those terms in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a), as added by subsection (b)(1).

(2) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a database to allow consumer reporting agencies to verify whether a debt furnished to a consumer reporting agency is a veteran's medical debt.

(3) **DATABASE FEATURES.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the database established under paragraph (2), to the extent permitted by law, provides consumer reporting agencies with—

(A) sufficiently detailed and specific information to verify whether a debt being furnished to the consumer reporting agency is a veteran's medical debt;

(B) access to verification information in a secure electronic format;

(C) timely access to verification information; and

(D) any other features that would promote the efficient, timely, and secure delivery of information that consumer reporting agencies could use to verify whether a debt is a veteran's medical debt.

(4) **STAKEHOLDER INPUT.**—Prior to establishing the database for verification under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register a notice and request for comment that solicits input from consumer reporting agencies and other stakeholders.

(5) **VERIFICATION.**—Provided the database established under paragraph (2) is fully functional and the data available to consumer reporting agencies, a consumer reporting agency shall use the database as a means to identify a veteran's medical debt pursuant to paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 605(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c(a)), as added by subsection (b)(2).

(d) **CREDIT MONITORING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1), as amended by section 301(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) **CREDIT MONITORING.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘active duty military consumer’ includes a member of the National Guard.

“(B) The term ‘National Guard’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(c) of title 10, United States Code.

“(2) **CREDIT MONITORING.**—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall provide a free electronic credit monitoring service that, at a minimum, notifies a consumer of material additions or modifications to the file of the consumer at the consumer reporting agency to any consumer who provides to the consumer reporting agency—

“(A) appropriate proof that the consumer is an active duty military consumer; and

“(B) contact information of the consumer.

“(3) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Federal Trade Commission shall promulgate regulations regarding the requirements of this subsection, which shall at a minimum include—

“(A) a definition of an electronic credit monitoring service and material additions or modifications to the file of a consumer; and

“(B) what constitutes appropriate proof.

“(4) **APPLICABILITY.**—

“(A) Sections 616 and 617 shall not apply to any violation of this subsection.

“(B) This subsection shall be enforced exclusively under section 621 by the Federal

agencies and Federal and State officials identified in that section.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 625(b)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681t(b)(1)), as amended by section 301(b), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(K) subsection (k) of section 605A, relating to credit monitoring for active duty military consumers, as defined in that subsection;”.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. IMMUNITY FROM SUIT FOR DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL EXPLOITATION OF SENIOR CITIZENS.

(a) **IMMUNITY.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(A) the term “Bank Secrecy Act officer” means an individual responsible for ensuring compliance with the requirements mandated by subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the “Bank Secrecy Act”);

(B) the term “broker-dealer” means a broker and a dealer, as those terms are defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a));

(C) the term “covered agency” means—

(i) a State financial regulatory agency, including a State securities or law enforcement authority and a State insurance regulator;

(ii) each of the Federal agencies represented in the membership of the Financial Institutions Examination Council established under section 1004 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3303);

(iii) a securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3);

(iv) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(v) a law enforcement agency; or

(vi) a State or local agency responsible for administering adult protective service laws;

(D) the term “covered financial institution” means—

(i) a credit union;

(ii) a depository institution;

(iii) an investment adviser;

(iv) a broker-dealer;

(v) an insurance company;

(vi) an insurance agency; or

(vii) a transfer agent;

(E) the term “credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301);

(F) the term “depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(G) the term “exploitation” means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual, including a caregiver or a fiduciary, that—

(i) uses the resources of a senior citizen for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain; or

(ii) results in depriving a senior citizen of rightful access to or use of benefits, resources, belongings, or assets;

(H) the term “insurance agency” means any business entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates insurance coverage;

(I) the term “insurance company” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a));

(J) the term “insurance producer” means an individual who is required under State law to be licensed in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance coverage;

(K) the term “investment adviser” has the meaning given the term in section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a));

(L) the term “investment adviser representative” means an individual who—

(i) is employed by, or associated with, an investment adviser; and

(ii) does not perform solely clerical or ministerial acts;

(M) the term “registered representative” means an individual who represents a broker-dealer in effecting or attempting to effect a purchase or sale of securities;

(N) the term “senior citizen” means an individual who is not younger than 65 years of age;

(O) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States;

(P) the term “State insurance regulator” has the meaning given the term in section 315 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6735);

(Q) the term “State securities or law enforcement authority” has the meaning given the term in section 24(f)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78x(f)(4)); and

(R) the term “transfer agent” has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

(2) **IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.**—

(A) **IMMUNITY FOR INDIVIDUALS.**—An individual who has received the training described in subsection (b) shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for disclosing the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen to a covered agency if the individual, at the time of the disclosure—

(i) served as a supervisor or in a compliance or legal function (including as a Bank Secrecy Act officer) for, or, in the case of a registered representative, investment adviser representative, or insurance producer, was affiliated or associated with, a covered financial institution; and

(ii) made the disclosure—

(I) in good faith; and

(II) with reasonable care.

(B) **IMMUNITY FOR COVERED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—A covered financial institution shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for a disclosure made by an individual described in subparagraph (A) if—

(i) the individual was employed by, or, in the case of a registered representative, insurance producer, or investment adviser representative, affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution at the time of the disclosure; and

(ii) before the time of the disclosure, each individual described in subsection (b)(1) received the training described in subsection (b).

(C) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be construed to limit the liability of an individual or a covered financial institution in a civil action for any act, omission, or fraud that is not a disclosure described in subparagraph (A).

(b) **TRAINING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A covered financial institution or a third party selected by a covered

financial institution may provide the training described in paragraph (2)(A) to each officer or employee of, or registered representative, insurance producer, or investment adviser representative affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution who—

(A) is described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i);

(B) may come into contact with a senior citizen as a regular part of the professional duties of the individual; or

(C) may review or approve the financial documents, records, or transactions of a senior citizen in connection with providing financial services to a senior citizen.

(2) CONTENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The content of the training that a covered financial institution or a third party selected by the covered financial institution may provide under paragraph (1) shall—

(i) be maintained by the covered financial institution and made available to a covered agency with examination authority over the covered financial institution, upon request, except that a covered financial institution shall not be required to maintain or make available such content with respect to any individual who is no longer employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution;

(ii) instruct any individual attending the training on how to identify and report the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen internally and, as appropriate, to government officials or law enforcement authorities, including common signs that indicate the financial exploitation of a senior citizen;

(iii) discuss the need to protect the privacy and respect the integrity of each individual customer of the covered financial institution; and

(iv) be appropriate to the job responsibilities of the individual attending the training.

(B) TIMING.—The training under paragraph (1) shall be provided—

(i) as soon as reasonably practicable; and

(ii) with respect to an individual who begins employment, or becomes affiliated or associated, with a covered financial institution after the date of enactment of this Act, not later than 1 year after the date on which the individual becomes employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution in a position described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1).

(C) RECORDS.—A covered financial institution shall—

(i) maintain a record of each individual who—

(I) is employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution in a position described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1); and

(II) has completed the training under paragraph (1), regardless of whether the training was—

(aa) provided by the covered financial institution or a third party selected by the covered financial institution;

(bb) completed before the individual was employed by, or affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution; and

(cc) completed before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) upon request, provide a record described in clause (i) to a covered agency with examination authority over the covered financial institution.

(C) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt or limit any provision of State law, except only to the extent that subsection (a) provides a greater level of protection against liability to an individual described in sub-

section (a)(2)(A) or to a covered financial institution described in subsection (a)(2)(B) than is provided under State law.

SEC. 304. RESTORATION OF THE PROTECTING TENANTS AT FORECLOSURE ACT OF 2009.

(a) REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISION.—Section 704 of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009 (12 U.S.C. 5201 note; 12 U.S.C. 5220 note; 42 U.S.C. 1437f note) is repealed.

(b) RESTORATION.—Sections 701 through 703 of the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009, the provisions of law amended by such sections, and any regulations promulgated pursuant to such sections, as were in effect on December 30, 2014, are restored and revived.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. REMEDIATING LEAD AND ASBESTOS HAZARDS.

Section 109(a)(1) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5219(a)(1)) is amended, in the second sentence, by inserting “and to remediate lead and asbestos hazards in residential properties” before the period at the end.

SEC. 306. FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437u) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “public housing and”; and

(B) by striking “the certificate and voucher programs under section 8” and inserting “sections 8 and 9”;

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) CONTINUATION OF PRIOR REQUIRED PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each public housing agency that was required to administer a local Family Self-Sufficiency program on the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act shall operate such local program for, at a minimum, the number of families the agency was required to serve on the date of enactment of such Act, subject only to the availability under appropriations Acts of sufficient amounts for housing assistance and the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(2) REDUCTION.—The number of families for which a public housing agency is required to operate such local program under paragraph (1) shall be decreased by 1 for each family from any supported rental housing program administered by such agency that, after October 21, 1998, fulfills its obligations under the contract of participation.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary shall not require a public housing agency to carry out a mandatory program for a period of time upon the request of the public housing agency and upon a determination by the Secretary that implementation is not feasible because of local circumstances, which may include—

“(A) lack of supportive services accessible to eligible families, which shall include insufficient availability of resources for programs under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.);

“(B) lack of funding for reasonable administrative costs;

“(C) lack of cooperation by other units of State or local government; or

“(D) any other circumstances that the Secretary may consider appropriate.”;

(3) by striking subsection (i);

(4) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (b), as amended, the following:

“(c) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE FAMILIES.—A family is eligible to participate in a local Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section if—

“(A) at least 1 household member seeks to become and remain employed in suitable employment or to increase earnings; and

“(B) the household member receives direct assistance under section 8 or resides in a unit assisted under section 8 or 9.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The following entities are eligible to administer a local Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section:

“(A) A public housing agency administering housing assistance to or on behalf of an eligible family under section 8 or 9.

“(B) The owner or sponsor of a multifamily property receiving project-based rental assistance under section 8, in accordance with the requirements under subsection (1).”;

(6) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” the first time it appears and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) in the first sentence, by striking “each leaseholder receiving assistance under the certificate and voucher programs of the public housing agency under section 8 or residing in public housing administered by the agency” and inserting “a household member of an eligible family”; and

(iii) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “Housing assistance may not be terminated as a consequence of either successful completion of the contract of participation or failure to complete such contract. A contract of participation shall remain in effect until the participating family exits the Family Self-Sufficiency program upon successful graduation or expiration of the contract of participation, or for other good cause.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the first sentence—

(aa) by striking “A local program under this section” and inserting “An eligible entity”;

(bb) by striking “provide” and inserting “coordinate”; and

(cc) by striking “to” and inserting “for”; and

(II) in the second sentence—

(aa) by striking “provided during” and inserting “coordinated for”; and

(bb) by striking “under section 8 or residing in public housing” and inserting “pursuant to section 8 or 9 and for the duration of the contract of participation”; and

(cc) by inserting “, but are not limited to” after “may include”;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “or attainment of a high school equivalency certificate” after “high school”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (G);

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (J) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (K) respectively;

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) education in pursuit of a post-secondary degree or certification;”;

(vi) in subparagraph (H), by inserting “financial literacy, such as training in financial management, financial coaching, and asset building, and” after “training in”;

(vii) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” at the end; and

(viii) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

“(J) homeownership education and assistance; and”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting “the first recertification of income after” after “not later than 5 years after”; and

(ii) in the second sentence—

(I) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”; and

(II) by striking “of the agency”; and

(D) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) EMPLOYMENT.—The contract of participation shall require 1 household member of the participating family to seek and maintain suitable employment.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) NONPARTICIPATION.—Assistance under section 8 or 9 for a family that elects not to participate in a Family Self-Sufficiency program shall not be delayed by reason of such election.”;

(7) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “whose monthly adjusted income does not exceed 50 percent” and all that follows through the period at the end of the third sentence and inserting “shall be calculated under the rental provisions of section 3 or section 8(o), as applicable.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “For each participating family, an amount equal to any increase in the amount of rent paid by the family in accordance with the provisions of section 3 or 8(o), as applicable, that is attributable to increases in earned income by the participating family, shall be placed in an interest-bearing escrow account established by the eligible entity on behalf of the participating family. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity may use funds it controls under section 8 or 9 for purposes of making the escrow deposit for participating families assisted under, or residing in units assisted under, section 8 or 9, respectively, provided such funds are offset by the increase in the amount of rent paid by the participating family.”;

(ii) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “All Family Self-Sufficiency programs administered under this section shall include an escrow account.”;

(iii) in the fourth sentence, by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (d)”;

(iv) in the last sentence—

(I) by striking “A public housing agency” and inserting “An eligible entity”; and

(II) by striking “the public housing agency” and inserting “such eligible entity”; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) FORFEITED ESCROW.—Any amount placed in an escrow account established by an eligible entity for a participating family as required under paragraph (2), that exists after the end of a contract of participation by a household member of a participating family that does not qualify to receive the escrow, shall be used by the eligible entity for the benefit of participating families in good standing.”;

(8) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by striking “, unless the income of the family equals or exceeds 80 percent of the median income of the area (as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families)”;

(9) in subsection (g), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) by striking “the public housing agency” and inserting “such eligible entity”; and

(iii) by striking “subsection (g)” and inserting “subsection (h)”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity” each place that term appears;

(ii) by striking “or the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act”;

(iii) by inserting “primary, secondary, and post-secondary” after “public and private”; and

(iv) in the second sentence, by inserting “and tenants served by the program” after “the unit of general local government”;

(10) in subsection (h), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) by striking “participating in the” and inserting “carrying out a”;

(iii) by striking “to the Secretary”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(ii) by striking “subsection (f)” and inserting “subsection (g)”;

(iii) by striking “residents of the public housing” and inserting “the current and prospective participants of the program”; and

(iv) by striking “or the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking “subsection (c)(2)” and inserting “subsection (d)(2)”;

(II) by striking “provided to” and inserting “coordinated on behalf of participating”;

(III) by inserting “direct” before “assistance”;

(IV) by striking “the section 8 and public housing programs” and inserting “sections 8 and 9”;

(ii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (e)”;

(II) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “deliver” and inserting “coordinate”;

(iv) in subparagraph (H), by striking “the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act”;

(v) in subparagraph (I), by striking “public housing or section 8 assistance” and inserting “assistance under section 8 or 9”;

(11) by amending subsection (i), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(1) FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY AWARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to appropriations, the Secretary shall establish a formula by which annual funds shall be awarded or as otherwise determined by the Secretary for the costs incurred by an eligible entity in administering the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

“(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.—The award established under paragraph (1) shall provide funding for family self-sufficiency coordinators as follows:

“(A) BASE AWARD.—An eligible entity serving 25 or more participants in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section is eligible to receive an award equal to the costs, as determined by the Secretary, of 1 full-time family self-sufficiency coordinator position. The Secretary may, by regulation or notice, determine the policy concerning

the award for an eligible entity serving fewer than 25 such participants, including providing prorated awards or allowing such entities to combine their programs under this section for purposes of employing a coordinator.

“(B) ADDITIONAL AWARD.—An eligible entity that meets performance standards set by the Secretary is eligible to receive an additional award sufficient to cover the costs of filling an additional family self-sufficiency coordinator position if such entity has 75 or more participating families, and an additional coordinator for each additional 50 participating families, or such other ratio as may be established by the Secretary based on the award allocation evaluation under subparagraph (E).

“(C) STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES.—For purposes of calculating the award under this paragraph, each administratively distinct part of a State or regional eligible entity may be treated as a separate agency.

“(D) DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF COORDINATORS.—In determining whether an eligible entity meets a specific threshold for funding pursuant to this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider the number of participants enrolled by the eligible entity in its Family Self-Sufficiency program as well as other criteria determined by the Secretary.

“(E) AWARD ALLOCATION EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report evaluating the award allocation under this subsection, and make recommendations based on this evaluation and other related findings to modify such allocation, within 4 years after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, and not less frequently than every 4 years thereafter. The report requirement under this subparagraph shall terminate after the Secretary has submitted 2 such reports to Congress.

“(3) RENEWALS AND ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds allocated by the Secretary under this subsection shall be allocated in the following order of priority:

“(i) FIRST PRIORITY.—Renewal of the full cost of all coordinators in the previous year at each eligible entity with an existing Family Self-Sufficiency program that meets applicable performance standards set by the Secretary.

“(ii) SECOND PRIORITY.—New or incremental coordinator funding authorized under this section.

“(B) GUIDANCE.—If the first priority, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), cannot be fully satisfied, the Secretary may prorate the funding for each eligible entity, as long as—

“(i) each eligible entity that has received funding for at least 1 part-time coordinator in the prior fiscal year is provided sufficient funding for at least 1 part-time coordinator as part of any such proration; and

“(ii) each eligible entity that has received funding for at least 1 full-time coordinator in the prior fiscal year is provided sufficient funding for at least 1 full-time coordinator as part of any such proration.

“(4) RECAPTURE OR OFFSET.—Any awards allocated under this subsection by the Secretary in a fiscal year that have not been spent by the end of the subsequent fiscal year or such other time period as determined by the Secretary may be recaptured by the Secretary and shall be available for providing additional awards pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), or may be offset as determined by the Secretary. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available for 3 years in order to facilitate the re-use of any recaptured funds for this purpose.

“(5) PERFORMANCE REPORTING.—Programs under this section shall be required to report the number of families enrolled and graduated, the number of established escrow accounts and positive escrow balances, and any other information that the Secretary may require. Program performance shall be reviewed periodically as determined by the Secretary.”

“(6) INCENTIVES FOR INNOVATION AND HIGH PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the amounts made available under this subsection to provide support to or reward Family Self-Sufficiency programs based on the rate of successful completion, increased earned income, or other factors as may be established by the Secretary.”

(12) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(B) by striking “public housing” before “units”;

(C) by striking “in public housing projects administered by the agency”;

(D) by inserting “or coordination” after “provision”; and

(E) by striking the last sentence;

(13) in subsection (k), by striking “public housing agencies” and inserting “eligible entities”;

(14) by striking subsection (n);

(15) by striking subsection (o);

(16) by redesignating subsections (l) and (m) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively;

(17) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

“(1) PROGRAMS FOR TENANTS IN PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTIES WITH PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) VOLUNTARY AVAILABILITY OF FSS PROGRAM.—The owner of a privately owned property may voluntarily make a Family Self-Sufficiency program available to the tenants of such property in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. Such procedures shall permit the owner to enter into a cooperative agreement with a local public housing agency that administers a Family Self-Sufficiency program or, at the owner's option, operate a Family Self-Sufficiency program on its own or in partnership with another owner. An owner, who voluntarily makes a Family Self-Sufficiency program available pursuant to this subsection, may access funding from any residual receipt accounts for the property to hire a family self-sufficiency coordinator or coordinators for their program.

“(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—Any cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall require the public housing agency to open its Family Self-Sufficiency program waiting list to any eligible family residing in the owner's property who resides in a unit assisted under project-based rental assistance.

“(3) TREATMENT OF FAMILIES ASSISTED UNDER THIS SUBSECTION.—A public housing agency that enters into a cooperative agreement pursuant to paragraph (1) may count any family participating in its Family Self-Sufficiency program as a result of such agreement as part of the calculation of the award under subsection (i).

“(4) ESCROW.—

“(A) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—A cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide for the calculation and tracking of the escrow for participating residents and for the owner to make available, upon request of the public housing agency, escrow for participating residents, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of

subsection (e), residing in units assisted under section 8.

“(B) CALCULATION AND TRACKING BY OWNER.—The owner of a privately owned property who voluntarily makes a Family Self-Sufficiency program available pursuant to paragraph (1) shall calculate and track the escrow for participating residents and make escrow for participating residents available in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (e).

“(5) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to properties assisted under section 8(o)(13).

“(6) SUSPENSION OF ENROLLMENT.—In any year, the Secretary may suspend the enrollment of new families in Family Self-Sufficiency programs under this subsection based on a determination that insufficient funding is available for this purpose.”

(18) in subsection (m), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “Each public housing agency” and inserting “Each eligible entity”;

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “The report shall include” and inserting “The contents of the report shall include”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “public housing agency” and inserting “eligible entity”; and

(II) by striking “local”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and describing any additional research needs of the Secretary to evaluate the effectiveness of the program” after “under paragraph (1)”; and

(19) in subsection (n), as so redesignated, by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(20) by adding at the end the following:

“(o) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that meets the requirements under subsection (c)(2) to administer a Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

“(2) ELIGIBLE FAMILY.—The term ‘eligible family’ means a family that meets the requirements under subsection (c)(1) to participate in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.

“(3) PARTICIPATING FAMILY.—The term ‘participating family’ means an eligible family that is participating in the Family Self-Sufficiency program under this section.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue regulations to implement this section and any amendments made by this section, and this section and any amendments made by this section shall take effect upon such issuance.

SEC. 307. PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY FINANCING.

Section 129C(b)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c(b)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) CONSIDERATION OF UNDERWRITING REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY FINANCING.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘Property Assessed Clean Energy financing’ means financing to cover the costs of home improvements that results in a tax assessment on the real property of the consumer.

“(ii) REGULATIONS.—The Bureau shall prescribe regulations that carry out the purposes of subsection (a) and apply section 130 with respect to violations under subsection (a) of this section with respect to Property Assessed Clean Energy financing, which shall

account for the unique nature of Property Assessed Clean Energy financing.

“(iii) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION AND CONSULTATION.—In prescribing the regulations under this subparagraph, the Bureau—

“(I) may collect such information and data that the Bureau determines is necessary; and

“(II) shall consult with State and local governments and bond-issuing authorities.”.

SEC. 308. GAO REPORT ON CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “consumer”, “consumer report”, and “consumer reporting agency” have the meanings given those terms in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report that includes—

(1) a review of the current legal and regulatory structure for consumer reporting agencies and an analysis of any gaps in that structure, including, in particular, the rule-making, supervisory, and enforcement authority of State and Federal agencies under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Public Law 106-102; 113 Stat. 1338), and any other relevant statutes;

(2) a review of the process by which consumers can appeal and expunge errors on their consumer reports;

(3) a review of the causes of consumer reporting errors;

(4) a review of the responsibilities of data furnishers to ensure that accurate information is initially reported to consumer reporting agencies and to ensure that such information continues to be accurate;

(5) a review of data security relating to consumer reporting agencies and their efforts to safeguard consumer data;

(6) a review of who has access to, and may use, consumer reports;

(7) a review of who has control or ownership of a consumer's credit data;

(8) an analysis of—

(A) which Federal and State regulatory agencies supervise and enforce laws relating to how consumer reporting agencies protect consumer data; and

(B) all laws relating to data security applicable to consumer reporting agencies; and

(9) recommendations to Congress on how to improve the consumer reporting system, including legislative, regulatory, and industry-specific recommendations.

SEC. 309. PROTECTING VETERANS FROM PREDATORY LENDING.

(a) PROTECTING VETERANS FROM PREDATORY LENDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 3709. Refinancing of housing loans

“(a) FEE RECOUPMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is being refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter unless—

“(1) the issuer of the refinanced loan provides the Secretary with a certification of the recoupment period for fees, closing costs, and any expenses (other than taxes, amounts held in escrow, and fees paid under this chapter) that would be incurred by the borrower in the refinancing of the loan;

“(2) all of the fees and incurred costs are scheduled to be recouped on or before the date that is 36 months after the date of loan issuance; and

“(3) the recoupment is calculated through lower regular monthly payments (other than taxes, amounts held in escrow, and fees paid under this chapter) as a result of the refinanced loan.

“(b) NET TANGIBLE BENEFIT TEST.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter unless—

“(1) the issuer of the refinanced loan provides the borrower with a net tangible benefit test;

“(2) in a case in which the original loan had a fixed rate mortgage interest rate and the refinanced loan will have a fixed rate mortgage interest rate, the refinanced loan has a mortgage interest rate that is not less than 50 basis points less than the previous loan;

“(3) in a case in which the original loan had a fixed rate mortgage interest rate and the refinanced loan will have an adjustable rate mortgage interest rate, the refinanced loan has a mortgage interest rate that is not less than 200 basis points less than the previous loan; and

“(4) the lower interest rate is not produced solely from discount points, unless—

“(A) such points are paid at closing; and

“(B) such points are not added to the principal loan amount, unless—

“(i) for discount point amounts that are less than or equal to one discount point, the resulting loan balance after any fees and expenses allows the property with respect to which the loan was issued to maintain a loan to value ratio of 100 percent or less; and

“(ii) for discount point amounts that are greater than one discount point, the resulting loan balance after any fees and expenses allows the property with respect to which the loan was issued to maintain a loan to value ratio of 90 percent or less.

“(c) LOAN SEASONING.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is refinanced may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter until the date that is the later of—

“(1) the date that is 210 days after the date on which the first monthly payment is made on the loan; and

“(2) the date on which the sixth monthly payment is made on the loan.

“(d) CASH-OUT REFINANCES.—(1) Subsections (a) through (c) shall not apply in a case of a loan refinancing in which the amount of the principal for the new loan to be guaranteed or insured under this chapter is larger than the payoff amount of the refinanced loan.

“(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall promulgate such rules as the Secretary considers appropriate with respect to refinancing described in paragraph (1) to ensure that such refinancing is in the financial interest of the borrower, including rules relating to recoupment, seasoning, and net tangible benefits.”.

(2) REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In prescribing any regulation to carry out section 3709 of title 38, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may

waive the requirements of sections 551 through 559 of title 5, United States Code, if—

(i) the Secretary determines that urgent or compelling circumstances make compliance with such requirements impracticable or contrary to the public interest;

(ii) the Secretary submits to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, and publishes in the Federal Register, notice of such waiver, including a description of the determination made under clause (i); and

(iii) a period of 10 days elapses following the notification under clause (ii).

(B) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—If a regulation prescribed pursuant to a waiver made under subparagraph (A) is in effect for a period exceeding 1 year, the Secretary shall provide the public an opportunity for notice and comment regarding such regulation.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) TERMINATION DATE.—The authorities under this paragraph shall terminate on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) REPORT ON CASH-OUT REFINANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the President of the Ginnie Mae, submit to Congress a report on refinancing—

(i) of loans—

(I) made to veterans for purposes specified in section 3710 of title 38, United States Code; and

(II) that were guaranteed or insured under chapter 37 of such title; and

(ii) in which the amount of the principal for the new loan to be guaranteed or insured under such chapter is larger than the payoff amount of the refinanced loan.

(B) CONTENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of whether additional requirements, including a net tangible benefit test, fee recoupment period, and loan seasoning requirement, are necessary to ensure that the refinancing described in subparagraph (A) is in the financial interest of the borrower.

(ii) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for additional legislative or administrative action to ensure that refinancing described in subparagraph (A) is carried out in the financial interest of the borrower.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3709 the following new item:

“3709. Refinancing of housing loans.”.

(b) LOAN SEASONING FOR GINNIE MAE MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES.—Section 306(g)(1) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)(1)) is amended by inserting “The Association may not guarantee the timely payment of principal and interest on a security that is backed by a mortgage insured or guaranteed under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, and that was refinanced until the later of the date that is 210 days after the date on which the first monthly payment is made on the mortgage being refinanced and the date on which 6 full monthly payments have been made on the mortgage being refinanced.” after “Act of 1992.”.

(c) REPORT ON LIQUIDITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the President of the Ginnie Mae shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the liquidity of the housing loan program under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in the secondary mortgage market, which shall—

(A) assess the loans provided under that chapter that collateralize mortgage-backed securities that are guaranteed by Ginnie Mae; and

(B) include recommendations for actions that Ginnie Mae should take to ensure that the liquidity of that housing loan program is maintained.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(i) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) GINNIE MAE.—The term “Ginnie Mae” means the Government National Mortgage Association.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT ON DOCUMENT DISCLOSURE AND CONSUMER EDUCATION.—Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall issue a publicly available report that—

(1) examines, with respect to loans provided to veterans under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code—

(A) the refinancing of fixed-rate mortgage loans to adjustable rate mortgage loans;

(B) whether veterans are informed of the risks and disclosures associated with that refinancing; and

(C) whether advertising materials for that refinancing are clear and do not contain misleading statements or assertions; and

(2) includes findings based on any complaints received by veterans and on an ongoing assessment of the refinancing market by the Secretary.

SEC. 310. CREDIT SCORE COMPETITION.

(a) USE OF CREDIT SCORES BY FANNIE MAE IN PURCHASING RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGES.—Section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7)(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘credit score’ means a numerical value or a categorization created by a third party derived from a statistical tool or modeling system used by a person who makes or arranges a loan to predict the likelihood of certain credit behaviors, including default; and

“(ii) the term ‘residential mortgage’ has the meaning given the term in section 302 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451).

“(B) USE OF CREDIT SCORES.—The corporation shall condition purchase of a residential mortgage by the corporation under this subsection on the provision of a credit score for the borrower only if—

“(i) the credit score is derived from any credit scoring model that has been validated and approved by the corporation under this paragraph; and

“(ii) the corporation provides for the use of the credit score by all of the automated underwriting systems of the corporation and any other procedures and systems used by the corporation to purchase residential mortgages that use a credit score.

“(C) VALIDATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—The corporation shall establish a validation and approval process for the use of credit score models, under which the corporation may not validate and approve a credit score model unless the credit score model—

“(i) satisfies minimum requirements of integrity, reliability, and accuracy;

“(ii) has a historical record of measuring and predicting default rates and other credit behaviors;

“(iii) is consistent with the safe and sound operation of the corporation;

“(iv) complies with any standards and criteria established by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency under section 1328(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992; and

“(v) satisfies any other requirements, as determined by the corporation.

“(D) REPLACEMENT OF CREDIT SCORE MODEL.—If the corporation has validated and approved 1 or more credit score models under subparagraph (C) and the corporation validates and approves an additional credit score model, the corporation may determine that—

“(i) the additional credit score model has replaced the credit score model or credit score models previously validated and approved; and

“(ii) the credit score model or credit score models previously validated and approved shall no longer be considered validated and approved for the purposes of subparagraph (B).

“(E) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Upon establishing the validation and approval process required under subparagraph (C), the corporation shall make publicly available a description of the validation and approval process.

“(F) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this paragraph, the corporation shall solicit applications from developers of credit scoring models for the validation and approval of those models under the process required under subparagraph (C).

“(G) TIMEFRAME FOR DETERMINATION; NOTICE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The corporation shall make a determination with respect to any application submitted under subparagraph (F), and provide notice of that determination to the applicant, before a date established by the corporation that is not later than 180 days after the date on which an application is submitted to the corporation.

“(ii) EXTENSIONS.—The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency may authorize not more than 2 extensions of the date established under clause (i), each of which shall not exceed 30 days, upon a written request and a showing of good cause by the corporation.

“(iii) STATUS NOTICE.—The corporation shall provide notice to an applicant regarding the status of an application submitted under subparagraph (F) not later than 60 days after the date on which the application was submitted to the corporation.

“(iv) REASONS FOR DISAPPROVAL.—If an application submitted under subparagraph (F) is disapproved, the corporation shall provide to the applicant the reasons for the disapproval not later than 30 days after a determination is made under this subparagraph.

“(H) AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR.—If the corporation elects to use a credit score model under this paragraph, the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency shall require the corporation to periodically review

the validation and approval process required under subparagraph (C) as the Director determines necessary to ensure that the process remains appropriate and adequate and complies with any standards and criteria established pursuant to section 1328(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992.

“(I) EXTENSION.—If, as of the effective date of this paragraph, a credit score model has not been approved under subparagraph (C), the corporation may use a credit score model that was in use before the effective date of this paragraph, if necessary to prevent substantial market disruptions, until the earlier of—

“(i) the date on which a credit score model is validated and approved under subparagraph (C); or

“(ii) the date that is 2 years after the effective date of this paragraph.”.

(b) USE OF CREDIT SCORES BY FREDDIE MAC IN PURCHASING RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGES.—Section 305 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘credit score’ means a numerical value or a categorization created by a third party derived from a statistical tool or modeling system used by a person who makes or arranges a loan to predict the likelihood of certain credit behaviors, including default.

“(2) USE OF CREDIT SCORES.—The Corporation shall condition purchase of a residential mortgage by the Corporation under this section on the provision of a credit score for the borrower only if—

“(A) the credit score is derived from any credit scoring model that has been validated and approved by the Corporation under this subsection; and

“(B) the Corporation provides for the use of the credit score by all of the automated underwriting systems of the Corporation and any other procedures and systems used by the Corporation to purchase residential mortgages that use a credit score.

“(3) VALIDATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—The Corporation shall establish a validation and approval process for the use of credit score models, under which the Corporation may not validate and approve a credit score model unless the credit score model—

“(A) satisfies minimum requirements of integrity, reliability, and accuracy;

“(B) has a historical record of measuring and predicting default rates and other credit behaviors;

“(C) is consistent with the safe and sound operation of the corporation;

“(D) complies with any standards and criteria established by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency under section 1328(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992; and

“(E) satisfies any other requirements, as determined by the Corporation.

“(4) REPLACEMENT OF CREDIT SCORE MODEL.—If the Corporation has validated and approved 1 or more credit score models under paragraph (3) and the Corporation validates and approves an additional credit score model, the Corporation may determine that—

“(A) the additional credit score model has replaced the credit score model or credit score models previously validated and approved; and

“(B) the credit score model or credit score models previously validated and approved shall no longer be considered validated and approved for the purposes of paragraph (2).

“(5) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Upon establishing the validation and approval process required under paragraph (3), the Corporation shall make publicly available a description of the validation and approval process.

“(6) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this subsection, the Corporation shall solicit applications from developers of credit scoring models for the validation and approval of those models under the process required under paragraph (3).

“(7) TIMEFRAME FOR DETERMINATION; NOTICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall make a determination with respect to any application submitted under paragraph (6), and provide notice of that determination to the applicant, before a date established by the Corporation that is not later than 180 days after the date on which an application is submitted to the Corporation.

“(B) EXTENSIONS.—The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency may authorize not more than 2 extensions of the date established under subparagraph (A), each of which shall not exceed 30 days, upon a written request and a showing of good cause by the Corporation.

“(C) STATUS NOTICE.—The Corporation shall provide notice to an applicant regarding the status of an application submitted under paragraph (6) not later than 60 days after the date on which the application was submitted to the Corporation.

“(D) REASONS FOR DISAPPROVAL.—If an application submitted under paragraph (6) is disapproved, the Corporation shall provide to the applicant the reasons for the disapproval not later than 30 days after a determination is made under this paragraph.

“(8) AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR.—If the Corporation elects to use a credit score under this subsection, the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency shall require the Corporation to periodically review the validation and approval process required under paragraph (3) as the Director determines necessary to ensure that the process remains appropriate and adequate and complies with any standards and criteria established pursuant to section 1328(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992.

“(9) EXTENSION.—If, as of the effective date of this subsection, a credit score model has not been approved under paragraph (3), the Corporation may use a credit score model that was in use before the effective date of this subsection, if necessary to prevent substantial market disruptions, until the earlier of—

“(A) the date on which a credit score model is validated and approved under paragraph (3); or

“(B) the date that is 2 years after the effective date of this subsection.”.

(c) AUTHORITY OF THE DIRECTOR.—Subpart A of part 2 of subtitle A of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4541 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1328. REGULATIONS FOR USE OF CREDIT SCORES.

“The Director shall—

“(1) by regulation, establish standards and criteria for any process used by an enterprise to validate and approve credit scoring models pursuant to section 302(b)(7) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)(7)) and section 305(d) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454(d)); and

“(2) ensure that any credit scoring model that is validated and approved by an enterprise under section 302(b)(7) (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)(7)) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act or section 305(d) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454(d)) meets the requirements of clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of section 302(b)(7)(C) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 305(d)(3) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act, respectively.”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 311. GAO REPORT ON PUERTO RICO FORECLOSURES.

Not earlier than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on foreclosures in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, including—

(1) the rate of foreclosures in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(2) the rate of return for housing developers in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(3) the rate of delinquency in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria;

(4) the rate of homeownership in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria; and

(5) the rate of defaults on federally insured mortgages in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before and after Hurricane Maria.

SEC. 312. REPORT ON CHILDREN'S LEAD-BASED PAINT HAZARD PREVENTION AND ABATEMENT.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “Department” means the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

(2) the term “public housing agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an overview of existing policies and enforcement of the Department, including public outreach, relating to lead-based paint hazard prevention and abatement;

(2) recommendations and best practices for the Department, public housing agencies, and landlords for improving lead-based paint hazard prevention standards and Federal lead prevention and abatement policies to protect the environmental health and safety of children, including within housing receiving assistance from or occupied by families receiving housing assistance from the Department; and

(3) recommendations for legislation to improve lead-based paint hazard prevention and abatement.

SEC. 313. FORECLOSURE RELIEF AND EXTENSION FOR SERVICEMEMBERS.

Section 710(d) of the Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-154; 50 U.S.C. 3953 note) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (3).

TITLE IV—TAILORING REGULATIONS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

SEC. 401. ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “the applicable threshold”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **RISKS TO FINANCIAL STABILITY AND SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS.**—The Board of Governors may by order or rule promulgated pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, apply any prudential standard established under this section to any bank holding company or bank holding companies with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000 to which the prudential standard does not otherwise apply provided that the Board of Governors—

“(i) determines that application of the prudential standard is appropriate—

“(I) to prevent or mitigate risks to the financial stability of the United States, as described in paragraph (1); or

“(II) to promote the safety and soundness of the bank holding company or bank holding companies; and

“(ii) takes into consideration the bank holding company's or bank holding companies' capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking “and credit exposure report”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting “, including credit exposure reports” before the semicolon at the end;

(3) in subsection (d)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”; and

(4) in subsection (h)(2), by striking “\$10,000,000,000” each place that term appears and inserting “\$50,000,000,000”;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i)—

(i) by striking “3” and inserting “2”; and

(ii) by striking “, adverse,”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking “semi-annual” and inserting “periodic”; and

(II) in the second sentence—

(aa) by striking “\$10,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(bb) by striking “annual” and inserting “periodic”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(ii)—

(I) by striking “3” and inserting “2”; and

(II) by striking “, adverse,”; and

(6) in subsection (j)(1), in the first sentence, by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to limit—

(1) the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in prescribing prudential standards under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) or any other law, to tailor or dif-

ferentiate among companies on an individual basis or by category, taking into consideration their capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of their subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate; or

(2) the supervisory, regulatory, or enforcement authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency to further the safe and sound operation of an institution under the supervision of the appropriate Federal banking agency.

(c) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010.**—The Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5311 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 115(a)(2)(B) (12 U.S.C. 5325(a)(2)(B)), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “the applicable threshold”;

(B) in section 116(a) (12 U.S.C. 5326(a)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(C) in section 121(a) (12 U.S.C. 5331(a)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(D) in section 155(d) (12 U.S.C. 5345(d)), by striking “50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”;

(E) in section 163(b) (12 U.S.C. 5363(b)), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” each place that term appears and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”; and

(F) in section 164 (12 U.S.C. 5364), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000,000”.

(2) **FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.**—The second subsection (s) (relating to assessments) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(s)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000,000”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$50,000,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000,000”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **TAILORING ASSESSMENTS.**—In collecting assessments, fees, or other charges under paragraph (1) from each company described in paragraph (2) with total consolidated assets of between \$100,000,000,000 and \$250,000,000,000, the Board shall adjust the amount charged to reflect any changes in supervisory and regulatory responsibilities resulting from the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act with respect to each such company.”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to any bank holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$100,000,000,000.

(3) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—Before the effective date described in paragraph (1), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may by order exempt any bank holding company with total consolidated assets of less than \$250,000,000,000 from any prudential standard under section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365).

(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from issuing an order or rule making under section 165(a)(2)(C) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365(a)(2)(C)), as added by this section, before the effective date described in paragraph (1).

(e) **SUPERVISORY STRESS TEST.**—Beginning on the effective date described in subsection (d)(1), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall, on a periodic basis, conduct supervisory stress tests of bank holding companies with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000 and total consolidated assets of less than \$250,000,000 to evaluate whether such bank holding companies have the capital, on a total consolidated basis, necessary to absorb losses as a result of adverse economic conditions.

(f) **GLOBAL SYSTEMICALLY IMPORTANT BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.**—Any bank holding company, regardless of asset size, that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be considered a bank holding company with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$250,000,000 with respect to the application of standards or requirements under—

(1) this section;

(2) sections 116(a), 121(a), 155(d), 163(b), 164, and 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5326(a), 5331(a), 5345(d), 5363(b), 5364, 5365); and

(3) paragraph (2)(A) of the second subsection (s) (relating to assessments) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(s)(2)).

(g) **CLARIFICATION FOR FOREIGN BANKS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) affect the legal effect of the final rule of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System entitled “Enhanced Prudential Standards for Bank Holding Companies and Foreign Banking Organizations” (79 Fed. Reg. 17240 (March 27, 2014)) as applied to foreign banking organizations with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000; or

(2) limit the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to require the establishment of an intermediate holding company under, implement enhanced prudential standards with respect to, or tailor the regulation of a foreign banking organization with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$100,000,000,000.

SEC. 402. SUPPLEMENTARY LEVERAGE RATIO FOR CUSTODIAL BANKS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “custodial bank” means any depository institution holding company predominantly engaged in custody, safekeeping, and asset servicing activities, including any insured depository institution subsidiary of such a holding company.

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “central bank” means—

(A) the Federal Reserve System;

(B) the European Central Bank; and

(C) central banks of member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, if—

(i) the member country has been assigned a zero percent risk weight under sections 3.32, 217.32, and 324.32 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

(ii) the sovereign debt of such member country is not in default or has not been in default during the previous 5 years.

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—The appropriate Federal banking agencies shall promulgate regula-

tions to amend sections 3.10, 217.10, and 324.10 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, to specify that—

(A) subject to subparagraph (B), funds of a custodial bank that are deposited with a central bank shall not be taken into account when calculating the supplementary leverage ratio as applied to the custodial bank; and

(B) with respect to the funds described in subparagraph (A), any amount that exceeds the total value of deposits of the custodial bank that are linked to fiduciary or custodial and safekeeping accounts shall be taken into account when calculating the supplementary leverage ratio as applied to the custodial bank.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed to limit the authority of the appropriate Federal banking agencies to tailor or adjust the supplementary leverage ratio or any other leverage ratio for any company that is not a custodial bank.

SEC. 403. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended—

(1) by moving subsection (z) so that it appears after subsection (y); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(aa) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘investment grade’, with respect to an obligation, has the meaning given the term in section 1.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto;

“(B) the term ‘liquid and readily-marketable’ has the meaning given the term in section 249.3 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto; and

“(C) the term ‘municipal obligation’ means an obligation of—

“(i) a State or any political subdivision thereof; or

“(ii) any agency or instrumentality of a State or any political subdivision thereof.

“(2) **MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.**—For purposes of the final rule entitled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards’ (79 Fed. Reg. 61439 (October 10, 2014)), the final rule entitled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Treatment of U.S. Municipal Securities as High-Quality Liquid Assets’ (81 Fed. Reg. 21223 (April 11, 2016)), and any other regulation that incorporates a definition of the term ‘high-quality liquid asset’ or another substantially similar term, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall treat a municipal obligation as a high-quality liquid asset that is a level 2B liquid asset if that obligation is, as of the date of calculation—

“(A) liquid and readily-marketable; and

“(B) investment grade.”.

(b) **AMENDMENT TO LIQUIDITY COVERAGE RATIO REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall amend the final rule entitled “Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards” (79 Fed. Reg. 61439 (October 10, 2014)) and the final rule entitled “Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Treatment of U.S. Municipal Securities as High-Quality Liquid Assets” (81 Fed. Reg. 21223 (April 11, 2016)) to implement the amendments made by this section.

TITLE V—ENCOURAGING CAPITAL FORMATION

SEC. 501. NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGE REGULATORY PARITY.

Section 18(b)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A);

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting “a security designated as qualified for trading in the national market system pursuant to section 11A(a)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k-1(a)(2)) that is” before “listed”; and

(B) by striking “that has listing standards that the Commission determines by rule (on its own initiative or on the basis of a petition) are substantially similar to the listing standards applicable to securities described in subparagraph (A)”;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or (B)”;

(4) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

SEC. 502. SEC STUDY ON ALGORITHMIC TRADING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the risks and benefits of algorithmic trading in capital markets in the United States.

(b) **MATTERS REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED.**—The matters covered by the report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the effect of algorithmic trading in equity and debt markets in the United States on the provision of liquidity in stressed and normal market conditions.

(2) An assessment of the benefits and risks to equity and debt markets in the United States by algorithmic trading.

(3) An analysis of whether the activity of algorithmic trading and entities that engage in algorithmic trading are subject to appropriate Federal supervision and regulation.

(4) A recommendation of whether—

(A) based on the analysis described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), any changes should be made to regulations; and

(B) the Securities and Exchange Commission needs additional legal authorities or resources to effect the changes described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 503. ANNUAL REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT-BUSINESS FORUM ON CAPITAL FORMATION.

Section 503 of the Small Business Investment Incentive Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 80c-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) The Commission shall—

“(1) review the findings and recommendations of the forum; and

“(2) each time the forum submits a finding or recommendation to the Commission, promptly issue a public statement—

“(A) assessing the finding or recommendation of the forum; and

“(B) disclosing the action, if any, the Commission intends to take with respect to the finding or recommendation.”.

SEC. 504. SUPPORTING AMERICA'S INNOVATORS.

Section 3(c)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “(or, in the case of a qualifying venture capital fund, 250 persons)” after “one hundred persons”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C)(i) The term ‘qualifying venture capital fund’ means a venture capital fund that has not more than \$10,000,000 in aggregate capital contributions and uncalled committed capital, with such dollar amount to be indexed for inflation once every 5 years by the Commission, beginning from a measurement made by the Commission on a date selected by the Commission, rounded to the nearest \$1,000,000.

“(ii) The term ‘venture capital fund’ has the meaning given the term in section 275.203(1)-1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.”.

SEC. 505. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION OVERPAYMENT CREDIT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Commission” means the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(2) the term “national securities association” means an association that is registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3); and

(3) the term “national securities exchange” means an exchange that is registered as a national securities exchange under section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f).

(b) CREDIT FOR OVERPAYMENT OF FEES.—Notwithstanding section 31(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee(j)), and subject to subsection (c) of this section, if a national securities exchange or a national securities association has paid fees and assessments to the Commission in an amount that is more than the amount that the exchange or association was required to pay under section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) and, not later than 10 years after the date of such payment, the exchange or association informs the Commission about the payment of such excess amount, the Commission shall offset future fees and assessments due by that exchange or association in an amount that is equal to the difference between the amount that the exchange or association paid and the amount that the exchange or association was required to pay under such section 31.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (b) shall apply only to fees and assessments that a national securities exchange or a national securities association was required to pay to the Commission before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 506. U.S. TERRITORIES INVESTOR PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-6(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SAFE HARBOR.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) SAFE HARBOR.—With respect to a company that is exempt under section 6(a)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-6(a)(1)) on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) EXTENSION OF SAFE HARBOR.—The Securities and Exchange Commission, by rule or regulation upon its own motion, or by order upon application, may conditionally or unconditionally, under section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-

6(c)), further delay the effective date for a company described in paragraph (2) for a maximum of 3 years following the initial 3-year period if, before the end of the initial 3-year period, the Commission determines that such a rule, regulation, motion, or order is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors.

SEC. 507. ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to increase from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 the aggregate sales price or amount of securities sold during any consecutive 12-month period in excess of which the issuer is required under such section to deliver an additional disclosure to investors. The Commission shall index for inflation such aggregate sales price or amount every 5 years to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounding to the nearest \$1,000,000.

SEC. 508. IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL.

The Securities and Exchange Commission shall amend—

(1) section 230.251 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to remove the requirement that the issuer not be subject to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) immediately before the offering; and

(2) section 230.257 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to an offering described in section 230.251(a)(2) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to deem any issuer that is subject to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as having met the periodic and current reporting requirements of section 230.257 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, if such issuer meets the reporting requirements of section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

SEC. 509. PARITY FOR CLOSED-END COMPANIES REGARDING OFFERING AND PROXY RULES.

(a) REVISION TO RULES.—Not later than the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall propose and, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall finalize any rules, as appropriate, to allow any closed-end company, as defined in section 5(a)(2) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-5), that is registered as an investment company under such Act, and is listed on a national securities exchange or that makes periodic repurchase offers pursuant to section 270.23c-3 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to use the securities offering and proxy rules, subject to conditions the Commission determines appropriate, that are available to other issuers that are required to file reports under section 13 or section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m; 78o(d)). Any action that the Commission takes pursuant to this subsection shall consider the availability of information to investors, including what disclosures constitute adequate information to be designated as a “well-known seasoned issuer”.

(b) TREATMENT IF REVISIONS NOT COMPLETED IN A TIMELY MANNER.—If the Commission fails to complete the revisions required by subsection (a) by the time required by such subsection, any registered closed-end company that is listed on a national securities exchange or that makes periodic repurchase offers pursuant to section 270.23c-3 of

title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be an eligible issuer under the final rule of the Commission titled “Securities Offering Reform” (70 Fed. Reg. 44722; published August 3, 2005).

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) NO EFFECT ON RULE 482.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to impair or limit in any way a registered closed-end company from using section 230.482 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to distribute sales material.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in this section to a section of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or to any form or schedule means such rule, section, form, or schedule, or any successor to any such rule, section, form, or schedule.

TITLE VI—PROTECTIONS FOR STUDENT BORROWERS

SEC. 601. PROTECTIONS IN THE EVENT OF DEATH OR BANKRUPTCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (8) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) the term ‘cosigner’—

“(A) means any individual who is liable for the obligation of another without compensation, regardless of how designated in the contract or instrument with respect to that obligation, other than an obligation under a private education loan extended to consolidate a consumer’s pre-existing private education loans;

“(B) includes any person the signature of which is requested as condition to grant credit or to forbear on collection; and

“(C) does not include a spouse of an individual described in subparagraph (A), the signature of whom is needed to perfect the security interest in a loan.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS RELATING TO BORROWER OR COSIGNER OF A PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—

“(1) PROHIBITION ON AUTOMATIC DEFAULT IN CASE OF DEATH OR BANKRUPTCY OF NON-STUDENT OBLIGOR.—With respect to a private education loan involving a student obligor and 1 or more cosigners, the creditor shall not declare a default or accelerate the debt against the student obligor on the sole basis of a bankruptcy or death of a cosigner.

“(2) COSIGNER RELEASE IN CASE OF DEATH OF BORROWER.—

“(A) RELEASE OF COSIGNER.—The holder of a private education loan, when notified of the death of a student obligor, shall release within a reasonable timeframe any cosigner from the obligations of the cosigner under the private education loan.

“(B) NOTIFICATION OF RELEASE.—A holder or servicer of a private education loan, as applicable, shall within a reasonable timeframe notify any cosigners for the private education loan if a cosigner is released from the obligations of the cosigner for the private education loan under this paragraph.

“(C) DESIGNATION OF INDIVIDUAL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE BORROWER.—Any lender that extends a private education loan shall provide the student obligor an option to designate an individual to have the legal authority to act on behalf of the student obligor with respect to the private education loan in the event of the death of the student obligor.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall only apply to private

education loan agreements entered into on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 602. REHABILITATION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 623(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) REHABILITATION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a consumer may request a financial institution to remove from a consumer report a reported default regarding a private education loan, and such information shall not be considered inaccurate, if—

“(I) the financial institution chooses to offer a loan rehabilitation program which includes, without limitation, a requirement of the consumer to make consecutive on-time monthly payments in a number that demonstrates, in the assessment of the financial institution offering the loan rehabilitation program, a renewed ability and willingness to repay the loan; and

“(II) the requirements of the loan rehabilitation program described in subclause (I) are successfully met.

“(ii) BANKING AGENCIES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If a financial institution is supervised by a Federal banking agency, the financial institution shall seek written approval concerning the terms and conditions of the loan rehabilitation program described in clause (i) from the appropriate Federal banking agency.

“(II) FEEDBACK.—An appropriate Federal banking agency shall provide feedback to a financial institution within 120 days of a request for approval under subclause (I).

“(iii) LIMITATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A consumer may obtain the benefits available under this subsection with respect to rehabilitating a loan only 1 time per loan.

“(II) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to require a financial institution to offer a loan rehabilitation program or to remove any reported default from a consumer report as a consideration of a loan rehabilitation program, except as described in clause (i).

“(iv) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘appropriate Federal banking agency’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

“(II) the term ‘private education loan’ has the meaning given the term in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)).”.

(b) GAO STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study, in consultation with the appropriate Federal banking agencies, regarding—

(A) the implementation of subparagraph (E) of section 623(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(1)) (referred to in this paragraph as “the provision”), as added by subsection (a);

(B) the estimated operational, compliance, and reporting costs associated with the requirements of the provision;

(C) the effects of the requirements of the provision on the accuracy of credit reporting;

(D) the risks to safety and soundness, if any, created by the loan rehabilitation programs described in the provision; and

(E) a review of the effectiveness and impact on the credit of participants in any loan

rehabilitation programs described in the provision and whether such programs improved the ability of participants in the programs to access credit products.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that contains all findings and determinations made in conducting the study required under paragraph (1).

SEC. 603. BEST PRACTICES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCIAL LITERACY.

Section 514(a) of the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9703(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) BEST PRACTICES FOR TEACHING FINANCIAL LITERACY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After soliciting public comments and consulting with and receiving input from relevant parties, including a diverse set of institutions of higher education and other parties, the Commission shall, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, establish best practices for institutions of higher education regarding methods to—

“(i) teach financial literacy skills; and

“(ii) provide useful and necessary information to assist students at institutions of higher education when making financial decisions related to student borrowing.

“(B) BEST PRACTICES.—The best practices described in subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

“(i) Methods to ensure that each student has a clear sense of the student's total borrowing obligations, including monthly payments, and repayment options.

“(ii) The most effective ways to engage students in financial literacy education, including frequency and timing of communication with students.

“(iii) Information on how to target different student populations, including part-time students, first-time students, and other nontraditional students.

“(iv) Ways to clearly communicate the importance of graduating on a student's ability to repay student loans.

“(C) MAINTENANCE OF BEST PRACTICES.—The Commission shall maintain and periodically update the best practices information required under this paragraph and make the best practices available to the public.

“(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require an institution of higher education to adopt the best practices required under this paragraph.”.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 2151, as modified.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2151, as modified, to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Bob Corker, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso,

Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Rounds, Jeff Flake, John Kennedy, Johnny Isakson, James Lankford, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the bill.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Bob Corker, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Rounds, Jeff Flake, John Kennedy, Johnny Isakson, James Lankford, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 598, Kevin McAleenan.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, Richard C. Shelby, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, Jeff Flake, Cory Gardner, Ron Johnson, Michael B. Enzi, John Kennedy, Susan M. Collins, James Lankford.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

The Senator from Idaho.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I would like to give an update to all of our colleagues about where we are on S. 2155.

We continue to be open and ready for amendments on our side. We have a number that we are ready to proceed forward with, and we so far have not received agreement from the other side to move forward. We hope that we can avoid this slowdown and start moving forward by setting votes on amendments as soon as we can, and we will continue to work to try to achieve that.

It is my hope that we will be able to get heavily engaged in and resolve the amendment stage of this legislation soon so that we can continue to move forward expeditiously.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND
CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, 10 years ago, millions of American families were on the verge of devastation. The failure of Bear Stearns in March of 2008 was the first major signal of a coming financial crisis that would cost 9 million people their jobs and millions more people their homes or their savings. Lives and plans and dreams would be crushed—and even after the economy began to recover its footing, millions of American families would have to spend years just to get back to where they started before 2008. A lot of those families have given up the dream of home ownership forever, and many are still struggling today.

But in the next few days, with broad support among Republicans and far too much support among Democrats, the Senate is on the verge of passing a bill that puts American families in danger of that same devastation all over again.

Over the last few days, I have talked about what this bill will do. I have explained how it strips consumer protections for American families who are trying to buy a home, particularly in low-income communities and communities of color. I have talked about how this bill will peel away vital safeguards we put on large banks after the financial crisis to make sure they can't crash the economy all over again.

Now, as the bill is on the verge of passing the Senate, I want to stop and just ask a basic question: Why? Who exactly is asking us to do this?

Our constituents hate it. A recent poll showed that an overwhelming majority of Americans oppose this bill. So why is it that the only thing Washington can agree to do on a bipartisan basis in this Congress is to help out giant banks?

I will tell you why. Washington's amnesia is legendary. We go through the same cycle like clockwork. When the economy is looking good, lobbyists flood Congress and tell politicians it is perfectly safe to roll back the rules on the big banks. It is always the same set of arguments: America needs more lending for more economic growth. Our country is losing ground to its competitors. Banks have learned their lesson and don't need rules to behave responsibly. And here is the kicker question: What could possibly go wrong? Every time, it works.

It works even though the lessons of history are clear. Strong financial rules help create a strong economy that works for everyone, and when we weaken the rules, it sets the stage for another financial crisis—a crisis that, every time, hits America's working families the hardest.

Let's go back to the beginning of the 20th century. A lot of our financial regulations in the United States come from the Great Depression. Before then, Washington ignored the booms and busts that rocked the country every few years. But after the unemployment rate topped 20 percent in the 1930s and the U.S. economy shrunk by about 30 percent, Washington—this Congress—finally got its act together to pass some laws.

Here is what they did. First, they looked at all of the places where people put their money—banks, home, markets—and then they built regulators for all of those different kinds of investments. Congress did something really smart. It put a law in place called the Glass-Steagall Act. It broke up the biggest banks, and it separated the banks that take deposits and make mortgages from high-risk institutions like investment banks.

This worked reasonably well for about half a century. There wasn't a single major financial crisis. But then, starting in the late 1970s and early 1980s, bankers, looking for higher profits and bigger paychecks, set their sights on government rules. They wanted less regulation and more freedom to trick their customers, to trap their customers, and to cheat their customers.

It started in the savings and loan industry. These institutions, which specialized in home mortgages, started to become insolvent because of the rising inflation and flaws in their business model. So the bank lobbyists had a solution: Deregulate them. They said: Instead of just safe mortgages, why don't we let these institutions put out some riskier stuff in hopes that some of

these gambles will pay off big. The Reagan administration agreed, but the plan failed. Over the next decade, taxpayers spent \$132 billion to bail out these institutions. That was in the 1980s.

But why stop there? Deregulating the thrifts, as disastrous as it was, was just small ball. Thrifts were allowed to gamble only with a chunk of their own money. The lobbyists wanted to tear down all of the barriers, throwing savings accounts and risky, complicated securities into one big institution and then letting that bank gamble with all of it.

They dreamt of a Wall Street where banks could take the money in grandma's checking account and use it to gamble in the markets. They wanted to tear down the wall Glass-Steagall had created between boring banking and high-risk trading.

In 1999, the conditions were perfect to rip up the rules. Why? The economy was cruising. Unemployment was down to 4.2 percent. The markets were on fire. The Dow, the S&P 500, and the NASDAQ smashed every record in their paths. In fact, the NASDAQ grew at 85.6 percent in 1999, the biggest annual jump for a major index in U.S. history. One respected finance professor gushed:

It's amazing. Every year we say it can't be another year of 20 percent-plus (gain)—and then every year it's a 20 percent-plus gain.

It was the prime time for the bank lobbyists to strike. They swarmed Capitol Hill pushing, pulling, cajoling, running from the House to the Senate and back again, and most of this was happening behind closed doors. But on a clear, cold day in February of 1999, eight bankers and two lobbyists testified in front of the Senate Banking Committee, and the knives were out for Glass-Steagall. The euphemism people used then was "modernization." When lobbyists start talking about modernization and clarification, it is time to buy a parachute.

Let me tell you about KeyCorp, one of the banks that would be taken off the watch list in the bill we are going to be voting on in the coming days. Back in 1999, the CEO of that company testified that the "financial law modernization that strengthens our financial institutions in and of itself will enhance safety and soundness." Think about what that means. Behind the buzzwords, that CEO was making the amazing claim that if banks were just allowed to take more risks and make more short-term profits, it would actually make the financial system safer. In other words, if we just deregulate the banks, they will become safer.

He wasn't the only one to make a claim like that. The vice chairman of JPMorgan said: "There is a consensus shared by most financial firms and their customers, as well as policymakers, that these rules restrict competition, reduce consumer choice, and

are not necessary to protect consumers or insured financial institutions.” In other words, rules are the problem—if banks could just do whatever they wanted, everything would be great.

Guess what. The pitch worked. Nine months later, in late 1999, a bill to repeal key parts of Glass-Steagall and roll back other financial rules passed both Houses of Congress overwhelmingly. Ninety Senators voted yes. Senator after Senator, including quite a few who are still here today, came to the Senate floor and praised the bill for modernizing our financial rules and getting rid of unnecessary and outdated requirements.

But not everyone was fooled. Some Senators knew better. Senator Paul Wellstone from Minnesota warned that Congress “seem[s] determined to unlearn the lessons from our past mistakes . . . [and] is about to repeal [Glass-Steagall] without putting any comparable safeguard in its place.”

Senator Byron Dorgan of North Dakota was especially prescient. He said:

I think we will look back in 10 years’ time and say we should not have done this but we did because we forgot the lessons of the past, and that that which is true in the 1930’s is true in 2010. . . . We now have decided in the name of modernization to forget the lessons of the past, of safety and of soundness.

But Congress ignored their warnings. For the bargain price of \$300 million in lobbyist bills, the big banks saw their wildest dreams come true. With the repeal of Glass-Steagall, too-big-to-fail megabanks were born. Citibank became Citigroup. J.P. Morgan became JPMorgan Chase. The banks got bigger and bigger and bigger.

But the lobbyists weren’t done yet. Over the next decade, they tried over and over to expand the loopholes that they had punched until both the regulators and the regulations gave way. By the middle of the decade, the conditions were right. Markets broke records. The unemployment rate was below 5 percent. It was time for the lobbyists to go at it again. Hand-tailored suits and Gucci loafers swarmed Capitol Hill. Meetings were scheduled. So were fundraisers. Their efforts again occasionally spilled out into the public hearing rooms.

This pitch might sound familiar. In 2006, the head of risk at Citigroup, on behalf of the Financial Services Roundtable, told the House Financial Services Committee: “The U.S. needs to modernize its capital regulations, and there are a variety of new approaches that all represent a significant improvement over the current system.” In other words, the regulations are outdated.

Steve Bartlett, a former Congressman who was a lobbyist for the 50 biggest banks, told the Senate Banking Committee in 2005: “Outdated laws and regulations impose significant, and unnecessary, burdens on financial serv-

ices firms, and these burdens not only make our firms less efficient, but also increase the cost of financial products and services to consumers.” In other words, set the banks free, and let them do whatever they want. What could possibly go wrong?

In 2005, the head of the American Bankers Association told the committee: “The cost of unnecessary paperwork and red tape is a serious long-term problem that will continue to erode the ability of banks to serve our customers and support the economic growth of our communities.” In other words, in the end, these rules hurt consumers. Let the banks do whatever they want to consumers.

Then, just as the lobbyists were gaining momentum, the economy they created crashed. It was 2008, and millions of families lost their homes, millions lost their savings, and millions lost their jobs. But the lobbyists didn’t lose their jobs. They peddled myths about the economy and the financial system, and they kept right on working for the big banks. All during the efforts to pass financial regulations to get our economy out of the ditch, the bank lobbyists were there. They pulled in more than \$1 million a day lobbying against financial reform.

When the American people started to demand action in the wake of the 2008 crash, the reforms passed anyway. But the lobbyists didn’t give up. They didn’t go away. Before the ink was dry on Dodd-Frank, they jumped right back in and started lobbying to roll back the new rules.

So here we are again. It took years, but the economy is humming again. In 2016, the unemployment rate dipped below 5 percent for the first time since before the 2008 crisis. In 2017, the Dow jumped 25 percent, and the NASDAQ grew by 28 percent. And you know what that means—it means the bank lobbyists have once again taken center stage, insisting that it is safe to deregulate their clients again, all in the name of economic growth and empowering consumers. It is the same argument as before.

Last spring, bank lobbyist Greg Baer said:

After nearly a decade of fundamental and continuing changes to financial regulation, now is an opportune time to review the efficacy of our current bank regulatory framework. My testimony will focus on reforms that could directly and immediately enhance economic growth.

In other words, turn the big banks loose, and let’s see what they can do.

Harris Simmons, the CEO of Zions Bank, which will be kicked off the watch list under the bill that is now under consideration, recently testified that “the uncertainty surrounding [Dodd-Frank reforms] can cause banks to withdraw or limit certain kinds of lending.” To put it another way: Get out of the way and let the big banks

cheat their customers again. It is good for bank profits.

Here we go again. I get it. Our financial regulations need work. There are things we could do to reduce the load on community banks, and there are still big dangers to consumers that we should take up. But this bill isn’t about the unfinished business of the last financial crisis; this bill is about laying the groundwork for the next financial crisis.

I will make a prediction. This bill will pass, and if the banks get their way, in the next 10 years or so, there will be another financial crisis. Of course, when the crash comes, the big banks will throw up their hands and say that it is not their fault, that nobody could have seen it coming. Then they will run to Congress and beg for bailout money, and—let’s be blunt—they will probably get it. But just like in 2008, there will be no bailout for working families. Jobs will be lost, and lives will be destroyed. The American people, not the banks, will once again bear the burden.

Then, caught in a fog of amnesia, the lobbyists and regulators and elected officials in Washington will scratch their heads and wonder how in the world it could have possibly happened again. But the American people won’t be confused about it at all. They never are. They are much smarter than the people around here give them credit for. They won’t wonder why it happened; they will know why it happened. They will know it was because the people in Washington ignored working people in order to do the bidding of the guys in fancy suits and the handmade shoes who write the fat campaign checks. Look at the numbers. Seventy-eight percent of Americans think big banks have too much control over Members of Congress. That includes 68 percent of people who voted for Donald Trump. Everyone knows that Congress sold them out last time, and everyone expects it to happen again this time.

As we prepare to vote on this bill, I ask my colleagues one more time, do the job you were sent here to do. Stand up for the people who sent us here. Stop doing the bidding of big bank lobbyists, and start working on the things that can make a difference in the lives of working people around this country. The American people need it. The American people deserve it. The American people will demand it. If you refuse to do it, don’t be surprised when they hold you responsible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO MARY ANN KELLEY

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise in this historic Chamber to offer my thanks, my respect, and to pay homage to an incredibly valued member of my staff who is about to retire from the U.S. Senate after decades of dedicated service.

A New Englander by birth and a Delawarian by choice, Mary Ann Kelley has served as my deputy scheduler now for 7 years and is due to retire tomorrow, March 9.

Mary Ann Kelley—or MAK, as she is affectionately called in my office—started a career with the U.S. Senate way back in December 1990 as a staff assistant for then-Senator Joseph Robinette Biden, Jr. Except for a break in service, Mary Ann served on Senator Biden's team until he resigned to become Vice President in 2009. She stayed on through the tenure of Senator Ted Kaufman and joined my scheduling team late in 2010.

In her having served now three U.S. Senators, Mary Ann brings a breadth of knowledge and experience to my front office and scheduling team. She helps to maintain my schedule, helps to organize and evaluate and to track hundreds of invitations and scheduling requests to coworkers and constituents. Mary Ann's professionalism and business acumen are unwavering and valued. She always maintains her composure despite the stress and sometimes craziness this unique position offers. My team in Delaware appreciates her ready wit, balanced judgment, and calming presence.

Krista Brady, my talented casework manager, said:

MAK adds that something extra Irish to the office. Every morning, she comes in wearing her snazziest outfit, drinking her cappuccino from Starbucks, and ready to tell a funny story.

Krista reminded me about Mary Ann's love for cats, her famous Halloween mask, her curry chicken, and, of course, her wicked New England spirit.

Mary Ann's story is rooted deeper than in just her years of Senate service. MAK's authenticity, personality, and devotion to friends and family make her a staff favorite and valued member of my team. To properly honor Mary Ann, let me share some details about her background and her persona.

A graduate of Cardinal Spellman High School and Framingham State University, Mary Ann was born and lived in Massachusetts until she moved to Delaware in 1979. Ask MAK about her hometown, and she will quickly chime in with "Brockton, MA—home of Rocky Marciano and Marvin Hagler!" Thanks to Rocky and Marvin, world heavyweight and middleweight boxing champions, Brockton is recognized as the City of Champions.

If Rocky and Marvin are Brockton's boxing champions, Mary Ann is the

city's undisputed world champion in cooking, whether it be baking, roasting, or toasting. Like Rocky and Marvin, Mary Ann has a passion and talent for her own chosen sport, one that she has practiced and refined over many years. Marvin Hagler explained what makes a winner, and what Mary Ann did to become a well-seasoned top chef is the same thing. Marvin Hagler, the boxer, once said, "Every fighter has got [to] be dedicated, learn how to sacrifice, know what devotion is all about, make sure you're paying attention and studying your art."

Mary Ann learned to cook at an early age. She will say that she was born with a love of cooking. This interest is something she has pursued through her college years and into today. She earned a bachelor's of science in food and nutrition from Framingham State in 1967 and subsequently mentored and educated students as a home economics teacher for 5 years. Mary Ann taught classes on food, nutrition, and, of course, cooking.

Over the decades, our very own MAK perfected a wide range of delicacies to soothe and feed family, friends, and fellow Delawarians. Often, the people she fed and cared for were through her efforts at the Ministry of Caring in Wilmington, DE. Mary Ann worked for a decade as the head chef at the Ministry of Caring, a community-based nonprofit that provides a network of social, health, and support services for those who are living in poverty or who are homeless. Mary Ann used her professional education, her faith, and her experience to feed the souls of people and provide them comfort through food served at the Ministry's Emmanuel Dining Room.

When Mary Ann returned to the Senate after her break in service, she rallied her coworkers to volunteer and serve food monthly at the Emmanuel Dining Room, where I, too, have volunteered. When I took office as a Senator, we continued this outreach, and it served as a great opportunity for my casework team and others to connect with constituents.

Besides MAK's involvement with the Ministry of Caring, for many years, she owned and operated her own excellent business, Creative Catering Cuisine. To this day, she still receives catering requests and calls from friends for cookies, cakes, and other treats. Mary Ann's depth and variety of dishes are unique and storied. Staff favorites include MAK's mouth-watering filet mignon, cranberry coffee cake, Irish cake, banana pudding, and a wide variety of pound cakes. Lynne Phifer, my intern coordinator, speaks highly of Mary Ann's homemade oatmeal cookies and other confections. Lynne and the rest of the team, however, are unanimous in their vote for MAK's curry chicken.

Mary Ann's food is influential and, I would say at times, even transcendent.

I am confident, if MAK's menu had existed in earlier times, it could have changed the course of history as we know it. If this sustenance had been available in 1775, Founding Father Patrick Henry may have exclaimed, "Give me Mary Ann's curry chicken or give me death!"

Mary Ann goes to great lengths, in all seriousness, to prepare meals for those she loves. She gets the best and freshest ingredients. Some on my staff remember the day Mary Ann returned from her lunch break with a half dozen lobsters—the main course for a dinner prepared in honor of her son's birthday.

Desiree Burritt, my immigration case worker, who also worked for Senators Biden and Kaufman before me, said:

Mary Ann has always been our in-house chef, always there to pull up a chair, quick to smile, laugh, and listen. MAK is like a mother to all of us.

Mary Ann may not know just how much she inspires and influences those around her. I have been moved to hear and witness the impression that she has made on my staff, on her friends, and her family.

Terry Wright, who also previously worked for Senator Biden—a member of my Service Academy Selection Board—has known Mary Ann for many years. Terry said Mary Ann is "generous with an absolute willingness to help anyone in any way she can. When she's your friend," Terry said, "you have a friend for life."

Elena Sassaman, a newer member of my casework team, said:

Mary Ann is one of the nicest and most thoughtful people I've met both here, working in the Senate, and in everyday life. MAK was one of the first people to include me in the office family dynamic when I first started.

Elena has developed a love for knitting, crocheting, and other crafts thanks to Mary Ann's encouragement and valued friendship.

When I am not in DC, I am usually in my Wilmington office in Delaware, and we enjoy the opportunity to have lunch as a group with everybody on the Delaware staff. I love those lunches, listening to Mary Ann tell funny stories, share observations, even show photos of or brag about her grandkids.

My dad, whom I miss dearly, was born in Boston, MA, himself, and Mary Ann, who never lost her remarkable Boston accent, has provided me a familiar and comforting presence whenever she speaks.

I love her Massachusetts spirit, her soul, and her positive attitude. Mary Ann is a good and decent person and a great presence in our office. She is at the same time both a fixture and a breath of fresh air.

Mary Ann's work in the Senate and her career as a chef shows us all the importance of working hard and embracing what you love, using your

strengths to help your friends and neighbors and to better the country and community.

Mary Ann said she would miss all aspects of working with us in the Senate. It has been such a big part of her life, I know. Mary Ann, I know you will also miss the comradery of your coworkers in the Delaware office.

As a longtime chef, I am confident, Mary Ann, that you already have a recipe for retirement and will embrace the joy of not working. Your retirement will surely be filled with activities such as cooking, knitting, and outings with your friends Jill, Norma, Sue, and Tanya, and you will spend more time with your sons Michael and Terence, daughters-in-law Nell and Jennifer, and beloved grandchildren Cole, Mitch, Meredith, and Nolan, who all live right nearby, just over the line in Pennsylvania. Whether their Nan is joining them for dinner or attending a Unionville High School rowing event, I know you will be there in high spirits, prepared with a great story and an even better dessert.

Mary Ann, I know you look forward to trips to Westborough, MA, and to spending holidays and warmer weekends with Terence, Jennifer, Meredith, and Nolan.

Let me conclude by saying to Mary Ann, thank you for your years of service to the Senate, to our community, and to the people of the First State. You have been a valued member of my team, and I will close with a traditional Irish blessing:

May there always be work for your hands to do.

May your purse always hold a coin or two.

May the sun always shine on your window-pane.

May a rainbow be certain to follow each rain.

May the hand of a friend be always near you.
May God fill your heart with gladness to cheer you.

With that, Mary Ann, I offer you a fond farewell and a thanks to you for all you have done for Delaware and the Senate.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to explain my opposition to the bill that is before the Senate, the banking deregulation bill, S. 2155.

First, I would like to say I am appalled this is how the Senate is spending its time this week. Three weeks ago, 17 students and teachers were

murdered when a teenager, armed with an AR-15 decorated with swastikas, opened fire at Stoneman Douglas High School in Florida, but this week we are not banning the sale of high-capacity magazines that enable mass shooters to fire 30, 40, or even 100 rounds without stopping to reload; we are not closing the gun show loophole or stopping violent people from buying assault weapons online with the click of a mouse; we are not taking steps to report more cases of severe mental illness to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; we are not even passing President Trump's proposal to raise the age one can buy an assault weapon to 21 years. Simply put, this week we are not doing anything to stop the next mass shooting from taking place.

So what are we doing this week?

Well, this week the Republican majority has brought to the floor legislation rolling back safeguards we passed after the financial crisis of 2008—not exactly something the American people have been clamoring for.

I want to be clear why I oppose this bill as written. It is not that I don't support measures that provide meaningful relief to small banks, credit unions, and consumers. I do. It is not that I don't believe in reexamining regulations and ways to reduce compliance costs. I do. It is not that I don't agree with efforts to better calibrate the rules of the road for small banks and credit unions while strengthening protections for consumers investors and taxpayers. I do. Indeed, I would support a bill like that, but that is not the bill we have before us today.

The bill before us today brings back risky mortgage lending practices that increase the likelihood of foreclosures. It undermines our efforts to police discriminatory lending practices, and it would allow 25 of America's 38 biggest banks to escape the safeguards we adopted after the 2008 financial crisis—a crisis that destroyed more than \$12 trillion worth of American wealth, required huge bank bailouts, sent our economy into a tailspin, and saddled us with the great recession.

Ten years later, it is worth remembering what caused that crisis—mortgages designed like ticking timebombs for home buyers and for our economy at large, large financial institutions making risky bets on those risky mortgages, and regulators who turned a blind eye to these risks. Borrowers were steered into loans with low interest rates, often below 4 percent at the start, but once the promotional period ended, these teaser rates disappeared, higher interest rates kicked in, and millions of borrowers suddenly saw their mortgage payments go through the roof—even doubling, in many cases. Between 2004 and 2006, one-third of all adjustable rate mortgages were designed this way, and at a time of stag-

nant wages, millions of families couldn't keep up. That is why a wave of foreclosures overtook our housing market—displacing families, decimating home values, and destabilizing neighborhoods. From 2006 to 2014, more than 9.3 million families lost their homes to foreclosure, sold their homes at a significant loss, or surrendered their homes to the bank.

For communities of color, the crisis was even worse. African-American and Latino borrowers were at least twice as likely to receive a higher cost loan than White applicants, even when controlling for income and credit scores, and they were nearly 50 percent more likely to face foreclosure during the crisis.

So what did we do about it? Well, we passed laws to stop lenders from offering mortgages that were, in many ways, doomed to fail. We said that from now on banks and mortgage lenders would have to make a reasonable and good-faith determination that borrowers could pay back their loans by looking at income, employment, credit history, monthly expenses, and other metrics. We prohibited banks from using these teaser rates to determine whether a borrower could repay a loan. We did the sensible thing, and we required them to make sure that borrowers could actually afford their payments once the higher interest rates kicked in.

We also passed reforms to better catch discriminatory lending practices because we know that, in many cases, the riskiest products were offered to minority communities. We asked banks to provide data that they already collected on things like debt-to-income ratios, credit scores, loan-to-value ratios, interest rates, and loan terms. This way, we could better identify emerging risks and possible discriminatory lending practices in our communities. Were all of these reforms perfect? Of course not. Have they made our mortgage lending system safer, smarter, and fairer for credit borrowers? Absolutely. Does that mean we still don't face challenges? No. New Jerseyans know that. Our State still suffers the highest rate of foreclosure in the Nation, and many New Jersey neighborhoods still struggle with frequent foreclosures, abandoned homes, and their painful consequences.

Likewise, discrimination still persists. I was appalled by a report released in January that showed African-American and Latino families—even controlling for income, loan amount, and location—continue to be disproportionately denied conventional mortgages. These practices are nothing short of modern-day redlining. We see it in Camden, NJ, for example, where Black applicants are still more than 2½ times likelier to be denied than White applicants.

Now, 10 years after the crisis, Congress is poised to turn back the clock.

Under this bill, some banks will once again be able to offer mortgages with teaser rates of 4 percent that more than double in just 2 years, without ever verifying if a borrower could afford a 9-percent interest rate, and all they have to do is keep the loans on their books.

This bill will excuse 85 percent of banks from sharing the data we need to identify discrimination and ensure all creditworthy borrowers have a fair shot at the American dream of home ownership. So if this sounds familiar, that is because it is. History is repeating itself.

Beyond making mortgage lending riskier and less fair, this bill removes guardrails we put in place for 25 of the 38 largest banks in the country. These are the banks identified as systemically important during the crisis—the banks that received \$47 billion in bailouts.

Now, I appreciate my colleagues who point out this bill's benefits for community banks and credit unions—and I mean that. That is a good thing. But I fear these provisions mask giveaways that will make big banks bigger and, ultimately, hurt smaller banks struggling to compete. Under title IV, for example, this bill significantly cuts oversight of banks with assets between \$50 billion and \$250 billion.

Have we forgotten so quickly the lessons we learned after the crisis? Do we not remember how the government had to arrange forced mergers of Countrywide, with \$200 billion in assets, and National City, with \$145 billion in assets, because their near-failures worked to spread risk from Wall Street to Main Street?

Do we really want to weaken these guardrails—the stress tests and the capital planning requirements to ensure that banks can survive a crisis, the living wills that ensure they have a feasible way to unwind if things go badly, and the minimum liquid assets they must hold in the event they lose access to funding markets?

When taxpayer dollars are on the line, I don't think it is unfair to ask big banks to be safe and smart. On the contrary, it is unfair to the American people who will have to bail them out when and if they get into trouble.

Supporters of this bill are quick to point out that it preserves the Federal Reserve's authority to take action if they become concerned about a bank with less than \$250 billion in assets. Well, forgive me for not having confidence in regulators with a long history of doing too little too late. That is exactly the kind of risk that taxpayers, homeowners, and investors can't afford.

As the chairman of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission recently wrote, "history has shown, time and again, that the failure of financial firms that are not among the largest mega-banks

can pose systemic risks to financial stability." According to the Congressional Budget Office, these weaker protections make it even more likely that taxpayers will once again have to bail out banks.

At the end of the day, this bill injects tremendous risk into the system and undercuts our tools to have our financial cops on the beat actually work to monitor the risk. So that leaves taxpayers on the hook if risk then turns into crisis. Rather than protecting families, this bill is packed full of goodies for large banks and special interests, because consumers—the families who would suffer the most in another crisis—don't have a seat at the table.

As a member of the Banking Committee, I worked in good faith to amend this bill and make it better. I offered an amendment called Christopher's Law to better protect consumers like the Bryski family in New Jersey. While mourning the tragic loss of their son Christopher, the Bryskis were stunned to learn that they would be responsible for paying an education their son could never use because they had cosigned his private student loan. I appreciate that my colleagues incorporated major components of Christopher's Law to protect families that suffer the tragic loss of a loved one into the manager's package for this bill.

When you look at the totality of the bill's provisions, the fact remains that we couldn't get an inch for consumers in exchange for the miles this bill gives to big banks. Take, for example, my amendment to enhance protections for military servicemembers who often struggle to protect their credit while they are serving our country abroad or the amendment I offered to prevent the rewards of this bill from flowing to banks that adopt punishing, Wells-Fargo-style sales cultures that put consumers at risk. These are just some of the pro-consumer, commonsense amendments that were rejected in the Banking Committee.

Ultimately, I still believe Congress could pass legislation that provides targeted relief to community banks and credit unions, but not in exchange for erasing the standards that protect working families and our economy from systemic risk. So you can bet that I will be working here on the floor to get those amendments included in full. Senator CORTEZ MASTO and I will offer an amendment to ensure that banks report the data we need to police against discriminatory lending practices.

Likewise, I am offering an amendment to require that consumer reporting agencies like Equifax quickly disclose data breeches and require a Federal study of how these breeches impact consumers over the long haul.

Finally, I am proposing an amendment that requires mutual funds to

disclose to their shareholders whether they invest in the gun industry, because it is downright offensive to be considering a banking bill this week instead of pressing corporate America to step up in the fight against gun violence that rips our country apart year after year.

These measures, if adopted, would make a bad bill a bit better, but as we quickly approach the 10-year anniversary of the government-backed bailout of Bear Stearns, I cannot, in good conscience, vote to remove the guardrails we put in place to prevent big banks from playing fast and loose with our economy in the first place.

The financial crisis and recession stripped trillions of dollars in wealth from communities all across the country. While banks were bailed out, families were left reeling with the consequences. From foreclosure to job losses to hard-hit retirement accounts and falling home values, the American people bore the brunt of the financial crisis. For years, Washington protected Wall Street from sensible regulations when we should have been protecting consumers. Unfortunately, it took the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression for us to pass the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act for us to make a fundamental choice to reject a system that took advantage of consumers and instead stand for a banking system that is more fair, transparent, and accountable to the American people.

To quote the Spanish philosopher George Santayana, "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Only in Washington would anyone think it is a good idea to commemorate the 10-year anniversary of the financial crisis with a bill that dares big banks to get bigger and increases risks to taxpayers.

I look forward to the day when this Congress strives to do better by the working families who lost their homes, their jobs, and their life savings during the crisis. Hard-working families had to fight their way back from the recession without bailouts and are counting on us to fight for them in Washington, and that is what I intend to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise again today to speak further on S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

We have had a lot of discussion on the floor about this bill in the last few days. Anybody who took the opportunity to watch all of that debate sees

that there is a strong bipartisan support for this bill and a strong debate coming from some quarters trying to say that the bill creates greater risk in our financial community. I would like to address exactly what this bill does and then respond to some of those charges, which I consider to be completely unfounded.

The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act is aimed at rightsizing regulation for financial institutions—including community banks and credit unions—making it easier for consumers to get mortgages and to obtain credit.

I have said a number of times, and I will repeat, back when we were debating the Dodd-Frank legislation about 10 years ago, it was marketed to the public as a bill to address excesses and problems on Wall Street by the big megabanks of our country, but its provisions hit hardest on Main Street.

As I have said, I actually held a news conference in Boise, ID—in my home State—on Main Street. I said the crosshairs of this bill and the bulls-eye are on Main Street, not Wall Street.

What has happened in the last 10 years? The Wall Street banks have been phenomenally profitable. They have been very successful, and the smaller banks—the credit unions, the community banks, even the regional banks—have been hammered.

We are losing credit unions and, more specifically, community banks across this Nation at an alarming pace, and the reason—the primary reason—is the phenomenally significant increased regulatory burden they face.

I have heard colleagues of mine on the floor in the last couple of days talking about specific community banks and credit unions in their States that have had so much pressure put on them, so much burden and financial costs put on them by the excessive regulations that they have either gone out of business or stopped issuing mortgages, just stopped doing mortgage business or stopped doing loans of certain types that are beneficial to our small businesses. So the real victims aren't even just the community banks and credit unions; they are the people—the people who want to get a loan in their local communities and who are entirely worthy of getting a loan to buy a house, but their credit unions and community banks are no longer in that business or they are no longer in existence. That is what this bill is addressing.

The bill also increases important consumer protections for veterans, senior citizens, victims of fraud, and those who fall on tough financial times. The provisions in this bill will directly address some of the problems I frequently hear about from financial institutions. Let me explain in a little more detail just what that is. I have already discussed some.

Community banks and credit unions are simple institutions, focused on relationship lending and have special relationships with the people in their communities. The bankers and their customers go to church, play ball, or their kids go to school with each other. They know their customers, and they are willing to work with them to help them be successful. They provide credit to traditionally underserved and rural communities, where it may be harder to access banking products and services or to get a loan.

Dodd-Frank instituted numerous new mortgage rules and complex capital requirements on community banks and credit unions that have hindered consumers' access to mortgage credit and lending more broadly.

I guess I will just insert here, this phenomenon we often see in Washington of one-size-fits-all or cookie-cutter solutions to a problem is directly the kind of problem we are seeing here.

Our smaller financial institutions are treated as though they were large megabanks and as though their business models and their portfolios contain the same kind of risk as the larger banks. Yet they don't have the same business models; they don't have the same risk footprint, but they are forced to go through phenomenally expensive regulatory burdens for no good reason.

I can't tell you how many of these small bank and credit union folks have said to me: Our industry did not cause or have any part in the financial crisis, but we are being asked to pay the price. That is what this bill deals with.

In July of 2016, the American Action Forum attempted to estimate the number of paperwork hours and final costs associated with these rules and regulations that I am talking about. In total, the forum estimated that the law had imposed more than \$36 billion in final rule costs and 73 million paperwork hours as of July 2016. What does that mean? To put these figures into perspective, the costs are nearly \$112 per person or \$310 per household.

Additionally, it would take 36,950 employees—that is 36,950 employees—working full time to complete a single year of the law's paperwork based on the agency's calculations themselves.

Our bill is focused on providing meaningful relief to our community banks and credit unions, helping them to prudently lend to consumers, home buyers, and small businesses—small businesses that we all acknowledge are the engines of our economy, yet lack credit and lack access to capital because of these unnecessary rules. That is why the first part of the name of this bill is "economic growth." This bill will provide a needed shot in the arm for our economy across this country.

By responsibly expanding the qualified mortgage safe harbor, addressing

severe appraiser shortages in rural areas, reducing superfluous HMDA reporting requirements, and exempting certain loans from escrow requirements, our bill will ease the compliance and regulatory reporting requirements borne by many of these small financial institutions and free up scarce resources for their communities, enabling more individuals to find a home loan or get the funding to start a business. And this does not increase financial risk.

A number of local credit unions have weighed in on the positive impact our bill will have on increasing access to affordable mortgage credit.

Additionally, had our bill's provisions on a rule called TRID—a 3-day waiting period—had they been in place in 2017, it would have helped over 1.5 million credit union members at over 3,800 credit unions throughout the Nation, enabling them to take advantage of a lower interest rate and to avoid potential delays in the mortgage origination process. I will tell my colleagues, anybody who has had to go through the mortgage origination process today knows the paperwork I am talking about.

Our bill also drastically simplifies the capital regime for certain highly capitalized community banks compared to the current Basel III requirements that are more appropriate for larger, sophisticated financial institutions.

Rebecca Romero Rainey, the former chairman and CEO of Centinel Bank of Taos and CEO-elect of the Community Bankers of America, made a common-sense observation. She said:

Under Basel III, community bank capital regulation has become significantly more punitive and complex. Do we really need four definitions of regulatory capital, a capital conservation buffer, and impossibly complex rules governing capital deductions and adjustments?

Applying the rule to community banks in a one-size-fits-all manner harms the consumers and businesses we serve.

She added:

I seriously doubt that my grandfather would have founded Centinel if he had to comply with Basel III and the other new regulations that exist today.

We want to encourage people to bank in their communities.

Dodd-Frank also dealt with midsized and regional banks, and our bill does too. Dodd-Frank swept many simple midsized and regional banks into its enhanced prudential standards, but it was meant for the largest and most complex institutions. Each new regulation poses a tradeoff between hiring new employees to help comply with those standards versus employees to provide customers the products and services they want and need.

Deron Smithy, executive vice president and treasurer for Regions Bank, a regional bank based in Alabama, described the implications of this on his

institution, saying, “We now have more people in our organization devoted to compliance-related matters than we do for commercial lending” and that “the direct cost, as well as management’s time and attention to meeting these rules, creates a disproportionate burden on regional banks. Collectively, the incremental cost of regulatory compliance exceeds \$2 billion annually.” The \$2 billion in costs that Mr. Smithy mentioned were just the direct costs. Indirect costs include management and other business units’ time being diverted from fully serving their clients.

These are not just empty numbers; behind these numbers are real economic consequences. That is a fact Mr. Smithy noted in his testimony before the Banking Committee.

For a company like Regions, that standard being lifted would likely liberate as much as 10 percent additional capacity for lending, which—

In his bank’s case—

would be \$8 billion to \$10 billion.

That is capital and access that are not available to individuals, families, and small businesses in this Nation. That is one bank.

During another Banking Committee hearing, Robert Hill, CEO of South State Corporation, a midsized bank, noted that when their institution crossed the \$10 billion threshold, “South State was impacted by over \$20 million per year, a significant sum for a bank our size. What impact does that have on our local communities? For us, that equates to 300 jobs. Approximately 10 percent of our branches were closed, and even more jobs diverted away from lending to regulatory compliance.”

Section 401 of our bill raises the SIFI threshold for applying enhanced prudential standards from \$50 billion to \$250 billion—a level that many, many financial experts have encouraged for years—and the \$10 billion threshold for applying an annual, company-run stress test to midsized banks while maintaining important safeguards against risks to the U.S. financial system. This will free up valuable financial and human resources to help keep more branches open, increase lending to consumers and small businesses, and lower the cost of borrowing for consumers.

The bill also deals with housing policy. Our bill provides some important improvements to HUD programs, making them more effective and efficient and enabling public housing authorities across the country to better address the housing needs of their local community.

Our bill enhances HUD’s Family Self-Sufficiency Program, which will enable a greater number of families currently assisted by HUD to obtain job training, education, childcare, and ultimately achieve financial independence. Specifically, the bill would broaden the scope of supportive services that can be

offered to these participants, including home ownership assistance, training in asset management, obtaining a GED, and education in pursuit of a postsecondary degree or certification. It would also streamline the administration of the program, making it easy for local public housing authorities to deliver it in their communities.

For the first time ever, our bill will enable many families who live in privately owned apartments backed by project-based rental assistance to also participate in the FSS Program.

Our bill would also provide targeted regulatory relief to small public housing agencies operating in rural communities. While smaller public housing authorities typically have far fewer staff and resources than larger urban agencies, they, too, are currently held to many of the same burdensome regulatory requirements as some of the largest ones in the country. As a result, this means that more of their time and money are spent completing paperwork and less are able to be dedicated to promoting access to affordable housing in these communities.

Our bill would provide tailored regulatory relief that recognizes the unique challenges faced by smaller public housing authorities in rural areas. Specifically, it would provide a simpler option for calculating utilities, simplify environmental review requirements for new developments, streamline inspection requirements, and make it easier to coordinate efforts, such as enabling shared waiting lists with neighboring agencies and enabling neighboring agencies to pool their resources to develop larger projects.

These changes will set up these small agencies for success and enable them to direct a greater amount of time, effort, and resources toward their core mission: promoting access to affordable housing.

The bill is also a consumer protection bill. It ensures that key consumer protections remain in place and increases protections for consumers who have fallen on hard financial times or become victims of fraud.

Following the Equifax data breach, we held two credit bureau hearings. These hearings demonstrated bipartisan support for some important measures. The bill provides 1 free year of fraud alerts for consumers potentially impacted by the Equifax breach or other instances of fraud. It gives consumers unlimited free credit freezes and unfreezes during the year. It allows parents to turn on and off credit reporting for children under 16.

The bill also includes important protections for veterans and senior citizens. The Department of Veterans Affairs Choice Program provides veterans non-VA medical care if they can’t access care at a VA medical facility. Unfortunately, the VA Choice Program has been rife with issues, including de-

layed payments and misassigned medical bills to veterans. As a result, veterans have experienced negative credit items on their reports, which unnecessarily complicates their and their families’ lives.

The largest credit reporting agencies took a step to alleviate this problem by delaying reporting medical debt on a consumer’s credit report for 180 days, but more can still be done. Our bill goes a step further by prohibiting medical debt arising from the Choice Program and other non-VA healthcare providers from being reported to credit-reporting agencies for 1 year and provides veterans a process to dispute or remove incorrect information already on their reports.

According to a study conducted by MetLife, seniors lose at least \$2.9 billion annually in reported cases of financial exploitation. Despite the prevalence of senior financial fraud, the National Adult Protective Services Association estimated that only 1 in 44 cases of financial abuse is ever reported.

Current bank privacy laws make it difficult for the financial institutions and their employees to report any potential fraudulent activity without incurring legal liability, and as a result, few cases of financial abuse are reported. Our bill would give financial advisers civil liability protection when reporting suspected financial abuse of seniors. This will empower and encourage our financial service representatives to identify warning signs of common scams and help stop financial fraud targeting our seniors.

Now I wish to turn for just a moment—I have gone over some of the positive benefits and provisions in this bill. I would like to turn for a moment to the criticisms, because, if my colleagues have been listening to the attacks, the attacks are that this is an effort to go help the big banks in America get richer at the expense of poor people. This is a very common type of attack on almost any proposal to fix a regulation in the financial system.

One of the things we have heard is that it gives the regulators too much flexibility to tailor regulations to the size of the institution being regulated. This bill carefully balances the need to provide regulators with the appropriate discretion at the technical level, while imposing specific directions to ensure appropriate tailoring for Main Street banks and maintaining core supervisory tools for the largest banks.

Regulators will still be required to ensure that banks operate in a safe and sound manner and still retain extensive authorities to do so.

The bill also requires regulators to do more to tailor regulations to ensure that the level of regulation and scrutiny of banks reflects the potential

risks posed by the institutions—something that folks in my State would say is just common sense.

In the face of all of this, we have talked to a lot of the regulators themselves to see what they think of the idea, and they are consistently saying: Let us have the flexibility to regulate appropriately, and we will do the job. We will ensure that we have safety and soundness, and we will ensure that we are not putting undue regulatory burdens on our financial institutions, particularly the smallest ones.

Federal Reserve Chairman Jay Powell said:

You know, we really want the most stringent things to be happening at the systemically important banks—the most stringent stress tests, in particular—and we want to tailor or taper, as we go down into less significant, less systemically important institutions.

Powell added: “Those banks [below \$100 billion] are not systemically important.”

What he meant by that is they don’t present systemic risks to the economy. We should analyze them and regulate them and supervise them in a more appropriate fashion.

Federal Reserve Vice Chairman for Supervision Randy Quarles has also noted the importance of tailoring, saying:

One of the important general themes of regulation is ensuring that the character of the regulation is adapted to the character of the institution being regulated, what has become the word “tailoring.”

I fully support that, and I think that it’s not only appropriate to recognize the different levels of risk, and types of risk that different institutions in the system pose, but that it also makes for better and more efficient regulation, and efficient regulation allows the financial system to more efficiently support the real economy.

That is what we are talking about here.

So I do think that we should look very carefully . . . at tailoring capital regulation and other types of regulation to the particular character of the institutions that are regulated, and that includes their size, and that includes other aspects of the character.

Another critique I have heard is that the bill erodes the power of stress testing as a supervisory tool. In one way or another, many have stood on this floor and talked about the need to have this kind of flexibility, and others have stood on this floor and said it creates a huge threat to our economy.

We have a hearing each year called the Humphrey-Hawkins hearing when the Chairman of the Federal Reserve comes and testifies to the Senate and then to the House. This year, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve came before the Senate. To ensure that people and Members understood what this bill does, I asked Chairman Jay Powell: If this bill were to pass, is it accurate that the Federal Reserve would still be required to conduct a supervisory stress test for any bank with total as-

sets between \$100 billion and \$250 billion to ensure that it has enough capital to weather economic downturns?

He replied: Yes, it is.

I asked: Is it accurate that the bill’s change of the threshold from \$50 billion to \$250 billion for enhanced prudential standards does not weaken oversight of the largest, globally systemic banks?

He said: That is correct.

The Dodd-Frank Act established a \$50 billion asset threshold to apply enhanced prudential standards to banks. Applying enhanced standards broadly to regional banks with simple business models and low-risk profiles has had significant consequences in the marketplace. Although there has been much debate about the appropriate level for the threshold, there is bipartisan agreement that \$50 billion is too low, including among Federal Reserve Chairman Powell, former Federal Reserve Bank Chairman Yellen, former Acting Comptroller Noreika, and former Comptroller Curry.

Current Federal Reserve Chairman Jay Powell said: “Our view has been that that combination of raising the threshold and giving us the ability to go below it in cases where needed gives us the tools that we need.”

Former Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen has said:

We’ve already said that we would favor some increase, if Congress sticks with a dollar threshold—that we would support some increase in the threshold. An approach based on business model or factors is also a workable approach from our point of view. Conceivably, some of the enhanced standards should apply to more firms with lower levels of assets, and others with higher levels. So I think either type of approach is something that we could—we could work with and would be supportive of.

That is the former Chair of the Federal Reserve.

Our bill rightsizes regulations by raising the \$50 billion threshold to \$250 billion. Banks with total assets below \$100 billion are exempt immediately from these enhanced standards, while those with between \$100 billion and \$250 billion are presumed exempt 18 months after the bill is enacted unless the Federal Reserve Board determines that they need to have some additional level of standard applied, and the Federal Reserve is given full authority to do so. The provision allows the Federal Reserve to tailor regulations to a bank’s business model and risk profile.

This provision in no way diminishes the effectiveness of prudential regulations, and it provides the Federal Reserve sufficient regulatory and supervisory discretion to apply these enhanced standards on any firm it deems a threat to systemic risk or safety and soundness.

Let me restate that. If you have heard any of the attacks, you have heard that the Federal Reserve will not be able to adequately regulate the banks anymore. The past two Chair-

men of the Federal Reserve have said that is not correct, but the bill itself provides that the Federal Reserve continues to have the authority to apply enhanced standards on any firm it deems a threat to systemic risk or safety and soundness.

So, again, for those who are attacking the bill, I think their arguments are unfounded and, frankly, based in an effort to try to create concern about a risk that does not exist.

This provision also requires the Federal Reserve to apply a periodic supervisory stress test to banks with between \$100 billion and \$200 billion in assets, something that is often overlooked by those commenting on the bill.

I have tried to go over some of the positive aspects of this bill and explain why its title is Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act and respond to some of the false, unfounded attacks on this bill.

This bill does not create any increased risk at the level of supervision for the megabanks, those that were intended to be the target of Dodd-Frank when it was adopted, but it does provide increased support for those community banks and credit unions, and those regional banks and midsized banks that are being so badly hurt and whose customers are being so deprived of needed and justified access to credit and capital. That is what this debate is about.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation as we move forward and help us bring economic growth, regulatory relief, and consumer protection to all Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, anyone tuning into the Senate floor this week is probably very confused right now, and that is because we are not debating how to address the scourge of gun violence plaguing this country, just 22 days after the horrific Parkland mass shooting and following a near-universal call from the American people for Congress to get serious about guns. They are debating it in the State legislature in Florida, but we just don’t have time in the U.S. Senate to debate this overarching issue of gun safety in our country.

The American people may be confused because we are not debating the fate of the 800,000 Dreamers and the uncertainty they still face; confused because we are not debating our crumbling infrastructure which, despite repeated calls from this President, we have seen nothing resembling a credible plan from him to fix our Nation’s bridges, roads, and water systems and provide broadband for rural Americans.

Democrats do have a real plan, and we should be debating that. But no. Instead, just 3 months after the passage of massive tax giveaways that handed

over more than \$1 trillion to the wealthiest Americans and megacorporations, we are here debating a giveaway to the world's biggest banks.

We have moved on from tax handouts to the wealthy, to taxpayer-funded bailouts for Wall Street megabanks. That is not my opinion. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office released their analysis of this bailout bill and noted that the risk of a financial crisis would go up under this legislation.

Why in the world is Congress doing anything that increases the risk of a financial crisis? It has only been 10 years since the great recession, but Republicans seem to have forgotten about that. Maybe that is why this week is so confusing—because the backers of this bill are not talking about the risk to the entire financial system they are enabling. They have forgotten that and are only talking about the benefits to community banks.

Yes, there are some benefits. Those of us on the other side of this legislation are not arguing about that point. You could probably find consensus among all 100 Senators in this body that there is a legitimate, targeted relief we can and should provide for those community banks, but that is far from all this bill does. This community bank relief is being used to protect the giveaways for some of the biggest banks in this country.

Anyone listening to the supporters of this legislation would have no idea that 25 of the 38 largest banks in the United States will have critical Dodd-Frank rules rolled back for them. Anyone listening would have no idea that banks with up to \$250 billion in assets are being told the current rules are too tough for them. These banks received \$48 billion in taxpayer-funded bailout money. Those banks are not community banks.

Now, a decade after the financial collapse of 2008, we are saying it is probably OK. We are pretty sure they have learned their lessons. We are pretty sure that now the big banks will put the economic security of the country ahead of their own profits.

So the bottom line: This bill, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, will increase risks to our entire economy, and the fact that the words “consumer protection” are mentioned last should make clear they are simply an afterthought.

When large institutions fail—whether it is Lehman Brothers, Enron, AIG—it is everyday working consumers who get hit the hardest and pay the highest price.

There is the rule on Wall Street: On the way up, the big guys clean up; on the way down, the little guys get cleaned out. We saw that during the last financial crisis, when millions of

Americans lost their jobs or their homes, and we are seeing it today, with increasingly common data breaches that compromise Americans' financial and personal information.

In recent years, devastating data breaches have become the new normal. The likes of Target, JPMorgan Chase, Yahoo, eBay, T.J.Maxx, Home Depot, and Sony are among so many who have become synonymous with massive data breaches.

Of course, there is Equifax, which is both a credit reporting agency and a data broker. Equifax's sole mission is using and profiting from consumers' most personal information, and they failed to protect that information. More than 145 million Americans' Social Security numbers, birth dates, addresses, and, in some instances, even driver's license numbers and credit card numbers were compromised because Equifax failed to institute even the most basic security protocols. It seems that, for the American consumer, every year is the year of the data breach, and they are sick and tired of their information falling into the wrong hands.

So as the Senate debates how to ensure financial institutions do not endanger the American economy the way they did during the financial crisis, we cannot forget our constituents' calls for new data protection rules. That is why I have filed my Data Broker Accountability and Transparency Act as an amendment to this legislation. I thank Senators BLUMENTHAL, SANDERS, and WHITEHOUSE for joining me.

My colleagues and I—Republican and Democratic alike—were outraged when we learned about the Equifax hack and how it hurts our constituents across the country, but what have we accomplished in the U.S. Senate since then? Nothing, and the threat is only growing.

We have an entire industry whose whole business model is predicated on profiting on Americans' most sensitive information. They are collecting it, storing it, selling it, and, in many instances, losing it in data hacks and breaches. Consumers don't even know who these companies are. They live in the shadows of our economy. Consumers rarely have any direct contact or business relationship with a data broker. Yet they know nearly everything about you. That is not just Social Security numbers, detailed credit histories, addresses, driver's license numbers. That is information on what you read, what music you listen to, your children, and your medical history.

In today's economy, you—the American consumer—are the commodity that is bought and sold in the open market. Right now, you have no rights. Data brokers are collecting, using, sharing Americans' personal information without your knowledge, without your consent.

Right now, American consumers are completely powerless. You can't say: Stop selling my information to any of these companies. That is unacceptable.

We need transparency; we need accountability. That is why I urge my colleagues to support my Data Broker Accountability and Transparency Act. My amendment would hold data brokers accountable.

First, my amendment allows consumers to access and correct the information that data brokers hold about them. Americans should be able to stop the spread of inaccurate information that could damage them personally and financially.

Second, my amendment provides consumers with the right to stop data brokers from using, sharing, or selling their personal information for marketing purposes.

Third, my amendment requires data brokers to implement comprehensive privacy and data security programs and to provide reasonable notice in the case of breaches. Equifax should have been required to have robust security to protect Americans' information. We must stop the next Equifax.

It has now been 6 months since the public became aware of that breach, and Congress has yet to enact any major legislation in response. We are still in the data broker Wild West. American consumers are still powerless, and the next breach could be around the corner.

Here is the financial services bill that we are taking up. Here is a bill that is directly related to these banks that we are talking about. Here is an opportunity for us to begin to figure out a way of protecting consumers in this data breach area where their financial records, where their health records, where their families' records could be compromised.

What is the solution? We are moving through legislation that deals with the problems the bankers say they have, but we are not dealing with problems consumers say they have with these financial institutions. When do we take up that bill? When do we finally say to the largest companies: What are the protections? What are the safeguards that are going to be constructed so that people's personal information is not compromised, so the data brokers aren't able to create a world in which everyone's information is just part of their profit-making opportunity?

That is what we should be talking about. Let's have a big debate here. Let's ensure that each and every one of these issues is dealt with.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment because we have to get to the heart of this Equifax issue. We have to actually deal with the world as it has changed. If the proponents of this bill say that the world has changed since the crash in 2008 and 2009, then the world has also changed

with regard to the potential for the compromise of the information of every American. Let's have that debate, as well, in the same bill.

I urge that my amendment be put in order, and I urge that the Members of the Senate support it. It is time for us to give those protections to consumers, which they are crying out for. No individual consumer is crying out for this change in the banking bill, but they are crying out for protections in a system where they have no voice, no way to ensure that their own family's personal data is not compromised.

I yield back to the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, I met in my office with four students from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, as well as one recent graduate. They are among the many students and graduates from Parkland, FL, who have been speaking out across the country, asking for commonsense gun safety reforms. They are having a real impact. They are changing the debate over guns in America.

Last week several of the Nation's largest gun retailers, including Dick's Sporting Goods and Walmart announced that they had listened to the Parkland students, and heard them. Dick's Sporting Goods announced it will no longer sell assault rifles or high capacity magazines at any of its stores. Their CEO also announced that the company would stop selling firearms to anyone under age 21. Walmart which had already stopped selling assault rifles, made the same decision to stop selling guns to people under 21, as did Kroger and L.L. Bean.

Making 21 the minimum age for buying any firearm is an idea that makes sense. It is already the law that a person must be 21 to buy a handgun. Why should the law be different for an assault rifle? In fact, President Trump

initially came out in support of the idea of making 21 the age limit for all gun purchases, but then the NRA's lobbyists went to work on the President with a private lunch and an Oval Office visit.

We will see who the President and Republicans ultimately end up listening to on commonsense proposals like these: the Parkland students or the gun sales lobby.

It is incredible to see students and businesses across the country taking a leadership role, in addressing gun violence. They have decided it is time to act, and they are acting. We have seen the Stoneman Douglas students convince companies to make meaningful changes when it comes to gun sales practices, and they have convinced many more companies to end their relationships with the NRA. That is a major development.

Unfortunately, the gun sales lobby has not been a constructive voice in this debate over the epidemic of gun violence. Their rhetoric has been increasingly paranoid and hysterical. It is clear that their priority is to preserve their ability to make gun sales. That is the gun lobby's agenda, but it doesn't need to be our agenda.

I want to commend the students and businesses that are showing such leadership in working to make our communities safer. Now the question is, Will the Republicans who control Congress show any leadership as well?

If we let the gun sales lobby control this debate, we will never take the steps we need to keep our schools and neighborhoods safe from gun violence. Remember, the NRA doesn't like any proposal that might hurt gun sales. They don't want to close loopholes in our laws, instead, they would rather roll back gun laws already on the books. That is not the agenda America needs.

I stand with the 97 percent of Americans who support universal background checks for gun sales. I want to close the loopholes in our laws that make it easy for dangerous people to get their hands on guns.

I also stand with the significant majorities of Americans who want to take military-style assault Weapons, high-capacity magazines, and bump stocks off of our streets. These are weapons of war, and they have no place in our neighborhoods.

We cannot become numb to the shootings that happen in our communities, our churches, our movie theaters, our concerts, and our schools. All of us, especially lawmakers, have to step up and take actions that will reduce the epidemic of gun violence and save lives.

I hope my Republican colleagues will finally step up and help get this done.

SYRIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the ongoing horrific vio-

lence in the nation of Syria, which seems to have hit yet new lows in terms of barbarity and Russian enabling. The senseless violence—in service of nothing more than enabling Syrian strongman Bashir al-Assad to maintain ironfisted rule over a country he has personally driven to ruin—demands the world's attention.

Quite simply, President Trump, who lambasted President Obama's approach to Syria, has sat by as the regime continues to use chemical weapons, relentlessly bomb civilians, ignore the unanimous U.N. Security Council ceasefire, and allows Iran to build its radical foothold in Syria. One missile strike is not a long term policy. President Trump's silence as Russian President Putin not only continues to meddle in our democracy but also empowers and enables the Syrian butcher is simply inexplicable and diminishes American leadership.

Let me start with the horror that has unfolded in Eastern Ghouta in the last few weeks. This area has actually been under siege by Syrian Government forces since 2013, but last week, Assad's henchmen stepped up their attacks. For over 2 weeks, Syrian forces supported by Russian warplanes have relentlessly bombarded Eastern Ghouta in a campaign that has killed over 1,000 people, wounded almost 5,000, and left 400,000 civilians trapped without food or medicine.

The siege had already led to chronic food and medicine shortages, devastating the population of Eastern Ghouta and leaving scores severely malnourished. The bombings have forced people to take shelter in their basements rather than risk death. Too frightened to venture outside to face the onslaught of mortar shells, barrel bombs, cluster bombs, and bunker-busting munitions, the civilian residents of Eastern Ghouta are being compelled to spend days without food or fresh air, suffocating in the heavily polluted air.

Despite the U.N. ceasefire, the number of dead climbs every day—from bombings, from ground assaults, and from hunger. Only yesterday, Assad's forces killed over 90 civilians and wounded over 300.

The number of casualties has overwhelmed rescuers and hospitals. Catastrophically, the Assad regime has chosen to re-employ one of its most heinous tactics and has bombed at least 28 hospitals and clinics. Doctors Without Borders said 15 of the 20 hospitals it supports have been destroyed or damaged, reducing access to emergency services just when they were most needed.

Doctors have run out of resources to treat patients. Doctors are being forced to make the most difficult choices and sometimes, tragically, leave critically wounded patients to die. A doctor in

Eastern Ghouta said, “We have a horrible situation here. We’re being targeted with all kinds of weapons non-stop. We lack everything, water, food, medical supplies, shelter. This is a disaster. Everyone is waiting to die.”

I spoke to a deeply respected friend from Chicago the other day who knows this crisis all too well, Dr. Mohammed Sahloul, who leads the heroic Syrian American Medical Association. He and his brave colleagues regularly travel to Syria to help provide medical treatment to victims of the war. He told me horrific accounts of the latest bombing and disappointment at the world’s seeming inaction amid such heinous cruelty.

U.N. Secretary General Antonio Guterres called Eastern Ghouta a “hell on Earth.” United Nations human rights chief Zeid Ra’ad al-Husseini called the onslaught in Eastern Ghouta a “monstrous campaign of annihilation.” He added, “When you are prepared to kill your own people so easily, lying is easy too. Claims by the government of Syria that it is taking every measure to protect its civilian population are frankly ridiculous.”

Most troublingly, Assad’s ruthless regime continues using chemical weapons to attack its own civilians despite Syria agreeing to eliminate its chemical weapons in 2013. We are in 2018 now and have seen the repeated use of chemicals to attack innocent people on the streets of Syria.

Among his various and numerous atrocities, Bashar al-Assad has made routine the use of internationally banned chemical weapons. He has deployed them against his own people nearly 200 times over 7 years. He has used them against very young children and the elderly, people who are clearly not fighters on the battlefield. He has targeted civilians repeatedly with sarin gas, a weapon notably developed by another abominable regime: the Nazis.

In 2013, Russia worked with a global coalition, including the United States, to ostensibly destroy Syria’s stockpile of chemical weapons, but the world watched in horror as Assad barbarically unleashed sarin gas on civilians in the town of Khan Shaykhun again in April 2017. Maybe you, too, saw the very disturbing reporting a week ago on “60 Minutes.”

While the United States responded to that incident, Russia has allowed Assad to conduct many other chemical attacks. In fact, in Eastern Ghouta, Assad has continued to attack civilians—among them at least 21 children—with chemical weapons. Just yesterday, doctors there said that at least 29 patients were showing effects consistent with exposure to chlorine munitions.

Instead of trying to stop this savage behavior, Russia stands by its client-state. Russia continues to obfuscate and deny these horrific attacks, despite

much evidence substantiating the use of chemical weapons.

In fact, Russia has seemingly condoned Assad’s cruel use of chemical weapons on innocent civilians. The United Nations was investigating Assad’s chemical attacks until late last year when Russia repeatedly blocked continuing the investigation. The U.N. investigation seemed to be getting too close to the truth for Russia’s comfort, so it used its vote to prevent the facts from being laid bare.

Unfortunately, Russia’s negative influence doesn’t end there. For 3 days, Russia blocked a ceasefire from taking hold in Eastern Ghouta. For 3 days, Russia delayed much-needed food, medicine, and emergency aid to reach the distressed civilian population. For 3 days, the entirety of the U.N. Security Council, save Russia, agreed an immediate ceasefire was necessary.

Even though the Security Council finally agreed to a 30-day ceasefire in Syria, Assad flouted international order as his warplanes continued to carry out airstrikes targeting civilians in Eastern Ghouta. He also launched a massive ground assault against Eastern Ghouta.

Hundreds of people have been killed since the ceasefire was supposed to have begun. The Assad regime has prevented humanitarian relief from reaching those who are hurt or sick, and no civilians have been able to leave because of the constant bombardment.

The man who runs the regional command in charge of U.S. troops in Syria, General Joseph Votel, has said that Russia plays “the role of both arsonist and fireman—fueling tensions and then trying to resolve them in their favor.” Instead of reasoning with its vassal-state and enforcing the ceasefire, Russia egregiously has prevented the ceasefire from taking hold.

Once again, Russia is abetting Assad’s defiance and destruction for its own perverse purposes. At the very least, it is abdicating its role as a permanent member of the Security Council.

What can be done about this devastating situation? Regrettably, there are no easy answers.

But a President who previously argued that “heinous actions by the Bashar al-Assad regime are a consequence of the last administration’s weakness and irresolution” has to demonstrate some resolve. I call on President Trump to put genuine pressure on Russian President Vladimir Putin to rein in Assad and end Russian obfuscation in the U.N. Security Council as the carnage and number of likely war crimes mount.

Any discussion with Putin must also address deeply troubling—and seemingly ignored—reports that Russian mercenaries controlled by Yevgeny Prigozhin attacked U.S. Special Operations Forces in Syria, with approval

of the highest levels of the Kremlin. Prigozhin is the same Russian oligarch who was recently indicted on charges of running a troll farm targeting American voters.

Donald Trump has also called on “all civilized nations” to help end the “slaughter and bloodshed in Syria.” I have to imagine that the United States is included in his exhortation. Unhappily, he has also recommended a 30-percent cut in our already minuscule foreign assistance and diplomacy budget. The United States must do more to meet the humanitarian needs of Syrians suffering the ravages of a dreadful war.

Incredibly, at a time when a long-term diplomatic and political solution will be needed in Syria, this administration has marginalized our top diplomatic expertise at the Department of State. This is wildly self-defeating.

We have taken a back seat to Russia and Iran in Syria long enough. We can see every day the devastating results: more violence and the further fracturing of a country and a region that have suffered at the hands of tyrants too long.

Despite the important achievement made by our military in destroying ISIS in Syria, Syria will remain a monumental security, humanitarian, and governance challenge for the United States and its allies, including Israel, for years to come. Russia and Iran are vying for the spoils of the civil war, with civilians paying the highest price. We don’t want to leave U.S. forces in Syria indefinitely, but doing nothing to bring a lasting peace to Syria is the worst option.

As such, President Trump, I call on your administration to come up with a real Syria strategy to bring an end to a war—and the senseless suffering—that has gone on for too long.

REMEMBERING MATT NIEMEYER

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to recognize and celebrate the life of a friend, a colleague, and a trusted adviser whom we tragically lost last week.

That is what Matt Niemeyer was to me, but Matt would say that he was a husband and a father first. Everything else was secondary. Matt leaves behind his beloved wife, Amy, and their two beautiful children, Anna and Peter.

I first met Matt in 2005 when he was an Assistant U.S. Trade Representative. He was well known in the trade community, and he stood out as a substantive expert in his field. Matt would say that his time at USTR was the most fun he had ever had in government. That says a lot as Matt also worked on Capitol Hill for the National Republican Congressional Committee and as a congressional liaison for a number of private companies and organizations throughout his life.

Matt played a key role in our successful efforts to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement. He was a happy warrior in that he loved trade, USTR, and getting things done. I think his thick skin and constant hopefulness was a credit to his upbringing as a long-suffering and then long-celebrating Boston Red Sox fan. He always found a way to get his mission accomplished and always had a quick wit.

I was lucky to remain close with Matt after our time together at USTR had ended. He would go to any length for his friends, and he was always thoughtful, kind, and jovial. He never passed at the opportunity to joke about one of his earliest experiences in politics, when he worked for the first primary opponent I ever faced. He would generously tell me how happy he was that, for one of the only times in his career, he wasn't successful in that job.

While Matt is no longer with us in person, his memory lives on through his family who love him dearly and friends and colleagues like myself who will forever cherish his impact on our lives.

TRIBUTE TO JANET JONES

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I wish to honor Janet Jones for her distinguished public service to the U.S. Senate.

Janet began her Senate career in the Office of the Senate Chief Counsel for Employment in 2006 as a litigation paralegal. Not long after that, she took on the tremendous responsibility of getting Senate offices prepared for their mandatory OSHA inspections by the congressional Office of Compliance.

During the 114th Congress alone, Janet pre-inspected almost a half-million square feet of office space, assisting Senate offices with identifying potential hazards and potential safety violations.

Janet's tireless work with Senate offices over the past 12 years has contributed to making the offices that serve this body safer for our employees, our visitors, and our constituents. With Janet's assistance, many Senate offices, including my own, have earned Safe Office Awards.

We will miss Janet's institutional knowledge and unparalleled professionalism.

Janet, thank you for your service, and I wish you great happiness in retirement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BILL GALT

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing a hard-working Montana rancher for his contributions to the community in

Meagher County. Bill Galt is a third-generation Montana rancher; he has been ranching all his life. His dedication to White Sulphur and the surrounding community, however, extends far beyond his work in agriculture.

Bill has rescued numerous folks from plane crashes and accidents on the Smith River as part of his volunteer search and rescue work. He has served on the White Sulphur Springs Airport Board, the Meagher County DUI Task Force, the Conservation District Board, and the Mountainview Medical Center Foundation, just to name a few.

Bill has been a volunteer firefighter and has volunteered with organizations such as the Boys and Girls Club and 4H. I would be remiss to not include his service in the U.S. Army Military Police Corps during Vietnam as well.

Bill is humble and civic-minded in all he does, and his service to Meagher has not gone unnoticed.

Thank you, Bill, for exemplifying what it means to be an active member of a Montana community. •

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 9:50 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 831. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Police Officer Scott Bashioum Post Office Building".

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 11:31 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1917. An act to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.

At 12:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1119. An act to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1119. An act to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1917. An act to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 8, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 831. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Police Officer Scott Bashioum Post Office Building".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4529. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4530. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commission Guidance on Pay Ratio Disclosure" (17 CFR Part 229 and 249) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4531. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commission Guidance Regarding Revenue Recognition for Bill-and-Hold Arrangements" (17 CFR Part 231, 241, and 271) received in the Office of the

President of the Senate on March 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4532. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updates to Commission Guidance Regarding Accounting for Sales of Vaccines and Bioterror Countermeasures to the Federal Government for Placement into the Pediatric Vaccine Stockpile or the Strategic National Stockpile" (17 CFR Part 231, 241, and 271) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4533. A communication from the Senior Regulatory Affairs Specialist, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf-Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments" (RIN1010-AD99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 6, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4534. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the progress made in licensing and constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4535. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Administering Section 113 of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4536. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Medicare Secondary Payer Commercial Repayment Center in Fiscal Year 2017"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4537. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Balanced System for Measuring Organizational and Employee Performance Within the Internal Revenue Service" ((RIN1545-BL88) (TD 9831)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4538. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2018 Trade Policy Agenda and 2017 Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4539. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2018-0018—2018-0023); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4540. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs of the Department of Homeland Security, transmitting legislative proposals relative to the President of the United States' Fiscal Year 2019 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4541. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2017 Annual Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4542. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4543. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustments" (RIN3245-AG96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2018; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-4544. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Assistance Provided to Foreign Aviation Authorities for FY 2017"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-179. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Gautier, Mississippi, urging the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to finalize a 2019–2024 National Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Program that maintains and expands access to Gulf of Mexico energy resources, and urging the United States Congress to keep its commitment under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act to share OCS revenues with Gulf producing states and their coastal political subdivisions, and to lift the existing cap on revenue-sharing with the Gulf Coast states; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-180. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 2519. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reform the renewable fuel program under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2520. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to ensure just and reasonable charges for inmate telephone and advanced communications services; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2521. A bill to authorize the issuance of extreme risk protection orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2522. A bill to provide for automatic acquisition of United States citizenship for certain internationally adopted individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2523. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicare program for FDA-approved qualifying colorectal cancer screening blood-based tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2524. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a loan repayment program for substance use disorder treatment employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RISC, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SASSE, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 2525. A bill to ensure that the Federal Government shall not take any discriminatory action against a person, wholly or partially on the basis that such person speaks, or acts, in accordance with a sincerely held religious belief or moral conviction that marriage is or should be recognized as a union of one man and one woman, or two individuals as recognized under Federal law, or that sexual relations outside marriage are improper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage retirement savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RISC, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2527. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2528. A bill to call on the United States and its partners to continue support for the Iranian people in their fight for freedom and prosperity; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the applicable percentage under the premium assistance tax credit for households with young adults; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2530. A bill to address the needs of individuals with disabilities within the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 2531. A bill for the determination of the taking of private property and damages caused by the Department of Interior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution to require certifications regarding actions by Saudi Arabia in Yemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 426. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. Res. 427. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Social Work Month during March 2018 and World Social Work Day on March 20, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. NELSON, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 428. A resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 429. A resolution commemorating the 59th anniversary of Tibet's 1959 uprising as "Tibetan Rights Day", and expressing support for the human rights and religious freedom of the Tibetan people and the Tibetan Buddhist faith community; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 177

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to provide for congressional review of the imposition of duties and other trade measures by the executive branch, and for other purposes.

S. 236

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 502

At the request of Ms. SMITH, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 502, a bill to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes.

S. 510

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 510, a bill to protect a woman's right and ability to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 545, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 639

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 639, a bill to clarify that nonprofit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity may accept donated mortgage appraisals, and for other purposes.

S. 781

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1016, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 1580

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

S. 1613

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1613, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to modernize the funding of wildlife conservation, and for other purposes.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1806

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1806, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, and for other purposes.

S. 1933

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1933, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2143

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2143, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment, to expand coverage under such Act, to provide a process for achieving initial collective bargaining agreements, and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes.

S. 2260

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2260, a bill to establish and fund an Opioids and STOP Initiative to expand, intensify, and coordinate fundamental, translational, and clinical research of the National Institutes of Health.

Health with respect to opioid abuse, the understanding of pain, and the discovery and development of safer and more effective treatments and preventive interventions for pain.

S. 2270

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2270, a bill to make improvements to the account for the State response to the opioid abuse crisis to improve tribal health.

S. 2296

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2296, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 2329

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

S. 2353

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2353, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes.

S. 2364

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2364, a bill to amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 to provide to State infrastructure financing authorities additional opportunities to receive loans under that Act to support drinking water and clean water State revolving funds to deliver water infrastructure to communities across the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2386

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2386, a bill to provide additional protections for our veterans.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S.

2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2469

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2469, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance efforts to address antibiotic resistance, and for other purposes.

S. 2475

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2475, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the illegal modification of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2495

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2495, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

S.J. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 2046

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2046 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2053

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2053 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2056

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2056 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2057

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2057 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2060

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2060 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2061

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2061 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2063

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2063 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2066

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2066 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2067

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2067 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2069

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2069 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2079

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2079 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2088

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a

cosponsor of amendment No. 2088 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2094

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2094 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2095

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2095 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2102

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2102 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2103

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2103 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2120

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2120 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2133

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2133 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2134

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2134 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage retirement savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Senator HATCH and I have introduced the Retirement Enhancement and Savings Act of 2018. This bill makes a number of improvements to our Nation's employer-provided retirement plans and is the result of several years of bipartisan work on the part of the Finance Committee. The Retirement Enhancement and Savings Act was unanimously reported out of the Finance Committee in the prior Congress, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The bill that Senator HATCH and I have introduced is identical to the bill reported by the Finance Committee except for updating effective dates, omitting provisions that already have been enacted into law, and several technical modifications to the provisions impacting the United States Tax Court and to the safe harbor for employers for annuity provider selection.

The safe harbor for annuity provider selection is a critical change to current law that will encourage employers to offer annuities to employees in 401(k) and other defined contribution retirement plans. Many employers are reluctant to offer annuities in these types of plans because of uncertainty about their liability in the event that an insurer becomes insolvent and is unable to pay benefits under the annuity. This safe harbor provides certainty for employers who select insurers who are financially capable of meeting their commitments and are in good standing with State regulators. The technical modification to the safe harbor is a one-word change that clarifies that the safe harbor is solely for the selection of the insurer and the possibility that the insurer may not be able to make payments due under the contract and is not a safe harbor for the selection of the contract. As under existing law, the plan fiduciary remains required to prudently select the type of annuity that is best for participants and beneficiaries.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2527. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a common sense piece of legislation that will expand the ability of the Small Business Administration (SBA) to nurture innovative and high-growth small businesses in Maryland and across the country.

Let me first say, I recently returned to the Senate Committee on Small

Business & Entrepreneurship as the Ranking Member. I look forward to continuing the important work of helping America's 29 million small businesses—the job creating engine of the country—access the essential capital to grow, to earn their fair share of Federal contracts, and to take advantage of SBA's counseling and mentoring programs that help entrepreneurs market and manage their businesses.

The Small Business Investment Opportunity Act is straightforward. It modifies SBA's Small Business Investment Company (SBIC) program by increasing the amount of capital that SBICs with a single fund can invest in qualifying small businesses.

The SBIC program stimulates investment in America's high-growth small businesses. SBICs are privately-owned and managed investment funds that use their own capital—plus funds borrowed with an SBA guaranty—to capitalize small businesses.

Last year, SBICs made 36 investments totaling \$61.3 million in 12 innovative Maryland firms. Over the past five years, the program has channeled more than \$21 billion of capital to 6,400 American small businesses across a variety of industries.

The program operates at no expense to taxpayers. Instead, the cost of the program is covered by fees paid by SBICs and their portfolio companies.

Consider this: since the program launched in 1958, SBIC has:

Deployed more than \$67 billion of capital;

Made more than 166,000 investments in American small businesses; and

Licensed more than 2,100 investment funds.

Some of America's most iconic brands have received investment capital from SBICs, including Apple, Tesla, Whole Foods, Staples, Intel, FedEx and Costco, among others.

Under current law, SBA can guarantee up to \$150 million of an SBIC investment fund. Our legislation increases that cap to \$175 million and unlocks additional capital for small businesses with high-growth potential. The cap has not been raised since 2009.

Raising this cap would simply keep up with inflation and maximize the amount of capital SBICs can direct to innovative small businesses that hire our workers, support our communities, drive innovation and help our country maintain its competitive edge.

This bill also builds upon a change that Senator RISCH, Senator SHAHEEN and I passed in 2015 to increase the maximum amount of leverage to SBICs with more than one fund. As some of my colleagues will recall, those types of SBICs are known as "Family of Funds."

As with the bill in 2015, the legislation we are introducing today is also bipartisan and bicameral. I am pleased the Small Business Investment Opportunity Act has the support of our

Chairman, Senator RISCH, as well as Senators SHAHEEN and KENNEDY. An identical bill passed the House last year, and the legislation is endorsed by the Small Business Investor Alliance.

Thank you, I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 426—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 426

Whereas, as of March 2018, there are more than 3,672,000,000 women in the world;

Whereas women around the world—

- (1) have fundamental rights;
- (2) participate in the political, social, and economic lives of their communities;
- (3) play a critical role in providing and caring for their families;
- (4) contribute substantially to economic growth and the prevention and resolution of conflict; and
- (5) as farmers and caregivers, play an important role in the advancement of food security for their communities;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas 2018 marks—

- (1) the 73rd anniversary of the entry into force of the Charter of the United Nations, which was the first international agreement to affirm the principle of equality between women and men;
- (2) the 23rd anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women, at which 189 countries committed to integrating gender equality into each dimension of society; and
- (3) the 7th anniversary of the establishment of the first United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, which includes a comprehensive set of commitments by the United States to advance the meaningful participation of women in decisionmaking relating to matters of war or peace;

Whereas the National Security Strategy of the United States, revised in December 2017—

- (1) declares that societies that empower women to participate fully in civic and economic life are more prosperous and peaceful;
- (2) supports efforts to advance the equality of women, protect the rights of women and girls, and promote women and youth empowerment programs; and
- (3) recognizes that governments of countries that fail to treat women equally do not allow the societies of those countries to reach full potential;

Whereas the United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, revised in June 2016, states that “[d]eadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become equal partners in all aspects of peacebuilding and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their voices heard, and their perspectives taken into account.”;

Whereas there are 72 national action plans around the world, and there are several addi-

tional national action plans known to be in development;

Whereas the joint strategy of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development entitled “Department of State & USAID Joint Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism” and dated May 2016—

- (1) notes that women can play a critical role in identifying and addressing drivers of violent extremism in their families, communities, and broader society; and
- (2) commits to supporting programs that engage women “as key stakeholders in preventing and countering violent extremism in their communities”;

Whereas, despite the historical underrepresentation of women in conflict resolution processes, women in conflict-affected regions have nevertheless achieved significant success in—

- (1) moderating violent extremism;
- (2) countering terrorism;
- (3) resolving disputes through nonviolent mediation and negotiation; and
- (4) stabilizing societies by improving access to peace and security—

(A) services;

(B) institutions; and

(C) venues for decisionmaking;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, peace negotiations are more likely to end in a peace agreement when women’s groups play an influential role in the negotiation process;

Whereas, according to a study by the International Peace Institute, a peace agreement is 35 percent more likely to last at least 15 years if women participate in the development of the peace agreement;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State, the full and meaningful participation of women in security forces vastly enhances the effectiveness of the security forces;

Whereas approximately 15,000,000 girls are married every year before they reach the age of 18, which means that—

- (1) 41,000 girls are married every day; or
- (2) 1 girl is married every 2 seconds;

Whereas, according to the International Labor Organization, an estimated 40,300,000 people were victims of modern slavery in 2016, and 71 percent of those victims were women and girls;

Whereas, according to UNICEF—

- (1) approximately ¼ of girls between the ages of 15 and 19 are victims of physical violence; and
- (2) it is estimated that 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of physical or sexual violence;

Whereas, according to the 2016 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime entitled “Global Report on Trafficking in Persons”—

- (1) 79 percent of all detected trafficking victims are women and children; and
- (2) while trafficking for the purposes of sexual exploitation and forced labor are the most prominently detected forms of trafficking, the trafficking of women and girls for the purpose of forced marriage is emerging as a more prevalent form of trafficking;

Whereas 603,000,000 women live in countries in which domestic violence is not criminalized;

Whereas, on August 10, 2012, the United States Government launched a strategy entitled “United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally”, which is the first interagency strategy that—

(1) addresses gender-based violence around the world;

(2) advances the rights and status of women and girls;

(3) promotes gender equality in United States foreign policy; and

(4) works to bring about a world in which all individuals can pursue their aspirations without the threat of violence;

Whereas, on October 6, 2017, the Women, Peace, and Security Act was enacted into law, which—

(1) requires the President to submit a government-wide “Women, Peace, and Security Strategy” describing how the United States would promote and strengthen the participation of women in peace negotiations and conflict prevention overseas;

(2) requires the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense to train personnel in matters related to the strategy of the President;

(3) requires the Department of State to brief the appropriate congressional committees on that training;

(4) encourages the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to establish guidelines for overseas personnel consulting with stakeholders regarding efforts to promote the participation of women in the mediation and negotiation processes; and

(5) requires the President to evaluate the impact of the “Women, Peace, and Security Strategy” and report the results to Congress;

Whereas, on October 27, 2017, Ambassador Michele J. Sison, United States Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations, stated in a United Nations Security Council debate on women, peace, and security that—

(1) the role of women in maintaining international peace and security is more critical than ever;

(2) collective work is still required for women to gain more positions of leadership in government and civil society, and more seats at the negotiating table;

(3) a growing body of evidence confirms that the inclusion of women in peace processes helps reduce conflict and advance stability long-term; and

(4) the involvement of women in efforts to bring about peace and security lead to more sustainable results;

Whereas, in June 2016, the Department of State released an update to the strategy entitled “United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally”, based on internal evaluations, lessons learned, and consultations with civil society, that underscores that “preventing and responding to gender-based violence is a cornerstone of the U.S. government’s commitment to advancing human rights and promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls”;

Whereas the ability of women and girls to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve—

(1) strong and lasting economic growth; and

(2) political and social stability;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—

(1) ⅓ of the 778,000,000 illiterate individuals in the world are female; and

(2) 130,000,000 girls worldwide are not in school;

Whereas, according to the United States Agency for International Development, as compared to uneducated women, educated women are—

- (1) less likely to marry as children; and
- (2) more likely to have healthier families;

Whereas, although the United Nations Millennium Project reached the goal of achieving gender parity in primary education in most countries in 2015, more work remains to be done to achieve gender equality in primary education worldwide by addressing—

- (1) discriminatory practices;
- (2) cultural norms;
- (3) inadequate sanitation facilities; and
- (4) other factors that favor boys;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, women have access to fewer income earning opportunities and are more likely to manage the household or engage in agricultural work than men, making women more vulnerable to economic insecurity caused by—

- (1) natural disasters; and
 - (2) long term changes in weather patterns;
- Whereas women around the world—

(1) face a variety of constraints that severely limit their economic participation and productivity; and

- (2) are underrepresented in the labor force;

Whereas closing the global gender gap in labor markets could increase worldwide gross domestic product by as much as \$28,000,000,000,000 by 2025;

Whereas despite the achievements of individual female leaders—

(1) women around the world remain vastly underrepresented in—

- (A) high-level positions; and

- (B) national and local legislatures and governments; and

(2) according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 22 percent of national parliamentarians and 17.7 percent of government ministers;

Whereas, according to the World Health Organization, during the period beginning in 1990 and ending in 2015, global maternal mortality decreased by approximately 44 percent, but approximately 830 women die from preventable causes relating to pregnancy or childbirth each day, and 99 percent of all maternal deaths occur in developing countries;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization—

(1) suicide is the leading cause of death for girls between the ages of 15 and 19; and

(2) complications from pregnancy or childbirth is the second-leading cause of death for those girls;

Whereas the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports that women and girls comprise approximately ½ of the 65,300,000 refugees and internally displaced or stateless individuals in the world;

Whereas it is imperative—

(1) to alleviate violence and discrimination against women; and

(2) to afford women every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities;

Whereas violence, discrimination, and harmful practices against women and girls are a direct result of negative social norms that undervalue females in society; and

Whereas March 8, 2018, is recognized as International Women's Day, a global day—

(1) to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women in the past, present, and future; and

(2) to recognize the obstacles that women face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of International Women's Day;

(2) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of a country to generate—

(A) economic growth;

(B) sustainable democracy; and

(C) inclusive security;

(3) recognizes and honors individuals in the United States and around the world, including women human rights defenders and civil society leaders, that have worked throughout history to ensure that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights;

(4) recognizes the unique cultural, historical, and religious differences throughout the world and urges the United States Government to act with respect and understanding toward legitimate differences when promoting any policies;

(5) reaffirms the commitment—

(A) to end discrimination and violence against women and girls;

(B) to ensure the safety and welfare of women and girls;

(C) to pursue policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide; and

(D) to promote meaningful and significant participation of women in every aspect of society and community;

(6) supports sustainable, measurable, and global development that seeks to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of women; and

(7) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 427—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SOCIAL WORK MONTH DURING MARCH 2018 AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY ON MARCH 20, 2018

Ms. STABENOW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 427

Whereas the profession of social work is—

(1) dedicated to enhancing the well-being of others and meeting the basic needs of all people, especially the most vulnerable people in society; and

(2) expected to grow faster than average relative to all professions over the next 6 years, with more than 649,000 individuals expected to be employed as social workers by 2024;

Whereas social workers embody the theme of Social Work Month in 2018, which is “Social workers: Leaders. Advocates. Champions.”;

Whereas social workers are—

(1) employed throughout society, including in government, schools, universities, social service agencies, the military, and health care and mental health organizations;

(2) the largest group of providers of mental health services in the United States; and

(3) present in times of crisis, helping—

(A) individuals overcome issues such as the death of a loved one and grief; and

(B) individuals and communities recover from natural disasters, including floods and hurricanes;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs is one of the largest employers of social workers who hold advanced degrees;

Whereas, for decades, social workers have pushed to ensure rights for all people, including women, African Americans, Latinos, individuals who are disabled, individuals who are LGBTQ, and various ethnic, cultural, and religious groups;

Whereas the profession of social work has helped bring about some of the most profound, positive changes in society over the past century, including improvements with respect to—

- (1) voting rights;
- (2) workplace safety;
- (3) the minimum wage; and
- (4) social safety net programs that help prevent poverty and hunger; and

Whereas social workers continue to engage and bring together individuals, communities, agencies, and units of government in order to help society address some of the most pressing current issues, including—

- (1) immigration reform;
- (2) ensuring equal rights for all people;
- (3) providing affordable and good health care and mental health care for all individuals; and
- (4) protecting the environment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Social Work Month during March 2018 and World Social Work Day on March 20, 2018;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups that promote the importance of social work and observe Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(3) encourages individuals to engage in appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote further awareness of the life-changing role that social workers play; and

(4) with gratitude, recognizes the contributions of the millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work.

SENATE RESOLUTION 428—RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINAS IN THE UNITED STATES

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. NELSON, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 428

Whereas the United States celebrates National Women's History Month every March to recognize and honor the achievements of women throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas there are more than 27,000,000 Latinas living in the United States;

Whereas 1 in 6 women in the United States is a Latina;

Whereas Latinas have helped shape the history of the United States since its inception;

Whereas Latinas contribute to the society of the United States through working in many industries, including business, education, science and technology, medicine, engineering, mathematics, literature and the arts, the military, agriculture, hospitality, and public service at every level of government;

Whereas Latinas come from diverse cultures across North America, Central America, and the Caribbean, and Afro-Latinas face disparities in recognition;

Whereas Latinas are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of the Federal Government, including the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Senate, and the United States House of Representatives;

Whereas Latinas make up an estimated 15 percent of women in the Armed Forces, and in 2006 Angela Salina became the first Latina general in the United States Marine Corps;

Whereas Latinas are breaking the glass ceiling in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, such as Ellen Ochoa, who became the first Latina to go into space during a 9-day Space Shuttle Discovery mission in 1993;

Whereas Latinas own more than 1,400,000 businesses and 1 in 9 women-owned companies in the United States is owned by a Latina;

Whereas Latina activists have led the fight for civil rights, including Dolores Huerta who cofounded the United Farm Workers and advocates for the rights of immigrants, agricultural workers, and women;

Whereas Latinas create award-winning art and are recipients of Emmy, Grammy, Oscar, and Tony awards, including Rita Moreno who earned all 4 awards between 1961 and 1977;

Whereas Latina singers and songwriters, like Selena, also known as the Queen of Tejano music, and Celia Cruz, also known as the Queen of Salsa, have made lasting and significant contributions to music throughout the world;

Whereas Latinas serve in the medical profession, including Antonia Novello, who became the first female and first Hispanic Surgeon General of the United States in 1990;

Whereas Latinas are paid just 55 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men;

Whereas, in the face of societal obstacles, including unequal pay, disparities in education, health care needs, and civil rights struggles, Latinas continue to break through and thrive;

Whereas the United States should continue to invest in the future of Latinas to address the barriers they face; and

Whereas, by 2060, Latinas will represent one third of the female population of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates and honors the successes of Latinas and the contributions they have made and continue to make to the United States; and

(2) recognizes the changes that are still to be made to ensure that Latinas can realize their full potential as equal members of society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 429—COMMEMORATING THE 59TH ANNIVERSARY OF TIBET'S 1959 UPRISING AS "TIBETAN RIGHTS DAY", AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE HUMAN RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF THE TIBETAN PEOPLE AND THE TIBETAN BUDDHIST FAITH COMMUNITY

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 429

Whereas March 10, 2018, marks the 59th anniversary of the 1959 uprising in Tibet, during which the people of Lhasa, fearing for the life of the Dalai Lama, surrounded his residence, organized a guard, and called for the withdrawal of Chinese forces from Tibet and the restoration of Tibet's freedom;

Whereas Chinese statistics estimate 87,000 Tibetans were killed, arrested, or deported to labor camps during the suppression of the 1959 uprising, which also forced the Dalai Lama and tens of thousands of other Tibetans to flee into exile;

Whereas March 10, 2018, also marks the 10th anniversary of a series of protests in Lhasa, which spread across Tibet, and which were suppressed by Chinese forces;

Whereas, according to the Department of State, the Government of the People's Republic of China is engaged in the severe repression of Tibet's unique religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage, and is engaged in gross violations of human rights in Tibet, including extrajudicial detentions, disappearances, and torture;

Whereas, in the ten years since the 2008 protests, at least 152 Tibetans in Tibet are known to have self-immolated, with statements or records left by these self-immolators calling for freedom for Tibet and the return of the Dalai Lama;

Whereas, in 1961, with the support of the United States, the United Nations General Assembly recognized the Tibetan people's "fundamental human rights and freedoms, including the right to self-determination";

Whereas, on October 18, 2007, Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to the Dalai Lama, finding that he is recognized around the world as a leading figure of moral and religious authority, and is the unrivaled spiritual and cultural leader of the Tibetan people;

Whereas Buddhists in Tibet, the United States, India, Nepal, Bhutan, Mongolia, Russia, and other countries where followers of Tibetan Buddhism reside look to the Dalai Lama for religious leadership and spiritual guidance;

Whereas, in its 2017 annual report, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom noted that "[t]he Chinese government claims the power to select the next Dalai Lama with the help of a law that grants the government authority over reincarnations," which purports to require all Tibetan Buddhist leaders to obtain the approval of the Government of the People's Republic of China in order to reincarnate;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has interfered in the identification and installation of reincarnated leaders of Tibetan Buddhism, as part of its efforts to maintain control over Tibet, including in 1995 arbitrarily detaining the recently identified 11th Panchen Lama, then a six-year-old boy, and purporting to install China's own candidate as Panchen Lama;

Whereas, in 2011, the 14th Dalai Lama declared that the responsibility for identifying a future 15th Dalai Lama will rest with officials of the Dalai Lama's private office and that "apart from the reincarnation recognized through such legitimate methods, no recognition or acceptance should be given to a candidate chosen for political ends by anyone, including those in the People's Republic of China";

Whereas, in 1981, the United Nations General Assembly passed the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, which provides that freedom of religion

shall include the freedom to "train, appoint, elect or designate by succession appropriate leaders called for by the requirements and standards of any religion or belief"; and

Whereas Congress has long held that the right to freedom of religion undergirds the very origin and existence of the United States, and that freedom of religious belief and practice is a universal human right and fundamental freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes March 10, 2018, as "Tibetan Rights Day";

(2) affirms its recognition of His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama for his outstanding contributions to peace, nonviolence, human rights, and religious understanding;

(3) affirms its support for the Tibetan people's fundamental human rights and freedoms, including their right to self-determination and the protection of their distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and national identity;

(4) expresses its sense that the identification and installation of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is a matter that should be determined solely within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community, in accordance with the inalienable right to religious freedom;

(5) expresses its sense that any attempt by the Government of the People's Republic of China to identify or install its own candidate as a Tibetan Buddhist religious leader, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is invalid interference in the right to religious freedom of Tibetan Buddhists around the world, including in Tibet as well as the United States and elsewhere; and

(6) calls on the Secretary of State to fully implement the provisions of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (subtitle B of title VI of Public Law 107-228; 22 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), in cooperation with like-minded states where appropriate, including that—

(A) representatives of the United States Government in exchanges with officials of the Government of the People's Republic of China should call for and otherwise promote the cessation of all interference by the Government of the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party in the religious affairs of the Tibetan people;

(B) the United States Ambassador to the People's Republic of China should meet with the 11th Panchen Lama, who was arbitrarily detained on May 17, 1995, and otherwise ascertain information concerning his whereabouts and well-being; and

(C) the Secretary of State should make best efforts to establish an office in Lhasa, Tibet, to monitor political, economic, and cultural developments in Tibet.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2156. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2157. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2158. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2159. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2160. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2161. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2162. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2163. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2164. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2165. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2166. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2167. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2168. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2169. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2170. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2171. Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEE, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2172. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2173. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2174. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2175. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2176. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2177. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2178. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2179. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2180. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2181. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2182. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2183. Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2184. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2185. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2186. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2187. Mr. KAINÉ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2188. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2189. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2190. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2191. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself,

Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2156. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 504. REPORT ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN REAL ESTATE IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on foreign investment in real estate in the United States that includes the following:

(1) For each of the 30 years preceding such date of enactment, an estimate of the following:

(A) The total amount of foreign investment in real estate in the United States.

(B) The amount of investment described in subparagraph (A), disaggregated by—

(i) each of the 10 foreign countries from which the most such investment originates;

(ii) each covered foreign country; and

(iii) investment by public and private entities.

(C) The total amount of foreign investment in real estate in the United States in the 20 metropolitan statistical areas with the most such investment.

(D) The amount of investment described in subparagraph (C), disaggregated by—

(i) each of the metropolitan statistical areas described in that subparagraph;

(ii) each covered foreign country; and

(iii) investment by public and private entities.

(E) The total amount of foreign investment in real estate in the United States in the 10 States with the most such investment.

(F) The amount of investment described in subparagraph (E), disaggregated by—

(i) each of the States described in that subparagraph;

(ii) each covered foreign country; and

(iii) investment by public and private entities.

(2) An estimate of the percentage of the average home price in the metropolitan statistical areas described in paragraph (1)(C) attributable to foreign investment in real estate.

(3) An estimate of the percentage of the average home price in the States described in paragraph (1)(E) attributable to foreign investment in real estate.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED COUNTRY.—The term “covered country” means—

(A) Argentina;

- (B) Brazil;
- (C) Canada;
- (D) Colombia;
- (E) Germany;
- (F) Japan;
- (G) Norway;
- (H) the People's Republic of China;
- (I) Singapore;
- (J) South Korea;
- (K) Switzerland;
- (L) the United Arab Emirates; and
- (M) Venezuela.

(3) METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA.—The term “metropolitan statistical area” has the meaning given that term by the Office of Management and Budget.

SA 2157. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 104 of the amendment.

SA 2158. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 308. SAFEGUARDS TO PREVENT DISPLACEMENT OF SENIORS.

Section 255(j) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20(j)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(j) SAFEGUARDS TO PREVENT DISPLACEMENT OF HOMEOWNERS.—

“(1) DEFERRAL OF OBLIGATIONS OF HOMEOWNERS.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) LOSS MITIGATION IN CASES OF DELINQUENT TAXES, INSURANCE, AND HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION FEES.—

“(A) REQUIREMENT.—In the case of a mortgage insured under this section that is in default by reason of failure to pay taxes or insurance required under the mortgage or homeowners association fees, the Secretary shall require that the mortgagee, as a precondition of sending a due and payable request to the Secretary, take appropriate loss mitigation actions, which may include—

“(i) establishing a realistic repayment plan for the delinquency;

“(ii) assisting the borrower in contacting a housing counseling agency approved by the Secretary to obtain free assistance with—

“(I) finding a viable resolution to the delinquency; or

“(II) identifying local resources available to provide funds or homestead exemptions;

“(iii) refinancing the delinquent mortgage into a new home equity conversion mortgage if—

“(I) there is sufficient equity to satisfy the existing mortgage and the delinquency; and

“(II) the applicant for refinancing meets the financial assessment guidelines of the Secretary;

“(iv) extending the deadline for foreclosure in a case in which the youngest living borrower—

“(I) is not less than 80 years of age; and

“(II) has critical circumstances, such as a terminal illness, long-term physical disability, or unique occupancy need;

“(v) refraining from submitting a due and payable request to the Secretary in a case in which the total arrearage for the delinquency is not more than \$2,000; and

“(vi) any other loss mitigation action the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(B) TREATMENT OF NON-BORROWING SPOUSES.—For purposes of loss mitigation required under subparagraph (A), a mortgagee shall treat a non-borrowing spouse as a borrower.

“(C) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—In the case of a claim for insurance benefits for a mortgage insured under this section made by a mortgagee who fails to comply with the requirement under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may reduce or deny those benefits based on that failure.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) BORROWER.—The term ‘borrower’, with respect to a mortgage insured under this section—

“(i) means the original borrower under the note and mortgage; and

“(ii) does not include successors or assigns of the original borrower.

“(B) NON-BORROWING SPOUSE.—The term ‘non-borrowing spouse’, with respect to a borrower under a mortgage insured under this section, means the spouse of the borrower who is not a borrower.”.

SA 2159. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, “primary financial regulatory agency” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301).

(b) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision in this title, this title shall not take effect until 30 days after the date on which each Federal primary financial regulatory agency has certified by order and in a report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that the primary financial regulatory agency has issued a final rule for each applicable regulation required under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), and any amendment made by that Act.

SA 2160. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 401, add the following:

() NO RELIEF FOR BAD ACTORS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) BAD ACTOR.—The term “bad actor” means a bank holding company with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000 if the company, its predecessor, or any of its subsidiaries was subject to an order, judgment, or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction entered on or after July 21, 2010, or a final order of an Executive agency entered on or after July 21, 2010, that—

(i) is the result of an enforcement action initiated by an Executive agency or State attorney general;

(ii) imposes penalties for violations—

(I) of any Federal or State law related to mortgage origination, servicing, or foreclosure processing, as defined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; or

(II) involving the offer or sale of residential mortgage-backed securities or any financial instrument that references residential mortgage-backed securities under—

(aa) the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b et seq.); or

(bb) the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.); and

(iii) imposes monetary penalties of more than \$1,000,000.

(B) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term “Executive agency” has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision in this title, a bad actor shall be subject to standards or requirements under sections 116(a), 121(a), 155(d), 163(b), 164, and 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5326(a), 5331(a), 5345(d), 5363(b), 5364, 5365) that are no less stringent than the standards or requirements applicable to the bad actor on December 1, 2017.

SA 2161. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 401, add the following:

() QUANTITATIVE OR QUALITATIVE OBJECTIONS TO CAPITAL PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any bank holding company with total consolidated assets greater than \$50,000,000,000 that, in the preceding 5 years, has received a quantitative or qualitative objection or conditional nonobjection to a capital plan submitted to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System pursuant to the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review conducted under section 225.8 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be—

(A) considered a bank holding company with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$250,000,000,000 with respect to the application of standards or requirements under—

(i) sections 116(a), 121(a), 155(d), 163(b), 164, and 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5326(a), 5331(a), 5345(d), 5363(b), 5364, 5365); and

(ii) paragraph (2)(A) of the second subsection (s) (relating to assessments) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(s)(2)); and

(B) subject to annual analyses to evaluate whether the bank has the capital, on a total consolidated basis, necessary to absorb

losses as a result of adverse economic conditions.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—Each analysis described in paragraph (1)(B) shall provide for at least 3 different sets of conditions under which the evaluation required by that paragraph shall be conducted, including baseline, adverse, and severely adverse.

SA 2162. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 110.

SA 2163. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FINANCIAL FINES AND CRIMES REGISTRY.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “covered agency” means—

- (1) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;
- (2) the Federal Housing Finance Agency;
- (3) the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency;
- (4) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;
- (5) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection;
- (6) the Securities and Exchange Commission;
- (7) the Department of Justice;
- (8) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
- (9) the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; and
- (10) the Department of the Treasury.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Each covered agency shall establish and make accessible on a public website a database to be known as the “Financial Fines and Crimes Registry” that shall list all penalties (civil and criminal) that the covered agency has assessed in the previous 20 years against any financial institution, as defined under section 5312(a) of title 31, United States Code, with assets greater than \$50,000,000,000 at the time the penalty was assessed, including any actions taken by the covered agency against an executive, director, or officer of the financial institution.

SA 2164. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. INVESTOR CHOICE.

(a) **ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS IN THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**—Section 15(o) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(o)) is amended to read as follows: “(o) **LIMITATIONS ON PRE-DISPUTE AGREEMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provi-

sion of law, it shall be unlawful for any broker, dealer, funding portal, or municipal securities dealer to enter into, modify, or extend an agreement with customers or clients of such entity with respect to a future dispute between the parties to such agreement that—

“(1) mandates arbitration for such dispute; “(2) restricts, limits, or conditions the ability of a customer or client of such entity to select or designate a forum for resolution of such dispute; or

“(3) restricts, limits, or conditions the ability of a customer or client to pursue a claim relating to such dispute in an individual or representative capacity or on a class action or consolidated basis.”.

(b) **ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS IN THE INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.**—Section 205(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-5(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful for any investment adviser to enter into, modify, or extend an agreement with customers or clients of such entity with respect to a future dispute between the parties to such agreement that—

“(1) mandates arbitration for such dispute; “(2) restricts, limits, or conditions the ability of a customer or client of such entity to select or designate a forum for resolution of such dispute; or

“(3) restricts, limits, or conditions the ability of a customer or client to pursue a claim relating to such dispute in an individual or representative capacity or on a class action or consolidated basis.”.

(c) **APPLICATION.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any agreement entered into, modified, or extended after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2165. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “bank” and “credit union” have the meanings given those terms in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301).

(b) **REVIVAL OF THE ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS RULE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Joint Resolution entitled “Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to ‘Arbitration Agreements,’” approved November 1, 2017 (Public Law 115-74), is repealed.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), part 1040 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on October 31, 2017, shall be applied and administered as if the Joint Resolution described in paragraph (1) had not been enacted.

(B) **EXEMPTION FOR COMMUNITY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—Part 1040 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply to any bank or credit union that, together with its affiliates, has less than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets.

SA 2166. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) **FINDINGS ON THE COSTS OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS.**—

(A) The 2007–2008 financial crisis, which led to the near-total collapse of the global financial system had both measurable and immeasurable costs to the economy of the United States and virtually every working family, throwing the United States into the longest and deepest recession in generations. The costs of that crisis are staggering and long-lasting by every measure.

(B) The crisis ravaged our economy, costing more than \$16,000,000,000,000 or about \$120,000 for every United States household.

(C) Tens of millions of Americans lost their jobs as the number of unemployed climbed to 14,700,000 over the course of the recession, and the number of underemployed and discouraged job seekers who gave up work rose to 12,000,000, a 94 percent increase.

(D) The unemployment rate also shot up to a high of 10 percent, up from 6.6 percent in October 2008. Research shows that many young people who entered into a terrible job market will suffer permanently lower income prospects over the course of their careers.

(E) During the 2007–2008 financial crisis, known as the “Great Recession”, long-term unemployment was significantly higher and persisted longer than in any previous period in data that go back to the late 1940s.

(F) At the outset of the recovery from the Great Recession there were 7 people looking for jobs for every one opening.

(G) The consequences of the crisis were particularly severe for minority populations. In late 2009, white Americans jobless rate peaked at 9.2 percent. For African-Americans, however, the jobless rate climbed as high as a staggering 16.8 percent in March 2010. Additionally, the jobless rate for Hispanics hit a peak of 13 percent in August 2009.

(H) Facing mounting unemployment and in many cases harsh and deceptive mortgage servicing practices, foreclosures displaced more than 11,000,000 Americans, which pushed down home prices, contributing to an average decline in home values of more than 30 percent.

(I) As many lost their jobs, they also lost their health insurance, driving nearly 4,000,000 Americans into the Medicaid program in 2009 alone.

(J) Median family income fell to \$45,800 in 2010 from \$49,600 in 2007, with low-income and middle-class families sustaining the largest percentage losses in both wealth and income during the crisis.

(K) Once again, the Great Recession had the most profound impact on African-Americans whose wealth declined by approximately 52 percent, and Latino households whose wealth declined by 66 percent, compared to a 16 percent decrease in wealth for White households.

(L) The Great Recession also reduced the value of homes disproportionately for minorities, as the average real home values for Latino homeowners decreased nearly \$100,000

or 35 percent and nearly \$69,000 or 31 percent for African-American homeowners, while the average home values for White homeowners fell 15 percent over this same period.

(M) Equity investments also dramatically declined, with the stock market falling by more than 50 percent in just 18 months, from October 2007 to March 2009.

(N) Declining stock market values also hit assets in retirement accounts such as 401(k)s that lost \$2,800,000,000,000, or about one third of their value between September 2007 and December 2008.

(O) Home prices across the nation fell about 30 percent from their peak in April 2006 until the end of the recession in June 2009.

(P) The poverty rate steadily rose 2.5 percentage points from 2007 to 2012, with 46,500,000 people living in poverty in 2012.

(Q) Real Gross Domestic Product in the United States in the fourth quarter of 2008, and the first and second quarters of 2009, decreased by an annual rate of about 5.4 percent, 6.4 percent, and 0.7 percent, respectively.

(R) Just as so many Americans had lost their jobs, their homes, and their retirement savings through no fault of their own, making it harder and harder for Americans to draw on credit to make ends meet. Faced with financial difficulty, more than 1,400,000 households declared bankruptcy in 2009, on top of the 1,100,000 who did so in 2008.

(S) From 2008 to 2014, more than 500 financial institutions failed.

(T) In addition to households, businesses (particularly small businesses) felt the effects of the crisis. Unlike larger firms which rely more on capital markets for funding, small businesses, which are more dependent on capital from traditional banks, other financial institutions, or the personal borrowing by owners, were hit hard by the credit crunch which made credit more scarce and expensive. With nearly 40 percent of the country's private-sector workforce employed by small businesses, the economic impact was substantial.

(U) The United States Government created various emergency programs and provided more than \$12,000,000,000,000 in direct support to the United States financial institutions, not including pre-crisis provisions such as deposit insurance limits by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the traditional monetary policy operations and lender-of-last-resort functions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(V) After the worst of the crisis subsided, it became clear that a massive reform of the financial system of the United States was necessary to reset the economy and prevent a future crisis.

(W) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act accomplished that goal, providing accountability, transparency and creating a stable financial system essential to grow the economy and create jobs.

(X) U.S. authorities collected more than \$150,000,000,000 in fines from financial institutions for deceptive practices involving subprime mortgages since the beginning of the credit crisis in 2007, including for systemic failures in record retention, mortgage servicing errors or abuses, misleading investors with fraudulent underwriting, inflated appraisals, and misstating capital levels.

(2) FINDINGS OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS INQUIRY COMMISSION.—

(A) Established as part of the of the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act (Public Law 111-21) passed by Congress and signed by the

President in May 2009, the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission was created to “examine the causes, domestic and global, of the current financial and economic crisis in the United States.”.

(B) The majority report issued by the Commission found that the crisis was primarily caused by the collapse of a housing bubble that was fueled by deteriorating mortgage lending standards and mortgage securitization. The majority report specifically concluded that—

(i) the crisis was avoidable because it was the product of human action and inaction, both by regulators and in the private sector, in the face of numerous clear warning signs;

(ii) widespread failures in financial regulation and supervision were devastating; for example, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System failed to write mortgage rules, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Office of Thrift Supervision preempted State regulators from reining in mortgage abuses, the Securities and Exchange Commission failed to regulate investment banks, and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and other regulators failed to stem excesses at large companies and did not identify problems and take corrective action towards troubled companies until it was too late;

(iii) there were dramatic failures of corporate governance and risk management at many systemically important firms, as companies recklessly took on risk, including enormous exposures to subprime mortgages and mortgage-related securities, because mathematical models were over-relied upon, compensation structures rewarded short-term risk without regard for longer-term consequences, and management often was ignorant of significant risk-taking, which enabled a combination of excessive borrowing, risky investments, and lack of transparency that put the financial system on a collision course with crisis;

(iv) companies took on excessive amounts of leverage, often through non-transparent off-balance-sheet vehicles or over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives, and relied excessively on short-term borrowing; borrowed funds were often used to acquire risky assets;

(v) the Government was ill-prepared for the crisis, largely because of lack of transparency in key markets, and inconsistent Government decisions about whether to save failing firms increased uncertainty and panic;

(vi) regulators did not foresee the broad systemic effects caused by the bursting of the housing bubble and did not fully appreciate the dire condition of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac until just before taking it over;

(vii) there was a systemic breakdown in accountability and ethics, in which borrowers took out loans they had no ability, sometimes even no intention, to repay and lenders knowingly made such loans, while securitizers packaged loans without regard to quality and regulators failed to say “no”;

(viii) collapsing mortgage lending standards and the mortgage securitization pipeline lit and spread the flame of contagion and crisis;

(ix) lenders offloaded risks associated with bad loans by selling them into a secondary market in which investors were eager to buy mortgage-related securities, which transformed toxic mortgages into toxic securities that were spread to investors around the globe;

(x) OTC derivatives contributed significantly to the crisis;

(xi) credit default swaps fueled mortgage securitization and enabled creation of synthetic collateralized debt obligations, which amplified losses by allowing multiple bets on the same securities which were spread throughout the system; and

(xii) failures of the credit rating agencies were essential cogs in the wheel of financial destruction because they gave seals of approval, which investors blindly relied upon, to poor-quality mortgages and mortgage-backed securities based on inadequate analytical models.

(3) FINDINGS ON THE ECONOMY SINCE THE ENACTMENT OF THE DODD-FRANK ACT.—

(A) Since enactment of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in the third quarter of 2010, the United States economy has grown by 16.1 percent, more than twice as fast as other advanced economies such as the Euro Area and Japan.

(B) Since passage of the Act, the economy has added a total of 17,607,000 private sector jobs, and the unemployment rate has fallen to 4.1 percent in January 2018 from the crisis high of 10 percent.

(C) Average hourly earnings for private employees increased nearly 3 percent in 2016, the fastest 12-month pace since the financial crisis. Average hourly earnings for private employees increased nearly 2.5 percent in 2017. From January 2017 to January 2018, average hourly earnings for private employees increased by .8 percent.

(D) According to the most recent data, community banks, which represent 92 percent of all insured institutions, are posting record profits since the crisis. In the third quarter of 2017, community banks posted a net income of \$6,000,000,000, a 9.4 percent increase from the same quarter in 2016.

(E) In the first quarter of 2011, just before the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection opened its doors, banks collectively posted profits of \$29,000,000,000. In 2016, the industry set an all-time record of \$171,300,000,000 in profits. In the most recent quarter, banks posted profits of \$47,900,000,000, a 5.2 percent increase from the same quarter in 2016.

(F) Since 2009, corporate profits in the financial sector have steadily increased. From 2010 to the third quarter of 2017, total profits after tax have increased by 26.4 percent.

(G) In 2017, the percentage of unprofitable banks decreased to 3.9 percent of all institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the third quarter of 2017 from 4.6 percent of all institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the third quarter of 2016. Only 21 banks failed between 2015 and 2018.

(H) Community banks showed strong growth in residential, commercial, and industrial loans, and in small business lending. In fact, overall loan growth at community banks has been faster than at bigger banks. In the fourth quarter of 2016, lending was up 7.3 percent for community banks, and 3.5 percent for all institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(I) Federally insured credit unions have substantially increased membership, assets, net income, and loans since the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection opened its doors in 2011. Credit union membership has expanded by 20,400,000 since 2010, which now stands at more than 111,900,000 members nationwide.

(J) Risk-weighted capital in the United States banking sector has increased by 41 percent since 2009, meaning that banks are significantly safer today than prior to the financial crisis.

(K) United States taxpayers gave \$187,000,000,000 to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. As the enterprises have stabilized, they have paid back \$271,000,000,000 to the Department of the Treasury. In total, the Department of the Treasury spent \$626,400,000,000 in funds, and taxpayers have received \$713,400,000,000 in refunds, dividends, interest, warrants, and other proceeds.

SA 2167. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL.

The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by that Act are restored or revived as if the Act had not been enacted.

SA 2168. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE VI—FINANCIAL SERVICES
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Financial Services Conflict of Interest Act”.

**SEC. 602. RESTRICTIONS ON PRIVATE SECTOR
PAYMENT FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE.**

Section 209 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “any salary” and inserting “any bonus or salary”; and

(B) by striking “his services” and inserting “services rendered or to be rendered”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” after “(b)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), a pension, retirement, group life, health or accident insurance, profit-sharing, stock bonus, or other employee welfare or benefit plan that makes payment of compensation contingent on accepting a position in the Federal Government shall not be considered bona fide.

“(3) For purposes of paragraph (2), compensation includes a retention award or bonus, severance pay, and any other payment linked to future service in the Federal Government in any way.”.

**SEC. 603. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SLOWING THE REVOLVING DOOR AMONG
FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“TITLE VI—SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR
FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORS**

“SEC. 601. DEFINITIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In this title, the terms ‘designated agency ethics official’ and ‘exec-

utive branch’ have the meanings given those terms under section 109.

“(b) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

“(1) COVERED FINANCIAL SERVICES AGENCY.—The term ‘covered financial services agency’—

“(A) means a primary financial regulatory agency (as defined in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301)); and

“(B) includes—

“(i) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

“(ii) the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency;

“(iii) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

“(iv) the National Credit Union Administration;

“(v) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

“(vi) the Federal Housing Finance Agency;

“(vii) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection;

“(viii) the Commodity Futures Trading Commission;

“(ix) the Department of the Treasury;

“(x) the National Economic Council; and

“(xi) the Council of Economic Advisors.

“(2) COVERED FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATOR.—The term ‘covered financial services regulator’ means an officer or employee of a covered financial services agency who occupies—

“(A) a supervisory position classified above GS-15 of the General Schedule;

“(B) in the case of a position not under the General Schedule, a supervisory position for which the rate of basic pay is not less than 120 percent of the minimum rate of basic pay for GS-15 of the General Schedule; or

“(C) any other supervisory position determined to be of equal classification by the Director.

“(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

“(4) FORMER CLIENT.—The term ‘former client’—

“(A) means a person for whom a covered financial services regulator served personally as an agent, attorney, or consultant during the 2-year period ending on the date (after such service) on which the covered financial services regulator begins service in the Federal Government; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) instances in which the service provided was limited to a speech or similar appearance; or

“(ii) a client of the former employer of the covered financial services regulator to whom the covered financial services regulator did not personally provide such services.

“(5) FORMER EMPLOYER.—The term ‘former employer’—

“(A) means a person for whom a covered financial services regulator served as an employee, officer, director, trustee, or general partner during the 2-year period ending on the date (after such service) on which the covered financial services regulator begins service in the Federal Government; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) an entity in the Federal Government, including an executive branch agency;

“(ii) a State or local government;

“(iii) the District of Columbia;

“(iv) an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304); or

“(v) the government of a territory or possession of the United States.

“SEC. 602. CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A covered financial services regulator shall not make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use the official position of the covered financial services regulator to influence a particular matter that provides a direct and substantial pecuniary benefit for a former employer or former client of the covered financial services regulator.

“(b) RECUSAL.—A covered financial services regulator shall recuse himself or herself from any official action that would violate subsection (a).

“(c) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of the covered financial services agency employing a covered financial services regulator, in consultation with the Director, may grant a written waiver of the restrictions under subsection (a) if, and to the extent that, the head of the covered financial services agency certifies in writing that—

“(A) the application of the restriction to the particular matter is inconsistent with the purposes of the restriction; or

“(B) it is in the public interest to grant the waiver.

“(2) PUBLICATION.—The Director shall make each waiver under paragraph (1) publicly available on the Web site of the Office of Government Ethics.

“SEC. 603. NEGOTIATING FUTURE PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYMENT.

“(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (c), and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a covered financial services regulator may not participate in any particular matter which involves, to the knowledge of the covered financial services regulator, an individual or entity with whom the covered financial services regulator is in negotiations of future employment or has an arrangement concerning prospective employment.

“(b) DISCLOSURE OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a covered financial services regulator begins any negotiations of future employment with another person, or an agent or intermediary of another person, or other discussion or communication with another person, or an agent or intermediary of another person, mutually conducted with a view toward reaching an agreement regarding possible employment of the covered financial services regulator, the covered financial services regulator shall notify the designated agency ethics official of the covered financial services agency employing the covered financial services regulator regarding the negotiations, discussions, or communications.

“(2) INFORMATION.—A designated agency ethics official receiving notice under paragraph (1), after consultation with the Director, shall inform the covered financial services regulator of any potential conflicts of interest involved in any negotiations, discussions, or communications with the other person and the applicable prohibitions.

“(c) WAIVERS ONLY WHEN EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of a covered financial services agency may only grant a waiver of the prohibition under subsection (a) if the head determines that exceptional circumstances exist.

“(2) REVIEW AND PUBLICATION.—For any waiver granted under paragraph (1), the Director shall—

“(A) review the circumstances relating to the waiver and the determination that exceptional circumstances exist; and

“(B) make the waiver publicly available on the Web site of the Office of Government Ethics, which shall include—

“(i) the name of the private person or persons involved in the negotiations or arrangement concerning prospective employment; and

“(ii) the date on which the negotiations or arrangements commenced.

“(d) SCOPE.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘negotiations of future employment’ is not limited to discussions of specific terms or conditions of employment in a specific position.

“SEC. 604. RECORDKEEPING.

“The Director shall—

“(1) receive all employment histories, recusal and waiver records, and other disclosure records for covered executive branch officials necessary for monitoring compliance with this title;

“(2) promulgate rules and regulations, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and the Attorney General, to implement this title;

“(3) provide guidance and assistance where appropriate to facilitate compliance with this title;

“(4) review and, where necessary, assist designated agency ethics officials in providing advice to covered financial services regulators regarding compliance with this title; and

“(5) if the Director determines that a violation of this title may have occurred, and in consultation with the designated agency ethics official and the Counsel to the President, refer the compliance case to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia for enforcement action.

“SEC. 605. PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIONS.

“(a) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates section 602 or 603 shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

“(2) WILLFUL VIOLATIONS.—Any person who willfully violates section 602 or 603 shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(b) CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States against any person who violates, or whom the Attorney General has reason to believe is engaging in conduct that violates, section 602 or 603.

“(2) CIVIL PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon proof by a preponderance of the evidence that a person violated section 602 or 603, the court shall impose a civil penalty of not more than the greater of—

“(i) \$100,000 for each violation; or

“(ii) the amount of compensation the person received or was offered for the conduct constituting the violation.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A civil penalty under this subsection shall be in addition to any other criminal or civil statutory, common law, or administrative remedy available to the United States or any other person.

“(3) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1) against a person, the Attorney General may petition the court for an order prohibiting the person from engaging in conduct that violates section 602 or 603.

“(B) STANDARD.—The court may issue an order under subparagraph (A) if the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the conduct of the person violates section 602 or 603.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The filing of a petition seeking injunctive relief under this paragraph shall not preclude any other remedy that is available by law to the United States or any other person.”.

SEC. 604. PROHIBITION OF PROCUREMENT OFFICERS ACCEPTING EMPLOYMENT FROM GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS.

(a) EXPANSION OF PROHIBITION ON ACCEPTANCE BY FORMER OFFICIALS OF COMPENSATION FROM CONTRACTORS.—Section 2104 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “or consultant” and inserting “consultant, lawyer, or lobbyist”; and

(ii) by striking “one year” and inserting “2 years”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “personally made for the Federal agency” and inserting “participated personally and substantially in”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION FROM AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS.—A former official responsible for a Government contract referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) may not accept compensation for 2 years after awarding the contract from any division, affiliate, or subcontractor of the contractor.”.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PROCUREMENT OFFICERS TO DISCLOSE JOB OFFERS MADE ON BEHALF OF RELATIVES.—Section 2103(a) of title 41, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting after “that official” the following: “, or for a relative (as defined in section 3110 of title 5) of that official.”.

(c) REQUIREMENT ON AWARD OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS TO FORMER EMPLOYERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 2108. Prohibition on involvement by certain former contractor employees in procurements

“An employee of the Federal Government may not be personally and substantially involved with any award of a contract to, or the administration of a contract awarded to, a contractor that is a former employer of the employee during the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the employee leaves the employment of the contractor.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“2108. Prohibition on involvement by certain former contractor employees in procurements.”.

(d) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and the Counsel to the President, promulgate regulations to carry out and ensure the enforcement of chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code, as amended by this section; and

(2) in consultation with designated agency ethics officials (as defined under section 601 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as added by section 603), monitor compliance with that chapter by individuals and agencies.

SEC. 605. REVOLVING DOOR RESTRICTIONS ON FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORS MOVING INTO THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) through (l) as subsections (f) through (m), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) RESTRICTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the restrictions set forth in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d), a covered financial services regulator shall not—

“(A) during the 2-year period beginning on the date on which his or her employment as a covered financial services regulator ceases—

“(i) knowingly act as agent or attorney for, or otherwise represent, any other person for compensation (except the United States) in any formal or informal appearance before;

“(ii) with the intent to influence, make any oral or written communication on behalf of any other person (except the United States) to; or

“(iii) knowingly aid, advise, or assist in—

“(I) representing any other person (except the United States) in any formal or informal appearance before; or

“(II) making, with the intent to influence, any oral or written communication on behalf of any other person (except the United States) to,

any court of the United States, or any officer or employee thereof, in connection with any judicial or other proceeding, that was actually pending under his or her official responsibility as a covered financial services regulator during the 1-year period ending on the date on which his or her employment as a covered financial services regulator ceases or in which he or she participated personally and substantially as a covered financial services regulator; or

“(B) during the 2-year period beginning on the date on which his or her employment as a covered financial services regulator ceases—

“(i) knowingly act as a lobbyist or agent for, or otherwise represent, any other person for compensation (except the United States) in any formal or informal appearance before;

“(ii) with the intent to influence, make any oral or written communication or conduct any lobbying activities on behalf of any other person (except the United States) to; or

“(iii) knowingly aid, advise, or assist in—

“(I) representing any other person (except the United States) in any formal or informal appearance before; or

“(II) making, with the intent to influence, any oral or written communication or conduct any lobbying activities on behalf of any other person (except the United States) to, any department or agency of the executive branch or Congress (including any committee of Congress), or any officer or employee thereof, in connection with any matter that is pending before the department, the agency, or Congress.

“(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be punished as provided in section 216.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘covered financial services regulator’ has the meaning given that term in section 601 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.); and

“(B) the terms ‘lobbying activities’ and ‘lobbyist’ have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 103(a) of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (2 U.S.C.

4702(a)) is amended by striking “section 207(e)” each place it appears and inserting “section 207(f)”.

(2) Section 207 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) in subsection (g)(1), as so redesignated, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “or (e)” and inserting “or (f)”;

(B) in subsection (j)(1)(B), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (f)” and inserting “subsection (g)”;

(C) in subsection (k), as so redesignated—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “(25 U.S.C. 450i(j))” and inserting “(25 U.S.C. 5323(j))”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “and (e)” and inserting “(e), and (f)”;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking “and (e)” and inserting “(e), and (f)”;

(iv) in paragraph (7)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and (e)” and inserting “(e), and (f)”;

(II) in subparagraph (B)(ii), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “subsections (c), (d), or (e)” and inserting “subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f)”.

(3) Section 141(b)(4) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)(4)) is amended by striking “207(f)(3)” and inserting “207(g)(3)”.

(4) Section 7802(b)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and (f) of section 207” and inserting “and (g) of section 207”.

(5) Section 3105(c) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h-3(c)) is amended by striking “and (d)” and inserting “and (e)”.

(6) Section 106(p)(6)(I)(ii) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and (f) of section 207” and inserting “and (g) of section 207”.

SEC. 606. RESTRICTIONS ON FEDERAL EXAMINERS AND SUPERVISORS OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10(k) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(k)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading—

(A) by striking “ONE-YEAR” and inserting “TWO-YEAR”; and

(B) by striking “EXAMINERS” and inserting “EXAMINERS AND SUPERVISORS”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) served—

“(i) not less than 2 months during the final 12 months of the employment of the person with that agency or entity as the senior examiner (or a functionally equivalent position) of a depository institution or depository institution holding company with continuing, broad responsibility for the examination (or inspection) of that depository institution or depository institution holding company on behalf of the relevant agency or Federal reserve bank; or

“(ii) as a supervisor of the senior examiner with responsibility for managing the oversight of not more than 5 depository institutions or depository institution holding companies on behalf of the relevant agency or Federal reserve bank; and”;

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years”;

(ii) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “other company” and inserting “other company, firm, or association”;

(II) by striking “or” at the end;

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) a business entity, firm, or association that represents the depository institution or depository institution holding company for compensation.”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) APPLICATION OF PENALTIES FOR SUPERVISORS.—A supervisor of a covered financial services regulator, or a supervisor of a senior examiner described in paragraph (1)(B)(i), shall be subject to the penalties described in paragraph (7) if the supervisor knowingly accepts compensation during the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the service of the supervisor is terminated—

“(A) as—

“(i) an employee;

“(ii) an officer;

“(iii) a director; or

“(iv) a consultant; and

“(B) from—

“(i) a depository institution;

“(ii) a depository institution holding company that is designated by the Financial Stability Oversight Council as a systemically important financial market utility under section 804 of the Payment, Clearing, and Settlement Supervision Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5463); or

“(iii) a business entity, firm, or association that represents an institution described in clause (ii) for compensation.”;

(5) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following:

“(A) the term ‘covered financial services regulator’ has the meaning given the term in section 601 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)”;

(6) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “or other company” each place it appears and inserting “or other company, firm, or association”;

(7) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “other company” and inserting “other company, firm, or association”;

(ii) in clause (i)(I), by striking “other company” and inserting “other company, firm, or association”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “a company” and inserting “a company, firm, or association”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 10(k) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(k)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;

(2) in paragraph (5)(A), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraph (1)(B)” and inserting “paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)”;

(3) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by striking “subject to paragraph (1)” and inserting “subject to paragraph (1) or (2)”;

(ii) by striking “paragraph (1)(C)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(C) or (2)”;

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “person described in paragraph (1)” and inserting “person described in paragraph (1) or (2)”;

(ii) by striking “the functions described in paragraph (1)(B)” and inserting “the func-

tions or duties described in paragraph (1)(B) or (2)”.

SEC. 607. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or any amendment made by this title, or any application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

SA 2169. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . IMPROVING THE NUMBER OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES IN UNDERLICENSED STATES.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 103 (15 U.S.C. 662)—

(A) in paragraph (18)(E), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (19), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(20) the term ‘underlicensed State’ means a State in which the number of licensees per capita is less than the median number of licensees per capita for all States, as calculated by the Administrator.”;

(2) in section 301(c) (15 U.S.C. 681(c))—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) shall give first priority to an applicant that is located in an underlicensed State with below median financing, as determined by the Administrator.”;

(B) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(i) by striking clause (i);

(ii) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(iii) by amending clause (i), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(i) is located in a State that—

“(I) is not served by a licensee; or

“(II) is an underlicensed State; and”;

(3) in section 308(g) (15 U.S.C. 687(g))—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and licensing” after “financing”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (J) as subparagraphs (E), through (L), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) The steps the Administration has taken to improve the number of licensees in underlicensed States.

“(D) The Administration’s plans to support States that seek to increase the number of licensees in the State.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) the geographic dispersion of licensees in each State compared to the population of the State, identifying underlicensed States.”.

SA 2170. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 308. EXTENSION OF CONSUMER CREDIT.

(a) CONSUMER CONTROL OVER BANK ACCOUNTS.—

(1) PROHIBITING UNAUTHORIZED REMOTELY CREATED CHECKS.—Section 905 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) LIMITATIONS ON REMOTELY CREATED CHECKS.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘remotely created check’ means a check, including a paper or electronic check and any other payment order that the Bureau, by rule, determines is appropriately covered under this subsection, that—

“(i) is not created by the financial institution that holds the customer account from which the check is to be paid; and

“(ii) does not bear a signature applied, or purported to be applied, by the person from whose account the check is to be paid; and

“(B) the term ‘Federal consumer financial law’ has the meaning given the term in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—Subject to the limitations in paragraph (3) and any additional limitations that the Bureau may establish, by rule, a remotely created check may only be issued by a person designated in writing by a consumer, with that written designation specifically provided by the consumer to the insured depository institution at which the consumer maintains the account from which the check is to be drawn.

“(3) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A designation provided by a consumer under paragraph (2) may be revoked at any time by the consumer.

“(B) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION LAWS.—No payment order, including a remotely created check, may be issued by any person in response to the exercise of, or attempt to exercise, any right by a consumer under—

“(i) any Federal consumer financial law; or

“(ii) any other provision of any law or regulation within the jurisdiction of the Bureau.”.

(2) CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR CERTAIN ONE-TIME ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFERS.—Section 913 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693k) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “No person”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(1), as so designated, by striking “preauthorized electronic fund transfers” and inserting “an electronic fund transfer”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) TREATMENT FOR ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFERS IN CREDIT EXTENSIONS.—If a consumer voluntarily agrees to repay an extension of a small-dollar consumer credit transaction, as defined in section 110(a) of the Truth in Lending Act, by means of an electronic fund transfer, the electronic fund transfer shall be treated as a preauthorized electronic fund transfer subject to the protections of this title.”.

(b) TRANSPARENCY AND CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT IN SMALL-DOLLAR LENDING.—

(1) SMALL-DOLLAR CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended—

(i) by inserting after section 109 (15 U.S.C. 1608) the following:

“SEC. 110. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT FOR SMALL-DOLLAR LENDERS.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘small-dollar consumer credit transaction’—

“(1) means any transaction that extends credit that is—

“(A) made to a consumer in an amount that—

“(i) is not more than—

“(I) \$5,000; or

“(II) such greater amount as the Bureau may, by rule, determine; and

“(ii) shall be adjusted annually to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor; and

“(B) extended pursuant to an agreement that is—

“(i)(I) other than an open end credit plan; and

“(II) payable in 1 or more installments of less than 12 months (or such longer period as the Bureau may, by rule, determine);

“(ii) an open end credit plan in which each advance is fully repayable within a defined time or in connection with a defined event, or both; or

“(iii) any other plan as the Bureau determines, by rule; and

“(2) includes any action that facilitates, brokers, arranges, or gathers applications for a transaction described in paragraph (1).

“(b) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—A person shall register with the Bureau before issuing credit in a small-dollar consumer credit transaction.”; and

(ii) in section 173 (15 U.S.C. 1666j), by adding at the end the following:

“(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, any small-dollar consumer credit transaction, as defined in section 110(a), shall comply with the laws of the State in which the consumer to which credit in the transaction is extended resides with respect to annual percentage rates, interest, fees, charges, and such other similar or related matters as the Bureau may, by rule, determine if the small-dollar consumer credit transaction is—

“(1) made over—

“(A) the Internet;

“(B) telephone;

“(C) facsimile;

“(D) mail;

“(E) electronic mail; or

“(F) other electronic communication; or

“(2) conducted by a national bank.”.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 109 the following:

“110. Registration requirement for small-dollar lenders.”.

(2) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN FEES.—Section 915 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693l-1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(D), by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (e)”;

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(C) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) ADDITIONAL FEES PROHIBITED.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘prepaid account’ has the meaning given the term by rule of the Bureau.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—With respect to the use of a prepaid account by a consumer—

“(A) it shall be unlawful for any person to charge the consumer a fee for an overdraft with respect to the prepaid account, including a shortage of funds or a transaction processed for an amount exceeding the account balance of the prepaid account;

“(B) any transaction for an amount that exceeds the account balance of the prepaid account may be declined, except that the consumer may not be charged a fee for that purpose; and

“(C) the Bureau may, by rule, prohibit the charging of any fee so that the Bureau may—

“(i) prevent unfair, deceptive, or abusive practices; and

“(ii) promote the ability of the consumer to understand and compare the costs of prepaid accounts.”.

(c) RESTRICTIONS ON LEAD GENERATION IN SMALL-DOLLAR CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1631 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 140B. RESTRICTIONS ON LEAD GENERATION IN SMALL-DOLLAR CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the terms ‘Internet access service’ and ‘Internet information location tool’ have the meanings given those terms in section 231(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 231(e));

“(2) the term ‘sensitive personal financial information’ means a Social Security number, financial account number, bank routing number, bank account number, or security or access code that is immediately necessary to permit access to the financial account of an individual; and

“(3) the term ‘small-dollar consumer credit transaction’ has the meaning given the term in section 110(a).

“(b) IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—Any person facilitating, brokering, arranging for, or gathering applications for the distribution of sensitive personal financial information in connection with a small-dollar consumer credit transaction shall prominently disclose information by which the person may be contacted or identified, including for service of process and for identification of the registrant of any domain name registered or used.

“(c) PROHIBITION ON LEAD GENERATION IN SMALL-DOLLAR CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS.—No person may facilitate, broker, arrange for, or gather applications for the distribution of sensitive personal financial information in connection with a small-dollar consumer credit transaction unless the person is directly providing the small-dollar consumer credit to a consumer.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Bureau to further restrict activities covered by this section.

“(2) CLARIFICATION.—For the purposes of this section, it shall not be considered facilitating the distribution of sensitive personal financial information in connection with a small-dollar consumer credit transaction to be engaged solely in 1 of the following activities:

“(A) The provision of a telecommunications service, an Internet access service, or an Internet information location tool.

“(B) The transmission, storage, retrieval, hosting, formatting, or translation (or any combination thereof) of a communication,

without selection or alteration of the content of the communication, except the deletion of a particular communication or material made by another person in a manner that is consistent with section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(c)).”

(2) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 2 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1631 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“140B. Restrictions on lead generation in small-dollar consumer credit transactions.”.

(d) **STUDIES.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

(A) the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(i) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(ii) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate;

(iii) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(iv) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(2) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding—

(A) the availability of capital on reservations of Indian tribes; and

(B) the impact that small-dollar consumer credit extended through Internet and non-Internet means to members of Indian tribes has had on economic opportunity and wealth for members of Indian tribes.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—In conducting the study required under paragraph (2), the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult, as appropriate, with—

(A) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection;

(B) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

(C) the Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(D) federally recognized Indian tribes; and

(E) community development financial institutions operating in Indian lands.

(4) **CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the study required under paragraph (2).

(e) **RULE MAKING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall adopt any final rules necessary to implement the provisions of this section and the amendments made by this section.

SA 2171. Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEE, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. **SUBJECTING THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION TO THE REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM BOARD OF GOVERNORS.” and inserting “BUDGET AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (1) through (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “BUDGET AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.” and inserting “IN GENERAL.”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (E);

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (d);

(3) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (b); and

(4) in subsection (b), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following:

“(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out this title for fiscal year 2020.”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2019.

SA 2172. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 401 and insert the following:

SEC. 401. SYSTEMIC RISK DESIGNATION IMPROVEMENT.

(a) **REVISIONS TO COUNCIL AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **PURPOSES AND DUTIES.**—Section 112(a)(2)(I) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5322(a)(2)(I)) is amended by inserting “, which have been identified as global systemically important BHCs under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under section 165(1)” before the semicolon.

(2) **ENHANCED SUPERVISION.**—Section 115(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5325(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “large, interconnected bank holding companies” and inserting “bank holding companies that have been identified as global systemically important BHCs under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under section 165(1)”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; or” at the end and inserting a period;

(ii) by striking “the Council may” and all that follows through “differentiate” and inserting “the Council may differentiate”; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B).

(3) **REPORTS.**—Section 116(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5326(a)) is amended by striking “with total consolidated assets of \$50,000,000,000 or greater” and inserting “that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regula-

tions, or subjected to a determination under section 165(1)”.

(4) **MITIGATION.**—Section 121(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5331(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “with total consolidated assets of \$50,000,000,000 or more” and inserting “that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under section 165(1)”.

(5) **OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH.**—Section 155(d) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5345(d)) is amended by striking “with total consolidated assets of 50,000,000,000 or greater” and inserting “that have been identified as global systemically important BHCs under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under section 165(1)”.

(b) **REVISIONS TO BOARD AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **ACQUISITIONS.**—Section 163 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5363) is amended by striking “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000” each place the term appears and inserting “that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under section 165(1)”.

(2) **MANAGEMENT INTERLOCKS.**—Section 164 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5364) is amended by striking “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000” and inserting “that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under section 165(1)”.

(3) **ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS.**—Section 165 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000” and inserting “that have been identified as global systemically important BHCs under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under subsection (1)”;

(ii) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **TAILORED APPLICATION.**—In prescribing more stringent prudential standards under this section, the Board of Governors may, on its own or pursuant to a recommendation by the Council in accordance with section 115, differentiate among companies on an individual basis or by category, taking into consideration their capital structure, riskiness, complexity, financial activities (including the financial activities of their subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors that the Board of Governors deems appropriate.”;

(B) in subsection (j)(1), by striking “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000” and inserting “that has been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under subsection (1)”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) **ADDITIONAL BANK HOLDING COMPANIES SUBJECT TO ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS BY TAILORED REGULATION.**—

“(1) **DETERMINATION.**—The Board of Governors may—

“(A) determine that a bank holding company that has not been identified as a global systemically important BHC under section

217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be subject to certain enhanced supervision or prudential standards under this section, tailored to the risks presented, based on the considerations described in paragraph (3), if material financial distress at the bank holding company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of the individual bank holding company, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States; or

“(B) by regulation determine that a category of bank holding companies that have not been identified as global systemically important BHCs under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be subject to certain enhanced supervision or prudential standards under this section, tailored to the risk presented by the category of bank holding companies, based on the considerations described in paragraph (3), if material financial distress at the category of bank holding companies, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of the category of bank holding companies, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States.

“(2) COUNCIL APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CATEGORIES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), a regulation issued by the Board of Governors to make a determination under that subparagraph shall not take effect unless the Council, by a vote of not fewer than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, approves the metrics used by the Board of Governors in establishing the regulation.

“(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making any determination under paragraph (1), the Board of Governors shall consider the following factors:

“(A) The size of the bank holding company.

“(B) The interconnectedness of the bank holding company.

“(C) The extent of readily available substitutes or financial institution infrastructure for the services of the bank holding company.

“(D) The global cross-jurisdictional activity of the bank holding company.

“(E) The complexity of the bank holding company.

“(F) Whether the bank holding company has a [method 1/method 2] score of not less than 52 [basis points? *Note: I'm not sure about the 52 number here. Do you mean 520? Method 1 scores range from below 130 to 530-629.*]

“(4) CONSISTENT APPLICATION OF CONSIDERATIONS.—In making a determination under paragraph (1), the Board of Governors shall ensure that bank holding companies that are similarly situated with respect to the factors described under paragraph (3), are treated similarly for purposes of any enhanced supervision or prudential standards applied under this section.

“(5) USE OF CURRENTLY REPORTED DATA TO AVOID UNNECESSARY BURDEN.—For purposes of making a determination under paragraph (1), the Board of Governors shall make use of data already being reported to the Board of Governors, including scores calculated under subpart H of part 217 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, to avoid placing an unnecessary burden on bank holding companies.

“(m) SYSTEMIC IDENTIFICATION.—With respect to the bank holding companies that have been identified as global systemically important BHCs under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under subsection (1), the Board of Governors shall—

“(1) publish, including on the Web site of the Board of Governors, a list of all bank holding companies that have been so identified, and keep such list current; and

“(2) solicit feedback from the Council on the identification process and on the application of such process to specific bank holding companies.”

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248) is amended—

(A) by redesignating the second subsection (s) (relating to assessments) as subsection (t); and

(B) in subsection (t)(2)(A), as so redesignated, by striking “having total consolidated assets of \$50,000,000,000 or more” and inserting “that have been identified as global systemically important bank BHCs under section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or subjected to a determination under section 165(1) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365(1))”.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to prohibit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from prescribing enhanced prudential standards for any bank holding company that—

(1) the Board of Governors determines, based upon the size, interconnectedness, substitutability, global cross-jurisdictional activity, and complexity of the bank holding company, could pose a safety and soundness risk to the stability of the United States banking or financial system; and

(2) has not been designated as a global systemically important bank holding company.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2173. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 124, line 21, strike “QUALIFIED” and insert “PRIVATE”.

On page 125, line 1, strike “QUALIFIED” and insert “PRIVATE”.

On page 125, line 7, strike “qualified” and insert “private”.

On page 127, line 10, strike “qualified” and insert “private”.

On page 127, lines 12 and 13, strike “section 221(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986” and insert “section 140(a)(7)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(7)(A))”.

SA 2174. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2. ENSURING A COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “each appropriate Federal banking agency represented on the Council”

and inserting “each of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection as the Federal agency representatives on the Council”;

(B) by striking “any such appropriate Federal banking agency” and inserting “any such Federal agency”; and

(C) by striking “insured depository institutions” and inserting “financial institutions”;

(2) in subsections (b), (c), and (d), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agency” each place that term appears and inserting “the appropriate Federal agency described in subsection (a)”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agencies” and inserting “the appropriate Federal agencies described in subsection (a)”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agency” and inserting “the appropriate Federal agency described in subsection (a)”.

(b) REQUIRED REGULATORY REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall complete the review required under section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311), complying with all the requirements under that section.

SA 2175. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . COMMUNITY FINANCIAL INSTITUTION EXEMPTION.

(a) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—Section 1022(b)(3) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “, as appropriate,”;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) whether any provision of this title, or any rule issued under this title, would be unnecessary or unduly burdensome for the class of covered persons.”

(b) ENSURING A COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “each appropriate Federal banking agency represented on the Council” and inserting “each of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection as the Federal agency representatives on the Council”;

(ii) by striking “any such appropriate Federal banking agency” and inserting “any such Federal agency”; and

(iii) by striking “insured depository institutions” and inserting “financial institutions”;

(B) in subsections (b), (c), and (d), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agency” each place that term appears and inserting “the appropriate Federal agency described in subsection (a)”; and

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agencies” and inserting “the appropriate Federal agencies described in subsection (a)”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “the appropriate Federal banking agency” and inserting “the appropriate Federal agency described in subsection (a)”.

(2) **REQUIRED REGULATORY REVIEW.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall complete the review required under section 2222 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (12 U.S.C. 3311), complying with all the requirements under that section.

SA 2176. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2. RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

Section 1022(b)(3) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “, as appropriate.”;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) whether any provision of this title, or any rule issued under this title, would be unnecessary or unduly burdensome for the class of covered persons.”.

SA 2177. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PROTECTIONS IN THE EVENT OF DEATH OR BANKRUPTCY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (8) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) the term ‘cosigner’—

“(A) means any individual who is liable for the obligation of another without compensation, regardless of how designated in the contract or instrument with respect to that ob-

ligation, other than an obligation under a private education loan extended to consolidate a consumer’s pre-existing private education loans;

“(B) includes any person the signature of which is requested as condition to grant credit or to forbear on collection; and

“(C) does not include a spouse of an individual described in subparagraph (A), the signature of whom is needed to perfect the security interest in a loan.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS RELATING TO BORROWER OR COSIGNER OF A PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.**—

“(1) **PROHIBITION ON AUTOMATIC DEFAULT IN CASE OF DEATH OR BANKRUPTCY OF NON-STUDENT OBLIGOR.**—With respect to a private education loan involving a student obligor and 1 or more cosigners, the creditor shall not declare a default or accelerate the debt against the student obligor on the sole basis of a bankruptcy or death of a cosigner.

“(2) **COSIGNER RELEASE IN CASE OF DEATH OF BORROWER.**—

“(A) **RELEASE OF COSIGNER.**—The holder of a private education loan, when notified of the death of a student obligor, shall release within a reasonable timeframe any cosigner from the obligations of the cosigner under the private education loan.

“(B) **NOTIFICATION OF RELEASE.**—A holder or servicer of a private education loan, as applicable, shall within a reasonable timeframe notify any cosigners for the private education loan if a cosigner is released from the obligations of the cosigner for the private education loan under this paragraph.

“(C) **DESIGNATION OF INDIVIDUAL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE BORROWER.**—Any lender that extends a private education loan shall provide the student obligor an option to designate an individual to have the legal authority to act on behalf of the student obligor with respect to the private education loan in the event of the death of the student obligor.”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall only apply to private education loan agreements entered into on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2178. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 402 of the amendment, strike subsection (a) and insert the following:

(a) **DEFINITION OF CUSTODIAL BANK.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In this section, the term “custodial bank” means—

(A) any depository institution holding company that—

(i) is not directly or indirectly controlled by a depository institution holding company; and

(ii) has consolidated assets under custody that are not less than 30 times the total consolidated assets of the depository institution holding company; and

(B) any company controlled directly or indirectly by a depository institution holding company described in subparagraph (A).

(2) **CONTROL.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a company has control over a bank or

over any company if the company has control over the bank or other company under section 2(a)(2) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841(a)(2)).

SA 2179. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 188, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 20, on page 190, and insert the following:

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) **REHABILITATION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.**—If a borrower of a private education loan successfully and voluntarily makes 9 payments within 20 days of the due date during 10 consecutive months of amounts owed on the private education loan, or otherwise brings the private education loan current after the loan is charged-off, the loan shall be considered rehabilitated, and the lender or servicer shall request that any consumer reporting agency to which the charge-off was reported remove the delinquency that led to the charge-off and the charge-off from the borrower’s credit history.”.

On page 191, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(A) the implementation of paragraph (12) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) (referred to in this paragraph as “the provision”), as added by subsection (a);

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VII—STUDENT PROTECTIONS **SEC. 701. STUDENT LOAN BORROWER BILL OF RIGHTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights”.

(b) **TRUTH IN LENDING ACT AMENDMENTS.**—The Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in section 128—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “PRIVATE”;

(ii) in paragraph (1)(O), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (9)”;

(iii) in paragraph (2)(L), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (9)”;

(iv) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking “paragraph (7)” and inserting “paragraph (10)”;

(v) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (12) as paragraphs (8) through (15), respectively;

(vi) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) **DISCLOSURES BEFORE FIRST FULLY AMORTIZED PAYMENT.**—Not fewer than 30 days and not more than 150 days before the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due from the borrower, the postsecondary educational lender shall disclose to the borrower, clearly and conspicuously—

“(A) the information described in—

“(i) paragraph (2)(A) (adjusted, as necessary, for the rate of interest in effect on the date the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due);

“(ii) subparagraphs (B) through (G) of paragraph (2);

“(iii) paragraph (2)(H) (adjusted, as necessary, for the rate of interest in effect on the date the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due);

“(iv) paragraph (2)(K); and

“(v) subparagraphs (O) and (P) of paragraph (2);

“(B) the scheduled date upon which the first fully amortized payment is due;

“(C) the name of the lender and servicer, and the address to which communications and payments should be sent including a telephone number and website where the borrower may obtain additional information;

“(D) a description of alternative repayment plans, including loan consolidation or refinancing, and servicemember or veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) or other Federal or State law related to postsecondary education loans; and

“(E) a statement that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under paragraph (16)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (16)(I).

“(6) DISCLOSURES WHEN BORROWER IS 30 DAYS DELINQUENT.—Not fewer than 5 days after a borrower becomes 30 days delinquent on a postsecondary education loan, the postsecondary educational lender shall disclose to the borrower, clearly and conspicuously—

“(A) the date on which the loan will be charged-off (as defined in paragraph (16)(A)) or assigned to collections, including the consequences of such charge-off or assignment to collections, if no payment is made;

“(B) the minimum payment that the borrower must make to avoid the loan being charged off (as defined in paragraph (16)(A)) or assigned to collection, and the minimum payment that the borrower must make to bring the loan current;

“(C) a statement informing the borrower that a payment of less than the minimum payment described in subparagraph (B) could result in the loan being charged off (as defined in paragraph (16)(A)) or assigned to collection; and

“(D) a statement that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under paragraph (16)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (16)(I).

“(7) DISCLOSURES WHEN BORROWER IS HAVING DIFFICULTY MAKING PAYMENT OR IS 60 DAYS DELINQUENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not fewer than 5 days after a borrower notifies a postsecondary educational lender that the borrower is having difficulty making payment or a borrower becomes 60 days delinquent on a postsecondary education loan, the postsecondary educational lender shall—

“(i) complete a full review of the borrower's postsecondary education loan and make a reasonable effort to obtain the information necessary to determine—

“(I) if the borrower is eligible for an alternative repayment plan, including loan consolidation or refinancing; and

“(II) if the borrower is eligible for servicemember or veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) or other Federal or State law related to postsecondary education loans;

“(ii) provide the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about alternative repayment plans and benefits for which the borrower is eligible, including all terms, conditions, and fees or costs associated with such repayment plan, pursuant to paragraph (8)(D);

“(iii) allow the borrower not less than 30 days to apply for an alternative repayment plan or benefits, if eligible; and

“(iv) notify the borrower that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under paragraph (16)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (16)(I).

“(B) FORBEARANCE OR DEFERMENT.—If a borrower notifies the postsecondary educational lender that a long-term alternative repayment plan is not appropriate, the postsecondary educational lender may comply with this paragraph by providing the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about short-term options to address an anticipated short-term difficulty in making payments, such as forbearance or deferment options, including all terms, conditions, and fees or costs associated with such options pursuant to paragraph (8)(D).

“(C) NOTIFICATION PROCESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each postsecondary educational lender shall establish a process, in accordance subparagraph (A), for a borrower to notify the lender that—

“(I) the borrower is having difficulty making payments on a postsecondary education loan; and

“(II) a long-term alternative repayment plan is not needed.

“(ii) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall promulgate rules establishing minimum standards for postsecondary educational lenders in carrying out the requirements of this paragraph and a model form for borrowers to notify postsecondary educational lenders of the information under this paragraph.”;

(vii) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by clause (v), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) MODEL DISCLOSURE FORM FOR ALTERNATIVE REPAYMENT PLANS, FORBEARANCE, AND DEFERMENT OPTIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall develop and issue model forms to allow borrowers to compare alternative repayment plans, forbearance, and deferment options with the borrower's existing repayment plan with respect to a postsecondary education loan. Such forms shall include the following:

“(i) The total amount to be paid over the life of the loan.

“(ii) The total amount in interest to be paid over the life of the loan.

“(iii) The monthly payment amount.

“(iv) The expected pay-off date.

“(v) Related fees and costs.

“(vi) Eligibility requirements, and how the borrower can apply for the alternative repayment plan, forbearance, or deferment option.

“(vii) Any relevant consequences due to action or inaction, such as default, including any actions that would result in the loss of eligibility for alternative repayment plans, forbearance, or deferment options.”;

(viii) in paragraph (11), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking “paragraph (7)” and inserting “paragraph (10)”;

(ix) by striking paragraph (13), as redesignated by clause (v), and inserting the following:

“(13) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘covered educational institution’, ‘private educational lender’, and ‘private education loan’ have the same meanings as in section 140; and

“(B) the term ‘postsecondary education loan’ means

“(i) a private education loan; or

“(ii) a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 1087a et seq., and 1087aa et seq.).”;

(x) in paragraph (14), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (8)”;

(xi) by adding at the end the following:

“(16) STUDENT LOAN BORROWER BILL OF RIGHTS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) BORROWER.—The term ‘borrower’ means the person to whom a postsecondary education loan is extended.

“(ii) CHARGE OFF.—The term ‘charge off’ means charge to profit and loss, or subject to any similar action.

“(iii) QUALIFIED WRITTEN REQUEST.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified written request’ means a written correspondence of a borrower (other than notice on a payment medium supplied by the student loan servicer) transmitted by mail, facsimile, or electronically through an email address or website designated by the student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers that—

“(aa) includes, or otherwise enables the student loan servicer to identify, the name and account of the borrower; and

“(bb) includes, to the extent applicable—

“(AA) sufficient detail regarding the information sought by the borrower; or

“(BB) a statement of the reasons for the belief of the borrower that there is an error regarding the account of the borrower.

“(II) CORRESPONDENCE DELIVERED TO OTHER ADDRESSES.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—A written correspondence of a borrower is a qualified written request if the written correspondence is transmitted to and received by a student loan servicer at a mailing address, facsimile number, email address, or website address other than the address or number designated by that student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers but the written correspondence meets the requirements under items (aa) and (bb) of subclause (I).

“(bb) DUTY TO TRANSFER.—A student loan servicer shall, within a reasonable period of time, transfer a written correspondence of a borrower received by the student loan servicer at a mailing address, facsimile number, email address, or website address other than the address or number designated by that student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers to the correct address or appropriate office or other unit of the student loan servicer.

“(cc) DATE OF RECEIPT.—A written correspondence of a borrower transferred in accordance with item (bb) shall be deemed to

be received by the student loan servicer on the date on which the written correspondence is transferred to the correct address or appropriate office or other unit of the student loan servicer.

“(iv) **SERVICER.**—The term ‘servicer’ means the person responsible for the servicing of a postsecondary education loan, including any agent of such person or the person who makes, owns, or holds a loan if such person also services the loan.

“(v) **SERVICING.**—The term ‘servicing’ means—

“(I) receiving any scheduled periodic payments from a borrower pursuant to the terms of a postsecondary education loan;

“(II) making the payments of principal and interest and such other payments with respect to the amounts received from the borrower, as may be required pursuant to the terms of the loan; and

“(III) performing other administrative services with respect to the loan.

“(B) **SALE, TRANSFER, OR ASSIGNMENT.**—If the sale, other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations of a postsecondary education loan results in a change in the identity of the party to whom the borrower must send subsequent payments or direct any communications concerning the loan—

“(i) the transferor shall—

“(I) notify the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, not fewer than 45 days before transferring a legally enforceable right to receive payment from the borrower on such loan, of—

“(aa) the sale or other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(bb) the identity of the transferee;

“(cc) the name and address of the party to whom subsequent payments or communications must be sent;

“(dd) the telephone numbers and websites of both the transferor and the transferee;

“(ee) the effective date of the sale, transfer, or assignment;

“(ff) the date on which the transferor will stop accepting payment; and

“(gg) the date on which the transferee will begin accepting payment; and

“(II) forward any payment from a borrower with respect to such postsecondary education loan to the transferee, immediately upon receiving such payment, during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the transferor stops accepting payment of such postsecondary education loan; and

“(ii) the transferee shall—

“(I) notify the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, not fewer than 45 days before acquiring a legally enforceable right to receive payment from the borrower on such loan, of—

“(aa) the sale or other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(bb) the identity of the transferor;

“(cc) the name and address of the party to whom subsequent payments or communications must be sent;

“(dd) the telephone numbers and websites of both the transferor and the transferee;

“(ee) the effective date of the sale, transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(ff) the date on which the transferor will stop accepting payment; and

“(gg) the date on which the transferee will begin accepting payment;

“(II) accept as on-time and may not impose any late fee or finance charge for any payment from a borrower with respect to such postsecondary education loan that is forwarded from the transferor during the 60-day

period beginning on the date on which the transferor stops accepting payment, if the transferor receives such payment on or before the applicable due date, including any grace period;

“(III) provide borrowers a simple, online process for transferring existing electronic fund transfer authority; and

“(IV) honor any promotion or benefit offered to the borrower or advertised by the previous owner or transferor of such postsecondary education loan.

“(C) **MATERIAL CHANGE IN MAILING ADDRESS OR PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING PAYMENTS.**—If a servicer makes a change in the mailing address, office, or procedures for handling payments with respect to any postsecondary education loan, and such change causes a delay in the crediting of the account of the borrower made during the 60-day period following the date on which such change took effect, the servicer may not impose any late fee or finance charge for a late payment on such postsecondary education loan.

“(D) **INTEREST RATE AND TERM CHANGES FOR CERTAIN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.**—

“(i) **NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), a student loan servicer shall provide written notice to a borrower of any material change in the terms of the postsecondary education loan, including an increase in the interest rate, not later than 45 days before the effective date of the change or increase.

“(II) **MATERIAL CHANGES IN TERMS.**—The Bureau shall, by regulation, establish guidelines for determining which changes in terms are material under subclause (I).

“(ii) **LIMITS ON INTEREST RATE AND FEE INCREASES APPLICABLE TO OUTSTANDING BALANCE.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), a loan holder or student loan servicer may not increase the interest rate or other fee applicable to an outstanding balance on a postsecondary education loan.

“(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The requirements under clauses (i) and (ii) shall not apply to—

“(I) an increase in any applicable variable interest rate incorporated in the terms of a postsecondary education loan that provides for changes in the interest rate according to operation of an index that is not under the control of the loan holder or student loan servicer and is published for viewing by the general public;

“(II) an increase in interest rate due to the completion of a workout or temporary hardship arrangement by the borrower or the failure of the borrower to comply with the terms of a workout or temporary hardship arrangement if—

“(aa) the interest rate applicable to a category of transactions following any such increase does not exceed the rate or fee that applied to that category of transactions prior to commencement of the arrangement; and

“(bb) the loan holder or student loan servicer has provided the borrower, prior to the commencement of such arrangement, with clear and conspicuous disclosure of the terms of the arrangement (including any increases due to such completion or failure); and

“(III) an increase in interest rate due to a provision included within the terms of a postsecondary education loan that provides for a lower interest rate based on the borrower's agreement to a prearranged plan that authorizes recurring electronic funds transfers if—

“(aa) the borrower withdraws the borrower's authorization of the prearranged recurring electronic funds transfer plan; and

“(bb) after withdrawal of the borrower's authorization and prior to increasing the interest rate, the loan holder or student loan servicer has provided the borrower with clear and conspicuous disclosure of the impending change in borrower's interest rate and a reasonable opportunity to reauthorize the prearranged electronic funds transfers plan.

“(E) **APPLICATION OF PAYMENTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, upon receipt of a payment, the servicer shall apply amounts first to the interest and fees owed on the payment due date, and then to the principal balance of the postsecondary education loan bearing the highest annual percentage rate, and then to each successive interest and fees and then principal balance bearing the next highest annual percentage rate, until the payment is exhausted. A borrower may instruct or expressly authorize the servicer to apply payments in a different manner.

“(ii) **APPLICATION OF EXCESS AMOUNTS.**—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, upon receipt of a payment, the servicer shall apply amounts in excess of the minimum payment amount first to the interest and fees owed on the payment due date, and then to the principal balance of the postsecondary education loan balance bearing the highest annual percentage rate, and then to each successive interest and fees and principal balance bearing the next highest annual percentage rate, until the payment is exhausted. A borrower may instruct or expressly authorize the servicer to apply such excess payments in a different manner. A borrower may also voluntarily increase the periodic payment amount, including by increasing their recurring electronic payment, with the right to return to their original amortization schedule at any time. Servicers shall provide a simple, online method to allow borrowers to make voluntary one-time additional payments, voluntarily increase the amount of their periodic payment, and return to their original amortization schedule.

“(iii) **APPLY PAYMENT ON DATE RECEIVED.**—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, a servicer shall apply payments to a borrower's account on the date the payment is received.

“(iv) **PROMULGATION OF RULES.**—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, may promulgate rules for the application of postsecondary education loan payments that—

“(I) implements the requirements in this section;

“(II) minimizes the amount of fees and interest incurred by the borrower and the total loan amount paid by the borrower;

“(III) minimizes delinquencies, assignments to collection, and charge-offs;

“(IV) requires servicers to apply payments on the date received; and

“(V) allows the borrower to instruct the servicer to apply payments in a manner preferred by the borrower, including excess payments.

“(v) **METHOD THAT BEST BENEFITS BORROWER.**—In promulgating the rules under clause (iv), the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall choose the application method that best benefits the borrower and is compatible with existing repayment options.

“(F) **PAYMENTS AND FEES.**—

“(i) **PROHIBITION ON RECOMMENDING DEFAULT.**—A loan holder or student loan servicer may not recommend or encourage

default or delinquency on an existing postsecondary education loan prior to and in connection with the process of qualifying for or enrolling in an alternative repayment arrangement, including the origination of a new postsecondary education loan that refinances all or any portion of such existing loan or debt.

“(ii) LATE FEES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A late fee may not be charged to a borrower for a postsecondary education loan under any of the following circumstances, either individually or in combination:

“(aa) On a per-loan basis when a borrower has multiple postsecondary education loans in a billing group.

“(bb) In an amount greater than 4 percent of the amount of the payment past due.

“(cc) Before the end of the 15-day period beginning on the date the payment is due.

“(dd) More than once with respect to a single late payment.

“(ee) The borrower fails to make a singular, non-successive regularly-scheduled payment on the postsecondary education loan.

“(ff) The student loan servicer has failed to adopt reasonable procedures designed to ensure that each billing statement required under subparagraph (K) is mailed or delivered to the consumer not later than 21 days before the payment due date.

“(iii) COORDINATION WITH SUBSEQUENT LATE FEES.—No late fee may be charged to a borrower for a postsecondary education loan relating to an insufficient payment if the payment is made on or before the due date of the payment, or within any applicable grace period for the payment, if the insufficiency is attributable only to a late fee relating to an earlier payment, and the payment is otherwise a full payment for the applicable period.

“(iv) PAYMENTS AT LOCAL BRANCHES.—If the loan holder, in the case of a postsecondary education loan account referred to in subparagraph (A), is a financial institution that maintains a branch or office at which payments on any such account are accepted from the borrower in person, the date on which the borrower makes a payment on the account at such branch or office shall be considered to be the date on which the payment is made for purposes of determining whether a late fee may be imposed due to the failure of the borrower to make payment on or before the due date for such payment.

“(G) BORROWER INQUIRIES.—

“(i) DUTY OF STUDENT LOAN SERVICERS TO RESPOND TO BORROWER INQUIRIES.—

“(I) NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF REQUEST.—If a borrower of a postsecondary education loan submits a qualified written request to the student loan servicer for information relating to the student loan servicing of the postsecondary education loan, the student loan servicer shall provide a written response acknowledging receipt of the qualified written request within 5 business days unless any action requested by the borrower is taken within such period.

“(II) ACTION WITH RESPECT TO INQUIRY.—Not later than 30 business days after the receipt from a borrower of a qualified written request under subclause (I) and, if applicable, before taking any action with respect to the qualified written request of the borrower, the student loan servicer shall—

“(aa) make appropriate corrections in the account of the borrower, including the crediting of any late fees, and transmit to the borrower a written notification of such correction (which shall include the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of

a representative of the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower);

“(bb) after conducting an investigation, provide the borrower with a written explanation or clarification that includes—

“(AA) to the extent applicable, a statement of the reasons for which the student loan servicer believes the account of the borrower is correct as determined by the student loan servicer; and

“(BB) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of an individual employed by, or the office or department of, the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower; or

“(cc) after conducting an investigation, provide the borrower with a written explanation or clarification that includes—

“(AA) information requested by the borrower or explanation of why the information requested is unavailable or cannot be obtained by the student loan servicer; and

“(BB) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of an individual employed by, or the office or department of, the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower.

“(III) LIMITED EXTENSION OF RESPONSE TIME.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—There may be 1 extension of the 30-day period described in subclause (II) of not more than 15 days if, before the end of such 30-day period, the student loan servicer notifies the borrower of the extension and the reasons for the delay in responding.

“(bb) REPORTS TO BUREAU.—Each student loan servicer shall, on an annual basis, report to the Bureau the aggregate number of extensions sought by the student loan servicer under item (aa).

“(ii) PROTECTION OF CREDIT INFORMATION.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date on which a student loan servicer receives a qualified written request from a borrower relating to a dispute regarding payments by the borrower, a student loan servicer may not provide negative credit information to any consumer reporting agency (as defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a)) relating to the subject of the qualified written request or to such period, including any information relating to a late payment or payment owed by the borrower on the borrower's postsecondary education loan.

“(H) SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR CERTAIN BORROWERS.—A student loan servicer shall designate an office or other unit of the student loan servicer to act as a point of contact regarding postsecondary education loans for borrowers considered to be at risk of default, including—

“(i) any borrower who requests information related to options to reduce or suspend his or her monthly payment, or otherwise indicates that he or she is experiencing or is about to experience financial hardship or distress;

“(ii) any borrower who becomes 60 calendar days delinquent on any loan;

“(iii) any borrower who has not completed the program of study for which the borrower received the loan;

“(iv) any borrower who is enrolled in discretionary forbearance for more than 9 months of the previous 12 months;

“(v) any borrower who has rehabilitated or consolidated one or more student loans out of default within the prior 12 months;

“(vi) a borrower under a private education loan who is seeking to modify the terms of the repayment of the postsecondary education loan because of hardship; and

“(vii) any borrower or segment of borrowers determined by the Director of the Bureau to be at risk of default.

“(I) SERVICEMEMBERS, VETERANS, AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(i) SERVICEMEMBER AND VETERANS LIAISON.—Each servicer shall designate an employee to act as the servicemember and veterans liaison who is responsible for answering inquiries from servicemembers and veterans, and is specially trained on servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws related to postsecondary education loans.

“(ii) TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE NUMBER.—Each servicer shall maintain a toll-free telephone number that shall—

“(I) connect directly to the servicemember and veterans liaison designated under clause (i); and

“(II) be made available on the primary internet website of the servicer and on monthly billing statements.

“(iii) PROHIBITION ON CHARGE OFFS AND DEFAULT.—A lender or servicer may not charge off or report a postsecondary education loan as delinquent, assigned to collection (internally or by referral to a third party), in default, or charged-off to a credit reporting agency if the borrower is on active duty in the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code) serving in a combat zone (as designated by the President under section 112(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

“(iv) ADDITIONAL LIAISONS.—The Secretary shall determine additional entities with whom borrowers interact, including guaranty agencies, that shall designate an employee to act as the servicemember and veterans liaison who is responsible for answering inquiries from servicemembers and veterans and is specially trained on servicemembers and veteran benefits and option under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.).

“(J) BORROWER'S LOAN HISTORY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A servicer shall make available through a secure website, or in writing upon request, the loan history of each borrower for each postsecondary education loan, separately designating—

“(I) payment history;

“(II) loan history, including any forbearances, deferrals, delinquencies, assignment to collection, and charge offs;

“(III) annual percentage rate history;

“(IV) key loan terms, including application of payments to interest, principal, and fees, origination date, principal, capitalized interest, annual percentage rate, including any cap, loan term, and any contractual incentives; and

“(V) balance due to pay off the outstanding balance.

“(ii) ORIGINAL DOCUMENTATION.—A servicer shall make available to the borrower, if requested, at no charge, copies of the original loan documents and the promissory note for each postsecondary education loan.

“(iii) PROMPT DELIVERY.—A loan holder or a student loan servicer that has received a request by a borrower or a person authorized by a borrower for the information described in clause (i) shall provide such information to the borrower or person authorized by the borrower not later than 5 business days after receiving such request.

“(K) ADDITIONAL SERVICING STANDARDS.—

“(i) STATEMENT REQUIRED WITH EACH BILLING CYCLE.—A student loan servicer for each borrower's account that is being serviced by

that student loan servicer and that includes a postsecondary education loan shall transmit to the borrower, for each billing cycle at the end of which there is an outstanding balance in that account, a statement that includes—

“(I) the outstanding balance in the account at the beginning of the billing cycle;

“(II) the total amount credited to the account during the billing cycle;

“(III) the amount of any fee added to the account during the billing cycle, itemized to show the amounts, if any, due to the application of an increased interest rate, and the amount, if any, imposed as a minimum or fixed charge;

“(IV) the balance on which the fee described in subclause (III) was computed and a statement of how the balance was determined;

“(V) whether the balance described in subclause (IV) was determined without first deducting all payments and other credits during the billing cycle, and the amount of any such payments and credits;

“(VI) the outstanding balance in the account at the end of the billing cycle;

“(VII) the date by which, or the period within which, payment must be made to avoid late fees, if any;

“(VIII) the address of the student loan servicer to which the borrower may direct billing inquiries;

“(IX) the amount of any payments or other credits during the billing cycle that was applied to pay down principal, and the amount applied to interest;

“(X) in the case of a billing group, the allocation of any payments or other credits during the billing cycle to each of the postsecondary education loans in the billing group;

“(XI) information on how to file a complaint with the Bureau and with the ombudsman designated pursuant to section 1035 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5535); and

“(XII) any other information determined by the Bureau, which may include information in the Bureau’s Student Loan Payback Playbook.

“(ii) **DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENT DEADLINES.**—In the case of a postsecondary education loan account under which a late fee or charge may be imposed due to the failure of the borrower to make payment on or before the due date for such payment, the billing statement required under clause (i) with respect to the account shall include, in a conspicuous location on the billing statement, the date on which the payment is due or, if different, the date on which a late fee will be charged, together with the amount of the late fee to be imposed if payment is made after that date.

“(L) **ARBITRATION.**—

“(i) **WAIVER OF RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.**—Any rights and remedies available to borrowers against servicers may not be waived by any agreement, policy, or form, including by a predispute arbitration agreement.

“(ii) **PREDISPUTE ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS.**—No predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable by a servicer, including as a third-party beneficiary or by estoppel, if the agreement requires arbitration of a dispute with respect to a postsecondary education loan. This clause applies to predispute arbitration agreements entered into before the date of enactment of the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights, as well as on and after such date of enactment, if the violation that is the subject of the dispute occurred on or after such date of enactment.

“(M) **ENFORCEMENT.**—The provisions of this paragraph shall be enforced by the agencies specified in subsections (a) through (d) of section 108, in the manner set forth in that section or under any other applicable authorities available to such agencies by law, and by State Attorneys General.

“(N) **PREEMPTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to preempt any provision of State law regarding postsecondary education loans where the State law provides stronger consumer protections.

“(O) **CIVIL LIABILITY.**—A servicer that fails to comply with any requirement imposed under this paragraph shall be deemed a creditor that has failed to comply with a requirement under this chapter for purposes of liability under section 130 and such servicer shall be subject to the liability provisions under such section, including the provisions under paragraphs (1), (2)(A)(i), (2)(B), and (3) of section 130(a).

“(P) **ELIGIBILITY FOR DISCHARGE.**—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall promulgate rules requiring lenders and servicers of loans described in paragraph (13)(B)(ii) to—

“(i) identify and contact borrowers who may be eligible for student loan discharge by the Secretary;

“(ii) provide the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about obtaining such discharge; and

“(iii) create a streamlined process for eligible borrowers to apply for and receive such discharge.

“(Q) **STUDENT LOAN SERVICER REQUIREMENTS.**—A student loan servicer may not—

“(i) charge a fee for responding to a qualified written request under this chapter;

“(ii) fail to take timely action to respond to a qualified written request from a borrower to correct an error relating to an allocation of payment or the payoff amount of the postsecondary education loan;

“(iii) fail to take reasonable steps to avail the borrower of all possible alternative repayment arrangements to avoid default;

“(iv) fail to perform the obligations required under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

“(v) fail to respond within 10 business days to a request from a borrower to provide the name, address, and other relevant contact information of the loan holder of the borrower’s postsecondary education loan or, for a Federal Direct Loan or a Federal Perkins Loan, the Secretary of Education or the institution of higher education who made the loan, respectively;

“(vi) fail to comply with any applicable requirement of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.);

“(vii) fail to comply with any other obligation that the Bureau, by regulation, has determined to be appropriate to carry out the consumer protection purposes of this chapter; or

“(viii) fail to perform other standard servicer’s duties.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **INFORMATION TO BE AVAILABLE AT NO CHARGE.**—The information required to be disclosed under this section shall be made available at no charge to the borrower.”; and

(2) in section 130(a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “128(e)(7)” and inserting “128(e)(10)”;

(B) in the flush matter at the end, by striking “or paragraph (4)(C), (6), (7), or (8) of section 128(e),” and inserting “or paragraph (4)(C), (9), (10), or (11) of section 128(e),”.

(c) **STUDENT LOAN INFORMATION BY ELIGIBLE LENDERS.**—Section 433 of the Higher

Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1083) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (12), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) a statement that—

“(A) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(B) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(16)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(16)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) A statement that—

“(i) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(ii) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(16)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(16)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(F) A statement that—

“(i) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(ii) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(16)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(16)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”.

SEC. 702. WAGE GARNISHMENT.

The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 812 (15 U.S.C. 1692j) the following:

“SEC. 812A. LIMITS ON SEIZURES OF INCOME FOR DEBT RELATING TO EDUCATION LOANS.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘adjusted gross income’ has the meaning given the term in section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(2) the term ‘poverty line’ means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

“(b) **LIMITATION ON COLLECTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a debt collector that is engaged in the collection of debts relating to education loans may not take any action to cause, or seek to cause, the collection of such a debt that is taken from the wages, Federal benefits, or other amounts due to a consumer through garnishment, deduction, offset, or seizure in an amount that is more than the amount described in paragraph (2).

“(2) CALCULATION.—The amount described in this paragraph is the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) 10 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the consumer exceeds 185 percent of the poverty line; by

“(B) 12.

“(3) PRESUMPTION.—For purposes of this section, if a debt collector described in paragraph (1) is unable to determine the family size of a consumer, that person shall presume that the family size of the consumer is 3 individuals.

“(c) COMMUNICATIONS.—Any communication by a debt collector described in subsection (b)(1) that is for the purpose of seizing income of a consumer for debt that relates an education loan shall be considered—

“(1) an attempt to collect a debt; and

“(2) conduct in connection with the collection of a debt for the purposes of this title.”.

SEC. 703. IMPROVED CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.

Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

“(17) DISCHARGE OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS IN THE EVENT OF DEATH OR DISABILITY OF THE BORROWER.—Each private education loan shall include terms that provide that the liability to repay the loan shall be cancelled—

“(A) upon the death of the borrower;

“(B) if the borrower becomes permanently and totally disabled, as determined under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 437(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a)) and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Education under that section; and

“(C) if the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of Defense determines that the borrower is unemployable due to a service-connected condition or disability, in accordance with the requirements of section 437(a)(2) of that Act and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Education under that section; and

“(18) TERMS FOR CO-BORROWERS.—Each private education loan shall include terms that clearly define the requirements to release a co-borrower from the obligation.

“(19) PROHIBITION OF ACCELERATION OF PAYMENTS ON PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a private education loan executed after the date of enactment of this paragraph may not include a provision that permits the loan holder or student loan servicer to accelerate, in whole or in part, payments on the private education loan.

“(B) ACCELERATION CAUSED BY A PAYMENT DEFAULT.—A private education loan may include a provision that permits acceleration of the loan in cases of payment default.

“(20) PROHIBITION ON DENIAL OF CREDIT DUE TO ELIGIBILITY FOR PROTECTION UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.—A private educational lender may not deny or refuse credit to an individual who is entitled to any right or protection provided under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) or subject, solely by reason of such entitlement, such individual to any other action described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 108 of such Act.”.

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) requirements for a co-borrower, including—

“(i) any changes in the applicable interest rates without a co-borrower; and

“(ii) any conditions the borrower is required meet in order to release a co-borrower from the private education loan obligation;”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (O), (P), (Q), and (R) as subparagraphs (P), (Q), (R), and (S), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (N) the following:

“(O) in the case of a refinancing of education loans that include a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.)—

“(i) a list containing each loan to be refinanced, which shall identify whether the loan is a private education loan or a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

“(ii) benefits that the borrower may be forfeiting, including income-driven repayment options, opportunities for loan forgiveness, forbearance or deferment options, interest subsidies, and tax benefits;”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (O) and (P) as subparagraphs (P) and (Q), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (N) the following:

“(O) in the case of a refinancing of education loans that include a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.)—

“(i) a list containing each loan to be refinanced, which shall identify whether the loan is a private education loan or a Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

“(ii) benefits that the borrower may be forfeiting, including income-driven repayment options, opportunities for loan forgiveness, forbearance or deferment options, interest subsidies, and tax benefits;”.

SEC. 704. KNOW BEFORE YOU OWE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Know Before You Owe Private Education Loan Act”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), before a creditor may issue any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall obtain from the relevant institution of higher education where such loan is to be used for a student, such institution’s certification of—

“(i) the enrollment status of the student;

“(ii) the student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined by the institution under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

“(iii) the difference between—

“(I) such cost of attendance; and

“(II) the student’s estimated financial assistance, including such assistance received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other financial assistance known to the institution, as applicable.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a creditor may issue funds, not to exceed the amount described in subparagraph (A)(iii), with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection

without obtaining from the relevant institution of higher education such institution’s certification if such institution fails to provide within 15 business days of the creditor’s request for such certification—

“(i) notification of the institution’s refusal to certify the request; or

“(ii) notification that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request.

“(C) LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—If a creditor issues funds without obtaining a certification, as described in subparagraph (B), such creditor shall report the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(21) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

“(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS.—

“(i) LOAN STATEMENT.—A creditor that issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall send loan statements, where such loan is to be used for a student, to borrowers of such funds not less than once every 3 months during the time that such student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

“(ii) CONTENTS OF LOAN STATEMENT.—Each statement described in clause (i) shall—

“(I) report the borrower’s total remaining debt to the creditor, including accrued but unpaid interest and capitalized interest;

“(II) report any debt increases since the last statement; and

“(III) list the current interest rate for each loan.

“(B) NOTIFICATION OF LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—On or before the date a creditor issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall notify the relevant institution of higher education, in writing, of the amount of the extension of credit and the student on whose behalf credit is extended. The form of such written notification shall be subject to the regulations of the Bureau.

“(C) ANNUAL REPORT.—A creditor that issues funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Bureau containing the required information about private student loans to be determined by the Bureau, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.”.

(2) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—Section 140(a)(7)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(7)(A)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);

(B) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(C) by adding after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and”.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue regulations in final form to implement paragraphs (3) and (21) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by paragraph (1). Such regulations shall become effective not later than 6 months after their date of issuance.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—

(1) PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AGREEMENTS.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of

1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) and inserting the following:

“(28)(A) Upon the request of a private educational lender, acting in connection with an application initiated by a borrower for a private education loan in accordance with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act, the institution shall, not later than 15 days after the date of receipt of the request—

“(i) provide such certification to such private educational lender—

“(I) that the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, is enrolled or is scheduled to enroll at the institution;

“(II) of such student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

“(III) of the difference between—

“(aa) the cost of attendance at the institution; and

“(bb) the student’s estimated financial assistance received under this title and other assistance known to the institution, as applicable;

“(ii) notify the creditor that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request; or

“(iii) provide notice to the private educational lender of the institution’s refusal to certify the private education loan under subparagraph (D).

“(B) With respect to a certification request described in subparagraph (A), and prior to providing such certification under subparagraph (A)(i) or providing notice of the refusal to provide certification under subparagraph (A)(iii), the institution shall—

“(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, has applied for and exhausted the Federal financial assistance available to such student under this title and inform the student accordingly; and

“(ii) provide the borrower whose loan application has prompted the certification request by a private education lender, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), with the following information and disclosures:

“(I) The availability of, and the borrower’s potential eligibility for, Federal financial assistance under this title, including disclosing the terms, conditions, interest rates, and repayment options and programs of Federal student loans.

“(II) The borrower’s ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower’s choice.

“(III) The impact of a proposed private education loan on the borrower’s potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.

“(IV) The borrower’s right to accept or reject a private education loan within the 30-day period following a private educational lender’s approval of a borrower’s application and about a borrower’s 3-day right to cancel period.

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms ‘private educational lender’ and ‘private education loan’ have the meanings given such terms in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).

“(D)(i) An institution shall not provide a certification with respect to a private education loan under this paragraph unless the private education loan includes terms that provide—

“(I) the borrower alternative repayment plans, including loan consolidation or refinancing; and

“(II) that the liability to repay the loan shall be cancelled upon the death or disability of the borrower or co-borrower.

“(ii) In this paragraph, the term ‘disability’ means a permanent and total disability, as determined in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary of Education, or a determination by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that the borrower is unemployable due to a service connected-disability.”

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the effective date of the regulations described in subsection (b)(3).

(3) **PREFERRED LENDER ARRANGEMENT.**—Section 151(8)(A)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1019(8)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting “certifying,” after “promoting.”

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 24 months after the issuance of regulations under subsection (b)(3), the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection and the Secretary of Education shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the compliance of institutions of higher education and private educational lenders with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by subsection (b), and section 487(a)(28) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)), as amended by subsection (c). Such report shall include information about the degree to which specific institutions utilize certifications in effectively encouraging the exhaustion of Federal student loan eligibility and lowering student private education loan debt.

SEC. 705. BANKRUPTCY PROTECTIONS.

(a) **EXCEPTIONS TO DISCHARGE.**—Section 523(a)(8) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking “dependents, for” and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “dependents, for an educational benefit overpayment or loan made, insured, or guaranteed by a governmental unit or made under any program funded in whole or in part by a governmental unit or an obligation to repay funds received from a governmental unit as an educational benefit, scholarship, or stipend.”

(b) **UNDUE HARDSHIP.**—Section 523 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **UNDUE HARDSHIP.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For the purpose of subsection (a)(8), there shall be a rebuttable presumption that excepting such debt from discharge under this section would impose an undue hardship on the debtor or the debtor’s dependents if the debtor demonstrates that, on the date of filing of the petition, the debtor—

“(A) is receiving benefits under title II or XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq., 1381 et seq.) on the basis of disability;

“(B) has been determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to be unemployable due to a service-connected disability;

“(C) is a family caregiver of an eligible veteran pursuant to section 1720G of title 38;

“(D) is a member of a household that has a gross income that is less than 200 percent of the poverty line, and provides for the care and support of an elderly, disabled, or chronically ill member of the household of the debtor or member of the immediate family of the debtor;

“(E) is a member of a household that has a gross income that is less than 200 percent of the poverty line, and the income of the debtor is solely derived from benefit payments under section 202 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402); or

“(F) during the 5-year period preceding the filing of the petition (exclusive of any applicable suspension of the repayment period), was not enrolled in an education program and had a gross income that was less than 200 percent of the poverty line during each year during that period.

“(2) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘poverty line’ means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a household of the size involved.”

SEC. 706. EDUCATION LOAN OMBUDSMAN.

Section 1035 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5535) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “PRIVATE”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “a Private” and inserting “an”; and

(B) by striking “private”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “private education student loan” and inserting “education loan”;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “private”;

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) coordinate with the unit of the Bureau established under section 1013(b)(3), in order to monitor complaints by education loan borrowers and responses to those complaints by the Bureau or other appropriate Federal or State agency;”;

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking “private”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “on the same day annually”; and

(ii) by inserting “and be made available to the public” after “Representatives”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include information on the number, nature, and resolution of complaints received, disaggregated by lender, servicer, region, State, and institution of higher education.”;

(6) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **EDUCATION LOAN.**—The term ‘education loan’ means—

“(A) a private education loan, as defined in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650); and

“(B) a student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“(2) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).”

SEC. 707. SERVICEMEMBERS AND STUDENT LOANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title II of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 209. CONTINUAL MONITORING BY PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL LENDERS OF STATUS OF SERVICEMEMBERS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each private educational lender shall continuously monitor the Defense Manpower Data Center, or any successor database, for the purpose of continuously monitoring the duty status of any

borrower of a private education loan who is a servicemember and complying with the requirements of this Act.

“(b) **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—Monitoring conducted under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with such policies and procedures as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe for purposes of this section.

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL LENDER.**—The term ‘private educational lender’ has the meaning given such term in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).

“(2) **PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.**—The term ‘private education loan’ has the meaning given such term in this section.

SEC. 210. FORGIVENESS OF STUDENT DEBT.

“(a) **FORGIVENESS OF STUDENT DEBT OF SERVICEMEMBERS WHO DIE IN LINE OF DUTY WHILE SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY.**—Upon the death of a servicemember who dies in line of duty while serving on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces, each student loan of the servicemember is forgiven.

“(b) **FORGIVENESS OF FEDERAL STUDENT DEBT UPON SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH.**—Upon the service-connected death of a servicemember, the balance of each student loan of the servicemember guaranteed or issued by the Federal Government is forgiven.

“(c) **SERVICE-CONNECTED DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘service-connected’ has the meaning given such term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 208 the following new items:

“Sec. 209. Continual monitoring by private educational lenders of status of servicemembers.

“Sec. 210. Forgiveness of student debt.”.

SA 2180. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 212, redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (e).

In section 212, insert after subsection (b) the following:

(c) **REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSENT TO ADOPT INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL INSURANCE STANDARDS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may not agree to, accept, establish, enter into, or consent to the adoption of a final international capital insurance standard with an international standard-setting organization or a foreign government, authority, or regulatory entity unless—

(1) the Secretary and the Chair of the Board of Governors have, with respect to the text of the proposed final international capital insurance standard—

(A) published the text in the Federal Register;

(B) made the text available for public comment for a period of not less than 30 days; and

(C) submitted a copy of the text to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives on a date on which both Houses of Congress are in session;

(2) the international capital insurance standard is not inconsistent with capital requirements set forth in the State-based system of insurance regulation;

(3) if the international capital insurance standard will apply to a company supervised by the Board of Governors, the international capital insurance standard is not inconsistent with the capital requirements of the Board of Governors for that company; and

(4) the international capital insurance standard recognizes the system of insurance regulation in the United States as satisfying the standard.

(d) **INVOLVEMENT OF STATE INSURANCE REGULATORS.**—During the development and negotiation of any international capital insurance standard or international insurance agreement, including a covered agreement under section 314 of title 31, United States Code, any party representing the United States shall, on any matter relating to insurance, closely consult and coordinate with, and include in any meeting with respect to that development and negotiation—

(1) the State insurance commissioners; or

(2) a designee of the State insurance commissioners, who shall act at the discretion of the State insurance commissioners.

SA 2181. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 105, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 106, line 7, and insert the following:

“(B) what constitutes appropriate proof.”.

SA 2182. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Subtitle A—Loans

PART I—PAYDAY, VEHICLE TITLE, AND CERTAIN HIGH-COST INSTALLMENT LOANS

Subpart A—General

SEC. 601. AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The regulation in this part is issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (in this section referred to as the “Bureau”) pursuant to title X of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.).

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this part is to identify certain unfair and abusive acts or practices in connection with certain consumer credit transactions and to set forth requirements for preventing such acts or practices. This part also prescribes requirements to ensure that the features of those consumer credit transactions are fully, accurately, and effectively disclosed to consumers. This part also prescribes processes and criteria for registration of information systems.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—For the purposes of this part, the following definitions apply:

(1) **ACCOUNT.**—The term “account” has the same meaning as in section 1005.2(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) **AFFILIATE.**—The term “affiliate” has the same meaning as in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(3) **CLOSED-END CREDIT.**—The term “closed-end credit” means an extension of credit to a consumer that is not open-end credit.

(4) **CONSUMER.**—The term “consumer” has the same meaning as in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(5) **CONSUMMATION.**—The term “consummation” means the time that a consumer becomes contractually obligated on a new loan or a modification that increases the amount of an existing loan.

(6) **COST OF CREDIT.**—The term “cost of credit” means the cost of consumer credit as expressed as a per annum rate and is determined as follows:

(A) **CHARGES INCLUDED IN THE COST OF CREDIT.**—The cost of credit includes all finance charges as set forth in section 1026.4 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, but without regard to whether the credit is consumer credit, as that term is defined in section 1026.2(a)(12) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or is extended to a consumer, as that term is defined in section 1026.2(a)(11) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(B) **CALCULATION OF THE COST OF CREDIT.**—

(i) **CLOSED-END CREDIT.**—For closed-end credit, the cost of credit must be calculated according to the requirements section 1026.22 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(ii) **OPEN-END CREDIT.**—For open-end credit, the cost of credit must be calculated according to the rules for calculating the effective annual percentage rate for a billing cycle as set forth in section 1026.14 (c) and (d) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(7) **COVERED LONGER-TERM BALLOON-PAYMENT LOAN.**—The term “covered longer-term balloon-payment loan” means a loan described in section 603(b)(2).

(8) **COVERED LONGER-TERM LOAN.**—The term “covered longer-term loan” means a loan described in section 603(b)(3).

(9) **COVERED PERSON.**—The term “covered person” has the same meaning as in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(10) **COVERED SHORT-TERM.**—The term “covered short-term loan” means a loan described in section 603(b)(1).

(11) **CREDIT.**—The term “credit” has the same meaning as in section 1026.2(a)(14) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(12) **ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER.**—The term “electronic fund transfer” has the same meaning as in section 1005.3(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(13) **LENDER.**—The term “lender” means a person who regularly extends credit to a consumer primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

(14) **LOAN SEQUENCE OR SEQUENCE.**—The term “loan sequence” or “sequence” means a series of consecutive or concurrent covered short-term loans or covered longer-term balloon-payment loans, or a combination thereof, in which each of the loans (other than the first loan) is made during the period in which the consumer has a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan outstanding and for 30 days thereafter. For the purpose of determining where a loan is located within a loan sequence—

(A) a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan is the first loan in a sequence if the loan is extended to a consumer who had no covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan outstanding within the immediately preceding 30 days;

(B) a covered short-term or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan is the second loan in the sequence if the consumer has a currently outstanding covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan that is the first loan in a sequence, or if the consummation date of the second loan is within 30 days following the last day on which the consumer's first loan in the sequence was outstanding;

(C) a covered short-term or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan is the third loan in the sequence if the consumer has a currently outstanding covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan that is the second loan in the sequence, or if the consummation date of the third loan is within 30 days following the last day on which the consumer's second loan in the sequence was outstanding; and

(D) a covered short-term or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan would be the fourth loan in the sequence if the consumer has a currently outstanding covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan that is the third loan in the sequence, or if the consummation date of the fourth loan would be within 30 days following the last day on which the consumer's third loan in the sequence was outstanding.

(15) **MOTOR VEHICLE.**—The term “motor vehicle” means any self-propelled vehicle primarily used for on-road transportation. The term does not include motor homes, recreational vehicles, golf carts, and motor scooters.

(16) **OPEN-END CREDIT.**—The term “open-end credit” means an extension of credit to a consumer that is an open-end credit plan as defined in section 1026.2(a)(20) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, but without regard to whether the credit is consumer credit, as defined in section 1026.2(a)(12) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, is extended by a creditor, as defined in section 1026.2(a)(17) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, is extended to a consumer, as defined in section 1026.2(a)(11) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, or permits a finance charge to be imposed from time to time on an outstanding balance as defined in section 1026.4 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(17) **OUTSTANDING LOAN.**—The term “outstanding loan” means a loan that the consumer is legally obligated to repay, regardless of whether the loan is delinquent or is subject to a repayment plan or other workout arrangement, except that a loan ceases to be an outstanding loan if the consumer has not made at least one payment on the loan within the previous 180 days.

(18) **SERVICE PROVIDER.**—The term “service provider” has the same meaning as in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(19) **VEHICLE SECURITY.**—The term “vehicle security” means an interest in a consumer's motor vehicle obtained by the lender or service provider as a condition of the credit, regardless of how the transaction is characterized by State law, including—

(A) any security interest in the motor vehicle, motor vehicle title, or motor vehicle registration whether or not the security interest is perfected or recorded; or

(B) a pawn transaction in which the consumer's motor vehicle is the pledged good

and the consumer retains use of the motor vehicle during the period of the pawn agreement.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—For purposes of this part, where definitions are incorporated from other statutes or regulations, the terms have the meaning and incorporate the embedded definitions, appendices, and commentary from those other laws except to the extent that this part provides a different definition for a parallel term.

SEC. 603. SCOPE OF COVERAGE; EXCLUSIONS; EXEMPTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This part applies to a lender that extends credit by making covered loans.

(b) **COVERED LOAN.**—The term “covered loan” means closed-end or open-end credit that is extended to a consumer primarily for personal, family, or household purposes that is not excluded under subsection (d) or conditionally exempted under subsection (e) or (f), and—

(1) for closed-end credit that does not provide for multiple advances to consumers, the consumer is required to repay substantially the entire amount of the loan within 45 days of consummation, or for all other loans, the consumer is required to repay substantially the entire amount of any advance within 45 days of the advance;

(2) for loans not otherwise covered by paragraph (1)—

(A) for closed-end credit that does not provide for multiple advances to consumers, the consumer is required to repay substantially the entire balance of the loan in a single payment more than 45 days after consummation or to repay such loan through at least one payment that is more than twice as large as any other payment(s); or

(B) for all other loans, either—

(i) the consumer is required to repay substantially the entire amount of an advance in a single payment more than 45 days after the advance is made or is required to make at least one payment on the advance that is more than twice as large as any other payment(s); or

(ii) a loan with multiple advances is structured such that paying the required minimum payments may not fully amortize the outstanding balance by a specified date or time, and the amount of the final payment to repay the outstanding balance at such time could be more than twice the amount of other minimum payments under the plan; or

(3) for loans not otherwise covered by paragraph (1) or (2), if both of the following conditions are satisfied:

(A) The cost of credit for the loan exceeds 36 percent per annum, as measured—

(i) at the time of consummation for closed-end credit; or

(ii) at the time of consummation and, if the cost of credit at consummation is not more than 36 percent per annum, again at the end of each billing cycle for open-end credit, except that—

(I) open-end credit meets the condition set forth in this clause in any billing cycle in which a lender imposes a finance charge, and the principal balance is \$0; and

(II) Once open-end credit meets the condition set forth in this clause, it meets the condition set forth in this clause for the duration of the plan.

(B) The lender or service provider obtains a leveraged payment mechanism as defined in subsection (c).

(c) **LEVERAGED PAYMENT MECHANISM.**—For purposes of subsection (b), a lender or service provider obtains a leveraged payment mechanism if it has the right to initiate a trans-

fer of money, through any means, from a consumer's account to satisfy an obligation on a loan, except that the lender or service provider does not obtain a leveraged payment mechanism by initiating a single immediate payment transfer at the consumer's request.

(d) **EXCLUSIONS FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF CREDIT.**—This part does not apply to the following:

(1) **CERTAIN PURCHASE MONEY SECURITY INTEREST LOANS.**—Credit extended for the sole and express purpose of financing a consumer's initial purchase of a good when the credit is secured by the property being purchased, whether or not the security interest is perfected or recorded.

(2) **REAL ESTATE SECURED CREDIT.**—Credit that is secured by any real property, or by personal property used or expected to be used as a dwelling, and the lender records or otherwise perfects the security interest within the term of the loan.

(3) **CREDIT CARDS.**—Any credit card account under an open-end (not home-secured) consumer credit plan as defined in section 1026.2(a)(15)(ii) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) **STUDENT LOANS.**—Credit made, insured, or guaranteed pursuant to a program authorized by title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), or a private education loan as defined in section 1026.46(b)(5) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(5) **NONRECOURSE PAWN LOANS.**—Credit in which the lender has sole physical possession and use of the property securing the credit for the entire term of the loan and for which the lender's sole recourse if the consumer does not elect to redeem the pawned item and repay the loan is the retention of the property securing the credit.

(6) **OVERDRAFT SERVICES AND LINES OF CREDIT.**—Overdraft services as defined in section 1005.17(a) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, and overdraft lines of credit otherwise excluded from the definition of overdraft services under section 1005.17(a)(1) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(7) **WAGE ADVANCE PROGRAMS.**—Advances of wages that constitute credit if made by an employer, as defined in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203), or by the employer's business partner, to the employer's employees, provided that—

(A) the advance is made only against the accrued cash value of any wages the employee has earned up to the date of the advance; and

(B) before any amount is advanced, the entity advancing the funds warrants to the consumer as part of the contract between the parties on behalf of itself and any business partners, that it or they, as applicable—

(i) will not require the consumer to pay any charges or fees in connection with the advance, other than a charge for participating in the wage advance program;

(ii) has no legal or contractual claim or remedy against the consumer based on the consumer's failure to repay in the event the amount advanced is not repaid in full; and

(iii) with respect to the amount advanced to the consumer, will not engage in any debt collection activities if the advance is not deducted directly from wages or otherwise repaid on the scheduled date, place the amount advanced as a debt with or sell it to a third party, or report to a consumer reporting agency concerning the amount advanced.

(8) **NO-COST ADVANCES.**—Advances of funds that constitute credit if the consumer is not required to pay any charge or fee to be eligible to receive or in return for receiving the

advance, provided that before any amount is advanced, the entity advancing the funds warrants to the consumer as part of the contract between the parties—

(A) that it has no legal or contractual claim or remedy against the consumer based on the consumer's failure to repay in the event the amount advanced is not repaid in full; and

(B) that, with respect to the amount advanced to the consumer, such entity will not engage in any debt collection activities if the advance is not repaid on the scheduled date, place the amount advanced as a debt with or sell it to a third party, or report to a consumer reporting agency concerning the amount advanced.

(e) **ALTERNATIVE LOAN.**—Alternative loans are conditionally exempt from the requirements of this part. The term “alternative loan” means a covered loan that satisfies the following conditions and requirements:

(1) **LOAN TERM CONDITIONS.**—An alternative loan must satisfy the following conditions:

(A) The loan is not structured as open-end credit, as defined in section 602(a)(16).

(B) The loan has a term of not less than 1 month and not more than 6 months.

(C) The principal of the loan is not less than \$200 and not more than \$1,000.

(D) The loan is repayable in 2 or more payments, all of which payments are substantially equal in amount and fall due in substantially equal intervals, and the loan amortizes completely during the term of the loan.

(E) The lender does not impose any charges other than the rate and application fees permissible for Federal credit unions under regulations issued by the National Credit Union Administration in section 701.21(c)(7)(iii) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) **BORROWING HISTORY CONDITION.**—Prior to making an alternative loan under this subsection, the lender must determine from its records that the loan would not result in the consumer being indebted on more than 3 outstanding loans made under this section from the lender within a period of 180 days. The lender must also make no more than one alternative loan under this subsection at a time to a consumer.

(3) **INCOME DOCUMENTATION CONDITION.**—In making an alternative loan under this subsection, the lender must maintain and comply with policies and procedures for documenting proof of recurring income.

(4) **SAFE HARBOR.**—Loans made by Federal credit unions in compliance with the conditions set forth by the National Credit Union Administration in section 701.21(c)(7)(iii) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, for a Payday Alternative Loan are deemed to be in compliance with the requirements and conditions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

(f) **ACCOMMODATION LOANS.**—Accommodation loans are conditionally exempt from the requirements of this part. Accommodation loan means a covered loan if at the time that the loan is consummated—

(1) the lender and its affiliates collectively have made 2,500 or fewer covered loans in the current calendar year, and made 2,500 or fewer such covered loans in the preceding calendar year;

(2)(A) during the most recent completed tax year in which the lender was in operation, if applicable, the lender and any affiliates that were in operation and used the same tax year derived no more than 10 percent of their receipts from covered loans; or

(B) if the lender was not in operation in a prior tax year, the lender reasonably anticipates that the lender and any of its affiliates

that use the same tax year will derive no more than 10 percent of their receipts from covered loans during the current tax year; and

(3) provided, however, that covered longer-term loans for which all transfers meet the conditions in section 622(a)(1)(ii), and receipts from such loans, are not included for the purpose of determining whether the conditions of paragraphs (1) and (2) have been satisfied.

(g) **RECEIPTS.**—For purposes of subsection (f), the term “receipts” means “total income” (or in the case of a sole proprietorship “gross income”) plus “cost of goods sold” as these terms are defined and reported on Internal Revenue Service (IRS) tax return forms (such as Form 1120 for corporations, Form 1120S and Schedule K for S corporations, Form 1120, Form 1065 or Form 1040 for LLCs, Form 1065 and Schedule K for partnerships, and Form 1040, Schedule C for sole proprietorships). Receipts do not include net capital gains or losses; taxes collected for and remitted to a taxing authority if included in gross or total income, such as sales or other taxes collected from customers but excluding taxes levied on the entity or its employees; or amounts collected for another (but fees earned in connection with such collections are receipts). Items such as subcontractor costs, reimbursements for purchases a contractor makes at a customer's request, and employee-based costs such as payroll taxes are included in receipts.

(h) **TAX YEAR.**—For purposes of subsection (f), the term “tax year” has the meaning attributed to it by the IRS as set forth in IRS Publication 538, which provides that a “tax year” is an annual accounting period for keeping records and reporting income and expenses.

Subpart B—Underwriting

SEC. 611. IDENTIFICATION OF UNFAIR AND ABUSIVE PRACTICE.

It is an unfair and abusive practice for a lender to make covered short-term loans or covered longer-term balloon-payment loans without reasonably determining that the consumers will have the ability to repay the loans according to their terms.

SEC. 612. ABILITY-TO-REPAY DETERMINATION REQUIRED.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) **BASIC LIVING EXPENSES.**—The term “basic living expenses” means expenditures, other than payments for major financial obligations, that a consumer makes for goods and services that are necessary to maintain the consumer's health, welfare, and ability to produce income, and the health and welfare of the members of the consumer's household who are financially dependent on the consumer.

(2) **DEBT-TO-INCOME RATIO.**—The term “debt-to-income ratio” means the ratio, expressed as a percentage, of the sum of the amounts that the lender projects will be payable by the consumer for major financial obligations during the relevant monthly period and the payments under the covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan during the relevant monthly period, to the net income that the lender projects the consumer will receive during the relevant monthly period, all of which projected amounts are determined in accordance with subsection (c).

(3) **MAJOR FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS.**—The term “major financial obligations” means a consumer's housing expense, required payments under debt obligations (including, without limitation, outstanding covered

loans), child support obligations, and alimony obligations.

(4) **NATIONAL CONSUMER REPORT.**—The term “national consumer report” means a consumer report, as defined in section 603(d) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(d)), obtained from a consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis, as defined in section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)).

(5) **NET INCOME.**—The term “net income” means the total amount that a consumer receives after the payer deducts amounts for taxes, other obligations, and voluntary contributions (but before deductions of any amounts for payments under a prospective covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan or for any major financial obligation); provided that, the lender may include in the consumer's net income the amount of any income of another person to which the consumer has a reasonable expectation of access.

(6) **PAYMENT UNDER THE COVERED SHORT-TERM LOAN OR COVERED LONGER-TERM BALLOON-PAYMENT LOAN.**—The term “payment under the covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan”—

(A) means the combined dollar amount payable by the consumer at a particular time following consummation in connection with the covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan, assuming that the consumer has made preceding required payments and in the absence of any affirmative act by the consumer to extend or restructure the repayment schedule or to suspend, cancel, or delay payment for any product, service, or membership provided in connection with the loan;

(B) includes all principal, interest, charges, and fees; and

(C) for a line of credit is calculated assuming that—

(i) the consumer will utilize the full amount of credit under the covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan as soon as the credit is available to the consumer; and

(ii) the consumer will make only minimum required payments under the covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan for as long as permitted under the loan agreement.

(7) **RELEVANT MONTHLY PERIOD.**—The term “relevant monthly period” means the calendar month in which the highest sum of payments is due under the covered short-term or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan.

(8) **RESIDUAL INCOME.**—The term “residual income” means the sum of net income that the lender projects the consumer will receive during the relevant monthly period, minus the sum of the amounts that the lender projects will be payable by the consumer for major financial obligations during the relevant monthly period and payments under the covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan during the relevant monthly period, all of which projected amounts are determined in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) **REASONABLE DETERMINATION REQUIRED.**—(1)(A) Except as provided in section 613, a lender must not make a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan or increase the credit available under a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan, unless the lender first makes a reasonable determination that the consumer will have the ability to repay the loan according to its terms.

(B) For a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan that is a line of credit, a lender must not permit a consumer to obtain an advance under the line of credit more than 90 days after the date of a required determination under this subsection, unless the lender first makes a new determination that the consumer will have the ability to repay the covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan according to its terms.

(2) A lender's determination of a consumer's ability to repay a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan is reasonable only if either—

(A) based on the calculation of the consumer's debt-to-income ratio for the relevant monthly period and the estimates of the consumer's basic living expenses for the relevant monthly period, the lender reasonably concludes that—

(i) for a covered short-term loan, the consumer can make payments for major financial obligations, make all payments under the loan, and meet basic living expenses during the shorter of the term of the loan or the period ending 45 days after consummation of the loan, and for 30 days after having made the highest payment under the loan; and

(ii) for a covered longer-term balloon-payment loan, the consumer can make payments for major financial obligations, make all payments under the loan, and meet basic living expenses during the relevant monthly period, and for 30 days after having made the highest payment under the loan; or

(B) based on the calculation of the consumer's residual income for the relevant monthly period and the estimates of the consumer's basic living expenses for the relevant monthly period, the lender reasonably concludes that—

(i) for a covered short-term loan, the consumer can make payments for major financial obligations, make all payments under the loan, and meet basic living expenses during the shorter of the term of the loan or the period ending 45 days after consummation of the loan, and for 30 days after having made the highest payment under the loan; and

(ii) for a covered longer-term balloon-payment loan, the consumer can make payments for major financial obligations, make all payments under the loan, and meet basic living expenses during the relevant monthly period, and for 30 days after having made the highest payment under the loan.

(C) PROJECTING CONSUMER NET INCOME AND PAYMENTS FOR MAJOR FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To make a reasonable determination required under subsection (b), a lender must obtain the consumer's written statement in accordance with paragraph (2)(A), obtain verification evidence to the extent required by paragraph (2)(B), assess information about rental housing expense as required by paragraph (2)(C), and use those sources of information to make a reasonable projection of the amount of a consumer's net income and payments for major financial obligations during the relevant monthly period. The lender must consider major financial obligations that are listed in a consumer's written statement described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) even if they cannot be verified by the sources listed in paragraph (2)(B)(ii). To be reasonable, a projection of the amount of net income or payments for major financial obligations may be based on a consumer's written statement of amounts under paragraph (2)(A) only as specifically permitted by paragraph (2)(B) or (C) or to the extent the stated amounts are consistent

with the verification evidence that is obtained in accordance with paragraph (2)(B). In determining whether the stated amounts are consistent with the verification evidence, the lender may reasonably consider other reliable evidence the lender obtains from or about the consumer, including any explanations the lender obtains from the consumer.

(2) EVIDENCE OF NET INCOME AND PAYMENTS FOR MAJOR FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS.—

(A) CONSUMER STATEMENTS.—A lender must obtain a consumer's written statement of—

(i) the amount of the consumer's net income, which may include the amount of any income of another person to which the consumer has a reasonable expectation of access; and

(ii) the amount of payments required for the consumer's major financial obligations.

(B) VERIFICATION EVIDENCE.—A lender must obtain verification evidence for the amounts of the consumer's net income and payments for major financial obligations other than rental housing expense, as follows:

(i) For the consumer's net income—

(I) the lender must obtain a reliable record (or records) of an income payment (or payments) directly to the consumer covering sufficient history to support the lender's projection under paragraph (1) if a reliable record (or records) is reasonably available. If a lender determines that a reliable record (or records) of some or all of the consumer's net income is not reasonably available, then, the lender may reasonably rely on the consumer's written statement described in subparagraph (A)(i) for that portion of the consumer's net income; and

(II) if the lender elects to include in the consumer's net income for the relevant monthly period any income of another person to which the consumer has a reasonable expectation of access, the lender must obtain verification evidence to support the lender's projection under paragraph (1).

(ii) For the consumer's required payments under debt obligations, the lender must obtain a national consumer report, the records of the lender and its affiliates, and a consumer report obtained from an information system that has been registered for 180 days or more pursuant to section 632(c)(2) or is registered pursuant to section 632(d)(2), if available. If the reports and records do not include a debt obligation listed in the consumer's written statement described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the lender may reasonably rely on the written statement in determining the amount of the required payment.

(iii) For a consumer's required payments under child support obligations or alimony obligations, the lender must obtain a national consumer report. If the report does not include a child support or alimony obligation listed in the consumer's written statement described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the lender may reasonably rely on the written statement in determining the amount of the required payment.

(iv) Notwithstanding clauses (ii) and (iii), the lender is not required to obtain a national consumer report as verification evidence for the consumer's debt obligations, alimony obligations, and child support obligations if during the preceding 90 days—

(I) the lender or an affiliate obtained a national consumer report for the consumer, retained the report under section 633(b)(1)(ii), and checked it again in connection with the new loan; and

(II) the consumer did not complete a loan sequence of three loans made under this section and trigger the prohibition under sub-

section (d)(2) since the previous report was obtained.

(C) RENTAL HOUSING EXPENSE.—For a consumer's housing expense other than a payment for a debt obligation that appears on a national consumer report obtained pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii), the lender may reasonably rely on the consumer's written statement described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

(d) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS ON LENDING (COVERED SHORT-TERM LOANS AND COVERED LONGER-TERM BALLOON-PAYMENT LOANS).—

(1) BORROWING HISTORY REVIEW.—Prior to making a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan under this section, in order to determine whether any of the prohibitions in this subsection are applicable, a lender must obtain and review information about the consumer's borrowing history from the records of the lender and its affiliates, and from a consumer report obtained from an information system that has been registered for 180 days or more pursuant to section 632(c)(2) or is registered with the Bureau pursuant to section 632(d)(2), if available.

(2) PROHIBITION ON LOAN SEQUENCES OF MORE THAN THREE COVERED SHORT-TERM LOANS OR COVERED LONGER-TERM BALLOON-PAYMENT LOANS MADE UNDER THIS SECTION.—A lender must not make a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan under this section during the period in which the consumer has a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan made under this section outstanding and for 30 days thereafter if the new covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan would be the fourth loan in a sequence of covered short-term loans, covered longer-term balloon-payment loans, or a combination of covered short-term loans and covered longer-term balloon-payment loans made under this section.

(3) PROHIBITION ON MAKING A COVERED SHORT-TERM LOAN OR COVERED LONGER-TERM BALLOON-PAYMENT LOAN UNDER THIS SECTION FOLLOWING A COVERED SHORT-TERM LOAN MADE UNDER SECTION 613.—A lender must not make a covered short-term loan or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan under this section during the period in which the consumer has a covered short-term loan made under section 613 outstanding and for 30 days thereafter.

(e) PROHIBITION AGAINST EVASION.—A lender must not take any action with the intent of evading the requirements of this section.

SEC. 613. CONDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN COVERED SHORT-TERM LOANS.

(a) CONDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN COVERED SHORT-TERM LOANS.—Sections 611 and 612 do not apply to a covered short-term loan that satisfies the requirements set forth in subsections (b) through (e). Prior to making a covered short-term loan under this section, a lender must review the consumer's borrowing history in its own records, the records of the lender's affiliates, and a consumer report from an information system that has been registered for 180 days or more pursuant to section 632(c)(2) or is registered with the Bureau pursuant to section 632(d)(2). The lender must use this borrowing history information to determine a potential loan's compliance with the requirements in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) LOAN TERM REQUIREMENTS.—A covered short-term loan that is made under this section must satisfy the following requirements:

(1) The loan satisfies the following principal amount limitations, as applicable—

(A) for the first loan in a loan sequence of covered short-term loans made under this section, the principal amount is no greater than \$500;

(B) for the second loan in a loan sequence of covered short-term loans made under this section, the principal amount is no greater than two-thirds of the principal amount of the first loan in the loan sequence; and

(C) for the third loan in a loan sequence of covered short-term loans made under this section, the principal amount is no greater than one-third of the principal amount of the first loan in the loan sequence.

(2) The loan amortizes completely during the term of the loan and the payment schedule provides for the lender allocating a consumer's payments to the outstanding principal and interest and fees as they accrue only by applying a fixed periodic rate of interest to the outstanding balance of the unpaid loan principal during every scheduled repayment period for the term of the loan.

(3) The lender and any service provider do not take vehicle security as a condition of the loan, as defined in section 602(a)(19).

(4) The loan is not structured as open-end credit, as defined in section 602(a)(16).

(c) **BORROWING HISTORY REQUIREMENTS.**—Prior to making a covered short-term loan under this section, the lender must determine that the following requirements are satisfied:

(1) The consumer has not had in the past 30 days an outstanding covered short-term loan under section 612 or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan under section 612.

(2) The loan would not result in the consumer having a loan sequence of more than 3 covered short-term loans under this section.

(3) The loan would not result in the consumer having during any consecutive 12-month period—

(A) more than 6 covered short-term loans outstanding; or

(B) covered short-term loans outstanding for an aggregate period of more than 90 days.

(d) **RESTRICTIONS ON MAKING CERTAIN COVERED LOANS AND NONCOVERED LOANS FOLLOWING A COVERED SHORT-TERM LOAN MADE UNDER THE CONDITIONAL EXEMPTION.**—If a lender makes a covered short-term loan under this section to a consumer, the lender or its affiliate must not subsequently make a covered loan, except a covered short-term loan made in accordance with the requirements in this section, or a noncovered loan to the consumer while the covered short-term loan made under this section is outstanding and for 30 days thereafter.

(e) **DISCLOSURES.**—

(1) **GENERAL FORM OF DISCLOSURES.**—

(A) **CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS.**—Disclosures required by this subsection must be clear and conspicuous. Disclosures required by this section may contain commonly accepted or readily understandable abbreviations.

(B) **IN WRITING OR ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—Disclosures required by this subsection must be provided in writing or through electronic delivery. The disclosures must be provided in a form that can be viewed on paper or a screen, as applicable. This subparagraph is not satisfied by a disclosure provided orally or through a recorded message.

(C) **RETAINABLE.**—Disclosures required by this subsection must be provided in a retainable form.

(D) **SEGREGATION REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICES.**—Notices required by this subsection must be segregated from all other written or provided materials and contain only the information required by this section, other

than information necessary for product identification, branding, and navigation. Segregated additional content that is not required by this subsection must not be displayed above, below, or around the required content.

(E) **MACHINE READABLE TEXT IN NOTICES PROVIDED THROUGH ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—If provided through electronic delivery, the notices required by paragraph (2)(A) and (B) must use machine readable text that is accessible via both web browsers and screen readers.

(F) **MODEL FORMS.**—

(i) **FIRST LOAN NOTICE.**—The content, order, and format of the notice required by paragraph (2)(A) must be substantially similar to a model form.

(ii) **THIRD LOAN NOTICE.**—The content, order, and format of the notice required by paragraph (2)(B) must be substantially similar to a model form.

(G) **FOREIGN LANGUAGE DISCLOSURES.**—Disclosures required under this subsection may be made in a language other than English, provided that the disclosures are made available in English upon the consumer's request.

(2) **NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **FIRST LOAN NOTICE.**—A lender that makes a first loan in a sequence of loans made under this section must provide to a consumer a notice that includes, as applicable, the following information and statements, using language substantially similar to the language set forth in a model form:

(i) **IDENTIFYING STATEMENT.**—The statement “Notice of restrictions on future loans,” using that phrase.

(ii) **WARNING FOR LOAN MADE UNDER THIS SECTION.**—

(I) **POSSIBLE INABILITY TO REPAY.**—A statement that warns the consumer not to take out the loan if the consumer is unsure of being able to repay the total amount of principal and finance charges on the loan by the contractual due date.

(II) **CONTRACTUAL DUE DATE.**—Contractual due date of the loan made under this section.

(III) **TOTAL AMOUNT DUE.**—Total amount due on the contractual due date.

(iii) **RESTRICTION ON A SUBSEQUENT LOAN REQUIRED BY FEDERAL LAW.**—A statement that informs a consumer that Federal law requires a similar loan taken out within the next 30 days to be smaller.

(iv) **BORROWING LIMITS.**—In a tabular form:

(I) Maximum principal amount on loan 1 in a sequence of loans made under this section.

(II) Maximum principal amount on loan 2 in a sequence of loans made under this section.

(III) Maximum principal amount on loan 3 in a sequence of loans made under this section.

(IV) Loan 4 in a sequence of loans made under this section is not allowed.

(v) **LENDER NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION.**—Name of the lender and a telephone number for the lender and, if applicable, a URL of the website for the lender.

(B) **THIRD LOAN NOTICE.**—A lender that makes a third loan in a sequence of loans made under this section must provide to a consumer a notice that includes the following information and statements, using language substantially similar to the language set forth in a model form:

(i) **IDENTIFYING STATEMENT.**—The statement “Notice of borrowing limits on this loan and future loans,” using that phrase.

(ii) **TWO SIMILAR LOANS WITHOUT 30-DAY BREAK.**—A statement that informs a consumer that the lender's records show that the consumer has had 2 similar loans with-

out taking at least a 30-day break between them.

(iii) **RESTRICTION ON LOAN AMOUNT REQUIRED BY FEDERAL LAW.**—A statement that informs a consumer that the third loan to be smaller than previous loans in the loan sequence.

(iv) **PROHIBITION ON SUBSEQUENT LOAN.**—A statement that informs a consumer that the consumer cannot take out a similar loan for at least 30 days after repaying the loan.

(v) **LENDER NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION.**—Name of the lender and a telephone number for the lender and, if applicable, a URL of the website for the lender.

(3) **TIMING.**—A lender must provide the notices required in paragraph (2)(A) and (B) to the consumer before the applicable loan under this section is consummated.

Subpart C—Payments

SEC. 621. IDENTIFICATION OF UNFAIR AND ABUSIVE PRACTICE.

It is an unfair and abusive practice for a lender to make attempts to withdraw payment from consumers' accounts in connection with a covered loan after the lender's second consecutive attempts to withdraw payments from the accounts from which the prior attempts were made have failed due to a lack of sufficient funds, unless the lender obtains the consumers' new and specific authorization to make further withdrawals from the accounts.

SEC. 622. PROHIBITED PAYMENT TRANSFER ATTEMPTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section and section 623:

(1) **PAYMENT TRANSFER.**—The term “payment transfer” means any lender-initiated debit or withdrawal of funds from a consumer's account for the purpose of collecting any amount due or purported to be due in connection with a covered loan.

(A) **MEANS OF TRANSFER.**—A debit or withdrawal meeting the description in paragraph (1) is a payment transfer regardless of the means through which the lender initiates it, including but not limited to a debit or withdrawal initiated through any of the following means:

(i) Electronic fund transfer, including a preauthorized electronic fund transfer as defined in section 1005.2(k) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(ii) Signature check, regardless of whether the transaction is processed through the check network or another network, such as the automated clearing house (ACH) network.

(iii) Remotely created check as defined in section 229.2(fff) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(iv) Remotely created payment order as defined in section 310.2(cc) of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations.

(v) When the lender is also the account-holder, an account-holding institution's transfer of funds from a consumer's account held at the same institution, other than such a transfer meeting the description in subparagraph (B).

(B) **CONDITIONAL EXCLUSION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS BY ACCOUNT-HOLDING INSTITUTIONS.**—When the lender is also the account-holder, an account-holding institution's transfer of funds from a consumer's account held at the same institution is not a payment transfer if all of the conditions in this subparagraph are met, notwithstanding that the transfer otherwise meets the description in this paragraph.

(i) The lender, pursuant to the terms of the loan agreement or account agreement, does not charge the consumer any fee, other than

a late fee under the loan agreement, in the event that the lender initiates a transfer of funds from the consumer's account in connection with the covered loan for an amount that the account lacks sufficient funds to cover.

(ii) The lender, pursuant to the terms of the loan agreement or account agreement, does not close the consumer's account in response to a negative balance that results from a transfer of funds initiated in connection with the covered loan.

(2) SINGLE IMMEDIATE PAYMENT TRANSFER AT THE CONSUMER'S REQUEST.—The term "single immediate payment transfer at the consumer's request" means—

(A) a payment transfer initiated by a one-time electronic fund transfer within one business day after the lender obtains the consumer's authorization for the one-time electronic fund transfer; or

(B) a payment transfer initiated by means of processing the consumer's signature check through the check system or through the ACH system within one business day after the consumer provides the check to the lender.

(b) PROHIBITION ON INITIATING PAYMENT TRANSFERS FROM A CONSUMER'S ACCOUNT AFTER TWO CONSECUTIVE FAILED PAYMENT TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A lender must not initiate a payment transfer from a consumer's account in connection with any covered loan that the consumer has with the lender after the lender has attempted to initiate 2 consecutive failed payment transfers from that account in connection with any covered loan that the consumer has with the lender. For purposes of this subsection, a payment transfer is deemed to have failed when it results in a return indicating that the consumer's account lacks sufficient funds or, if the lender is the consumer's account-holding institution, it is for an amount that the account lacks sufficient funds to cover.

(2) CONSECUTIVE FAILED PAYMENT TRANSFERS.—For purposes of the prohibition in this subsection:

(A) FIRST FAILED PAYMENT TRANSFER.—A failed payment transfer is the first failed payment transfer from the consumer's account if it meets any of the following conditions:

(i) The lender has initiated no other payment transfer from the account in connection with the covered loan or any other covered loan that the consumer has with the lender.

(ii) The immediately preceding payment transfer was successful, regardless of whether the lender has previously initiated a first failed payment transfer.

(iii) The payment transfer is the first payment transfer to fail after the lender obtains the consumer's authorization for additional payment transfers pursuant to subsection (c).

(B) SECOND CONSECUTIVE FAILED PAYMENT TRANSFER.—A failed payment transfer is the second consecutive failed payment transfer from the consumer's account if the immediately preceding payment transfer was a first failed payment transfer. For purposes of this this subparagraph, a previous payment transfer includes a payment transfer initiated at the same time or on the same day as the failed payment transfer.

(C) DIFFERENT PAYMENT CHANNEL.—A failed payment transfer meeting the conditions in subparagraph (B) is the second consecutive failed payment transfer regardless of whether the first failed payment transfer was initiated through a different payment channel.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR ADDITIONAL PAYMENT TRANSFERS AUTHORIZED BY THE CONSUMER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the prohibition in subsection (b), a lender may initiate additional payment transfers from a consumer's account after 2 consecutive failed payment transfers if the additional payment transfers are authorized by the consumer in accordance with the requirements and conditions in this subsection or if the lender executes a single immediate payment transfer at the consumer's request in accordance with subsection (d).

(2) GENERAL AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENTS AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) REQUIRED PAYMENT TRANSFER TERMS.—For purposes of this subsection, the specific date, amount, and payment channel of each additional payment transfer must be authorized by the consumer, except as provided in subparagraph (B) or (C).

(B) APPLICATION OF SPECIFIC DATE REQUIREMENT TO REINITIATING A RETURNED PAYMENT TRANSFER.—If a payment transfer authorized by the consumer pursuant to this subsection is returned for nonsufficient funds, the lender may reinitiate the payment transfer, such as by re-presenting it once through the ACH system, on or after the date authorized by the consumer, provided that the returned payment transfer has not triggered the prohibition in subsection (b).

(C) SPECIAL AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENTS AND CONDITIONS FOR PAYMENT TRANSFERS TO COLLECT A LATE FEE OR RETURNED ITEM FEE.—A lender may initiate a payment transfer pursuant to this subsection solely to collect a late fee or returned item fee without obtaining the consumer's authorization for the specific date and amount of the payment transfer only if the consumer has authorized the lender to initiate such payment transfers in advance of the withdrawal attempt. For purposes of this subparagraph, the consumer authorizes such payment transfers only if the consumer's authorization obtained under paragraph (3)(C) includes a statement, in terms that are clear and readily understandable to the consumer, that payment transfers may be initiated solely to collect a late fee or returned item fee and that specifies the highest amount for such fees that may be charged and the payment channel to be used.

(3) REQUIREMENTS AND CONDITIONS FOR OBTAINING THE CONSUMER'S AUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the lender must request and obtain the consumer's authorization for additional payment transfers in accordance with the requirements and conditions in this paragraph.

(B) PROVISION OF PAYMENT TRANSFER TERMS TO THE CONSUMER.—The lender may request the consumer's authorization for additional payment transfers no earlier than the date on which the lender provides to the consumer the consumer rights notice required by section 623(c). The request must include the payment transfer terms required under paragraph (2)(A) and, if applicable, the statement required by paragraph (2)(C). The lender may provide the terms and statement to the consumer by any one of the following means:

(i) In writing, by mail or in person, or in a retainable form by email if the consumer has consented to receive electronic disclosures in this manner under section 623(a)(4) or agrees to receive the terms and statement by email in the course of a communication initiated by the consumer in response to the consumer rights notice required by section 623(c).

(ii) By oral telephone communication, if the consumer affirmatively contacts the

lender in that manner in response to the consumer rights notice required by section 623(c) and agrees to receive the terms and statement in that manner in the course of, and as part of, the same communication.

(C) SIGNED AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For an authorization to be valid under this subsection, it must be signed or otherwise agreed to by the consumer in writing or electronically and in a retainable format that memorializes the payment transfer terms required under paragraph (2)(A) and, if applicable, the statement required by paragraph (2)(C). The signed authorization must be obtained from the consumer no earlier than when the consumer receives the consumer rights notice required by section 623(c) in person or electronically, or the date on which the consumer receives the notice by mail. For purposes of this clause, the consumer is considered to have received the notice at the time it is provided to the consumer in person or electronically, or, if the notice is provided by mail, the earlier of the third business day after mailing or the date on which the consumer affirmatively responds to the mailed notice.

(ii) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AUTHORIZATION OBTAINED BY ORAL TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION.—If the authorization is granted in the course of an oral telephone communication, the lender must record the call and retain the recording.

(iii) MEMORIALIZATION REQUIRED.—If the authorization is granted in the course of a recorded telephonic conversation or is otherwise not immediately retainable by the consumer at the time of signature, the lender must provide a memorialization in a retainable form to the consumer by no later than the date on which the first payment transfer authorized by the consumer is initiated. A memorialization may be provided to the consumer by email in accordance with the requirements and conditions in subparagraph (B)(i).

(4) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATION.—An authorization obtained from a consumer pursuant to this subsection becomes null and void for purposes of the exception in this subsection if—

(A) the lender subsequently obtains a new authorization from the consumer pursuant to this subsection; or

(B) two consecutive payment transfers initiated pursuant to the consumer's authorization fail, as specified in subsection (b).

(d) EXCEPTION FOR INITIATING A SINGLE IMMEDIATE PAYMENT TRANSFER AT THE CONSUMER'S REQUEST.—After a lender's second consecutive payment transfer has failed as specified in subsection (b), the lender may initiate a payment transfer from the consumer's account without obtaining the consumer's authorization for additional payment transfers pursuant to subsection (c) if—

(1) the payment transfer is a single immediate payment transfer at the consumer's request as defined in subsection (a)(2); and

(2) the consumer authorizes the underlying one-time electronic fund transfer or provides the underlying signature check to the lender, as applicable, no earlier than the date on which the lender provides to the consumer the consumer rights notice required by section 623(c) or on the date that the consumer affirmatively contacts the lender to discuss repayment options, whichever date is earlier.

(e) PROHIBITION AGAINST EVASION.—A lender must not take any action with the intent of evading the requirements of this section.

SEC. 623. DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENT TRANSFER ATTEMPTS.

(a) GENERAL FORM OF DISCLOSURES.—

(1) **CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS.**—Disclosures required by this section must be clear and conspicuous. Disclosures required by this section may contain commonly accepted or readily understandable abbreviations.

(2) **IN WRITING OR ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—Disclosures required by this section must be provided in writing or, so long as the requirements of paragraph (4) are satisfied, through electronic delivery. The disclosures must be provided in a form that can be viewed on paper or a screen, as applicable. This paragraph is not satisfied by a disclosure provided orally or through a recorded message.

(3) **RETAINABLE.**—Disclosures required by this section must be provided in a retainable form, except for electronic short notices delivered by mobile application or text message under subsection (b) or (c).

(4) **ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—Disclosures required by this section may be provided through electronic delivery if the following consent requirements are satisfied:

(A) **CONSUMER CONSENT.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Disclosures required by this section may be provided through electronic delivery if the consumer affirmatively consents in writing or electronically to the particular electronic delivery method.

(ii) **EMAIL OPTION REQUIRED.**—To obtain valid consumer consent to electronic delivery under this paragraph, a lender must provide the consumer with the option to select email as the method of electronic delivery, separate and apart from any other electronic delivery methods such as mobile application or text message.

(B) **SUBSEQUENT LOSS OF CONSENT.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a lender must not provide disclosures required by this section through a method of electronic delivery if—

(i) the consumer revokes consent to receive disclosures through that delivery method; or

(ii) the lender receives notification that the consumer is unable to receive disclosures through that delivery method at the address or number used.

(5) **SEGREGATION REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICES.**—All notices required by this section must be segregated from all other written or provided materials and contain only the information required by this section, other than information necessary for product identification, branding, and navigation. Segregated additional content that is not required by this section must not be displayed above, below, or around the required content.

(6) **MACHINE READABLE TEXT IN NOTICES PROVIDED THROUGH ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—If provided through electronic delivery, the payment notice required by subsection (b) and the consumer rights notice required by subsection (c) must use machine readable text that is accessible via both web browsers and screen readers.

(7) **MODEL FORMS.**—

(A) **PAYMENT NOTICE.**—The content, order, and format of the payment notice required by subsection (b) must be substantially similar to a model form.

(B) **CONSUMER RIGHTS NOTICE.**—The content, order, and format of the consumer rights notice required by subsection (c) must be substantially similar to a model form.

(C) **ELECTRONIC SHORT NOTICE.**—The content, order, and format of the electronic short notice required by subsection (b) must be substantially similar to model forms. The content, order, and format of the electronic short notice required by subsection (c) must be substantially similar to model forms.

(8) **FOREIGN LANGUAGE DISCLOSURES.**—Disclosures required under this section may be made in a language other than English, provided that the disclosures are made available in English upon the consumer's request.

(b) **PAYMENT NOTICE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Prior to initiating the first payment withdrawal or an unusual withdrawal from a consumer's account, a lender must provide to the consumer a payment notice in accordance with the requirements in this subsection as applicable.

(A) **FIRST PAYMENT WITHDRAWAL.**—The term “first payment withdrawal” means the first payment transfer scheduled to be initiated by a lender for a particular covered loan, not including a single immediate payment transfer initiated at the consumer's request as defined in section 622(a)(2).

(B) **UNUSUAL WITHDRAWAL.**—The term “unusual withdrawal” means a payment transfer that meets one or more of the conditions described in paragraph (3)(B)(iii).

(C) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The payment notice need not be provided when the lender initiates—

(i) the initial payment transfer from a consumer's account after obtaining consumer authorization pursuant to section 622(c), regardless of whether any of the conditions in paragraph (3)(B)(iii) apply; or

(ii) a single immediate payment transfer initiated at the consumer's request in accordance with section 622(a)(2).

(2) **FIRST PAYMENT WITHDRAWAL NOTICE.**—

(A) **TIMING.**—

(i) **MAIL.**—If the lender provides the first payment withdrawal notice by mail, the lender must mail the notice no earlier than when the lender obtains payment authorization and no later than 6 business days prior to initiating the transfer.

(ii) **ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—

(I) If the lender provides the first payment withdrawal notice through electronic delivery, the lender must send the notice no earlier than when the lender obtains payment authorization and no later than three business days prior to initiating the transfer.

(II) If, after providing the first payment withdrawal notice through electronic delivery pursuant to the timing requirements in this subparagraph, the lender loses the consumer's consent to receive the notice through a particular electronic delivery method according to subsection (a)(4)(B), the lender must provide notice of any future unusual withdrawal, if applicable, through alternate means.

(iii) **IN PERSON.**—If the lender provides the first payment withdrawal notice in person, the lender must provide the notice no earlier than when the lender obtains payment authorization and no later than 3 business days prior to initiating the transfer.

(B) **CONTENT REQUIREMENTS.**—The notice must contain the following information and statements, as applicable, using language substantially similar to the language set forth in model forms:

(i) **IDENTIFYING STATEMENT.**—The statement, “Upcoming Withdrawal Notice,” using that phrase, and, in the same statement, the name of the lender providing the notice.

(ii) **TRANSFER TERMS.**—

(I) **DATE.**—Date that the lender will initiate the transfer.

(II) **AMOUNT.**—Dollar amount of the transfer.

(III) **CONSUMER ACCOUNT.**—Sufficient information to permit the consumer to identify the account from which the funds will be transferred. The lender must not provide the complete account number of the consumer, but may use a truncated version similar to model forms.

(IV) **LOAN IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.**—Sufficient information to permit the consumer to identify the covered loan associated with the transfer.

(V) **PAYMENT CHANNEL.**—Payment channel of the transfer.

(VI) **CHECK NUMBER.**—If the transfer will be initiated by a signature or paper check, remotely created check (as defined in section 229.2(ff) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations), or remotely created payment order (as defined in section 310.2(cc) of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations), the check number associated with the transfer.

(iii) **PAYMENT BREAKDOWN.**—In a tabular form:

(I) **PAYMENT BREAKDOWN HEADING.**—A heading with the statement “Payment Breakdown,” using that phrase.

(II) **PRINCIPAL.**—The amount of the payment that will be applied to principal.

(III) **INTEREST.**—The amount of the payment that will be applied to accrued interest on the loan.

(IV) **FEES.**—If applicable, the amount of the payment that will be applied to fees.

(V) **OTHER CHARGES.**—If applicable, the amount of the payment that will be applied to other charges.

(VI) **AMOUNT.**—The statement “Total Payment Amount,” using that phrase, and the total dollar amount of the payment as provided in subparagraph (B)(ii)(II).

(VII) **EXPLANATION OF INTEREST-ONLY OR NEGATIVELY AMORTIZING PAYMENT.**—If applicable, a statement explaining that the payment will not reduce principal, using the applicable phrase “When you make this payment, your principal balance will stay the same and you will not be closer to paying off your loan” or “When you make this payment, your principal balance will increase and you will not be closer to paying off your loan.”

(iv) **LENDER NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION.**—Name of the lender, the name under which the transfer will be initiated (if different from the consumer-facing name of the lender), and 3 different forms of lender contact information that may be used by the consumer to obtain information about the consumer's loan.

(3) **UNUSUAL WITHDRAWAL NOTICE.**—

(A) **TIMING.**—

(i) **MAIL.**—If the lender provides the unusual withdrawal notice by mail, the lender must mail the notice no earlier than 10 business days and no later than 6 business days prior to initiating the transfer.

(ii) **ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—

(I) If the lender provides the unusual withdrawal notice through electronic delivery, the lender must send the notice no earlier than 7 business days and no later than 3 business days prior to initiating the transfer.

(II) If, after providing the unusual withdrawal notice through electronic delivery pursuant to the timing requirements in clause (ii), the lender loses the consumer's consent to receive the notice through a particular electronic delivery method according to subsection (a)(4)(B), the lender must provide notice of any future unusual withdrawal attempt, if applicable, through alternate means.

(iii) **IN PERSON.**—If the lender provides the unusual withdrawal notice in person, the lender must provide the notice no earlier than 7 business days and no later than 3 business days prior to initiating the transfer.

(iv) **EXCEPTION FOR OPEN-END CREDIT.**—If the unusual withdrawal notice is for open-end credit as defined in section 602(a)(16), the lender may provide the unusual withdrawal

notice in conjunction with the periodic statement required under section 1026.7(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, in accordance with the timing requirements of that section.

(B) **CONTENT REQUIREMENTS.**—The unusual withdrawal notice must contain the following information and statements, as applicable, using language substantially similar to the language set forth in model forms:

(i) **IDENTIFYING STATEMENT.**—The statement, “Alert: Unusual Withdrawal,” using that phrase, and, in the same statement, the name of the lender that is providing the notice.

(ii) **BASIC PAYMENT INFORMATION.**—The content required for the first withdrawal notice under paragraph (2)(B)(ii) through (iv) of this section.

(iii) **DESCRIPTION OF UNUSUAL WITHDRAWAL.**—The following content, as applicable, in a form substantially similar to the model forms:

(I) **VARYING AMOUNT.**—

(aa) **IN GENERAL.**—If the amount of a transfer will vary in amount from the regularly scheduled payment amount, a statement that the transfer will be for a larger or smaller amount than the regularly scheduled payment amount, as applicable.

(bb) **OPEN-END CREDIT.**—If the payment transfer is for open-end credit as defined in section 602(a)(16), the varying amount content is required only if the amount deviates from the scheduled minimum payment due as disclosed in the periodic statement required under section 1026.7(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(II) **DATE OTHER THAN DATE OF REGULARLY SCHEDULED PAYMENT.**—If the payment transfer date is not a date on which a regularly scheduled payment is due under the terms of the loan agreement, a statement that the transfer will be initiated on a date other than the date of a regularly scheduled payment.

(III) **DIFFERENT PAYMENT CHANNEL.**—If the payment channel will differ from the payment channel of the transfer directly preceding it, a statement that the transfer will be initiated through a different payment channel and a statement of the payment channel used for the prior transfer.

(IV) **FOR PURPOSE OF REINITIATING RETURNED TRANSFER.**—If the transfer is for the purpose of reinitiating a returned transfer, a statement that the lender is reinitiating a returned transfer, a statement of the date and amount of the previous unsuccessful attempt, and a statement of the reason for the return.

(4) **ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—When the consumer has consented to receive disclosures through electronic delivery, the lender may provide the applicable payment notice required by paragraph (b)(1) of this section through electronic delivery only if it also provides an electronic short notice, except for email delivery as provided in subparagraph (C).

(B) **ELECTRONIC SHORT NOTICE.**—

(i) **GENERAL CONTENT.**—The electronic short notice required by this subsection must contain the following information and statements, as applicable, in a form substantially similar to model forms:

(I) **IDENTIFYING STATEMENT.**—Identifying statement, as required under paragraphs (2)(B)(i) and (3)(B)(i).

(II) **TRANSFER TERMS.**—

(aa) **DATE.**—Date, as required under paragraphs (2)(B)(ii)(I) and (3)(B)(ii).

(bb) **AMOUNT.**—Amount, as required under paragraphs (2)(B)(ii)(II) and (3)(B)(ii).

(cc) **CONSUMER ACCOUNT.**—Consumer account, as required and limited under paragraphs (2)(B)(iii)(III) and (3)(B)(ii); and

(III) **WEBSITE URL.**—When the full notice is being provided through a linked URL rather than as a PDF attachment, the unique URL of a website that the consumer may use to access the full payment notice required by this subsection.

(ii) **ADDITIONAL CONTENT REQUIREMENTS.**—If the transfer meets any of the conditions for unusual attempts described in paragraph (3)(B)(iii), the electronic short notice must also contain the following information and statements, as applicable, using language substantially similar to the language in model forms:

(I) **Varying amount,** as defined under paragraph (3)(B)(iii)(I).

(II) **Date other than due date of regularly scheduled payment,** as defined under paragraph (3)(B)(iii)(II).

(III) **Different payment channel,** as defined under paragraph (3)(B)(iii)(III).

(C) **EMAIL DELIVERY.**—When the consumer has consented to receive disclosures through electronic delivery, and the method of electronic delivery is email, the lender may either deliver the full notice required by paragraph (1) in the body of the email or deliver the full notice as a linked URL webpage or PDF attachment along with the electronic short notice as provided in paragraph (4)(B).

(c) **CONSUMER RIGHTS NOTICE.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—After a lender initiates 2 consecutive failed payment transfers from a consumer’s account as described in section 622(b), the lender must provide to the consumer a consumer rights notice in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs (2) through (4).

(2) **TIMING.**—The lender must send the notice no later than 3 business days after it receives information that the second consecutive attempt has failed.

(3) **CONTENT REQUIREMENTS.**—The notice must contain the following information and statements, using language substantially similar to the language set forth in model forms:

(A) **IDENTIFYING STATEMENT.**—A statement that the lender, identified by name, is no longer permitted to withdraw loan payments from the consumer’s account.

(B) **LAST TWO ATTEMPTS WERE RETURNED.**—A statement that the lender’s last two attempts to withdraw payment from the consumer’s account were returned due to non-sufficient funds, or, if applicable to payments initiated by the consumer’s account-holding institution, caused the account to go into overdraft status.

(C) **CONSUMER ACCOUNT.**—Sufficient information to permit the consumer to identify the account from which the unsuccessful payment attempts were made. The lender must not provide the complete account number of the consumer, but may use a truncated version similar to model forms.

(D) **LOAN IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.**—Sufficient information to permit the consumer to identify any covered loans associated with the unsuccessful payment attempts.

(E) **STATEMENT OF FEDERAL LAW PROHIBITION.**—A statement, using that phrase, that in order to protect the consumer’s account, Federal law prohibits the lender from initiating further payment transfers without the consumer’s permission.

(F) **CONTACT ABOUT CHOICES.**—A statement that the lender may be in contact with the consumer about payment choices going forward.

(G) **PREVIOUS UNSUCCESSFUL PAYMENT ATTEMPTS.**—In a tabular form:

(i) **PREVIOUS PAYMENT ATTEMPTS HEADING.**—A heading with the statement “previous payment attempts.”

(ii) **PAYMENT DUE DATE.**—The scheduled due date of each previous unsuccessful payment transfer attempted by the lender.

(iii) **DATE OF ATTEMPT.**—The date of each previous unsuccessful payment transfer initiated by the lender.

(iv) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of each previous unsuccessful payment transfer initiated by the lender.

(v) **FEEs.**—The fees charged by the lender for each unsuccessful payment attempt, if applicable, with an indication that these fees were charged by the lender.

(H) **CFPB INFORMATION.**—A statement, using that phrase, that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau created this notice, a statement that the CFPB is a Federal Government agency, and the URL to www.consumerfinance.gov/payday-rule. This statement must be the last piece of information provided in the notice.

(4) **ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—When the consumer has consented to receive disclosures through electronic delivery, the lender may provide the consumer rights notice required by paragraph (c) of this section through electronic delivery only if it also provides an electronic short notice, except for email delivery as provided in subparagraph (C).

(B) **ELECTRONIC SHORT NOTICE.**—

(i) **CONTENT.**—The notice must contain the following information and statements, as applicable, using language substantially similar to the language set forth in model forms:

(I) **IDENTIFYING STATEMENT.**—As required under paragraph (3)(A).

(II) **LAST TWO ATTEMPTS WERE RETURNED.**—As required under paragraph (3)(B) of this section.

(III) **CONSUMER ACCOUNT.**—As required and limited under paragraph (3)(C).

(IV) **STATEMENT OF FEDERAL LAW PROHIBITION.**—As required under paragraph (3)(E).

(V) **WEBSITE URL.**—When the full notice is being provided through a linked URL rather than as a PDF attachment, the unique URL of a website that the consumer may use to access the full consumer rights notice required by this subsection.

(ii) **RESERVED.**—

(C) **EMAIL DELIVERY.**—When the consumer has consented to receive disclosures through electronic delivery, and the method of electronic delivery is email, the lender may either deliver the full notice required by paragraph (1) in the body of the email or deliver the full notice as a linked URL webpage or PDF attachment along with the electronic short notice as provided in subparagraph (B).

Subpart D—Information Furnishing, Record-keeping, Anti-Evasion, and Severability

SEC. 631. INFORMATION FURNISHING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **LOANS SUBJECT TO FURNISHING REQUIREMENT.**—For each covered short-term loan and covered longer-term balloon-payment loan a lender makes, the lender must furnish the loan information described in subsection (c) to each information system described in subsection (b)(1).

(b) **INFORMATION SYSTEMS TO WHICH INFORMATION MUST BE FURNISHED.**—

(1) A lender must furnish information as required in subsections (a) and (c) to each information system that, as of the date the loan is consummated—

(A) has been registered with the Bureau pursuant to section 632(c)(2) for 180 days or more; or

(B) has been provisionally registered with the Bureau pursuant to section 632(d)(1) for 180 days or more or subsequently has become registered with the Bureau pursuant to section 632(d)(2).

(2) The Bureau will publish on its website and in the Federal Register notice of the provisional registration of an information system pursuant to 632(d)(1), registration of an information system pursuant to section 632(c)(2) or (d)(2), and suspension or revocation of the provisional registration or registration of an information system pursuant to section 632(h). For purposes of paragraph (1), an information system is provisionally registered or registered, and its provisional registration or registration is suspended or revoked, on the date that the Bureau publishes notice of such provisional registration, registration, suspension, or revocation on its website. The Bureau will maintain on the Bureau's website a current list of information systems provisionally registered pursuant to section 632(d)(1) and registered pursuant to section 632(c)(2) and (d)(2). In the event that a provisional registration or registration of an information system is suspended, the Bureau will provide instructions on its website concerning the scope and terms of the suspension.

(c) **INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED.**—A lender must furnish the information described in this subsection, at the times described in this subsection, concerning each covered loan as required in subsections (a) and (b). A lender must furnish the information in a format acceptable to each information system to which it must furnish information.

(1) **INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED AT LOAN CONSUMMATION.**—A lender must furnish the following information no later than the date on which the loan is consummated or as close in time as feasible to the date the loan is consummated:

(A) Information necessary to uniquely identify the loan.

(B) Information necessary to allow the information system to identify the specific consumer(s) responsible for the loan.

(C) Whether the loan is a covered short-term loan or a covered longer-term balloon-payment loan.

(D) Whether the loan is made under section 612 or 613, as applicable.

(E) The loan consummation date.

(F) For a loan made under section 613, the principal amount borrowed.

(G) For a loan that is closed-end credit—
(i) the fact that the loan is closed-end credit;

(ii) the date that each payment on the loan is due; and

(iii) the amount due on each payment date.

(H) For a loan that is open-end credit—

(i) the fact that the loan is open-end credit;

(ii) the credit limit on the loan;

(iii) the date that each payment on the loan is due; and

(iv) the minimum amount due on each payment date.

(2) **INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED WHILE LOAN IS AN OUTSTANDING LOAN.**—During the period that the loan is an outstanding loan, a lender must furnish any update to information previously furnished pursuant to this section within a reasonable period of the event that causes the information previously furnished to be out of date.

(3) **INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED WHEN LOAN CEASES TO BE AN OUTSTANDING LOAN.**—A

lender must furnish the following information no later than the date the loan ceases to be an outstanding loan or as close in time as feasible to the date the loan ceases to be an outstanding loan:

(A) The date as of which the loan ceased to be an outstanding loan.

(B) Whether all amounts owed in connection with the loan were paid in full, including the amount financed, charges included in the cost of credit, and charges excluded from the cost of credit.

SEC. 632. REGISTERED INFORMATION SYSTEMS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—

(1) **CONSUMER REPORT.**—The term “consumer report” has the same meaning as in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a).

(2) **FEDERAL CONSUMER FINANCIAL LAW.**—The term “Federal consumer financial law” has the same meaning as in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(b) **ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR INFORMATION SYSTEMS.**—An entity is eligible to be a provisionally registered information system pursuant to subsection (d)(1) or a registered information system pursuant to subsection (c)(2) or (d)(2) only if the Bureau determines that the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) **RECEIVING CAPABILITY.**—The entity possesses the technical capability to receive information lenders must furnish pursuant to section 631 immediately upon the furnishing of such information and uses reasonable data standards that facilitate the timely and accurate transmission and processing of information in a manner that does not impose unreasonable costs or burdens on lenders.

(2) **REPORTING CAPABILITY.**—The entity possesses the technical capability to generate a consumer report containing, as applicable for each unique consumer, all information described in section 631 substantially simultaneous to receiving the information from a lender.

(3) **PERFORMANCE.**—The entity will perform or performs in a manner that facilitates compliance with and furthers the purposes of this part.

(4) **FEDERAL CONSUMER FINANCIAL LAW COMPLIANCE PROGRAM.**—The entity has developed, implemented, and maintains a program reasonably designed to ensure compliance with all applicable Federal consumer financial laws, which includes written policies and procedures, comprehensive training, and monitoring to detect and to promptly correct compliance weaknesses.

(5) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF FEDERAL CONSUMER FINANCIAL LAW COMPLIANCE PROGRAM.**—The entity provides to the Bureau in its application for provisional registration or registration a written assessment of the Federal consumer financial law compliance program described in paragraph (4) and such assessment—

(A) sets forth a detailed summary of the Federal consumer financial law compliance program that the entity has implemented and maintains;

(B) explains how the Federal consumer financial law compliance program is appropriate for the entity's size and complexity, the nature and scope of its activities, and risks to consumers presented by such activities;

(C) certifies that, in the opinion of the assessor, the Federal consumer financial law compliance program is operating with sufficient effectiveness to provide reasonable assurance that the entity is fulfilling its obligations under all Federal consumer financial laws; and

(D) certifies that the assessment has been conducted by a qualified, objective, independent third-party individual or entity that uses procedures and standards generally accepted in the profession, adheres to professional and business ethics, performs all duties objectively, and is free from any conflicts of interest that might compromise the assessor's independent judgment in performing assessments.

(6) **INFORMATION SECURITY PROGRAM.**—The entity has developed, implemented, and maintains a comprehensive information security program that complies with the Standards for Safeguarding Customer Information in part 314 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations.

(7) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION SECURITY PROGRAM.**—

(A) The entity provides to the Bureau in its application for provisional registration or registration and on at least a biennial basis thereafter, a written assessment of the information security program described in paragraph (6) and such assessment—

(i) sets forth the administrative, technical, and physical safeguards that the entity has implemented and maintains;

(ii) explains how such safeguards are appropriate to the entity's size and complexity, the nature and scope of its activities, and the sensitivity of the customer information at issue;

(iii) explains how the safeguards that have been implemented meet or exceed the protections required by the Standards for Safeguarding Customer Information in part 314 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations;

(iv) certifies that, in the opinion of the assessor, the information security program is operating with sufficient effectiveness to provide reasonable assurance that the entity is fulfilling its obligations under the Standards for Safeguarding Customer Information in part 314 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(v) certifies that the assessment has been conducted by a qualified, objective, independent third-party individual or entity that uses procedures and standards generally accepted in the profession, adheres to professional and business ethics, performs all duties objectively, and is free from any conflicts of interest that might compromise the assessor's independent judgment in performing assessments.

(B) Each written assessment obtained and provided to the Bureau on at least a biennial basis pursuant to subparagraph (A) must be completed and provided to the Bureau within 60 days after the end of the period to which the assessment applies.

(8) **BUREAU SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY.**—The entity acknowledges it is, or consents to being, subject to the Bureau's supervisory authority.

(c) **REGISTRATION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS PRIOR TO AUGUST 19, 2019.**—

(1) **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL.**—Prior to August 19, 2019, the Bureau may preliminarily approve an entity for registration only if the entity submits an application for preliminary approval to the Bureau by the deadline set forth in paragraph (3)(A) containing information sufficient for the Bureau to determine that the entity is reasonably likely to satisfy the conditions set forth in subsection (b) by the deadline set forth in paragraph (3)(B). The assessments described in subsection (b)(5) and (7) need not be included with an application for preliminary approval for registration or completed prior to the submission of the application. The Bureau may require additional information and documentation to facilitate this determination.

(2) **REGISTRATION.**—Prior to August 19, 2019, the Bureau may approve the application of an entity to be a registered information system only if—

(A) the entity received preliminary approval pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) the entity submits an application to the Bureau by the deadline set forth in paragraph (3)(B) that contains information and documentation sufficient for the Bureau to determine that the entity satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (b). The Bureau may require additional information and documentation to facilitate this determination or otherwise to assess whether registration of the entity would pose an unreasonable risk to consumers.

(3) **DEADLINES.**—

(A) The deadline to submit an application for preliminary approval for registration pursuant to paragraph (1) is April 16, 2018.

(B) The deadline to submit an application to be a registered information system pursuant to paragraph (2) is 120 days from the date preliminary approval for registration is granted.

(C) The Bureau may waive the deadlines set forth in this subsection.

(d) **REGISTRATION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS ON OR AFTER AUGUST 19, 2019.**—

(1) **PROVISIONAL REGISTRATION.**—On or after August 19, 2019, the Bureau may approve an entity to be a provisionally registered information system only if the entity submits an application to the Bureau that contains information and documentation sufficient for the Bureau to determine that the entity satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (b). The Bureau may require additional information and documentation to facilitate this determination or otherwise to assess whether provisional registration of the entity would pose an unreasonable risk to consumers.

(2) **REGISTRATION.**—An information system that is provisionally registered pursuant to paragraph (1) shall automatically become a registered information system pursuant to this paragraph upon the expiration of the 240-day period commencing on the date the information system is provisionally registered. For purposes of this paragraph, an information system is provisionally registered on the date that the Bureau publishes notice of the provisional registration on the Bureau's website.

(e) **APPLICATIONS.**—Applications for preliminary approval, registration, and provisional registration shall be submitted in the form required by the Bureau and shall include, in addition to the information described in subsection (c) or this subsection, as applicable, the following information:

(1) The name under which the applicant conducts business, including any “doing business as” or other trade name.

(2) The applicant's main business address, mailing address if it is different from the main business address, telephone number, electronic mail address, and Internet website.

(3) The name and contact information (including telephone number and electronic mail address) of the person authorized to communicate with the Bureau on the applicant's behalf concerning the application.

(f) **DENIAL OF APPLICATION.**—The Bureau will deny the application of an entity seeking preliminary approval for registration under subsection (c)(1), registration under subsection (c)(2), or provisional registration under subsection (d)(1), if the Bureau determines, as applicable, that—

(1) the entity does not satisfy the conditions set forth in subsection (b), or, in the

case of an entity seeking preliminary approval for registration, is not reasonably likely to satisfy the conditions as of the deadline set forth in subsection (c)(3)(B);

(2) the entity's application is untimely or materially inaccurate or incomplete; or

(3) preliminary approval, provisional registration, or registration of the entity would pose an unreasonable risk to consumers.

(g) **NOTICE OF MATERIAL CHANGE.**—An entity that is a provisionally registered or registered information system must provide to the Bureau in writing a description of any material change to information contained in its application for registration submitted pursuant to subsection (c)(2) or provisional registration submitted pursuant to subsection (d)(1), or to information previously provided to the Bureau pursuant to this subsection, within 14 days of such change.

(h) **SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.**—

(1) The Bureau will suspend or revoke an entity's preliminary approval for registration pursuant to subsection (c)(1), provisional registration pursuant to subsection (d)(1), or registration pursuant to subsection (c)(2) or (d)(2) if the Bureau determines—

(A) that the entity has not satisfied or no longer satisfies the conditions described in subsection (b) or has not complied with the requirement described in subsection (g); or

(B) that preliminary approval, provisional registration, or registration of the entity poses an unreasonable risk to consumers.

(2) The Bureau may require additional information and documentation from an entity if it has reason to believe suspension or revocation under subsection (h)(1) may be warranted.

(3) Except in cases of willfulness or those in which the public interest requires otherwise, prior to suspension or revocation under subsection (h)(1) of this section, the Bureau will provide written notice of the facts or conduct that may warrant the suspension or revocation and an opportunity for the entity or information system to demonstrate or achieve compliance with this section or otherwise address the Bureau's concerns.

(4) The Bureau will revoke an entity's preliminary approval for registration, provisional registration, or registration if the entity submits a written request to the Bureau that its preliminary approval, provisional registration, or registration be revoked.

(5) For purposes of sections 612 and 613, suspension or revocation of an information system's registration is effective five days after the date that the Bureau publishes notice of the suspension or revocation on the Bureau's website. For purposes of section 631(b)(1), suspension or revocation of an information system's provisional registration or registration is effective on the date that the Bureau publishes notice of the suspension or revocation on the Bureau's website. The Bureau will also publish notice of a suspension or revocation in the Federal Register.

(6) In the event that a provisional registration or registration of an information system is suspended, the Bureau will provide instructions concerning the scope and terms of the suspension on its website and in the notice of suspension published in the Federal Register.

(i) **ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.**—

(1) **GROUND FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.**—An entity may appeal a determination of the Bureau that—

(A) denies the application of an entity seeking preliminary approval for registration under subsection (c)(1), registration under subsection (c)(2), or provisional registration under subsection (d)(1); or

(B) suspends or revokes the entity's preliminary approval for registration pursuant to subsection (c)(1), provisional registration pursuant to subsection (d)(1), or registration pursuant to subsection (c)(2) or (d)(2).

(2) **TIME LIMITS FOR FILING ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.**—An appeal must be submitted on a date that is within 30 business days of the date of the determination. The Bureau may extend this time for good cause.

(3) **FORM AND CONTENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.**—An appeal shall be made by electronic means as follows:

(A) The appeal shall be submitted as set forth on the Bureau's website. The appeal shall be labeled “Information System Registration Appeal”.

(B) The appeal shall set forth contact information for the appellant including, to the extent available, a mailing address, telephone number, or email address at which the Bureau may contact the appellant regarding the appeal.

(C) The appeal shall specify the date of the letter of determination, and enclose a copy of the determination being appealed.

(D) The appeal shall include a description of the issues in dispute, specify the legal and factual basis for appealing the determination, and include appropriate supporting information.

(4) **APPEALS PROCESS.**—The filing and pendency of an appeal does not by itself suspend the determination that is the subject of the appeal during the appeals process. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Bureau may, in its discretion, suspend the determination that is the subject of the appeal during the appeals process.

(5) **DECISIONS TO GRANT OR DENY ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.**—The Bureau shall decide whether to affirm the determination (in whole or in part) or to reverse the determination (in whole or in part) and shall notify the appellant of this decision in writing.

SEC. 633. COMPLIANCE PROGRAM AND RECORD RETENTION.

(a) **COMPLIANCE PROGRAM.**—A lender making a covered loan must develop and follow written policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure compliance with the requirements in this part. These written policies and procedures must be appropriate to the size and complexity of the lender and its affiliates, and the nature and scope of the covered loan lending activities of the lender and its affiliates.

(b) **RECORD RETENTION.**—A lender must retain evidence of compliance with this part for 36 months after the date on which a covered loan ceases to be an outstanding loan.

(1) **RETENTION OF LOAN AGREEMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OBTAINED IN CONNECTION WITH ORIGINATING A COVERED SHORT-TERM OR COVERED LONGER-TERM BALLOON-PAYMENT LOAN.**—To comply with the requirements in this subsection, a lender must retain or be able to reproduce an image of the loan agreement and documentation obtained in connection with a covered short-term or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan, including the following documentation, as applicable:

(A) Consumer report from an information system that has been registered for 180 days or more pursuant to section 632(c)(2) or is registered with the Bureau pursuant to section 632(d)(2).

(B) Verification evidence, as described in section 612(c)(2)(ii).

(C) Written statement obtained from the consumer, as described in section 612(c)(2)(i).

(2) **ELECTRONIC RECORDS IN TABULAR FORMAT REGARDING ORIGINATION CALCULATIONS AND DETERMINATIONS FOR A COVERED SHORT-**

TERM OR COVERED LONGER-TERM BALLOON-PAYMENT LOAN UNDER SECTION 612.—To comply with the requirements in this subsection, a lender must retain electronic records in tabular format that include the following information for a covered loan made under section 612:

(A) The projection made by the lender of the amount of a consumer's net income during the relevant monthly period.

(B) The projections made by the lender of the amounts of a consumer's major financial obligations during the relevant monthly period.

(C) Calculated residual income or debt-to-income ratio during the relevant monthly period.

(D) Estimated basic living expenses for the consumer during the relevant monthly period.

(E) Other consumer-specific information considered in making the ability-to-repay determination.

(3) ELECTRONIC RECORDS IN TABULAR FORMAT REGARDING TYPE, TERMS, AND PERFORMANCE OF COVERED SHORT-TERM OR COVERED LONGER-TERM BALLOON-PAYMENT LOAN.—To comply with the requirements in this subsection, a lender must retain electronic records in tabular format that include the following information for a covered short-term or covered longer-term balloon-payment loan:

(A) As applicable, the information listed in section 631(c)(1)(i) through (viii) and (c)(2).

(B) Whether the lender obtained vehicle security from the consumer.

(C) The loan number in a loan sequence of covered short-term loans, covered longer-term balloon-payment loans, or a combination thereof.

(D) For any full payment on the loan that was not received or transferred by the contractual due date, the number of days such payment was past due, up to a maximum of 180 days.

(E) For a loan with vehicle security: Whether repossession of the vehicle was initiated.

(F) Date of last or final payment received.

(G) The information listed in section 631(c)(3).

(4) RETENTION OF RECORDS RELATING TO PAYMENT PRACTICES FOR COVERED LOANS.—To comply with the requirements in this subsection, a lender must retain or be able to reproduce an image of the following documentation, as applicable, in connection with a covered loan:

(A) Leveraged payment mechanism(s) obtained by the lender from the consumer.

(B) Authorization of additional payment transfer, as described in section 622(c)(3)(iii).

(C) Underlying one-time electronic transfer authorization or underlying signature check, as described in section 622(d)(2).

(5) ELECTRONIC RECORDS IN TABULAR FORMAT REGARDING PAYMENT PRACTICES FOR COVERED LOANS.—To comply with the requirements in this subsection, a lender must retain electronic records in tabular format that include the following information for covered loans:

(A) History of payments received and attempted payment transfers, as defined in section 622(a)(1), including—

(i) date of receipt of payment or attempted payment transfer;

(ii) amount of payment due;

(iii) amount of attempted payment transfer;

(iv) amount of payment received or transferred; and

(v) payment channel used for attempted payment transfer.

(B) If an attempt to transfer funds from a consumer's account is subject to the prohibition in section 622(b)(1), whether the lender or service provider obtained authorization to initiate a payment transfer from the consumer in accordance with the requirements in section 622(c) or (d).

SEC. 634. PROHIBITION AGAINST EVASION.

A lender must not take any action with the intent of evading the requirements of this part.

SEC. 635. SEVERABILITY.

The provisions of this part are separate and severable from one another. If any provision is stayed or determined to be invalid, the remaining provisions shall continue in effect.

SA 2183. Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, strike the item relating to section 214 and insert the following:

Sec. 214. Promoting construction and development on Main Street.

On page 67, line 15, insert "ON MAIN STREET" after "MENT".

On page 106, line 4, strike "section" and insert "subsection".

On page 151, line 15, strike "may" and insert "shall".

On page 156, line 6, insert "the" after "for".

On page 156, line 10, strike "uses" and insert "use".

On page 157, line 7, strike "if".

On page 157, line 15, insert "the" after "for".

SA 2184. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 308. BEST PRACTICES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCIAL LITERACY.

Section 514(a) of the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9703(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) BEST PRACTICES FOR TEACHING FINANCIAL LITERACY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—After soliciting public comments and consulting with and receiving input from relevant parties, including a diverse set of institutions of higher education and other parties, the Commission shall, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, establish best practices for institutions of higher education regarding methods to—

"(i) teach financial literacy skills; and

"(ii) provide useful and necessary information to assist students at institutions of higher education when making financial decisions related to student borrowing.

"(B) BEST PRACTICES.—The best practices described in subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

"(i) Methods to ensure that each student has a clear sense of the student's total borrowing obligations, including monthly payments, and repayment options.

"(ii) The most effective ways to engage students in financial literacy education, including frequency and timing of communication with students.

"(iii) Information on how to target different student populations, including part-time students, first-time students, and other nontraditional students.

"(iv) Ways to clearly communicate the importance of graduating on a student's ability to repay student loans.

"(C) MAINTENANCE OF BEST PRACTICES.—The Commission shall maintain and periodically update the best practices information required under this paragraph and make the best practices available to the public.

"(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require an institution of higher education to adopt the best practices required under this paragraph."

SA 2185. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CREDIT LOCKS.

(a) CREDIT LOCKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 605B (15 U.S.C. 1681c-2) the following:

"SEC. 605C. PROTECTION OF CREDIT INFORMATION OF CONSUMERS.

"(a) SECURE, CONVENIENT, ACCESSIBLE, AND COST-FREE FILE LOCKS FOR CONSUMERS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall provide to any consumer a secure, convenient, accessible, and cost-free method that, with the express authorization of the consumer, allows that consumer reporting agency to release, or prevents that consumer reporting agency from releasing, any information in the file of the consumer for the purpose of—

"(A) the marketing or extension of credit or insurance; or

"(B) opening any financial account.

"(2) PROHIBITIONS.—With respect to the method described in paragraph (1)—

"(A) the method may not be used by the consumer reporting agency that provides the method, or by any other person, to collect any information on a consumer that is not necessary for the purposes of preventing the release of information described in that paragraph;

"(B) no information collected under the method may be used for any purpose other than a purpose described in subparagraph (A);

"(C) in offering the method, a credit reporting agency described in section 603(p) may not require a consumer to—

"(i) waive any rights of the consumer; or

"(ii) indemnify the credit reporting agency with respect to any liabilities that arise from offering the method; and

"(D) the method may not be used by any person to market or advertise any product or service.

“(3) RELEASE OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this subsection shall affect the ability of a person with whom a consumer has an account, contract, or debtor-creditor relationship to obtain information regarding the consumer for the purposes of reviewing the account or collecting on the account.”

“(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Bureau shall prescribe regulations carrying out this section.”

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 605B the following:

“605C. Protection of credit information of consumers.”

(b) PERMISSIBLE PURPOSES OF CREDIT REPORTS; DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 604 (15 U.S.C. 1681b)—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(aa) by striking “Subject to subsection (c), any” and inserting “Any”; and

(bb) by striking “a consumer report” and inserting “information from the file of a consumer”;

(II) in paragraph (3)—

(aa) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (C);

(bb) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (A);

(cc) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively; and

(dd) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by striking “information—” and all that follows through the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting the following: “information to review an account to determine whether the consumer continues to meet the terms of the account; or”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) Pursuant to the express authorization of a consumer, subject to the method provided under section 605C(a) in the case of a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p).”;

(ii) by striking subsection (c); and

(iii) by redesignating subsections (d) through (g) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively;

(B) in section 609(a)(1) (15 U.S.C. 1681g(a)(1)), by striking “request, except that—” and all that follows through the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting the following: “request, without regard to whether the information is held by a parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the consumer reporting agency.”;

(C) in section 612(a)(1)(A) (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)(1)(A)), by striking “once during any 12-month period”; and

(D) in section 615 (15 U.S.C. 1681m)—

(i) by striking subsection (d); and

(ii) by redesignating subsections (e) through (h) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively.

(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue regulations carrying out section 609(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g(a)(1)), as amended by paragraph (1)(B).

(3) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION ACT OF 2010.—Section 1002(12)(F) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481(12)(F)) is amended—

(i) by striking “615(e)” and inserting “615(d)”;

(ii) by striking “1681m(e)” and inserting “1681m(d)”;

(B) FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 603 (15 U.S.C. 1681a)—

(I) in subsection (d)(3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 604(g)(3)” and inserting “section 604(f)(3)”;

(II) in subsection (k)(1)(B)—

(aa) in clause (iii), by striking “section 604(a)(3)(D)” and inserting “section 604(a)(3)(B)”;

(bb) in clause (iv)(I), by striking “section 604(a)(3)(F)(ii)” and inserting “section 604(a)(3)(D)”;

(ii) in section 621 (15 U.S.C. 1681s)—

(I) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “persons who furnish information to such agencies, and users of information that are subject to section 615(d)” and inserting “and persons who furnish information to such agencies”; and

(II) in subsection (e)(1), in the first sentence, by striking “615(e)” and inserting “615(d)”;

(iii) in section 623(c)(3) (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(c)(3)), by striking “subsection (e)” and inserting “subsection (d)”;

(iv) in section 625(b) (15 U.S.C. 1681t(b))—

(I) in paragraph (1)—

(aa) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (c) or (e) of section 604” and inserting “section 604(d)”;

(bb) by striking subparagraph (D);

(cc) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) through (I) as subparagraphs (D) through (H), respectively; and

(dd) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated, by striking “section 615(h)” and inserting “section 615(g)”;

(II) in paragraph (5)(F), by striking “(e), (f), and (g)” and inserting “(d), (e), and (f)”.

(C) ENHANCEMENT OF FRAUD ALERT PROTECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (a);

(B) by redesignating subsections (b) through (h) as subsections (a) through (g), respectively;

(C) in subsection (a), as so redesignated—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “EXTENDED” and inserting “FRAUD”; and

(ii) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “submits an identity theft report” and inserting “asserts in good faith a suspicion that the consumer has been or is about to become a victim of fraud or related crime, including identity theft, or has been or will be harmed by the unauthorized disclosure of the financial or personally identifiable information of the consumer.”;

(II) in subparagraph (A), by striking “7-year” and inserting “10-year”;

(III) by striking subparagraph (B);

(IV) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(V) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated—

(aa) by striking “extended”; and

(bb) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(VI) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) upon the expiration of the period described in subparagraph (A), or a subsequent 10-year period, and in response to a direct request by the consumer or such representative, continue the fraud alert for an additional period of 10 years if the consumer or

such representative submits an identity theft report.”;

(D) in subsection (b), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking paragraph (2);

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (3) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(iii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking “Upon the direct request” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the direct request”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ACCESS TO FREE REPORTS.—If a consumer reporting agency includes an active duty alert in the file of an active duty military consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall—

“(A) disclose to the active duty military consumer that the active duty military consumer may request a free copy of the file of the active duty military consumer under section 612(d) during each 1-year period beginning on the date on which the activity duty military alert is requested and ending on the date of the last day that the active duty alert applies to the file of the active duty military consumer; and

“(B) not later than 3 business days after the date on which the active duty military consumer makes a request described in subparagraph (A), provide to the active duty military consumer all disclosures required to be made under section 609, without charge to the active duty military consumer.”;

(E) by amending subsection (c), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(c) PROCEDURES.—Each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall establish and make available to the public on the Internet website of the consumer reporting agency policies and procedures to comply with this section, including policies and procedures—

“(1) that inform consumers of the availability of fraud alerts, active duty alerts, or the method provided under section 605C(a), as applicable;

“(2) that allow consumers to request fraud alerts and active duty alerts in a simple and easy manner; and

“(3) for asserting in good faith a suspicion that the consumer has been or is about to become a victim of fraud or related crime, including identity theft, or has been or will be harmed by the unauthorized disclosure of the financial or personally identifiable information of the consumer, for a consumer requesting a fraud alert.”;

(F) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:

“(1) paragraphs (1)(A), (1)(C), and (2) of subsection (a), in the case of a referral under subsection (a)(1)(B); and

“(2) subsection (b)(1)(A), in the case of a referral under subsection (b)(1)(B).”;

(G) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by inserting “or has been or will be harmed by the unauthorized disclosure of the financial or personally identifiable information of the consumer,” after “identity theft.”;

(H) in subsection (g), as so redesignated—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the paragraph heading, by striking “INITIAL” and inserting “FRAUD ALERTS”;

(II) in subparagraph (A), by striking “initial”;

(III) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “an initial” and inserting “a”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in the paragraph heading, by striking “EXTENDED” and inserting “FRAUD”;

(II) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “extended” and inserting “fraud”; and

(III) in subparagraph (B), by striking “an extended” and inserting “a”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 612(d) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(d)) is amended by striking “subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) of section 605A, as applicable” and inserting “section 605A(a)(2)”.

(d) STOPPING ERRORS IN CONSUMER USE AND REPORTING.—

(1) LEGAL RECOURSE FOR CONSUMERS.—

(A) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 616 (15 U.S.C. 1681n)—

(I) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting “(a) DAMAGES.—”;

(II) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(III) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

“(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party costs and reasonable attorney’s fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.”; and

(ii) in section 617 (15 U.S.C. 1681o)—

(I) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting “(a) DAMAGES.—”;

(II) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(III) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

“(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party costs and reasonable attorney’s fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.”.

(B) ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Section 621(a)(2)(A) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “(A) KNOWING VIOLATIONS.—” and inserting “(A) NEGLIGENT, WILLFUL, OR KNOWING VIOLATIONS.—”; and

(ii) in the first sentence, by inserting “negligent, willful, or” before “knowing”.

(2) INCREASED REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES AND FURNISHERS OF INFORMATION.—

(A) PROVISION AND CONSIDERATION OF DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY CONSUMERS.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 611 (15 U.S.C. 1681i)—

(I) in subsection (a)—

(aa) in paragraph (2)—

(AA) in subparagraph (A), in the second sentence, by inserting “, including all documentation provided by the consumer” after “received from the consumer or reseller”; and

(BB) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, including all documentation provided by the consumer,” after “from the consumer or the reseller”; and

(bb) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, including all documentation,” after “relevant information”; and

(II) in subsection (f)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting “, including all documentation,” after “relevant information”; and

(i) in section 623 (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2)—

(I) in subsection (a)(8)(E), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) review and consider all relevant information, including all documentation, provided by the consumer with the notice.”; and

(II) in subsection (b)(1), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) review and consider all relevant information, including all documentation, provided by the consumer reporting agency under section 611(a)(2).”.

(B) GATHERING AND REPORTING OF INFORMATION RELATING TO CONSUMER DISPUTES.—Section 611 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) GATHERING AND REPORTING OF INFORMATION RELATING TO CONSUMER DISPUTES.—

“(1) REPORTS REQUIRED.—The Bureau shall provide reports regarding the disputes described in subsection (a)(1) received by consumer reporting agencies in such intervals and to such parties as the Bureau deems appropriate.

“(2) GATHERING OF INFORMATION.—The Bureau shall prescribe rules for the gathering of information relating to disputes described in subsection (a)(1) received by consumer reporting agencies to be used in generating the reports under paragraph (1), including rules establishing—

“(A) the type and format of information that the Bureau shall receive from each consumer reporting agency; and

“(B) the frequency with which the Bureau shall receive the information from consumer reporting agencies.”.

(C) ACCURACY COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES.—Section 607 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681e) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) ACCURACY OF REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency shall follow reasonable procedures when preparing a consumer report to ensure the maximum possible accuracy of the information concerning the individual to whom the consumer report relates.

“(2) BUREAU RULE TO ENSURE MAXIMUM POSSIBLE ACCURACY.—

“(A) PROPOSED RULE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, the Bureau shall issue a proposed rule establishing the procedures that a consumer reporting agency shall follow to ensure maximum possible accuracy of all consumer reports furnished by the agency in compliance with this subsection.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—When formulating the rule required under subparagraph (A), the Bureau shall consider if requiring the matching of the following information would improve the accuracy of consumer reports:

“(i) The first name and last name of a consumer.

“(ii) The date of birth of a consumer.

“(iii) All 9 digits of the social security number of a consumer.

“(iv) Any other information that the Bureau determines would aid in ensuring maximum possible accuracy of all consumer reports furnished by consumer reporting agencies in compliance with this subsection.”.

(D) RESPONSIBILITIES OF FURNISHERS OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—Section 623(a)(8)(F)(i)(II) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(8)(F)(i)(II)) is amended by inserting “, and does not include any new or additional information that would be relevant to a re-investigation” before the period at the end.

(E) DISCLOSURES TO CONSUMERS.—Section 609 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(3)(B)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end; and

(II) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) the address and telephone number of the person; and

“(iii) the permissible purpose of the person for obtaining the consumer report, including the specific type of credit product that is extended, reviewed, or collected, as described in section 604(a)(3)(A).”;

(ii) in subsection (f)—

(I) by amending paragraph (7)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) supply the consumer with a credit score that—

“(i) is derived from a credit scoring model that is widely distributed to users by the consumer reporting agency for the purpose of any extension of credit or other transaction designated by the consumer who is requesting the credit score; or

“(ii) is widely distributed to lenders of common consumer loan products and predicts the future credit behavior of the consumer; and”;

(II) in paragraph (8), by inserting “, except that a credit score shall be provided free of charge to the consumer if requested in connection with a free annual consumer report described in section 612(a)” before the period at the end; and

(iii) in subsection (g)(1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “subparagraph (D)” and inserting “subparagraph (C)”; and

(II) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “consistent with subparagraph (C)”; and

(III) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively.

(F) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) ADVERSE INFORMATION NOTIFICATION.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(I) in section 612 (15 U.S.C. 1681j), by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) FREE DISCLOSURE AFTER NOTICE OF ADVERSE ACTION OR OFFER OF CREDIT ON MATERIALLY LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which a consumer reporting agency receives a notification under subsection (a)(2) or (h)(6) of section 615, or from a debt collection agency affiliated with the consumer reporting agency, the consumer reporting agency shall make, without charge to the consumer, all disclosures required in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Bureau under section 609(h).

“(2) TRANSITION PERIOD.—During the period beginning on the effective date of the Stopping Errors in Consumer Use and Reporting Act of 2017 and ending on the date on which the Bureau finalizes the rule required under section 609(h), a consumer reporting agency that is required to make disclosures under this subsection shall provide to the consumer a copy of the current credit report on the consumer and any other disclosures required under this Act or the Stopping Errors

in Consumer Use and Reporting Act of 2017, without charge to the consumer.”; and

(II) in section 615(a) (15 U.S.C. 1681m(a))—
(aa) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(bb) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report that was used in the decision to take the adverse action to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b);”;

(cc) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—
(AA) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “of the consumer’s right”;

(BB) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) that the consumer shall receive a copy of the consumer report with respect to the consumer, free of charge, from the consumer reporting agency that furnished the consumer report; and”;

(CC) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “of the right of the consumer” before “to dispute”.

(ii) NOTIFICATION IN CASES OF LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—Section 615(h) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)) is amended—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;

(III) in paragraph (5)(C), by striking “may obtain” and inserting “shall receive”;

(IV) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (7), (8), and (9), respectively; and

(V) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) REPORTS PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS.—A person who uses a consumer report as described in paragraph (1) shall notify and direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b).”.

(iii) NOTIFICATION OF SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS OF NEGATIVE INFORMATION.—Section 623(a)(7)(A)(ii) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(7)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking “account, or customer” and inserting “or account”.

(iv) BUREAU RULE DEFINING CERTAIN DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 609 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) BUREAU RULE DEFINING CERTAIN DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) PROPOSED RULE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, the Bureau shall publish a proposed rule to implement the disclosure requirements described in section 612(b).

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In formulating the rule required under paragraph (1), the Bureau shall consider—

“(A) what information would enable consumers to—

“(i) determine the reasons for which a person—

“(I) took adverse action; or

“(II) offered credit on materially less favorable terms; and

“(ii) verify the accuracy of that information; and

“(B) how to provide the information described in subparagraph (A) while protecting consumer privacy, including procedures to ensure that the information is provided to the consumer at the appropriate address.”.

(3) REGULATORY REFORM.—Section 621 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C.

1681s) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY REGISTRY.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, the Bureau shall establish 3 publicly available registries of consumer reporting agencies, including a registry that contains—

“(A) each consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis;

“(B) each nationwide specialty consumer reporting agency; and

“(C) all other consumer reporting agencies that are not included under section 603(p) or 603(x).

“(2) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—Each consumer reporting agency shall register with a registry established by the Bureau under this subsection in a timeframe established by the Bureau.”.

(4) IDENTITY THEFT PROTECTION FOR MINORS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 605B (15 U.S.C. 1681c-2) the following:

“SEC. 605C. ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR CREDIT REPORTS OF MINOR CONSUMERS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘blocked file’ means a file of a minor consumer with respect to which, under this section, a consumer reporting agency—

“(A) maintains with the name, social security number, date of birth, and, if applicable, any credit information of the minor consumer;

“(B) may not provide any person with a consumer report of the minor consumer; and

“(C) blocks the input of any information, except with permission from a covered guardian of the minor consumer;

“(2) the term ‘covered guardian’ means—

“(A) the legal guardian of a minor child;

“(B) the custodian of a minor child; or

“(C) in the case of a child in foster care, the State agency or Indian tribe or tribal organization responsible for the foster care of the child; and

“(3) the term ‘minor consumer’ means a consumer who has not attained 16 years of age.

“(b) BLOCKING A FILE.—A consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis shall, upon request by, and receipt of appropriate proof of identity of, a minor consumer or the covered guardian of a minor consumer—

“(1) create a blocked file for the minor consumer; or

“(2) convert a file of the minor consumer already in existence to a blocked file.

“(c) UNBLOCKING A FILE.—A consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis shall unblock a blocked file—

“(1) upon request by the covered guardian of a minor consumer;

“(2) if the file was blocked as a result of a material misrepresentation, including a representation that—

“(A) the consumer was a minor consumer when the consumer was not a minor consumer as of the date on which the representation was made; and

“(B) an individual was the covered guardian of a minor consumer when the individual was not the covered guardian of the minor consumer as of the date on which the representation was made;

“(3) on the date of the 16th birthday of the minor consumer; or

“(4) if the minor consumer becomes emancipated under the law of the State in which the minor consumer resides, on the date of the emancipation of the minor consumer.

“(d) REGULATIONS.—The Bureau shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section.

“(e) FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A credit reporting agency may charge a fair and reasonable fee, as determined by the Bureau, to create a blocked file or to unblock a file.

“(2) EXEMPTION.—The Bureau may exempt an individual who suspects that the individual has been a victim of fraud or identity theft from a fee described in paragraph (1).

“(f) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed as requiring a consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis to prevent a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency from accessing a blocked file.”.

(B) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 605B the following:

“605C. Additional protections for credit reports of minor consumers.”.

(5) STUDY OF A PUBLIC CREDIT REPORTING SYSTEM.—

(A) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study—

(i) of credit systems in the international credit system with government-administered consumer credit reporting systems;

(ii) of available information regarding the accuracy of government-administered consumer credit reporting systems that are in existence as of the date on which the Comptroller General begins conducting the study;

(iii) to evaluate the feasibility of a national, government-administered consumer credit reporting system;

(iv) of any consumer benefits that might reasonably be expected to result from a government-administered consumer credit reporting system; and

(v) of any costs that might result from a government-administered consumer credit reporting system in the United States.

(B) PUBLICATION OF FINDINGS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall publish the findings of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

(6) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection, this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2186. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REGULATORY RELIEF FOR BANKS DURING DISASTERS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—
 (1) the terms “appropriate Federal banking agency” and “depository institution” have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(2) the term “major disaster” has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the President declares a major disaster under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), or not later than 15 days after a state of disaster is declared by a Governor of a State for all or part of that State, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall issue guidance to depository institutions located in the area for which the President declared the major disaster or the Governor declared a state of disaster, as applicable, for reducing regulatory burdens for borrowers and communities in order to facilitate recovery from the disaster.

(c) **CONTENTS.**—Guidance issued under subsection (b) shall include instructions from the appropriate Federal banking agency consistent with existing flexibility for a major disaster declared under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170).

SA 2187. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13 of the amendment, strikes lines 11 through 26 and insert the following:

“(1) **CLOSED-END MORTGAGE LOANS.**—With respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to closed-end mortgage loans if the insured depository institution or insured credit union originated fewer than 100 closed-end mortgage loans in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.

“(2) **OPEN-END LINES OF CREDIT.**—With respect to an insured depository institution or insured credit union, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to open-end lines of credit if the insured depository institution or insured credit union originated fewer than 100 open-end lines of credit in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.

SA 2188. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON CHILDREN'S LEAD-BASED PAINT PREVENTION AND ABATEMENT.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “Department” means the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

(2) the term “public housing agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) an overview of existing policies and enforcement of the Department, including public outreach, relating to lead-based paint hazard prevention and abatement;

(2) recommendations and best practices for the Department, public housing agencies, and landlords for improving lead-based paint hazard prevention standards and Federal lead prevention and abatement policies to protect the environmental health and safety of children, including within housing receiving assistance from or occupied by families receiving housing assistance from the Department; and

(3) recommendations for legislation to improve lead-based paint hazard prevention and abatement.

SA 2189. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INDIVIDUAL SBIC LEVERAGE LIMIT INCREASE.

Section 303(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 683(b)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking “\$150,000,000” and inserting “\$175,000,000”.

SA 2190. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXCLUSION OF INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EXPENSES FROM ANNUAL RECEIPTS.

Section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(10) **EXCLUSION OF INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EXPENSES FROM RECEIPTS.**—In determining the average annual gross receipts of a small business concern, the Administrator, at the request of the concern, may exclude from consideration any expenses or expenditures for independent research and development.”.

SA 2191. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SIZE STANDARDS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) **CALCULATION ON THE BASIS OF ANNUAL AVERAGE GROSS RECEIPTS.**—Section 3(a)(2)(C)(ii)(II) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)(2)(C)(ii)(II)) is amended by striking “over a period of not less than 3 years” and inserting “, which shall be calculated by using the 3 lowest annual average gross receipts of the business concern during the preceding 5-year period”.

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall promulgate regulations as necessary to implement the amendment made by subsection (a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. FISCHER. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on S. 2421, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSION

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Opioid Crisis: Leadership and Innovation in the States.”

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSION

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 1:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, Frank T. Brogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, and Mark Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Institute of Education Science, both of the Department of Education, Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and other pending nominations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 8, 2018 at 2:15 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPERFUND, WASTE
MANAGEMENT, AND REGULATION OVERSIGHT

The Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulation Oversight of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 8, 2018 at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Legislation Hearing on S. 2421, the Fair Agricultural Reporting Method Act."

REMOVING OUTDATED RESTRICTIONS TO ALLOW FOR JOB GROWTH ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1177 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1177) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States the condition that certain lands conveyed to the City of Old Town, Maine, be used for a municipal airport, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1177) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 12,
2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Monday, March 12; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time

for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2155, and notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the filing deadlines with respect to the cloture motions filed during today's session be Monday at 4:30 p.m. for first-degree amendments and 5:30 p.m. for second-degree amendments; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MARCH 12, 2018, AT 4 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:35 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 12, 2018, at 4 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 44:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. KARL L. SCHULTZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 47:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. CHARLES W. RAY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 8, 2018

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Pastor Tony Perkins, Greenwell Springs Baptist Church, Greenwell Springs, Louisiana, offered the following prayer:

Father, we thank You for today.

I thank You for the men and women in this distinguished body, whom You have given the privilege of serving the people of this country. May they understand the unique, but fleeting, moment they occupy in the history of man.

The challenges of our day are certainly many, and, as a result, the burden that those in this Chamber carry is very heavy. May they look to You as the Apostle James encouraged when we need the wisdom to face challenges and solve problems.

As citizens of this country, we pray for them, that You will give them wisdom, wisdom which is from above.

I ask that the Holy Spirit guide them like the pillar of fire and the cloud that led the children of Israel.

I pray they will recognize and declare dependence upon You, governing with an understanding of the Psalmist's words: "Blessed is the nation, whose God is the Lord."

In Jesus' name, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CAPUANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of International Women's Day, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of two women from Cincinnati.

Long ago, Harriet Beecher Stowe wrote "Uncle Tom's Cabin" in Cincinnati. When she later met Abraham Lincoln in the White House, he reportedly said: "So you are the little woman who wrote the book that started this great war."

More recently, Elina Govil, a high school student from Indian Hill, is fighting to provide at-risk girls in conflict zones with access to a proper education.

To assist Elina in her efforts, as a senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I introduced the Protecting Girls' Access to Education Act, bipartisan legislation that could help millions of young girls across the globe.

Children who are denied an education, because they live in an area that is torn by chaos and war, have little chance of ever attaining a stable existence. Girls, in particular, are subject to exploitation and the pitfalls of human trafficking, violence, and poverty.

Thank you, Elina, for helping girls everywhere to have the opportunity to reach their fullest potential.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

(Mr. CAPUANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am here to recognize International Women's Day.

We all know that women have made some progress over the years: the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Lilly Ledbetter Equal Pay Act. We have made progress, but we know there is more to do.

This Congress and this President have to improve the Family and Medical Leave Act. We have to make sure the laws that we have are enforced, equal pay is made, and equal actions happen in the workplace. We are not doing it, and we all know that.

And the truth is—when I am home—I tell people, when you look to Congress to lead, it is always a mistake. Most of the progress in this country comes from the bottom up. We are almost always last. I will give you an example.

Years ago, George Bush vetoed the Family and Medical Leave Act four times. I was the mayor of my city, we did it on our own. The Federal Government didn't make us do it, and the State didn't make us do it.

So I am here today to simply ask all Americans, at every level, to do what you can to equalize opportunity and treatment in this world. We don't have to wait for our government. There are people like me, ROSA DELAULO, and others who are going to continue to push, and we will make progress. But we all have our own individual responsibilities, and I call on all Americans to do that.

REMEMBERING TOM BERNIS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, to remember Tom Bernis, a friend and respected community leader, who passed away last month.

After graduating college, Tom established the firm Bernis, Clancy and Associates, which has grown into one of today's premier engineering firms in the area. Over the course of his career, Tom was considered by many to be an expert in civil engineering. He found great joy in his profession and shared it with others through teaching.

However, Tom is, perhaps, most known for his impact on the community. He was a member of over a dozen clubs, boards, and civic organizations, many of which he served as president or chairman. He served as village engineer for five different central Illinois towns throughout his lifetime and was also actively involved in his congregation, St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, for over 50 years.

In 2000, Tom became a Member of the Illinois House of Representatives, where he represented Illinois' 104th House District.

Tom knew what it meant to serve. He lived his life in a way that put others before himself, always looking for ways to help, to get involved, and to improve his community.

I am inspired by the legacy of Tom Bernis and the numerous lives he touched throughout central Illinois. I pray for his wife, Jeannie, and their family during this difficult time.

HONORING DORIS A. DAVIS

(Ms. BARRAGÁN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, on this International Women's Day, I rise to honor the life of the Honorable Doris A. Davis, who passed away last month, after providing decades of public service to the city of Compton.

After serving as Compton's first African-American city clerk, Ms. Davis then went on to become the first African-American mayor of a major metropolitan city in the country.

During her time in office, Mayor Davis worked tirelessly to increase tax revenues and job opportunities in Compton.

Upon leaving office, she founded the Daisy Child Development Centers, a nonprofit organization that provided assistance to single parents and families in and around Compton.

Mayor Davis was always an active participant in our community—belonging to over two dozen organizations, including the NAACP, the Urban League, and the League of Women Voters—and her legacy of public service will live on.

ESTABLISH A UNIFORM RULE OF NATURALIZATION

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I wish to commend Attorney General Jeff Sessions and the Trump administration for finally taking action against California's lawlessness on sanctuary cities and immigration practices.

California is clearly violating Federal immigration laws. States don't get to dictate to the Federal Government when and where these laws are enforced.

California needs to be held accountable for their willful defiance of Federal immigration law and its sanctuary State insurrection.

Several laws have been passed by the Federal Government over the years on immigration. Actually enforcing a law on the books, arresting and deporting illegal immigrants shouldn't be shocking. The Supreme Court has held that immigration regulation was a Federal responsibility exclusively in 1876.

Under the Obama administration, Arizona, in order to try to fix the immigration problem in this country, passed a bill called S.B. 1070, but the Supreme Court ruled that they couldn't enforce the border themselves.

Now we have California going the other direction, trying to cause no enforcement to be done on immigration in our State. The Federal Government is ruling and working to overcome that as well.

So I commend Attorney General Sessions for taking action on California's lawlessness.

HONORING DR. GEORGE NIELD

(Mr. BRIDENSTINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Dr. George Nield, on the occasion of his retirement as the FAA Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation.

Dr. Nield has been a tireless advocate for a commercial space industry that is more robust than ever and has been a great partner for those of us on the Hill who have worked to create an environment where the commercial space industry can thrive.

Dr. Nield is a graduate of the United States Air Force Academy, and his time in the Air Force included assignments as an engineer at the Space and Missile Systems Center and Air Force Test Center, and as an assistant professor at the Air Force Academy.

He later held many roles at NASA, managing the Flight Integration Office for the Space Shuttle program, and later working on the International Space Station program. Prior to coming to the FAA, Dr. Nield was a senior scientist in the advance programs group of Orbital Sciences Corporation, now Orbital ATK.

George Nield has long understood the important role space plays in our country and dedicated his career to ensuring that the United States is the world's preeminent spacefaring nation. For the past 10 years, he has devoted himself to an industry that helps the United States Government complete its missions, grow our economy, and improve the quality of life for all Americans and those around the world. Our country is losing an important advocate for space. I wish him well in his retirement.

SENSE ACT WILL HELP RESTORE PENNSYLVANIA LANDS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act, also called the SENSE Act.

The SENSE Act will have a tremendous impact on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Decades of historic mining has left behind piles of coal refuse or waste coal, which is essentially a worthless material, but its presence has led to environmental degradation in many cases.

Today, the coal refuse-to-energy industry uses waste coal to generate affordable energy. This means hundreds of good-paying jobs and remediated waste coal piles across the Commonwealth.

Pennsylvania is home to 14 of the 19 coal refuse-to-energy plants in the United States. And we have already seen enormous environmental and economic benefits thanks to this industry. We are keeping Pennsylvanians employed and working to restore our beautiful streams and countryside.

Mr. Speaker, one-size-fits-all government regulations do not work.

The SENSE Act crafts responsibly tailored regulations to address the application of an EPA rule for electric generating units that utilize coal refuse to generate electricity and serve critical environmental cleanup and remediation purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

SATISFYING ENERGY NEEDS AND SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT ACT

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 762, I call up the bill (H.R. 1119) to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Pursuant to House Resolution 762, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1119

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act" or the "SENSE Act".

SEC. 2. STANDARDS FOR COAL REFUSE POWER PLANTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) BOILER OPERATING DAY.—The term "boiler operating day" has the meaning given such term in section 63.10042 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(3) COAL REFUSE.—The term "coal refuse" means any byproduct of coal mining, physical coal cleaning, or coal preparation operation that contains coal, matrix material, clay, and other organic and inorganic material.

(4) COAL REFUSE ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATING UNIT.—The term "coal refuse electric utility steam generating unit" means an electric utility steam generating unit that—

(A) is in operation as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) uses fluidized bed combustion technology to convert coal refuse into energy; and

(C) uses coal refuse as at least 75 percent of the annual fuel consumed, by heat input, of the unit.

(5) **COAL REFUSE-FIRED FACILITY.**—The term "coal refuse-fired facility" means all coal refuse electric utility steam generating units that are—

(A) located on one or more contiguous or adjacent properties;

(B) specified within the same Major Group (2-digit code), as described in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual (1987); and

(C) under common control of the same person (or persons under common control).

(6) **ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATING UNIT.**—The term "electric utility steam generating unit" means an electric utility steam generating unit, as such term is defined in section 63.10042 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(b) **EMISSION LIMITATIONS TO ADDRESS HYDROGEN CHLORIDE AND SULFUR DIOXIDE AS HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—For purposes of regulating emissions of hydrogen chloride or sulfur dioxide from a coal refuse electric utility steam generating unit under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412), the Administrator—

(A) shall authorize the operator of such unit to elect that such unit comply with either—

(i) an emissions standard for emissions of hydrogen chloride that meets the requirements of paragraph (2); or

(ii) an emission standard for emissions of sulfur dioxide that meets the requirements of paragraph (2); and

(B) may not require that such unit comply with both an emission standard for emissions of hydrogen chloride and an emission standard for emissions of sulfur dioxide.

(2) **RULES FOR EMISSION LIMITATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall require an operator of a coal refuse electric utility steam generating unit to comply, at the election of the operator, with no more than one of the following emission standards:

(i) An emission standard for emissions of hydrogen chloride from such unit that is no more stringent than an emission rate of 0.002 pounds per million British thermal units of heat input.

(ii) An emission standard for emissions of hydrogen chloride from such unit that is no more stringent than an emission rate of 0.02 pounds per megawatt-hour.

(iii) An emission standard for emissions of sulfur dioxide from such unit that is no more stringent than an emission rate of 0.20 pounds per million British thermal units of heat input.

(iv) An emission standard for emissions of sulfur dioxide from such unit that is no more stringent than an emission rate of 1.5 pounds per megawatt-hour.

(v) An emission standard for emissions of sulfur dioxide from such unit that is no more stringent than capture and control of 93 percent of sulfur dioxide across the generating unit or group of generating units, as determined by comparing—

(I) the expected sulfur dioxide generated from combustion of fuels emissions calculated based upon as-fired fuel samples, to

(II) the actual sulfur dioxide emissions as measured by a sulfur dioxide continuous emission monitoring system.

(B) **MEASUREMENT.**—An emission standard described in subparagraph (A) shall be measured as a 30 boiler operating day rolling average per coal refuse electric utility steam generating unit or group of coal refuse electric utility steam generating units located at a single coal refuse-fired facility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1119.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, coal-fired electric generation has been the subject of many costly regulations, and we are already seeing an economic impact on conventional coal facilities. But, today, we are focusing on a relatively small number of very unconventional facilities that take environmentally damaging waste coal, burn it to produce electricity, and then use the resulting ash to remediate the land.

The more you learn about H.R. 1119, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment, the SENSE, Act, the more you will agree that these facilities are worth saving, which is what this bill does. I thank my colleague, KEITH ROTHFUS from Pennsylvania, for sponsoring this innovative measure, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Decades of coal mining in Pennsylvania, and other States, have led to a legacy of massive piles of waste coal that contributes to water and air pollution in communities where they are located.

□ 0915

The cost of eliminating this waste coal has been estimated at \$2 billion for Pennsylvania alone, so absent a massive new program, it almost certainly won't get done.

Fortunately, coal refuse-to-energy plants have been developed and built in several communities with waste coal. These plants burn waste coal to produce electricity, and the resulting ash is then used to remediate the land. Thus far, these plants have eliminated 214 million tons of waste coal and restored thousands of acres and 1,200 miles of rivers and streams.

The electricity and the jobs created by these plants are really just a bonus compared to the tremendous environmental benefits; nonetheless, coal refuse-to-energy plants are now under threat. Although these plants utilize a specialized process, EPA has decided to treat them no differently than conventional coal-fired power plants. As a result, the Agency has jeopardized the continued operation of these facilities by setting standards that are not appropriate for them.

The SENSE Act addresses the problem by providing an alternative compliance mechanism for the compounds regulated under the Mercury and Air Toxic Standards, which is commonly known as the MATS. The bill still requires stringent emission reductions at these waste coal-to-energy plants, but ones that are achievable at these facilities.

I should note that earlier versions of the SENSE Act also included changes to the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, or CSAPR, but those provisions have been taken out of the version we are voting on today.

The result of this bill would be that these coal refuse-to-energy plants can continue operating, which would be a big win for the environment as well as for jobs in the communities in Pennsylvania and other States where they are located.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1119, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment, or SENSE, Act.

The SENSE Act continues the theme of the floor this week, giving unnecessary preferences to a handful of special interests at the expense of clean air and people's health.

The SENSE Act would weaken requirements of EPA's Mercury and Air Toxic Standards, or MATS, for power plants that burn waste coal by enabling a weaker compliance option for hydrochloric acid and sulfur dioxide emissions. To make matters worse, the bill prevents EPA from strengthening these standards for waste coal plants in the future even if pollution control technologies become significantly better or less expensive.

I think we are all proud of the record of the Clean Air Act. As a nation, we have made significant progress since the 1970s, reducing air pollution while growing our economy.

This bill is against the spirit of the Clean Air Act and the bipartisan amendments that have followed. We should not lock in an insufficient standard when progress is still possible.

Polluters should be pushed to do better, especially when comparable facilities are meeting those given standards; but instead, these power plant owners would prefer to get special treatment and a pathway for meeting the weaker standards for many, many years to come. All the while, these plants will produce harmful air pollution.

This is not only dangerous but unnecessary. The health risks of these pollutants are well documented, and it is, in fact, possible for waste coal plants to meet EPA's MATS. A number of waste coal units have achieved the standards, and pollution control technologies exist that would enable non-compliant facilities to meet them, too.

EPA's MATS have already been examined by the courts, which would not grant an exclusion for waste coal utilities. The courts did not agree with waste coal plant owners that these standards were impossible to meet.

EPA established that 8 out of 19 waste coal units nationwide could meet the rules' acid gas standard or alternative sulfur dioxide standard already. So now those companies are coming to Congress to circumvent the court process.

Last year, every Democrat on the Energy and Commerce Committee opposed this bill. Those members understood that this bill is simply not fair. It picks winners and losers in States with waste coal plants, it disadvantages traditional coal-fired power generators, and it will allow for more hazardous air pollution. That isn't a good deal for the power generators that are already compliant with the standards, and it is a terrible deal for the people who have to live with more dangerous air pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote "no" on the SENSE Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the author of this legislation.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHIMKUS for leading and his help with this important legislation.

This is going to be an interesting debate. This is a debate about one size fits all coming out of Washington, D.C., and the failure of folks in this town at regulatory agencies to not appreciate the nuance of what is going on in the rest of the country.

I have been on these waste coal piles of western Pennsylvania. I have seen streams that are dead. I have seen hillsides scarred. I have seen restoration. I have seen streams come back to life. I have seen hillsides come back to life.

This Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment, SENSE, Act, makes sense for those who live outside the Capital Beltway.

The SENSE Act is a vitally important effort that I have championed in various forms throughout my time in Congress. The bill recognizes the huge success that the coal refuse-to-energy industry is making in Pennsylvania, and especially my district, to make it a healthier and cleaner place to live.

Without the SENSE Act, five coal refuse-to-energy facilities in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia will close, and their environmental remediation efforts will end.

Despite what the bill's opponents say, the SENSE Act is, first and foremost, a pro-environment bill, but it is also a pro-jobs bill, a pro-union jobs bill, because it is union workers who are going to be thrown out of work when these plants close. And it is a

pro-taxpayer bill because the environment is being cleaned up without a contribution from the taxpayers.

The coal industry has a long and storied history in Pennsylvania. Not only has it been an important part of the economy for generations, but Pennsylvania coal helped the U.S. and our allies win two world wars.

Historic mining activity, unfortunately, left behind large piles of coal refuse. These piles consist of lower quality coal mixed with rock and dirt.

For a long time, we did not have the technology to use this material, so it accumulated in large piles outside of cities and towns, close to schools, neighborhoods, and in fields across coal country. This has led to many environmental problems that diminished the quality of life for people in these areas surrounded by these piles. Vegetation and wildlife have been harmed, the air has been polluted, and acid mine drainage has impaired nearby rivers and streams.

I have seen these sites firsthand, as I said, and the environmental danger they pose.

Coal refuse piles can catch fire. Think about that. They can catch fire with no limitations at all. It is an unmitigated disaster when these things catch fire—uncontrolled air pollution. Many are already smoldering, giving off toxic emissions, again, without any controls whatsoever.

Runoff from these sites literally turn rivers orange, leaving them devoid of life.

The cost to clean up all of this is astronomical. Pennsylvania's environmental regulator estimates that fixing abandoned mine lands could cost over \$16 billion, over \$2 billion of which would be needed for coal refuse piles alone.

We needed an innovative solution to this tough challenge, a commonsense compromise. This was necessary to get the job done and to protect the environment. That is where the coal refuse-to-energy industry comes in.

Using advanced technology, this industry has been able to use previously worthless material to generate electricity. This activity is what powers remediation efforts and has successfully removed over 200 million tons of coal refuse, reclaiming polluted sites across Pennsylvania and other historic coal regions.

Thanks to the hard work of the dedicated people in this industry—again, many union workers in this industry—landscapes have been restored, rivers and streams have been brought back to life, and many towns have been relieved of hazardous waste coal piles.

Here is an example of what this industry has been able to do. Here you have an abandoned waste coal pile, but through the restoration efforts, the countryside has been reclaimed. This is a picture of success done without tax-

payer money, improving the environment.

I want to highlight again private sector leadership on this issue that has saved taxpayers millions of dollars in cleanup costs; and if the SENSE Act becomes law, taxpayers will continue to save millions.

I should also note that the waste-to-energy industry pays millions in tax dollars, too, something that my colleagues should be mindful of, because many of the plants in these areas are areas where there is still a struggle economically. Multiple groups have previously endorsed the SENSE Act, including Pennsylvania's abandoned mine reclamation groups and clean water advocates.

Unfortunately, intensifying and, importantly, inflexible EPA regulations threaten five plants in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia. This would leave hundreds of millions of dollars of vital cleanup unfinished, lead to job losses, and leave many localities exposed to the harmful conditions waste coal piles pose.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking a handful—a handful—of plants.

The sky is falling. The catastrophic scenario the opponents of this legislation are arguing about, they don't appreciate the nuance of what we are trying to do here. The SENSE Act, as it has been amended, addresses a significant challenge arising from the implementation of the existing rules, including those under the Mercury and Air Toxic Standards.

Importantly, these plants comply with mercury emission standards. There is an issue with how they deal with HCL, hydrogen chloride, and sulfur dioxide, SO₂.

This is a targeted piece of legislation, a customization, as it were, to recognize the important and vital work that this industry has been doing. Contrary to what critics allege, the SENSE Act simply provides operators with additional alternative MATS compliance standards, but it is still strict and it is still achievable.

Despite opponents' claims, this bill is not a sweetheart deal for the coal refuse-to-energy industry. This bill only prevents a few plants from being regulated out of existence. This industry represents a tiny fraction of the energy industry, but it provides enormous environmental benefits.

Again, this legislation brings a stark contrast to the difference between elites in this town and what is out there in flyover country, that you cannot even go in and see the specific issue and that you have to apply this one size fits all because you are operating from some ideological framework. It is really unfortunate, because it is the environment that is going to hurt; it is jobs that are going to be lost.

The industry works with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental

Protection to identify especially dangerous piles and prioritize remediation.

Mr. Speaker, the amended version of this bill accurately reflects the spirit of previous SENSE Act versions, and I thank my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their work on it.

It is my hope that we can continue to build support for this bill, especially in the Senate, where Senators TOOMEY and CASEY, Republican and Democrat, have previously offered a bipartisan amendment relating to it in the past. Despite that prior bipartisan Senate support, previous efforts have failed to achieve the supermajority necessary to pass, but I am hopeful that the SENSE Act can win enough support to pass both Chambers.

What we are looking to achieve today is this: a narrow and limited addition to existing rules for a very small but pro-environment industry.

This should not be a controversial or partisan issue. We want to hold this industry to high standards, but to standards they can actually reach. But for the EPA emission extension that expires in 2019, current regulations discount the environmental remediation benefits this industry provides.

□ 0930

My bill will help keep the coal refuse industry in business so that local communities, economies, and the environment will continue to reap the benefits.

The people who live near coal refuse piles and all of the communities downstream of these hazards expect us to find a solution. Many workers at the endangered power plants, folks throughout the supply chain, and their families, are counting on us to protect their livelihoods. We owe it to them to pass the SENSE Act, including people like Bill Turner.

Bill is a shift supervisor at the Colver refuse facility in Cambria County. He has worked at Colver for over two decades. He has also lived close to coal refuse piles. Bill and his colleagues at Colver are proud of the reclamation work they do. He has put three kids through college thanks to his job. I know I have said this before, but his children even played soccer on a field reclaimed from a coal refuse pile because of this industry. Bill said it would be a travesty if the coal waste-to-energy industry disappeared.

Another industry worker is Dennis Simmers. He is an engineer at Colver. For him, this issue is personal. He said three generations of his family lived in the shadow of a large coal refuse pile. Unfortunately, his relatives died without ever seeing this environmental catastrophe corrected. He said: "There is a real shot now that I will see it in my lifetime."

Finally, I would like to recognize Vince Brisini, who testified at the En-

ergy and Commerce Subcommittee hearing last fall. Vince not only worked for the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, but he also lives next to a waste coal pile. Like Bill and Dennis, he has devoted so much of his time and energy, both professionally and personally, to solving this problem.

Madam Speaker, we owe it to the environment to keep these five endangered plants open. We owe it to people like Dennis and Bill and Vince to see if we can solve the waste coal problem during this generation. The SENSE Act will help ensure that that remains a probability. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, pro-environment bill.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE), a longtime member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a thoughtful and passionate voice for the greater Pittsburgh area, and for that matter, all of Pennsylvania and our Nation.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the SENSE Act. This bill is an unnecessary and permanent carve-out for waste coal plants that forfeits scientific and industrial progress.

Waste coal plants may be unfamiliar to many of my colleagues here in Congress because the vast majority of them are located in my State, Pennsylvania. These plants take waste coal left over from mining anytime before the late 1970s and use it as fuel. You see, these areas were mined before laws required reclamation or remediation of mine damage.

I would just like to remind my colleagues who rail against government regulation all of the time, that the reason we have this environmental catastrophe is because there were no regulations before the late 1970s. This is what happens when we have industry, no government regulations, we get environmental catastrophes and now we are left to clean up the mess.

These piles of waste coal have sat covering hundreds of thousands of acres in my home State of Pennsylvania for decades because there was no regulation. Many don't realize, Pennsylvania has produced more coal than any other State. Our mines powered the country while our steel mills built it into the world's greater industrial nation, the arsenal of democracy through two world wars.

But now my home State remains saddled with the leftovers, the legacy of nearly 200 years of unregulated mining. These piles can directly affect people's health, their communities, and their environment. These abandoned sites can contaminate local water sources with harmful runoff, or combust and release toxins into the air at eye level.

Now, I have seen mining sites reclaimed because of these plants, and

the turnaround is remarkable. Over decades of operating, they have cleaned up about 4 to 6 percent of the total affected lands across our State, and they have dramatically improved the land at those sites.

They are an important but minor accessory to the use of abandoned mine land reclamation funds. Let me provide some context to that. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection estimates that, using abandoned mine land reclamation funds, the State and outside organizations have reclaimed 70,000 acres in my home State. The most recent industry estimate I have seen on waste coal plants reclaims approximately 200 acres a year.

Now, let's hear the arguments in favor of this bill. Waste coal plants help facilitate remediation of abandoned mine sites. Some plants say they are having a hard time meeting clean air standards, so let's loosen those standards forever.

But my problem is, we know plants can meet these Clean Air Act protections. Many already are. The scientists at EPA have determined this, and the Federal courts have upheld the EPA's ruling. In fact, the largest plant in Pennsylvania can meet the standards that this bill undermines.

I understand it can be difficult to upgrade emission controls technologies in current market conditions. I understand that, with the many issues that are at the nexus of the energy versus environment debate when one side wins and the other side loses. But coal refuse plants present us with an exciting opportunity to have a true win-win. This bill does not.

This bill says, let's sacrifice our air quality and the air quality of States downwind, and let's give these plants a pass. Let's sacrifice progress for a few companies' convenience, and let's stick it to those companies that have already invested in upgrading their plants, and let's do this forever.

I believe the environmental issues and the energy challenges our country and the planet face will be solved through technological progress and innovation, through scientific advancement and thoughtful policy. For that reason, I oppose this bill.

Let me be clear. Pennsylvania has inherited and shoulders a debt, the collective legacy from our Nation's unregulated industrial past. This debt is levied on our land, our children, and our communities. We need help, and we deserve help, to continue righting this wrong. That requires strong environmental stewardship, increased abandoned mine land reclamation funds. The RECLAIM Act would provide greater R&D into making fossil fuels cleaner, and the list goes on.

I want to applaud my colleague on the other side of the aisle for highlighting the importance of this issue.

This legislation, however, is not the answer. It is still not the answer, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it so that we can try a different, smarter approach.

I think we can make great progress on this issue in the coming months. I would welcome cooperation and input from colleagues on both sides of the aisle in doing so. Let's do this the smart way, the right way. Let's not penalize companies that are spending the money to comply, by helping a few companies that claim they don't want to.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume before I yield to Mr. ROTHFUS just to get things straight here.

Let's see. We can remediate environmental hazards by private sector dollars. I think that is good, saving the AML for other sites that can't use private sector dollars. We have a revenue stream to pay for that remediation. We have good-paying jobs and, as my colleague said, union jobs.

I am from a coal-producing State everyone knows, deep southern Illinois. We have a local tax base to protect. Again, it protects the abandoned mine funds.

When I was a young boy, I had a motorbike, and one of the places to ride which kind of scared me—I did it a couple of times—was on what we would call a slag hill.

What is a slag hill?

A slag hill is an abandoned mine refuse pile.

So many of us have lived in and around these sites.

This opportunity to take this and turn it into this, without taxpayer dollars, is a win. And the gentleman stole my line. The SENSE Act does make sense for jobs, for a tax base, for remediation, both in land and water, and protecting the abandoned mine funds to go to those sites that don't have a reclamation facility that can produce power and put it on the grid. So I am pleased to be down here and fighting with my colleague, Congressman ROTHFUS.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I would like to make a couple of points here. Without this relief, the plants are going to close. This is not a broad-based industry carve-out. This is for a subset of plants.

When you look at the economics of running a plant, you are looking at income, you are looking at cost. The fact is, we are seeking a nuanced approach to recognize the environmental benefit that these plants have provided, the hundreds of jobs, family-sustaining jobs that are at stake. It is just frustrating to hear my colleagues just insist on this one-size-fits-all, seemingly we are incapable of appreciating a nuance.

We don't rail against regulation. We rail against overregulation. Regulation is important. It is necessary. It should be responsible. It should be prudent. It should meet a cost-benefit analysis.

I talked about right regulation, not deregulation; right regulation. You pick the regulation to fit the circumstance that you are in.

A picture paints a thousand words. That paints a thousand words right there, and the EPA has even recognized the benefit of this industry here. A quote from the EPA: "Coal refuse piles are an environmental concern because of acid seepage and leachate production, spontaneous combustion, and low soil fertility. Units that burn coal refuse provide multimedia environmental benefits. . . ."

Let me say that again. The EPA said: "Units that burn coal refuse provide multimedia environmental benefits by combining the production of energy with the removal of coal refuse piles and by reclaiming land for productive use. Consequently, because of the unique environmental benefits that coal refuse-fired EGUs provide, these units warrant special consideration. . . ."

Let me say that again. The EPA said: "These units warrant special consideration," because of the unique environmental benefits they provide.

That is what the SENSE Act is about.

Up in Cambria County, where they have a number of these piles, there are streams that flow into the Conemaugh River, that flows into the Kiskiminetas River, that flows into the Allegheny River, that flows into the Ohio River. This industry is cleaning up those tributaries, preventing acid seepage into the Conemaugh, into the Kiskiminetas, into the Allegheny, and the Ohio.

This bill makes sense, and I would urge my colleagues to seriously consider it because this is an area where people can come up out of their trenches and find common ground, something that makes common sense, reaches common sense. It is pro-environment. The sky is not falling, as some of the opponents might say. And it saves jobs and union jobs.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, let me just say to my friend—and he is my friend—that none of us have a problem with these plants. They are providing an important service. The largest one in our State is complying.

What I don't understand is, when the majority of these plants can comply and are in the process of complying, why do you want to pass a law that would exempt them from having to do that?

□ 0945

It seems that when we have this debate, we only define "burden" as one way. When I hear my colleagues talk about the burden, it sort of has a singular dimension: money, dollars and cents on a business, on an individual, on a taxpayer.

What about the burden of lower air quality? Is it not burdensome to the health of our students, the elderly, folks with asthma to breathe in higher levels of particulate matter? What about those folks?

When we have an opportunity and we have the technology to have these plants continue to remediate sites, but to do so in a more environmentally friendly way, why would we not want to do that, especially when there are only 14 of these sites in Pennsylvania, and the majority of them are in the process of complying or are complying?

You know, this bill is the same bill you brought here last year that didn't pass the Senate. This bill is not going to become law either. I would just encourage my friend to sit down with members of the Democratic Party, sit down with these stakeholders, and let's work on a solution that is futuristic, not one that takes us back to the past.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The EPA quote that Congressman ROTHFUS mentioned about they should deserve special consideration was not this EPA. In fact, it was authored by, in 2011, an EPA under the Obama administration, and the Administrator at that time was Lisa Jackson.

So we are not, in today's world, saying these plants should have special considerations. We are in the last administration's world. And we just believe that that is correct. We believe that we have got to consider the benefits, and the benefits are remediation of these slag mounds, restoration of land, sometimes for recreational activities, protecting our water supply.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), author of the bill.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about some burdens, burdens like uncontrolled release of toxins into the air when these piles catch fire, uncontrolled seepage into rivers.

This subset of plants, my colleague from Pennsylvania makes the point about some of these plants are in compliance. There is such a thing as economics of scale. And when any business is in operation, you are looking at costs and expenses. You are looking at revenue. And when the costs and expenses exceed the revenue, you go out of business.

Unless we are able to do a customization for these handful of plants, they will close. Hundreds of people will lose their jobs. The cleanup

they are doing will stop. While some other plants may continue to operate and continue the good work, that is great, but it is going to go at a slower pace. It is going to cost taxpayers more because less will be cleaned up.

This industry, so far, has cleaned up 200 million tons of waste coal in Pennsylvania, and that is just the start of the work that needs to be done. My hope is that it is all going to be cleaned up in our lifetimes.

So, no, this isn't forever. This isn't forever.

This, again, is taking a look at a situation we have in Pennsylvania, that we want to recognize the good work that is going on there and, again, when you look at the EPA under the Obama administration, talking of the unique environmental benefits that these plants provide and that they warrant special consideration.

Again, I just urge my colleagues to come up. Let's get out of our trenches. Let's take a look, meeting, you know, in the middle here. Support this legislation. Save these jobs. Save these union jobs. Let these plants stay open, and let's continue to clean up western Pennsylvania.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, let me just say to my friend that at the rate of 200 acres a year, it will be well into the year 3000 before we reclaim all these sites. So when I say, "forever," there is not going to be any of us sitting here today around to see it, nor will our children, nor will our grandchildren, at that rate.

And, by the way, the quote you give from the EPA regarding that was under a different rule, not the rule that we are talking about. This boils down to companies that are already spending the money and complying. Where is the fairness to those companies, their bottom line, their workers, when they are complying with this rule?

And then you want, literally, a handful of companies not to comply? And when you talk about customizing a solution, what you are talking about is no rules. I mean, you are basically saying they don't have to comply with anything. So the answer to these 19 plants that operate in the entire United States, of which better than half are in the process or already complying, is to tell the ones that aren't complying there are no rules.

Every year, our technology gets better. Every year, technology gets cheaper. Why would we want to give a lifetime exemption to a handful of companies that are reclaiming 200 acres a year? And at that rate, we are going to be into the year 3000. Why would we say you never have to comply with any rules, when most of those companies

are? It just doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

No one is saying anything bad about these plants. They are providing a valuable service. They can do it in a much more environmentally friendly way because technology is allowing that to happen. And all the EPA and their scientists who study this and the Federal courts, which upheld their decision, are saying is let's make the environment even cleaner.

We have seen what happens to our State when there is no regulation. It is called "environmental catastrophe." Let's not go back to saying no environmental regulation to this handful of companies that aren't complying.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the author of the language.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wonder if my friend from Pennsylvania has really taken a look at the legislation, because there are rules that apply. The entire bevy of environmental rules apply to these plants, and the SENSE Act is going to leave those in place, all the rules.

What the SENSE Act does is take a look at two factors—two factors—hydrogen chloride and sulfur dioxide. That is it. And it says, if you are in compliance with hydrogen chloride, you will be deemed to be in compliance with sulfur dioxide, or, conversely, if you are in compliance with sulfur dioxide, you will be deemed in compliance with hydrogen chloride. Everything else is applicable. Everything else is applicable.

This is why I talk about a customization for a small handful of the plants. The group that represents these plants supports this legislation. The workers in these plants support this legislation. The people who live next to these coal piles support this legislation.

But to suggest that this legislation means no rules for these plants is just not accurate. All the rules apply to these plants. We are seeing a small tweak because, again, when you look at the economics of running a business, running a plant, you are looking at cost; and if you are going to impose the cost to put the additional mechanics within the plant, it is not going to happen. Those plants are going to close. That is what we are looking at.

So, again, I would appreciate if folks who take a look at this legislation understand that these plants are still subject to strict regulation both at the Federal and State level and that this is a minor tweaking of one rule. While the EPA may have been discussing the benefit of these plants in the context of

another rule, the fact remains the same: these units warrant special consideration. If it is true under one rule, it is going to be true under all rules because of, again, the unique environmental benefits that these plants provide.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. At the risk of beating this horse to death—and this will be my final remarks—I would just say to the Speaker that there are many of these plants that are complying with this rule, and I commend those plants that are doing that.

It is not fair to those plants that are complying that we exempt those plants that aren't complying or don't want to comply because they don't want to spend the money to do so. The idea that all of these plants are going out of business if they are forced to do that is simply not based in any reality.

I would encourage the gentleman and the Speaker to reconsider this bill, which is going nowhere. It may pass the House, but it is not going any further than that. Let's sit down and work together on a bipartisan basis to come up with a rule that utilizes the best and latest technologies, that continues to improve and get cheaper, help work with these companies that may need a little assistance in complying and help them comply, and then we truly do have a win-win situation.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I believe I have the right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have no other speakers. I just would make mention that some 18 groups that are public interest groups have joined together in a letter opposing this legislation, suggesting and indicating strongly that it pits waste coal-burning plants against coal-burning plants, that it creates a public health situation that is an outcome that is negative for our constituents, and it basically cites that the courts have reviewed some of the requests made earlier and denied those requests because they felt that technology was available.

I include the letter in the RECORD.

MARCH 6, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose the amended Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act, or SENSE Act (H.R. 1119). This bill would weaken health safeguards for Americans on behalf of special interest groups and result in more toxic air pollution and health hazards.

The SENSE Act would provide a giveaway to power plants that burn waste coal under EPA's Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS). The bill favors waste coal-burning power plants at the expense of other in-state coal power plants and the public through blunt political favoritism.

Specifically, the SENSE Act would permanently exempt power plants that burn waste coal from having to meet certain pollution limits. Power plants, including waste coal plants, are already meeting these standards—passing this bill would be a free giveaway to polluters, and nothing more.

And the courts agree.

When waste coal plant owners filed lawsuits challenging the MATS standards in the first place, they claimed it was “virtually impossible” to meet the acid gas and sulfur dioxide limits set in MATS. The court rejected the plants’ arguments.

The judges pointed to clear evidence that waste coal plants already were meeting these limits. EPA had evidence demonstrating that 8 out of 19 waste coal units nationwide already could meet the rule’s acid gas standard or alternative sulfur dioxide standard. In fact, the court noted that not only were the plants meeting these supposedly “impossible” standards, but some of these plants were “among the best performers” in achieving hydrogen chloride reductions among all coal-burning units under the rule.”

Doomsday claims to justify this bill are just that. Waste coal plants have already had more time than other power plants to come into compliance with MATS. Rewarding laggards who continue to drag their feet, even after already getting special treatment, would undermine all pollution reduction programs and disincentivize compliance.

Were this bill to become law, the result will be dirtier air for communities. Indeed, the SENSE Act drags health standards down to the level of the laggards—resulting in greater harms for Americans living in states with waste coal plants as well as in their downwind neighboring states. This bill is not only bad policy—it is unjustified. It favors the very dirtiest of polluting facilities at the expense of Americans, air quality, and responsible power plants who have already taken steps to clean up their air pollution. Worst of all, it will lead to greater toxic pollution and health harms to Americans. We urge you to oppose the SENSE Act.

Sincerely,

Center for Biological Diversity; Clean Water Action; Climate Hawks Vote; Earthjustice; Environment America; Environmental Defense Fund; Friends of the Earth; GreenLatinos; Hip Hop Caucus; Interfaith Power & Light; League of Conservation Voters; Moms Clean Air Force; National Parks Conservation Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Power Shift Network; Public Citizen; Sierra Club; Southern Environmental Law Center.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, much like the bill considered by the House yesterday, the SENSE Act would provide so-called relief to a handful of companies by shifting the burdens of pollution onto the public. Congress should not be in the business of putting the profits of polluters before the health of our constituents.

The reality is, by allowing these plants to pollute more, we would be doing just that. It will result in greater harm to Americans living in States with waste coal plants as well as in their downwind neighboring States, such as my home State of New York.

EPA’s MATS are achievable and provide considerable health benefits. Why shouldn’t waste coal plants have to comply? The courts think they should.

We shouldn’t have to choose between a giveaway to a couple of special interests over clean air.

Again, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

This has been a great debate. We don’t have debates on the floor too much. I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania. He is a good friend. I think it was well conducted.

Just to close, these are specialized plants for twofold purposes. The first purpose is to clean up coal refuge sites, which are all over, again, and it keeps them from having the piles on the ground. And if they catch on fire, there is no controlling technology for that.

It keeps them from leaching into our streams, as Congressman ROTHFUS said numerous times, which is why EPA, again, has said these units warrant special consideration. That is what this legislation does.

Again, not a Trump EPA, but an Obama EPA made that statement.

□ 1000

If that 200 acres is in your backyard, that is an important 200 acres to clean up.

Mr. ROTHFUS brought this down.

If those 200 acres are here, you want this? This is a pretty good deal—paid for not by the taxpayers, but paid for by this industry that is using this technology to take the coal refuse and create electricity.

As I said once before in this debate, if you have remediation of environmental hazards, if you have a revenue stream to pay for it, if you have good-paying jobs, you create a local tax base, and you protect the Abandoned Mine Land fund, this SENSE Act makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, ask anyone who lives in or near communities with waste coal piles from abandoned mines and they will tell you that they can be a significant environmental hazard. They can leak acidic water into rivers and streams. They can sometimes catch fire, burn uncontrollably for months and result in both damage and heavy emissions. And they can have an economic drag on any community that has to deal with them.

The good news is that a process exists that can take this byproduct and use it to produce electricity. The result of that process is an environmentally-safe ash that can be used to remediate the land from which the waste coal was taken. It has worked well, and there are numerous examples of contaminated lands and streams being restored because of these coal refuse-to-energy plants.

Given the substantial environmental benefits of coal refuse-to-energy plants, I believe we have an obligation to work to keep them open. That is why I urge support for H.R. 1119, the SENSE Act.

Unfortunately, these plants are at risk of being tripped up by EPA regulations aimed at

conventional coal-fired power plants. Specifically, EPA’s Mercury and Air Toxics standards did not distinguish between conventional coal-fired plants and these coal refuse-to-energy plants that operate very differently. The EPA’s standard as written for one of the targeted compounds, hydrogen chloride, or HCL, would be difficult for these facilities to consistently meet.

The bill before us today, H.R. 1119, the SENSE Act, addresses these concerns and provides an alternative compliance mechanism for HCL that still requires substantial emissions reductions, but one that is achievable for these facilities.

By finding a use for potentially dangerous and damaging coal refuse piles, coal refuse-to-energy plants provide affordable energy and a tremendous environmental benefit. The SENSE Act is commonsense, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill that benefits both consumers and the environment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1119, the “Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act”.

The SENSE Act continues yesterday’s latest effort by Republicans to undermine the commonsense protections found in the Clean Air Act in order to give special breaks to polluters at the expense of public health. The winner of today’s Republican special breaks are power plants that burn waste coal.

The SENSE Act would give power plants that burn waste coal for energy a free pass on critical public health protections that keep dangerous toxins out of the air.

It does this by giving waste coal power plants a carve-out from the pollution control requirements of EPA’s Mercury and Air Toxic Standards—or MATS Rule. This rule represents the first national standards to address power plant emissions of toxic air pollutants like mercury, arsenic, dioxin, sulfur dioxide and hydrochloric acid.

The SENSE Act provides a weaker compliance option for MATS that would give waste coal facilities license to pollute more than they should. And, the bill would lock in this weaker standard for the foreseeable future.

That means a small number of waste coal units would be allowed to avoid controlling harmful pollution in perpetuity, regardless of any subsequent developments in control technologies, or new information on the health effects of their pollution. Passing this bill means waste coal power plants would never have to clean up their act, putting the health and safety of those nearby and downwind in jeopardy.

So, why are we even discussing such a ridiculous sweetheart deal? Because the waste coal industry says they need, and deserve, a legislative earmark, just for using the coal that wasn’t good enough to burn in other power plants.

But that claim doesn’t pass the smell test.

EPA determined, and the D.C. Circuit Court agreed, that since emissions from waste coal units are no different than emissions from other coal-fired power plants, there is no justification for special treatment. Many of the waste coal plants already meet the requirements of the MATS rule, because in reality, waste coal plants are among the best performing coal-fired power plants in the country.

I see no justification for giving waste coal plants the ability to pollute more than other facilities, as the SENSE act would allow.

These special breaks are especially offensive to me since I represent a down-wind state. Pollution generated west of New Jersey moves into our air shed threatening the public health and welfare of my constituents. It also increases the burden on New Jersey businesses that would ultimately be required to do more and spend more to compensate for the extra pollution generated by these plants.

The Republicans claim that EPA is over-regulating business. But, time and again, the courts have found that EPA is actually failing to regulate pollutants known to cause harm. This Mercury and Air Toxics rule has been in development and litigation for nearly 20 years—the time it takes for a child to reach adulthood. That's more than enough delay, enough mercury, and enough toxic air pollution. It's time to clean it up.

Republican-led attacks on clean air protections will not create jobs, nor will they magically build infrastructure. All a Yes vote on this dirty air bill will do is boost profits for Republican allies, and make it easier for corporate polluters to contaminate the air in our neighborhoods. Meanwhile our children's health is threatened and their future is sold out, all in the name of more corporate profits.

I strongly oppose the SENSE Act, and urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting No. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 762, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kildee moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1119 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of section 2, add the following new subsection:

(c) LIMITATION.—This Act does not apply with respect to any coal refuse electric utility steam generating unit associated with air pollution that—

- (1) harms brain development or causes learning disabilities in infants or children;
- (2) increases the risk of cancer;
- (3) causes respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses and deaths, including cases of heart attacks, asthma attacks, and bronchitis; or
- (4) increases mercury deposition to lakes, rivers, streams, and other bodies of water, that are used as a source of public drinking water.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the latest attempt by Republicans to undermine the Clean Air Act and give breaks to special interests, this time to power plants that burn waste coal.

The bill undermines the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, the MATS rule, one of most important protections for public health from toxic air pollutants from waste coal-burning power plants.

Simply put, the bill would mean more pollutants being put into our air and our water by waste coal power plants.

And on that point, there is really no disagreement. That is the point of the legislation, to allow more pollutants to be put into the air.

But not only would this bill give waste coal power plants permission to pump more pollution into our air, it also prohibits higher standards from being enacted, even if future technologies are invented to help control toxic pollution emissions better.

My motion would protect public health and prevent more pollutants, toxic substances like mercury, sulfur dioxide, and other hazardous particles, from being released into the air and into the water.

These harmful substances impact brain development. They cause cancer. They harm respiratory systems. They pollute our lakes, our streams, our rivers, where people get their drinking water.

As this body has heard me discuss many times, I know firsthand what happens when we fail to protect our environment and when we fail to protect our water supplies.

We know what happened in my hometown of Flint, a city of 100,000 people, including thousands of children, poisoned by lead in their drinking water because of callous decisions by government that put the balance sheet approach, the dollars and cents that would accrue in this case to an operator, ahead of the interests of health.

For 4 years, the people I represent have not had access to safe drinking water because of decisions that were made by government that allowed the water to be contaminated with high levels of lead, a dangerous neurotoxin with irreversible and damaging effects on children.

America is the wealthiest, most prosperous country in the world. It is a shame that the people of my hometown can't turn on their taps and trust the water coming out.

What happened in Flint is the result of policymakers, again, putting the balance sheet ahead of the interests of people. We can't measure every question on the ledger of a corporation. We

have to think about the health of our people.

Just looking at those short-term effects can lead to really bad choices. What happened in Flint is absolutely tragic. We ought to take that lesson and make sure that we do everything we can to prevent the consequences of ignoring environmental protections, the consequences on people.

Flint is not an anomaly. Flint is a warning.

What happened there could happen to lots of people all across the country if we don't take care to ensure that we protect public health and strike a reasonable balance between the interests of the companies that are, unfortunately, unwilling to comply as other companies have, as other operators have, with existing standards. The public interest has to come first. We should be protecting our constituents from pollutants, not enacting law that explicitly allows for more pollutants to go into our air and water. It is the wrong direction for us.

As my colleague Mr. DOYLE said, Democrats and Republicans can figure out solutions to these problems, but the solution is not to take a step back and pass legislation that rather than empowering organizations and communities to protect air and water says these rules are too hard for some to adhere to; and because they are unwilling to spend the resources necessary to protect public health, we just say: Well, then it is okay.

We know what happens when government takes that approach. There are human consequences—consequences that we can't ignore, consequences that are made clear by the experience of my hometown. I don't wish that on anyone in Michigan or Pennsylvania, or anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress ought to do what it can to protect people from that ever happening to them. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit, stand up for kids, stand up for the people who live in those communities who breathe that air, who depend on clean water. Support this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, this is really a great debate, and I appreciate my colleague coming down here to offer this.

I am not sure he was here for the whole debate, but these coal refuse sites sometimes catch on fire. And you want to talk about pollution and hazards? These power plants clean those up.

Some of these coal refuse sites leach into the groundwater, the streams, the

tributaries, so that the water is yellow. These power plants clean them up.

The Obama administration, under Lisa Jackson, said that these units “warrant special consideration.”

Why?

Because they are remediating all of these environmental hazards. They are not like a typical power plant. They are meeting environmental standards, as the author has said.

This bill is supported by the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, the Eastern Pennsylvania Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation. Actually, the abandoned mine reclamation is not on the taxpayers’ dollar, it is on the power plants’ dollar. We are saving money in the Abandoned Mine Land Fund. And the Western Pennsylvania Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation. So, you see, the eastern and the western side of Pennsylvania.

It is like the Phillies and the Steelers. Right? There is always going to be a divide there in Pennsylvania.

Cambria County Conservation District, the Blacklick Creek Watershed Association. Here is a watershed association supporting this piece of legislation. The Anthracite Region Independent Power Producers Association.

As I have said a couple of times during this debate, this is what this is about: You remediate environmental hazards, and you take land like this and turn it into land like this at no government cost.

That is why this is the step forward. This is the reasonable approach. The revenue stream is paid for by corporate America. You have got good-paying jobs. You have got a local tax base.

Some of these power plants, if this power plant leaves a county, that is their major employer. That is their major tax base. What are they going to do? Raise local taxes to meet their schools’, counties’, and municipal’s obligations?

The SENSE Act makes sense. This motion to recommit is trying to obviously defeat this bill. This is a sensible bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 225, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—181

Adams	Gomez	Napolitano
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Neal
Barragán	Gottheimer	Norcross
Beatty	Green, Al	O'Halleran
Bera	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Beyer	Grijalva	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Panetta
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Payne
Bonamici	Heck	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peters
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pingree
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Butterfield	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jeffries	Quigley
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cartwright	Jones	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kennedy	Rush
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clay	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kind	Schiff
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Cooper	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Costa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Courtney	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sinema
Cuellar	Levin	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Soto
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Speier
DeGette	Lofgren	Suo zzi
Delaney	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeBene	Lowe y	Takano
Demings	Lujan Grisham, M.	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Lynch	Titus
Dingell	Maloney,	Tonko
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Torres
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Ellison	Matsui	Vargas
Engel	McCollum	Veasey
Eshoo	McEachin	Vela
Espallat	McGovern	Velázquez
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Visclosky
Evans	Meeks	Wasserman
Foster	Meng	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Fudge	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Welch
	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NAYS—225

Abraham	Buchanan	Denham
Aderholt	Buck	Dent
Allen	Bucshon	DeSantis
Amash	Budd	DesJarlais
Amodei	Burgess	Diaz-Balart
Arrington	Byrne	Donovan
Babin	Calvert	Duffy
Bacon	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Banks (IN)	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Chabot	Dunn
Barr	Cheney	Emmer
Barton	Coffman	Estes (KS)
Bergman	Cole	Farenthold
Biggs	Collins (GA)	Faso
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Ferguson
Bishop (MI)	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Conaway	Flores
Blum	Cook	Fortenberry
Bost	Culberson	Fox
Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Brat	Curtis	Gallagher
Brooks (AL)	Davidson	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Gianforte

Gibbs	Loudermilk	Ross
Gohmert	Love	Rothfus
Goodlatte	Lucas	Rouzer
Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Royce (CA)
Gowdy	MacArthur	Russell
Granger	Marchant	Rutherford
Graves (GA)	Marino	Sanford
Graves (LA)	Marshall	Scalise
Graves (MO)	Massie	Schweikert
Griffith	Mast	Scott, Austin
Grothman	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Guthrie	McCaul	Sessions
Handel	McClintock	Shimkus
Harper	McHenry	Shuster
Harris	McKinley	Simpson
Hartzler	McMorris	Smith (MO)
Hensarling	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Herrera Beutler	McSally	Smith (NJ)
Hice, Jody B.	Meadows	Smucker
Higgins (LA)	Meehan	Stefanik
Hill	Mitchell	Stewart
Holding	Moolenaar	Stivers
Hollingsworth	Mooney (WV)	Taylor
Huizenga	Mullin	Tenney
Hultgren	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)
Hunter	Noem	Thornberry
Hurd	Norman	Tipton
Issa	Nunes	Trott
Jenkins (KS)	Olson	Turner
Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo	Upton
Johnson (LA)	Palmer	Valadao
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Wagner
Johnson, Sam	Perry	Walberg
Jordan	Pittenger	Walden
Joyce (OH)	Poliquin	Walker
Katko	Posey	Walorski
Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Walters, Mimi
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Weber (TX)
King (IA)	Reichert	Webster (FL)
King (NY)	Renacci	Wenstrup
Kinzing	Rice (SC)	Westerman
Knight	Roby	Williams
Kustoff (TN)	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Labrador	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
LaHood	Rogers (KY)	Womack
LaMalfa	Rohrabacher	Woodall
Lamborn	Rokita	Yoder
Lance	Rooney, Francis	Yoho
Latta	Rooney, Thomas J.	Young (AK)
Lewis (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IA)
LoBiondo	Roskam	Zeldin
Long		

NOT VOTING—24

Bass	DeLauro	Pearce
Black	Gabbard	Poe (TX)
Bridenstine	Gaetz	Polis
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Richmond
Costello (PA)	Hudson	Shea-Porter
Cramer	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Crawford	Messer	Smith (TX)
Cummings	Noian	Walz

□ 1035

Messrs. MEEHAN, CHABOT, HIGGINS of Louisiana, HARRIS, ROYCE of California, and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 100 regarding the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 1119. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 189, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—215

Abraham	Goodlatte	Norman
Aderholt	Gosar	Nunes
Allen	Gowdy	Olson
Amodel	Granger	Palazzo
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Babin	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Perry
Banks (IN)	Griffith	Peterson
Barletta	Grothman	Pittenger
Barr	Guthrie	Posey
Barton	Handel	Ratcliffe
Bergman	Harper	Reichert
Biggs	Harris	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Roby
Bishop (GA)	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Rogers (KY)
Blackburn	Higgins (LA)	Rohrabacher
Blum	Hill	Rokita
Bost	Holding	Rooney, Francis
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rooney, Thomas J.
Brat	Huizenga	Roskam
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Ross
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rothfus
Buck	Hurd	Rouzer
Buschon	Issa	Royce (CA)
Budd	Jenkins (KS)	Russell
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Rutherford
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Carson (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Sessions
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Cheney	Katko	Shuster
Coffman	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Smith (NE)
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Smucker
Comer	Kinzinger	Stewart
Comstock	Knight	Stivers
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Taylor
Cook	Labrador	Tenney
Cuellar	LaHood	Thompson (PA)
Culberson	LaMalfa	Thornberry
Curtis	Lamborn	Tipton
Davidson	Latta	Trott
Davis, Rodney	Lewis (MN)	Turner
Denham	Long	Upton
Dent	Loudermilk	Valadao
DeSantis	Love	Wagner
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Walden
Donovan	Marchant	Walker
Duffy	Marino	Walorski
Duncan (SC)	Marshall	Walters, Mimi
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Weber (TX)
Dunn	McCarthy	Weber (FL)
Emmer	McCaul	Wenstrup
Estes (KS)	McClintock	Westerman
Farenthold	McHenry	Williams
Ferguson	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Fleischmann	McMorris	Wittman
Flores	Rodgers	Womack
Fortenberry	McSally	Woodall
Fox	Meadows	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Yoho
Gallagher	Mitchell	Young (AK)
Garrett	Moolenaar	Young (IA)
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Zeldin
Gibbs	Mullin	
Gohmert	Newhouse	
Gonzalez (TX)	Noem	

NOES—189

Adams	Boyle, Brendan F.	Castor (FL)
Aguilar		Castro (TX)
Amash	Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Cicilline
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bera	Buchanan	Clarke (NY)
Beyer	Bustos	Clay
Blumenauer	Butterfield	Cleaver
Blunt Rochester	Capuano	Clyburn
Bonamici	Carbajal	Cohen
	Cartwright	Connolly

Cooper	Khanna	Pocan
Correa	Kihuen	Poliquin
Costa	Kildee	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kilmer	Quigley
Crist	Kind	Raskin
Crowley	Krishnamoorthi	Reed
Curbelo (FL)	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Rosen
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Delaney	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lawson (FL)	Rush
Demings	Lee	Ryan (OH)
DeSaulnier	Levin	Sanchez
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Sanford
Dingell	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Doggett	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael F.	Loeb sack	Schiff
	Lofgren	Schneider
Ellison	Lowenthal	Schrader
Engel	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Lujan Grisham, M.	Scott, David
Espallat	Luján, Ben Ray	Serrano
Esty (CT)	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Evans	Maloney	Sherman
Fitzpatrick	Malone, Sean	Sinema
Foster	Carolyn B.	Sires
Frankel (FL)	Mast	Smith (NJ)
Fudge	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Gallego	McCollum	Soto
Gomez	McEachin	Speier
Gottheimer	McGovern	Stefanik
Green, Al	McNerney	Suozi
Green, Gene	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Grijalva	Meng	Takano
Gutiérrez	Moore	Thompson (CA)
Hanabusa	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
Hastings	Murphy (FL)	Titus
Heck	Nadler	Tonko
Higgins (NY)	Napolitano	Torres
Himes	Neal	Tsongas
Hoyer	Norcross	Vargas
Huffman	O'Halleran	Veasey
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Vela
Jayapal	Pallone	Velázquez
Jeffries	Panetta	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Wasserman
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Schultz
Kaptur	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine
Keating	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Welch
Kennedy	Pingree	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Bass	Gabbard	Poe (TX)
Black	Gaetz	Polis
Bridenstine	Garamendi	Rice (SC)
Cárdenas	Hudson	Richmond
Costello (PA)	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
Cramer	Lucas	Slaughter
Crawford	Messer	Smith (TX)
Cummings	Nolan	Walz
DeLauro	Pearce	

□ 1044

Mr. LOEB SACK changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 101 on H.R. 1119, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yea” when I should have voted “nay.”

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No.

101 regarding the “Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act” (H.R. 1119). Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was at a medical appointment with my son and was unable to vote, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 100 and “yea” on rollcall No. 101.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

One worth highlighting is H.R. 4909, the Student, Teachers, and Officers Preventing School Violence Act, sponsored by former sheriff, Representative JOHN RUTHERFORD.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House were saddened and horrified by the tragic events in Parkland, Florida. Sheriff Rutherford's bill will provide local communities with critical resources to upgrade our schools and keep our children safe. I look forward to the House speaking with one bipartisan voice next week and passing this important bill without delay.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider several bills from the Financial Services Committee. This includes two bills sponsored by Representative SCOTT TIPTON: H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act; and H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act; as well as H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act, sponsored by Representative TOM MACARTHUR.

Taken together, these bills will consider House Republican's work to create an economic environment that is both pro-competition and smart and balanced in its regulatory approach.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are possible, including potential legislation making further appropriations for FY 2018. I will be sure to inform all Members as soon as

any additional items are added to our schedule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for that information.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the last year, we have continually run up against deadlines on how we were going to keep the government of the United States operating properly.

The omnibus is currently being discussed. The negotiations for the omnibus were made possible by the fact that a significant number of Democrats voted for it, while a significant number of Republicans voted against it. It was a bipartisan statement proceeding.

That omnibus needs to be passed by March 23. We are not scheduled to be here, Mr. Speaker, on March 23. That does not mean that we might not go over, but it means that it needs to pass the House and the Senate and be sent to the President prior to or on March 22.

Negotiations are, unfortunately, not proceeding as effectively as I would hope they would. I am hopeful that there will be a clean bill from either side without any riders that would lead either side to oppose that bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about an issue. First of all, let me say that the leader has announced a number of bills for consideration next week. I venture to say that an extraordinarily infinitesimal amount of the American people have any ideas what those bills do or are urging those bills to be passed. I do not mean that they are without substance. I mean that they are not the issues on the mind of the American people. This is the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, the Speaker appeared on television at a townhall on CNN some 14 months ago. He made a promise at a CNN townhall to a Dreamer that asked him a question.

House Speaker PAUL RYAN strongly suggested to that young woman that "revocation on protection for the Dreamers brought here as children will not be carried out."

Notwithstanding that, the President of the United States put that Dreamer and hundreds of thousands of other Dreamers—indeed, close to 2 million Dreamers—at risk by withdrawing their protections, which Speaker RYAN indicated would not happen: "Will not be carried out."

That was some 6 months ago, Mr. Speaker. Not the CNN; that was 14 months ago.

I have talked to the Speaker, I have brought it up continuously on this floor, and I have been told by the Republican leadership: Don't worry, we have got until March 5 to do something.

I was told that in October, I was told that in November, I was told that in December, I was told that in January, and I was told that in February: Don't worry, we have got until March 5.

March 5 came and went. No action. None.

That Dreamer to whom the Speaker spoke is still at risk, still worried, and still twisting in the wind. Eighty-six percent of the American public, Mr. Speaker, say that that young woman should not be kicked out of the country that she knows: brought here as a child, went to elementary school, middle school, high school; some to college, some practicing medicine, some practicing law, some being social workers, many being teachers.

I was told: Don't worry. They were told: Don't worry, March 5 is a long way away.

It has come and gone.

And we are told this week that we will consider H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act. I am not sure that any of my constituents have talked to me about the TAILOR Act.

H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act, I doubt that a single one of my constituents has talked to me about that act.

They are fillers, Mr. Speaker. They are fillers while we fiddle, while Rome burns.

I have asked, Leader PELOSI has asked, frankly, and leaders of the Catholic Church and other denominations have asked to put the Dreamer bill on the floor in the people's House.

The Speaker of this House, when he became the Speaker, said: We will not duck the tough issues. We will take them head-on. Don't worry, we have got until March 5.

March 5 is behind us, and we consider these bills, which I think are filler bills, and controversial bills at that.

We have asked, Mr. Speaker, when the majority party put on the floor three bills on an issue of vital importance to the American people, that every American knows about, that the people's House ought to have the right to speak on, and express the views of the American people and establish policy they support—86 percent of them.

So I will, again, ask the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, to put the Dream Act on the floor; to put Mr. GOODLATTE's bill on the floor; to put the bipartisan bill, sponsored by Mr. HURD from Texas and Mr. AGUILAR from California; put them on the floor.

□ 1100

Take the issues. I know they are tough. The Speaker said he wants to take the issues head-on, Mr. Speaker, not duck. Show some political courage. And not only that, respect this institution and every Member in it who wants to express their opinion on this legislation of critical importance to at least 1.8 million Americans, vital to their future, to their life.

And 86 percent of Americans believe they ought to be protected, just as Speaker RYAN pledged they would be 14 months ago when he said revocation of

protection for the Dreamers brought here as children will not be carried out. Mr. Speaker, that bill ought to be brought to the floor to carry out that representation and that assurance.

I have been patient. I have talked. I have worked. I have come to meetings. I met with the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, with my colleague and friend, the majority leader, and Mr. DURBIN and others, 25 of us sitting around the Cabinet table, Mr. Speaker, when the President said we will take care of DACA, and he said: You send me a bill; I will sign it, and I will take the heat.

He was not telling the truth, Mr. Speaker, because we had a bill, called the commonsense crowd, about 25 United States Senators brought a bill to the floor. It took care of a couple of the things the President wanted to take care of, but it wasn't good enough for him, notwithstanding the fact he said: You send me a bill. You decide, i.e., the Congress, the coequal branch of government that now stands suppliant in the face of saying we will pass something only if the President will sign it.

That is not what the framers meant, Mr. Speaker. We are a coequal branch, not a subservient branch of the government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if we brought those three bills to the floor that I just referred to—the Dream Act, cosponsored by ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, a Republican, and LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, a Democrat; and the Goodlatte bill, sponsored by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee; and a bipartisan bill sponsored by many Republicans and many Democrats, Mr. HURD, a Republican from Texas, and Mr. AGUILAR, a Democrat from California—if we brought those bills to the floor, the problem is they know the Hurd-Aguilar bill would pass, which would reflect the views of 86 percent of the American people.

No, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the American people are overwhelmingly for that, we are going to be considering H.R. 1116, H.R. 4545, H.R. 4263, ignoring that 1.8 million people, ignoring that promise that the Speaker made to that young woman that she would be protected.

The Speaker has told me over and over again: Oh, I want to do this. I want to do that. I am going to have some task force. I am going to do this, that, and the other.

March 5 has come and gone. Nothing has happened.

I used to be the majority leader. I could bring a bill to the floor. If I said something was going to happen, I tried to make sure it happened.

If I sound angry, it is because I am angry. If I sound frustrated, it is because I am frustrated. The people's House ought to be given the opportunity to express the will of the American people on this issue.

There is another issue, and we do have a bill, the so-called Rutherford bill that we are bringing to the floor on suspension. We are probably all going to vote for the Rutherford bill.

But we are going to ignore a bill, as we have been ignoring for years under Republican leadership, a bill that is supported even more than the DACA, Dreamer bills, and that is comprehensive background checks, which clearly will save lives, which will close the loopholes, which will make sure that those with criminal records don't get guns, will make sure that those with mental health issues don't get guns, will make sure that terrorists who can't fly on airplanes can't get guns.

Mr. Speaker, we have been urging and pleading for that bill to be brought to the floor over and over and over again. The National Rifle Association is not for that bill. I can't understand why. Rather, we bring a bill to the floor that will help schools—I think that is positive—do what they can do right now.

Should we help them? Of course. But we ought not to pretend that we are doing something to make our children safer in their schools, to make concertgoers safer at their concerts, to make churchgoers safer in their church, to make people who go to a nightclub safer in that nightclub, to make people who go to shopping centers safer in those shopping centers. We ought not to pretend the Rutherford bill is going to do that.

Will comprehensive background checks do it all? It will not. There are other things I think ought to be done. But at a minimum, the American people think that we ought to make sure that everybody who purchases a weapon has a background check to make sure that they are not a criminal, somebody with a substantial mental health problem that makes them unsafe to own a gun, spousal abusers.

Mr. Speaker, the bills we are going to consider next week I am sure have some merit from some perception, from somebody's perception, but the two bills that I have just discussed are on the minds of the American people, and millions are at risk if we do not pass legislation dealing with that issue.

I do not criticize the Rutherford bill, but it will not solve the problem, and everybody knows it will not solve the problem; nor, frankly, will universal background checks in and of itself solve the problem, but experts say it will save thousands of lives over time. It would have saved lives in Charleston, South Carolina, the nine people killed in Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I like to work in a bipartisan way, but that requires respecting one another. My Republican friends wrote a book in which they were very critical of the way we ran the House because it wasn't open and

transparent. I would ask them to reread that book. I have read it.

My friend is smiling.

In that book, they really wanted to change the way this House runs, make it open and transparent, take the tough issues head-on. That is what the Speaker said.

Mr. Speaker, they are not taking the tough issues head-on. They are hiding from the NRA. They are hiding from some of their hardline people who want to kick people out of America, who want to take that lamp that the Statue of Liberty holds high and bring it down.

Yes, I am disappointed. Yes, I am angry. Yes, I am frustrated. I came to this body to express my opinion on the important issues confronting my country and to try to make it better.

Mr. Speaker, I would plead with the majority leader to perhaps delay those four bills. Rutherford's could be on suspension. It won't take much time. Delay those three bills that a miniscule amount of Americans, there may be 100, there may be 200 Americans who would be concerned those bills aren't brought forward, and put on the floor the three bills I referred to—the Dream Act, the Goodlatte bill, and the Hurd-Aguilar bill—and let the people's House express its opinion. That is not an unfair request.

And let the background check, universal background check bill come to the floor, and let the House vote. I know that there are some Republicans who don't want to vote on that bill because the public is so overwhelmingly for it and they may upset the NRA. That is what this business is about, Mr. Speaker, expressing openly and clearly what we think the policies of our country ought to be to make our public better, to make our country safer.

Mr. Speaker, I would end on those two issues, and I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BIGGS). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have great respect for the gentleman, and there were a lot of questions inside there, I believe.

Out of my respect for the gentleman, I am quite concerned that if he is fact-checked, he is going to get quite a few Pinocchios, so let me walk through, first, how he started the debate.

The gentleman started and the first question was concerning government funding to March 23. He then felt that work was not being done, and he used the phrase—and I may get it a little incorrect, but he said we only were able to pass a budget agreement because of the majority of the Democrats, and not the majority on the Republican side, passing it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time to just make a correction.

I said a significant number of Democrats voted for it and a significant number of Republicans voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So I think it would just be helpful on the record to actually state what the vote was.

There were 167 Republicans who voted for that budget agreement, 67 who did not. There were 73 Democrats who voted for it, but the majority of Democrats, 119, voted against it, which Mr. HOYER was in that group, as well, voting against it. So I would make one point, and that is 71 percent of Republicans voted for this budget agreement.

And just to make the facts correct, Mr. HOYER's concern about the appropriations process, this House passed all 12 appropriations bills, and we did it on time and we sent it over to the Senate. In the meantime, the Democrats shut the government down before we could ever get there. So I think history should actually play to facts.

Yes, I am concerned about the March 23 deadline, but I am pushing hard. I would actually like to take those bills up next week. And as Mr. HOYER knows, being a member of the Appropriations Committee as he was in the past, when you get to this point where we already have the numbers set, it is really what is called a four corners, the four leaders.

Now, the committees are all working through it. They are actually making great progress. There are a few things left to actually close out. I would like to get it done a week ahead of time, and I hope Mr. HOYER's side would as well.

So let's walk through some others.

First of all, I was a small-business owner. The idea is having a bill on this floor that creates more jobs, that brings more access to capital. Mr. Speaker, I heard from the other side, the leader, she thought crumbs was the idea of Americans getting \$1,000 in a bonus. That is about equal to what I am hearing, and I am offended by it. It is not insignificant that someone wants to create a job and have access to capital. The gentleman is wrong about that.

Then the gentleman talks about our Speaker. Our Speaker has worked a great deal, and, yes, he has kept his word.

Mr. HOYER was in that meeting with me when we were in the White House. Before we left that bipartisan, bicameral meeting with the administration, we agreed to work on this issue in four areas, and we have had numerous meetings in my office about that as well.

□ 1115

I don't know, maybe you forget to state that we are a rule of law Nation.

In doing so, that is why we are in this position we are today, because there was a past executive branch that thought they were a legislative branch and they did something that everyone would agree they do not have the power to do. So the current President said to move it to the legislative branch like it should be because there are court cases coming. In doing so, that is what we are working on.

The courts have now come back, giving further time. The Supreme Court has now given a timeline that wants to make sure the Ninth Circuit before there—so this gives us time to solve the problem.

I am more concerned about solving a problem than just passing a bill for some political favor. I do not want to be back at this place in another 2 years and having kids sitting here who are questioning where they are going to go.

I know you raised some issue about individuals. Not one person is in jeopardy that is registered within DACA. You have been in meetings where you heard that from the Secretary of Homeland Security, where you heard that from the Chief of Staff to the President as well.

The President even went further than talking about DACA to even making the point solving, but he also had three other pillars. As you know, we need a secure border. You also know the current law does not treat everybody equally who comes here illegally, so you are going to perpetuate the problem if you maintain the current law.

Thirdly, the idea that we want to make sure the nuclear family is closer together sooner—you have got a 30-year wait when someone wants to come in and petition a brother and sister.

Why don't we help them be able to bring their children and their spouses in together?

That is one of the proposals as well.

Then the whole concept of merit. Those are all common sense. I think they could be bipartisan. And the sooner we solve that problem, we will solve it for a long term.

So on this side of the aisle we want to get this job done long before the courts even have to act. I think that would be the proper thing to do. So, yes, that is what we have been working upon.

Now, another issue you brought up was about guns, and you talked about this Congress. I first want to give you a few little facts. I appreciate that you always mention my book. That is why I smile. We don't get any royalties from it, but the veterans do, so please mention it as much as you like.

If I take—and let me just give you the numbers. Quorum does this. Some bright kids out of Harvard created a company and it is all about data.

There are more bills out of committee, 643 in this Congress; and there are more bills out of this House, 558,

than any Congress in the last 25 years. And in that meantime, we also passed tax reform that hasn't been done in three decades.

I know some people on your side of the aisle refer to it as crumbs or Armageddon, but I will tell you, to those families out there that got extra money, that are actually fixing their car or actually paying their hospital bills, or those 1.2 million people who just work at one company that now have a longer maternity leave, they don't think it is crumbs, and they don't think having a bill on the floor that let more people take a risk and create a small business is insignificant.

Now let me talk to you about what we did because we believe background checks are important as well. Let me give you a little background. The background check is only as good as the database of what you have.

The National Instant Criminal Background Check System, referred to as the NICS database, is currently administered by the FBI. If the NICS check indicates a person as being in a prohibited category, the FBI will signal a deny on the firearm transfer. However, the NICS database is incomplete and outdated.

For example, on November 5, 2017, a mass shooting occurred at the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, Texas. Devin Patrick Kelley murdered 26 and injured 20 others. Kelly was prohibited by law from purchasing or processing firearms or ammunition due to a domestic violence conviction in a court martial while in the United States Air Force. However, the Air Force failed to record the conviction in the FBI NICS database.

That is why this House, this Congress, this majority acted. We put the Fix NICS bill in December—it is sitting in the Senate—which would strengthen our background check system and make it more accurate. It would require Federal agencies to certify twice per year that they are uploading criminal record information to NICS, requiring agencies to establish an implementation plan to ensure maximum coordination and reporting of records. Now you are on record to voting against that.

We have another bill on the floor from a former sheriff from Jacksonville, Florida. He is looking at school violence. Let me walk you through that one.

As I mentioned, Congress will vote next week on the STOP School Violence Act. This bill is proudly supported by Sandy Hook Promise, who note that it will ensure that millions more schools will be trained in prevention and lives will be saved.

Now, this isn't the only thing we are doing. Just this week, we are having oversight. We took the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in this Congress and the Judiciary Committee

in this Congress this week, and brought the FBI in, and they will come back again; because there is not one person in America who wants to see what happened in Florida to happen again.

But let's walk through this situation, because I think it is important that we examine it because we want to solve these problems. There were multiple red flags that were raised to the FBI about the behavior of Nikolas Cruz.

The very first red flag: On September 25, 2017, a YouTube channel host took a snapshot of a comment under his video that said: "I am going to be a professional school shooter." He sent that comment to the West Virginia FBI tip center, where all tips are supposed to go, which deemed it a credible threat and opened an investigation.

FBI agents searched for files on Nikolas Cruz, but they were unable to identify the individual and did not even reach out to YouTube in an attempt to recover records on Cruz, so on October 11, 2017, the FBI formally closed the inquiry. That was one red flag, but that is not where it ended.

A second red flag: On January 5, 2018, a second tip came via a phone call to the FBI from a concerned family member. They described in detail problems with Cruz he was showing with regard to social media, cruelty to animals, school trouble, and dealing with a recent death in the family.

When the FBI searched the database again for Nikolas Cruz, the previous tip popped up. However, despite the call from a family member, from a previous red flag, from a YouTube comment from the individual himself that he wanted to be a professional school shooter, they closed the investigation. The shooting happened on February 14, 5 months after the first tip.

This House has not stopped to act. This House acted in December. The background checks have to be fixed. That is why we passed it and put it into the Senate. That is why we are taking up more action now for the schools and adding that to what we already took up in this House. Those aren't insignificant.

I believe there is a path forward. Just as we did all appropriations bills, just as we have been through numerous meetings when it comes to DACA, there is not one child in jeopardy today. The only jeopardy that we will have is if we don't get together and solve the problem.

We have narrowed it to four areas. You and I know what has been said in those meetings. You and I know where it is. We can find compromise. We can solve this problem. But let's make a pledge to the American public that we don't do a bill for the sake of something politically. We create law that solves something so we are not back here in a future Congress taking up the exact same issue putting other people in jeopardy. That is my promise, and

that is what I will continue to work for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader talked about a lot of issues, one of which was NICS. What he didn't say was they put a poison pill in the Fix NICS bill, which is why so many of us voted against it on concealed carry. There is a disagreement in this House on that. We disagree, for the most part, on that provision. We don't think that makes America safer. There are differences of opinion on that.

My suggestion to the majority leader is, the Rutherford bill is on the floor. By unanimous consent, let's put the Fix NICS bill in the Rutherford bill without the poison pill in it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman to see if he will be agreeable to doing that.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

That would be the same outcome that is already sitting in the Senate. The Senate has the Fix NICS bill now. We will add more to it.

I hope you are just as frustrated with the Senate as I am.

Why can they not pass something?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my question was, will you agree—you talked a lot about NICS and where it is failing, and we can fix it. We agree with that.

So what I am asking you—you put the Rutherford bill on. I think most of us are going to vote for the Rutherford bill. Maybe all of us will vote for the Rutherford bill, which says let's help schools make themselves more safe.

Why should anybody be opposed to that?

What I say to you is: you just spent a significant amount of time talking about how we could make the NICS process work better, but that many of us voted against it and it hasn't moved in the Senate.

I guarantee you—I don't know that I can guarantee you, but my thinking is: if you do the Rutherford bill, and if you add in the Fix NICS bill—not with concealed carry, but the Fix NICS bill that you talk about in the Rutherford bill—I will work with you to get that passed in the United States Senate, and I think we will be successful.

My question to the majority leader: Will you agree to a unanimous consent request to add the Fix NICS bill into the Rutherford bill on the suspension calendar?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Let me give the gentleman a few facts. There are 426 bills that have

passed this House that sit over in the Senate. Of those 426, there is less than 10 that are partisan. The rest of them all have bipartisan votes.

There are more than 200 votes on bills that sit over in that Senate that were passed here by voice unanimously. So I am not one to do something politically just so somebody else feels better that now they can vote for something because they voted against it before. I am for making law and saving children.

So from this point, we are going to pass the STOP School Violence Act. We are going to send it to the Senate, just the way they already have our Fix NICS bill over there. And let's have the Senate—and I will take you up on this. Let's work together right now to get that bill back over here.

Mr. HOYER. The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. The answer is no, because we want to continue to have that on which we agree defeated by that on which we do not agree. That is the pattern. And when the gentleman says all those bipartisan bills, there were some, obviously, Democrat votes on many of those bills, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear a word about a bill that has the majority's support on the floor of the House of Representatives that I spoke about, and that is Hurd-Aguilar. Mr. GOODLATTE, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee said if Goodlatte was put on the floor, it will lose 50, 60, 70 Republicans. Mr. GOODLATTE said that, and that was passed out of the Judiciary Committee. It hasn't been brought to the floor because it would fail.

Hurd-Aguilar, which has not been considered by the committee, but which has the majority of votes on this floor, that bill has not been brought up; just as the bill that passed the United States Senate 5 years ago, to deal with so many of the problems that immigration confronts us with, including security at the border, 5 years, has not been brought up. March 5, nothing happened. Come and gone.

The majority leader spent a lot of time, Mr. Speaker, talking about things that are important but were not on the subject because he doesn't want to deal with the subject. Apparently the Republicans don't want to deal with the subject and they won't put it on the floor. They are obstructing the will of the American people and they are putting thousands and thousands and thousands of people at risk.

The majority leader, with all due respect, is wrong. All of the DACA recipients are not protected, and many of them are not signing up again because they are afraid their government will come after them. They feel they were flim-flammed.

I disagree with the majority leader, Mr. Speaker. Many of us believe what the President did is absolutely legal. It is consistent with what Ronald Reagan

did, with what George H.W. Bush did, with what Bill Clinton did, and what George W. Bush did.

□ 1130

Every President, since I have been serving here, has modified immigration consistent with their executive authority. There was nothing mentioned about the quote of the Speaker that was clearly directed at this young woman to say that revocation of protections for the Dreamers brought here as children will not be carried out.

Nobody can sign up for DACA protection now under the court order—nobody. You can re-up, but you can't sign up—1.8 million. The President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, sent a message down here, or maybe he tweeted it, they would agree to 1.8 million and a pathway to citizenship, parenthesis, if you agree with this, if you agree with that, if you agree with the other.

That is not what was said at the White House, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the majority leader. He brought up some other points, said we need to agree to discuss those. I agreed to discuss them. I didn't agree to agree to them, nor did anybody else in that room. And the President of the United States, 25 Members of the House and Senate sitting around the Cabinet table, said: Are we agreed that we are going to solve the DACA issue first?

Not a single Member demurred. Not a single Member said no—not a single one, Mr. Speaker, yet we can't get that bill to the floor. And the majority leader says: Oh, well, we are bringing up a bill that will create jobs.

I am for doing that. And, frankly, if we do that the week after or the week after that—frankly, I don't know the bills well enough to be speaking about them with much depth of information as to how they were voted on in committee, but my inkling is that the majority Democrats—I don't know what is in there, in these bills—may well have voted against them. Most of those bills coming out of committee are pretty partisan.

We didn't discuss the three bills that I brought up. The majority leader didn't mention them. They have bipartisan support on two; and one, the chairman of the committee admits, does not have the votes on this floor. He would get no Democratic votes, and he would lose a substantial number of Republican votes, and the majority leader knows that, Mr. Speaker.

And we talk about NICS. I want to fix NICS. I don't want concealed carry to be part of that. And I regret that the majority leader would not agree to let's fix NICS and put the Rutherford bill through. That would pass the Senate, but he has got a bill over there he knows won't pass the Senate but maybe it makes a good talking point.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what we have to do. We have been waiting a

long time, not just the 6 months since September, waiting for March 5 to come and go. We have been waiting for a long time to have bills on the floor with an open amendment process so we can, in fact, do the people's will on immigration and on protecting our students and our families and our citizens from the irresponsible use of guns.

We are not against the responsible use of guns. We believe the Second Amendment protects people on owning handguns and hunting guns; but the Supreme Court, in the Heller decision, said there are things that the community could do. There are things that the government can do to protect its people and to make sure that gun use, within the framework of the Second Amendment, is responsible.

I don't know what we have to do, Mr. Speaker. I don't think anybody doubts that the Hurd-Aguilar bill has the majority votes in this House. I would urge people to, if they believe in this issue, sign a discharge petition. They refused to bring the Export-Import Bank bill to the floor for 1½ or 2 years. Some of the leadership weren't for it. As a matter of fact, the two highest weren't for it. But 127 Republicans to 117 Republicans, they were for it, and over 300 votes were for it, and they would not bring it to the floor short of a discharge petition.

That is not transparency; that is not openness; that is not taking the tough issues head on. That is obfuscating. That is undermining democracy in the people's House. If the gentleman wants to respond, I will yield to him. If not, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I actually have the same question. I don't know what we have to do.

You know, we come here quite often to have these colloquies. They are supposed to just be for what is happening the next week, but we talk about more issues. For a long time, I heard: What about the Children's Health Insurance Program? You know what, this House brought it up early. We tried to work through committee. The Speaker knows how many times I went on the other side.

They wouldn't even let their committee work on it. So what did we do? We took the ideas that the Democrats had, we put it in the bill; we passed it bipartisan; they still said no. They didn't say no once, they said it numerous times to the Children's Health Insurance Program. And I sat here wondering: What more do we have to do?

Disaster relief. I know, Mr. Speaker, the heart of the minority whip. We went together to Puerto Rico. We went together to the Virgin Islands. We went to Florida. What more do we have to do? Then we brought it to the floor, and he still said no. But you know what? We still got it done.

Government funding. He started this whole discussion about government funding. He misspoke and said it was because of the Democrats that we were able to make this plan. He said a majority of them; and it was not a majority, it was a minority.

Mr. HOYER. I did not.

Mr. MCCARTHY. It was a majority of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the leader what I said, and I knew what I said, and I know what the facts are. The Republicans could not pass that bill on their own. There were over 60 Republicans who voted "no" on that bill, and they got 167. You may have given me—or 170.

That is, Mr. Speaker, almost 50 short of passage. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, when I was majority leader, we didn't get much help from the other side, and we always had 218 to pass what we wanted to pass on our side. Seventy-three of our Democrats voted for it, which is why it passed. Not the majority, because the majority of us were so frustrated.

Again, the majority leader has not spoken to the bills. He has spoken about what we have passed. And the CHIP bill, by the way, was brought up weeks after its authority expired. Weeks after it expired.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Legitimately, may I respond?

Mr. HOYER. He says it was because of our committee. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we can't stop anything in committee. They have a majority on every committee and can bring a bill up tomorrow—the next hour if they decide to do so.

Mr. MCCARTHY. May I ask the gentleman: Are you stating that we brought CHIP up just weeks before it expired?

Mr. HOYER. No, after.

Mr. MCCARTHY. After?

Mr. HOYER. It expired on September 30. You didn't bring it up until weeks after that.

Mr. MCCARTHY. With all due respect, I think you might want to ask your staff before you put that on record, with all due respect. Well, I am not sure you are correct because we brought it, and it passed this House.

Mr. HOYER. I have consulted with the staff person for whom you have great respect and affection, and she says that I am right. Now, she is my staffer, so maybe she is somewhat biased, but I will tell you that we believe we are right on that.

But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker. The point is not what we have done in the past—particularly what we have done. And we all are for CHIP. That is not the point. The point is we have two critical pieces of legislation this House must address and that the overwhelming majority of the American

people think we ought to address and think we ought to pass and are for. And I don't mean 51 percent or 52 percent of them. I mean 86 percent of the people or more. It is not a close question.

And rather than talking about, well, we did this, we passed 5,950 bills, I am not talking about those bills. I am talking about bills we haven't brought to the floor, Mr. Speaker, that we haven't allowed the House to consider; that we have hundreds of thousands of kids, young people who we respect and who are teachers, are doctors, are workers in our factories making a difference, working in restaurants and hotels.

I was with the Chamber of Commerce in Maryland just the other day, and three different CEOs came up to me and said: We have got DACA people working for us and doing an excellent job, and they are worried that they are going to be kicked out of the only country they know.

But we talk about NICS, and we talk about this, that, and the other. Bring those bills to the floor. That is what we are asking for. We want that respect. We want that respect for this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield to the majority leader again. It is those two bills that we believe would pass with significant majorities in this House—the three bills, and we can choose between them. We have offered the queen of the hill, with the explanation for those who may be watching and not bored stiff. One of those three bills that I have mentioned, one a Republican bill, the other two bipartisan bills, Ros-Lehtinen-Roybal-Allard bill and the Hurd-Aguilar bill, both of those bills are bipartisan. Certainly one of those will get a significant majority of this House, and I am not denigrating the bills.

I may or may not be for them that are on the schedule, but there are no issues that the country feels are more important right now than background checks, and there is no issue more timely than fixing—as the Speaker pledged to do 14 months ago, putting at risk that young woman and hundreds of thousands of other individuals in our country similarly situated. That is what we ought to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know you reclaimed your time the time before, but let me finish what I was saying.

With all due respect, what do we have to do? Yes, we have Fix NICS sitting over in the Senate. And, yes, we are going to add to it for school violence. We know that it does not have to be partisan, but the background check system is broken. Let's not make it partisan. Let's get it done.

When it comes to the challenge for DACA, we are just down to four items.

Border security. Not one person in here would probably argue against that. And I know my friend across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, I know his heart. He is a good man. He was, as he stated earlier, majority leader. They had the majority here. They had 60 votes over in the Senate. They had a lot of Members in the Senate, and they had the Presidency. Same problem at that time, too. They did not fix it.

I don't want to be in that same place in the future. My commitment is to fixing this problem. So let's sit down. Let's talk about border security, but let's make sure our borders are actually secure.

When I look back—and people talk about that Gang of Eight bill—you put more money in there for border security than was even being requested today. But people still, on the other side, say no, Mr. Speaker.

But the other point, too, is, if somebody comes from Mexico or Canada and illegally comes across the border, why are they sent back to their country but everybody else is not? Let's secure the border correctly. Then, when it comes to really protecting the nuclear family, why don't we make it a little faster that you could have your children and your spouse with you? And do you know what that would do? I think that would make everybody a little stronger.

When it comes to the idea of coming to America, should it just be the luck of a lottery, or should it be merit? I think merit is a fairer process for everybody's opportunity.

Now, I don't think anybody out there that is listening or can hear this later would say those are partisan ideas. But when we sat in the White House and we discussed it and we said let's narrow it to those four items, I know the way our government is designed.

□ 1145

It is not designed that one person gets all their way. It is based upon compromise.

This city, our capital, was because of a compromise. The creator of the banking system, Alexander Hamilton, made this our capital. George Washington, our first President, never served here. He was sworn in on Wall Street and served his second term in Philadelphia.

As my good friend knows, Mr. Speaker, when a bill comes out of committee, it gets worked on, then it is brought to the floor. That is exactly what is happening with Mr. GOODLATTE today, so we can bring something to the floor and pass it, that everybody, hopefully, can vote for.

This Congress has acted on so many items, but so many times this year it has felt like the election has never ended. I know the heart of many of the Members on the other side. They wanted to vote for disaster relief. They were so frustrated that they shut the government down.

Do you know what? We have all learned from that lesson before. It is not productive.

I also watched people when they talked about health facilities. They wanted that funding, but they couldn't vote for it.

Then they said the whole problem was, when we brought all 12 appropriation bills to the floor, that they couldn't vote for them because they needed a budget agreement. They needed more money. So, yes, it took a long time to work that out because you want to hold that with other issues as well.

Finally, after the shutdown, that was able to be broken apart. But when we finally got that budget agreement that really is negotiated by both sides, even the individual on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, came to the floor and said she was going to vote "no," but she negotiated and wanted to tell how she got victories inside the bill.

That is not compromise. You can't sit in a room and say, "Okay, I will give here and you give there," and based upon the formation of our government, with the Senate as well, we come to an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what goes on in people's minds and why they wanted to be there. I will make this promise to the American public: I will stay in the room, I will take the ups and downs, but at the end of the day, I want to solve a problem. I don't want a political bill.

I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker. I have been in the room many times with this President. He said on this very floor, he went beyond DACA. For those in the American public must understand. It is a much higher number. And for him to find that compromise, he just asked for three other things. That doesn't mean we are going to get them all, but that does mean we could find compromise in those three.

Mr. Speaker, the one sad part, if we had this debate with the American public, they would find compromise with those three items. They would probably find it very fast. They would want their borders secure; they would want the nuclear family closer together sooner; and they would probably want to see some merit.

So I know there are times here that we get heated, but the majority of bills that pass this floor are bipartisan.

As I stated earlier, more than 200 of those more than 400 bills that are sitting in the Senate passed by voice, all the Democrats and all the Republicans.

We are going to differ on some items, and that is right. I want you to keep your principles. But there is a window, and there is an opportunity. And I know, as the days get closer, the election will be sooner, but let us make a promise to one another. Let's keep that election on the outside, and let's find solutions on this side, in this House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the leader spoke in a very calm and reasoned way. I will do the same.

As an aside, I will tell you the CHIP bill passed on November 3, over a month after its authorization expired.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader talks about coming to compromise. I went down to the White House. Mr. DURBIN and I talked about whether we would go to the White House. We went to the White House out of respect for the Presidency, out of a hope that the discussions that we had at the White House would lead to resolution of a serious issue threatening hundreds of thousands, indeed, close to 2 million individuals who know America as their country and who 86 percent of Americans think ought to stay here in America.

In that meeting, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said—and he said it on television. You don't have to take my word. There is a video record of what the President said. What he said is we would take care of the DACA issue, consistent, Mr. Speaker, with what Speaker RYAN said to that young woman when he said that the revocation of protections for Dreamers brought here as children will not be carried out.

There was no parenthetical addition, if we do X, Y, Z, A, B, C, D, W. There was no parenthetical phrase. He said: We will not put you at risk, young woman, and those similarly situated.

We have a bipartisan coalition on this floor, but the leader speaks about going into a room—if you want to have a pejorative, a back room, privately—to try to resolve issues not directly related to the DACA protectees.

They are here. The President said they ought to stay here. And the President made a representation, Mr. Speaker, that if we passed a bill, he would sign it. But as the Senate considered a compromise piece of legislation, agreed to by Republican Senators and Democratic Senators, just a few hours before it was brought to the floor, the President said he would veto it. That was not what he said on television in the White House. He said that he would take the heat, if heat there is, and sign the bill that we sent down.

Now we have a Speaker of the House and a majority leader of the Senate who say we won't send something down to the President unless he agrees to sign it, meaning that the House and Senate will not act independently of the President's imprimatur. How sad a position it is that the people's House and the United States Senate have subjugated themselves to the President of the United States.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, that prolonging this discussion apparently will make no difference. But, Mr. Speaker, our side of the aisle represents just short of 50 percent, maybe 48 percent, of the American people. Mr. Speaker,

we are saying let us consider. Let us have on this floor—not in a back room, not in somebody's office, not somewhere privately—on the House floor, the people's floor, let us vote.

Let the American people see who raises their hand “aye” and “nay” on propositions that have been worked on in committee, the Goodlatte bill, and for months between Republicans and Democrats, bipartisan bills. Let the people speak through their Representatives. Don't bottle it up in somebody's office. Let the people's House work its will. Have the courage to pursue that which you said you would do and take the tough issues head-on, not duck them.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope, on behalf of that 86 percent of the American people who support the Dreamers, and even more who support comprehensive background checks, that we have the ability to consider those bills and consider them next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

— HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 2018, TO TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2018

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

— PAYING TRIBUTE TO BOONE COUNTY DEPUTY JACOB PICKETT

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Hoosier hero who paid the ultimate sacrifice. Deputy Jacob Pickett of the Boone County Sheriff's Office was killed in the line of duty on March 2, 2018.

Jacob was a 5-year veteran in law enforcement and served as the leader in the department's K-9 unit. He held the ranking of sheriff deputy in Boone County.

One of Indiana's finest, Jacob is a hero and acted selflessly on the day that took an unexpected and fatal turn. But he died doing what he was trained to do: protecting the thin blue line and keeping the community he loved safe from harm's grasp, and he did that that day.

Boone County citizens and all Hoosiers mourn over the loss of Jacob, who

was known as a man of integrity and compassion.

Jacob leaves behind his wife, Jennifer, two young children, and his K-9 partner, Brik, to carry on his legacy of service to fellow Hoosiers. His sacrifice will never be forgotten.

As the Gospel of Matthew says:

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.

Rest in peace, Deputy Pickett.

— PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 and March 6, 2018, I was unavoidably detained attending to representation duties, and I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present.

On rollcall vote No. 92, I would have voted “aye.”

On rollcall vote No. 93, I would have voted “aye.”

On rollcall vote No. 94, I would have voted “aye.”

On rollcall vote No. 95, H.R. 4607, the Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act, I would have voted “no.”

— PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPONSOR OF H.R. 40 AND H.R. 1498

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of H.R. 40, the Commission to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African-Americans Act, and H.R. 1498, the End Racial Profiling Act, bills originally introduced by Representative Conyers of Michigan, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

— THE NICS FIX AND DACA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I could not help, as I listened to the colloquy of my two friends, to recognize that the key element is saving lives, saving lives from the pillage and the murderous acts that are done with guns.

The NICS fix is crucial. The banning bump stocks is crucial. The expanded waiting period is crucial, and banning of AR-15s.

But if we can move the issue of the NICS fix, if we can move the issue of expanded background checks, we can lose the taint of not doing anything since Las Vegas, not doing anything since Sandy Hook, Mother Emanuel, or, tragically, Florida. It is imperative that we save lives.

Now, let me speak very clearly to DACA.

I invite my ICE officers to stand with me on Sunday in Houston and tell my thousands of DACA young people that they will not raid their homes, they will not jeopardize their lives, and that they are, in fact, statused individuals who can go about their daily business. Join me Sunday and announce it to them.

And I ask ICE officers to join the Members of Congress across the Nation, because these young people are scared to death, and I would ask that we recognize that.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to honor the late Council Member Larry Green with a statement in the RECORD acknowledging the very fact of his great leadership and the fact that he has passed.

□ 1200

— WASTEFUL SPENDING

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, we sure find a lot of ways to waste money in this town, but the EPA may have just reached a new low. We are spending \$5 million on a study to force-feed rats lard and coconut oil until they are morbidly obese, then we pump their enclosures full of exhaust until they die. Then the EPA measures the amount of toxins in the fat cells of the rats as opposed to their skinny counterparts.

So we are borrowing money from the next generation so that we can fat-shame dead rats that we ourselves have poisoned in the government.

I would invite my colleagues to join me in fighting against this and so much other wasteful spending that we seem to find in Washington.

— HONORING THE LIFE OF KERI GALVAN

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Keri Galvan.

Keri attended the Route 91 music festival in Las Vegas on October 1. She was a mother of three and a wife to her husband, Justin Galvan. She worked as a cocktail server at Mastro's Steakhouse, where she worked for almost a decade.

She was known by her friends as supermom, and was always there for anybody. Keri never forgot anybody's special occasion and constantly made sure everybody was okay. She is remembered for being a devoted wife and mother who put others before herself.

I would like to extend my condolences to Keri Galvan's family and

friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

AMERICAN DOLLARS FOR AMERICAN INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I just introduced legislation that would require all federally funded transportation and infrastructure projects to use materials made right here in America.

The Buy America 2.0 Act would bolster American manufacturing and create quality, family-sustaining jobs right here in our country. Democrats have been long fighting for these policies, but this effort should be bipartisan.

American infrastructure projects should start supporting American workers. This is a wonderful opportunity to create millions of jobs right here at home while investing in critical infrastructure needs that have been long neglected.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members of this House, both Democrats and Republicans, to cosponsor my Buy America 2.0 Act. Let's put the American people back to work.

NO HELP FOR DREAMERS

(Mr. NORCROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, March 5, the President's self-imposed deadline, has come and gone, and there is still no solution for Dreamers.

We know them as Dreamers. The President knows them as human bargaining chips. They make up the fabric of our country. They sit next to our children in classes. They are our neighbors, our friends, and our families.

I am here to tell a story about my family, one you may not know.

My son joined the Army and was stationed in South Korea, where he met a lovely young lady. He finally and she finally got together, and they were married and stationed at Fort Hood, Texas, together, where my granddaughter was born. It was a very proud day.

Later that same year, I got a call in the middle of the night from my son, who was crying, saying that his wife was going to be deported. I said: Deported where?

Apparently, some misfiled paperwork had shown up. My daughter-in-law is a Dreamer. She served our country and would give her life up.

Pass the Dream Act now so the current generation of Dreamers can obtain the same thing as my daughter-in-law did.

THE SECOND AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to bring the good news to Congress about where we are on the gun violence debate because I know there have been a lot of accusations flying back and forth. I want us to look for the common ground. I want to bring the good news today.

The good news is that we actually have an overwhelming policy consensus in America as to what we need to do about gun violence, and we have an overwhelming—indeed, a unanimous—judicial consensus about what is constitutional to do.

I want us to focus on that, and then that will allow us to isolate what the problem is in dislodging the paralysis in Washington today. But let's start with the overwhelming policy consensus that has emerged in the wake of a sequence of massacres, and it is enough to invoke their names to remind people of the bloodshed that is engulfing our society in Parkland, Florida; in San Bernardino, California; in Las Vegas; in Texas; at Virginia Tech; at Sandy Hook in Newtown, Connecticut; and so on. In the wake of all these massacres, America is demanding action.

But here is the good news. Everybody has agreed. As close to a unanimous agreement as you are ever going to find in the United States of America has emerged: 97 percent of the American people favor a universal criminal and mental background check on all firearm purchases in America.

That is the overwhelming majority of Democrats, the overwhelming majority of Republicans, the overwhelming majority of Independents, the overwhelming majority of gun owners, and the overwhelming majority of non-gun owners. Almost everyone in America, 97 out of 100 people—and if you take the margin of error, it might be 99 out of 100 people—agree that firearms should not be sold without a background check so that criminals, gang members, and terrorists can't go to a gun show and acquire a weapon of war and then use it in our schools, in our movie theaters, in our churches, and in the public square.

So we have got virtually unanimous public consensus on that. Every public opinion poll is showing the same thing, except the numbers continue to go up.

Now, some people will say in response to this: Aha, but the Second Amendment won't allow us to do anything.

There are a lot of people in this debate who are now wrapping themselves

in the flag of the Second Amendment and saying that the Second Amendment prohibits us from implementing this overwhelming public mandate for a universal criminal and mental background check; but they are wrong, and we know that they are wrong.

The Supreme Court, in 2008, in the *District of Columbia v. Heller* case, interpreted the Second Amendment definitively for us, at least sufficiently for us to understand that a background check is perfectly constitutional.

In the *Heller* case, the Supreme Court first divided over the question of whether or not the Second Amendment confers a collective militia-based right or an individual right. Four Justices said that the text of the Second Amendment means that you only have a right to a firearm in connection with militia service, which today we would call National Guard service.

You will recall the language of the Second Amendment is: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Four Justices suggested that your right to bear and keep an arm is tethered to service in the militia. But that view lost. Five Justices took the individual rights view that the so-called prefatory clause just announces the purpose of the Second Amendment, but it defines an individual right.

But nine Justices, the entire Supreme Court, agreed that, whether the right was collective or individual in nature, that right is subject to reasonable regulation by Congress and by the States. Of course, that has got to be right. Every right, all fundamental rights, are subject to reasonable regulation by the government.

Think about the First Amendment, which guarantees the right of free speech. It gives you the right to go out and march in front of the White House, but does it give you the right to march in front of the White House at 2 o'clock in the morning with bullhorns and to wake up the President's family? Of course not.

The First Amendment is conditioned on reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions the Supreme Court held in a case called *Ward v. Rock Against Racism*, where the Court said it was perfectly fine for New York City to turn the sound down when they have a concert in Central Park because there are other social activities taking place.

The Second Amendment is the exact same way, said the Supreme Court. You have the right to possess a handgun for self-defense. You have a right to possess a rifle for purposes of hunting and recreation. You don't have a right to a machine gun. There is no constitutional right to carry a sawed-off shotgun.

There is no constitutional right to carry weapons of war in public places.

There is no right to carry a firearm in public buildings, said Justice Scalia, into public schools and into the U.S. Congress. There is no constitutional right for that, and there is certainly no constitutional right for anybody to access a weapon without passing through the regulatory screen that the government sets up.

That is the common sense of the American people, too. Thomas Paine, who wrote the pamphlet "Common Sense," said that common sense is essential in a democracy because it is the sense that we have in common. The sense that we have in common today about guns that we need a universal criminal and mental background check is something that is nearly unanimously held, and it is something that clearly passes constitutional muster according to the Supreme Court's decision in the District of Columbia v. Heller in 2008.

So we have got a public policy consensus, a popular consensus, and a constitutional juridical consensus about the right thing to do and the constitutional thing to do. Yet what do we have here in Congress? We have got paralysis. We have got absolute inaction in defiance of the public will.

Why? Nobody really says. The GOP leaders, Mr. Speaker, simply refuse to bring a universal background check bill to the floor of Congress. They won't even permit a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee about it, despite the fact that that is what everybody wants and that is what the times demand right now.

Why? Have we become a failed state?

□ 1215

Are we unable to govern?

Does democracy not work anymore?

Is that what we are saying?

I hope not. I hope we have not become a failed State. I hope we are able to address the public safety needs of the people. I hope we are able to address the democratic will of the American public. I hope we are able to effectuate the majority will of Congress, because we know that, forced to a vote, a majority of Congress would support this.

So what is going on?

Well, James Madison, in Federalist Paper No. 10, predicted it well when he talked about the problem of faction. He talked about a minority of people animated by some passion or some common interest that goes against the rights of the rest of the public and against the common good, against the general interest of the people.

But our institutions have got to be set up to legislate over the demands of one small faction, the 2 or 3 percent of the people who don't want to see a universal background check because they spread the mythology that any gun safety regulation will lead to a confiscation of people's firearms, which is ut-

terly absurd and ridiculous and demonstrably false.

Yet, that tiny group of people, that tiny faction, has been allowed in this Congress to control the public agenda and to dictate to everybody else, when we have tens of thousands, and soon, on Saturday, March 24th, hundreds of thousands of young people marching for the most elementary rights of life in a civil society.

And what is that?

The right to security and safety—the whole reason we have got a social contract. If you read your Thomas Hobbes, you read your John Locke, you read your Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the whole basis of civil society is that we will be safer entering into the social contract than we would be if we stuck it out in the state of nature, which John Locke and Thomas Hobbes described as a war of all against all, where life is nasty, poor, brutish, and short.

So we are asking for the leadership in Congress simply to act. Let us bring this bill to the floor of Congress, and stop with the distractions and the deflections and the diversions. They can bring up 50 other things. The people of America know, with our common sense, that we need a universal criminal and mental background check for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I would love it if someone could explain why that legislation is not allowed to see the light of day on the floor of the House with not even a hearing or a vote in the House Judiciary Committee. This is a public emergency. The young people of America, beginning with the heroic kids, the survivors in Parkland, Florida, will not let us off the hook.

One of them was asked the question: Well, why suddenly have you unleashed this revolution across the country against one minor faction control of all of Congress? Why did it happen now, but it didn't happen back at Sandy Hook?

One of the young leaders said: "At Sandy Hook, they assassinated first graders with an AR-15 at pointblank range; but in Parkland, Florida, they assassinated high school students. We are more educated and we have a voice and we know how social media works."

There is no putting the genie back in the bottle. There is going to be no avoiding this question. At the very least, we must have a vote on a universal criminal and mental background check for all firearm purchases in the United States of America. The people want it. The Supreme Court has made it clear that such legislation is constitutional.

In Maryland, in 2013, we passed not only fingerprint licensing and universal background checks, we passed a ban on military-style assault weapons, a ban on high-capacity magazines. These are bans that are, again, favored by more than two-thirds of the American people.

It was challenged in Federal district court in Maryland and it was upheld against Second Amendment attack. They appealed to the Fourth Circuit of Appeals. It was upheld against Second Amendment attack. They went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court let it stand.

So within the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, within our circuit, we have already got all of the legislation upheld as constitutional, which some people are saying you can't do because of the Second Amendment.

Stop hiding behind the Second Amendment. Stop hiding behind it. The Second Amendment is just like every other amendment. You can pass a reasonable regulation, as long as you don't destroy the underlying right itself.

Nobody is trying to take away anyone's handgun for self-defense. No one is trying to take away anyone's rifle for hunting and recreational purposes. But you don't need an AR-15 in order to go hunting. Any real hunter will tell you.

You certainly don't need to allow the sale of firearms in the United States of America to criminals and terrorists and gang members in order to support the Second Amendment. That is ludicrous. It is absurd. We should stop spreading that propaganda. I think it is just so important that we get this message out to the American public.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that, for 242 years, whenever and wherever America's freedom has been threatened, we called in the Marines.

A Marine Corps infantry platoon is trained to close with and destroy the enemy by firearm and maneuver. That is what we do. That is our purpose. Marines kick in the door and kill the bad guys. Period. I know because that is what I had to do in Iraq. My platoon fought door-to-door against deadly insurgents. For this mission, the Marine Corps issued me an M-16 A4.

The M-16 is a weapon designed with exquisite precision for the singular purpose of killing as many people as possible in the shortest amount of time. It is not for deer hunting. It is for killing people.

The original M-16 was relentlessly refined to take enemy lives in combat. But you might know the version available in stores called an AR-15. Republicans and their bosses at the NRA believe almost anyone should be able to carry this weapon of war. That is right. Republicans honestly believe that this killing machine has a place in our communities. They think that a weapon very similar to one I carried in Al Anbar belongs on the streets of Phoenix.

That is idiotic, and I will explain why.

Republicans aren't just ignoring the voices of the thousands of victims.

They are also denying basic physics. Because a round from an AR-15 is larger and leaves the muzzle traveling faster, it will impact the body without about three times more energy than a bullet from a handgun.

Surgeons treating the Parkland victims described organs that looked like “overripe melons smashed by a sledgehammer.” They talk about exit wounds as big as oranges. They recount opening bodies of these children, hoping to stem the bleeding, and discovering that, as one doctor put it, “there was nothing left to repair.”

And here is the thing: that is not an unexpected outcome. Delivering fatal wounds that no surgeon can fix is the whole point of these weapons. That is precisely why they were given to us in combat.

The AR-15 also has a standard magazine of 30 rounds. Those 30 rounds are necessary if you are putting down suppressive fire or engaging insurgents. They are not very useful when you are hunting deer.

Mr. Speaker, I can confidently say that if you need more than a handful of shots to put down the deer, you are probably the problem, not the weapon.

In addition, the AR-15 has a significantly faster effective rate of fire than a bolt-action hunting rifle or a handgun. That means you can shoot more people in less time. That means police officers responding to the scene of a shooting will be outgunned and outmatched. That means more children will die in the classrooms before help can arrive.

I went through literally thousands of hours of training to become a marine. It was arduous and grueling. I was taught how to clean and care for my weapon. I had to pass a rigorous marksmanship test. I was only armed after I earned the privilege and responsibility for that weapon.

In contrast, my Republican friends think anyone should be able to walk into a sporting goods store anywhere in America and walk out with an AR-15.

When children are slaughtered in their classrooms, we respond with thoughts and prayers instead of smarter policies or stronger laws. We are asked to simply accept this bloodshed as an unavoidable fact of American life.

Not anymore.

How about this? Let's reform our background check system. Let's ban assault rifles and keep weapons of war out of our communities. Then, if people are truly desperate to fire those types of weapons, they can do what I did: go to www.marines.mil and enlist.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 294. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the “Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building”.

H.R. 452. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the “Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office”.

H.R. 1207. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, as the “Tilden Veterans Post Office”.

H.R. 1208. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the “Converse Veterans Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1858. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the “Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office”.

H.R. 1988. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the “Merle Haggard Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2254. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the “Janet Capello Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2302. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the “Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office”.

H.R. 2464. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the “John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office”.

H.R. 2672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the “Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office”.

H.R. 2815. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the “Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office”.

H.R. 2873. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the “Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building”.

H.R. 3109. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the “Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building”.

H.R. 3369. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the “Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office”.

H.R. 3638. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the “Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building”.

H.R. 3655. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the “Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building”.

H.R. 3821. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the “Zack T. Addington Post Office”.

H.R. 3893. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the “Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office”.

H.R. 4042. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the “Borinqueneers Post Office Building”.

H.R. 4285. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, as the “James C. ‘Billy’ Johnson Post Office Building”.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 97. An act to enable civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies by private and public institutions, to expand theoretical and practical knowledge of nuclear physics, chemistry, and materials science, and for other purposes.

S. 931. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the “George Sakato Post Office”.

S. 2040. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621 Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, as the “Amelia Earhart Post Office Building”.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARVIN “CY” MEYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Marvin “Cy” Meyers and recognize his lifelong service to the United States Military and to his community of Winlock and across Lewis County.

Born during the Great Depression and from a military family, Cy grew up poor, but he had an abundant love of family. In the summer of 1943, Cy joined the Marines and served in World War II, where he fought at Iwo Jima.

After his service in the military, Cy came home to the Pacific Northwest and met the love of his life, Bonita. A friend of Cy's started an egg farm in Winlock and asked him to work delivering eggs, a job Cy maintained for 20 years. Cy and Bonita bought a home in Winlock, where they settled for the remainder of their lives and raised their four children.

Cy was a cornerstone community member. Everyone in Lewis County knew him. He served on the city council, Educational Service District 113 Board, Civil Service Commission, Board of Adjustment, and the Washington State Republicans Executive Board. Cy also served as mayor of Winlock for 6 years.

Please join me in honoring the selfless and passionate dedication of Marvin “Cy” Meyers and his legacy that will remain with us all, as this was the week that he left this world for

the next. We love him. We are grateful to him and his family for his service, and we will remember him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARAMENDI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 931. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 831. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Police Officer Scott Bashioum Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 9, 2018, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4186. A letter from the General Counsel, Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Council's final rule — Collection and Transmission of Annual AMC Registry Fees [Docket No.: AS17-07] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4187. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Human Subject Protection; Acceptance of Data From Clinical Investigations for Medical Devices [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0080] (RIN: 0910-AG48) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4188. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Modification of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Western United States [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0344; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-11] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4189. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Johnson City, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0279; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-10] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4190. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Spanish Fork, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0897; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-22] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4191. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fort Scott, KS; and Phillipsburg, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0523; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ACE-9] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4192. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0901; Product Identifier 2017-NM-106-AD; Amendment 39-19183; AD 2018-03-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4193. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0630; Product Identifier 2017-NM-058-AD; Amendment 39-19173; AD 2018-02-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4194. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0811; Product Identifier 2017-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-19184; AD 2018-03-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4195. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0030; Product Identifier 2014-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-19180; AD 2018-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4196. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; 328 Support Services GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by AvCraft Aerospace GmbH; Fairchild Dornier GmbH; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0026; Product Identifier 2016-NM-157-AD; Amendment 39-19175; AD 2018-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4197. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0069; Product Identifier 2013-NM-090-AD; Amendment 39-19181; AD 2018-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4198. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0713; Product Identifier 2016-NM-199-AD; Amendment 39-19170; AD 2018-02-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4199. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0070; Product Identifier 2015-NM-146-AD; Amendment 39-19182; AD 2018-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4200. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0029; Product Identifier 2015-NM-132-AD; Amendment 39-19179; AD 2018-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4201. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; for the following Ohio Towns; Millersburg, OH and Coshocton, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0342; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-6] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4202. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0943; Product Identifier 2017-NE-34-AD; Amendment 39-19186; AD 2018-03-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4203. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Balanced System for Measuring Organizational and Employee Performance Within the Internal Revenue Service [TD 9831] (RIN: 1545-BL88) received March 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3221. A bill to provide exemptions under the Truth in Lending Act and the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to encourage access to affordable mortgages, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3864. A bill to reauthorize the native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5212. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reform the renewable fuel program under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 5213. A bill to prohibit the Rural Utilities Service from providing assistance for the provision of broadband service with a download speed of less than 25 megabits per second or an upload speed of less than 3 megabits per second, and clarify the broadband loan and loan guarantee authority provided in section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 5214. A bill to modify the congressional budget and appropriations process to provide fiscal stability for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. BOST, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 5215. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to prohibit employees found to have knowingly misused Department of Veterans Affairs purchase cards from serving as purchase card holders or approving officials; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 5216. A bill to direct the President to impose sanctions on certain senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation and certain Russian parastatal entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 5217. A bill to establish a White House Rural Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MARINO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 5218. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to national priority safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5219. A bill to require sellers of opioids at retail to verify the identity of the prospective purchaser and enter certain information about the purchase into the respective State's prescription drug moni-

toring system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 5220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on investment income of private colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 5221. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to develop, test, deploy, implement, or administer the Disability Case Processing System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Mr. JONES, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 5222. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Korean war combat veterans, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Korean war; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 5223. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health rule that requires covered health care employers to adopt a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 5224. A bill to clarify the requirements of authorized representatives under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5225. A bill to reinstate the final rule issued by the Social Security Administration entitled "Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 5226. A bill to preserve appropriate and achievable Federal standards for greenhouse gas emissions and corporate average fuel economy for cars and light trucks through model year 2025, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 5227. A bill to require a report and strategy with respect to virtual currencies and other related emerging technologies being used to evade sanctions, finance terrorism, and launder monetary instruments, and threaten United States national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 5228. A bill to strengthen the authorities of the Food and Drug Administration to address counterfeit drugs, illegal and synthetic opioids, and opioid-like substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. BIGGS):

H.R. 5229. A bill to amend section 505 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify the prohibition on postsecondary education benefits for certain aliens, to grant a private right of action to persons injured by a violation of such prohibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 5230. A bill to ensure labor organization transparency and accountability; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 5231. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit a Member or Member-elect of Congress from mailing as franked mail any material with a photographic image, to establish an annual limit on the amount of funds which may be expended on franked mail by a Member or Member-elect of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JONES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 5232. A bill to prohibit the use of funds provided for the official travel expenses of Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the legislative branch for airline accommodations which are not coach-class accommodations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 5233. A bill to provide for automatic acquisition of United States citizenship for certain internationally adopted individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 5234. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to expand opportunities for algae-based research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 5235. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to ensure that politically derived information is not used in an application to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court for an order under title I or III of such Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5236. A bill to expand opportunities available to employee-owned business concerns through Small Business Administration loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself and Ms. GABBARD):

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. VELA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BASS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. COSTA, and Mrs. TORRES):

H. Res. 768. A resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 5213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "The Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several States, and with the Indian tribes"

Congress is granted authority to regulate commerce between the states. This bill pertains to regulating broadband internet which crosses state lines. Therefore, Congress has authority to legislate on this matter.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 5214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 5215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 5216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

Article I; Section 8; Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 5221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 5222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 5223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 5224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 . . .

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 5226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 states, "The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ." And; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 states, "The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations . . ." And; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 states, "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 5228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 5229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 5 of the XIV Amendment of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 5230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 5231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 5, Clause 2; Article 1 Section 8, Clauses 1, 7, and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 5234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 5235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

4th Amendment to the Constitution

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 66: Mr. SIREs, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 299: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 303: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 508: Mr. McEACHIN.

H.R. 846: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 930: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1054: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1095: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1100: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1267: Mr. FASO and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1415: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1562: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1596: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1661: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1681: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1683: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1734: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1802: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1911: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1943: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2077: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2090: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 2151: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2212: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2452: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2598: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 2655: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2687: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2856: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2895: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 2901: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2913: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 3018: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3252: Mr. COHEN and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3464: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3530: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 3563: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3582: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3596: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 3894: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4057: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 4345: Mr. KIND, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 4525: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4527: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4548: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4751: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 4777: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4811: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 4838: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 4841: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 4846: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. DeFAZIO.

H.R. 4903: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 4909: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4949: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4953: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 5004: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 5011: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 5016: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 5028: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 5045: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5090: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 5094: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 5105: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 5116: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 5119: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 5127: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 5142: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 5143: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 5171: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 5187: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 5206: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 5207: Mr. KATKO.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.J. Res. 122: Mr. BUDD and Mr. DAVIDSON.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H. Res. 128: Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 401: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 421: Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 576: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 756: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BOST, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 766: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. ROYCE of California.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

84. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to enact legislation that would guarantee retirees of state governments, and retirees of local governments, full receipt of Social Security benefits if, while employed in state or local government, those retirees made full payments into the Social Security Trust Fund, via Social Security payroll taxes on their employment earnings, and that would cease the appropriation of excess funds for any purposes unrelated to the Social Security program, including intra-governmental debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

85. Also, a petition of the House of Representatives of the 20th Northern Marianas Commonwealth Legislature, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 20-8, to support the passage of S. 2325, the Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Work Force Act; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNITION OF CORPORAL
ROBERT H. MEIER

HON. DAVE BRAT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Corporal Robert H. Meier. Corporal Meier served in the 88th Division which served in continuous combat operations for 14 months. Corporal Meier would eventually make the ultimate sacrifice as a soldier in Castelforte, Italy in 1944 where he was killed in action. Corporal Meier's nephew, Bob Meier, recognized that his uncle should have, in addition to receiving the Purple Heart, received Combat Infantryman's Badge and Bronze Star.

Because of Bob Meier's effort, and the work of my staff and the U.S. Army we were able to ensure that Corporal Meier received his medals posthumously and that his legacy will be passed along to future generations.

CHINA IN AFRICA: THE NEW
COLONIALISM?

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we held a hearing on China in Africa. The hearing analyzed China's activity and engagement in sub-Saharan Africa. In particular, we looked into what motivates China and how Chinese involvement has affected African countries.

While a number of African nations have welcomed Chinese engagement and investment, it often comes at a cost: a focus on extractive industries, entanglement with a neo-mercantilist trade policy and a tendency to adopt "worst practices" that prop up kleptocrats and autocrats—such as the DR Congo's Joseph Kabila—while fueling corruption in an effort to win contracts.

China's engagement in Africa once was driven by revolutionary ideology, motivated by competition with the Soviet Union as much as it was directed at "capitalist roaders" aligned with the United States. In Angola, for example, in 1975, Soviet-backed Communists bested Chinese-backed revolutionary rivals, including Jonas Savimbi, who was a Maoist before he was reborn in the 1980s as an anti-Communist freedom fighter.

Today, China's one-time Marxist-Leninist-Maoist impulse has been softened to the point of almost—but not quite—disappearing, with revolution replaced by infrastructure projects, trade missions, soft loans and scholarships for promising African students.

While on the one hand Africa needs investment and it needs infrastructure, we see a

worrisome trend of African countries sliding into indebtedness to China, accumulating burdens that may be beyond their capacity to meet.

All too often, the roads China builds are meant to allow it access to mineral resources that it can extract and ship to China, or are part of its "One-Belt, One-Road" initiative which is designed to benefit China, ultimately, and help it project power. Further, as anyone who has been to Africa has observed, these grand construction projects often utilize Chinese engineers and workers, not Africans.

As we heard yesterday from the witnesses, nowhere in Africa is the problem of indebtedness more pronounced than in Djibouti—a strategically important country in the Horn of Africa which sits astride the Mandeb Strait, and one of only five African countries which Secretary of State Tillerson is visiting on his trip to Africa this week.

A former French colony, Djibouti hosts a French military base, and an American one at Camp Lemonnier. And, since last summer, Djibouti also hosts China's only permanent military base outside of China. Query whether that concession, fraught with geopolitical implications, is linked to leverage China is able to exert due to Djibouti's vulnerability on indebtedness.

China's overall foreign aid and financial leverage on the continent has been difficult to quantify, as has demonstrating how that translates into influence. Yeoman work in this regard has been done by AidData at the College of William & Mary which, in written testimony that was submitted as part of the RECORD today, demonstrates a correlation with how an African country votes at the United Nations General Assembly with how much aid it receives from China.

Another strategically important country with high indebtedness to China that the Secretary will visit is Ethiopia. It is also a country where China has most clearly aligned itself with repressive forces. In addition to assisting the government in controlling information flows, such as via signal jamming of Voice of American and BBC broadcasts, the Chinese Communist Party has engaged with Ethiopia's ruling party on "training and exchanges."

As the Brookings Institution has documented, cadres from the ruling Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front "were taught comprehensively how to manage their own organizational structure, ideological work, propaganda system, [and] cadre education."

Thus, it seems ideology still matters with regard to how China engages Africa. It is no coincidence that Ethiopia has become one of the most repressive regimes on the continent, and the subject of a House resolution focused on Ethiopia's abusive practices that Ms. BASS and I have sponsored, H. Res. 128. Whereas the U.S. emphasizes good governance, it suits China's interest to train its partners in old-style Leninism.

We also heard from one of our witnesses on how China projects power in the form of Confucius Institutes located in close to forty African nations. This subcommittee has held hearings on how China in our own country and elsewhere uses these Institutes to push a Sinocentric narrative which aligns with Communist Party propaganda and curtails academic freedom.

In addition to utilizing Confucius Institutes to train Mandarin speakers and indoctrinate students with a pro-China world view, China is expanding its media presence in Africa. Kenya is the country with the largest penetration of Chinese media and the highest level of brand recognition, according to our Broadcasting Board of Governors, which oversees the Voice of America and which recently conducted a survey of China's media presence in Africa. It should be noted that of five major international networks in Kenya, China's news broadcasts were the least trusted.

Here also is a thought for Voice of America and the Broadcasting Board of Governors to consider—add Mandarin programming to the repertoire of languages in which you broadcast in Africa. By broadcasting objective news stories in Mandarin, you will expose not only African students learning Mandarin to more truthful media, but you will be able to reach the estimated million or so Chinese living or working in Africa with news that they are otherwise unable to access.

China is also Kenya's largest bilateral lender, and one of the three highest debtor nations to China in Africa, along with Djibouti and Ethiopia. It is also a country where Secretary Tillerson will be visiting. On his trip, he may want to highlight the following anecdote, which I believe aptly contrasts China's Africa engagement with that of the United States.

Health commodities supplied by USAID, including life-saving anti-retrovirals distributed as part of our PEPFAR program and anti-malarial commodities, used to be shipped to and stored in a warehouse near Nairobi for distribution not only throughout Kenya, but also in neighboring East African countries as well.

Then in July 2013, Kenya's parliament imposed a 1.5 per cent levy on all imports to Kenya to help pay for a nearly \$4 billion railroad from the port of Mombasa to Nairobi built by the state-owned China Road and Bridge Corporation. Donated goods—including anti-retrovirals for Kenyans living with HIV/AIDS—were subject to this levy to help pay Kenya's debt to China.

As a result of this, the flow of life-saving commodities into Kenya and neighboring countries was burdened and slowed. Kenya's Ministry of Health offered to step in and pay the levy, but their payments were often delayed by some two months. Meanwhile, demurrage charges attributable to clearance delays continued to accrue, and had to be paid by the U.S. taxpayer.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Ultimately, over a year later, Kenya's parliament amended the legislation to exclude donated goods from the Chinese railway-payment levy, but the damage had been done. Today, due to this experience and other factors related to logistics and a new USAID implementing partner, USAID no longer uses a warehouse in Kenya. Storage and distribution has been moved offshore, to a location less centrally located but one hopes less prone to disruption.

How did this warehouse episode, borne out of Kenya's need to repay debt to China, benefit Kenyans suffering from HIV/AIDS? How did it affect the ability of Kenya to serve as a regional distribution hub for East Africa, with all the collateral economic benefits that accrue from this purely humanitarian initiative paid for by U.S. taxpayers? More broadly, where is China's PEPFAR, or the equivalent of the President's Malaria Initiative?

These are questions which Africa's leaders, and the African people, need to consider.

**HONORING THE DISTINGUISHED
CAREERS OF TOMMY AARON,
TONY HERDENER AND BEN LAN-
CASTER**

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three northeast Georgians whom neighbors recently honored at the 2018 Gainesville American Values Dinner: Tommy Aaron, Tony Herdener, and Ben Lancaster.

Tommy Aaron graduated from Gainesville High School, where he won the 1955 state title in golf. After joining the Professional Golfers' Association Tour, he won the Master's Tournament in 1973.

Tony Herdener has served the people of northeast Georgia as the Chief Financial Officer of Northeast Georgia Health System for 23 years. In his position, Herdener grew the organization into one of the largest health systems in Georgia.

Ben Lancaster serves as an officer at Crystal Farms. Members of AgriTrust of Georgia appointed him to their Board of Trustees, where he has helped steward a workers' compensation insurance program to assist agribusinesses across the state.

These three men have inspired their neighbors through their leadership, and I'm thankful for their example.

**IN RECOGNITION OF JAMES JAY
DELANEY, RECIPIENT OF THE
2018 GREATER PITTSBURGH FRIEND-
LY SONS' SWINGLE AWARD**

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize James Jay Delaney, who

will receive the W. Francis Swingle Award from the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. Jay will be honored formally during the Friendly Sons' 104th annual celebration on March 17, 2018. He has been part of the Wilkes-Barre Fire Department since 1981 and has served as the city's fire chief for the past 13 years.

Chief Delaney is a longtime resident of Avoca, Pennsylvania and a graduate of St. John the Evangelist High School. He attended Luzerne County Community College to study Fire Science Technology. He has completed advanced course work at the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, Maryland and at the Center for Domestic Preparedness in Anniston, Alabama. He is also a certified paramedic.

In addition to his role as chief, Delaney serves as Wilkes-Barre's Emergency Management Coordinator. Under Chief Delaney's leadership, the Wilkes-Barre Fire Department's ISO Public Protection Classification was elevated to Class 2, which put Wilkes-Barre in the top 1 percent of fire departments in Pennsylvania. He has been responsible for securing a substantial amount of federal support and has made multiple upgrades to the city's emergency response operations and equipment.

Chief Delaney has earned appointments by Governor Ed Rendell to the Pennsylvania Game Commission Board of Commissioners and by Governor Tom Wolf to the Governor's Advisory Council for Hunting, Fishing, and Conservation.

He resides in the Miners Mills section of Wilkes-Barre with his wife, the former Valerie Sakaduski. They have three children, Sarah, Jamie and Megan and seven grandchildren.

It is an honor to recognize Chief Delaney as he accepts the W. Francis Swingle Award. I am grateful to him for having spent his entire career in service to the people of Northeastern Pennsylvania. His 37 years as a firefighter is an outstanding contribution to the community. I wish him all the best this St. Patrick's Day.

DUI REPORTING ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the DUI Reporting Act, a bill I introduced today with my colleague STEVE CHABOT along with the support of Mothers Against Drunk Driving and a bipartisan coalition of Representatives from across the United States.

If enacted, it would address the loophole in our nation's drunken-driving laws that enables repeat DUI offenders to be charged and tried; as first-time offenders because of inconsistent reporting.

Currently, when police make a drunk driving arrest, they don't always have access to information about all of the driver's previous arrests for driving under the influence.

The reason is because not all police report DUI arrests to either the National Crime Information Center, or "NCIC" for short, or the

Next Generation Identification database, or "NGI," which are the national crime databases that can be made instantly available to police right from their patrol cars.

The consequences of this lack of reporting can prove tragic. Just a few years ago there was a terrible accident in northern Mississippi, just outside of my Congressional District. Two teenagers from Memphis were killed when the car they were driving was struck by a drunk driver who had accrued seven DUI charges since 2008 and had been allowed to plead guilty five times to a first-offense DUI.

When the law enforcement officer ran the suspect's driving record in the national database, his past DUI convictions never showed up.

This is shameful. A DUI somewhere should be recognized as a DUI anywhere. It should not matter where you were caught driving drunk. If you drive drunk, previous offenses should be recorded and penalties should increase so innocent lives can be saved.

The accrual of multiple first-time DUI offenses is unconscionable and must be brought to an end.

Our bill will save lives by enacting common-sense, bipartisan reforms to harmonize reporting standards for DUI offenses across the states.

I urge my colleagues to help pass it quickly.

**SALUTING THE ACHIEVEMENTS
AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF JONA-
THAN DOS SANTOS RAMÍREZ**

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute Jonathan dos Santos Ramírez for his many positive contributions to Los Angeles and beyond, both as a prominent soccer player and as an active member of the community.

Jonathan was born April 26, 1990, in Monterrey, Mexico, as the youngest of three children born to Geraldo Francisco dos Santos and Liliana Ramírez. A member of FC Barcelona's famed youth academy system, La Masia, Jonathan made his eventual debut with the senior team as a 19-year-old during a match in Spain's Copa del Rey. He remained in Barcelona through 2014, making 29 appearances in all competitions, including matches played in the UEFA Champions' League, La Liga Super Copa, and the Copa del Rey.

In 2014, Jonathan transferred to Villarreal CF in La Liga, where he developed into one of Spain's standout midfielders. During his time with the club, he has made over 120 appearances in all competitions, while scoring seven times and adding eight assists. Internationally, he has made 29 appearances in all competitions as a member of the Mexican National Team, including matches in FIFA World Cup Qualifying and the FIFA Confederations Cup.

Jonathan's extraordinary soccer career, and his hard work to reach his goals, are an inspiration to young people around the world. As a new member of the Los Angeles Galaxy, he has become an incredible role model throughout Southern California.

Jonathan joined the Galaxy as the team's third Designated Player on July 28, 2017, and plays alongside his brother, Giovanni dos Santos Ramírez. Since joining the Galaxy, Jonathan's passion for giving back has inspired his many philanthropic efforts in the LA community. In July 2017, he and Giovanni hosted a community soccer clinic based on the values and techniques they have learned during their careers. The brothers wanted to contribute to the educational and athletic development of aspiring low-income young soccer players by shaping their skills, instilling virtues such as respect, humility, and teamwork, and setting them on a path to success.

On March 17, 2018, Jonathan will once again support the community and appear for his fans in South Gate, California, to support the biggest Soccer Community Tournament in Los Angeles County history. The tournament is being hosted by the largest Latin regional record label, DEL Records, a company headquartered in Bell Gardens in my 40th Congressional District.

Jonathan Dos Santos Ramírez has shown exemplary commitment to the people of Los Angeles and beyond, and I am pleased to recognize his work as an athlete and philanthropist. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his varied contributions and positive impact.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF WALTER DARTLAND

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Walter Dartland—a leader in Florida who recently lost his battle with lymphoma. He was a gentleman and an honest man.

Throughout his life, Walter worked to help people, whether that be in the Marine Corps, or as a university professor back home in Florida, he always gave of himself to better the lives of others.

Walter was an attorney by trade, and spent much of his life fighting for the “little guy” in consumer advocacy. In fact, one of his greatest achievements was Florida's Lemon Law—protecting car buyers across the state from vehicles that were brand new, but faulty.

Walter dedicated his life to giving a voice to those who needed it most. Aside from advocacy, his wife of 36 years Diana, children, and grandchildren were the greatest joys in his life.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the memory of Walter Dartland. He was a class act and a sincere advocate for the very best of America. *Semper Fi.*

HONORING MR. TOM COLE OF THE
EAST KINGSTON FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I rise today to recognize Mr. Tom Cole who has served as a member of the East Kingston Fire Department for fifty years.

A broad thinker and steward of the Ulster County community, I admire Mr. Cole's curiosity. Even though he has many years of experience, having served as Fire Chief and responded to many unique situations, Mr. Cole is an eager student, always willing to improve his skills and expand his knowledge.

Members of our local fire service play an important role in our Upstate communities, selflessly responding to emergency situations and safeguarding our neighborhoods. The commitment of Mr. Cole to our state through his fifty years with the East Kingston Fire Department is a milestone very few have reached. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Mr. Cole for his lifetime of hard work and dedicated service.

RECOGNIZING THE CITY OF
MOUNT CLEMENS, MICHIGAN

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Mount Clemens, Michigan, as it celebrates its 200th Anniversary of its founding and designation as the county seat of Macomb County. I have been proud to represent this vibrant community for more than 25 years.

In 1818, Governor of the Michigan Territory, Lewis Cass, established the County of Macomb, and designated Mount Clemens, which had been settled by explorer Christian Clemens, as the county seat. When Michigan became the 26th state admitted to the Union in 1837, Clemens's settlement was incorporated as a village and then later voted to become a city.

In the 1870's mineral water wells were discovered throughout Mount Clemens and soon people from all over the world were traveling there to experience the healing waters, including Hollywood stars Clark Gable and Mae West, and sports icons Babe Ruth and Jack Dempsey. Mount Clemens became known as “Bath City” and the bath industry thrived in this community.

The “Capital of Macomb”, Mount Clemens, has a lot to offer its residents and the surrounding communities. Not only is it the hub of county government and services, but Mount Clemens is also the center of many cultural and recreational activities. It is home to vibrant institutions, including the Anton Art Center and the Crocker House Museum, along with several other historical museums. From its parks and riverfront to its growing downtown, the city

offers many community concerts, festivals, and a weekly Farmers Market. And every Fourth of July, residents gather together for a bike parade through the neighborhood to celebrate the holiday.

Oakland University has a campus in downtown Mount Clemens, and the city is home to two strong hospital systems, McLaren Macomb and Henry Ford Macomb, and a community health center, MyCare. A favorite gathering place in the community is the Mount Clemens Public Library, one of the two oldest public libraries in Michigan.

Over the years, I have been especially grateful to be able to spend time with the students in Mount Clemens. Whether it's been playing basketball with them at the Jermaine Jackson Community Center or talking to the students at the High School about the civil rights marches in Selma and the passing of the Voting Rights Act, I have seen firsthand their passion and thoughtfulness about the community and about important issues. My office has also worked closely with the community to support and grow the Mount Clemens Community Coalition for Youth and Families, a community anti-drug coalition leading the way in preventing substance abuse and creating a safe and healthy city for our young people.

Over the years, I have been proud to work with city leaders and to fight for federal dollars to support this hardworking community. The Recovery Act provided funding for public safety and public housing programs. And through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, the city was able to purchase several blighted and vacant residential buildings slated for demolition and acquire property to become part of Clemens Park.

Money through the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative has helped improve the Clinton River that flows through the city and supported habitat improvements on the Clinton River Spillway that connects the Clinton River to Lake St. Clair. We worked with the city of Mount Clemens to get funding to dredge the Clinton River channel in downtown. And we joined with other members of the delegation to bring funding to replace deteriorated sidewalks with pedestrian and bike trails.

Residents and leaders will gather on March 10, 2018, to celebrate the past, present and future of this great community. As the City of Mount Clemens commemorates this milestone, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the leaders, residents, churches, businesses, and organizations that make this city so great. And I especially want to thank the residents of Mount Clemens who have provided me with the honor of representing them in Congress for more than 25 years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on Tuesday March 6, 2018. I had intended to vote “yes” on Roll Call vote 94, and “no” on vote 95.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION
RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE,
CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS
OF LATINAS IN THE UNITED
STATES

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, the month of March celebrates Women's History Month. As a proud father, I am honored to recognize Latinas this month and believe in the importance of investing in the next generation of Latinas.

One in six women in the United States is a Latina. There are currently over 27 million Latina women living in the United States. Latinas are vital contributing members of our American society through their work in business, education, science and technology, engineering, mathematics, literature and the arts, the military, and public service at all levels of government.

As we celebrate Women's History Month, let's honor Latina women and their history. Therefore, today, I am introducing a resolution on International Women's Day, March 8, 2018, that celebrates the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States.

CELEBRATING FRANCES NORRIS'
100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Frances Norris, a neighbor from Dawsonville who celebrated her 100th birthday on January 31.

Originally from the state of Kansas, Mrs. Norris lived there with her family until the Dust Bowl hit in 1939, forcing them to make a new home in southern California. Five years ago, Mrs. Norris moved to northeast Georgia with her son and his family.

Mrs. Norris built a rich career that included managing both a school cafeteria and a construction company. In her spare time, she loves to garden, a hobby that stemmed from her childhood on a farm.

In her 100 years of life, Mrs. Norris has seen America change and grow. She's experienced two World Wars and seen the fall of the Berlin Wall. According to her, the secret to a long life is "walking and playing bingo."

I can imagine how wonderful it has been for Mrs. Norris' friends and neighbors to learn from a woman with her wisdom. As loved ones continue to celebrate a new year of life, I join them in wishing Mrs. Norris a very happy birthday.

COMMEMORATING THE 53RD ANNI-
VERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY,
TURNAROUND TUESDAY, AND
THE FINAL MARCH FROM SELMA
TO MONTGOMERY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, fifty-three years ago, in Selma, Alabama, hundreds of heroic souls risked their lives for freedom and to secure the right to vote for all Americans by their participation in marches for voting rights on "Bloody Sunday," "Turnaround Tuesday," or the final, completed march from Selma to Montgomery.

Those "foot soldiers" of Selma, brave and determined men and women, boys and girls, persons of all races and creeds, loved their country so much that they were willing to risk their lives to make it better, to bring it even closer to its founding ideals.

The foot soldiers marched because they believed that all persons have dignity and the right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote.

On March 15, 1965, before a joint session of the Congress and the eyes of the nation, President Lyndon Johnson explained to the nation the significance of "Bloody Sunday":

"I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy. . . .

"At times history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom.

"So it was at Lexington and Concord.

"So it was a century ago at Appomattox.

"So it was last week in Selma, Alabama."

The previous Sunday, March 7, 1965, more than 600 civil rights demonstrators, including our beloved colleague, Congressman John Lewis of Georgia, were brutally attacked by state and local police at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they marched from Selma to Montgomery in support of the right to vote.

"Bloody Sunday" was a defining moment in American history because it crystallized for the nation the necessity of enacting a strong and effective federal law to protect the right to vote of every American.

No one who witnessed the violence and brutally suffered by the foot soldiers for justice who gathered at the Edmund Pettus Bridge will ever forget it; the images are deeply seared in the American memory and experience.

Mr. Speaker, what is so moving, heroic, and awe-inspiring is that the foot soldiers of Selma faced their heavily armed adversaries fortified only by their love for their country and for each other and their audacious faith in a righteous cause.

The example set by the foot soldiers of Selma showed everyone, here in America and around the world, that there is no force on earth as powerful as an idea whose time has come.

These great but nameless persons won the Battle of Selma and helped redeem the greatest nation on earth.

But we should not forget that the victory came at great cost and that many good and

dear persons lost their lives to win for others the right to vote.

Men like Jimmy Lee Jackson, who was shot by Alabama state trooper as he tried to protect his mother and grandmother from being beaten for participating in a peaceful voting rights march in Marion, Alabama.

Women like Viola Liuzzo, a housewife and mother of five, who had journeyed to Selma from Detroit to join the protests after witnessing on television the events at Edmund Pettus Bridge on "Bloody Sunday" and who was shot and killed by Klansmen while driving back from a trip shuttling fellow voting rights marchers to the Montgomery airport.

Persons of faith, goodwill, and non-violence like the Reverend James Reeb of Boston, a minister from Boston who heeded the call of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to come to Selma and who succumbed to the head injuries he suffered at the hands of his white supremacists attackers on March 9, two days after Bloody Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of unspeakable hostility, violence, brutality, and hatred, the foot soldiers of Selma would not be deterred—would not be moved—would not be turned around.

They kept their eyes on the prize and held on.

And help came the very next week when President Johnson announced to the nation that he would send to Congress for immediate action a law designed to eliminate illegal barriers to the right to vote by striking down "restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote."

On August 6, 1965, that legislation—the Voting Rights Act of 1965—was signed into law by President Johnson and for the next 48 years did more to expand our democracy and empower racial and language minorities than any act of government since the Emancipation Proclamation and adoption of the Civil War Amendments.

But our work is not done; the dreams of Dr. King and of all those who gave their lives in the struggle for justice are not behind us but still before us.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Supreme Court's 2013 ruling in *Shelby County v. Holder*, which severely crippled the Voting Rights Act, we have seen many states across our nation move to enact legislation designed to limit the ability of women, the elderly, and racial and language minorities to exercise their right to vote.

To honor the memory of the foot soldiers of Selma, we must rededicate ourselves to a great task remaining before us—to repair the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by working to pass H.R. 2978, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2017, which I am proud to be one of the original co-sponsors.

As I have stated many times, the 1965 Voting Rights Act is no ordinary piece of legislation.

For millions of Americans, and for many in Congress, it is sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

As we remember and honor the foot soldiers of Selma, let us resolve also to restore

the Voting Rights Act of 1965, so that it remains a lasting monument to their heroism and devotion to the country they loved.

**HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF CAPTAIN GEORGE FRANK
MYLES, JR.**

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to honor the life and legacy of my dear friend, Captain George Frank Myles, Jr. George passed away peacefully on March 4, 2018 at the age of 69 in Boca Raton, Florida. He was a husband, father, grandfather, brother, nephew, uncle, friend, and dedicated public servant. George is survived by his wife of 46 years, Jacqueline Williams Myles; their three daughters: Tequisha, Kendyll, and Kersti Myles; one grandchild Savannah; sister, Fossteen Reese (Ellenwood, GA); brother, Michael Myles (Augusta, GA); aunt, Juanita Phillips (Decatur, GA); and numerous nieces, nephews, cousins, and godchildren.

A native of Augusta, Georgia, George was a star football and basketball player at T.W. Josey High School. Through football, he attended Morris Brown College in Atlanta, GA. In 1970, George graduated with a Bachelor's degree in Sociology and a Minor in Psychology. That same year, "Brick" Myles, as he was known on the football field, was drafted by the Miami Dolphins. As his professional football career was beginning, his draft number was called to serve his country. As the first African American to graduate from the Georgia Military Institute's Officers Candidates School in Milledgeville, Georgia, George subsequently joined the Florida National Guard.

In 1971, George went to work for Sears, Roebuck & Co., and became a manager there in 1983. He served as General Manager at the Westside Mall in Miami, and at SearsTown in downtown Fort Lauderdale. George always made it a priority to diversify the workforce by employing local minority residents. In 1991, he retired from Sears to start his own business.

George entered politics in 1993, where he was a Commissioner for the City of Lauderhill. During the course of his career, George served on the boards of numerous community organizations such as the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce, Urban League of Broward County, the United Negro College Fund, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Broward County Girl Scouts of America, as well as countless other organizations.

Mr. Speaker, George's civic engagement in our community will never be forgotten. He was a true gentleman, who served this nation and our great state with distinction. George's positive contributions to the community were a true reflection to his generosity, humor, love of public service, and family.

I was so truly honored to have known George, and to call him my friend. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this most difficult time. He will be dearly missed.

**TRIBUTE TO COUNTY DEPUTY
JACOB PICKETT**

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Hoosier hero who paid the ultimate sacrifice. Deputy Jacob Pickett of the Boone County Sheriff's Office was killed in the line of duty on March 2, 2018.

Jacob was a five year veteran in law enforcement and served as the leader in the department's K-9 unit. He held the rank of Sheriff Deputy in Boone County.

One of Indiana's finest, Jacob is a hero. He acted selflessly on a day that took an unexpected and fatal turn. But he died doing what he was trained to do: protecting the thin blue line and keeping the community he loved safe from harm's grasp. He is a reminder that we must never take for granted the sacrifice of those who live serving others while putting their lives on the line.

Jacob was a Brownsburg, Indiana native and pursued his dream of becoming a police officer after graduating from Brownsburg High School. His passion and commitment to law enforcement gained him notoriety among his colleagues as he joined the ranks at the Boone County Sheriff's Office. He became notable in handling the K-9 division and was rarely seen without his partner 'Brik', a brown and black German Shepherd. Jacob's leadership within his department and community was unmatched.

Boone County citizens and all Hoosiers mourn over the loss of Jacob who was known as a man of integrity and compassion. The impact of Jacob's death bears great weight, and has left his colleagues, companions and loved ones with a deep loss.

The day Jacob went on to be with our Lord and Savior, he did so by performing flawlessly at the side of his colleagues. He did not hesitate when he was called to run into the turmoil. As the Gospel of Matthew says "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God."

Jacob leaves behind his wife, Jennifer, two young children, and K-9 partner Brik to carry on his legacy of serving fellow Hoosiers. His passing is a great loss for our community and the State of Indiana. His sacrifice will never be forgotten.

Rest in peace Deputy Pickett.

HONORING MR. RICK ROVEGNO

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Rick Rovegno who is receiving the Exchange Club of Carlisle's prestigious Molly Pitcher Award. I know I will neither be the first, nor the last, to applaud Mr. Rovegno upon his receipt of this well-deserved honor.

Chartered by the National Exchange Club in 1949, the Exchange Club of Carlisle gives in-

dividuals the opportunity to use their time and talents to benefit their local communities and the country as a whole. The Molly Pitcher Award, which has annually honored citizens for their outstanding service to the Carlisle community since 1969, is named after the revolutionary war heroine who risked her life to bring water to artillerymen under fire. As evidenced by receiving this honor, Mr. Rovegno's charitable endeavors have made a significant impact and improved the lives of many in central Pennsylvania.

Throughout his successful career in business and local government, Mr. Rovegno served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Helen H. Stevens Community Mental Health Center, the Greater Carlisle Area Chamber of Commerce, and the Carlisle Regional Performing Arts Center, in addition to serving as an advisor to the Boy Scouts of America's Explorer Post 189. Mr. Rovegno's devotion to bettering his community is also underscored by his participation in local preservation and renovation efforts, such as maintaining the Carlisle Theatre. Furthermore, Mr. Rovegno and his wife of 36 years established the Rick and Karen Rovegno Trust, which supports local initiatives in education, the arts, libraries, and the environment. Needless to say, Mr. Rovegno's devotion to the betterment of his community continues to improve lives and inspire individuals across the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Mr. Rovegno for all he has done and continues to do for the Carlisle community and congratulate him on receiving the Molly Pitcher Award.

**TRIBUTE: CITY OF FLORENCE,
ALABAMA COMMEMORATING THE
200TH ANNIVERSARY**

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the City of Florence, Alabama, as it celebrates its 200th Anniversary. I am honored to serve the people of Florence, which is located in Alabama's 5th District.

By way of background, on March 12, 1818, General John Coffee saw the potential for a settlement on the banks of the Tennessee River, and he founded Florence, Alabama. General Coffee led the Cypress Land Company, and these visionaries established what they saw as a bold, new, and prosperous settlement.

At this time, these founding fathers of Florence commissioned an Italian surveyor named Ferdinand Sannoner to lay out the town. In deciding on a name for the new settlement, he named it Florence after the beautiful and historic city of Florence, Italy.

Through the years, the city's population grew, and many businesses and educational institutions were established in Florence. The city became known for having a legacy of commerce, industry, music and the arts, education, and architecture.

Florence stands as a testament to the Tennessee Valley's rich heritage, and I am proud to celebrate with the city's residents today. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the City of Florence on this momentous occasion of its 200th Anniversary. I wish the city the best for another 200 years.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, public education is the foundation of our 21st Century democracy. Our public schools are where our students come to be educated in the fullest sense of the word as citizens of this great country. We strive every day to make every public school a place where we prepare the nation's young people to contribute to our society, economy, and citizenry.

Ninety percent of American children attend public schools. We call on local, state, and federal lawmakers to prioritize support for strengthening our nation's public schools and empowering local education leaders to implement, manage, and lead school districts in partnership with educators, parents, and other local education stakeholders and learning communities. This support would also provide for counseling, extra/co-curricular activities and mental health supports that are critical to help students engage in learning.

We support and value inclusive and safe high-quality public schools where children learn to think critically, problem solve, and build relationships. We support an environment where all students can succeed beginning in the earliest years, regardless of their zip code, the color of their skin, native language, disability, gender/gender identity, immigration status, religion, or social standing.

We promote advancing equity and excellence in public education, and implementing continuous improvement and evidence-based practices. Every child has the right to an education that helps them reach their full potential and to attend schools that offer a high quality educational experience.

We support stable, equitable, predictable, and adequate funding for great public schools for every student in America so that students have inviting classrooms and school libraries with up-to-date resources as well as well-prepared and supported educators. These educators include teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals who provide a well-rounded and complete curriculum and create joy in learning. Our school buildings should have class sizes small enough to allow one-on-one attention and have access to support services such as health care, nutrition, and after-school programs for students who need them.

We believe that public tax dollars should only support public schools that are publicly governed and accountable to parents, educators, and communities. In no way should local, state, or federal funding be taken away from public schools and given to private schools that are unaccountable to the public.

We reiterate our love for public education and pride in our public schools. We will con-

tinue to promote the promise and purpose of public education, to elevate the great things happening every day in our public schools, and to engage communities about strategies that help students succeed. We affirm our commitment to fight for resources for public schools, and will be steadfast in our efforts to protect students and their families, public schools, and our communities from any policies that would undermine these values.

HONORING THE HEROIC SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF BOONE COUNTY DEPUTY JACOB PICKETT

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life of an outstanding public servant, Boone County Deputy Jacob Pickett, who served his city and country with principle and integrity. Tragically, Deputy Pickett was killed in the line of duty on March 2, 2018.

Deputy Pickett, or "Jake" as he was known to his family and friends, served in law enforcement for the last eight years. Jake made the decision every day to put his life on the line to make Indiana a safer place. A true Hoosier, Jake graduated from Brownsburg High School and then graduated from the Marion County Sheriffs Office Training Academy in 2010. In 2014, he was a member of class 202 and completed training with the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy as a pistol expert.

Jake served with the Boone County Sheriff's Office for three years. Before joining the Boone County Sheriff's Office, he served as a Deputy with the Tipton County Sheriff Department. Jake also worked in the Marion County Jail. Although, I did not have the good fortune of knowing Deputy Pickett, I am incredibly proud of his heroic and brave actions to protect his fellow Hoosiers.

On March 2, Jake pinned on his badge and went to work on what he thought would be an ordinary day on the job. He was out on patrol, and joined officers from the Lebanon Police Department in pursuit of three suspects. Deputy Pickett was on foot in pursuit of the suspects when he was fatally shot. Jake laid down his life to protect his community from a dangerous individual. His last moments demonstrate the bravery, commitment, and sacrifice that he and his brothers and sisters in uniform display every day while working to make Indiana a safer and better state. Each and every day, officers like Jake put their lives in harm's way to protect us.

For the last two years, Jake led the Boone County Sheriff's Department K-9 team. His partner was Brik, a brown and black German shepherd-Belgian Malinois. They began working together in March 2016, and Brik rarely left Jake's side. On Tuesday, when Boone County Sheriff Mike Nielsen and prosecutors held a news conference to announce charges against the man accused of fatally shooting Jake, Brik was there with Sheriff Nielsen.

I join with Sheriff Nielsen and all of Boone County in mourning Jake's loss. As Sheriff

Nielsen said, "There will forever be a loss felt in our community for him. He was a warrior, and he died laying down his life for you. He will never be forgotten."

Day after day, Jake displayed the compassion and integrity of a true public servant. In uniform, Jake would greet children at school. When off-duty, Jake spent time saving rescue animals. Jake's selflessness extended in death. He was an organ donor, and his heart saved the life of another patient at St. Vincent's Hospital in Indianapolis.

Jake and his wife, Jennifer, were married for ten years and have two young sons. Jake was a beloved husband and a devoted father. In addition to his wife and two sons, Jake is survived by his parents, Marlin and Rebecca Pickett; his sister Kristi Woo and niece Hannah Woo; his parents-in-law, Jon and Carol Lindstrom; his brothers-in-law, Jeremy Lindstrom and Christopher Lindstrom. Deputy Pickett is a hero.

Jake will be forever missed by his colleagues at the Boone County Sheriff's office and by his family. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are eternally grateful for Jake's contributions to our Hoosier community and it is my privilege to honor him today. On behalf of all Hoosiers, I would like to salute Deputy Jacob Pickett for his impact and service to our community. His work with the Boone County Sheriff's Department and the K-9 unit were unmatched, and his presence will be greatly missed. I extend my deepest condolences to Jake's family, the Boone County Sheriff's Department, his friends, and the fellow officers who mourn his loss. My thoughts and prayers are with them.

RETIREMENT RECOGNITION FOR ROBERT HOLDEN

HON. MARKWAYNE MULLIN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Robert Holden, a member of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes, who joined the staff of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) in 1984 and retired last December after 33 years of dedicated service to NCAI and to the millions of Native people that were foremost in his mind every day of his life.

Many of you know that NCAI was begun in 1944 at the peak of the Federal government's "Termination Policy," which sought to dissolve Indian tribal governments and to assimilate Indian people into the mainstream of America. Today, NCAI is the oldest, largest and most representative tribal organization in the country, with more than 300 member tribes.

When people in Congress or in public want to gauge the views of Indian Country on matters of health care, housing, cultural issues, economic development or sovereignty, they turn to NCAI.

For more than three decades, these people have often talked to Robert who spent most of his career at NCAI when salaries were low, there was no proper retirement program or health care, and with few staff. This meant

long days, evenings and weekends, travel away from home and family, and often-frustrating times getting the attention of decision-makers in Congress and Federal agencies.

Working under the leadership of at least 6 Executive Directors, Robert became, over time, the institutional and collective memory of the NCAI organization as well as the source of continuity that is so important to a membership organization like NCAI.

None of these challenges could prevent Robert from persisting in his life's work and his absolute dedication to the cause of tribal sovereignty and improving the lives of Indian people.

Robert's leadership and commitment to the mission of NCAI stabilized the organization through many internal changes and external challenges.

Robert's work for NCAI over the years has been varied and compelling.

In the 1990's he managed the Nuclear Waste Policy Committee for NCAI on a contract with the U.S. Department of Energy, which anchored the organization's finances during a very difficult period. By identifying other contract and grant opportunities, Robert generated millions of dollars to NCAI, making possible the good work of the organization over the years.

Robert had great success on policy issues—particularly emergency response and tribal-friendly amendments to the Stafford Act, which he labored on for more than two decades. His efforts bore fruit when a window of opportunity opened after Hurricane Sandy and, as was typical of his work ethic, Robert jumped in with both feet. This is a prime example of Robert's patient but steady vision and how his long-term commitment has benefited not just NCAI but tribal communities across the United States.

Robert is also leaving a legacy from his work with Native Veterans: his accomplishments include the recent decision by the Veterans Administration to expand the Tribal Veterans Service Officers Program; Native Code Talker legislation; and the establishment and funding of the National Indian Veterans Memorial, which will be housed on the grounds of the National Museum of the American Indian.

As a strong supporter and advocate for Native political participation, Robert pressed for increased voter awareness and action in Native communities even before the "Native Vote" phenomenon took shape.

In all of Robert's work, his fundamental belief in the wisdom of Indian people and the capacity of tribal governments to take on challenges of increasing technical complexity before long was one of the anchors of the Tribal Self-Governance movement, particularly in law enforcement and public safety.

Robert Holden may have retired, but he is not going away. He plans to serve as an Ambassador at Large for NCAI, continuing to participate in NCAI gatherings, and continuing to serve the Indian people and our country as he has done his whole adult life.

In 2017, the NCAI's member tribes unanimously passed Resolution MKE-17-027 titled "Appreciation for Robert Holden." Therefore, I include this Resolution in the RECORD.

I am grateful to Robert for his life's dedication to these important matters and for his in-

domitable spirit in making sure Indian tribes were always part of the discussion here in the halls of power in Washington, D.C.

I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in wishing Robert all the best in whatever the Creator has in store for him in the years to come.

APPRECIATION FOR ROBERT HOLDEN

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Whereas, We, the members of the National Congress of American Indians of the United States, invoking the divine blessing of the Creator upon our efforts and purposes, in order to preserve for ourselves and our descendants the inherent sovereign rights of our Indian nations, rights secured under Indian treaties and agreements with the United States, and all other rights and benefits to which we are entitled under the laws and Constitution of the United States and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian people, to preserve Indian cultural values, and otherwise promote the health, safety and welfare of the Indian people, do hereby establish and submit the following resolution; and

Whereas, The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) was established in 1944 and is the oldest and largest national organization of American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments; and

Whereas, Robert Holden, the Deputy Director of NCAI, is preparing for a well-deserved retirement; and

Whereas, Robert started at NCAI in 1984 and for 33 years has graciously shared his tenacity, resilience, intelligence and compassion to make lasting change for tribal nations; and

Whereas, Robert's leadership and commitment to the mission of NCAI has stabilized the organization through many internal and external changes; and

Whereas, For more than a decade Robert managed the important National Indian Nuclear Waste Policy Committee, with Russell Jim of the Yakama Nation serving as Chairman, at a time when Congress was considering the creation of a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain and the movement of significant amounts of high-level nuclear waste across many reservations; and

Whereas, Robert Holden has been a leader in promoting emergency and radiological preparedness and transportation safety and urged proactive steps to address impacts on Indian tribes and provide emergency response capabilities; and

Whereas, Robert Holden's work led directly to the Stafford Act amendments authorizing Indian tribes, as sovereigns, to make disaster declarations directly to the President of the United States; and

Whereas, Robert has been consistently committed to working with Native Veterans, and the expansion of tribal veterans services and Robert has kept forth issues such as the Native Code Talker Bill and a National Indian Veterans Memorial, and fought to keep the Veterans Committee going for every veteran to attend at no cost; and

Whereas, Robert has maintained exemplary commitment to voting participation in Indian Country; and

Whereas, In all of Robert's work, his support for the capacity of tribal government to take on challenges of increasing technical complexity has been one of the anchors of the Self-Governance movement, particularly in law enforcement and public safety; and

Whereas, Robert has developed and maintained hundreds of relationships with tribal

leaders from around Indian country, building trust with NCAI; and

Whereas, Robert plans to continue as an ambassador for NCAI, participating in the NCAI gatherings, continuing his lifelong commitment to advancing tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, and the federal trust responsibility; and

Whereas, words cannot capture the immeasurable spirit and incomparable contributions of Robert Holden to NCAI and to the whole of Indian Country; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) expresses deep appreciation, love, gratitude, friendship, and respect for Robert Holden.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the General Assembly at the 2017 Annual Session of the National Congress of American Indians, held at the Wisconsin Center in Milwaukee, WI, Oct 15, 2017–Oct 20, 2017, with a quorum present.

SALUTING THE ACHIEVEMENTS
AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF
GIOVANI "GIO" DOS SANTOS
RAMÍREZ

HON. LUCILE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Giovanni "Gio" dos Santos Ramirez on his athletic and philanthropic contributions to the Los Angeles community and beyond.

Giovani, who was born May 11, 1989, is a Mexican professional soccer player who currently plays for the Major League Soccer club the Los Angeles Galaxy, as well as the Mexico national team. He began his football career at a very young age, being recruited by Spanish club FC Barcelona and playing for their B team until age 18. Giovani made his way up the ranks, eventually debuting for the senior squad in 2007. That year, he was named by World Soccer Magazine as one of the "Top 50 Most Exciting Teen Footballers."

As a member of the Mexico under-17 team, Giovani won the 2005 U17 World Championship held in Peru. In 2007, he made his debut for the senior national team in a victory over Panama on September 9, and represented El Tri at the 2010 and 2014 FIFA World Cups. With Mexico, he won the CONCACAF Gold Cup in 2009, 2011 and 2015, scoring in the 2009 and 2011 finals and winning the 2009 MVP award. He was also a member of the Mexican team that won the gold medal at the 2012 Summer Olympics.

Since joining the Los Angeles Galaxy, Giovani's passion for giving back has led him and his brother to host community soccer events in LA. In July 2017, Giovani and his brother Jonathan hosted a community soccer clinic based on the values and methods they have acquired over the course of their careers. The brothers contributed to the educational and athletic development of aspiring low-income young soccer players by helping shape their skills and guiding them on a path to becoming future stars. I commend them for

this project, for their desire to give back to the community, and for their willingness to share their career lessons with young people. I understand the clinic was an unforgettable experience for the youth in attendance.

On March 17, 2018, Giovanni will support the community once again by appearing for his fans in South Gate, California, to support the biggest Soccer Community Tournament in Los Angeles County history. The tournament will be hosted by the largest Latin regional record label, DEL Records, a company headquartered in Bell Gardens in my 40th Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to salute Giovanni dos Santos Ramírez for his achievements on the playing field and in the commu-

nity. I ask my colleagues to please join me in applauding his outstanding contributions.

RECOGNIZING GAINESVILLE'S TOP
SPELLERS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize two Gainesville students, Hannah Stewart and Rasmit Devkota, who recently earned the title of the area's top spellers after competing in the local spelling bees.

Hannah Stewart, a fifth grade student at Enota Multiple Intelligences Academy, won the

Gainesville City School System's elementary spelling bee competition, clinching the victory by correctly spelling "infraction."

Rasmit Devkota, a seventh grade student at Gainesville Middle School, triumphed in the middle school spelling bee competition. Overcoming thirty of his peers through seven rounds, the word "ricochet" delivered Devkota the championship title.

Devkota went on to represent the city of Gainesville at the Georgia Association of Educators Regional Spelling Bee, which determined who would compete at the state-level.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Hannah Stewart and Rasmit Devkota for their academic achievement and wish them well as they move forward in their education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, March 9, 2018

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 9, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRED UPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Dan C. Cummins, Peoples Church, Jacksonville, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, how grateful we are for the opportunity that prayer provides: to find grace and mercy in our times of need.

For Your law is perfect, O Lord, converting the soul, making wise the simple, teach us Thy statutes that our eyes may be enlightened.

For Your judgments are true and righteous, let us desire them above silver and gold.

For by Your words we are warned and in keeping Your commandments there is great reward, show us the error of our ways and reveal our secret sins, O Lord. Let them not have dominion over us.

Cause us to walk uprightly toward our neighbors for all the law is fulfilled in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

But if we bite and devour one another, we shall be consumed one of another.

So let our words always be gracious, O Lord.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 294. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the "Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building".

H.R. 452. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 1208. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the "Converse Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 1858. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office".

H.R. 1988. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the "Merle Haggard Post Office Building".

H.R. 2254. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building".

H.R. 2302. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 2464. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

H.R. 2672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office".

H.R. 2815. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the "Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office".

H.R. 2873. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building".

H.R. 3109. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the "Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building".

H.R. 3369. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the "Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 3638. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the "Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building".

H.R. 3655. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the "Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building".

H.R. 3821. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the "Zack T. Addington Post Office".

H.R. 3893. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the "Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 4042. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building".

H.R. 4285. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, as the "James C. "Billy" Johnson Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4204. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a report titled, "Summary Report to Congress of the Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2016 Inventory of Contracted Services", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2330a(c)(1); Public Law 107-107, Sec. 801(c)(1) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, Sec. 812); (130 Stat. 2269); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4205. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interpretation — Commission Guidance on Pay Ratio Disclosure [Release No.: 33-10415; 34-81673; File No.: S7-07-13] received March 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4206. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interpretation — Commission Guidance Regarding Revenue Recognition for Bill-and-Hold Arrangements [Release Nos.: 33-10402; 34-81428; IC-32784] received March 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4207. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 141, Minimum Sound Requirements for Hybrid and Electric Vehicles [Docket No.: NHTSA-2018-0018] (RIN: 2127-AL84) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4208. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting seven (7) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4209. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2018 Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4210. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's 2017 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Litigation and Compliance Report, pursuant to subsection (e)(6) of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. 552(e)(6) and subsection (a)(4)(F)(i)(II); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4211. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's FY 2018-2022 Strategic Plan, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 306(a); Public Law 103-62, Sec. 3(a) (as amended by Public Law 111-352, Sec. 2); (124 Stat. 3866); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4212. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0694; Product Identifier 2017-NM-007-AD; Amendment 39-19192; AD 2018-03-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4213. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aeroclubul Romaniei Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1068; Product Identifier 2017-CE-034-AD; Amendment 39-19190; AD 2018-03-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4214. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0066; Product Identifier 2017-CE-046-AD; Amendment 39-19187; AD 2018-03-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4215. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Stemme AG Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0952; Product Identifier 2017-CE-028-AD; Amendment 39-19189; AD 2018-03-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4216. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0658; Directorate Identifier 2017-NE-20-AD; Amendment 39-19195; AD 2018-03-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4217. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0075; Product Identifier 2018-NM-251-AD; Amendment 39-19193; AD 2018-03-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4218. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rosemount Aerospace, Inc. Pitot Probes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6616; Product Identifier 2016-CE-004-AD; Amendment 39-19177; AD 2018-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4061. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5237. A bill to require the holder of a subordinate lien on the property that secures a federally related mortgage loan, upon a request by the homeowner for a short sale, to make a timely decision whether to allow the sale; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DONOVAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B.

MALONEY of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FASO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. KATKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 5238. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, as the "Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 5239. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a voluntary Cyber Sense program to identify and promote cyber-secure products intended for use in the bulk-power system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 5240. A bill to provide for certain programs and developments in the Department of Energy concerning the cybersecurity and vulnerabilities of, and physical threats to, the electric grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 5241. A bill to address the needs of individuals with disabilities within the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5242. A bill to require the Attorney General and the Secretary of Education to conduct a survey of all public schools to determine the number of school resource officers at such schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5243. A bill to direct the Attorney General and the Secretary of Education to develop and implement national standards and best practices for school resource officers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 5244. A bill to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 5245. A bill to transfer Coast Guard property in the Town of Jupiter Island, Florida, for inclusion in Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COLE, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 5246. A bill to require directors of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to submit plans to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on how to improve such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. KILMER, and Mrs. TORRES):

H. Res. 769. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 9, 2018, as a national day of remembrance in honor of the life, legacy, and many accomplishments of Billy Frank, Jr; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Res. 770. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Social Work Month during March 2018 and World Social Work Day on March 20, 2018; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

164. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution 18-1004, recognizing the bravery and sacrifice of the crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the capture of the U.S.S. Pueblo by North Korea; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

165. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 117, urging the U.S. Congress and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to take appropriate action to ensure that new teaching hospitals are timely provided with annual federal funding for graduate medical education (GME); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 5238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 5241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S.C. Art. 1, Sec 8, Cl 18.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S.C. Art I, Sec 8, Cl 18

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 5244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce and relations between the United States and Indian Tribes, and to pass all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution of the foregoing powers, as well as all other power vested by the Constitution.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 5245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 5246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 66: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 721: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 788: Mr. ROSS and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 811: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 911: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 914: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1123: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1243: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1267: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BASS, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1276: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1478: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1655: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1697: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1744: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1746: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1972: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2004: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2106: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 2150: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2436: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2598: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2911: Mr. COSTA, Mr. VELA, Mr. KIHUEN, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 3207: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MAST, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3566: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 3790: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3918: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3941: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MCCOL-

LUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4384: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4571: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 4682: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 4691: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4693: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4732: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 4733: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4811: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 4909: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4912: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 4932: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4954: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4984: Mr. WALKER and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 5035: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 5042: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 5049: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 5065: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 5126: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 5132: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 5135: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 5141: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COOK, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SIREN, Mr. McCALL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MAST, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. DUNN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 5167: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 5199: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 5201: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 5217: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.J. Res. 33: Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CORREA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 207: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 652: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H. Res. 761: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

86. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Erie County, New York, relative to a resolution, urging both Chambers of Congress to work together to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), and in doing so upholding their civic commitment to protect and safeguard our nation's children from sickness and illness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

87. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Erie County, New York, relative to a resolution, declaring strong support for Senator

Charles Schumer's efforts to include additional federal funding in the forthcoming federal budget bill to help address the opioid epidemic in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

88. Also, a petition of the City of Council of Gautier, Mississippi, relative to Resolution Number 8-2018, supporting continued and increased exploration and production of the Gulf of Mexico, and urging the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to finalize a 2019–2024 National OCS Program that maintains and expands access to Gulf of Mexico energy resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 6 by Mr. THOMPSON of California on H.R. 4240: Mr. Engel, Mrs. Torres, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. Sinema, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Neal, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. Payne, Ms. Speier, Mr. Costa, and Mr. Correa.

Petition 7 by Mr. CLYBURN on H.R. 3464: Mr. Engel, Mrs. Torres, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. Maxine Waters of California, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Keating, Mr. Neal, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. Payne, Ms. Speier, Mr. Costa, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Ms. Titus, Mr. Correa, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Ruppersberger, and Mr. O'Halleran.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING CHRIS SMITH

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I along with Representative HUFFMAN rise today to honor Chris Smith in celebration of his 40 years as a reporter and columnist for the Santa Rosa Press Democrat in Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California.

Mr. Smith grew up in Riverside, California where he attended Chemawa Junior High School and Ramona High School. He graduated from San Jose State University, where he earned a degree in reporting and editing. After graduation, he worked as a reporter for the Press-Enterprise in Riverside, California and the weekly Independent Coast Observer in Gualala and The Sea Ranch in Northern California.

He first joined The Press Democrat as a correspondent in Fort Bragg and Mendocino, reporting on the pulse of Mendocino County. In 2002, he became a full-time columnist and since then has kept Sonoma County residents in tune with our region. Mr. Smith writes of the good people do for one another—the sculpture Patrick Amiot created for Carla Filgas, wife of the late Denny Martin; the delegation from Ichikikushikino, Japan who came to support their sister city of Santa Rosa after the fires; members of Threshold Choirs, who packed boxes of heirlooms and other items of personal significance for victims of the fires.

Mr. Smith is also active in our veterans community. For the last several years he has hosted and emceed an annual event honoring Pearl Harbor veterans. When support beams from the Twin Towers were brought to Sonoma County as a permanent memorial to 9/11, he was instrumental in publicizing the associated events to honor the people who lost their lives.

Mr. Smith is married to Diane Peterson, a fellow Press Democrat writer who covers food and music. According to Mr. Smith, he “lives primarily to sustain and amuse Betty, an Australian shepherd.”

Mr. Speaker, two words come to mind when thinking of Chris Smith—patriotic and compassionate. He is truly dedicated to serving our region with his strong, community-focused reporting. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

IN HONOR OF RICHARD “DICK”
MORRIS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a dedicated public servant, Richard

Morris, at the time of his retirement, for his lifelong career in service of the residents of East Lyme, CT. As town fire marshal for the past 27 years, Dick has become an institution in the community, and his commitment and leadership will not be forgotten.

Dick's first foray into firefighting came as a teenager, when he began volunteering with the Niantic Fire Department. This general interest eventually became a professional career for Dick and in 1986, he became fire inspector. Over the years, Dick climbed the ladder to deputy fire marshal, assistant fire chief, and finally fire marshal in 1991. In this role he also served as emergency management director for the town, guiding residents through difficult situations, including storms and power outages.

In addition to being fire marshal, Dick is also Chairman of the board for the Connecticut Fire Marshals Association and serves as the town's harbor master. In that position he advocated at the state and federal level for policies and funding to upgrade Connecticut's homeland security and improve training for first responders. Previously he was President of the Connecticut chapter of the International Association of Arson Investigators.

The town of East Lyme has been lucky to have Dick and I'm confident he will find new ways to contribute to the community for years to come. I ask my colleagues to please join me in wishing him a happy retirement.

TRIBUTE TO SENIOR CHIEF HARRY
OLIVER

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time today to honor Harry Oliver, also known by his rank as Senior Chief, an exemplary constituent who I am immensely proud to represent. Mr. Oliver is retiring for the second time, after serving in the United States Navy for 23 years and then serving our nation's youth for another 20 years. Mr. Oliver is retiring as a teacher and NJROTC instructor for Santa Ana High School, as well as carrying his Senior Chief military rank. Though his teaching journey is coming to an end, the impact he has made will live on forever.

Mr. Oliver is a teacher in every sense of the word. He carries the qualities that every teacher should strive for—dedication, genuine interest, and being a role model for all his students. His time in the Navy unearthed his passion for guiding future generations as a Company Commander, teaching Damage Control to over 10,000 new recruits. His understanding and natural talent for helping recruits develop into their best selves led to his astounding success. It was after this time that he retired from the Navy to be with his wife and four chil-

dren. After a short stint working for a delivery company, Mr. Oliver was inspired to become a teacher again and sought the Santa Ana High School NJROTC program. His dedicated focus on his students became evident to all that witnessed him teach. He was not only a teacher, but a mentor, friend, and at times even a father figure to his students. It is because he genuinely loved his students that they loved him. While working with Santa Ana High School's NJROTC unit for almost 21 years, he helped develop one of the most distinguished units in the country. They received numerous awards including “Distinguished Unit” for 17 years in a row, “Most Improved Unit,” and honored as one of the top 5 NJROTC units in the nation.

Mr. Oliver has enriched the lives of everyone he encounters and is a pillar of his community. His time in both the Navy and NJROTC will be remembered, and we are saddened to see him leave. His actions deeply impact all his students who will carry on his legacy. Even though he is retiring, he will continue to be a teacher, leading by example and demonstrating the best qualities of a life lived in service. I am truly honored to recognize Mr. Oliver today for his service in the U.S. military and for improving and guiding the lives of future generations.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH COUNTRY PUBLIC RADIO

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize North Country Public Radio on its 50th anniversary.

North Country Public Radio (NCPR) is a public radio network with a mission to inform, enrich, and connect the community. Based out of Canton, New York, the network is the NPR affiliate for the North Country, providing NPR programming as well as music and award-winning regional news coverage. In addition, NCPR serves as the emergency broadcast system for many communities within the North Country. Established in 1965 with a single transmitter covering St. Lawrence County, NCPR expanded to operate 34 transmitters today, serving not only the entire Adirondack North Country region, but also western Vermont and southeastern Ontario.

NCPR provides a particularly important service to my district, delivering invaluable content to the people of the North Country. The hard work of NCPR employees has greatly expanded the options available to North Country residents, whether they are looking for entertainment programming or for news and information.

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

On behalf of New York's 21st district, I would like to thank NCPR for prioritizing the enrichment of our community during its 50 years of broadcasting.

RECOGNIZING FAIRMOUNT FIRE
DEPARTMENT

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the selfless actions of several members from the Fairmount Fire Department who went above and beyond the call of duty to help an elderly couple.

On January 12, 2018, members of the Fairmount Fire Department were called to the residence of an elderly couple in Camillus, New York. Heavy rains and melting snow had flooded their basement, leaving their hot water heater and furnace submerged under a foot of water. To make matters worse, temperatures that evening were expected to plummet to below freezing, putting the couple's safety in danger. With no family in the area to assist, and unable to relocate for the night, the Fairmount Fire Department came to the rescue.

Exhibiting consummate professionalism, the first responders replaced a broken sump pump to drain remaining water from the couple's basement. Fairmount's Fire Chief personally arranged for a last-minute heater installation. Ernie Kreis, the owner of Ernie Kreis and Sons Heating Co. Inc., rushed to the couple's home, and placed heaters throughout the house to keep the couple warm. The following day, Fairmount firefighters returned with dehumidifiers while Mr. Kreis and his crew finished installing a new furnace and hot water tank.

Today, it is my distinct honor to recognize Fairmount Fire Department's President Greg Poppas, Chief of Fire Scott Clarke, Lieutenant Chris Barlow, Jesse Belon, Stephanie Barlow, Billy Spinelli, Zachary Benjamin, Chris Sheedy, and Lucas Patchen for their selfless actions. Fairmount Fire Department is comprised of countless community volunteer firefighters, and I am grateful for their countless hours working to keep the public safe.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF RE-
TIRED MISSISSIPPI ARMY NA-
TIONAL GUARD MAJOR GENERAL
(MG) JERRY KEETON

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of retired Mississippi Army National Guard and Army Reserve Major General (MG) Jerry Keeton who passed away on Saturday, February 24, 2018, in Baldwin, Mississippi. MG Keeton, a native of Wheeler, Mississippi, was known for his devotion to God, country, family, and to his many friends.

MG Keeton was born on March 17, 1937. He enjoyed playing basketball at Wheeler

High School and served as the captain of the team when they won the 1955 State Basketball Championship. Upon graduation, MG Keeton entered Mississippi State University (MSU), where he continued his love of basketball by serving as the co-captain of the MSU Bulldogs Men's Basketball Team. The team won the Southeastern Conference Championship in 1959. He was also a member of the Blue Key Honor Society and President of the M-Club. He was a proud ROTC Graduate. MG Keeton was a Distinguished Engineering Fellow and earned a degree in civil engineering in 1959.

In 1960, MG Keeton joined the United States Army. The following year, MG Keeton married Josie Browning. He began a long and successful career that included command of troops at the Platoon, Company, Battalion, Brigade, and Group unit levels in the Mississippi Army National Guard. He served as Deputy Commander, Reserve Command of the 2nd U.S. Army located at Fort Gillem, Georgia. Following a long and distinguished military career, MG Keeton retired from the Army in 1993.

In the civilian world, MG Keeton was a registered professional engineer. He worked for the USDA National Resources Conservation Service from 1965–2002 as a supervisory civil engineer. While living in Tupelo, Mississippi, MG Keeton was an active member of Harrisburg Baptist Church, where he served as a deacon.

After a distinguished engineering career, MG Keeton retired and moved back to his hometown. He and his wife became members of Booneville First Baptist Church. It was in Wheeler where MG Keeton decided to become a cattle farmer. In addition to his love of farming, MG Keeton enjoyed hunting for quail and going fishing. He remained a loyal fan of Mississippi State University and Wheeler High School athletics, regularly attending games, especially basketball.

Jerry Hutcheson, a friend of MG Keeton and fellow member of Booneville First Baptist Church, said he always enjoyed MG Keeton's sense of humor. He liked to make people laugh. "Jerry was just a good guy," Mr. Hutcheson said. "He loved to talk politics every morning as a member of the Hardee's Coffee Club. He was devoted to everyone in the Berea Sunday School Class and to all his fellow senior adults in the church. He loved people."

A funeral was held on Tuesday, February 27, 2018, at First Baptist Church in Booneville. Reverend Carter Smith and Dr. Lynn Jones officiated. MG Keeton was laid to rest at the Booneville Cemetery.

MG Keeton is survived by his wife of 56 years, Josie Browning Keeton; their son, Joe Keeton; and his brother, Billy Keeton. He was preceded in death by his parents, Wilmer E. and Helen Martin Keeton.

MG Keeton was a true leader, who proudly served our nation. He touched many lives in both his professional and private life. MG Keeton will be missed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. KURT
TOPPEL

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Mr. Kurt Toppel—a beloved father, husband, and Los Angeles community leader—who passed away on February 9, 2018 at the age of 85.

Kurt Toppel was born in Cologne, Germany and immigrated to the U.S. in 1954. He served in the National Guard in the late 1950's and later moved to Pacific Palisades in 1960 where he became very active in the community.

Kurt served as president of the Pacific Palisades Community Council (PPCC), and was instrumental in formulating its Guiding Principles which are still used today. He played a critical role in securing funds to assure the construction of the new gym in the Palisades Park, which led to him being honored with the Pacific Palisades Citizen of the Year Award. He served as the president of the Marquez Knolls Property Owners Association for over 10 years, serving as an important advocate for homeowners' rights.

Through his prodigious community involvement, Kurt became President of PRIDE, a non-profit designed to improve and enhance the aesthetics of Pacific Palisades. He was also a member of the Community-Policy Advisory Board for 10 years.

Additionally, Kurt was a member of American Legion Post 283 Pacific Palisades. He served on the Palisades Park Advisory Board, and on his 80th birthday his family donated \$20,000 in matching funds to build a Veteran's Garden at the Recreation Center in Pacific Palisades.

Kurt believed that the residents of Pacific Palisades should continue working together to maintain the beauty of Pacific Palisades here in Los Angeles. May Kurt's memory be a blessing to us all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 94; NAY on Roll Call No. 95; NAY on Roll Call No. 96; YEA on Roll Call No. 98; and NAY on Roll Call No. 99.

HONORING ROBIN LANTZ

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Robin Lantz in celebration of her 50 years in service for the State of California.

Ms. Lantz was born in Marion, Ohio. She grew up in a military family and spent her childhood in many places throughout the United States before settling in California. Robin graduated from Hayward High School and went on to earn an Associate of Arts degree from Stockton Junior College. She attended the University of the Pacific on an acapella scholarship and was a member of that institution's touring choir.

Ms. Lantz began her career serving California at the Department of Motor Vehicles. In the 1980s, she worked for the San Joaquin Women's Auxiliary Police—Badge #275—typing booking sheets for the jail. As part of her training, she walked through tear gas and had mace placed under her eyes. To this day, Ms. Lantz loves the sound of a police scanner and listens to one all the time. Currently, Ms. Lantz is a Correctional Case Records Supervisor in Forensic Service at Napa State Hospital, a position she has held for the past 37 years.

Through her many years of service, Ms. Lantz has developed an astounding familiarity with the California Penal Code. Her encyclopedic knowledge of California's criminal statutes is so great that Superior Court judges have been known to ask her sentencing questions.

In addition, Ms. Lantz has honored our men and women in uniform with her volunteer work. She and her late husband, Dave Lantz, helped stage an annual encampment centered on service and military vehicles, complete with a parade. Ms. Lantz also volunteered to work at international airshows.

Mr. Speaker, Robin Lantz is truly dedicated to serving our State and our country. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor her here today.

FOREVER WELCOME PEACE WALK

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the work being done at home in my community by my friend Sunayana Dumala.

Sunayana is the widow of Srinivas Kutchibotla, the Indian immigrant worker who was tragically murdered in a hate crime in Olathe last year.

Understandably, Sunayana questioned her existence here in the United States following the loss of her husband—asking “do I really belong here?”

The man that took her husband was pure evil. He did not represent what is right and true about Kansas or America. But our community stepped up to answer her call loudly and clearly that she does belong. We responded with love.

And that love has given Sunayana a renewed purpose and a mission.

She's spreading that love and acceptance with her newly formed organization called Forever Welcome—sharing the stories of immigrants like herself who are here in America trying to build a better life.

This Friday she's hosting a Peace Walk to honor her late husband and spread her message.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon all of us in this body to join in her mission of love.

CONGRATULATING MADISON FLEMING ON BEING NAMED 2018 NATIONAL AMBASSADOR OF HYDROCEPHALUS AWARENESS

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Madison Fleming as the 2018 National Ambassador of Hydrocephalus Awareness.

Madison was diagnosed with Hydrocephalus, an incurable brain condition affecting one in every 500 newborns, only three weeks after she was born. As a result of her condition, Madison bravely endured multiple emergency brain surgeries, as well as eye surgeries, migraines, learning disabilities, and years of physical therapy.

Madison courageously fought through these obstacles, and did not let them stop her from leading a successful life. Madison has competed in cross country, horseback riding, ice hockey, and lacrosse, which is a testament to her determination. She is also committed to her studies, and will be graduating high school a year early and will attend SUNY Jefferson in the fall of 2018. Madison aspires to become a Registered Nurse and dedicate her life to helping others. She is truly an inspiration.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to recognize the fantastic example that Madison sets as the 2018 National Ambassador of Hydrocephalus Awareness. I am so proud of all Madison has achieved, and have no doubt that she will continue to accomplish great things in the years ahead.

RECOGNIZING HOCKEY'S DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Congressional Hockey Caucus, and as an avid fan of the game, to recognize hockey's Declaration of Principles.

Those who love hockey know that it requires teamwork and perseverance, instills integrity and a sense of humility, strengthens character and brings communities together. On September 6th, 2017, the National Hockey League and the National Hockey League Players' Association issued a joint statement signaling the end to a two-year discussion between seventeen major worldwide hockey organizations including: American Collegiate Hockey Association (ACHA); American Hockey League (AHL); Canadian Hockey League (CHL); Canadian Junior Hockey League (CJHL); Canadian Women's Hockey League (CWHL); College Hockey Inc.; ECHL; Hockey Canada; International Ice Hockey Federation (IIHF); National Collegiate Athletic Association

(NCAA); National Women's Hockey League (NWHL); North American Hockey League (NAHL); U SPORTS; United States Hockey League (USHL); and USA Hockey.

As part of the group's reaffirmation to the game, these seventeen hockey organizations have collectively issued a set of eight key principles—the Declaration of Principles—aimed at rededicating the game at every level to the group's core values and beliefs. The Principles are meant to serve as an internal compass to help guide decisions and shift behaviors of hockey organizations, as well as players, parents, coaches, fans, partners and all those who represent and care for the sport of hockey.

These Principles are:

1. Hockey should be an enjoyable family experience; all stakeholders—organizations, players, parents, siblings, coaches, referees, volunteers and rink operators—play a role in this effort.

2. Hockey's greatest value is the role it plays in the development of character and life skills.

3. All hockey organizations—regardless of size or level of competition—bring value to players and families in their ability to deliver a positive family experience.

4. Physical activity is important for a healthy body, mind and spirit.

5. There are significant benefits of youth participation in multiple sports.

6. Hockey programs should be age-appropriate for all players, accounting for each individual's physical, emotional and cognitive development.

7. There is great value in all forms of hockey, both on and off the ice.

8. All hockey programs should provide a safe, positive and inclusive environment for players and families regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation and socio-economic status. Simply put, hockey is for everyone.

This set of principles serve as a powerful platform for participants to build character, foster positive values and develop important life skills that transcend the game. Moving forward, the adoption of this declaration of principles will advance policies, programs and initiatives, while inspiring fans, players and communities to create the best possible experience for the entire hockey community.

It is my distinct honor to recognize hockey's Declaration of Principles, and thank the National Hockey League, National Hockey League Players' Association, and all groups involved in this declaration for their continued dedication to the improvement of Hockey, and by extension the lives of millions of Americans who watch, play, and love the sport.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FORMER TUPELO MAYOR EDWIN CLYDE NEELLY III

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of former Tupelo Mayor

Edwin Clyde Neelly, III, who died on February 21, 2018. Mr. Neelly strived to excel in every pursuit, from his distinguished military service to a long and successful career in banking. He would also add public service to his list of accomplishments.

Mr. Neelly, a native of Greenwood, Mississippi, was born on October 2, 1939. His childhood was spent in Grenada, where his father, Edwin Clyde Neelly, Jr. operated a business and served as the mayor of Grenada from 1936 until 1940. Upon graduation from Randle High School, Mr. Neelly attended the University of Mississippi, where he earned a bachelor's degree in marketing. Mr. Neelly earned a master's degree in banking from Louisiana State University and he was a graduate of the Harvard Business School's Finance for Senior Executives program.

Mr. Neelly entered military service, joining a long line of family members who have served our nation. His predecessors served in the Indian War under George Washington, the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and Korea. Mr. Neelly served eight years in the Mississippi Army National Guard and the United States Air Force Reserve. He was on active duty in the U.S. Air Force during the Vietnam war.

Mr. Neelly pursued a career in the field of commercial banking for 44 years. In Grenada, he began his career in banking as a management trainee and worked his way up to bank president. In 1980, his family moved to Tupelo, Mississippi, where he served as President and Chief Executive Officer of the Peoples Bank and Trust Company. Following a brief retirement, Mr. Neelly returned to the banking business as President of the First American National Bank.

In 2000, Mr. Neelly's desire to serve the citizens of Tupelo led him to run for a councilman-at-large seat on the Tupelo City Council. Then, he served as mayor of Tupelo from 2005 until 2009. He also served as chairman of the Community Development Foundation and the United Way of Northeast Mississippi. Mr. Neelly was a member of the Salvation Army Advisory Board and the 4-H Advisory Board. For eight years, he served on the board of directors for the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Additionally, Mr. Neelly served as an elder of the First Presbyterian Church in Tupelo.

Claudia Neelly, Mr. Neelly's wife, said they had a happy life together. "Ed was wonderful to his family," Mrs. Neelly said. "He was also wonderful to everyone he met. He always wanted to help others."

Ed Neelly, IV, Mr. Neelly's son, said he had a special relationship with his father. "My father and I shared a lot of experiences together," Ed said. "He was my best friend."

Mr. Neelly's funeral was held on February 24, 2018, at the First Presbyterian Church in Tupelo. He was laid to rest at Woodlawn Cemetery in Grenada, Mississippi.

Mr. Neelly is survived by his wife, Claudia; son, Ed Neelly, IV; his daughter-in-law, Leigh Carol Neelly; daughter, Perry Erickson; and his brothers, Dick Neelly and Mike Neelly. He was preceded in death by his parents, Edwin Clyde Neelly, Jr. and Margaret Crenshaw Neelly; and son, Tucker McGowan Neelly.

Mr. Neelly's many contributions stand testament to what can be achieved through hard work and the desire to serve others.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MS. BIRD

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Ms. Teresa Bird—a beloved mother, grandmother, and Los Angeles activist—who passed away on January 16, 2018 at the age of 86.

Teresa was born in Los Angeles on September 19, 1931. She married her late husband, Richard G. Bird, on September 2, 1950 and together they moved to the city of Torrance in the South Bay region of Los Angeles County.

Teresa was a loving mother who volunteered at her children's schools and became the President of her local Parent-Teacher Association. Teresa, who was a young mother, was inspired to do more in her community when she heard that then Senator John F. Kennedy was going to run for President. Teresa recounted that Senator Kennedy, "turned her on to getting really involved and doing something good for the country."

Inspired by the 1960 election, Teresa went on to volunteer for the presidential campaigns of Senators John Glenn and Gary Hart, President Bill Clinton, and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. In addition to volunteering for national campaigns, Teresa spent eight years as manager of Governor Jerry Brown's Los Angeles office during his first term and thirteen years working in the district office of the late California state Senator Ralph Dills. Through her continued activism, Teresa became a founding member of the South Bay Democratic Club.

Teresa's activism in her community continued unabated outside of her professional career. She organized grape boycotts to call attention to the plight of farmworkers and lobbied local governments in support of expanded civil rights; she led voter-registration drives and marched to protest the Vietnam war. Teresa's prodigious community involvement led to the California State Senate naming her 2007 Woman of the Year for the 28th Senate District.

Teresa is survived by her three children, Elaine Bird Jones, Lisa Marcum, and David Bird as well as her grandchildren Jarrod Fletcher, Stephanie Robinson, Sean, Justin and Lucas Marcum and her great-granddaughters Chloe Robinson and Evie Fletcher whom I hope take comfort in the way Teresa lived her life as a patriotic, selfless and caring citizen. Teresa described the life she led as wonderful due to those whom she cared for most, her family and friends. May her memory be a blessing to us all.

RECOGNIZING THE 10TH ANNUAL BRENT BERRY FOOD DRIVE

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, compassion, goodwill, and the strong desire to help others in need are all characteristics embodied by my constituents, Brent Berry and his family, of Harrisonburg, Virginia. I am honored to represent the Sixth Congressional District in the House of Representatives, home to kind-hearted and caring Virginians like the Berry family.

This March marks the 10th annual Brent Berry Food Drive. For a decade, Brent has worked countless hours, often in below freezing temperatures, collecting food for local families in his hometown of Harrisonburg. The food drive benefits the Salvation Army, collecting most of the food the organization needs to feed over 300 families per month. In 2017, the Brent Berry Food Drive collected nearly 11,000 food items.

Brent's strong desire to serve the community is remarkable, and he's a familiar face around Harrisonburg. You'll find him outside of grocery stores, shopping centers, and on local university campuses. Brent has also recruited the help of the local fire, police, and sheriff's departments to assist in collecting donations. I've participated in the food drive several times myself, and I am often amazed by the support it receives from friends and neighbors.

And what's most touching is that Brent's partner in service is his father, Bucky, who once relied on the services from the Salvation Army himself. He recalls living in a shack as a 5-year-old boy, his family not having enough to eat. The same organization that his son now passionately volunteers for provided young Bucky and his family with meals and even presents at Christmas.

Brent's passion for service and selfless nature are unmatched. So much so, that in February of this year, he was presented with a key to the City of Harrisonburg by the City Council. This is a well-deserved honor.

It is hard-working and dedicated volunteers like Brent Berry who make real differences in our communities. I thank Brent, his father Bucky, and his team of volunteers who make the good work of the Salvation Army in Harrisonburg possible. I wish Brent continued success as he works to positively impact the lives of many Virginia families and ensure no family in Harrisonburg goes hungry.

HONORING CATHY IVERS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cathy Ivers upon the occasion of her retirement from the Shell Martinez Refinery.

Ms. Ivers was born in Galesburg, Illinois and grew up in Anoka, Minnesota and Pleasant Hill, California. She graduated from Pleasant

Hill High School and moved to Martinez. She attended classes in Environmental Studies and Geology at Diablo Valley College and California State University East Bay.

Ms. Ivers began her association with Shell on their Community Advisory Panel, where she worked to ensure balance between the needs of the company and the values of her community. She later joined Shell as the Shell Community Liaison and was the epitome of "bringing the outside in." During her tenure she played a valuable role in helping Shell better understand the community. Some of the programs she helped launch include Community Appreciation Days and neighborhood ice cream socials.

One of the personal highlights of Ms. Ivers' career at Shell, and an important contribution to the community, was her work on the Save Mount Diablo Beacon Restoration Project in

2013, which restored the Beacon at the peak of Mount Diablo. Ms. Ivers also led Shell's efforts to refurbish historic buildings, developed many valuable environmental partnerships and was a key supporter in the development of two important programs—Shell's 5k Run for Education and the Shell essay contest. Through these efforts and many more, Ms. Ivers played an integral role in building an exceptional community and social performance program.

Ms. Ivers has been committed to Martinez since she moved here over 30 years ago. She has served in multiple leadership roles at many organizations. She is currently a Board Member of the Martinez Historical Society, the Martinez Community Foundation and the John Muir Association. Additionally, she is the only Martinez Kiwanian to have served two consecutive terms as President.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Ivers is the kind of citizen we should all strive to be. She seamlessly blended her professional and personal passions, leaving a legacy of community collaboration. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Cathy Ivers here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 2018

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 100 and NAY on Roll Call No. 101.

SENATE—Monday, March 12, 2018

The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JONI ERNST, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our source of hope, we praise You for Your daily mercies. Bless our lawmakers with Your goodness, empowering them to labor for justice and truth.

Lord, guide them as they grapple with difficult issues so that they will choose right over political expediency. Give them wisdom to forget yesterday's disappointments and tomorrow's fears. Teach them to focus on accomplishing their present duties for Your Name's glory, trusting You to take care of all their tomorrows. May they build their hopes in You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JONI ERNST, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. ERNST thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

CONGRATULATING KENTUCKY NCAA BASKETBALL TEAMS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I want to start with what I know is on everybody's mind, and that is Kentucky basketball.

The University of Kentucky Wildcats men's team won their 31st SEC title—their fourth straight, by the way. Hall of Fame coach John Calipari is leading Big Blue Nation back to the NCAA tournament and, we hope, to the school's ninth national championship.

At Western Kentucky University, the Lady Toppers just brought home a second straight Conference USA title. They are hoping the hardware keeps on coming as they head to their school's 20th showing in the NCAA tournament.

I proudly join many Kentuckians in congratulating both UK and WKU. We will be rooting for them in the Big Dance.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, later this afternoon the Senate will vote to advance the financial reform bill that is before us.

Senator CRAPO's legislation starts from a simple premise: Small community lenders on Main Street are not the same as the multi-trillion-dollar banks on Wall Street. But since the Dodd-Frank Act passed in 2010, too many regulations have treated all of them the same and imposed a crushing burden on community banks that are not able to bear it.

A small number of our colleagues in the Senate seem dead set against any commonsense reforms to help these smaller institutions. They are dusting off old arguments and predicting apocalyptic consequences from even this modest set of reforms. That is a shame because when small lenders shut their doors, communities throughout America pay the price. Even in this online era, research tells us that the closure of physical banks makes it harder for farmers, ranchers, small business owners, and low-income families to access capital. This story has played out thousands of times across the country.

The legislation before us would restore a community lenders' ability to provide credit without having to navigate a maze of regulation that was designed for far bigger organizations.

This commonsense bill has earned the support of a wide bipartisan coalition. I would urge all Members to join us in moving it forward this afternoon.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on one final matter, for more than 20 years, Hope House in Spokane, WA, has offered vulnerable women refuge from the streets and a safe place to sleep. Unfortunately, the need is great. Even after stacking bunk beds in every available inch, the shelter reaches capacity every single night. Last year, more than 2,000 women had to be turned away.

But there is good news this morning. Premera Blue Cross, a major health insurer in the Pacific Northwest, announced that it will make a \$1 million contribution to the organization that operates Hope House. The gift will jump-start the nonprofit's plan to build a brand-new shelter with 120 beds—triple the current capacity.

Across the State, in Everett, WA, another organization called Cocoon House serves at-risk and homeless youth. They are also receiving a donation of \$1.6 million to finish funding a brand-new youth center.

What has made all of this possible? Well, that would be tax reform. Premera's president and CEO explained that America's new 21st century Tax Code is allowing his company to devote major new resources to help investment and philanthropy.

The women of Hope House and the children of Cocoon House are not alone. There are stories like this all over our country. Just how many Americans' lives will be changed for the better by tax reform when all is said and done?

There are the big donations to countless nonprofits such as these serving homeless women and children, higher take-home pay for American families to help them make ends meet, more investment and more job opportunities over the long term now that our Tax Code gives our job creators a fairer fight with overseas competitors, and, of course, special bonuses, raises, and new benefits for 4 million American workers and counting.

We can add Premera workers to that list, by the way. They are getting \$15,000 bonuses as well. Every single Democrat voted to block these good things—every single one of these guys over here. They did all they could to stop tax reform from happening. Now that the law they opposed is unleashing so much good news, they are in a tricky spot.

My colleagues across the aisle are falling back on the same old rhetoric. They are trying to divide Americans, pitting different groups against one another. Now they are even proposing to claw back tax reform. Well, with a Republican Congress, that is not going to

happen. Democrats may want to repeal tax reform; that is, repeal the bonuses, the raises, the family tax cuts, and the huge donations to life-changing organizations. They may want to repeal all of that, but Republicans set out to take money out of Washington's pocket and put it back in the pockets of the American people, who know best how to use it. We will make sure that is exactly where it stays.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Madam President, after the deadly shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School, the American people are wondering if Congress can do something meaningful to curb the epidemic of gun violence—an epidemic that has gone on far too long and taken the lives of far too many.

For years, Democrats have proposed commonsense gun safety policies to ensure that dangerous people can't get their hands on dangerous weapons. Recently, Democrats have reiterated our support for several specific measures, including universal background checks, protection orders, and a debate on banning assault weapons.

Americans of all political stripes support a debate on these policies, and yet the majority leader, who has given gun safety no time on the floor of the Senate, has also given us no indication we might consider the issue anytime soon. He is sweeping it under the rug. The NRA is powerful around here.

At the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, President Trump failed to show the conviction and steady leadership required to make progress on this issue. After indicating support for a host of reasonable gun safety measures a few weeks ago and in front of the TV cameras he invited in, yesterday President Trump released a list of administration policies which represent a 180-degree reversal. What President Trump said at the public meeting and what he proposed yesterday are opposites.

After signaling, for instance, he would be for raising the age of purchase of assault weapons from 18 to 21—a modest measure—President Trump backed off saying he would

leave it to the States and the courts to decide. That is a copout, and we know that. After indicating support for universal background checks, President Trump makes no mention of closing the dangerous gun show loophole or internet sales loophole. There is no mention of anti-domestic violence legislation, no mention of assault weapons or support for significant changes to protection orders. The President's plan consists only of small-bore, NRA-approved policies, including the absurd proposal to send more guns into classrooms by arming teachers.

In the wake of so many American tragedies, the Trump proposal on gun safety is utterly insufficient as a response. Even if you discarded the idea of arming teachers and took the Fix NICS proposal and the changes to mental health in President Trump's proposal, that wouldn't be close to enough to address the issue of gun violence. The Nation is clamoring for significant, meaningful progress on gun safety, but President Trump's proposal is just a baby step, when America needs to take a giant leap.

The administration's proposal makes it perfectly clear that President Trump has an obeisance to the NRA. Even when President Trump momentarily departs the NRA script, he quickly gets reeled back in. If President Trump, his staff, and some of our Republican friends are wondering why his ratings are so low, it is because he does this all the time. At the meeting, he publicly challenged conservative Republican Senator TOOMEY. He said: Oh, I guess you are afraid of the NRA.

Well, Toomey is not afraid of the NRA. He has taken them on. It is President Trump who is afraid of the NRA. He is afraid to do anything that doesn't meet their approval. We all know what this Fix NICS bill is about. It is tiny, but it is OK with the NRA, so my good friend from Texas is happy to come to the floor and talk about it. When is he going to come to the floor and say something we really need that the NRA doesn't support? We are all waiting, not just for him but for our Republican colleagues. We all know the game going on here—make it seem like you want to do something but don't offend the NRA, which is way to the extreme when you look at where Americans are at on this issue.

After watching the same sequence of events take place on guns, on immigration, no one should be surprised when President Trump initially talks about bipartisanship but ends up caving to hard-right special interests. No one should be surprised that the Republican leadership in the Senate, when it comes to guns, does the same exact thing. In this case, the gun lobby is the hard-right special interest.

President Trump's behavior on the most sensitive political issues is turning into a predictable Kabuki theater,

where he invites the cameras in, talks the good talk but then refuses to walk the walk. It shows great weakness in this President, and if he doesn't have the guts to move forward, he shouldn't invite the cameras in and act like he does. Now, that may give him a temporary little high, but it is not what the American people want. It is not leadership and, in my judgment at least, that is why the President is down so much in the polls no matter what he does. That is why even a race in the southwestern corner of Pennsylvania, in a district he won by 20 points, is a nail-biter.

I hope the President will change, I hope he will become a leader, and I hope he will stop just focusing on the show but actually get things done. So far, the American people, not just us, are disappointed.

Now, Democrats in the Senate are going to keep fighting to go much further than the President's proposal. We are going to fight to pass universal background checks, to actually get Federal legislation on protection orders, and to start debating banning assault weapons. This is the conversation the country needs to have. We will keep pushing our Senate colleagues and President Trump to do something real, not just something they think they can talk about that the NRA rubberstamps approval of.

RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on a different subject—Russia. Despite heaps of evidence Russia interfered in our election, President Trump has hardly lifted a finger to punish Russia or safeguard future elections. This is a dereliction of duty.

Over the last few weeks, the Senate has heard testimony from the DNI—the Director of National Intelligence—and the head of the U.S. Cyber Command. Neither had been directed by the administration to counter Russia's continued efforts to undermine our democracy. A report in the New York Times last week documented how President Trump's State Department "has yet to spend any of the \$120 million it has allocated since late 2016 to counter foreign efforts to meddle in elections or sow distrust in democracy." Still, the Trump administration has not fully implemented the sanctions Congress passed to punish Putin.

Meanwhile, Russia-linked bots continue to sow division and inflame political tensions on social media. Multiple officials from the intelligence community have warned that Russia will try to interfere in our elections again. We have done nothing to harden our election security in anticipation of the midterms.

Our democracy is under attack, and the President of the United States

seems unwilling to punch back or even harden our defenses. It is as if an enemy naval flotilla were headed to our shores, and we didn't put up any defense. That is exactly what is happening. It is a new world. It is not a flotilla of a navy or planes buzzing along our coasts, but it is these cyber attacks and social media attacks on our election system, but they are every much as vital to America as our physical defense. Yet we hear nothing, nothing, nothing out of the White House.

You only have to look to our ally, the United Kingdom, for an example of how a nation should respond to the threat from Russia. Just today, Prime Minister Theresa May went to the House of Commons to expose a likely Russian attack against two people in her country using a nerve agent. She demanded a response from President Putin and promised appropriate countermeasures if he refuses or the answer is insufficient.

Prime Minister May's quick and decisive action is exactly what is missing from President Trump when it comes to cyber security in our elections.

President Trump still has an opportunity. Over the weekend, President Putin rather ridiculously blamed Ukrainians, Jews, or other minorities for the attack on our election in 2016—another attempt, of course, at misdirection and distraction. In reality, Special Counsel Mueller's investigation has charged 13 Russian nationals with subverting the 2016 elections—not Ukrainians, not Tatars, not Jews but 13 Russian nationals.

Today Leader PELOSI and I, alongside Senator FEINSTEIN and Congressman NADLER, sent President Trump a letter urging him to use all available resources to extradite the 13 Russian nationals named in the special counsel's investigation to stand trial here in the United States. Ensuring these Russian nationals stand trial in the United States would be a clear signal to those who seek to meddle with our elections that their actions are not without consequences. This is imperative to deter Russia and any other nation in the future from attacking our democracy. This is another test of President Trump's leadership and another test he is failing miserably.

If President Trump really cared about our country, he would expand every resource in his possession to bring justice to these foreign actors who meddled with our country's most sacred democratic process—the one enshrined by the Founding Fathers, embraced and even worshiped by Americans over the centuries with good reason.

Now there is meddling in this sacred process and President Trump does nothing? Why are we not hearing anything from those on the other side of the aisle about that? You can be sure

that if it were another President—particularly a Democratic one—we would hear howls, but this is not about Democrats or Republicans. This is about our democracy, and Americans inevitably ask the question, Why is President Trump so afraid to do anything about Putin?

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2155, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2155) to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 2151, in the nature of a substitute. Crapo amendment No. 2152 (to amendment No. 2151), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this week, we will complete work on an important bipartisan bill. Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, who is chairman of the Banking Committee, they passed it out of the Banking Committee, and now it is time for us to do our job and pass it out of the Senate. Last week, we voted to proceed, and we will vote to pass it out of the Senate in the next few days.

Senator CRAPO explained why this work is so important. Since the passage of the Dodd-Frank legislation in 2010—as we all recall, after the great recession of 2008, when Wall Street melted down together with our financial institutions, there were reform efforts undertaken known as Dodd-Frank—Senator Dodd and Congressman Frank—which imposed regulatory requirements on banks large and small. The problem is, the small community banks—the ones that are disproportionately harmed by this overregulation—weren't the cause of the great recession, the financial meltdown of 2010 and 2009, but they are the collateral damage. What has happened is, there has been a lot of consolidation. Many small community banks and credit

unions have simply had to close or been consolidated with other larger banks and institutions. It has taken a toll on our economy, and it has taken a toll on our communities across the country. What happens is, these community banks have less money to loan because they have had to use the money they would loan to hire more people to help them comply with all the unnecessary redtape because of the Dodd-Frank overregulation. Some have had to basically defer that sort of investment in their communities and others have had to shutter completely because of the financial burden.

The second-order effect is, some people don't have access to capital; that is, to loans they need. They can't get credit they need in order to start a small business, grow an existing business, or even get a mortgage to buy their first home.

Let's be clear, though, about which financial institutions this bill is tailored toward helping. It is small community banks, midsized regional ones, as well as credit unions. The bill we are considering somehow does not exempt large banks from those regulations, and saying it does, which some have said, doesn't make it so. It is a claim too eagerly peddled by those who want to maintain the status quo, to the detriment of our smaller communities and small businesses. Large banks are still subject to measures designed to protect the stability of the overall economy, like rigorous stress testing.

After all, this bill is called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. What it actually does is rightsize those regulations. It does this by providing targeted exemptions from risk-weighted capital requirements, for example, and the Volcker rule. It also provides a qualified mortgage safe harbor for small banks and raises the SIFI threshold so community banks are not lumped into the same overall category as giant financial institutions operating on Wall Street.

The majority leader recently said: "In an era of online banking and multinational corporations, smaller institutions remain uniquely able to build community connections," and that is important to our civic fabric as well as the economies in rural and smalltown America.

Based on research, community banks provide more than half of all small business loans. That could translate into small banks getting to know their customers on a personal level and then extending credit to entrepreneurs and families who might not have access otherwise.

That is certainly the situation in parts of my State, the State of Texas. I have heard from banks and communities there that are more than ready to finally be freed of the shackles of Dodd-Frank.

As the chief executive officer of the Independent Bankers Association of Texas put it, "Congress holds the key to unchain community banks from the burden pushing them toward consolidation"—in other words, mergers, forcing them to become big banks, which seems to me to be an odd way to deal with this problem, to be sure, or putting them out of business altogether.

In the IBAT's view—Independent Bankers Association of Texas—rules meant to curb the abuses of banks deemed too big to fail have instead trickled down to harm their much smaller counterparts. Because of this effect, in essence, community banks have become too small to survive as mergers and acquisitions have occurred all over the map.

Independent bankers have reported that since 2009, Texas has lost nearly one-third of its banks—one-third of its banks. They have said that based on Federal data on rural counties, approximately one-third don't have a local credit union or bank at all. This bill addresses that situation. It enjoys wide bipartisan support, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting passage before the end of the week.

FIX NICS BILL

Madam President, on another matter, I want to emphasize another point and talk about a new milestone reached and announce some good news.

We have now reached 64 total cosponsors for a bill I have introduced with the junior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY, called the Fix NICS, which is the background check reform bill we cosponsored together.

In an institution like this, during polarized times, it is pretty remarkable that you have 64 Senators—32 Democrats and 32 Republicans—coming together and saying: Yes, we have a problem, and, yes, we want to work together to fix it.

This is the kind of legislation the Nation has been waiting for, as people continue to be frustrated, frightened, and depressed by random acts of violence that have broken out in and around some of our churches, our cities, and our schools. I am talking about shootings like those that occurred at Sutherland Springs, TX, outside of San Antonio, in Las Vegas, and, of course, Parkland, FL. With Fix NICS, we are saying the status quo is not acceptable.

I am happy to hear my friend the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, say there are other things he and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to do. I would just quote to him some ancient wisdom; that "the journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step." We ought to take that first step and do what we can do today and do what is achievable in order to make our communities safer.

I have talked about it before, but if the background check system had been working the way Congress intended,

the shooter who murdered 26 people as they worshiped on Sunday morning in Sutherland Springs, outside of San Antonio, and injured 20 more would not have been able to legally purchase firearms because the background check system would have reflected the fact that he was a convicted felon, he had been convicted of domestic violence, and he had been in a mental institution. All three of those things are disqualifiers from being able to legally purchase firearms under current law, but if the background system isn't uploaded with the appropriate information for the FBI to maintain, then those convictions will never be discovered, and someone can merely lie their way into purchasing firearms and committing atrocities like we saw in Sutherland Springs.

Fix NICS is designed to make sure convicted felons can't get access to firearms because, under current law, they are disallowed from doing so. It is designed to make sure people who commit domestic violence can't buy a firearm because they are currently prohibited by law from doing so. It is designed to make sure people who are dishonorably discharged from the military can't legally get a firearm because the current law prohibits them from doing so.

Sometimes criminals with domestic abuse convictions, records of mental illness, and violent erratic behavior slip through the cracks and get their hands on guns, despite what the law already prohibits. That is why it is so important for us to pass this legislation now—again, with 64 cosponsors of the legislation, evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

The effectiveness of doing this sort of background check system has been confirmed by academic research. A recent study by RAND Corporation found evidence that dealer background checks may decrease firearm homicides by as much as 20 percent or more. In other words, it saves lives. One specific part of that study further suggested that enforcing background checks for felony records may have a similar diminishing effect. In other words, enforcement matters, and enforcement is what we are trying to ensure.

We have learned from Sutherland Springs that the NICS system is not operating as Congress intended and that the military, in this instance, was not uploading certain records, but they are not alone. Recent news reports out of places like Ohio have shown it is often the case at the State level as well. We know, a few years back, the shooter at Virginia Tech, near Washington, DC, had been adjudicated mentally ill by the State of Virginia, but the State had never uploaded that information on the background check system, so he was able to purchase a firearm.

This bill will save lives. I know my friend the Democratic leader, the mi-

nority leader, has said: Well, it is not enough, but if it saves lives, isn't it a good start? I am grateful to him for cosponsoring the legislation. You couldn't tell he cosponsored the legislation by his comments here, acting like this is somehow not a very important step, but it is because it will save lives.

This bill has the backing of the President as well, whom I have spoken to personally, and the minority and majority leaders in the Senate and is supported by gun groups across the spectrum from—yes, the National Rifle Association but also Everytown for Gun Safety. They are at the opposite ends of the ideological spectrum when it comes to the Second Amendment. It is not just them. It is others like the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Sandy Hook Promise, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the National Domestic Violence Hotline, and the National Sheriffs' Association.

It really is remarkable when you have groups with such widely divergent views, when it comes to the Second Amendment, come together and say: Well, this is where we can find common ground. This is where we can actually do something. That is reflected in the 64 bipartisan cosponsors we have for the bill.

The bill would do this: First, it would require Federal agencies and States to produce NICS implementation plans, in other words, to fix what is broken, including measures to verify the accuracy of the records.

It would hold Federal agencies accountable if they fail to upload the relevant information.

I think it is accurate information, but I have heard that after the shooting in Sutherland Springs, the military has now gone back and uploaded 4,000 additional records into the NICS background check system that weren't previously loaded. Those are 4,000 people now in the system who, if they attempted to buy a firearm legally through a gun store or Federal licensed firearm dealer, would not be able to do so because there would be a hit on the FBI background check system.

I think if we provided similar incentives to the States, we would see a similar increase in compliance and public safety continue to be enhanced.

This bill would reward States that comply with their NICS implementation plan through Federal grants incentives. It would reauthorize and improve law enforcement programs to help State governments share relevant criminal record information. Let's not forget, this is not just a Federal problem.

Finally, the bill would provide important technical assistance to Federal agencies and States that are working to comply with NICS record-sharing requirements.

We have all the support we need. What we need is a vote. I know that despite the minority leader's comments here today, he does not oppose this bill. He says it is merely not enough, but why can't we pass this bill that we all agree on and then build from there? I am not afraid of having any debate or any vote on any matter related to the Second Amendment. That is why our constituents sent us here, to debate and to vote and to be held accountable for those votes.

I know there is pressure from those who want more controversial measures to be added, but frankly they are ones that can't pass the Senate, much less the House, or be signed into the law. I would hope we focus—focus our attention on what is achievable, what is bipartisan, what brings people together at the opposite ends of the ideological spectrum and pass the Fix NICS bill. Again, NICS is the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. It will improve our background check system and in the process save lives.

If we did nothing else—and I am not advocating that for a moment, but if we did nothing else in this space other than pass this background check reform system, we would save lives. I don't know why that is not compelling enough to everyone to actually get it done. I hope it is, and I hope we do so without further delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Thank you, Madam President.

Ten years ago today, at breakfast tables all around the country, Americans read a shocking headline: "Fed assumes the role of lender of last resort." The biggest investment banks on Wall Street were getting their first taxpayer bailout, but some of the banks were so addicted to poisonous scam mortgages that even that bailout wasn't enough. Within a week, Bear Stearns—an 85-year-old fixture on Wall Street—would fail, and the financial crisis would begin.

Within a year, American workers' retirement accounts had lost \$2.7 trillion, almost one-third of their value. No one bailed them out. Within 2 years, 8.8 million Americans had lost their jobs. No one bailed them out. Within 3 years, more than 4 million homes had been lost to foreclosures, and millions more were in danger. No one bailed the homeowners out. Now, to mark the 10th anniversary of that devastating crisis, the Senate is on the verge of

rolling back the rules on the big banks again.

Last week I talked about how this bill guts important consumer protections, how it weakens the oversight of banks with up to a quarter of a trillion dollars in assets, and how it could set the stage for another financial crisis, just like past bipartisan bills to roll back the financial rules. But the bill will also roll back the rules on the very biggest banks in the country, the true Wall Street banks, including JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, and the rest—banks that taxpayers spent \$180 billion bailing out in 2008. And no matter what the supporters of this bill say, there are three glaring parts of this bill that without question help the very biggest Wall Street banks.

First, this bill opens the door to easing up on big banks' stress tests. Right now, about 40 of the biggest banks go through stress tests every year, simulating a financial crisis and making sure that if it happened, they could survive. This bill says that 25 of them can just skip the hard test from now on, and the remaining 15 or so—well, they don't necessarily have to do those tests every single year. For the banks that are still going to be doing stress tests, they can now be done, under this bill, "periodically." Who decides what "periodically" means—the former investment bankers Donald Trump has nominated to lead the Fed and to head up the Fed's supervisory work? Does that make you feel safe?

Second, the bill gives the biggest banks a new legal tool to fight for weaker rules. Right now, the law says that the Fed "may" tailor capital and other rules for the biggest banks. This bill says the Fed "shall" tailor the rules for the banks with more than \$250 billion in assets—the very biggest banks in this country. That one word—the switch from "may" to "shall"—may not seem like much, but it means everything to the high-priced lawyers who represent these banks.

Here is what Jeffrey Gordon, a professor at Columbia Law School, had to say about that one-word change:

This apparently minor change is likely to produce significant degradation of financial stability, especially over the long run. The change would expose the Fed to litigation challenges to its enhanced standards, in particular whether they are already adequately tailored. . . . The statute thus empowers the largest firms which pose the biggest risks to bargain with the Fed for laxer standards with the threat of a well-resourced litigation challenge in the background. Over time this bargaining for laxity will produce a race-to-the-bottom dynamic that will dramatically increase the chance of another financial crisis.

Professor Gordon of Columbia Law School says that will dramatically increase the chance of another financial crisis.

If you think the one-word change from "may" to "shall" won't change

much, consider this: Opponents to the bill have been pointing out this problem loudly and publicly, but the bill's sponsors won't change it. They won't change that one word. Why? Because the giant banks want the change.

The third bank giveaway in this bill undercuts capital requirements for the biggest banks. The best way to stop another taxpayer bailout of the big banks is to make sure they have enough capital on hand to withstand a crisis. That is why Congress and the regulators established tougher capital requirements for the big banks after the last financial crisis. This bill reverses direction, opening the door to big banks like JPMorgan and Citigroup facing much lower capital requirements than they do now. In fact, the independent Congressional Budget Office says there is a 50-percent chance that JPMorgan and Citigroup can take advantage of a provision in the bill to reduce their capital requirements.

The Wall Street Journal editorial board—no fan of tough regulation—wrote that the change proposed in the banking bill is dangerous and "will make the financial system more vulnerable in a panic." The Bloomberg editorial board says the bill "chip[s] away at the bedrock of financial resilience—the equity capital that allows banks to absorb losses and keep on lending in bad times." And the consequences could be huge. According to the FDIC, this provision could lower capital requirements for JPMorgan by \$21.4 billion and for Citigroup by \$8.6 billion.

At the end of last week, the supporters of the bill introduced a new amendment that they claimed would address the problems in this bill, but that amendment did nothing to address these three glaring big-bank giveaways: The stress test provision is unchanged, the litigation provision is unchanged, and the capital requirements provision is unchanged. Victories for the big banks have been preserved 100 percent.

But it is not just the big-bank giveaways that remain unaddressed in this new amendment. Over the last week, we have heard a lot of criticism about this bill from experts and from civil rights groups and from consumer advocates and from former regulators, and, most importantly, from our constituents back home. They don't like it. This banking bill undermines civil rights laws. It weakens consumers protections on mortgages and mobile home purchases. It rolls back rules on 25 of the 40 largest banks in the country. It does almost nothing to protect consumers. Let me be perfectly clear about this. The new amendment does not address a single one of these legitimate criticisms. It is a bunch of fig leaves designed to let supporters of the bill pretend that they have addressed

those criticisms without actually addressing them. In some cases, these little fig leaves actually make things worse.

Let's start with the fake fixes—first, mortgage discrimination. Mortgage discrimination is real in America. Some banks charge African Americans more for loans than they charge Whites with similar credit. Some deny loans to Latinos or to single women. How do we know that? Because banks have to disclose information about the loans they provide under something called the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, or HMDA. Using HMDA data, a new report shows that in 61 different cities around the country, minority borrowers were more likely to be denied a mortgage than White borrowers with the same income. But this bill—the bill that is pending on the floor of the Senate—now exempts 85 percent of banks from reporting any HMDA data, making it much harder to discover and stamp out discrimination.

Senator CORTEZ MASTO had a great idea for fixing this: Take the HMDA provision out of the pending bill. Leave HMDA alone. If the authors of this bill really wanted to fix this problem, they would support her amendment and insist that without that amendment, they would withdraw their support for the bill. But now the bill's supporters have a fig leaf. They say that of the 85 percent of banks that no longer will have to report information about discrimination, if one of those banks flunks two consecutive examinations under the Community Reinvestment Act, those banks will have to start reporting discrimination data. If that looks like a tiny little fig leaf, consider this: Banks get tested at most every 3 years, which means it would take 6 years of discrimination to flunk twice. This fig leaf is so small, it is basically invisible.

Now, for some of these so-called consumer protection fig leaves—the problems are real; it is just the solutions that are fake. For example, there is a provision to deal with private student loans from banks. It says that if a student loan borrower dies, then the bank can't go after the cosigner of the loan for the full balance. That sounds really good—at least until you read the fine print. It turns out that spouses don't count. So the bank will still be free to hound widows and widowers for the balances of their deceased spouses. And the loan isn't actually forgiven. That means the bank can still go after the dead borrower's estate for the loan, maybe take half of the house or take whatever is in the checking account or savings account. It is a nightmare for a grieving family—and it is also perfectly OK under this fig leaf amendment.

In some places, it isn't even a fig leaf that pretends to address problems with the bill; it is just new provisions to cre-

ate new problems—like a section that blows a hole in regulators' ability to require banks to hold capital for commercial real estate. Does anyone remember that risky commercial real estate investments were a factor in Bear Stearns' failure 10 years ago this week? Does anyone remember that 6 months later, commercial real estate losses would help blow up Lehman Brothers? I guess not—at least not right here in Congress, because 10 years later—right now, this week—Congress wants to let banks take one more commercial real estate fix with less oversight.

Banks of all sizes are making record profits. Only in Washington would people think it is time to scrap the protections that have kept us safe for a decade, all so that these same profitable banks can make even more money. It is the same mindset that set the stage for the savings and loan crisis in the late 1980s and the financial crisis of 2008.

America's working families will pay the price if we make the same mistakes again. It isn't too late. We should stop this bill from becoming law.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, so many are still grieving from the atrocious killing of 17 people at the high school in Florida. Indeed, our entire State is grieving. Broward County is grieving. Parkland is grieving. I think we are going to find on March 24, in the rallies and the marches that will occur in 500 cities around this country and will have a focus of the main one in Washington, that a lot of people are grieving, because a lot of people all across this country have been touched by these massacres that continue to occur, starting almost three decades ago at Columbine in Colorado. We have certainly had our fill of it in Florida just in the last 2 years: 49 people gunned down with an assault rifle, a Sig Sauer MCX, at the Pulse nightclub; another assault pistol used to gun down 5 people in the Fort Lauderdale Airport; and now an AR-15 used to gun down 17. He would have gotten a lot more had he been able to open the third-story window overlooking the courtyard from a perch as the students fled across the courtyard to get out of the schoolyard. He couldn't get the window open. He tried to shoot it open, but it was hurricane-proof glass, and it only shattered; it didn't break.

It has been almost 1 month since the tragic shooting. Those 17 families—14 students and 3 adults—are certainly grieving, and we have seen in the last few weeks many of the parents, students, families, and community leaders stand up to say that enough is enough. They are asking us, the U.S. Congress, to enact meaningful legislation to reduce gun violence.

The action starts in Tallahassee, and the students are going there while the State legislature is still in session, talking about commonsense solutions, such as enacting universal background checks in the purchase of a gun; not allowing a gun show loophole or a private transaction loophole; not allowing a loophole for orders on the internet; universal background checks that would include mental problems; if you have been on the terrorist watch list, that would include, of course, criminal records but also mentally adjudicated records; universal background checks in the acquisition of a gun, particularly an assault rifle. But we can't get that passed here because some folks aren't listening.

Take, for example, what was said at the White House just last night. Giving in to the will of the NRA, the White House announced that it would provide Federal funding for firearms training for teachers and other school personnel. This Senator thinks that arming teachers is a terrible idea. It is not what the students are asking for. It is not what the teachers are asking for. It is not what the American people want us to do.

Just last week, the Florida legislature passed and the Governor signed into law a bill—a watered-down version, but it is still arming school personnel, and it falls short on what is really needed to reduce gun violence and especially the massacres that are occurring. While what Florida has done is a step in the right direction, particularly with regard to mandating 3-day waiting periods in the purchase of an assault rifle, we are far from where we need to be in addressing gun violence if we are talking about putting more guns in our schools, and if—as the President suggested last night—we arm teachers. The teachers don't want it, and I can tell you who else doesn't want it. The SWAT teams that have to storm the building looking for the shooter don't want to encounter a teacher with a gun and mistakenly think that teacher is the shooter. It is common sense.

What studies do supporters of this idea cite, suggesting that arming teachers will reduce gun violence at schools? Why even propose this solution before seeing what policies are proposed by a new Federal commission on school safety, which has now been developed? Why don't we at least see what they are proposing? No, this is to sell more guns by arming teachers.

I have spoken to many teachers, students, and families. I haven't found one person who wants teachers to be armed, including the teachers themselves. There is near universal agreement that arming teachers is a terrible idea. Yet such an idea continues to direct Congress's attention away from obvious and commonsense solutions supported by most Americans, which

are universal background checks and getting the assault rifles and banana clips that have 30 rounds off the streets.

I have supported several bipartisan bills—some with my colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO—that address background check issues and seek to make sure our schools have the resources to keep our students safe.

Senator RUBIO and I announced last week that if there are red flags, they need to be brought to the attention of law enforcement. We are offering in our bill a Federal incentive program to the States to get those red flags about a problem person to the authorities before it is too late. But ideas like arming teachers and putting more guns in our schools are just plain dangerous.

Mr. President, I know you have backed off of certain things because the NRA wanted you to, and I know you are now proposing arming teachers. Let's get down to some real commonsense solutions. Let's work on how to prevent assault weapons from getting into the wrong hands and to stop the massacres that continue to plague this country. The people of America want no less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks and for the Senator from Arizona to follow me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL NUTRITION MONTH

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the role of nutrition in the health and wellness of our Nation and the development of our children. Arkansas' agricultural producers play a vital role in providing affordable, nutritious food, not only for our State and country but for the entire world.

March is recognized as National Nutrition Month. This is a time to focus attention on the importance of a balanced diet and healthy eating choices. As a cochair of the Senate Hunger Caucus, I am committed to supporting and raising awareness of efforts that provide nutritious, healthy meals; creating policies that fight hunger; and supporting programs that have proven successful.

The Department of Agriculture's Child and Adult Care Food Program is a unique effort that uses public-private partnerships to meet the nutritional needs of vulnerable children and adults. This has become a critical tool in the fight against hunger.

Senator KLOBUCHAR and I recently introduced a resolution designating this week as National Child and Adult Care Food Program Week to honor and raise awareness of the important role the Child and Adult Care Food Program plays in the health of those in Arkansas, Minnesota, and throughout the country. Through this program, more than 4 million children and 130,000 adults in childcare centers, adult daycare homes, and afterschool programs receive nutritious meals and snacks daily.

Studies show that access to the Child and Adult Care Food Program can measurably and positively impact the cognitive, social, emotional, and physical health and development of children, leading to more favorable outcomes, such as decreased likelihood of being hospitalized, an increased likelihood of healthy weight gain, and an increased likelihood of a more varied diet.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I will be working to ensure that individuals who need food assistance are able to access affordable, nutritious meals. I will also continue to press for flexibility in the Department of Agriculture's Summer Food Service Program so children who rely on school meals when class is in session can access healthy, nutritious meals during the summer in order to have a seamless transition from the school year to the summer programs.

In Arkansas, more than 50,000 children receive nutritious meals through this program. For many rural areas of the country, like the Natural State, this one-size-fits-all approach fails to meet the needs of communities and the children who are most in need.

More than 60 percent of Arkansas' children rely on free or reduced meals during the school year, so we need to modernize the program so that summer meal sites are available to children no matter where they live. Arkansas is blessed to have the support of schools, churches, Boys & Girls Clubs, libraries, and other organizations that serve as host sites for summer meal programs, and we need to allow them the flexibility that is necessary to reach the students in their communities. It is time that Federal policy responds to this need.

I have seen how community involvement in Arkansas is fighting food insecurity. Efforts like the Cooking Matters at the Store Initiative, launched by the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance, teaches families who are on budgets to compare prices, read food labels, and buy fruits and vegetables.

This month is recognized as School Breakfast Month in Arkansas. State educators have seen how essential breakfast is to students' progress, so they have instituted programs to promote breakfast and are helping to grow gardens where the food produced is

used in school lunches. Grocery stores are allowing SNAP beneficiaries to purchase locally grown produce at a discount. Proper nutrition is crucial to our well-being.

Creating opportunities to access healthy, nutritious food is also important to our State's and the Nation's economic development. In order to break the cycle of food insecurity, we must work together. Hunger knows no boundaries, but it is preventable, and we have the tools to help fight it. We have made significant gains in Arkansas, across the country, and throughout the world to improve nutrition for the most vulnerable in our society, and I will continue to be a champion of efforts to improve access to healthy nutritious, foods.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2538 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2151, as modified, to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Bob Corker, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Rounds, Jeff Flake, John Kennedy, Johnny Isakson, James Lankford, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2151, as modified, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Boozman	Hassan	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Carper	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Coons	Johnson	Shaheen
Corker	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kaine	Stabenow
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	King	Tester
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Enzi	McCaskey	Warner
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—30

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Blumenthal	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Smith
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Duckworth	McCain
Heinrich	Paul

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 30.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, when you went to a local bank in Mansfield, OH, to buy a house 30, 40, or 50 years ago, you knew the lender, and the lender knew you. You saw him or her at the grocery store. Maybe they went to your church or synagogue. Your kids probably went to the same school. You knew that your deposits at the bank helped fund your neighbor's house or the hardware store down the street. A lot of banks and credit unions don't work this way.

The 2008 crisis taught us that finance has changed. Now a mortgage in Zanesville, OH, is diced and sliced and sold to an investor in Zurich, Switzerland. Banks in Frankfurt place bets on loans in Fostoria.

When the system went bust a decade ago and predatory loans began to fail, Ohio taxpayers picked up the tab, including for foreign banks headquartered an ocean away. The Federal Reserve opened up a spigot of cheap money to keep the global economy from tanking. Banks in Spain, France, Japan, Canada, and Korea all came to the United States for help to weather the financial storm.

Think about this. An analysis of the Fed's lending from February 2008 to

2009 showed that the vast majority of loans went to foreign banks. After the crisis, records released to the public showed that foreign banks took more than 70 percent of the Fed's loans during the crisis and 65 percent of loans from other emergency programs.

Under one bailout scheme, British Barclays alone borrowed \$232 billion from the Fed at a sweetheart interest rate—the kind of rate a hardware store in Hillsboro, OH, could never get on a loan to keep them afloat back in 2008. Think about that. British Barclays got a sweetheart deal, a better deal than a hardware store in Ohio could get from a bank.

After the crisis, Congress responded with a law, the Wall Street reform act, to ensure that taxpayers would never again have to send bailout money to British and Swiss megabanks. We ordered the Fed to keep a closer eye on the big banks—to use their power to make sure the largest global banks did not again crash the economy.

Congress instructed that the Fed apply the strictest protections to the biggest banks—those with more than \$50 billion in assets. We know that.

When the Fed implemented these rules, they applied some standards to banks that have more than \$50 billion across the globe, but for global banks that have more than \$50 billion in the United States, the Fed applied the strongest standards. For foreign banks with not only trillions worldwide but systemic operations in the United States, the Fed wrote rules that are as strict as those for our domestic megabanks, standards that former Fed Governor Dan Tarullo called “special prudential measures.” They are standards that ensure that we only import Swiss chocolate, not Swiss bank failures. These special measures are important.

Last year, the Office of Financial Research released a report showing that foreign banks in the United States are riskier than similarly sized U.S. regional banks. Hear that again. Foreign banks in the United States are riskier than similarly sized U.S. regional banks. Think of that in terms of what this bill that we just voted cloture on actually does.

This legislation threatens to undo important rules protecting us from risk. The legislation puts taxpayers on the hook for bailouts. That is what the Congressional Budget Office said.

Under this bill, foreign banks that took billions in bailouts would be able to take more risk under a less watchful eye. Who are some of them? Deutsche Bank, Santander, and UBS would all be treated more like they were an Ohio regional bank. Deutsche Bank, the Trump family's personal business bank; Santander, the bank in Spain that repossessed the cars of hundreds of service men and women cars while those service men and women were

serving our country overseas; UBS, the Swiss bank that illegally financed Iranian activities—they would all be treated more like they were Huntington in Columbus, or Fifth Third in Cincinnati, or KeyBank in Cleveland. What is right about that? What is fair about that? What is smart about that?

Don't take my word for it. Secretary Mnuchin sat right in front of the Banking Committee; Senator CRAPO, the chairman, and I, as the ranking member, looked straight at him just a few weeks ago. He confirmed that this bill would treat foreign banks with up to \$250 billion in assets the same as U.S. regional banks. So they are up to \$250 billion, just like Huntington, just like KeyCorp, just like Fifth Third in Ohio. Secretary Mnuchin said: We are going to treat those foreign banks the same if they are up to \$250 billion in assets. That may be the first direct answer I have ever heard from Secretary Mnuchin. I sit on the Finance Committee and the Banking Committee, and he has trouble giving direct answers. He did at least that time.

It makes sense because he was just confirming his intention. From what he and the Treasury Department wrote in a report last year, that is precisely what this administration wants to do. That is what they said in this report that we should do—deregulate these foreign banks that have assets under \$250 billion in the United States. They wrote it into their banking deregulation blueprint back in June.

I give credit to Secretary Mnuchin, and I give credit to the Trump administration. While I don't give them credit for the White House looking like a retreat for Wall Street executives, I do give them credit for at least finally owning up in that report, in the legislation, and in his answer to my question in the Banking Committee hearing that, yes, they are going to deregulate these foreign, huge megabanks—Deutsche, Santander, UBS, and Barclays—as long as they have under \$250 billion of assets in the United States, and they do.

Paul Volcker, former Chairman of the Fed, is worried, as I am, that this bill deregulates the U.S. operations of foreign banks. Sarah Bloom Raskin, former Fed Governor and Deputy Treasury Secretary, said this bill “removes necessary guardrails that were installed to reduce the chances of foreign megabanks drawing on U.S. bailout funds.”

I have watched the Presiding Officer—the junior Senator from Oklahoma—serve with integrity and honesty. I don't think you, any of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, or anybody else wants to face the voters 5 years from now, 10 years from now if what we voted on today and will vote on this week results in our bailing out foreign banks. Americans were angry that we bailed out the big U.S.

megabanks. Imagine the anger if the story is focused more precisely on the fact that we bailed out foreign banks—which we actually did—but the story was more about Wall Street. Imagine if that were the story.

Former Treasury officials Michael Barr and Antonio Weiss are worried that this bill is rolling back rules that protect the U.S. economy from foreign bank risk. The former CFTC Chairman, Gary Gensler, thinks we need to amend this bill to make sure that foreign banks don't get a windfall. These are across-the-board regulators, present, past, Republicans, Democrats. That is quite a list of watchdogs, but what is most interesting: Do you know who else is under the impression this bill helps foreign banks? Foreign bank lobbyists.

I offered an amendment during the committee markup to close the loophole. I am offering it again on the Senate floor if Republican leadership allows amendments on the Senate floor. My amendment would have ensured that foreign megabanks in the United States are watched over just as closely as Wall Street banks. They are roughly the same size; some are bigger, but because their assets are smaller in the United States, we are going to treat them like Huntington and Key and Fifth Third rather than treating them like JPMorgan Chase and Bank of America and Wells Fargo.

Foreign bank lobbyists—they are American citizens. They are lobbyists for foreign banks; they are not foreign lobbyists, a difference. These lobbyists for foreign banks, representing Deutsche and UBS—most of them—wrote a letter opposing my amendment, saying it was unfair for me to try to keep these rules in place. They said their banks should be treated like U.S. regional banks, not like the global giants they are. That amendment was defeated in the committee; we will leave it at that.

Now, why is that such a problem? Let's look at the rap sheet on some of these foreign banks. Santander, a Spanish bank, failed a stress test 3 years in a row. It would have its rules rolled back under this bill. Stress tests are exercises, as my colleagues know, to ensure that a bank can survive an economic downturn without a bailout. So this Spanish bank, Santander, failed not once, not twice but three times. What that failure means—most people, if they fail three times, they flunk out. If they fail three times, they get in this bill, and they get a potential bailout. What is smart about that? What is honorable about that? What is good economic policy about that? What is fair about that? What is just about that?

In addition to failing its stress test, it is a bank that illegally repossessed cars from 1,100 American service men and women while they were serving our country. I spend a lot of time at the

Wright Patterson Air Force Base, the largest employer in Ohio. I see all kinds of financial institutions that prey on those young airmen and their families. Airmen and women, young Americans serving in the Air Force—particularly when they are 18, 19, 20, 21 years old—are more financially vulnerable. They are a little less sophisticated than somebody 10 years older. They don't make much money. Their families are always anxious when their husband or wife or mother or father serve overseas. This Spanish bank repossessed the cars of 1,100 American service men and women while they were serving our country. We are going to give them a break?

This is a bank that overcharged racial and ethnic minorities for car loans. It is a bank that violated a Federal order to keep more capital and instead improperly paid out money to its shareholders, and we are going to give them a break? I don't pretend to understand the thinking of that.

This bill helps Deutsche Bank, which the IMF called “the most important net contributor to systemic risks” of all worldwide banks. Deutsche Bank, a German bank, one of the biggest banks in the world, the International Monetary Fund called it “the most important net contributor to systemic risks” of all worldwide banks.

Deutsche Bank is the only bank that would lend to the Trump family economic empire. Even after all of its failed business deals, they kept lending, for whatever reason, to businessman Trump and the family. This is a bank that every week is met with a new request for information on shady financial arrangements with people in the White House.

I don't think my colleagues and I were sent here to serve Deutsche Bank. I am thinking none of us goes back in our campaigns—I am on the ballot this year. I am not going to go back and say: Please reelect me so I can help Deutsche Bank, so I can bail them out, so I can pass a bill that will actually give them something they don't deserve.

This bill would also help banks like Barclays and UBS and BNP Paribas—banks that have rigged interest rates, helped people avoid paying taxes, violated U.S. sanctions against Iran and Sudan, and manipulated energy markets. These aren't banks down the street lending to homeowners in Sandusky or businesses in Findlay or small companies in my hometown of Mansfield; these are some of the most complex global banks. They hold \$1.4 trillion in assets. That is \$1,400 billion—\$1.4 trillion—in assets in the United States and more than \$14 trillion in assets abroad.

Listen to Paul Volker, listen to Sarah Bloom Raskin, listen to Gary Gensler, listen to Michael Barr and Antonio Weiss. Believe Secretary

Mnuchin when he tells you what he wants to do. Believe the lobbyists for these foreign banks when they say that is what they want. That is why they oppose this amendment. This bill gives them exactly what they want.

Let me talk about one change made to the substitute amendment. Because I have come to this floor and some others have joined me in objecting to this foreign bank provision, the leadership—Senator McConnell and his office, I assume, down the way—I assume they huddled and thought: We have to answer this somehow; we have to at least look like we care about prohibiting a bailout of foreign banks. So they made a change in the substitute. The new version of the bill came out last week. There is a new provision that provides some window dressing. It is a figleaf protection to try to convince the public that this bill doesn't do what it actually does. It doesn't actually help Santander; it doesn't actually help UBS; it doesn't actually help Barclays; it doesn't actually help the President's bank, Deutsche Bank—but it actually does. The provision provides some vague, ambiguous language and puts the question to the Fed: You can regulate the foreign banks or not; it is your choice. It doesn't require the Fed to deregulate. It doesn't stop the foreign banks from suing if the Fed doesn't obey their requests.

Why not just prohibit? Why not just say: No, we are not going to do it. But they don't want to do that. They want to keep that door open because they know the regulators on FSOC, whether it is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Jay Clayton, whether it is Mr. Otting of the SEC, whether it is Secretary Mnuchin, or whomever they put at any of these, we know what they are going to do. They have already said what they are growing to do.

Even a writer at the Wall Street Journal agrees, saying it will be up to the Fed to decide whether Deutsche Bank “deserves a tighter leash.”

So we are expected—we, in a pretty much party-line vote, because most Democrats think you don't want Wall Street people in these positions regulating the banks, in a party-line vote, Randal Quarles was confirmed. His job is to be the Director of Supervision at the Federal Reserve. So we are expected to trust Randal Quarles not to weaken the rules in the foreign banks—to trust Quarles, even though he himself missed the last crisis. He predicted as late as, I believe, 2007, as a member of the Bush administration, that the economy was great, the banks weren't under duress, any of that. It might have been 2006, but I think 2007. He missed the last crisis and, I might add, he personally profited from Wall Street malfeasance. I am not saying he did it on purpose, but he personally profited because of Wall Street malfeasance.

We are supposed to trust Quarles, even though just last week he spoke at

an international bankers conference, where a lot of those foreign bank representatives and lobbyists were in attendance, including CEOs and other executives, and he promised those bankers regulatory relief.

So we have the head of supervision at the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States—one of the most powerful people in this country—speaking to an international bankers group saying: Yes, we are going to give you regulatory relief. Aren't you lucky you came to this conference because I am in charge of these issues at the Federal Reserve, and I am going to help you get regulatory relief as a foreign bank. Congratulations.

Finally, this last point is technical, but it is important. The bills make sure that a globally systemic U.S. bank will not benefit from any deregulation, even if it has fewer than \$250 billion in assets, but the bill doesn't even do the same for foreign banks.

Let me repeat. State Street has fewer than \$250 billion in assets. State Street is called a custodial bank, located in Boston, as the Presiding Officer knows. It has fewer than \$250 billion in assets. The bill says, because that bank is systematically significant, it doesn't get a free pass. This legislation says that about State Street, but it doesn't say the same for similarly—or, I would argue, way more—risky foreign banks in the United States.

My amendment would close that loophole. It treats systemically risky foreign banks like systemically risky U.S. banks. Why? Because why treat Barclays and Santander and UBS and Deutsche Bank better than we treat Huntington or Fifth Third or Key or Regents in Alabama or any of these regional banks—many of which we want to help. If we want to help community banks and credit unions and our regional banks to do the right thing, let's help them. Foreign megabanks shouldn't get another chance of a hand-out from American taxpayers—never.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, across America, nearly 100,000 public schools

open the door of opportunity to more than 50 million students from kindergarten through high school. In honor of this remarkable national accomplishment, I rise today to join Senator TESTER in recognizing March 12 through 16 as Public Schools Week.

I have visited more than 200 schools throughout my home State of Maine, and I have seen firsthand an inspiring commitment to excellence. It is a commitment that is shared by dedicated educators and staff, involved parents and community members, and enthusiastic students.

Public education has had a profound impact on our Nation's history and continues to shape our future. Nine out of 10 students in the United States attend public schools. Last year, our public high schools achieved an alltime high graduation rate of 83 percent, and nearly 70 percent of our high school graduates went on to higher education. Public schools both inspire students and give them tools to achieve their dreams.

Not only do our public schools create lifelong learners, but they also help to foster active citizenship. In addition to academics, athletics, and the arts, schools throughout Maine offer programs to encourage environmental responsibility, civic engagement, and community service. I am so proud that every Veterans Day and Memorial Day, schools throughout my State hold assemblies to honor the men and women of their communities who served our Nation and defended our freedom.

Our schools have become so much more than places where children are taught. From nutritious meals to health and emotional support services, public schools play a vital role in the lives of our young people.

Education has been described as “not the filling of a pail, but the lighting of a flame.” We are fortunate to have many keepers of the precious flame of learning throughout our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to join Senator TESTER and me in recognizing them during Public Schools Week.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the founding of the International Baccalaureate, which has made significant contributions to educating students around the world.

In 2018, the IB celebrates 50 years of a curriculum that prioritizes critical thinking skills with a focus on international mindfulness. This organization pioneered a movement of international education in 1968 that now offers four high-quality, diverse and challenging educational program for students aged 3 to 19 years old. Through a unique curriculum of high academic standards, the IB program emphasizes

critical thinking and flexibility of learning by intertwining disciplines across cultural and national boundaries. The IB currently works with more than 1.4 million students in over 4,775 schools in 153 countries.

The IB's founders sought to create a program with a multinational approach to scholarship that would help young people develop the skills, values, and knowledge necessary to build a more peaceful future. The program inspires young people to become lifelong learners, using their energy, conviction, and positivity to engage with increasingly complex and interconnected global issues. Its program is highly respected, as the best universities in the world actively seek out IB students because of their experience with IB's crossdisciplinary and crosscultural approach. IB alumni are equipped with the skills and mindset needed to succeed and to approach challenges in innovative and effective ways.

The International Baccalaureate is one of the world's leading educational initiatives. I am honored that the IB Global Centre is located in Maryland and am delighted to recognize IB's achievements and the profound contributions it has made to education throughout the world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING CARMEN RODRIGUEZ

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today, with a heavy heart, I wish to pay tribute to Carmen Rodriguez, a wonderful leader, role model, and family woman. Sadly, Mrs. Rodriguez passed away on January 22, 2018—her 83rd birthday. She will be remembered for her outstanding public service, particularly her advocacy of Hartford's Puerto Rican community.

Mrs. Rodriguez was born in Aguirre, PR, where she lived until she moved to Buffalo, NY, with her husband, Faustino, and their seven children. She became an active member of the Puerto Rican community there, serving as a member of the Puerto Rican Center, as well as the director of bilingual education at Public School 76, now known as the Herman Badillo Bilingual Academy. During her time in Buffalo, Carmen worked tirelessly on her own education, obtaining her GED, a bachelor's degree from Rosary Hill College, a master's in education from the State University of New York at Buffalo, and began her PhD.

She took her passion for learning and educating to Hartford, CT, in 1979, where she managed the Work Places program at the Hartford Board of Education, which helped students learn specific trades. Soon after, she began working for the deputy mayor to measure the efficiency of the program. Subsequently, she supervised Hartford

Housing Authority's tenant education program for a decade. For 3 years, Carmen served as the executive director of La Casa de Puerto Rico, until retiring in 1994.

Her legacy of extraordinary service and dedication to her community shines clearly through the many people she affected, as well as through her children's unflinching efforts to uphold their mother's progress. I have seen this firsthand as two of Carmen's children, Maria and Raul, served in the Office of the Connecticut Attorney General during my tenure as attorney general.

Carmen is known by many of us throughout Connecticut as an invaluable supporter of Hartford's best interests and a fearless leader of the Puerto Rican community. Her passion to use politics to initiate change has left her town—as well as the entire State—with great hope for the future.

My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our deepest sympathies to Carmen's family during this difficult time, particularly to her 7 children, 15 grandchildren, and 8 great-grandchildren. May their many wonderful memories of Carmen provide them solace and comfort in the days ahead.●

REMEMBERING CHARLES PENCE SLICHTER

● Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the remarkable life of Charles Pence Slichter, a University of Illinois professor emeritus of physics and of chemistry, who died on Monday, February 19, 2018, in Boulder, CO, at the age of 94.

Slichter was a pioneer in the development and application of nuclear magnetic resonance, NMR, spectroscopy to elucidate the structure and behavior of matter at the atomic scale and a renowned expert on superconductivity. Slichter's seminal contributions to the fields of condensed matter physics and chemistry have been recognized with numerous awards, including the 2007 National Medal of Science.

Slichter is revered at the University of Illinois, where he served on the faculty for 57 years, for his fostering of the "Urbana style," a way of tackling longstanding scientific problems by a combination of theory and experiment that emphasizes close interdisciplinary collaboration and mutual respect. Known by everyone for his brilliant smiles, infectious enthusiasm, and trademark bowties, Slichter exemplified science at its finest: creative, rigorous, curious, and scrupulously honest. His inspired teaching trained generations of American physicists and chemists and, through them, enabled a host of modern technologies.

NMR studies atomic nuclei by probing them with radio waves and measuring their response. The nuclei respond only when the radio waves are

tuned to specific resonance frequencies, which depend on both the properties of the nuclei and their local magnetic field. The measured spectrum of resonance frequencies, as well as the time dynamics of the resonance response, gives information about the local environment of the nuclei. Magnetic resonance imaging, MRI, widely used in medicine, is an extension of NMR that enables 2D and 3D images to be reconstructed from NMR spectra.

Slichter pioneered many fundamental techniques in NMR. He was a codiscoverer, with H.S. Gutowsky and D.W. McCall, of indirect spin-spin coupling, known as J-coupling, in molecules. This phenomenon enables structural information about molecules to be deduced from their NMR spectrum and is a key analytical tool in modern chemistry. With T.R. Carver, Slichter performed the first dynamic polarization of nuclei using electron spins. Dynamic nuclear polarization can be used to increase the sensitivity of NMR dramatically, enabling the study of more complex molecules and smaller samples. Extensions of the technique are used to determine aspects of molecular structure or to provide a method of operation for the three-level maser, a microwave-frequency precursor to the laser.

Slichter and his student L.C. Hebel performed the first NMR studies on superconductors, materials in which electric current can flow without resistance. This was a major feat in itself because superconductors exclude the magnetic fields and radiowaves used to perform NMR spectroscopy. The results of their experiments are recognized as the first proof of the electron-pairing concept central to the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer, BCS, theory of superconductivity, which was developed concurrently, also at the University of Illinois, and was honored with the 1972 Nobel Prize in Physics. Slichter conceived of the experiment while listening to a presentation from Bardeen, and the analysis was carried out with substantial collaboration from the BCS authors, even while they raced to prepare their own theoretical work. This strong collaborative interaction between theory and experiment typified the "Urbana style" of research, and Slichter played an important role in setting this tone for colleagues. Another research "first" of Slichter's, the measurement of the Pauli spin susceptibility, came after a chance hallway meeting with colleague David Pines, who had just derived a more precise theoretical model for the effect, but lamented to Slichter that "no one can measure it." Slichter, who had worked on some related problems as a graduate student, replied, "David, I know how to measure it," and the experimental results were published shortly thereafter.

Other notable research achievements include discoveries on the behavior of

high-temperature superconductors, fundamental studies of metal surfaces for catalysis, the introduction of phase sensitive detection to pulsed NMR, the theory of chemical exchange and its effects on NMR spectra, studies of charge density waves and the Kondo effect, and the theory of chemical shifts in fluorine.

At the University of Illinois, Slichter directed the research of 63 doctoral students and more than 15 postdoctoral researchers, including Nobel laureate Sir Peter Mansfield, coinventor with Paul Lauterbur of MRI. Slichter's textbook, *Principles of Magnetic Resonance*, now in its third edition, has trained students around the world for nearly 60 years. Slichter said in 2004, "I really love doing physics; the personal connection is the way I love to do it. If I were not in a university setting, I would have to find students to work with."

Slichter's contributions to science were not limited to the laboratory and the classroom. He served the Nation with distinction as a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee from 1965 to 1969; the President's Committee on the National Medal of Science from 1969 to 1974; the President's Committee on Science and Technology Policy in 1976; and the National Science Board from 1975 to 1984. In 1975, Slichter chaired a delegation of U.S. solid-state physicists selected by the National Academy of Sciences in an initiative to open scientific exchanges with the People's Republic of China. On this trip, he met his future wife, Anne FitzGerald, who worked for the National Academy of Sciences and acted as translator for the U.S. delegation.

In academia, Slichter served for 25 years from 1970 to 1995 as a fellow of the seven-member Harvard Corporation, Harvard University's highest governing body, including 10 years as senior fellow. He chaired the selection committee that chose Neil Rudenstine as the president of Harvard in 1991. Slichter was the president of the International Society of Magnetic Resonance from 1986 to 1989. His service to U.S. industry included membership on the board of directors of Polaroid from 1975 to 1995, and on science advisory committees to IBM from 1978 to 1993, and United Technologies from 1972 to 1982.

Among his many honors and awards are the National Medal of Science in 2007; the Comstock Prize, shared with E.L. Hahn, of the National Academy of Sciences in 1993; the Irving Langmuir Prize in Chemical Physics in 1969 and the Oliver E. Buckley Prize in Condensed Matter Physics in 1996 from the American Physical Society; the Citation for Chemical Breakthrough Award, shared with H.S. Gutowsky and D.W. McCall, from the American Chemical Society in 2016; and the Triennial

Prize of the International Society of Magnetic Resonance in 1986. He received honorary doctor of science degrees from the University of Waterloo in 1993 and the University of Leipzig in 2010 and an honorary doctor of laws degree from Harvard University in 1996. He was elected a member of the National Academy of Sciences in 1967, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1969, and the American Philosophical Society in 1971.

Sir Anthony J. Leggett, Nobel laureate and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Professor and Center for Advanced Study Professor of Physics at the University of Illinois, described Slichter as “a towering figure in condensed matter physics, on both the national and international stage. He was a warm and supportive figure in the Urbana physics department right up to his last years.”

University of Illinois emeritus professor Gordon Baym said, “Charlie was a remarkable colleague, one of the last of the great physicists of the postwar generation. He was always intellectually curious and remarkably wise. At the same time he was a great human being, amazingly encouraging and supportive of his colleagues, students, and friends, whether young or old. Just seeing his warm smile would brighten everyone’s day.”

Head of the University of Illinois Department of Physics and professor Dale Van Harlingen said, “Charlie Slichter was a legend, a role model, and a friend to everyone who ever had the opportunity to meet him. His passion for good science, his contagious kindness, and his remarkable energy has inspired me throughout my career, and I think everyone else at the University of Illinois and beyond. In many ways, Charlie has best defined the Urbana style that characterizes the culture and spirit of the Department of Physics at Illinois through his stellar contributions in NMR that have significantly impacted our understanding of condensed matter physics, especially superconductivity, and the chemistry of materials, his excellence in teaching and mentoring of students, and his unparalleled warmth and friendliness. He is truly one of the great scholars and gentlemen of our generation. Charlie has made a lasting impression on all of us—he will be missed but never forgotten.”

Slichter was born on January 21, 1924, in Ithaca, NY, to Sumner Huber Slichter, a labor economist who became the first Lamont University Professor at Harvard University, and Ada—nee Pence—Slichter. Slichter was named after his paternal grandfather, Charles Sumner Slichter, a noted professor of applied mathematics and dean of the graduate school at the University of Wisconsin. His maternal grandfather, William David Pence, was a professor of railway engineering at the

University of Wisconsin. From a young age, Slichter was interested in science and mathematics. It was his senior-year physics course at the Browne & Nichols School in Cambridge, MA, that made it clear, without a doubt, that he wanted to be a physicist.

Slichter studied physics at Harvard University, receiving his A.B. in 1946; M.A. in 1947; and Ph.D. in 1949 degrees there. During World War II, while an undergraduate at Harvard, he worked as a research assistant at the Underwater Explosives Research Laboratory at Woods Hole, MA, where he constructed oscilloscopes, an experience that prepared him for his doctoral research with Edward Purcell, who led the group at Harvard that codiscovered nuclear magnetic resonance. Slichter was his third graduate student, beginning research with Purcell shortly after that discovery.

Slichter came to the University of Illinois in 1949 as an instructor, recruited by then-department head F. Wheeler Loomis as an integral part of an effort to build a world-class faculty in the emerging field of solid-state physics. Slichter was appointed assistant professor 2 years later and quickly rose through the ranks to full professor in 1955. At Illinois, he held additional professorial appointments at the Center for Advanced Study from 1968 to 1997 and the Department of Chemistry from 1986 to 1997. After his retirement in 1996, Slichter maintained an active research program at Illinois, holding an appointment as research professor of physics and continuing to advise graduate students from 1997 to 2006.

Slichter is survived by his wife, Anne FitzGerald Slichter, of Champaign, IL; by his children William Almy Slichter of Minneapolis, MN; Jacob Huber Slichter of Brooklyn, NY; Ann Thayer Slichter of Los Angeles, CA; Daniel Huber Slichter of Boulder, CO; and David Pence Slichter of Binghamton, NY; and by his grandchildren, Sarah Thayer Slichter of Kingston, NY; Thayer Ellery Slichter and Lila Mackinnon Slichter of Minneapolis, MN; and Trevor Hagar Slichter and Isabela Hagar Slichter of Boulder, CO. He was preceded in death by his son Sumner Pence Slichter, policy director for U.S. Senator Russ Feingold. He is also survived by his first wife, Gertrude Thayer Almy of Mitchellville, MD, who is the mother of Sumner, William, Jacob, and Ann.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages

from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 9, 2018, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 294. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the “Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building”.

H.R. 452. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the “Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office”.

H.R. 1208. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the “Converse Veterans Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1858. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the “Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office”.

H.R. 1988. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the “Merle Haggard Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2254. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the “Janet Capello Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2302. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the “Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office”.

H.R. 2464. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the “John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office”.

H.R. 2672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the “Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office”.

H.R. 2815. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the “Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office”.

H.R. 2873. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the “Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building”.

H.R. 3109. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the “Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building”.

H.R. 3369. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the “Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office”.

H.R. 3638. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the "Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building".

H.R. 3655. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the "Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building".

H.R. 3821. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the "Zack T. Addington Post Office".

H.R. 3893. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the "Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 4042. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building".

H.R. 4285. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, as the "James C. "Billy" Johnson Post Office Building".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4545. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Agriculture, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4546. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lipochitooligosaccharide (LCO) SP104; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9973-39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4547. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Kasugamycin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9972-96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluopicolide; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9973-44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4549. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Defense Production Act Annual Fund Report for Fiscal Year 2017"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4550. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the re-

port of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustments" ((RIN1029-AC75) (Docket ID OSM-2017-0012)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4551. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Washington: Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 9974-35-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4552. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Revision to References for Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Sector to Incorporate Latest Edition of Certain Industry, Consensus-based Standards; Withdrawal" (FRL No. 9975-19-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4553. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Plans; Pennsylvania; Lebanon County 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard Determination of Attainment" (FRL No. 9975-00-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4554. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources; Amendments" (FRL No. 9975-10-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4555. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs" (FRL No. 9975-32-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4556. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revisions to the Regulatory Definition of Volatile Organic Compound" (FRL No. 9975-37-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4557. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of the 2015 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone; Nonattainment Area Classifications Approach" (FRL No. 9975-23-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on

March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4558. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Amendment to Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone" (FRL No. 9975-13-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4559. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Delta, Ohio Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9975-46-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4560. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Logan Airport Parking Freeze" (FRL No. 9974-96-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4561. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (P.L. 102-1) for the November 9, 2017-January 8, 2018 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 292. A bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1091. A bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment:

S. 2278. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve health care in rural areas.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 2532. A bill to make demonstration grants to eligible local educational agencies or consortia of eligible local educational agencies for the purpose of increasing the numbers of school nurses in public elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2533. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to allow National Health Service Corps members to provide obligated service as behavioral and mental health professionals at schools, other community-based settings, or patient homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2534. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit individuals who are eligible for assistance under a Department of Defense educational assistance program or authority to use such tuition assistance for licensing and certification programs offered by entities other than an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2535. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to strengthen Drug Enforcement Administration discretion in setting opioid quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2536. A bill to make daylight savings time permanent for the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2537. A bill to make daylight savings time permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 2538. A bill to prohibit an increase in duties on imports of steel and aluminum; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 430. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 9, 2018, as a national day of remembrance in honor of the life, legacy, and many accomplishments of Billy Frank, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 431. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "International Parental Child Abduction Month" and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 432. A resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Con-

gressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 283

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

S. 422

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 422, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 482

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 482, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to use only human-based methods for training members of the Armed Forces in the treatment of severe combat injuries, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance

backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 781

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 811

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 811, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 974

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 974, a bill to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the timely entry of lower-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1292, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes.

S. 1419

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1419, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1942

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1942, a bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1945, a bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

S. 1995

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1995, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, and for other purposes.

S. 2006

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2006, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2178

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2178, a bill to require the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency to make open recommendations of Inspectors General publicly available, and for other purposes.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2244

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2244, a bill to create opportunities for women in the aviation industry.

S. 2268

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2268, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modify certain provisions relating to the capital financing of historically Black colleges and universities.

S. 2272

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2272, a bill to amend the Revised Statutes to grant State attorneys general the ability to issue subpoenas to investigate suspected violations of State laws that are applicable to national banks.

S. 2324

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2324, a bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes.

S. 2416

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2416, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 37, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services for certain benefits.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and

penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2455

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2455, a bill to encourage United States-Ukraine cybersecurity cooperation and require a report regarding such cooperation, and for other purposes.

S. 2461

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2461, a bill to allow for judicial review of certain final rules relating to national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with the rules by existing sources.

S. 2488

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2488, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to exclude the receipt of basic allowance for housing for members of the Armed Forces in determining eligibility for certain Federal benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 2494

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2494, a bill to provide standards for short-term limited duration health insurance policies.

S. 2495

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2495, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2507

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Georgia

(Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2507, a bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such coverage at the option of the enrollees.

S. 2513

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to improve school safety and mental health services.

S. RES. 376

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 376, a resolution urging the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh to ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2018, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

S. RES. 407

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 407, a resolution recognizing the critical work of human rights defenders in promoting human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and good governance.

S. RES. 426

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 426, a resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

AMENDMENT NO. 2047

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2047 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2133

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2133 intended to be

proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2139

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2139 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2179

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2179 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2180

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2180 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2535. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to strengthen Drug Enforcement Administration discretion in setting opioid quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2535

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Opioid Quota Reform Act".

SEC. 2. STRENGTHENING CONSIDERATIONS FOR DEA OPIOID QUOTAS.

Section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 826) is amended—

(1) in the last sentence of subsection (a), by striking " and not in terms of individual pharmaceutical dosage forms prepared from or containing such a controlled substance"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(i)(1) In fixing and adjusting production and manufacturing quotas under this section for fentanyl, oxycodone, hydrocodone, oxycodone, and hydromorphone, the Attorney General shall consider the impact of the production and manufacturing quotas on

overall public health and rates of diversion, abuse, and overdose deaths related to these controlled substances in the United States. Any of the considerations in this subsection or in subsection (a) may be used to determine changes to levels of such production and manufacturing quotas in a given year.

"(2)(A) For any year in which the approved production quota for fentanyl, oxycodone, hydrocodone, oxycodone, or hydromorphone is higher than the approved production quota for the substance in the previous year, the Attorney General shall include in its final order an explanation of why the public health benefits of increasing such quota outweigh the consequences of having an increased volume of such substance available for sale, and potential diversion, in the United States.

"(B) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall provide to the Caucus on International Narcotics Control, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Energy and Commerce, and Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the following information with regard to each of the substances described in subparagraph (A):

"(i) An anonymized count of the total number of manufacturers issued individual manufacturing quotas that year for that substance.

"(ii) A count of how many such manufacturers were issued an approved manufacturing quota that was higher than the quota issued to that manufacturer for that substance in the previous year.

"(3) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on how the Attorney General will ensure that the annual process of fixing and adjusting production and manufacturing quotas under this section takes into consideration—

"(A) efforts to reduce the costs, injuries, and deaths associated with the diversion and abuse of prescription opioids and heroin, including changes in the accepted medical use of certain controlled substances; and

"(B) data collection and evaluation of the volume of controlled substances that are diverted and collected from approved drug collection receptacles, mail-back programs, and take-back events."

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 2538. A bill to prohibit an increase in duties on imports of steel and aluminum; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, when these ill-conceived tariffs were announced last week, I said I would introduce legislation that would immediately nullify this very unfortunate exercise in protectionism before it could wreak havoc on our economy.

If implemented, these tariffs will do just what tariffs have always done. They will lead to job losses and will stymie economic growth. What is worse, the President's attempt at flexibility in the form of poorly defined exceptions only serves to harm the economy further by creating uncertainty. Tariffs are bad enough on their own; tariffs married with uncertainty are even worse.

Can you imagine the President saying one day, "Well, I think that Australia is moving in ways that we think are good in this area or that, so I am going to lessen the tariffs that we impose on steel and aluminum for Australia"? The next day it is Brazil. "If it does this or that that is unrelated to these tariffs, I might lift tariffs or lessen the burden of tariffs on that country." Yet, a week later, if Brazil makes another move, the President might seek to reimpose or to make the burden heavier. That simply doesn't work if you are trying to achieve economic growth and if you are trying to convince countries to enter into trade partnerships with you. Particularly when you are dealing with our allies, that is no way to treat your allies.

I understand free trade is sometimes a challenge. I understand that it is a challenge on the campaign trail, certainly. It is often easier to point to a shuttered factory and blame trade or immigration or some other convenient scapegoat other than what is usually the case—modernization or mechanization or something that has meant that we have increased productivity or simply the best allocation capital in order to facilitate trade.

We have to aggressively negotiate both bilateral and multilateral trade deals if we are to catch up. If we fail to do this and continue to withdraw from the global marketplace, we are going to be left far behind. We saw this with regard to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. We pulled out of those negotiations, and the other 11 countries involved simply went on their own and left us behind. That has meant, in particular, countries in Southeast Asia, which would like to be a part of our trade orbit, have had no choice but to be more reliant on China. That doesn't serve our interests at all.

We have to remember we represent just 20 percent of the world's economic output. We represent just 5 percent of the world's population or just less than that. If we don't trade, we don't grow. You can be pro-growth or you can be pro-tariff, but you can't be both.

Those who have reservations about these tariffs ought to support this legislation that I am introducing today to nullify the tariffs. Those who have expressed admiration for free trade or supply-side economics ought to support this bill as well. Those who are happy with the economic growth that we have recently achieved and are interested in seeing it continue ought to support this bill. We now have a better climate for economic growth on both the regulatory side and the tax side. If we enter a trade war, we risk reversing those gains we have made.

We in Congress cannot be complicit as this administration courts economic disaster in this fashion. I urge my colleagues to join me in exercising our constitutional oversight and to invalidate these irresponsible tariffs.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 430—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 9, 2018, AS A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE, LEGACY, AND MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BILLY FRANK, JR.

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 430

Whereas, in the 1850s, the United States Government signed a series of treaties with Washington State Tribes under which the Tribes granted millions of acres of land to the United States in exchange for the establishment of reservations and the recognition of traditional hunting, fishing, and gathering rights;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., was born to Willie Frank, Sr., and Angeline Frank on March 9, 1931, at Frank's Landing on the banks of the Nisqually River in Washington State;

Whereas the tireless efforts and dedication of Billy Frank, Jr., led to a historic legal victory that ensured that the United States would honor promises made in treaties with the Washington Tribes;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., was first arrested in December of 1945, at the age of 14, for fishing for salmon in the Nisqually River;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., was subsequently arrested more than 50 times for exercising his treaty-protected right to fish for salmon;

Whereas over the years, Billy Frank, Jr., and other Tribal members staged "fish-ins" that often placed the protestors in danger of being arrested or attacked;

Whereas during these fish-ins, Billy Frank, Jr., and others demanded that they be allowed to fish in historically Tribal waters, a right the Nisqually had reserved in the Treaty of Medicine Creek;

Whereas declining salmon runs in Washington waters resulted in increased arrests of Tribal members exercising their fishing rights under the Treaty of Medicine Creek;

Whereas, on February 12, 1974, in the case of *United States v. Washington*, Judge George Hugo Boldt of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington issued a decision that affirmed the right of Washington treaty Tribes to take up to half of the harvestable salmon in western Washington, reaffirmed Tribal treaty-reserved rights, and established the Tribes as co-managers of the salmon resource;

Whereas the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the Boldt decision;

Whereas after the Boldt decision, Billy Frank, Jr., continued his fight to protect natural resources, salmon, and a healthy environment;

Whereas the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, where Billy Frank, Jr., served as chairman, assists its 20 member Tribes in managing fisheries and works to establish relationships with State agencies and non-Indian groups to restore and protect habitats, and protect Tribal treaty rights;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., refused to be bitter in the face of jail, racism, and abuse, and his influence was felt not just in Washington State but around the world;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., was awarded the Albert Schweitzer Prize for Humanitarianism, the Common Cause Award for Human Rights Efforts, the American Indian Distinguished Service Award, the Washington State Environmental Excellence Award, and the Wallace Stegner Award for his years of service and dedication to his battle;

Whereas, in 2015, Billy Frank, Jr., was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Barack Obama;

Whereas, in 2015, Congress passed the Billy Frank Jr. Tell Your Story Act (Public Law 114-101), renaming the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge in honor of Billy Frank, Jr., and establishing a national memorial at nearby McAllister Creek, where the Medicine Creek Treaty was signed in 1854 between the United States Government and the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Squaxin Island Tribes;

Whereas the legacy of Billy Frank, Jr., will live on in stories, in memories, and every time a Tribal member exercises his or her right to harvest salmon in Washington State; and

Whereas the legacy of Billy Frank, Jr., continues to inspire those still around today and those still to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports a national day of remembrance in honor of the life, legacy, and many accomplishments of Billy Frank, Jr.

SENATE RESOLUTION 431—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF "INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION MONTH" AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD RAISE AWARENESS OF THE HARM CAUSED BY INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 431

Whereas thousands of children in the United States have been abducted from the United States by parents, separating those children from their parents who remain in the United States;

Whereas it is illegal under section 1204 of title 18, United States Code, to remove, or attempt to remove, a child from the United States or retain a child (who has been in the United States) outside of the United States with the intent to obstruct the lawful exercise of parental rights;

Whereas more than 600 children experienced international parental child abduction during 2015;

Whereas, during 2016, 1 or more cases of international parental child abduction involving children who are citizens of the United States were identified in 106 countries around the world;

Whereas the United States is a party to the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at the Hague October 25, 1980 (TIAS 11670) (referred to in this preamble as the "Hague Convention on Abduction"), which—

(1) supports the prompt return of wrongly removed or retained children; and

(2) calls for all participating parties to respect parental custody rights;

Whereas a significant number of children who were abducted from the United States have yet to be reunited with their custodial parents;

Whereas, during 2016, 13 countries were identified under the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) as engaging in a pattern of noncompliance;

Whereas, during the 20-year period ending on the date of enactment of this resolution, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has provided assistance for more than 6,000 international family abduction cases involving children wrongfully removed from or retained outside of the United States;

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that family abduction—

(1) is a form of child abuse with potentially “devastating consequences for a child”, that may include negative impacts on the physical and mental well-being of the child; and

(2) can cause a child to “experience a loss of community and stability, leading to loneliness, anger, and fear of abandonment”;

Whereas, according to the 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by the Department of State, research shows that an abducted child is at risk of significant short- and long-term problems, including “anxiety, eating problems, nightmares, mood swings, sleep disturbances, [and] aggressive behavior”;

Whereas international parental child abduction has devastating emotional consequences not only for the child but also for the parent from whom the child is separated;

Whereas the United States has a history of promoting child welfare through institutions including—

(1) in the Department of Health and Human Services—

(A) the Administration for Children and Families; and

(B) the Children’s Bureau; and

(2) in the Department of State, the Office of Children’s Issues;

Whereas Congress has signaled a commitment to ending international parental child abduction by enacting the International Child Abduction Remedies Act (22 U.S.C. 9001 et seq.), the International Parental Kidnapping Crime Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-173; 107 Stat. 1998), and the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.);

Whereas, in 2012, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 543, 112th Congress, agreed to December 4, 2012, which—

(1) condemned international parental child abduction;

(2) urged countries identified by the Department of State as noncompliant with the Hague Convention on Abduction to fulfill the commitment those countries made to implement the Hague Convention on Abduction; and

(3) expressed the sense of the Senate that the United States should—

(A) pursue the return, by all appropriate means, of each child abducted by a parent to another country;

(B) if a child is abducted by a parent and not returned to the United States, facilitate access to the abducted child for the parent remaining in the United States; and

(C) where appropriate, seek the extradition of the parent that abducted the child;

Whereas all 50 States and the District of Columbia have enacted laws criminalizing parental kidnapping;

Whereas, in 2016, the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children’s Issues of the Department of State—

(1) fielded 2,537 inquiries from the general public relating to preventing a child from being removed from the United States; and

(2) enrolled 4,087 children in the Children’s Passport Issuance Alert Program, which—

(A) is one of the most important tools of the Department of State for preventing international parental child abduction; and

(B) allows the Office of Children’s Issues to contact the enrolling parent or legal guardian to verify whether the parental consent requirement has been met when a passport application has been submitted for an enrolled child;

Whereas, the Department of State cannot track the ultimate destination of a child through the use of the passport of the child issued by the Department of State if the child is transported to a third country after departing from the United States;

Whereas a child who is a citizen of the United States may have another nationality and may travel using a passport issued by another country, which—

(1) increases the difficulty in determining the whereabouts of the child; and

(2) makes efforts to prevent abductions all the more critical;

Whereas, in 2016, the Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children’s Issues of the Department of State, enrolled 131 children in a program aimed at preventing international parental child abduction;

Whereas, the Department of State, through the International Visitor Leadership Program and related initiatives with global partners of the United States, has reduced the number of children who have been reported abducted from the United States by 25 percent during the past 2 years; and

Whereas the United States should continue to play a leadership role in raising awareness about the devastating impacts of international parental child abduction by educating the public about the negative emotional, psychological, and physical consequences to children and parents victimized by international parental child abduction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes and observes “International Parental Child Abduction Month” during the period beginning on April 1, 2018, and ending on May 1, 2018, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, international parental child abduction.

SENATE RESOLUTION 432—CONGRATULATING THE BALTIC STATES OF ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR DECLARATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 432

Whereas, in 1918, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania declared their independence on February 24, November 18, and February 16, respectively, as sovereign, democratic countries;

Whereas, on July 28, 1922, the United States formally recognized Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as independent countries;

Whereas the United States refused to recognize the Soviet Union’s forcible incorporation of the Baltic states;

Whereas, in August 1991, the Baltic states regained their de facto independence from the Soviet Union, and on September 2, 1991, President George H.W. Bush recognized the restoration of their independence, reestablishing full diplomatic relations between the United States and Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania several days later;

Whereas, in the United States, communities of Baltic descent have contributed significantly to American culture, prosperity, and security and have helped strengthen United States relations with the Baltic states;

Whereas relations between the United States and Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have developed into a robust partnership based on shared values and principles, including respect for the rule of law, human rights, freedom of speech, and free trade;

Whereas Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have shown their resolve as responsible and dedicated members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) by contributing to regional and global security, including to operations in Afghanistan;

Whereas the Baltic states have been leaders in addressing and combatting 21st century security threats, exemplified by their active leadership and advancement of the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence in Estonia, the NATO Strategic Communications Center of Excellence in Latvia, and the NATO Energy Security Center of Excellence in Lithuania; and

Whereas Russia’s continued aggressive and provocative actions against its neighboring countries, including violations of sovereign Baltic airspace, test both the region and the NATO alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence;

(2) commends the people and Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania for their successful reforms and remarkable economic growth since 1991;

(3) applauds the productive partnership the United States enjoys with the Baltic states in many spheres, including NATO;

(4) recognizes the determination of the Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to strengthen transatlantic security through defense spending and host nation support for NATO deployments;

(5) recognizes the commitment among the Baltic states to further respect for the values of democracy and human rights within their own countries and abroad; and

(6) reiterates the continued support of Congress for the European Deterrence Initiative as a means for enhancing deterrence and increasing military capabilities on NATO’s eastern flank.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2192. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HETKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2193. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2194. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2195. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2196. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2197. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2198. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2199. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2200. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2201. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2202. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2203. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2204. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2205. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2206. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2207. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2208. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2152 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DON-

NELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2192. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 105, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 106, line 7, and insert the following:

“(B) what constitutes appropriate proof.”.

SA 2193. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 402.

SA 2194. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN NON-SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENTS IN THE CAPITAL OF UNCONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828), as amended by section 403(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(bb) TREATMENT OF NONSIGNIFICANT INVESTMENTS IN THE CAPITAL OF UNCONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—For purposes of the final rules titled ‘Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule’ (78 Fed. Reg. 62018; published Oct. 11, 2013 and 79 Fed. Reg. 20754; published April 14, 2014) and any other regulation which incorporates a definition of the term ‘nonsignificant investments in the capital of unconsolidated financial institutions’, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall provide that investments in trust preferred securities (pooled and individual instruments) by a depository institution with assets of less than \$15,000,000,000 as of July 21, 2010, or a depository institution holding company with assets of less than \$15,000,000,000 as of July 21, 2010, shall not be subject to deduc-

tion from the regulatory capital of such depository institution or depository institution holding company or any depository institution holding company of such an institution, provided such investments were held prior to July 21, 2010.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO BASEL III CAPITAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than the end of the 3-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall amend the final rules titled “Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule” (78 Fed. Reg. 62018; published Oct. 11, 2013 and 79 Fed. Reg. 20754; published April 14, 2014) to implement the amendments made by this Act.

SA 2195. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RESTORING MAIN STREET INVESTOR PROTECTION AND CONFIDENCE.

(a) SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT OF 1970 AMENDMENTS.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(b)(3) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78eee(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEE AND ATTORNEY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the court issues a protective decree under paragraph (1), such court shall forthwith appoint, as trustee for the liquidation of the business of the debtor and as attorney for the trustee, such persons as the court determines best fit to serve as trustee and as attorney from among the persons selected by the Commission pursuant to subparagraph (B). The persons appointed as trustee and as attorney for the trustee may be associated with the same firm.

“(B) COMMISSION CANDIDATES.—The Commission shall maintain a list of candidates for the position of trustee and attorney for the trustee for a debtor in a liquidation proceedings, and shall periodically update the list, as appropriate. With respect to a debtor and upon the court issuing a protective decree under paragraph (1), the Commission shall forthwith provide the court with such list.

“(C) DISINTEREST REQUIREMENT.—No person may be appointed to serve as trustee or attorney for the trustee if such person is not disinterested within the meaning of paragraph (6), except that for any specified purpose other than to represent a trustee in conducting a liquidation proceeding, the trustee may, with the approval of SIPC and the court, employ an attorney who is not disinterested.

“(D) QUALIFICATION.—A trustee appointed under this paragraph shall qualify by filing a bond in the manner prescribed by section 322 of title 11, United States Code, except that neither SIPC nor any employee of SIPC shall

be required to file a bond when appointed as trustee.

“(E) PROHIBITION ON TRUSTEE SERVING IN MULTIPLE LIQUIDATIONS.—A trustee may not be appointed under this paragraph if the trustee is currently serving as trustee for the liquidation of the business of another debtor under this Act.”.

(B) COMPENSATION FOR TRUSTEE AND ATTORNEY.—Section 5(b)(5) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78eee(b)(5)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by adding at the end the following: “The court shall publicly disclose all such allowances that are granted.”;

(ii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) AWARDING OF ALLOWANCES.—Whenever an application for allowances is filed pursuant to subparagraph (B), the court shall determine the amount of allowances, giving due consideration to the nature, extent, and value of the services rendered.”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) SIPC DISCLOSURES.—SIPC shall issue quarterly public reports on—

“(i) all payments made by SIPC to the trustee;

“(ii) all other costs in connection with the liquidation proceeding, including legal and accounting costs; and

“(iii) all additional expenses incurred by SIPC, and the nature of such expenses.”.

(C) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall apply with respect to trustees and attorneys appointed after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) DEFINITION OF CUSTOMER STATUS.—Section 16(2)(B) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78lll(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) any person that had cash or securities that were converted or otherwise misappropriated by the debtor (or any person that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with the debtor, if such person was operating through the debtor), irrespective of whether the debtor held or otherwise had custody, possession, or control of such cash or securities; and

“(v) any other person that the Commission, in its discretion and without any need for court approval, deems a customer of the debtor.”.

(3) COMMISSION AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE SIPC ACTION.—Section 11(b) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78ggg(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) COMMISSION AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE SIPC ACTION.—In the event of the refusal of SIPC to commit its funds or otherwise to act for the protection of customers of any member of SIPC, the Commission may require SIPC to discharge its obligations under this Act without court approval.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—Except as provided under subsection (a)(1)(C), the amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a liquidation proceeding under the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78aaa et seq.) that—

(1) was in progress on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) is initiated after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2196. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, line 20, strike “subcontractor” and insert “contractor”.

On page 73, line 23, strike “The” and insert “In accordance with section 1106 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1306), the”.

On page 75, line 23, insert “and any additional privacy and data security requirements that the Commissioner may require,” before “with respect to”.

On page 76, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(5) Any other declaration, as determined necessary by the Commissioner.

On page 76, beginning on line 21, strike “in section 106” and all that follows through line 23 and insert the following: “for purposes of section 3504 of title 44, United States Code, and must comply with any other requirements for obtaining the electronic consent of the individual that the Commissioner may require.”.

On page 77, line 11, insert “electronic signature processes and” before “the database”.

On page 78, line 5, insert “, and the Commissioner may (in addition to any action taken by such agencies) suspend or terminate the provision of fraud protection data under this section to any permitted entity that violates this section or its certification under this section” before the period.

On page 78, lines 7 and 8, by striking “, pursuant to an audit described in paragraph (1).”.

SA 2197. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401(f), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), insert after “Regulations,” the following: “or any intermediate holding company that meets the requirements under section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to a foreign banking organization (as defined in section 211.21 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations) that has been identified as a global systemically important bank by the Financial Stability Board.”.

Strike section 401(g).

SA 2198. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL.

The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by that Act are restored or revived as if the Act had not been enacted.

SA 2199. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CUSTOMER PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency”—

(i) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(ii) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(B) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “depository institution”—

(i) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(ii) includes an insured credit union.

(C) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(2) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer, or a group of customers, unless—

(i) the agency has a valid reason for the request or order; and

(ii) the reason described in clause (i) is not based solely on reputation risk to the depository institution.

(B) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency has a belief described in clause (ii) of this subparagraph, that belief shall be deemed to satisfy the requirement under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a request or order described in that subparagraph.

(ii) BELIEF OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREAT.—A belief described in this clause is a belief by an appropriate Federal banking agency that a specific customer, or a group of customers, is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity that—

(I) poses a threat to national security;

(II) is involved in terrorist financing;

(III) is an agency of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the state sponsor of terrorism list;

(IV) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country described in subclause (III); or

(V) does business with any entity described in subclause (III) or (IV), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer, or group of customers, has exercised due diligence to avoid doing business with any such entity.

(3) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders that a depository institution terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, the appropriate Federal banking agency shall provide—

(i) the request or order to the depository institution in writing; and

(ii) along with the request or order provided under clause (i), a written justification for why the termination is needed, including any specific law or regulation that the appropriate Federal banking agency believes the customer, or group of customers, is violating, if any.

(B) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification provided under subparagraph (A)(ii) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution to which the justification is provided.

(4) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(A) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination provided by the appropriate Federal banking agency under paragraph (3)(A)(ii).

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(i) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, based on a belief that the customer, or group of customers, poses a threat to national security, or is otherwise described in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination of the account or accounts, as applicable.

(ii) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under subparagraph (A) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution that is required to provide the notice nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination of the account or accounts, as applicable.

(5) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall submit to Congress an annual report that contains—

(A) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered that a depository institution terminate during the year covered by the report;

(B) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making the requests and orders described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) the frequency with which the agency relied on each legal authority described in subparagraph (B).

SA 2200. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL

(for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CUSTOMER PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency”—

(i) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(ii) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(B) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “depository institution”—

(i) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(ii) includes an insured credit union.

(C) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(2) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer, or a group of customers, unless—

(i) the agency has a valid reason for the request or order; and

(ii) the reason described in clause (i) is not based solely on reputation risk to the depository institution.

(B) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency has a belief described in clause (ii) of this subparagraph, that belief shall be deemed to satisfy the requirement under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a request or order described in that subparagraph.

(ii) BELIEF OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREAT.—A belief described in this clause is a belief by an appropriate Federal banking agency that a specific customer, or a group of customers, is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity that—

(I) poses a threat to national security;

(II) is involved in terrorist financing;

(III) is an agency of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the state sponsor of terrorism list;

(IV) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country described in subclause (III); or

(V) does business with any entity described in subclause (III) or (IV), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer, or group of customers, has exercised due diligence to avoid doing business with any such entity.

(3) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally re-

quests or orders that a depository institution terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, the appropriate Federal banking agency shall provide—

(i) the request or order to the depository institution in writing; and

(ii) along with the request or order provided under clause (i), a written justification for why the termination is needed, including any specific law or regulation that the appropriate Federal banking agency believes the customer, or group of customers, is violating, if any.

(B) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification provided under subparagraph (A)(ii) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution to which the justification is provided.

(4) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(A) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination provided by the appropriate Federal banking agency under paragraph (3)(A)(ii).

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(i) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, based on a belief that the customer, or group of customers, poses a threat to national security, or is otherwise described in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination of the account or accounts, as applicable.

(ii) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under subparagraph (A) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution that is required to provide the notice nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination of the account or accounts, as applicable.

(5) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall submit to Congress an annual report that contains—

(A) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered that a depository institution terminate during the year covered by the report;

(B) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making the requests and orders described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) the frequency with which the agency relied on each legal authority described in subparagraph (B).

SA 2201. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2018”.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.**—Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

“Sec.

“801. Congressional review.

“802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.

“803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.

“804. Definitions.

“805. Judicial review.

“806. Exemption for monetary policy.

“807. Effective date of certain rules.

“§ 801. Congressional review

“(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

“(i) a copy of the rule;

“(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

“(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 804(2);

“(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

“(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

“(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

“(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

“(ii) the agency’s actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

“(iii) the agency’s actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

“(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

“(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing com-

mittee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency’s compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

“(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General’s report under subparagraph (A).

“(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

“(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

“(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

“(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

“(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

“(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

“(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

“(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

“(C) necessary for national security; or

“(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

“(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

“(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

“(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

“(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the

date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

“(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

“(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

“(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

“(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

“(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

“(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

“(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

“§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

“(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

“(A) bears no preamble;

“(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): ‘Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____’;

“(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): ‘That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____’; and

“(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

“(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

“(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

“(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a

joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

“(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

“(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

“(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

“(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

“(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

“(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

“(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

“§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

“(a) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

“(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring

and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

“(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

“(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

“(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

“(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

“(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

“(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

“(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

“§ 804. Definitions

“For purposes of this chapter:

“(1) The term ‘Federal agency’ means—

“(A) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

“(B) the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency;

“(C) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

“(D) the National Credit Union Administration;

“(E) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

“(F) the Commodity Futures Trading Commission;

“(G) the Federal Housing Finance Agency;

“(H) the Farm Credit Administration; and

“(I) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

“(2) The term ‘major rule’ means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

“(A) an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more;

“(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

“(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

“(3) The term ‘nonmajor rule’ means any rule that is not a major rule.

“(4) The term ‘rule’ has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

“(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

“(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

“(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

“(5) The term ‘submission or publication date’, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

“(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

“(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

“(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

“(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

“§ 805. Judicial review

“(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

“(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

“(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

“§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

“Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

“§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

“Notwithstanding section 801—

“(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

“(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.”.

(d) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES

CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.”.

(e) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(B) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(C) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SA 2202. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FAIR ATM FEES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER ACT.—Section 904(d)(3) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693b(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

“(A) FEE DISCLOSURE.—”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) REGULATION OF FEES.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall require—

“(i) any fee charged by an automated teller machine operator for a transaction conducted at that automated teller machine to bear a reasonable relation to the cost of processing the transaction, and in no case shall any such fee exceed \$2.00; and

“(ii) any fee charged by a financial institution for a transaction conducted at an automated teller machine to bear a reasonable relation to the cost of processing the transaction by the financial institution, and in no case shall any such fee exceed \$2.00.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section.

SA 2203. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote eco-

nomie growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON ERRORS BY CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall submit to Congress a report on the errors made by consumer reporting agencies that damage the credit of consumers.

SA 2204. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REQUIREMENT OF BANKS THAT RECEIVE TAXPAYER-FUNDED BAILOUTS TO DISCHARGE STUDENT LOAN DEBT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any bank that receives a taxpayer-funded bailout similar to the relief provided under the Troubled Asset Relief Program established under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) shall discharge any student loan debt held by the bank.

SA 2205. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . VISITORIAL POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The sixth undesignated paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 484) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)—

“(i) lawfully authorized State auditors and examiners may, at reasonable times and upon reasonable notice to a bank, review its records solely to ensure compliance with applicable State unclaimed property or escheat laws upon reasonable cause to believe that the bank has failed to comply with such laws;

“(ii) an attorney general (or other chief law enforcement officer) of a State may issue subpoenas or administer oversight and examination to national banks or officers of national banks based upon reasonable cause to believe that the national bank or an officer of a national bank has failed to comply with applicable State laws; and

“(iii) national banks shall submit to an attorney general (or other chief law enforcement officer) of a State aggregate loan data, types of products, any other information that the national bank determines is appropriate for each State.”.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on how many enforcement actions could have been initiated after the financial crisis if State attorneys general had visitorial powers.

SEC. _____. REQUIREMENT OF BANKS THAT RECEIVE TAXPAYER-FUNDED BAILOUTS TO DISCHARGE STUDENT LOAN DEBT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any bank that receives a taxpayer-funded bailout similar to the relief provided under the Troubled Asset Relief Program established under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) shall discharge any student loan debt held by the bank.

SA 2206. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF FIDUCIARY RULE OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

The final rule of the Department of Labor entitled "Definition of the Term 'Fiduciary'; Conflict of Interest Rule—Retirement Investment Advice", published April 8, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 20946), shall have no force or effect.

SA 2207. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 106, strike lines 1 through 7.

SA 2208. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2152 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FAIR AND ACCURATE INFORMATION REPORTING FOR CONSUMERS.

(a) **FREE AND EASY ACCESS TO PERSONAL DATA.**—Section 612(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) **ONLINE CONSUMER PORTAL.**—

"(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall develop an online consumer portal that gives each consumer—

"(I) unlimited free access to—

"(aa) the consumer report of the consumer;

"(bb) the means by which the consumer may exercise the rights of the consumer

under subparagraph (E) and section 604(e)(2)(B);

"(cc) the ability to initiate a dispute with the consumer reporting agency regarding the accuracy or completeness of any information in a report in accordance with section 623(a)(3);

"(dd) the ability to freeze a consumer report for free;

"(ee) if the consumer reporting agency offers a product to consumers to prevent access to the consumer report of the consumer for the purpose of preventing identity theft, a disclosure to the consumer regarding the differences between that product and a credit freeze; and

"(ff) information on who has accessed the consumer report of the consumer and for what permissible purpose the consumer report was furnished in accordance with section 604 and section 609; and

"(II) access to a free, annual credit score of the consumer in accordance with section 609(f)(7)(A).

"(ii) **NO WAIVER.**—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) may not require a consumer to waive any legal or privacy rights to access—

"(I) a portal established under this subparagraph; or

"(II) any of the services described in subclauses (I) or (II) of clause (i) that are provided through a portal established under this subparagraph.

"(iii) **NO ADVERTISING OR SOLICITATIONS.**—A portal established under this subparagraph may not contain any advertising, marketing offers, or other solicitations.

"(E) **OPT-OUT OPTIONS.**—

"(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If a consumer reporting agency sells or shares consumer information in a manner that is not a consumer report, the consumer reporting agency shall provide each consumer with a clear, free method, through a website, by phone, or in writing, by which the consumer may elect not to have the information of the consumer so sold or shared.

"(ii) **NO EXPIRATION.**—An election made by a consumer under regulations promulgated under clause (i) shall expire on the date on which the consumer expressly revokes the election through a website, by phone, or in writing."

(b) **ACCURACY IN CREDIT REPORTS.**—Section 607 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681e) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) **ENSURING ACCURACY.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Whenever a consumer reporting agency prepares a consumer report it shall follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of the information concerning the individual about whom the report relates.

"(2) **MATCHING.**—In assuring the maximum possible accuracy under paragraph (1), each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall ensure that, when including information in the file of a consumer, the consumer reporting agency matches all 9 digits of the social security number of the consumer with the information that the consumer reporting agency is including in the file.

"(3) **PERIODIC AUDITS.**—Each consumer reporting agency shall perform periodic audits on a representative sample of consumer reports to check for accuracy."

(c) **IMPROVED DISPUTE PROCESS FOR CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.**—

(1) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF FURNISHERS OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.**—Section 623(a)(8)(F)(i)(II) of the Fair

Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(8)(F)(i)(II)) is amended by inserting "and does not include any new or additional information that would be relevant to a re-investigation" before the period at the end.

(2) **FTC OMBUDSPERSON.**—Section 611(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) **FTC OMBUDSPERSON.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Federal Trade Commission shall create the position of ombudsperson for the purpose of resolving persistent errors that are not resolved in a timely manner by a consumer reporting agency or addressing violations of paragraph (5).

"(B) **CIVIL FINES.**—The ombudsperson described in subparagraph (A) may levy a civil fine of not more than \$3,500 per violation on a consumer reporting agency if the consumer reporting agency repeatedly fails to resolve disputes in a timely manner or to comply with paragraph (5)."

(3) **PROVISION AND CONSIDERATION OF DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY CONSUMERS.**—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 611 (15 U.S.C. 1681i)—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

"(D) **OBLIGATIONS OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES RELATING TO REINVESTIGATIONS.**—

Commensurate with the volume and complexity of disputes about which a consumer reporting agency receives notice, or reasonably anticipates to receive notice, under this paragraph, each consumer reporting agency shall—

"(i) maintain sufficient personnel to conduct reinvestigations of those disputes; and

"(ii) provide training with respect to the personnel described in clause (i).";

(II) in paragraph (2)—

(aa) in subparagraph (A), in the second sentence, by inserting "including all documentation provided by the consumer" after "received from the consumer or reseller"; and

(bb) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "including all documentation provided by the consumer," after "from the consumer or the reseller";

(III) in paragraph (4), by inserting "including all documentation," after "relevant information"; and

(IV) in paragraph (6)(B)—

(aa) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

"(iii) a description of the actions taken by the consumer reporting agency regarding the dispute;

"(iv) if applicable, contact information for any furnisher involved in responding to the dispute and a description of the role played by the furnisher in the reinvestigation process;

"(v) a description of the results of the dispute, including if applicable the specific modification or deletion of information that was made to the file of the consumer following the reinvestigation; and

"(vi) the options available to the consumer if the consumer is dissatisfied with the result, including—

"(I) submitting documents in support of the dispute;

"(II) adding a consumer statement to the file;

"(III) filing a dispute with the furnisher; and

"(IV) submitting a complaint against the consumer reporting agency or furnishers

through the consumer complaint database of the Bureau, the ombudsperson of the Federal Trade Commission, or the State attorney general for the State in which the consumer resides.”;

(ii) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) NOTIFICATION OF DELETION OF INFORMATION.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall communicate with other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p) to ensure that a dispute initiated with one consumer reporting agency is reflected in a file maintained by the other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p).”;

(iii) in subsection (f)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting “, including all documentation,” after “relevant information”; and

(B) in section 623 (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2)—

(i) in subsection (a)(8)(E), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) review and consider all relevant information, including all documentation, provided by the consumer with the notice;”; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(1), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) review and consider all relevant information, including all documentation, provided by the consumer reporting agency under section 611(a)(2).”;

(4) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 616 (15 U.S.C. 1681n)—

(i) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting “(a) DAMAGES.—”;

(ii) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

“(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party costs and reasonable attorney’s fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.”; and

(B) in section 617 (15 U.S.C. 1681o)—

(i) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting “(a) DAMAGES.—”;

(ii) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(iii) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

“(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party costs and reasonable attorney’s fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.”.

(5) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 615(h)(8) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)(8)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section” and inserting “subsection”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “This section” and inserting “This subsection”.

(d) INCREASED TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) DISCLOSURES TO CONSUMERS.—Section 609 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end; and

(ii) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) the address and telephone number of the person; and

“(iii) the permissible purpose of the person for obtaining the consumer report, including the specific type of credit product that is extended, reviewed, or collected, as described in section 604(a)(3)(A).”;

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) by amending paragraph (7)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) supply the consumer with a credit score through the portal established under section 612(a)(1)(D) or as requested by the consumer, as applicable, that—

“(i) is derived from a credit scoring model that is widely distributed to users by the consumer reporting agency for the purpose of any extension of credit or other transaction designated by the consumer who is requesting the credit score; or

“(ii) is widely distributed to lenders of common consumer loan products and predicts the future credit behavior of the consumer; and”; and

(ii) in paragraph (8), by inserting “, except that a credit score shall be provided free of charge to the consumer if requested in connection with a free annual consumer report described in section 612(a)” before the period at the end; and

(C) in subsection (g)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “subparagraph (D)” and inserting “subparagraph (C)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “consistent with subparagraph (C)”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively.

(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) ADVERSE INFORMATION NOTIFICATION.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 612 (15 U.S.C. 1681j), by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) FREE DISCLOSURE AFTER NOTICE OF ADVERSE ACTION OR OFFER OF CREDIT ON MATERIALLY LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which a consumer reporting agency receives a notification under subsection (a)(2) or (h)(6) of section 615, or from a debt collection agency affiliated with the consumer reporting agency, the consumer reporting agency shall make, without charge to the consumer, all disclosures required in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Bureau.”; and

(ii) in section 615(a) (15 U.S.C. 1681m(a))—

(I) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(II) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report that was used in the decision to take the adverse action to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b);”; and

(III) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—

(aa) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “of the consumer’s right”;

(bb) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) that the consumer shall receive a copy of the consumer report with respect to

the consumer, free of charge, from the consumer reporting agency that furnished the consumer report; and”; and

(cc) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “of the right of the consumer” before “to dispute”.

(B) NOTIFICATION IN CASES OF LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—Section 615(h) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;

(iii) in paragraph (5)(C), by striking “may obtain” and inserting “shall receive”;

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (7), (8), and (9), respectively; and

(v) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) REPORTS PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS.—A person who uses a consumer report as described in paragraph (1) shall notify and direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b).”.

(C) NOTIFICATION OF SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS OF NEGATIVE INFORMATION.—Section 623(a)(7)(A)(ii) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(7)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking “account, or customer” and inserting “or account”.

(3) REGULATORY REFORM.—Section 621 of the Federal Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY REGISTRY.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Federal Trade Commission shall establish a publicly available registry of consumer reporting agencies that includes—

“(A) each consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis;

“(B) each nationwide specialty consumer reporting agency;

“(C) all other consumer reporting agencies that are not included under section 603(p) or 603(x); and

“(D) links to any relevant websites.

“(2) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—Each consumer reporting agency shall register with a registry established by the Federal Trade Commission under this subsection in a timeframe established by the Commission.”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Jason Klitenic, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, dated March 12, 2018.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of Jason Klitenic, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), until the ODNI and the Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (IC IG) provide fulsome responses to questions posed and documents requested concerning the Acting IC IG’s

efforts to terminate the Executive Director for Intelligence Community Whistleblowing and Source Protection and to hamstring the whistleblower protection program in the intelligence community.

To be clear, I have no concerns regarding Mr. Klitenic's capabilities or qualifications, and ultimately no intent of withholding my support for him as soon as this matter is resolved.

On November 29, 2017, I sent a letter to ODNI Director Daniel Coats and to Acting IC IG Wayne Stone noting disturbing allegations my office received that the IC IG was moving to terminate the Executive Director as part of an effort to significantly weaken the IC IG's role in ensuring consistent and effective whistleblower protections throughout the intelligence community. I requested that the offices seek to preserve all information contained in the Executive Director's office, much of which concerned highly sensitive protected disclosures made by individuals within the intelligence community, as well as allegations of wrongdoing against senior officials within the IC IG. I also sought all documents related to the IC IG's efforts to place the Executive Director on administrative leave and pursue personnel action against him. At that time, I informed the Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that I would object to any unanimous consent request to confirm Mr. Klitenic until I received an answer to my letter. To date, I have received no response.

Since that time, the IC IG has indeed moved to terminate the Executive Director, and I have continued to receive reports that this process has been marked by significant irregularities, conflicts of interest, and ongoing efforts to "stack the decks" in hiring prior to the arrival of a new permanent, Senate-confirmed head of that office, who rightfully should have the authority to make such decisions. Moreover I have reason to believe these latest efforts may be a direct response to displeasure within the IC IG with Congress's exercise of its constitutional responsibility to provide fully informed advice and consent with respect to the President's nomination of a permanent IG. If true, such behavior is totally unacceptable. It is an affront not only to this institution but to the President's prerogative to choose nominees, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to lead the agencies under his authority. On the contrary, I would note that there is no independent authority anywhere in the Constitution granted to freewheeling bureaucrats.

Based on these ongoing concerns, Senator RON WYDEN joined me in sending a letter on March 6, 2018 to Director Coats following up on my original letter and seeking a stay of any personnel action against the Executive Di-

rector until Congress has an opportunity to review this action and fully understand exactly how the IC IG is, or is not, appropriately administering the IC whistleblowing program. Until we have answers, I will object to Mr. Klitenic's confirmation.

RETURN OF PAPERS REQUEST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate request the return of the papers with respect to H.R. 1207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 13; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2155. Finally, I ask that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postclosure on amendment No. 2151, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:49 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

KIMBERLY BREIER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 20, 2020, VICE ADOLFO A. FRANCO, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KIMBERLY BREIER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (WESTERN HEMISPHERE AFFAIRS), VICE ROBERTA S. JACOBSON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DALLAS L. CARLSON, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PAUL WARD, RETIRED.

SONYA K. CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CONRAD ERNEST CANDELARIA, RESIGNED.

GREGORY ALLYN FOREST, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT

OF NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KELLY MCDADE NESBIT, RETIRED.

BRENDAN O. HEFFNER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KENNETH P. BOHAC, RESIGNED.

BRADLEY A. MAXWELL, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DON SLAZINIK, RETIRED.

THEODOR G. SHORT, OF MAINE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE NOEL CULVER MARCH, RESIGNING.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

DENNIS DEAN KIRK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD FOR THE TERM OF SEVEN YEARS EXPIRING MARCH 1, 2023, VICE SUSAN TSUI GRUNDMANN, TERM EXPIRED.

DENNIS DEAN KIRK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD, VICE SUSAN TSUI GRUNDMANN.

ANDREW F. MAUNZ, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD FOR THE TERM OF SEVEN YEARS EXPIRING MARCH 1, 2025, VICE MARK A. ROBBINS, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DANIEL T. LASICA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK H. BERRY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SCOTT A. STEARNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GREGORY N. TODD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK J. MOURISKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN S. LEMMON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. EILEEN H. LAUBACHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RONALD C. COPLEY
REAR ADM. (LH) KATHLEEN M. CREIGHTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN K. COREY
REAR ADM. (LH) LORIN C. SELBY
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHNNY R. WOLFE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5149:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DARSE E. CRANDALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ANN H. DUFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KRISTEN B. FABRY
CAPT. JOSEPH D. NOBLE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN W. KORKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN NANCY S. LACORE
CAPTAIN THEODORE P. LECLAIR
CAPTAIN ERIC C. RUTTENBERG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN HEIDI K. BERG
CAPTAIN MICHAEL A. BROOKES
CAPTAIN WILLIAM E. CHASE III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN J. ADAMETZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. THOMAS J. ANDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN JAMES A. AIKEN
CAPTAIN RICHARD J. CHEESEMAN, JR.
CAPTAIN CRAIG A. CLAPPERTON
CAPTAIN KEITH B. DAVIDS
CAPTAIN JOSEPH A. DIGUARDO, JR.
CAPTAIN LEONARD C. DOLLAGA
CAPTAIN CHRISTOPHER S. GRAY
CAPTAIN JOHN E. GUMBLETON
CAPTAIN JAMES A. KIRK
CAPTAIN TIMOTHY J. KOTT
CAPTAIN FREDRICK R. LUCHTMAN
CAPTAIN BRENDAN R. MCLANE
CAPTAIN SCOTT W. PAPPANO
CAPTAIN RYAN B. SCHOLL
CAPTAIN LANCE G. SCOTT
CAPTAIN PHILIP E. SOBECK
CAPTAIN JOHN D. SPENCER
CAPTAIN DOUGLAS C. VERISSIMO
CAPTAIN GEORGE M. WIKOFF

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN J. MORRIS
MIN S. RO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER M. BELL
ADRIANA B. DEJULIO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

MIKAL L. STONER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

TODD M. YOSICK

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEFFREY G. BENTSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

NANA K. APPIAWIAH
DALE F. BUTLER
YIBO CHEN
ASHTON H. GOLDMAN
JOSEPH P. HARMON
MOFEI LIU
VICTOR M. MARWIN
BRANDON E. PRIORESCHI
ASHLIE N. WHITE
JOHNATHAN F. WILLIAMS
AUSTIN R. YOUNGER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

TUYVAN NGUYEN, OF TEXAS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MICHAEL CALVERT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
JOSEPH CARREIRO, OF VIRGINIA
SHAKIR FARSAKH, OF NEW YORK
PAUL FROST, OF TEXAS
JEFFREY GEIGER, OF VIRGINIA
TYLER HACKING, OF WISCONSIN
DANIEL LEW, OF CALIFORNIA
ARLENE MAYEDA, OF VIRGINIA
ALLISON MELLO, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL MIDDLETON, OF VERMONT
RANDOLPH MOORE, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL MUTH, OF FLORIDA
PAUL OLIVA, OF CALIFORNIA
CHARLES PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RHONDA SINKFIELD, OF GEORGIA
MICHELE SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE WERNER, OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KYLE BARNETT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ROBERT BAKER, OF VIRGINIA
KITISRI SUKHAPINDA, OF VIRGINIA
DAMIEN FELTON, OF WISCONSIN
ANDREW EDLEFSEN, OF NEVADA
LAURA HAMMEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JENNIFER WOODS, OF WASHINGTON
BRAEDEN YOUNG, OF VIRGINIA
PETER MEHRVARI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARVIN SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BENJAMIN THOMAS ARDELL, OF CALIFORNIA
JORGE MARCELO ARELLANO, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL R. BAILEY, OF WASHINGTON
ABINET Y. BELACHEW, OF VIRGINIA
AARON JAMES BENNETT, OF CALIFORNIA
TEFFERA M. BETRU, OF COLORADO
NINA R. BOWEN, OF ALASKA
WILLIAM EDWIN BRADLEY, OF MINNESOTA
SOPHIA BREWER, OF OKLAHOMA
AMBER B. BROOKS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREA P. CAPELLAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
SANDRO CARRILLO, OF TEXAS
MELISSA RICKE CHIPILI, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MATT CURTIS, OF CALIFORNIA
MARY ELIZABETH DE BOER, OF OHIO
KEVIN ZACHARY DEAN, OF NEW YORK
KRISTA A. DESGRANGES ELKHAMRI, OF FLORIDA
NIKHIL M. DIVECHA, OF MARYLAND
JAIME L. DOMINGUEZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARY O. EDWARDS, OF FLORIDA
MELANIE LOVE EDWARDS, OF OREGON

KEISHA L. EFFIOM, OF MARYLAND
ALEI H. ELDORRY, OF VIRGINIA
KATRINA ERDAHL, OF VIRGINIA
ARMANDO ESPINOSA, OF MARYLAND
JOHN ROBERT EZELL, OF CALIFORNIA
SARA KATHERINE FARNSWORTH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PAUL FIGUEROA, OF NEW MEXICO
RACHEL ELIZABETH GOLDSTEIN, OF CALIFORNIA
RAYMOND E. GRANT, OF VIRGINIA
AMINA HALIDOU GUEYE, OF TEXAS
DEBRA L. GUEYE, OF VIRGINIA
SHARON M. GULICK, OF MARYLAND
CHERRY M. GUMAPAS, OF WASHINGTON
BETHANY ANN HABERER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREW T. HABLE, OF ILLINOIS
AMY MELISSA HAMELIN, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH JEAN HARRISON, OF MARYLAND
MARK ADAM HENDERSON, OF FLORIDA
DANIEL RUSSELL HICKS, OF VIRGINIA
CHUNG WEI HUANG, OF MISSOURI
BENJAMIN H. ISQUITH, OF WASHINGTON
DEBBIE PATRICE JACKSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
GARY C. JAHN, OF VIRGINIA
RAYMUND JOHN JOHANSEN, OF NEVADA
ADAM CHRISTOPHER JUNG, OF OREGON
DAVID F. KAUPER, OF CALIFORNIA
STEFANIE K. KENDALL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHELLE S. KIM, OF CALIFORNIA
RICHARD E. KIMBALL, OF VIRGINIA
SAMUEL E. KRAEGEL, OF FLORIDA
SINU KURIAN, OF NEW YORK
ALEXANDER C. LANE, OF CALIFORNIA
JOSEPH LEINWEBER, OF ILLINOIS
ANDREW ALAN LUCAS, OF COLORADO
KIMBERLY LYNN LUDWIG, OF NEVADA
ERIK ANDRIS MARKOV, OF MARYLAND
ROBIN MORRISON MARTZ, OF FLORIDA
SAIT MBOOB, OF TENNESSEE
MICHAEL A. MCBROOM, OF MICHIGAN
EDITH I. MCCLINTOCK, OF WASHINGTON
DONALD MCCUBBIN, OF MARYLAND
ROBERT CALVIN MCKENNEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
AMY ELIZABETH MCQUADE, OF TEXAS
PATRICIA JEPTOO MENGECH, OF TEXAS
EVAN MEYER, OF NEW YORK
ERIN MARIE MONE-MARQUEZ, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DANIEL MORRIS, OF NEW YORK
ADAM WESLEY NORIKANE, OF WASHINGTON
JENELLE M. NORIN, OF VIRGINIA
MAURICE O. OGUTU, OF ILLINOIS
RANDALL B. OLSON, OF MINNESOTA
JULIE R. OTA, OF OREGON
ROBERT EDWARD PIERCE, OF CALIFORNIA
CONOR JAMES POLITZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA
REBECCA MOANIKEALA ROBINSON, OF ARIZONA
PATRICK EDWARD ROBISON, OF FLORIDA
ALEXIS ROTTER, OF MARYLAND
ZAKI MOHAMAD SAAD, OF VIRGINIA
NATHAN N. SAGE, OF CONNECTICUT
CHRISTOPHER M. SCHAAN, OF NEVADA
BENJAMIN JEFFREY SCHAPIRO, OF FLORIDA
JOSEPH ALAN SCHIBEL, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN MATTHEW SCOTT, OF VIRGINIA
ROBIN SHARMA, OF FLORIDA
RITU W. SINGH, OF TEXAS
JEFFREY M. SKARIN, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK DELINDE SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL ANTHONY SMITH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSIE SNAZA, OF NEVADA
ADAM P. STEFAN, OF TENNESSEE
AMY L. M. STENOEN, OF MINNESOTA
ANDREA STONE, OF FLORIDA
ETHAN NATHANIEL TAKAHASHI, OF TEXAS
YASMEEN T. THOMASON, OF MARYLAND
JEFFREY D. TILTON, OF NEVADA
C. JESSICA TORRENS-SPENCE, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW K. UDZIELA, OF NORTH CAROLINA
ERUMIS MIGUEL URENA, OF UTAH
LUIS VELAZQUEZ, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINE VEVERKA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHERYL YVETTE VOISARD, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ANN WALLACE, OF CALIFORNIA
STACY L. WALLICK, OF LOUISIANA
ADAM JOSEPH WALSH, OF FLORIDA
KATHLEEN K. WEBB, OF MARYLAND
ANI H. ZAMGOCHIAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CLAUDE J. ZULLO, OF MARYLAND
ALEXANDER ZVINAKIS, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ABIGAIL MARIE NGUEMA, OF VIRGINIA

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 13, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 14

Time to be announced

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Business meeting to consider S. 526, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, S. 791, to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, S. 1538, to amend the Small Business Act to establish awareness of, and technical assistance for, the creation of employee stock ownership plans, S. 1961, to amend the Small Business Act to temporarily reauthorize certain pilot programs under the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, S. 1995, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, S. 2283, to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management within the Small Business Administration, S. 2419, to amend the Small Business Act to improve the technical and business assistance services under the SBIR and STTR programs, S. 2527, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies, and the nominations of David Christian Tryon, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, and Hannibal Ware, of the Virgin Islands, to be Inspector General, both of the Small Business Administration.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Parkland shooting and legislative proposals to improve school safety.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine rebuilding infrastructure in America, focusing on Administration perspectives.

SD-106

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine an original bill entitled, "the Agriculture Creates Real Employment (ACRE) Act".

SD-406

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy

To hold hearings to examine Somalia's current security and stability status.

SD-419

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.

SD-G50

Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules for the second session of the 115th Congress.

SD-215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy

To hold hearings to examine food security.

SD-419

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine opioids in Indian country.

SD-628

MARCH 15

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States Pacific Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Theodore J. Garrish, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Affairs), and James Edward Campos, of Nevada, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, both of the Department of Energy.

SD-366

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of State and redesign plans.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine perspectives on the 340B Drug Discount Program.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Joel M. Carson III, of New Mexico, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Colm F. Connolly, and Maryellen Noreika, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Delaware, William F. Jung, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Ryan T. Holte, of Ohio, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Jonathan F. Mitchell, of Washington, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, and William M. McSwain, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Matthew D. Harris, to be United States Marshal for the District of Utah, Johnny Lee Kuhlman, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Oklahoma, Joseph D. McClain, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Indiana, and David A. Weaver, to be United States Marshal for the District of Colorado, all of the Department of Justice.

SD-226

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Lieutenant General Paul M. Nakasone, to be Director of the National Security Agency, Department of Defense.

SH-216

MARCH 20

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SH-216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Marine Corps ground modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.	in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Fu- ture Years Defense Program.	POSTPONEMENTS
SR-232A	SR-222	MARCH 15
MARCH 21	Committee on Indian Affairs	10 a.m.
2:30 p.m.	To hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget re- quest for fiscal year 2019 for Indian Programs.	Committee on Energy and Natural Re- sources
Committee on Armed Services		To hold hearings to examine the Presi- dent's proposed budget request for fis- cal year 2019 for the Forest Service.
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces		SD-366
To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense policies and programs	SD-628	

SENATE—Tuesday, March 13, 2018

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we seek Your blessings this day for our lawmakers. You know their hearts, their motives, and their needs. Lord, provide for their needs out of the abundance of Your riches in glory. Remind them that unless You provide Your guidance, they labor in vain. So guide them in what they propose to accomplish so that they will reap a bountiful harvest. Hold them with Your mighty hand until doubts and fears subside.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SASSE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it has been less than 3 months since his-

toric tax reform became law. It has been less than 3 months since we have cut taxes significantly for middle-class families by lowering rates and increasing the standard deduction, since we created new deductions to help small businesses keep more of what they earn and purchase new equipment more easily, and since we leveled the playing field for American producers by making our corporate tax rates more competitive—a measure that mainstream economists agree will boost future wages for workers.

There is a common theme here. Each part of this bill was built on the simple idea that American workers, job creators, and middle-class families know best what to do with their own hard-earned money, and they ought to be able to keep more of it. It is a defining philosophy on our side of the aisle.

Our Democratic friends don't seem to share that notion. The Democratic leader in the House called these historic tax cuts “probably one of the worst bills in the history of the United States of America.”

In the Senate, my Democratic colleagues' predictions were equally dire. My friend the Democratic leader offered this assessment: “There is nothing about this bill that suits the needs of the American worker.”

Tax reform used to be a shared, bipartisan priority—apparently, not anymore. Now our Democratic friends seem fully committed to the notion that there is no problem Washington, DC, can't solve by raising taxes and imposing more regulations.

Just last week, my friend the Democratic leader made this clear. He announced that he wants to claw back tax reform and have Americans send more money to the IRS.

Here is his rationale: There are much better ways to use this money—much better ways to use this money than for people to keep more of their own money, apparently. The unspoken assumption is unmistakable: Democratic leaders know how to spend that money better than the citizens and employers. The government knows best.

Of course, just a few months in, we are getting a clear picture of which philosophy really works. The good news about tax reform keeps pouring in, and with every favorable story, my Democratic friends tie themselves in knots trying to convince everyone that new investments, new jobs, new raises and bonuses, and companies repatriating money back home are somehow not good news after all.

Even as billions of dollars are put toward raises, bonuses, and new worker

benefits, it is nothing more than “crumbs.” Even as billions more are invested in U.S. manufacturing and new jobs, they stick by their predictions of “Armageddon”—all of this, even as tax reform is achieving specific goals they spent years claiming to support.

Consider the issue of the minimum wage. Because of tax reform, Hormel Foods has raised starting pay to \$13, Wells Fargo has established a \$15 minimum wage, and Walmart has raised the starting wage for its associates. That is great, but, apparently, Senate Democrats have better uses for the money going forward than your raise.

Take the subject of family leave. Because of tax reform, including the family leave incentive championed by Senator FISCHER, huge national employers such as Starbucks and CVS are expanding paid family leave programs or creating new ones.

These new family leave programs are great, but I think Senate Democrats have other designs on the private dollars financing these programs. They have better uses in mind for the tax savings that are flowing to charities and nonprofits around the country, like the women's shelter in Washington State that is getting \$1 million toward a brand-new building.

Well, Republicans just don't see it that way. Rather than trying to regulate our way into prosperity through higher taxes and heavyhanded mandates, we believe in simply taking Washington's foot off the brake. Because we did, American free enterprise is creating the very pay raises and benefits that our Democratic colleagues insisted only government could provide.

My friends across the aisle may want to repeal the tax cuts that have generated these raises, bonuses, new jobs, new investments, minimum wage increases, and paid family leave expansions. They may want to raise taxes so badly that they are willing to shrink workers' paychecks and send jobs and investments back overseas. Fortunately, Republicans in Congress will not let that happen. We are standing with the American people.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2155, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2155) to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 2151, in the nature of a substitute. Crapo amendment No. 2152 (to amendment No. 2151), of a perfecting nature.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on September 5 of last year, President Trump announced the repeal of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. As a result of that decision by President Trump, hundreds of thousands of immigrants who came to the United States as children, known as Dreamers, face losing their work permits and their right to stay in America without deportation. They are threatened with being returned to countries that many of them barely remember, if at all.

These Dreamers were brought here as children—infants, toddlers, young kids—by their parents to America, and they grew up here. They went to school in America, to our public schools and other schools that were available to them. They stood up in their classrooms every morning and pledged allegiance to the flag. They grew up believing that this was their home.

At some point in their lives their parents pulled them aside and told them the bitter truth—that they were not legally in America, they were undocumented, and they were vulnerable. At any minute, a knock on the door or a stop on the highway could result in not only their deportation but the deportation of every member of their family. Growing up is tough enough for an adolescent. I can't imagine growing up with this shadow over me, wondering whether at any moment a misstep or being in the wrong place might mean that I would be sent from this country and that my parents would be sent with me, but they grew up with that reality and with that danger.

They did some extraordinary things. They not only prospered in America

and finished their education, they went on with great ambition, believing the day would come when they would get a chance to be part of this country.

Seventeen years ago, I introduced the Dream Act. The purpose of that bill was to give those young people a chance—a chance to earn their way to legal status, earn their way to citizenship. If they have a serious criminal record, they are gone and we want nothing to do with them. They had squandered any opportunity they had to be part of America's future. But if they were doing the right thing, leading a good life, working hard, finishing school, many of us believed they deserved a chance. In fact, at this point, 85 percent of Americans believe they deserve a chance, and that includes 60 percent of the people who voted for President Trump.

We have never passed the Dream Act and made it the law, but when I asked my former Senate colleague, President Obama, to see if there was something he could do by Executive order, he created DACA. DACA gave these young people a 2-year renewable protection. They had to pay a \$500 fee, submit themselves to a criminal background check, and if they passed it, they would end up with a temporary, renewable right to stay in America. About 800,000 came forward and did it.

There were many more who were eligible but scared—scared that turning over their family's information and their personal information to this government or any government could turn out badly. Can you blame them? They have lived their whole lives in fear that a highway stop or somebody being arrested next to them could mean they would have to leave the only country they had ever known. But 800,000 stepped up and said: We will do it. I encouraged them. I went to so many meetings in Chicago, around the State of Illinois, and around the country telling them that this DACA Program was for real and that the government was giving them a pledge that they would stand by them on a renewable basis because of President Obama's order.

The program was a huge success. As I mentioned, 800,000 signed up, and some even renewed. Then came the decision by President Trump to end the program. What he said was that by March 5 of this year, there would be no more DACA. Those who were protected could play out their temporary protection but no renewals.

That is where the issue stood for the longest time. Many of us decided that we needed to do something about it and to accept the President's challenge and create a law—a law that would provide protection for these young people. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Republican from South Carolina; Senator JEFF FLAKE, a Republican from Arizona; Senator CORY GARDNER, a Republican from Colorado; Senator MICHAEL BEN-

NET, a Democrat from Colorado; and Senator BOB MENENDEZ, a Democrat from New Jersey—we came together and decided on a bipartisan basis to draw up a bill to try to solve this problem, be fair to these young people, and give them a chance to stay in America and earn their way to citizenship. When we proposed the bill to President Trump, he rejected it. In fact, he rejected six different bipartisan proposals to solve this problem.

So the deadline was looming and passed last week on March 5, and the program, by the President's proclamation, would have been finished were it not for two Federal courts that intervened and said: No, Mr. President. You may have overstepped. You may have done more than you can legally do. So we are going to protect these Dreamers, these DACA young people, until we resolve the question on your constitutional authority to make that decision.

At the current moment, more than 700,000 of these young DACA recipients are protected by a court order that required that they reopen DACA eligibility for those whose DACA protection had expired, the 2-year temporary protection. Now tens of thousands of them are coming forward and applying for DACA renewal.

Last week I called Secretary Nielsen at the Department of Homeland Security and said: I have some questions that I am hearing as I travel around. For example, if I was protected by DACA and my protection came to an end and I am now reapplying for DACA and going to your agency, how long will it take your agency to process my application?

Secretary Nielsen could not give me an exact date, but there has been speculation that it could take 4 to 6 months. You see, there is a big backlog of cases, and it could take months before they process all those cases. That was my first question.

My second question: In that 4- to 6-month period, can these young DACA recipients be deported?

She said no. I put out an order, she said, that no one is to be deported if they made an application for DACA renewal.

I asked Secretary Nielsen: Can we have that in writing?

I will get back to you, she said.

I don't think that is too much to ask—whether these young people can be protected from deportation while they are applying for DACA renewal.

The third question: There is also a legal ability to work under DACA. Can you protect these young people's ability to have a job while you are processing their applications?

She didn't know whether she could. I have since learned that she has the authority to do that, but it is an important question, isn't it? If you happen to be one of these DACA recipients—the vast majority of them are actually

working, and most of them are in school or have graduated. They have to. They don't qualify for any Federal Pell grants or government loans, so they need to work to pay off their education. That is understandable.

So it is still uncertain as to what is going to happen. Then what happens when the court lifts this injunction, and what will be the future of these young people?

President Trump said some harsh things about immigration during the course of the Presidential campaign. We all remember his comments about people of the Muslim religion, his comments about Mexican rapists, and his pledge to build a big, beautiful wall from sea to shining sea and have Mexico pay for it. Do you remember? We all heard those things. But an interesting thing happened after he was elected: He started saying more moderate, positive things about Dreamers, to the point where I actually had some hope that this particular group would have a fighting chance. As of today, there is no indication that President Trump feels the same way. Six different bipartisan proposals have been rejected. So here we stand with this uncertainty.

When the issue came before the Senate, we did our best to put together a bipartisan rollcall. We came close but not close enough. There were 4 proposals on the floor, and the one with the largest number of votes received 54 votes. There were three Democrats who disagreed with some parts of it. I think we could have probably found a way to get their support. But we only had 8 Republicans who joined us—8 out of 51—to vote for the measure to deal with this issue. So it is still an unresolved issue at this moment as to what is going to happen after the court cases.

I have come to the floor many times—in fact, over 100 times—to tell the stories of these Dreamers, and I would like to do that today before I yield to the Democratic leader.

This is Maria Torres Mendoza. Maria is the 111th Dreamer I have featured here on the floor of the Senate. She came here to the United States from Mexico when she was 5 years old, and she grew up in the State of Washington. Her family didn't have much money, so she worked pretty hard. She used to deliver newspapers. She delivered 100 newspapers before school each morning. She worked odd jobs—shoveled snow, cut grass. When she was in high school, she worked as a server at a restaurant every day while she was still going to school, kept up with her studies, and delivered the newspapers in the morning. You can tell Maria is not a lazy person.

Because of her family's financial struggles, despite her best efforts, her family was homeless for some time. Through it all, she was an excellent

student, and despite her family difficulties, she graduated from high school with a 3.8 grade point average.

She didn't believe she would ever make it to college, but she did. She was accepted at Washington State University Tri-Cities. She is a senior now, and this spring, she will graduate with a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering and a minor in computer science. She is currently working as a student engineer at ATI Titanium and Specialty Alloys, a specialty parts manufacturer. Her main project is creating a system to facilitate the usage of AutoCAD drawings and manuals for engineering and maintenance. I hope none of my colleagues ask me to explain what I just said, but it sounds like pretty important work. What is her dream? She wants a master's degree in engineering. She is particularly interested in nuclear-powered mechatronics—the technology that combines electronics and mechanical engineering.

Maria wrote me a letter, and here is what it said:

DACA is a whole world of opportunities for me. If DACA were to be taken away from me, all my hard work would not count. I want to see the results of my hard work and I wouldn't be able to do so without DACA.

Would America be a better place if Maria was asked to leave? Would we be a stronger nation if we took this young girl's amazing energy, her academic accomplishment, and her dream and drive and sent them back to Mexico? After all these years, after education and hard work—two jobs at a time when she was in high school—is there any doubt that this young woman is going to be a spectacular success in life?

That is what this comes down to—real human beings, DACA recipients, protected by that Executive order of President Obama's, who are now under the threat of deportation because of President Trump's decision. It is a test of who we are as a nation, whether we believe in fairness and opportunity or whether we are going to walk away from our legacy. This is a nation of immigrants.

I stand before you proudly, the son of an immigrant to this country. My mother was brought here from Lithuania when she was 2 years old, and here her son stands as a Senator from the State of Illinois. That is my story, that is my family's story, and that is America's story.

It is time for us to remember Maria and the hundreds of thousands just like her who are asking for a chance to be part of our future.

Mr. President, is it possible that with all the things on your mind, you have forgotten DACA and the Dreamers?

We need President Trump to step up and lead.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

DACA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me thank my friend from Illinois, Senator DURBIN. There has been no more passionate, effective, strong, and consistent voice for the Dreamers, for those beautiful, young people who simply want to become Americans and contribute to America. He will never let this issue rest, nor will we. We are going to do everything we can to help the Dreamers. We hope President Trump finally sees it in his heart to actually get something done. We had a bipartisan agreement. It could have passed. It had some things we didn't like, and it had some things the other side didn't like, but President Trump, in one of the more inept acts in terms of legislating, blew the whole deal. We are going to keep working.

I thank my colleague from Illinois.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. President, as the Senate debates the banking bill, Americans are wondering if the Republican majority will ever move to take up the issue of gun safety. Tomorrow, thousands of students across the country—awakened students—will participate in a nationwide walkout to demand action. At 10 a.m. in high schools from one end of America to the other, students will walk out for 17 minutes in honor of the 17 who gave their lives at Stoneman Douglas High School, in solidarity. But they are not going to stop there; they are going to keep working and working and working until we get something done.

When the students walk out, what will this Senate, what will this Congress, what will our Republican friends be able to say? Nothing, because we will have done nothing in that time to address gun safety in a meaningful way.

The unfortunate reality is that it seems there is too little courage in the White House to take on the NRA. After sounding the right notes when the cameras were on, President Trump has backed away from everything but the policies to which the NRA gives its rubberstamp approval.

I am still amazed at this. I believe it was on the issue of age that the President criticized Senator TOOMEY at his televised meeting and told him not to be afraid of the NRA. He said he wasn't.

And what does the President do? He doesn't show one one-hundredth of the courage that Senator TOOMEY showed on guns.

Senator TOOMEY and I don't agree on much, and I would have gone further than he did in the checks bill that he and Senator MANCHIN put together, but he had the courage to buck the NRA.

President Trump, you have no courage to buck the NRA. You talk a good game, and then, when it comes to action, you are afraid to do anything—anything—that gets the NRA upset.

The NRA is so far away from where America is. Over 90 percent of America wants background checks. The NRA and Trump don't. A huge percentage—over 80 percent of gun owners—want background checks—comprehensive and universal background checks. President Trump and the NRA don't. The majority of Americans want protective orders so that if a family member or a friend or a teacher sees a young person acting like they are angry or upset and might do damage, their gun could be temporarily taken away. Most Americans want that. President Trump and the NRA don't, and neither do our Republican friends. The vast majority of Americans would like a debate on assault weapons—or certainly the majority. President Trump, the NRA, and our Republican majority don't.

Mr. President, why don't you retract what you said to Senator TOOMEY. Why don't you admit that he had more courage than you? Why don't you say that you are afraid of the NRA, because that is really what is going on here. No one is going to be taken in by nice words spoken in an hour in front of a TV camera when you then back off on anything. Of course, the plan was released Sunday night. They thought, hopefully, that it would get no news coverage, but it is still in the news.

Unfortunately, too many Republicans here on the Hill are in the same boat as President Trump, but not Senator TOOMEY. They want to appear as though they are doing something for gun safety but are only willing to support the smallest bore policies that the NRA gives a green light to. They say: OK, let's do these small things first; maybe we will do more later.

We all know the game here. Everyone sees what is going on. My friends on the other side don't dare support anything that the NRA opposes, even though the vast majority of Americans want them to. Our friends hope that we will pass something tiny, something small so that they can clap their hands and say they did something on gun violence and move on. The day they want to do something meaningful and real on gun safety never seems to come.

My friend the Senator from Texas—he is a good friend of mine. We banter in the gym almost every morning. I have worked with him on a number of issues. But he comes to the floor every day and says: Let's do the small Fix NICS bill, and then we will see about other proposals. He knows as well as I do that Fix NICS is not even close to enough of a response to the epidemic of gun violence in the country. He knows as well as I do that the NRA is OK with Fix NICS but not universal background checks.

Fix NICS only improves reporting within the existing background check system. The big loopholes that allow so many bad people, felons, and those ad-

judicated mentally ill to get guns—the gun show loophole, the online loophole—are not touched by Fix NICS.

I say to my good friend the senior Senator from Texas, when you are a doctor and you are sewing up a wound, you don't just do the first stitch and then walk away and say: We did something. No, you have to do the real job to cure the injury. I appreciate that my friend from Texas wants to pass this bill. Democrats support it. I am a cosponsor. But as a response to the spree of shootings in our schools, on our streets, in our churches, movie theaters, nightclubs, concerts, and on street corners every evening, a bill to repair just one tiny little aspect of the background check system is not sufficient.

A policy or an attitude that says that we cannot offend the NRA on anything will never, never, never help ameliorate our problem of gun violence to a sufficient extent.

As my colleague Senator MURPHY, Senator CORNYN's coauthor of Fix NICS, has said: "If we were to only debate the Fix NICS Act, we would be slamming the door in the face of all of these kids who are demanding change."

He said it perfectly.

Democrats are fighting to make sure that Fix NICS isn't our only response. I hope and pray that my Republican colleagues will find the courage to go beyond what the gun lobbyists tell them is OK and work with Democrats on real and significant gun safety legislation.

TRADE

Mr. President, now on another matter, this is a happy moment because many Democrats—certainly I—agree with the Trump administration when they blocked the proposed bid by the Singapore-based Broadcom to purchase the San Diego-based Qualcomm, on national security grounds.

Let me say this unequivocally: President Trump and his administration made the right decision on blocking Broadcom from taking over Qualcomm.

We all know that China has been rapacious about trade and very smart. They look for places where they can steal our best technology. They develop it there in China and keep us out of their markets and then try to flood the world with their products, sometimes dumping them. China has been rapacious about trade. Frankly, in my opinion, neither the Bush administration nor the Obama administration did enough. President Trump has a much better attitude.

One particular area of concern is how frequently foreign companies have sought controlling stakes in cutting-edge technology companies like Qualcomm. Qualcomm has done a great job, and they are leading the world in developing the 5G system. We need to preserve that as Americans because it has both economic and national security concerns.

As China seeks dominance in the semiconductor and wireless industries, the United States must be wary of attempts to acquire U.S. leaders in these industries. As to a foreign-controlled Broadcom, I don't know what the links are between Broadcom and China. I suspect there may be some, but China could move to take it over and, poof, the dominance that we would seek in 5G technology developed here would go away. It is a national security concern and an economic security concern.

We Democrats believe that the CFIUS model should extend not just to national security but to economic security. When China attempts to steal our best technology by buying American companies—whether it is robotics, AI, or chips on Qualcomm—we ought to block it.

China doesn't play fair. Lifetime President Xi hopes to dominate in the crown jewel of America's industries—the tech industries and others, where we dominate because we have been so good because we have taken immigrants, Mr. President, from around the world, and they helped develop these great things. We have to be wary of China—wary of China. To his credit, President Trump is more wary of China than the last five or six administrations, and I am glad he is. I am glad his administration is. It is just almost too late, but it is not yet.

It is no secret that President Trump and I share similar feelings on the issue of trade, particularly when it concerns China. I have often been critical of this administration—like I have been of previous administrations—when it fails to follow through on the President's rhetoric or misdirects its policies.

The recent steel and aluminum tariffs are an example of how the administration has the right instincts but bad execution. If properly calibrated, tariffs could be an effective tool to rein in China. China certainly dumps and has sought dominance in the steel and aluminum industries. Instead of targeting heavily subsidized Chinese steel and aluminum, the President has put in place across-the-board tariffs that would hurt many of our domestic industries. There was an article today about a Missouri ball bearing company that doesn't know where it is going to get its steel from. It hurts allies like Canada.

Canada makes its own steel and aluminum. We have a trade surplus with Canada. Putting Canada in the same boat as China is a huge mistake. That is why these tariffs—and I support the thrust of them—should have been more carefully targeted.

In contrast, the action on Qualcomm is targeted and effective in terms of protecting U.S. industry, and I urge the Trump administration to do more of these things. They will fill a hole that previous administrations failed to fill.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, finally, on Russia, we all know that the Republican majority on the House Intelligence Committee has ended its investigation into foreign interference in the 2016 elections. The House Republican majority on the Intelligence Committee has so discredited itself.

The report makes several assertions that are contradicted by already well-known facts. It says that Russia had no preference for Donald Trump in the 2016 elections. Remember, it is not just the intelligence community's assessment that the Russians were trying to elect Trump, but an independent grand jury—nonpolitical—in the special counsel's investigation concluded the same thing on the basis of evidence independently acquired and presented by the special counsel. By saying they disagree with the intelligence community's assessment that Russia interfered in the 2016 election to help Trump, Speaker RYAN and Chairman NUNES are closer to Putin's view than the view of the CIA, the FBI, the NSA, and the DNI—people in the administration.

It seems that there are no lengths to which Chairman NUNES and Speaker RYAN will not go to protect this White House, even when it damages America's security.

After Chairman NUNES's midnight run to the White House, his partisan memo, fake memo, and fake scandals about unmasking FBI text messages, no one should take this report seriously. I would say, to the vast majority of Americans, Chairman NUNES has discredited himself. He is much more of a partisan operative than a representative helping America be secure.

The House Republican majority has never taken this investigation seriously. From the very beginning, they have sought to distract and kick up dust. They have shown time and again that they are willing to put party before country—something our Founding Fathers warned against. They are willing to twist facts and ignore evidence about a foreign power attacking our democracy because it might cause political damage to the President. It is a shocking and shameful abdication of duty.

In my judgment, Chairman NUNES, you and your committee have made a shocking and shameful abdication of duty to America. A congressional party that is wholly subservient to the political interests of the President is failing fundamentally to fulfill its constitutional obligation. Congress is supposed to be a separate, equal branch of government. Read the Constitution. Read the Federalist Papers. One of the main purposes of Congress was to check the power of the executive branch. Our Founding Fathers feared an overreaching executive branch, as I know my friend from Nebraska knows, be-

cause he cites these things. That responsibility doesn't fall only on one party. It falls on all of us.

That is why there has been a history of bipartisanship and cooperation on the Intelligence Committees, where the vital interests of the Nation are at stake. That has been the case through the years. Until Chairman NUNES seemed to get ahold of this, that tradition was a grand one and a good one. Now that tradition has been discarded by House Republicans on the Intelligence Committee through this embarrassing episode that will historically go down as one of the lowest moments of any committee's actions in Congress.

Let me say pointedly to my colleagues that the Senate Intelligence Committee has been quite different than the House Intelligence Committee. I salute both Chairman BURR and Ranking Member WARNER for trying to run things in a different way. Let us hope that the Senate Intelligence Committee does not go the way of the House and continues its bipartisan cooperation to get to the bottom of this mess. That is because we have a responsibility to get to the bottom of what happened in 2016 and to report those findings in an unbiased way. If the House isn't going to do it, the Senate must.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like my colleagues to take a trip down memory lane. Go back a decade or two to 2006, 2007, 2008, and look at the decade before that. My State of Ohio, for 14 years in a row—from the late 1990s through the year 2010—experienced almost a decade and a half of foreclosure increases leading up to the crisis. That meant that in Ohio, literally every year for 14 years, there were more foreclosures than the year before in my State.

Predatory and irresponsible lenders made dangerous, subprime loans. They often ignored whether borrowers had the ability to repay that loan. The incentives were these: We will keep writing these; we will keep underwriting; we will keep collecting fees. We don't care if the borrower can pay.

We can see that is a setup for disaster. Because of the lack of standards for underwriting, we learned a painful lesson that not all mortgage lending is created equal.

Look at some headlines from that period. On September 18, 2008, the front

page of the Wall Street Journal featured three headlines. This was September 18, 2008, so just slightly less than 10 years ago: "Mounting Fears Shape World Markets As Banking Giants Rush to Raise Capital." "Bad Bets and Cash Crunch Push Ailing AIG to Brink." "Worst Crisis Since '30s, With No End."

On the same day the Washington Post reported: "Markets in Disarray as Lending Locks Up."

How did we get to that crisis? Banks forgot the essential rule of lending. A borrower needs to be able to pay back the loan. It is pretty simple, but a forgotten dictum. Instead, lenders offered loans that required no documentation. They offered loans with teaser interest rates that shot through the roof after 2 or 3 years. They offered loans where borrowers never paid down their principal or they stripped their home's value through cash-out refinances.

So borrowers had these mortgages where they simply paid the interest with the belief the home would go up in value more and more and more, never paying the principal. The homes didn't go up in value, and look what happened.

All of these practices had devastating results for families and communities and the economy. My wife Connie and I live in ZIP Code 44105 in Cleveland, OH, just south of Slavic Village in the great city of Cleveland. Eleven years ago, in the first half of 2007, 44105 had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States of America. I can still see the blight brought on by those foreclosures—what it did to individual families, what it did to the neighborhood, what it did to the city of Cleveland.

Think about—and we don't do that very much here. We don't really think all that much when we talk about things like this. We look at numbers. We look at statistics. We read analyses and data, but we don't really think about individual families.

Think about what happens when somebody suffers a foreclosure. First of all, these families understand that things are getting tighter. It is harder and harder to pay their mortgage. Their spouse may have been scaled back to half time, depending on the economic circumstances.

The first thing they do is often get rid of the family pet. It costs too much to take the dog to the vet. The second thing they do is cut back on everything. They just start cutting back on everything. Eventually they have that sit-down with their 12-year-old daughter and their 14-year-old son and their 15-year-old son, and tell them: We are going to have to move. We don't know where we are going or what school district we will be in. We don't know how much we are going to get; we have to sell the car. We don't know how much you are going to be able to see your

friends. They think about the personal side, but we don't do that much here.

Pope Francis used to admonish his parish priests to go out and smell like the flock. We don't do that very much here. We look at data and ideas, and we don't think about our policies and our votes and the impact they have on individual human beings.

So thinking back to ZIP Code 44105, if those faulty mortgage products weren't bad enough on their own, they were targeted to communities of color. The neighborhood my wife and I live in, ZIP Code 44105, is mostly African American, but pretty diverse. A lot of people look more like me, but there are a lot of people with moderate to low incomes.

These mortgage products were targeted to communities of color. In those communities in particular, even those who qualified for no-frills, no-surprises prime mortgages were often instead steered into subprime loans. Why? Because the lender could make more money on a subprime loan than a straightforward loan that most Members of the Senate generally sign up for. So even African-American and Hispanic borrowers with higher incomes than other borrowers found themselves—because the banks put them there—with subprime mortgages.

These practices of discrimination, which went on for years, stripped a generation's worth of equity from communities that had fought hard for equal access to home ownership. Think about this: The household wealth of communities of color simply hasn't recovered from the last decade. Middle-class Black and Hispanic families lost half of their wealth from 2007 to 2013. In 2016, it was \$38,000. The numbers are similar for Hispanic households: \$85,000 in 2007, \$46,000 in 2016. They all sound like numbers, but what that does to a family who has lost half its wealth, particularly because their wealth is generally in the home that they own—think of what that does.

My colleagues talk about how hard the banks have it, how hard it is to be a banker now, and how hard it is for Wall Street. I would like to revisit what happens when banks stop following the rules. Borrowers with these higher cost loans were foreclosed on at almost triple the rate of borrowers with standard 30-year, fixed-rate mortgages. Between 2006 and 2014, more than 9 million homeowners lost their homes to foreclosure in distressed sales or surrendered their home to the lender—9.3 million homeowners. What does that mean to us? Do we know any of them? Do we ever talk to any of them? Do we listen to their stories about what happens when you get thrown out of your house? Do we sit there and patiently listen and ask them questions and ask them to tell us about what has happened during the last 10 years of their lives? Because when you get

thrown out of your home, whether you are evicted or whether you get put out because of foreclosure, you don't just give away the family pet. You don't just cut back on everything. You lose a lot of your possessions because you can't take things with you. You start again in your life, and you start again in debt. Does anybody here care about that?

They talk about how hard it is for the banks and how Wall Street is suffering, but they don't think about the individual homeowners who struggle. Some of them get foreclosed on. Some of them are just struggling. Some of them have lost half of their wealth.

It is not just families of color who lost half their wealth; a whole lot of working class White families have lost a lot of their wealth. Does this place seem to care? Not a whole lot.

It wasn't just subprime mortgages. The crisis revealed a host of other harmful practices, like steering borrowers to affiliated companies, kickbacks for business referrals, inflated appraisals, and loan officer compensation based on the loan product. If you have a certain loan product that might be more profitable, even though it is a little sleazy and a little underhanded, you make a little more money because you steer people into those loan products. It might lead to the ruining of their lives or it might lead to their foreclosure, but they are making more money.

So what does that mean? It means the worse the loan was for the borrower, the more money the lender made. In 2008, the worse the loan was for the borrower, the more money the lender made. That is what our laws were. We fixed that, and we are going to undo some of that in this bill.

After the dust settled, this country realized how twisted our mortgage lending market had become. Congress finally stepped in to do what the market and regulators refused to do for too long.

I believe in free enterprise. I believe in the dynamism of capitalism. But when the market and the regulators did nothing except encourage this kind of behavior—that is why government is involved. That is why government steps in. That is why we did Wall Street reform. It established a commonsense rule that lenders should evaluate whether a borrower has the ability to repay a home loan. The ability to repay rule means that lenders can no longer make a loan based on the home's value or ignore the fact that an adjustable rate mortgage will become unaffordable in a year or two.

A mortgage is the largest financial transaction most families will make in their lifetime. It is a big deal, central to the economic life and the life overall of a great majority of people in this country. Requiring that the mortgage process, services, and fees be trans-

parent and understandable to borrowers is essential. We don't all have great sophistication when we get a homeowner's loan. That is why it is so important that it be transparent and understandable to borrowers. But the bill before us today chips away at that principle. It includes several provisions that, when taken together, weaken transparency and inclusiveness and undermine fairness in mortgage lending.

The bill says lenders need not consider whether a borrower can afford an adjustable rate mortgage after the interest rate adjusts. Banks and mortgage companies make more money when they write more loans. I get that. They should. But when the incentive is only that and there is no requirement that the borrower be able to afford an adjustable rate mortgage after the interest rate adjusts—we know what will happen.

The bill also allows the largest banks to acquire small banks and retains these legal protections for the larger banks.

I spoke to a member of a bank board in Mansfield, OH, yesterday, a longtime friend of our family's. That is where I grew up. I know the locally owned banks in Mansfield, OH. I know that Mechanics Bank works hard for their enrichment. I know they work hard for their customers. They know their customers. Small banks work with their customers. If they lose a job or face a sudden illness, the bank can try to work with them to figure out how to avoid foreclosure. Would a megabank in Cleveland, Columbus, or Dayton do the same thing? Based on the record of Secretary Mnuchin's bank, OneWest, and others during the crisis, we can be pretty sure we know the answer to that, and the answer is no, they won't.

The bill before us also gives lenders a pass on the requirement to escrow for taxes and insurance when making subprime loans. It doesn't cost real money to the lender to put money aside for taxes and insurance; it is part of the calculation when you buy a house. Most of us want our taxes and insurance included so we have a more predictable stream of outflow, so we know how much we are paying next month, and it doesn't change. It may change once a year, but it doesn't change often. By definition, someone taking out a subprime loan is at a higher risk of default. Also, escrow helps a borrower plan for the expenses of taxes and insurance, and it protects the lender from unexpected losses. That is in the bill, and we are stripping that out of the law.

Former FDIC Chair Sheila Bair, appointed by President Bush, is a terrific public servant. She was a high-ranking employee—I believe chief of staff—for Senator Dole when he was a Member of the Senate. She steered the FDIC

through the worst of the financial crisis. She raised her opposition to this provision in a letter to me.

This bill exempts 85 percent of banks from reporting the HMDA data they are collecting and reporting today. I credit Senator CORTEZ MASTO, who, as the attorney general of Nevada before she joined us in the Senate 14 months ago, saw up close what happened with foreclosures. She is a strong, outspoken opponent of this bill. She has had those discussions with people who have lost their homes. She understands how it happened. She doesn't have the amnesia that apparently a majority of my colleagues have, forgetting what happened 10 years ago and learning almost nothing from what happened 10 years ago. Her amendment would fix HMDA data collection. Without this data, we can't monitor trends in mortgage lending, particularly in rural areas. Without this data, it will be even harder to see who has access to affordable mortgage credit and who does not.

We know that redlining is still happening. The latest report from the Center for Investigative Reporting analyzed tens of millions of mortgage records and found that across the country, people of color are far more likely to be turned down for a loan even when you take into account factors like their income and the size of the loan. Without this data, we won't know when redlining happens. It will make it more difficult to show that community lenders go the extra mile for their customers. That is why the NAACP, National Community Reinvestment Coalition, Unidos, National Urban League, Rural Community Assistance Corporation, and more than 170 State and national organizations have objected to this devastating new hole in lending data. Why in the world would Congress want to keep us from getting that information, keep us from getting that data, so we, in fact, understand better what goes on?

Part of our problem in 2007 and 2008 was that we had a whole bunch of regulators who were asleep at the switch, we had a Congress that was oblivious, and we had a national media that was not paying enough attention to this. Part of that was that the regulators didn't have the information they needed. That is why the head of supervision at the Federal Reserve, Randal Quarles, who was in the Bush administration then, could see nothing but roses and candy in the years ahead. He said that in 2006 and I believe in 2007. He had no idea what was going on, partly because he maybe didn't want to know but partly because we didn't have the data collected that we are starting to collect now. So we are going to say we don't care about that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from former FDIC Chair Sheila Bair and the letters from

civil rights groups in opposition to this provision be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Any one of these provisions is bad enough, but taken together, they add up to riskier loans for American families and more foreclosures on American families.

Think about this: If this bill passes, a bank could make a subprime loan without considering whether a borrower could afford the higher interest rate when the teaser rate expires. The first 2 or 3 years, you are paying rate X, and then in the third or fourth year, you are paying X plus two or X plus three, and then the next year, maybe X plus that number plus one, to the point you can't afford your mortgage anymore. What happens? You get foreclosed on, and your life turns upside down.

If this bill passes, a bank could make a subprime loan without considering whether the borrower could pay the higher interest rate. A bank wouldn't have to collect taxes and insurance on a monthly basis, making a loan look affordable when it may not be because you have insurance and taxes. Why not put that in the monthly payment so people can predict more and understand their finances better?

The homeowner loses her right to take the bank to court for removing her from her home even though the bank made a loan it knew she could never repay. So the bank makes a loan to a homeowner. The homeowner perhaps doesn't have the sophistication the banker sitting across the table has, doesn't quite understand what the teaser rate will mean to the cost of her house. Then the bank doesn't do the escrow adding insurance and taxes, and the bank convinces this perspective homeowner, the borrower, that she can make these payments, no problem. Then she loses her right to action if she is foreclosed on. She has no recourse even though the bank sold her something that a good banker wouldn't have. It is a recipe for disaster. It is a recipe for more families ending up in homes they were misled into thinking they could afford. Is it too much to ask a lender to consider whether a family can afford the loan they are getting? Are we back here already?

The cherry on top is this bill eliminates data we need to determine whether banks are targeting certain communities for these risky loans. We know this administration and the heads of Departments are not concerned about accountability for financial institutions' equity, lending, and inclusivity. We learned that HUD is considering changing its mission statement to delete references to inclusive communities. Imagine that, Secretary Carson, that you would do such a thing.

I am concerned this bill will put more families at risk of poor housing conditions, particularly in rural com-

munities that are so often ignored in this town. The bill reduces the frequency of required inspections for units overseen by rural public housing agencies that administer 550 or fewer units of HUD public housing and section 8 rental vouchers. For many of these so-called PHAs, HUD will inspect their property once every 3 years rather than every 1 or 2 years. This bill would allow PHAs to inspect more voucher-assisted units just once every 3 years. A lot can happen to an apartment in 3 years that could put residents' health and safety at risk. In my neighborhood, it is in the 90 percent rate, those homes that have toxic levels of lead, and it gets worse as the house gets older and the paint chips. And we are not going to inspect these places.

I understand that PHAs face many challenges in maintaining high-quality housing for families. Due to years of underfunding, public housing alone faces an estimated \$26 billion backlog of repairs. My Senate Democratic colleagues and I have proposed an infrastructure package that includes funding for public housing repairs and revitalization to help address these challenges. We have an obligation to make sure these struggling families have safe and decent housing. I have been clear throughout this process that I want to help community lenders and housing providers better serve their customers. We don't do that by reducing accountability. We don't do that by returning to the freewheeling housing market that led to millions of families losing their homes.

When we talk about escrow and lending requirements, it sounds kind of boring, it sounds dry, and it may sound like legalese that don't matter, but it matters when it comes to the biggest, most important purchase most Americans will make.

It just seems that particularly when people buy that first home and they don't really know much about how to do that—maybe they don't have a lot of political sophistication; they are 25 or 30 years old or whatever age they are—we shouldn't make it more complicated, we should make it less complicated. Bankers should not be incentivized only by how much money they make by writing more and more mortgages but instead should walk through what this is going to cost: Here is the escrow. Here is what your insurance costs. Here is what you are going to pay if you have a teaser rate. We are going to make some decisions, and this house may be a little too expensive for you because of that teaser rate, because of what you will be paying 3 years from now in addition to the escrow, the taxes and insurance that you hadn't really planned for.

Weakening a standard here or granting an exemption there will end up causing real pain for real families.

Growth in the housing sector is only sustainable if families can afford their loans and homes are maintained. I know families in my ZIP Code can't afford a repeat of the housing crisis. I know what it has done to my neighborhood. Some of them are still digging out.

Let's stop listening to the big-bank lobbyists and start listening to the people we serve, the families across this country who remember all too well what foreclosures and job losses mean to them.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 2018.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,
Ranking Member, Senate Banking Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: You had requested my views on S. 2155, the "Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief and Consumer Protection Act". At the outset, I would like to commend the Senate Banking Committee leadership for developing this legislation on a bipartisan basis, and proceeding in the traditional way with hearings and a markup. I appreciate that much work has gone into negotiating its provisions, and I am highly supportive of most of them, particularly those reforms which give relief to community and regional institutions, as well as changes that would give consumers more control over their credit information.

Regrettably, the bill also includes Section 402 which would significantly weaken a key constraint on the use of excessive leverage by the largest financial institutions in the US. In these times of market volatility, I would strongly urge the Senate to reject this provision as imprudent and short-sighted. Now is the time we should be bolstering bank capital levels, not chipping away at them.

Banks operated with far too little capital during the run up to the 2008 financial crisis. In setting capital requirements, regulators erroneously judged certain activities—for instance mortgage securities, derivatives, and European sovereign debt—as having little, if any risk. Banks piled into these activities because regulators let them lever returns with borrowed money. The consequences were catastrophic.

Because their judgments about risk were so wide of the mark, regulators have made greater use of non-risk weighted standards since the crisis. The most important of these is the "supplemental leverage ratio" or "SLR"—a relatively simple metric which sets minimums for big banks' common equity as a percentage of their total assets and certain off-balance sheet exposures. In the US, the SLR has been set at 5% for the largest banking organizations (6% for their insured bank subsidiaries).

Section 402 is a seemingly innocuous provision which would exempt from the SLR deposits held at central banks by "custodian" banks. This includes deposits at the Federal Reserve (Fed), as well as the central banks of other Organization for the Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) members such as Turkey and Greece.

As originally introduced, Section 402 was limited to three so-called "custodian" banks, specialized banks which safeguard customer assets but do not engage in traditional commercial banking. However, during the markup, the Senate Banking Committee

loosened the definition of "custodian" bank, potentially creating a gaping loophole as any bank arguably serves as "a custodian" of depositor money. Most big banks will likely press the Fed to let them benefit from Section 402, given the huge competitive advantage it would bestow. Data from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) indicate that capital reductions for some banks could approach 30%.

The laudable goal of the sponsors of S. 2155 is to support economic growth. But it seems Section 402 will simply give banks more incentives to take on additional leverage by parking money with central banks, not making business and consumer loans. They can arbitrage the near-zero interest rates they pay on deposits with the 150 basis points they can get at the Fed. That's a nice, tidy margin that will grow even wider as the Fed raises rates this year.

Central bank deposits do not support lending in the real economy. They do include the extra reserves created by central banks when they intervene in the markets through things like quantitative easing, the practice of buying government and private securities to increase the money supply. If the goal of S. 2155's supporters is to facilitate monetary interventions, then that should be made clear. However, even assuming that is the purpose, there is no need for Section 402. The Fed already has substantial flexibility to temporarily ease capital requirements during times of economic stress. The Basel Committee, an international regulatory forum which includes central bank supervisors, has said that in times of exceptional macroeconomic circumstances central banks should have the flexibility to temporarily remove reserve deposits from the leverage ratio calculation to facilitate such interventions. Only the Brexit-challenged Bank of England has removed central bank deposits from its leverage calculation. Notably, it also made an upward adjustment in its ratio to mitigate the reduction in capital levels, something which S. 2155 does not do.

More fundamentally, why does Congress want to start designating banking activities as low or no risk, when expert financial regulators were so spectacularly wrong prior to the crisis? The SLR's key strength is that it does not reflect government judgments about risk. Central bank deposits may seem low risk, but where does this slippery slope end? The Treasury Department wants US government securities also removed from the leverage ratio, notwithstanding their significant interest rate risk. What's next? Housing agency debt? How about AAA corporate bonds? To the extent these instruments compete with central bank deposits for banks' liquid investments, Section 402 will put them at a competitive disadvantage unless they get similar treatment. It will also alter the competitive landscape as it provides a special capital break for big banks that does not apply to smaller institutions, an ironic result for a bill designed to help community and regional banks.

Before concluding, I would like to address some of the confusion surrounding this change, not surprising given the complexity of bank capital regulation. Assets of pension funds, mutual funds, endowments and other bank clients that are held in custody and invested under the control of those clients are already excluded from the SLR. Losses on those assets fall to the clients, not the bank. The SLR applies to funding, be they deposits or other borrowings, over which banks have control. Even though custody banks may not operate as traditional commercial lenders,

they are highly systemic and have significant operational risk with many trillions under custody. They can also suffer losses on their investment portfolios, as they did during the crisis. As Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) Vice-Chair Tom Hoenig has pointed out, custodian banks were borrowing from the Federal Reserve \$60 to \$90 billion dollars a day to cover funding shortfalls during that tumultuous time.

In the years following the crisis, custodian and other large, systemic banks have grown and remained profitable notwithstanding toughened capital rules. Indeed, the higher capital standards we imposed in the US relative to Europe have been key to our faster economic recovery. It is true that during times of market stress, deposits significantly increase at custodian banks. But this is true of all banks—FDIC insured deposits went up dramatically during the crisis. This is why risk-based capital rules have built in counter-cyclical buffers, and there would certainly be no harm in Congress recognizing the authority of bank regulators to provide capital accommodation in times of severe stress when deposits are increasing dramatically as investors seek out safety. This is authority I believe they already have.

Government judgments favoring one asset class over another inevitably distort markets. I would strongly encourage Congress not to embark down this path. The responsibility—and accountability—for capital rules should rest with the Fed and other bank regulators. Weakening capital rules now will undermine the resiliency of the banking system and heighten the risk of bank failures during the next downturn. This current recovery is already long in the tooth by historical standards. For now, growth is strong and banks are profitable, but that will eventually change. If anything, Congress should be encouraging banks and their regulators to increase capital buffers.

You had also requested my views on other aspects of S. 2155. As previously indicated, outside of Section 402, I am highly supportive of this bill with two caveats. First, in limiting the application of Enhanced Prudential Standards (EPS) Congress should take care not to weaken pre-Dodd-Frank authorities to utilize forward-looking supervisory tools and protect the deposit insurance fund. You would not want to inadvertently weaken supervisory tools that existed prior to the crisis. Second, I am troubled by Section 109 which would exempt many more lenders from escrow requirements for high-cost mortgage loans. Mandatory escrow of insurance and taxes for borrowers with troubled credit histories provide both consumer and safety and soundness benefits. Borrowers who have difficulty managing their finances may well have trouble making these essential payments on their own, forcing them to turn to high cost lenders to cover those costs when they come due, or worse, defaulting on their mortgage obligations. Moreover, administrative costs of escrow requirements are not high and certainly less than costs associated with default. To both protect consumers from the loss of their homes as well as the FDIC-insured banks from mortgage defaults, I would encourage Congress to leave current escrow requirements alone.

Sincerely,

SHEILA C. BAIR.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2018.

Re NAACP Strong opposition to S. 2155, the
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief,
and Consumer Protection Act.

THE HONORABLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to oppose, work against, and vote "Nay" on passage of S. 2155, the mis-named Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. This dangerous bill does irreparable damage to fair lending protections against racial discrimination; it harms homebuyers; and it contains over two deregulatory provisions of the financial services industry that were put into place after the 2008 global crises which led to a recession from which many American families and communities are still trying to recover.

Section 104 of the bill would exempt 85% of depository institutions from full reporting of loan data under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA). This would devastate our attempts to determine—and potentially rectify—racially discriminatory lending or loan approval patterns at play. The HMDA dataset contains the most comprehensive publicly available information on mortgage market activity. Each fall, new HMDA data are made available. In 2016, almost 7,000 institutions released over 16 million records, making HMDA an invaluable administrative dataset on housing and homeownership for policymakers, regulators, and researchers.

Furthermore, S. 2155 provides exemptions from crucial mortgage lending protections for buyers of manufactured homes, such as mobile homes. These provisions would allow sellers of manufactured homes to overcharge customers and make the millions of Americans who wish to purchase a manufactured home more vulnerable to predatory lending practices similar to those which caused so many—too many—families to lose their homes in the 2008 crisis.

If we as a nation learned anything from the 2008 financial crisis, it is that American consumers need more information and protection, not less. Thus, I urge you to reject S. 2155 and to focus on policies and proposals to help the average American consumer. Thank you in advance for your attention to the position of the NAACP. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at my office.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director, NAACP
Washington Bureau
& Senior Vice President
for Policy and
Advocacy.

MARCH 8, 2018.

Re Oppose section 104, "The Home Mortgage
Disclosure Act Adjustment".

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned civil rights, fair housing, consumer, and community organizations write to highlight our strong concerns with Section 104 of S. 2155, "the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act Adjustment and Study". This section would undermine efforts to ensure that the nation's mortgage lenders are serving all segments of the market fairly by exempting the vast majority of lenders from the updated reporting required by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-

Frank). Public officials use this information in distributing public-sector investments so as to attract private investment to areas where it is needed, and to identify possible discriminatory lending patterns.

THE DODD-FRANK ACT'S UPDATED HMDA REPORTING REFLECTS LESSONS FROM THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

In response to widespread concerns about predatory lending and opacity in the mortgage market in the run-up to and following the financial crisis, Congress amended the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) to require both banks and non-bank lenders to disclose more information about their mortgage lending activities—updates finalized by the CFPB in 2015. Although not previously reported and disclosed through HMDA, these data points are already collected on a routine basis by banks, credit unions and for-profit mortgage companies in the normal course of business, either as a part of basic loan underwriting, for securitization or for other purposes required by law.

The CFPB Reduces the Reporting Burden on Small Lenders Without Sacrificing Data About Lending in Underserved Communities

After considering a number of higher reporting thresholds and receiving extensive feedback from all size and type of lending institutions, the CFPB adopted a standard that applies the new reporting requirements to institutions that made 25 closed-end mortgage loans or 100 open-end/home equity lines of credit (HELOCs). Importantly, in response to concerns raised by lenders and by some in Congress, the CFPB has already temporarily raised the reporting threshold for HELOCs to 500 through 2019, in order to further review the impact of the rule and what the permanent HELOC threshold should be. In adopting the HMDA thresholds, the agency balanced several Congressional interests—adopting a uniform and simplified reporting regime for banks and non-banks; eliminating the need for low-volume banks to report while maintaining sufficient data for analysis at the national, local, and institutional levels; and increasing visibility into the home mortgage lending practices of non-banks.

Section 104 upsets the careful balance: its proposed reporting thresholds—500 closed end loans or 500 open-end lines—would exempt the vast majority of the nation's mortgage lenders from the updated requirements. Based on 2013 data, under the threshold set by the CFPB, 22 percent (1,400) of the depository institutions that currently report on their closed-end mortgages would be exempt. In contrast, if Section 104 is enacted, the agency estimates that 85 percent (5,400) of depositories and 48 percent of nondepositories (497) would not have to update reporting on their mortgages. This higher threshold would sacrifice key data about lending in underserved communities that would help to ensure the flow of credit to qualified borrowers, stimulate the economy, and prevent future mortgage crises.

Tiered Reporting Sacrifices Critical Data Without Reducing Lender Burden

Section 104 proposes to adopt a tiered reporting approach, exempting some lenders from reporting the new data points pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Act only. This is purportedly a way to reduce burden. However, because the data points covered by the rule are already collected by lenders, the burden associated with the rule is minimal. Further, as with any data collection effort, the primary driver of HMDA costs is in establishing and maintaining systems to collect and re-

port data, and not the costs associated with collecting and reporting a particular data field. Therefore, this approach sacrifices critical information without relieving much of the purported HMDA reporting burden on banks or non-banks.

SECTION 104 WOULD UNDERMINE FAIR ACCESS TO MORTGAGE CREDIT

HMDA was passed in 1975 to provide the necessary tools to dismantle uneven access to mortgage credit and expand equal lending opportunities for qualified borrowers, yet important segments of the market continue to lack fair access. For people of color, low-to moderate-income families, and borrowers in rural areas, access to mortgage credit remains tight. While the numbers of loan originations have gone down for all borrowers, African Americans and Latinos have experienced the steepest declines. A Federal Reserve analysis of lending in rural areas has found higher denial rates in those communities since the housing crisis than in urban areas. The new data would help explain and inform responses to these lending gaps. A new HMDA data point on the applicant's age is also vital information for evaluating age bias in lending, especially in conjunction with reverse mortgages.

The stark disparities in access to mortgage credit and the continued struggle for economic recovery in the communities hit hardest by the financial crisis call for a strengthening of our nation's fair lending laws, specifically HMDA, not a weakening of them. Quite simply, the updated HMDA data will provide critical information about whether similarly situated borrowers and underserved communities are receiving equitable access to mortgage credit, data that we lacked a decade ago when the crisis hit. This is not the time to limit the nation's ability to adequately assess the reasons for restricted credit access for underserved borrowers. Instead, we must increase efforts to address the causes behind the increased difficulty in accessing safe, affordable credit.

For these reasons and more, we urge you to oppose Section 104 and any other efforts to roll back the data collection and reporting as called for in Dodd-Frank and implemented by the CFPB. Should you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Gerron Levi at the National Community Reinvestment Coalition.

Sincerely,

National Groups: Americans For Financial Reform, Center for Responsible Lending, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Equal Rights Center, Grounded Solutions Network, Housing Choice Partners, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Morningstar Urban Development, Incorporated, NAACP, National Community Reinvestment Coalition, National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development, People's Action, National Fair Housing Alliance, National Housing Law Project, National Organization of African Americans in Housing, National Urban League, Public Counsel, Rural Community Assistance Corporation, Take Charge America, UnidosUS (Formerly NCLR).

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss S. 2155. It is called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. One would think from the title that I would be all for it, but as one who went through the drop in the economy when we were on the brink of collapse, I believe this is a very bad bill.

Let me go back to that time. Banks were teetering and over 300 would fail in the next 3 years. For perspective, only three banks had failed in the year of 2007. Unemployment was skyrocketing. We lost \$19 trillion in household wealth. Americans lost nearly 9 million jobs.

In my State of California, more than 2 million people were unemployed, 3½ million mortgages were at risk, and nearly 200,000 people filed for bankruptcy.

Now that the economy has recovered and unemployment has decreased from its high point of 10 percent during the crisis, I worry that my colleagues have forgotten the magnitude of this crisis. I simply cannot.

I remember sitting in caucuses hearing from our top financial officials about the potential for a total collapse of our economy. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner testified to the House Financial Services Committee that “our financial system failed to do its job and came precariously close to failing altogether.” That is not an exaggeration. For those of us who were here, who listened to the economists, who heard what was happening, we feared a total collapse. Personal conversations I had with these economists carried the most dire warnings. We should never get close to that point again.

Congress spent more than \$400 billion on something labeled TARP, Troubled Asset Relief Program, to help stabilize the economy. It was very controversial at the time, but we have since recouped more than we spent on that bank program.

Congress then passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in 2010, putting in place policies to prevent another financial crisis, including strong protections on the largest banks. Now, just 8 years later—how quickly we forget—we are considering loosening these protections.

Have we forgotten the lessons from 10 years ago and the devastating consequences for American families?

As with any bill we pass, I am open to looking at how it has been implemented and making adjustments as needed. For Dodd-Frank, I agree that community banks and credit unions shouldn't be regulated the same way as the largest banks in the country. I am open to adjusting some of these regulations for them, but this bill simply goes too far. It goes beyond targeted relief for small institutions.

The nonpartisan CBO, Congressional Budget Office, says the probability of a large bank failing or another financial crisis will go up if this bill is enacted. One provision I am particularly worried about would roll back regulations and supervision for banks with assets between \$50 billion and \$250 billion. These aren't just small community banks we are talking about. Instead, this would apply to some of the largest banks in our country.

Paul Volcker, the former chairman of the Federal Reserve, wrote that Countrywide, National City, and GMAC were all below \$250 billion and “required billions of dollars in official capital assistance and debt guarantees either for themselves or their acquiring institutions.”

Here is what Phil Angelides, who served as chairman of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, said about this particular provision:

The bill's provisions to lift the asset threshold for enhanced prudential standards and supervision from \$50 billion to \$250 billion would substantially reduce oversight over 25 of the nation's 38 largest banks, including institutions of over \$100 billion in assets that were deemed “Too Big to Fail” in 2009.

A number of financial institutions with less than \$250 billion triggered the need for bailout assistance during the crisis and history has shown, time and time again, that the failure of financial firms that are not among the largest mega-banks can pose systemic threats to financial stability.

In addition to weakening these requirements, the bill can also weaken capital requirements for even the largest banks.

Sheila Bair, former Chair of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, said this could lead up to a 30-percent capital reduction at some banks. Just think of that. She also raises a question that we should all take a moment to reflect on: Why does Congress want to start designating banking activities as low or no risk, when expert financial regulators were so wrong prior to the crisis?

Finally, this bill would amend the SAFE Act that I authored to ensure mortgage brokers and lenders meet minimum standards. This was necessary to curb the abusive lending practices we saw leading up to the financial crisis in which many consumers were taken advantage of through predatory lending.

This was a serious problem in California. Between March and June of 2008, 406 defendants were charged in 144 mortgage fraud-related cases, and approximately \$1 billion in losses were attributed to these fraudulent acts.

The SAFE Act created a new system of registration and licensing that included background checks, education requirements, and testing to ensure that mortgage brokers and lenders could meet basic standards.

The bill before us, interestingly enough, would allow mortgage loan

originators to operate without a license—without a license—for up to 120 days if they move from a bank to a nonbank or across State lines. Allowing this transition period without ensuring that lenders have passed the licensing test we required in the SAFE Act weakens the protections we put in place for consumers.

Before I conclude, I want to say that I appreciate this is a bipartisan bill. It has gone through the Banking Committee. I also understand the interest in ensuring regulations are appropriately tailored to the size and activity of financial institutions, but I am really worried that Members here have become too comfortable in our economic recovery and have forgotten where the path of deregulation ends.

I oppose this bill because it simply goes too far in deregulating some of our largest institutions and weakening the protections we put in place to prevent another financial crisis.

If we don't learn from past failures, we are doomed to repeat them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of Phil Angelides.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sacramento, CA, March 5, 2018.

Re S. 2155.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Banking,
Housing, and Urban Affairs, Washington,
DC.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,
Ranking Member, U.S. Senate Committee on
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
Washington, DC.

I am writing this letter to express my strong opposition to S. 2155 by Senator Crapo which would weaken the financial system safeguards and taxpayer and consumer protections put in place in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis. The provisions of the bill, particularly when coupled with the clearly expressed deregulatory agenda of the Trump Administration and its key financial regulators, will once again put us on the path of exposing American taxpayers, our financial system, and our economy to significant risk.

As Chairman of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, which conducted the nation's official inquiry into the causes of the financial crisis, I am deeply troubled by the potential passage of this legislation, considering the magnitude of the economic and human damage caused by the crisis and the effectiveness of post-crisis reforms in stabilizing our financial system and economy. That the Senate is taking up this bill on the floor at this time is particularly astounding given that next week will mark the 10th anniversary of the collapse of Bear Stearns, one of the seminal events in the unraveling of our financial markets that plunged our nation into the Great Recession.

Before the financial crisis abated, the federal government and the nation's taxpayers provided trillions of dollars of financial assistance through two dozen separate programs, including the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP), to bail out Wall Street. Even with this historic and unprecedented government response, the consequences of the crisis were dire. Millions lost their jobs

and their homes, cities and towns across the nation were devastated, and trillions of dollars in wealth were stripped away from hard working families and businesses. The aspirations of millions of Americans were crushed in the financial assault on our nation, with all too many families and regions still struggling today from the fall-out of the crisis.

Without any compelling public policy rationale—other than the deceptive guise of aiding regional and community banks—this bill now seeks to undo key bulwarks of public protection designed to avert future crises. Indeed, its provisions would put us on the road to re-creating conditions that the FCIC concluded led to the 2008 crisis. While the bill purports to be the “Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act”, only the “regulatory relief” portion of its title bears any relationship to reality. Like the “Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000”, which ensured that over-the-counter derivatives would remain hidden in a dark market, or the House “Financial CHOICE Act”, which would eviscerate the Dodd-Frank financial reforms, S. 2155’s benign name deliberately obscures its detrimental effects.

Below are just some of my specific concerns with the legislation.

First, the bill’s provisions to lift the asset threshold for enhanced prudential standards and supervision from \$50 billion to \$250 billion would substantially reduce oversight over 25 of the nation’s 38 largest banks, including institutions of over \$100 billion in assets that were deemed “Too Big To Fail” in 2009. A number of financial institutions with less than \$250 billion triggered the need for bailout assistance during the crisis and history has shown, time and again, that the failure of financial firms that are not among the largest mega-banks can pose systemic threats to financial stability. While the bill purports to allow the Federal Reserve to “reach back” to institutions with more than \$100 billion in assets, those provisions would be legally difficult to implement, given the likelihood of financial industry litigation; undermine the very purpose of having enhanced prudential standards in place prior to the emergence of risks; and undercut the Federal Reserve’s current broad authority to impose such standards.

Secondly, while existing law allows the Federal Reserve to tailor financial stability rules for banks over \$50 billion in assets, this bill would now require the Federal Reserve to do so for the banks still subject to enhanced prudential standards—those with assets over \$250 billion. There is legitimate concern that this change, from “may” to “shall”, will be implemented to reduce scrutiny of the 13 biggest banks in our nation.

Third, the bill will weaken stress testing of major financial institutions by, among other things, reducing the timeframe for testing from semi-annually for the nation’s biggest banks to “periodically”, which could be as infrequently as once every three years. What public purpose could possibly be served by diminishing the understanding by regulators of how major financial institutions would fare in the event of adverse financial and economic conditions?

Fourth, as Secretary Mnuchin himself has indicated, the legislation is likely to be implemented in a manner that deregulates 10 foreign megabanks—including but not limited to firms such as Credit Suisse and Deutsche Bank—heightening the risk that those banks could infect and debilitate our nation’s financial system.

Fifth, the bill would punch a new hole in leverage ratios, leading to a substantial re-

duction in required capital at certain large banks, a troubling reversal of the drive toward stronger capital requirements in the wake of the crisis. The need for enhanced capital at major financial institutions has been one of the areas of broadest consensus emanating from the 2008 meltdown. It should also be noted that this proposal is wholly outside the realm of the bill’s stated purpose of aiding regional and community banks.

Finally, this bill begins to chip away at the post-crisis reforms made to the woeful mortgage lending standards that the FCIC found to be a primary cause of the crisis. There is no sound policy rationale or good public purpose served by exempting most financial institutions from reporting mortgage lending data which they already collect; eliminating escrow requirements for subprime loans; or giving lenders a liability shield for adjustable rate mortgages underwritten at low teaser rates.

Based on the above concerns, I urge the Senate to reject S. 2155. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PHIL ANGELIDES,
*Chairman, Financial Crisis Inquiry
Commission (2009–2011).*

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions on Tuesday, March 13, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIX NICS BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, just 2 days ago, the White House announced its plans to reduce gun violence in our Nation’s schools. This is an important issue, and the White House’s recommendations should be taken seriously. I certainly do.

The President’s blueprint attempts to address this pervasive problem from multiple angles during what has been a period of heightened tension and discord across the country. Parents and children continue to grapple every day with the aftermath of the shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL. But, of course, the problem didn’t start with that single event and what I think can only be fairly called a catastrophic failure across the board, which resulted in this terrible tragedy.

One important piece of the White House plan is to train school staffers. The President strongly supports a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Utah that would authorize funding for school safety improvements. You wouldn’t think that would be controversial. Those school safety improvements include training efforts,

school threat assessment, and crisis intervention teams. This bill is called the STOP School Violence Act. We ought to pass it, and we ought to pass it today.

As Senator HATCH said last week, there has been little disagreement but a lot of discussion and debate and not much legislative progress. He said: “To break the impasse, we must unite on the issues where we agree.”

I couldn’t agree with Senator HATCH more. We must unite on the issues where we can agree. One of those issues relates to a bill that I have introduced with the junior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY, to improve background checks on gun purchases.

NICS is the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. As of earlier today, the bill called Fix NICS now has 69 cosponsors. That is nine votes more than we need in order to pass legislation, so clearly we could and should get it done.

The numbers speak for themselves: 32 Republicans and 36 Democrats want to strengthen the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Why? Because we want to save lives.

There have been some who have come to the floor and have said in public comments: Well, we want to do more.

Well, God bless you. I hope that we will have other ideas presented that could do even more, but we know this has the political support and the critical mass we need to get this done in the Senate and to get it done now.

The reason this particular legislation is supported by so many Senators is, essentially, that it enforces current law. In other words, current law states that a felon—a person convicted of a felony in any court in the Nation—cannot buy or possess a firearm. It also says that a person who has committed and been convicted of an act of domestic violence cannot purchase or possess a firearm. If you entered the country illegally, you cannot possess or purchase a firearm, and so on and so forth. There are also provisions that if you have been adjudicated as a person with mental illness, you cannot legally purchase or possess a firearm. The problem is that many States and the Federal Government have done a very poor job of uploading the appropriate information into the FBI’s National Instant Criminal Background Check System, so there are gaps in the system.

The most notable one recently occurred in Sutherland Springs, TX, outside of San Antonio, where 26 people were killed and 20 more were injured by a gunman who purchased the guns illegally. He lied on his background check and, sadly, the Federal Government had failed to discharge its duty to upload the appropriate information, which would have revealed that at the point of sale. I am convinced that those 26 people who are dead would be alive

today and the 20 more who were wounded would not have been shot if an appropriate background check system had been in place. We have reached critical mass, and I believe we are at a tipping point.

I believe the public is demanding that we do something. That is what we usually hear when these mass shootings occur. People say: Well, do something.

My question is, OK, what is it that you want us to do?

This is something concrete and specific. It enjoys broad political support and will save lives, so I believe it is worth doing, and it is worth doing today, if possible.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, the other topic I want to address is the legislation that was signed into law in December called the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. That is the formal name of the comprehensive overhaul of our Nation's Tax Code. The tax change we made was a change in the law that doubled the standard deduction, meaning that for the first \$24,000 a married couple earns, they will pay zero income tax. It doubled the child tax credit. It lowered tax rates across the board, and for the first time in a long time, it made the United States more competitive when it comes to attracting investment and businesses around the globe.

(Mr. CRUZ assumed the Chair.)

We know that our Tax Code had been a self-inflicted wound. With the highest tax rate in the world, businesses were moving offshore to lower tax jurisdictions—such as Ireland, for example—in order to avoid the highest taxes here in the United States. We changed that by lowering the business tax rate to attract people to bring that money back to the United States rather than leaving it overseas.

Today, I want to briefly mention one of several portions of the law that is frequently overlooked. They don't steal the headlines, but they actually deserve more recognition.

The one I am thinking of is the one sponsored by the junior Senator from South Carolina, Mr. SCOTT, called the Investing in Opportunity Act. Importantly, this measure helps incentivize long-term private investment in communities that need it most. That is why it is called the Investing in Opportunity Act. It provides a new way for investors across the Nation to pool their resources through newly created opportunity funds established specifically for making investment in economically distressed communities, so designated by State Governors.

As any businessperson will tell you, private capital formation is a necessary ingredient for planting the seeds of job creation and opportunity. Our economically distressed communities need this sort of investment, and this provision of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act makes that possible and more likely.

That is just one of the provisions we need to keep reminding folks back home about because they get so much disinformation, and, of course, there is so much information coming at us that it easily gets lost in the day-to-day shuffle. These are important provisions, and I think they bear some emphasis.

The Presiding Officer and I have the great privilege of representing 28 million Texans. He and I hear from them from time to time on the legislation we pass. On the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, I heard from Pam from Amarillo, TX. She prefers that her last name not be mentioned, and I will certainly respect that. She thought she had made a mistake when she was figuring out her payroll at her company at the end of February. Because the pay increases to employees were just that big, she thought she had made a mistake. She said the differences in withholding were "significant" and a real "boost in salary."

Similarly, we heard from Glenda from Midland, TX, who wrote to me recently. Glenda has been retired since 2013, which, she reminded me, means that she is living on a fixed income with no possibility of pay increases or year-end bonuses. That doesn't mean she is not grateful for the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. She said that the reduction in her income taxes feels like a raise, even though she is retired and living on a fixed income.

She took the critics to task for calling her additional income crumbs. She said that maybe to them it is crumbs, but "every single dollar makes a difference" to her. She called the effects of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act an "absolute blessing."

I want to express my gratitude to Glenda and Pam for sharing their stories because I think it is really important to make sure that the facts get out.

According to what the Bureau of Labor Statistics said last week, Midland—where Glenda lives—had the largest employment increase in the country over the last year. This past January in Midland, the increase was 10.4 percent. In Texas, they also had the lowest unemployment rate of 2.4 percent, a significant decrease from 4 percent at the same time last year.

Of course, as the Presiding Officer and I know, Midland is the epicenter of energy production, and they are basically trying to get as many people as are willing to work on the jobs that produce energy to fuel our economy. Glenda is actually a part of a larger story that involves not only the place she calls home but also the entire country.

After years of economic stagnation, Americans are finally getting some good economic news. In February, the U.S. economy added 313,000 jobs—313,000 jobs. That is about one-third of

a million. The unemployment rate is at a 17-year low, and it would have been even lower but for the fact that the number of people actually in the workforce increased by 806,000 in February alone. Let me say that again. The reason the unemployment rate actually didn't dip statistically lower from 4.1 percent is that 800,000-plus Americans reentered the workforce. To me, that is a remarkable statistic and a reason for hope that our economy will continue to grow and people will continue to find work, provide for their families, and pursue their dreams.

Since January of last year, our economy has added nearly 3 million jobs. Consumer confidence is at the highest level since 2000. The good news is that it is happening not because the Federal Government is spending the money but because the people who are actually earning it are getting the money and spending it as they see fit.

Glenda and Pam are just two of the examples I have mentioned, but they are proof that spirits are high, people are hopeful, and the economy is gaining force.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:34 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to express my strong support for the legislation we are debating, which will restore economic opportunity, create jobs, help businesses grow, and help every Nevadan as they work to achieve the American dream.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, I can tell you that this legislation is years in the making, and I wish to thank the chairman of the committee, Senator CRAPO, and my fellow colleagues who are on the committee for their efforts to get us where we are today.

For years the economy had been growing slowly after the great recession. It was like a truck with a bad

transmission. It was moving, but it wasn't going anywhere fast. Today everything has changed. The American economy has been primed, the engine has been started, and through the work of the Senate and President Trump, the gas pedal has been hit, and our economy is finally going full speed ahead.

Just a few month ago, we passed historic tax cuts for Nevada families and for Nevada businesses. A typical Nevada family of four will roughly get a \$2,200 tax cut. We lowered the individual rates across the board and doubled the standard deduction used by most Nevadans, allowing them to keep more of their paycheck. This bill also included my efforts to double the child tax credit, from \$1,000 to \$2,000, further easing the tax burden on working families.

Overall, these tax cuts accomplish my three major goals of creating more jobs, increasing wages, and making America more competitive around the world. I am proud to have worked on these tax cuts, but Congress can do more. That is why we are here today.

The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act we are debating is the next major step that we must take to shift our economy into another gear. This bipartisan bill tailors financial regulations to protect consumers and help Nevadans have more access to financial resources and more access to economic opportunities. It will give Nevadans more choices when it comes to finding a loan to buy a house, to buy a car to get to work, to start a business, and, for that matter, to grow their business. Finally, this bill helps to ensure that local lenders can grow their services for every community in Nevada.

This is the oil in the economic engine. It keeps not only cities like Las Vegas, Henderson, and Reno running but all communities in Nevada, such as Mesquite, Pahrump, Carson City, Fallon, Elko, and Ely. This bill includes many bipartisan proposals that I fought for. I am pleased that the legislation I offered with Senator MENENDEZ to ease workforce mobility for mortgage loan officers who wish to move to Nevada or to change jobs is included in the base text.

In committee I offered an amendment that was based off of legislation I worked on with Senator WARNER that would require the regulators for credit unions to publish their annual budgets and to hold a public hearing on that budget. It would increase public transparency and ensure that Nevada credit union members have a voice in Washington, DC.

Working with my friend Senator TESTER, we were able to include language to increase congressional oversight of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Department in order to ensure that our best interests are represented at international insurance discussions on capital standards.

I was also pleased that language authored by Senators PERDUE, TESTER, DONNELLY, and myself was incorporated to require consumer credit bureaus to provide free and timely security credit freezes to all consumers. It also requires credit bureaus to provide consumers a notice at any time of their consumer rights and for the credit bureaus to tell consumers on their websites that they have a right to request a security freeze, fraud alert, and an Active-Duty military fraud alert.

Additionally, this bill includes the Community Lender Exam Act that I co-led with Senator DONNELLY, which would allow more highly rated community lenders to be examined every 18 months instead of 12 months. This will help safe and sound local lenders to direct more of their time and capital to Nevada communities and ensure the same level of regulatory supervision.

With this bill we are seeing something rare in Washington, DC—Democrats and Republicans working together to help Americans have more economic opportunities. Let me say that again. This bill will help Americans have more economic opportunities. That is why I am here in the Senate—to give every Nevadan the opportunity to live the fullest life and to achieve their goals. I look forward to voting to support this legislation, and I would encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I am here to discuss the merits of S. 2155, a bill that I have been working on since coming to the Senate in 2013. It is a bill that addresses the concerns of rural financial institutions, particularly those in our rural communities. It is a bill that was drafted to address access to capital concerns and the consolidation of small banks in areas where I live, which is in the State of North Dakota. It is a bill that I am incredibly proud of. I know that there have been a lot of statements made about this bill in the last week, and I am here to set a lot of those straight.

Before I start, I wish to talk about what it is like in rural communities where I grew up. I find it interesting when I hear that this bill is about Wall Street banks and big bank bailouts. The last time I checked, Lincoln State Bank, which is my small community bank in the community where I went to high school, in Hankinson, ND, is not on the Fortune 500. It is not on the Fortune 100. It is a small community

bank that has been operating and has been available to consumers in my community to help them achieve their family goals, achieve their farming goals, and achieve their needs for capital going forward.

I don't recognize the bill that is being debated here in the U.S. Senate because it is not the bill that has been written, and it is not the bill that is hopefully going to pass the Senate. I don't think that it is any mistake, when you look at the five primary sponsors of this bill—the five of us who wrote this bill—that most of us are from predominantly rural States. I think we understand the needs of those living in our States and the needs of those living in our rural communities.

When you look at an opportunity to fix regulation and to respond to concerns that people have, one of the constant arguments that I get when I go home is this: There is no longer any common sense in Washington, DC. They don't understand where we live. They don't understand who we are. They don't understand that we live in communities and that we support and protect each other. Instead, they write one regulation that is supposed to be one-size-fits-all.

That is certainly not what this is. This is an attempt to write a bill that would give direction to the Federal regulators so that small banks could be treated as small banks and so that large banks could continue to be regulated and treated as the large, systemically significant institutions that they are.

I will give just a few statistics that I think everybody should understand.

Thirty years ago, there were approximately 14,000 banks in the United States. Today, there are approximately 5,000. Since the passage of Dodd-Frank, the United States has lost about 14 percent of its smallest banks. Meanwhile, the small banks' share of U.S. domestic deposits and banking assets has decreased, and the five largest U.S. banks, which don't benefit from our bill, appear to have absorbed much of this market share.

What I have said consistently is that Dodd-Frank was supposed to have stopped too big to fail, but the net result has been too small to succeed. The big banks have gotten bigger since the passage of Dodd-Frank, and the small banks have disappeared. They have retreated from their traditional role of relationship lending, first out of fear for regulation in that they might be doing something wrong and then out of fear of the cost of regulation if they are going to work towards compliance.

I will make one simple point. This bill was not written by Wall Street bankers, and it was not written by Wall Street lobbyists. If it had been, it would have been a completely different bill in that it would actually provide relief to Wall Street banks and Wall

Street bankers, but it does exactly the opposite. It will give relief to those institutions, whether they be regional banks or small community banks, that can be effective competition for the largest institutions in this country.

It is absolutely essential that we set the record straight that this bill is to get our relationship institutions—whether they be credit unions or banks or our regional institutions that are not doing anything more sophisticated than the work that is being done in our small community banks—the regulatory relief that they need to effectively compete against the biggest banks in this country and to tailor our regulations, to set our regulations, in a way that reflects the common sense of American citizens.

I will take a minute because I think a lot of things that have been said about this bill have been incredibly reckless. These inaccurate claims, if left unchallenged and undiscussed, will create the legislative history of this bill, which could, in fact, then be used by many of the same institutions that we believe are not affected by this bill to argue that they are entitled to some sort of protection. We can't let that happen.

First, let me start by saying this is not a giveaway to Wall Street. It is not a giveaway to the largest institutions. Our bipartisan bill makes targeted, commonsense fixes so as to provide tangible relief to community banks and credit unions so that they can lend to borrowers in rural America and support rural communities. It leaves in place rules and regulations that hold Wall Street accountable. In fact, the big banks aren't necessarily happy with this bill because it doesn't benefit them much.

When we asked the current regulators, such as Fed Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell—he basically said that he believes the bill gives the regulators the tools they need to continue to protect and prevent against financial collapse.

Let me say how the bill doesn't help the largest institutions.

It will not make any significant changes to the regulations that face the largest Wall Street banks. They will continue to be reined in from causing havoc to the financial system like they did during the financial crisis. It will not make any structural changes to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It will be allowed to continue to protect consumers. It will do nothing to weaken or repeal the Volcker rule. The only institutions that will be given any relief from the Volcker rule will be those banks that have under \$10 billion in assets. That is not JPMorgan; that is not Citibank; that is not Goldman Sachs; that is not the largest of institutions. Those institutions of \$10 billion or less are the only institutions that will get relief from

the Volcker rule. It also does not change the way the Federal Reserve regulates foreign banks.

Second, this bill will not lead to another mortgage lending crisis.

Let's just go back and examine what happened in 2008. We had a significant number of liar loans—subprime lending—which drove the mortgage market. That was troublesome and problematic in and of itself, but the real problem came when those mortgages were securitized and sold into the secondary market. That is where the trouble began. It was trouble enough that they were putting institutions in jeopardy, but they were passing along that risk to the public through these securitized products—derivatives. Guess what. When the whole thing collapsed, we looked behind, and we saw these risky mortgage loans. We saw what actually created some of the problems on the front end before it was securitized.

Nothing in this bill changes qualified mortgage standards. Nothing in this bill removes the protections that Dodd-Frank has provided to the secondary market. The only thing this bill does as it relates to mortgages is to say to those small institutions, which are the small community banks that I am familiar with, that they can make mortgages without worrying about the qualified mortgage standards. They can go ahead and do that. The one thing they can't do is sell those mortgages into the secondary market. They have to keep those mortgages on the books.

When you have a requirement that they keep them on the books, do you really, honestly believe that these institutions are going to take unnecessary risks? The answer is no. Guess what. They didn't take unnecessary risks before 2008. They did not cause this problem, but they are incurring the bulk of the expenses to fix this problem.

To suggest that we are, in fact, risking the financial security of this country—of our institutions—because we gave a small, discrete break on mortgages to the smallest of institutions, which have to keep these mortgages in portfolio, is absurd. If you don't believe me, let's look at what Congressman Barney Frank, one of the architects of Dodd-Frank, said yesterday. He said, "Nothing in this bill in any way weakens the prohibition about making shaky loans to people with weak credit and then packaging them into a security."

Our bill restores the balance for small community banks in the mortgage business without opening the door to excesses and predatory lending standards that led to the financial crisis. To suggest otherwise is disingenuous and simply not true. We have to push back against this idea that somehow we are rolling back the clock. In fact, in this same interview, Congress-

man Barney Frank said that about 95 percent of Dodd-Frank, as it is written, will remain intact after this bill passes—95 percent. You would not believe that to listen to the dialogue and the diatribe we have heard on the floor.

The third misstatement is that we will somehow scrap the rules for the largest Wall Street banks and allow regional banks with up to \$250 billion in assets to follow the same rules and regulations as the tiny community banks.

Again, this is not true. Far from scrapping the rules, our bill simply provides that the Federal Reserve has the ability to tailor one piece of Dodd-Frank, and that is the section 165 regulations. For certain regional lenders, that means that if they do not pose systemic risk, they will not be subject to the requirements of section 165. Yet, if the Fed determines that they could, as in the case, as you have heard, of Countrywide—if there is another Countrywide out there and the Fed discovers another Countrywide—it can, in fact, include that institution in section 165.

So let's not exaggerate the impact of this bill. Let's talk about how we have moved the assumption from \$50 billion or \$100 billion to \$250 billion in terms of what is systemically risky, knowing that the Fed can always go back and include smaller institutions if they, in fact, see the challenges.

The other thing that we need to point out about the Dodd-Frank regulations and consistent regulations in moving forward is that our bill still requires very rigorous stress testing for these regional institutions. Regional institutions would have to have the ability to meet those stress tests.

At his confirmation hearing, Chairman Powell called the framework of this bill a sensible one, and he affirmed that he would like to continue meaningful and frequent stress tests on banks between \$100 billion and \$250 billion, as provided for in this bill, while he confirmed that it is not necessary to stress test the smaller banks. I think that this position is supported, again, by Janet Yellen, who said, "I do think it's appropriate to tailor regulations to the system footprint of the financial organization" and called our bipartisan Senate bill "a move in a direction that we think would be good."

Moreover, our bill does not change the risk-based capital and leverage regime for these regional institutions under the Basel III reforms. Relatedly, our bill does not change the fact that the comprehensive capital analysis and review—what we call CCAR—applies to these regional banks. Of course, the Fed has said it will continue to implement enhanced prudential standards.

In addition to stress tests that are required under this bill for some banks over \$100 billion, we have all of these other requirements and the requirement that they continue to meet qualified mortgage standards. They can sell

these mortgages into the secondary market if they meet those standards.

It is critically important that we be very clear about what this bill does and does not do for our mid-sized or regional institutions.

The fourth and probably the most hurtful of the claims that have been made is that those of us who care deeply about preventing and eliminating discrimination in lending have somehow opened the door to allow for discrimination in lending by changing the HMDA standards. That is an outrageous claim and particularly hurtful for the Members of this body who have spent their lives fighting discrimination. I want to talk about the facts.

Our bill continues to require that all lenders, no matter the size, collect the traditional HMDA data, which includes information on race, gender, and ethnicity. Contrary to what some have said, our bill only relaxes the new, additional data requirements for some of the smallest lenders in the country—those that make less than 500 loans a year. This data only makes up 3.5 percent of all of the data collected under HMDA. Think about that. We are claiming that people are discriminating and allowing for discrimination because we are relaxing the standards for the smallest institutions, and it only amounts to 3.5 percent of the total data collected—3.5 percent. This is an outrageous statement, and it is needs to be corrected on the record.

You might ask, why even change the 3.5? For those small institutions, the 44 pages of data that they are required to collect—it may, in fact, be that they no longer are interested in doing those kinds of mortgages.

So it is very important that we correct the record. In fact, I asked Chairman Powell during a recent Banking Committee hearing to clarify whether he believed the change in S. 2155 would result in or lead to additional discrimination in lending. He said that he did not believe that it in any way would affect their ability to enforce the fair lending laws in this country.

Fifth, some have inaccurately alleged that the change from “may” to “shall” in the tailoring is a dangerous provision that empowers big banks to secure more favorable treatment from the government. I think that claim does not stand up to scrutiny.

First, it is common sense that we should tailor Federal regulations so they are implemented in a practical and effective way. Second, in our bill, we retain the broad rule of construction under section 165, which provides the Federal Reserve with wide latitude to tailor prudential standards to any company or category of companies based on any risk the Fed deems appropriate—pretty broad authority on the part of the Federal Government. Third, in the event of a lawsuit, the Fed would be given strong deference by the

courts to interpret what might apply to section 165.

Sixth, our bill would not open up targeted reforms to the supplementary leverage ratio beyond the three custody banks. Under the plain reading of this bill, the three custody banks are the only three institutions that are predominantly engaged in the custody business. Of course, the regulators retain the discretion to make appropriate adjustments to SLR.

To be clear, there is broad agreement among regulators that the unique business model of custody banks warrants tailored treatment of the SLR provision. That is why a substantially similar bill passed the House Financial Services Committee—no lighthearted people there on the minority side—by a vote of 60 to 0.

Finally, our bill will not gut oversight of foreign megabanks operating in the United States such as Barclays and Deutsche Bank. These three institutions, all of which have over \$250 billion in assets, will be subject to section 165 of Dodd-Frank. That means foreign banks will still be subject to foreign bank stress test requirements, liquidity stress testing, and strict Basel III capital requirements.

Our bill does not change the Fed’s requirement that large foreign banks establish an intermediate holding company in the United States, which subjects foreign banks’ U.S. operations to requirements similar to those imposed on U.S. banks.

Chairman Powell at the March Senate Banking Committee hearing was asked about this, and he said he did not believe this bill would exempt foreign banks from tough oversight under Dodd-Frank. Additionally, the substitute amendment for this bill has affirmed that large foreign banks do not escape Dodd-Frank supervision.

I think it is really important that we debate the actual merits of this bill and not the “boogeyman” merits—the statements that this bill will somehow lead to a catastrophic downfall of our financial system. As I said, even Barney Frank disagrees with that evaluation of this bill.

It is important we set the record straight on what this bill does and does not do and that we make sure that when a court is reviewing this provision—if, in fact, there is ever litigation—that the court has a record to go to on the floor of the Senate and in the committee which corrects misstatements and refocuses the bill on what the actual intended outcome is and how the bill was actually written.

So with that, I will yield the floor, but I will say I intend to submit a document for the RECORD in the next discussion, which, hopefully, will provide a written document outlining the myth versus the facts of this bill so we can have an actual record that the courts can look to that documents the intent

and the purpose of this legislation beyond the hyperbole and overstatement that we have heard.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I have come to the floor of the Senate five times over the past week to talk about how the bank lobbyist act puts American families in danger of getting punched in the gut in another financial crisis. I have talked about how it rolls back consumer protections and how, if it passes, 25 of the 40 largest banks in this country—banks that sucked down, collectively, almost \$50 billion in bailout money during the crisis, and nobody went to jail—can be regulated like tiny, little community banks.

I talked about how the bill will roll back the rules on the very biggest banks in this country—JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, and the rest of them—banks that broke our economy in 2008, banks where no one went to jail, banks where taxpayers coughed up \$180 billion to bail them out. I talked about how Washington is poised to make the same mistake it has made many times before deregulating giant banks while the economy is cruising, only to set the stage for another financial crisis.

Now, I am not the only one who has talked about problems with this bill. The Wall Street Journal, Bloomberg, the FDIC, the Congressional Budget Office, the NAACP, the Urban League have all talked about parts of this bill that cause problems and would cause problems in our economy.

Today, I want to talk about another part of the bill that keeps me awake at night—the part that guts our ability to find and go after mortgage discrimination by exempting 85 percent of banks from reporting data about the loans they make under a law called the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act or HMDA.

There is a long and shameful history in this country of discriminating against communities of color when they try to buy homes. From 1934 to 1968, the Federal Housing Administration led the charge, actively discriminating by refusing to insure loans to qualified buyers while helping White families finance their plans to achieve the American dream. This policy was not a secret. Nope. It was not the product of a handful of racist government officials. Nope. It was the official policy of the U.S. Government until 1968—

in my lifetime and the lifetime of 90 Senators who serve today. The official policy of this government was to help White people buy homes and to deny that help to Black people. Because the Federal Government had set this standard, private lenders enthusiastically followed Washington's lead.

Homes are the way that millions of working families built some economic security. They pay down a mortgage and own an asset that over time often appreciates. A home serves as security to fund other ventures—to start a small business or to send a youngster to college. If Grandma and Grandpa could hang on to the home and get it paid off, they can often pass along an asset that boosts the finances of the next generation and the one after that.

That is exactly what White people have done for generations—but not Black people. Systematically, over many decades, government policies that encouraged mortgage companies to lend only to White borrowers cut the legs out from under minority families trying to build some family wealth, and the result has been exactly what you would predict. It has contributed to a staggering gap of wealth between White communities and communities of color today. One statistic from Massachusetts, according to the Boston Globe, states that the median net worth of White families living in Boston is \$247,500, and the median net worth for a Black family is \$8. That is something all Americans, regardless of race, should be ashamed of.

When I was traveling around the country in the aftermath of the financial crisis, it became clear to me that the crash had made the problem worse. Subprime lenders that had peddled mortgages full of tricks and traps had specifically targeted minority borrowers. That meant that during the great recession, a huge number of minority borrowers lost their homes. When rising home prices helped White Americans regain some financial security, communities of color, with their lower homeownership rates and their higher foreclosure rates, were often left behind.

Again, this is just one example. According to Pew, between 2010 and 2013, the median wealth of White households grew by 2.4 percent, but the wealth of Hispanic households in that same time fell by 14.3 percent, and the wealth of African-American households fell by 33.7 percent.

Mortgage discrimination didn't end in the 1960s when formal redlining policies were abolished. It didn't end with the tightening of mortgage rules following the financial crisis. Lending discrimination is still alive and well in America in 2018.

According to a new report that just came out from the Center for Investigative Reporting and Reveal, in 2015 and 2016, nearly two-thirds of mortgage

lenders denied loans for people of color at higher rates than for White people. This problem affects both big and small lenders, and it is nationwide. Minority borrowers were more likely to be denied a mortgage than White borrowers with the same income in 61 different cities across America.

How do we know that? Because of HMDA data. That is how we can see how much Black families were charged for a mortgage or how often Latino families were denied a chance to take out a mortgage—and we can compare those numbers with White borrowers who have the same income and same credit scores, but we can't do that if the data is missing. It is impossible to detect and fight mortgage discrimination without HMDA data.

The banking bill on the floor of the Senate says that 85 percent of the banks will no longer be required to report HMDA data, including the borrower's credit score and age; the loan's points, fees, and interest rates, and the property value. Eighty-five percent. This data is essential to figuring out whether the borrower got a fair deal.

If this bill passes, there will be entire communities where there will not be enough data to figure out whether borrowers are getting ripped off, entire communities where it will be impossible to monitor whether people are getting cheated because of their race or gender, entire communities where Federal and State regulators will not be able to bring cases, and independent groups like Reveal will not be able to hold these groups accountable.

Sure, banks will save a little money by not having to fill out the HMDA data, but when communities of color are once again left behind, there will be no way to prove it. That is why civil rights groups around the country have spoken up against this bill. The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights said "[e]xempting the overwhelming majority of our Nation's banks and credit unions from an expanded HMDA requirement that would better enable Federal regulators, State attorneys general, fair housing advocates, and others to identify and address discriminatory and predatory mortgage practices is unwise."

The Urban League and the National Community Reinvestment Coalition wrote in a newspaper column that the bill "would be a giant step backwards for the public and national groups who use this data to ensure banks treat all borrowers equally." According to the NAACP, the bill "would devastate our attempts to determine—and potentially rectify—racially discriminatory lending or loan approval patterns at play."

This is about basic fairness. HMDA data is an investment we should be making to make sure that all qualified Americans have the same chance to buy a home. Throughout our history,

Washington has always fallen short of that goal. Gutting HMDA allows our country and our government to ignore discrimination, letting history repeat itself.

Communities of color will pay the price if this Congress makes this same mistake again. It isn't too late. We can stop this bill from becoming law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I want to talk about the tragedy of human trafficking. I want to talk about it today because this is an issue that I hope the entire U.S. Senate will take up within the next week.

We have legislation on which we have worked on a bipartisan basis over the last couple of years, and we have an opportunity late this week or early next week to address this growing problem. I have spent a lot of time focused on this issue over the last couple of years because of the growth of trafficking and my sense that we can do something constructive about it. Others have been involved as well.

Today, I will be at the White House for a meeting that Ivanka Trump is hosting with congressional colleagues, anti-trafficking advocates, and others who have demonstrated a commitment to addressing this issue. We will talk about the need to pass this legislation, get it to the President's desk for signature, and begin to help women and children across our country who are currently being exploited online.

We will probably talk about lots of different kinds of trafficking this afternoon, including work trafficking and other human trafficking, but the one I want to focus on this afternoon is sex trafficking, and the reason is that we think we have a legislative solution for addressing the biggest problem.

Unbelievably, right now in this country, sex trafficking is actually increasing. That is based on all the best data we are getting from all the experts around the country. They say that it is increasing primarily for one simple reason, and that is the internet. The great increase is happening online.

As some have said, this is because of the ruthless efficiency of selling people online. When I am back home in Ohio, victims tell me: Rob, this has moved from the street corner to the smartphone. There is a ruthless efficiency about it.

Anti-trafficking organizations, such as the National Center for Missing and

Exploited Children, Shared Hope International, and others, have told us that the majority of the online sex trafficking they encounter occurs through one single website, and that is backpage.com.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children says that backpage is involved in about 75 percent of the online trafficking reports it receives from the public. Shared Hope International says it is more than that.

I chair the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Learning about what is going on online, we decided to do an in-depth investigation to find out what is really happening and how we could address it. We spent 18 months studying this, and studying online trafficking quickly led us to backpage.com because, again, that is where the majority of this commercial sex trafficking is occurring.

What we found was really shocking. Not only was backpage—as other websites have in the past—selling women and children online, but this organization and others are actually complicit in these crimes; in other words, they knew much more than we had previously thought. We found that backpage was actually knowingly selling people online.

We did this through a subpoena process that had to be approved here in the U.S. Senate because the company objected to responding to our subpoenas. For the first time in 21 years, we had to come to the U.S. Senate to get approval to actually enforce the subpoena. We then had to take it all the way to the Supreme Court because they appealed it all the way up, and we won.

Through this, we were able to get about 1 million documents. We went through these documents to find out what was happening. What we learned was that this website actually was actively and knowingly involved in selling people online. When a user would post an ad that might have a word indicating that the girl they were selling was underage—for instance, it might say “cheerleader” or it might simply reference the age of the girl being 16, 17 years old or younger sometimes—instead of rejecting that ad, knowing that it was of course illegal, they would instead clean up the ad; in other words, they would edit out the words that indicated someone was underage. They didn’t just remove the post because they didn’t want to lose the revenue—and you can imagine this is a very lucrative business. They just insisted that the ad be edited.

By the way, this also covered up the evidence of the crime, so it was then harder for law enforcement to find out who was involved in the selling of girls online—and underage girls. Of course, it also increased the company’s profits. That is what we found in our investigation.

We also found that for years and years people who had been trying to hold these websites accountable in court had failed, and they had failed and been unsuccessful because of a Federal law that, in essence, said to these websites: You have an immunity to be able to do this. You couldn’t do it on the street corner, but online you have an immunity to be able to do it.

I recommend a powerful documentary. It is called “I am Jane Doe.” You can find it on iamjanedoe.com. It is on Netflix. It tells the story of underage girls who have been exploited on backpage. It talks about the trauma they have experienced, and, finally, it also talks about their frustration with their inability to hold these websites accountable.

What might surprise you is the reason these websites are not held accountable—the more we dug into it, the more it became clear—is that Washington basically passed a Federal law, which I believe has been misinterpreted by the courts, but it has been interpreted by the courts to say that these websites have no risk, that they are not liable, and that they have an immunity under Federal law. It is called the Communications Decency Act.

The Communications Decency Act was enacted back in 1996, when the internet was in its infancy. It was intended to protect websites from liability based on third-party posts on that website. I understand the intention of Congress, but it now protects websites when they knowingly allow this criminal activity—the crime of sex trafficking—to occur through their site.

I believe Congress meant well when enacting this law. In fact, part of its original intent was actually to protect children from indecent material on the internet by holding individuals liable for sending explicit material to those children.

Now that same law is being used as a shield by websites that promote and engage in online sex trafficking with immunity. I don’t believe Congress ever intended this broad liability protection for websites that actively and knowingly facilitate online sex trafficking, but the legal interpretation of the law has led to this. That is why America’s district attorneys, 50 State attorneys general, judges all over the country, and so many others have called on Congress to amend this Communications Decency law and fix this injustice—really, this loophole.

Last year, a Sacramento judge threw out pimping charges against backpage and directly called on Congress to act. Here is what this judge said—again, this sort of message has been repeated by other courts: “If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the ex-

ploitation of others by human trafficking.” That is not just a suggestion; it is an invitation—an invitation to this Congress to act, calling on us to do what we were sent here to do, which is to craft laws that promote justice.

For too long, victims of online sex trafficking have been denied the justice they deserve, and now we have the opportunity here in the Senate—I hope within the next week—to fix that.

Last August, I introduced legislation called the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA, with a bipartisan group of 24 cosponsors, including my coauthor, Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, and Senators JOHN MCCAIN, CLAIRE MCCASKILL, JOHN CORNYN, HEIDI HEITKAMP, and others.

SESTA would provide justice for victims of online sex trafficking and hold accountable those websites that intentionally facilitate these crimes. We do this by making two very narrowly crafted changes to Federal law. First, we remove the Communications Decency Act’s broad liability protections for a narrow set of bad-actor websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking crimes—high standard: knowingly. Second, the legislation allows State attorneys general to prosecute websites that violate existing Federal trafficking laws. SESTA simply says that if you are violating Federal sex trafficking laws and you are knowingly facilitating it, then you have to be held to account. That seems to make all the sense in the world, and it will make a big difference for these girls and women who are being exploited online.

Our bill protects websites that are doing the right thing, by the way. In fact, it preserves what is called the Good Samaritan provision of the Communications Decency Act, which protects good actors who proactively block and screen their sites for offensive material, and thus it shields them from frivolous lawsuits. I think that is appropriate. We simply carve out a very limited exception in the Communications Decency Act’s liability protections for those who knowingly facilitate sex trafficking.

By the way, there are already exceptions for things in this law—exceptions for things like copyright infringement. This isn’t a new idea. So unless you think protecting copyrights is more important than protecting women and children from the trauma of trafficking, you should be for this. Even those who support section 230 otherwise should strongly support this.

If a prosecutor can prove in court that a website has committed these acts, SESTA allows that website to be held liable and the victims to get the justice they deserve.

By the way, 68 Senators now—more than two-thirds of this body—have signed on as cosponsors of this legislation, a majority of Republicans and a majority of Democrats. That doesn’t

happen very often around here. The House of Representatives passed SESTA as an amendment to a broader anti-sex trafficking bill just a couple of weeks ago by an overwhelming margin—more than 300 folks. The Trump administration has endorsed this solution and again shown a commitment to the issue. So SESTA has overwhelming support from the White House, from more than 300 House Members, and from the 68 Senators who signed on to be a part of this solution.

I think one reason it has gotten so much support is because of the logic of the legislation, the fact that we narrowly drew up the legislation not to affect internet freedom, to be sure we were listening to people who had concerns, but also, and more importantly, because we are all hearing about this issue back home. We are all hearing the stories, and they are powerful, they are compelling, and they are heart-breaking.

Kubiiki Pride came to Congress, to our subcommittee, as we were looking into this issue and told us her story. In testimony, she said: My daughter ran away from home. She had gone missing. She had been missing for several weeks. Obviously, I was very concerned. I couldn't find her. Someone suggested that I look at this website called backpage, so I did. I found my daughter.

She found her daughter—14 years old—but found her daughter in very sexually difficult photographs, horrible photographs of her beautiful daughter. So she called backpage.com and said: I am Kubiiki Pride, and that is my daughter on your website. She is 14 years old. I am so glad I found her. Thank you for taking down that ad. She is 14 years old.

Do you know what the person on the other end of the phone said? They said: Did you post the ad?

This is how evil these people are.

She said: No, I didn't post the ad. That is my daughter. I have been trying to find her. She has been missing for several weeks.

They said: If you didn't post the ad, if you didn't pay for it, you can't take it down and we won't take it down.

That is what we are dealing with here.

Eventually, she found her daughter, got her daughter back. She went through the proper process to be able to hold backpage accountable, and guess what. The court said: Sorry. Under section 230 of the Communications Decency Act—Congress wrote this bill—this website has immunity, even though she is 14 years old and she was being sold online.

So I think that is why 68 Senators have said: Let's step up and do this. This is something we can do around here that is not partisan, that isn't about politics. It is about people. It is about human dignity. It is about ensur-

ing that more girls like Kubiiki Pride's daughter don't have to go through this trauma, that more women and children can live out their life's purpose without having to go through this trauma. I think that is why we have been able to find so many Members who want to step up and do something here and do something that will really make a difference.

So let's vote on this legislation in the next week. Let's get it signed into law so that more children and more women are not exploited through this brutally efficient online process of selling people. If we do this, we are going to be able to provide justice to those victims who deserve it, and we are going to make this world a little better place. I urge the Senate to vote this next week.

For those Members who are not yet a part of this legislation, we urge you to join us. Wouldn't it be great to have everybody on board to correct this injustice, to close this loophole, and to ensure that everybody has the ability to meet their God-given purpose in life?

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1551

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, today, I rise once again to urge this body to address the critical issue of securing the border and protecting those young immigrants impacted by the uncertain future of the DACA Program. Last week, I offered legislation to extend DACA protection for 3 years and provide 3 years of increased funding for border security. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues chose to block that measure.

Let me first say, I understand and sympathize with my colleagues' concerns. I, too, believe that DACA recipients deserve a permanent solution, and I have repeatedly stated my strong preference for such a measure. We have tried to find this permanent solution through Republican-led bills, Democratic-led bills, and bipartisan bills. Yet somehow, each time, we are incapable of finding a compromise that can garner 60 votes. It is clear that we cannot achieve this goal right now, and no one is more disappointed about that fact than I am.

I am the first to admit that this solution I propose is far from perfect, but it provides a temporary fix to those crucial and critical problems. It begins the process of improving border security, and it ensures that DACA recipients

will not lose protections or be left to face potential deportation. These young immigrants, brought here through no fault of their own, cannot wait for these protections. Likewise, border communities, like those in my home State of Arizona, cannot wait for increased security along the southern border.

As I have said before, we in Congress have too regularly confused action with results and have become entirely too comfortable ignoring problems when they seem too difficult to solve. That is why, if this measure is blocked again today, I will be returning to the Senate floor repeatedly until we can pass some sort of solution. To put it as bluntly as possible, it is simply not something we can ignore any longer.

I would like to again thank Senator HEITKAMP for joining me as a cosponsor of this bill. She has always been a valuable ally in bipartisan efforts to secure the border and to pass other immigration reform measures. We may not be able to deliver a permanent solution for these problems at this time, but we can't abdicate the responsibility of Congress to, at one point, solve them. There are many people whose lives and well-being depend on our ability to deliver meaningful results.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 300, H.R. 1551. I further ask that the Flake substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I, for one, really appreciate the Senator's attempt to solve this issue. Our hearts are very similar. But a temporary solution, such as the one the Senator from Arizona has proposed, is not a solution, as he just said. It is, rather, another failure of Congress to provide real border security for the American people. It provides only 25 percent of what we need to secure that border for the next 3 years. Does anybody really think that is acceptable?

Something the President and the American people have in common is that they want border security. In addition, Members of this body and the administration have spent a great deal of time over the last year, as a matter of fact, talking about a potential DACA solution. I am happy to report that people on both sides want this DACA situation solved permanently. I think the Senator from Arizona and I have the same desire there.

Further, as a result of recent decisions by Federal district courts, current DACA recipients are free to continue renewing their status unless and

until the Supreme Court overturns those lower court decisions. It will likely be over a year before the Supreme Court would even hear such a case.

It is my opinion that we should take that time right now and continue working on a permanent DACA solution, as well as the other legal immigration issues that we know are within reach, rather than settling for a temporary solution that does not address the problem. That permanent solution should also be one that ensures we are not back here in the future dealing with the same issue again.

The bill the Senator from Arizona is now proposing would only take us further away from fulfilling our congressional responsibility, with a 3-year delay. I will be happy to work with the Senator from Arizona and any of our colleagues in this body to try to address any of the concerns he and they have with the Secure and Succeed Act, which we just voted on a couple of weeks ago. That bill is exactly what the President said he would sign into law. Therefore, Mr. President, I respectfully object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PERDUE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

YEMEN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to use an oversized visual poster to be displayed during my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WYDEN be added as a cosponsor to my resolution, S.J. Res. 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, along with Senator MURPHY and Senator LEE, I rise to talk about one of the most important jobs the U.S. Congress has, and that is to fulfill its constitutional responsibility about whether the United States of America engages in military action.

We can disagree about the merits of this or that military action, but there should be absolutely no confusion that sending men and women of the U.S. military into conflict is the responsibility not of the President of the United States alone but of the U.S. Congress.

Let us be very clear—and I say this especially to my conservative friends

who talk about the Constitution all the time. Let me remind them as to what article I, section 8 of the Constitution reads in no uncertain terms: “The Congress shall have Power . . . to declare War.” The Founding Fathers gave the power to declare war to Congress—the branch most accountable to the people. For far too long, Congress, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has, in my view, abdicated its constitutional role in authorizing war. We are moving down a very slippery slope by which Congress is now becoming increasingly irrelevant in terms of that vitally important issue.

In my view, the time is long overdue for Congress to reassert its constitutional authority. That is what Senator LEE, Senator MURPHY, and I are doing with S.J. Res. 54. I am proud to have as cosponsors on that resolution Senator DURBIN, Senator BOOKER, Senator WARREN, Senator LEAHY, Senator MARKEY, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator WYDEN.

Many Americans are unaware that the people of Yemen—one of the poorest countries in the world—are suffering terribly today in a devastating civil war with Saudi Arabia and their allies on one side and Houthi rebels on the other. In November of last year, the United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator said that Yemen was on the brink of the “largest famine the world has seen for many decades.”

So far, thousands of civilians have died. The last count that I have seen is about 10,000. Over 40,000 have been wounded in the war. There are 15 million people who lack access to clean water and sanitation in an infrastructure which has been devastated. More than 20 million people in Yemen—over two-thirds of the population—need some kind of humanitarian support, with nearly 10 million people in acute need of assistance. This is a humanitarian disaster.

This very sad picture of a young child who faces starvation is what is taking place throughout this country. Sadly, this is not the only child in that position. Famine is a serious and growing problem in Yemen. Further, more than 1 million suspected cholera cases have been reported, potentially representing the worst cholera outbreak in world history. The pictures I have here today have been taken by photojournalists in Yemen, and they can attest to this human disaster.

One of the problems we have is, unfortunately, foreign policy is not an issue we talk about enough on the floor, and it is certainly not talked about enough in the media. Many Americans today are not aware that American forces have been actively engaged in the support of the Saudi coalition in this war—in its providing intelligence and the aerial refueling of planes whose bombs have killed thousands of people and made this crisis far worse.

My colleagues and I, along with all of our cosponsors, believe that as Congress has not declared war or authorized military force in this conflict, the U.S. involvement in Yemen is unconstitutional and unauthorized and the U.S. military support of the Saudi coalition must end. Without congressional authorization, our engagement in this war should be restricted to providing desperately needed humanitarian aid and diplomatic efforts to resolve this terrible civil war. That is why Senator LEE and Senator MURPHY and I have introduced this joint resolution pursuant to the 1973 War Powers Resolution, which calls for an end to U.S. support for the Saudi war in Yemen.

The War Powers Resolution defines the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces to include the “assignment of members of such Armed Forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities.” Assisting with targeting intelligence and refueling warplanes as they bomb those targets clearly meet this definition.

Here is the bottom line: If the U.S. Congress wants to go to war in Yemen, vote on that war, but I and the cosponsors of this legislation do not believe that the authority to go to war is now appropriate. We think what is going on now is unconstitutional, and unless Congress authorizes this war, it should be ended and ended immediately.

I look forward to a colloquy with Senator LEE and with Senator MURPHY. I now yield to Senator LEE, who has been very active on this issue from day one. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank Senator SANDERS for his leadership on this issue. It is an honor to be here with my friend and colleague, the Senator from Vermont, to talk about our joint resolution to force a vote on U.S. military involvement in a civil war that is going on in Yemen.

Whether one is present in the Senate Chamber today or whether one is tuning in from home, I hope you will listen closely for the next hour or so, so we can fill you in on the unauthorized Middle East war that your U.S. Government is supporting.

This war in Yemen has killed tens of thousands of innocent victims—human beings, lest we forget—each with immeasurable, innate, God-given dignity. This war has created refugees, orphans, and widows. It has cost many millions of dollars. Believe it or not, at the end of the day, according to at least one U.S. Government report, it has, arguably, undermined our fight against terrorist threats, such as ISIS, rather than to advance those efforts.

I will expand on these uncomfortable facts in a few minutes, but, for now,

let's focus on just one thing. Our military's involvement in Yemen has not been authorized by the U.S. Congress as is required by the U.S. Constitution. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution is pretty clear on this point. It reads that Congress shall have the power to declare war—Congress, not the President, not the Pentagon—Congress.

This is the branch of government that is most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals. It makes sense that this power would only be granted to that branch of government. Yet, in 2015, President Obama initiated our military involvement in Yemen without having permission from Congress, without having an authorization for the use of military force, without having a declaration of war. The current administration has continued Obama's war.

Senator SANDERS and I, along with Senator MURPHY and our six other cosponsors, are giving Congress a chance to fix this error by debating and voting on our Nation's continued involvement in this illegal, unauthorized war in Yemen.

Now, as our opponents claim, if this war is necessary, then, surely, they will be willing to come down to this floor within the Senate Chamber and defend it. Surely they will be willing to come onto the floor of the Senate and onto the floor of the House and seek authorization from Congress as the Constitution demands. Let's have an honest reckoning about this war today.

At this very moment, a tragedy is unfolding in Yemen. Very sadly, it is a tragedy for which our Nation shares some blame. Here are just a few facts about this war in Yemen, which is now approaching its third year: Fifteen million human souls in Yemen lack clean water and sanitation, and 8 million are at risk of starvation. The Yemeni people have been visited by the worst cholera outbreak in recorded human history—over 1 million cases. Every 10 minutes, a child under the age of 5 dies of preventable causes. A total of 10,000 civilians have been killed in this war, and 40,000 more civilians have been wounded in this war.

I think it is important to discuss the human toll this war is inflicting. I think it is especially important to have discussions like this one at the outset so that as we go into a conflict, the stakes are clear. For thousands of human beings, the decision we make in this Chamber will make the difference between life and death. This is one of the many reasons it is so important to keep reminding ourselves that the Founding Fathers were very clear about this. They didn't leave any ambiguity in terms of identifying who has the power to make decisions like this one, who has the power to decide when we go to war. Article I, section 8, says that Congress shall have the power to declare war.

From time to time, I hear it argued that declarations of war are somehow antiquated, that they are outdated, that they are anachronisms akin to ceremonial relics like powdered wigs or a key to the city, akin to a society whose principal mode of transportation involved a horse and a buggy, but that isn't true. These principles are as true today as they were then. Nothing about those principles has become outdated.

If you read the Founding Fathers, it is very clear that they thought the power to declare war was, in fact, important. They deliberately considered the matter and withheld it from the President for a reason. They did not vest this power in the Office of the Presidency, and that was a conscious, deliberate, and I believe wise choice.

To quote Alexander Hamilton in *Federalist* No. 69, the Founding Fathers wanted their President to be "much inferior" in power to a King. Kings declare war unilaterally. They can make life-or-death military decisions—on a whim if they want to. They don't need to go and seek support from the public before doing so. In our system, Presidents, by contrast, have to garner support from the public and the legislative branch before initiating war—far from a unilateral decision. The decision to go to war in America is supposed to be based on collaboration and consensus so that our Nation will be united to the greatest degree possible when we go through trying conflicts, at that moment when unity is what is so badly needed.

So which does the modern Executive resemble more today—a President as the Founding Fathers understood that term or a King? The answer is uncomfortably clear from the string of unauthorized military excursions that Presidents from both political parties have initiated in recent decades.

Of course, some people claim that the President has broad constitutional authority to make war as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. They are absolutely right. The President of the United States is, in fact, the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, but this is not the beginning and the end to the question. This does not mean the President may authorize at will military excursions around the globe for any reason or no reason at all without authorization from Congress. It does not mean that. It means nothing close to that. Only Congress can authorize a military campaign. Once Congress has done so, then the President has broad authority, vast discretion to decide how specifically to command the Armed Forces to victory.

There is one important notable exception to this big principle, and that exception arises specifically in the event of an attack on the United States. The Founders were wise. They anticipated that there could be threats to the homeland so serious that it

might be physically impossible for Congress to respond quickly enough, so they preserved to the President the power to "repel sudden attacks," in the words of James Madison.

Clearly, this strategy—we might describe it as a "break glass in case of emergency" kind of strategy. It is that kind of power. It is a "break glass in times of emergency" kind of power. It is supposed to be used only under extreme, extraordinary circumstances where Congress cannot convene in time to save the Nation. The Founders did not intend for the Commander in Chief's power to be used to justify military intervention in civil wars 8,000 miles away. That authorization can come only from this body in the form of a declaration of war or in the form of an authorization for use of military force. To date, we have not considered either one of these, much less voted on them and passed them in the case of this civil war in Yemen.

So I would ask my colleague, Senator SANDERS from Vermont, how long the American people can be expected to ignore our involvement in a foreign war.

Mr. SANDERS. Before I answer that very important question, I thank Senator LEE for his remarks. He is right on virtually everything he has said.

I want to bring Senator MURPHY into this colloquy. Senator MURPHY has been ahead of his time in focusing attention on what is going on in Yemen. He is one of the original sponsors of this legislation.

If Senator MURPHY would express his thoughts on this issue.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank Senator SANDERS and Senator LEE for allowing me to step in and say a few words before we have a short colloquy about the resolution we are bringing to the floor.

I brought this picture to the floor before, and I hesitate to keep it up for more than a few moments. It is very disturbing to look at, but this is the reality of Yemen today. This is the reality of a country in which thousands and thousands of civilians have been killed by a bombing campaign that the United States is facilitating—facilitating with intelligence sharing, facilitating with targeting assistance, facilitating with midair refueling, facilitating with the sale of munitions that end up being dropped on the homes of families like this.

This, as has been stated, is perhaps the worst cholera outbreak in modern history. Let's talk about why that happens.

Why are over 1 million people in Yemen today suffering from cholera, a disease that is entirely 100 percent preventable? The reason is that the water treatment facilities inside Yemen have been bombed, have been rendered useless such that there is no means by which they can keep the water that these young children drink clean.

Bombs sold to the Saudi coalition by the United States, bombs dropped from planes refueled by the U.S. Air Force, bombs that are directed via targeting centers in which U.S. personnel are embedded hit water treatment facilities inside Yemen, and there is now the worst cholera outbreak in our lifetime.

I cannot do a better job than Senator LEE did of explaining to the body why we believe it is so important for Congress to exercise our Article I responsibility to declare war. He laid it out better than I can. The Founding Fathers believed, as he said, that when there were matters of great import to the national security of this country, when there were decisions that the Executive was making with respect to hostilities with other nations that included serious consequences for the United States and the world, that should not be simply an Executive function. Very specifically, as Senator LEE said, that power of declaring war, of entering into hostilities against another nation, is housed here in the Congress. So it is relevant to talk about what is happening in Yemen today. What is the degree of the hostilities, and does it come with serious national security concerns for the United States of America, for the constituents we represent?

We are absolutely engaged in hostilities today. There is no way that what we see in these charts could not be categorized as hostilities. The bombs that ruined this entire neighborhood are made in the United States, are dropped by planes refueled by the United States, are directed by a targeting center that involves U.S. personnel. This is clearly an act of hostility that the United States, in partnership with the Saudi coalition, has entered into against the Yemeni people.

Remember, this is a civil war inside Yemen. There are not-so-good people on both sides of this civil war. The Houthis have been responsible for major, catastrophic acts in the country, just as the coalition has, but we are only on one side of that, so it makes sense for us to focus on the hostilities that have been entered into by the United States and the Saudi coalition. But let's for a second talk about the other implications for U.S. national security.

What has happened inside Yemen as this civil war has persisted? Al-Qaida and ISIS have grown in strength. For a period of time, AQAP—the arm of al-Qaida inside Yemen that has the most direct intention to hit the United States—had captured a major port inside Yemen and was drawing substantial revenue, allowing them to become stronger than ever before. By continuing to feed weapons into this civil war, the United States is helping to expand the reach and the power of the two entities inside Yemen that the administration argues they do have au-

thorization to fight—al-Qaida and ISIS. Many of us would draw issue with the interpretation of an AUMF passed a decade and a half ago as it applies to ISIS, but no doubt the administration has the ability to pursue war against al-Qaida, and al-Qaida is gaining strength because of the continuation of this civil war.

If you talk to Yemeni-Americans, they will tell you that inside Yemen, this is not seen as a Saudi bombing campaign, this is seen as a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign. And what they will further tell you is that Yemenis are becoming radicalized against the United States because there is a U.S. imprint on every bomb that is dropped and every single death inside that country.

While we may talk a good game about humanitarian relief and we may enter into occasional efforts to settle this conflict through negotiations, all they know is that for 3 years the United States has been supporting a Saudi bombing campaign that does not end. We have been supporting a Saudi-led coalition that has blocked humanitarian relief from entering this country. We may hear a lot about the money that the Saudis are putting into humanitarian relief, but we don't hear as much about the fact that at one point they completely closed the port through which the majority of humanitarian relief flows. Although now it is technically open, they are still narrowing the channel greatly through which relief supplies get to this country. So nobody should applaud the United States or the Saudis for providing relief to a country that they, indeed, are bombing.

I am not setting aside the culpability of the Houthis for substantial atrocities in this civil war as well, but we are only on one side of it.

This is clearly covered by the powers vested in the U.S. Congress to make war. If it isn't, it unlocks a horrific Pandora's box. If the President can enter into hostilities against another country so long as all they are doing is providing vast logistical support to a coalition partner, then there is no end to what the President can do so long as he doesn't put a troop on the ground.

Our involvement in the Saudi-led coalition has serious national security implications for the United States, aside from the fact that it has resulted in the deaths of thousands of civilians and has set off the worst humanitarian catastrophe the world has seen today. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I just want to bring these consequences to bear for our colleagues to think about—our colleagues who might not think that this rises to the powers vested in the Congress by the Constitution. There are very few more serious conflicts with respect to consequences for the United States than this one. So I guess I would wrap back around that question that Senator LEE posed to Senator SANDERS.

If the United States doesn't weigh in here, then, when? What is the precedent that is set by Congress's continuing to remain silent even when you have a humanitarian catastrophe and a set of consequences for U.S. national security that are this big?

Mr. SANDERS. Well, let me thank Senator MURPHY for his comments and Senator LEE before him. I think they touch on the most important issues. I wish to respond to what Senator LEE and Senator MURPHY both said, but I wish to make a point that needs to be made again and again.

This is not a partisan issue. We are talking about Democratic administrations acting militarily without congressional authorization. We are talking about Republican administrations doing the same. Senator LEE is a conservative Republican. Senator MURPHY is a Democrat. I am an Independent who caucuses with the Democrats. So if you are talking about bipartisanship, you are looking at it right here.

I should tell you that there are many organizations around the country—conservative and progressive—that are raising exactly the same issue that we are raising right here, and that is that Congress has to reassert its congressional authority over the issues of war.

If you want to go to war and you think the war in Yemen makes sense, that is fine. Come down here on the floor and tell us why you feel that way. Tell the American people and tell your constituents why you think it is a good idea to work with Saudi Arabia to wreak utter horror on one of the poorest countries in the world. Fine, come on down here and tell us. What we have to do, from a precedent point of view, is finally to say to our Republican President or a Democratic President: Enough is enough. Listen to the Constitution.

The Founding Fathers of this country were amazingly smart on this issue, and they understood that before we send our young men—and now women—off to war to die or to get maimed, there better well be a very good reason that we have to explain to the people who elected us—not just somebody sitting up there in the Oval Office. That is why the authority for going to war is vested in the representatives of the people, whether we are elected for 2 years or elected for 6 years.

I would also point out that this is not the first time that the Congress has weighed in on the devastating war in Yemen. In November of last year, the House of Representatives—and I hope my Senate colleagues know this—voted by a vote of 366 to 30. That was not even close. There was overwhelming support among Democrats and Republicans. They passed a nonbinding resolution stating that the United States' involvement in the Yemen civil war is unauthorized. The Democratic leadership supported it, as did the Republican

chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE.

Here is the bottom line. The bottom line is that Congress has ducked its responsibilities for many years, and if we continue to duck our responsibility on the all-important issue of U.S. military intervention, this Congress and, in fact, the people of the United States become increasingly irrelevant on this most important matter.

We are bringing forward a privileged motion. There will be a vote on this issue in one form or another. If you like the war in Yemen, then be prepared to defend why you think it is a great idea to work with the Saudis to destroy the infrastructure and to create a situation where famine and cholera are rampant in that incredibly poor country. Come on down and tell us why you think it is a good idea. If not, I hope you will vote with us to end this war and to allow the United States to get involved in bringing the warring parties together to see if we can bring peace and to see if we can bring humanitarian relief to these terribly suffering people.

I yield to Senator LEE.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to display an oversized visual display.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. I am not sure what constitutes oversized, but I have it on good authority that the ordinary Senate rules don't allow for a picture this big without unanimous consent. So, therefore, I sought it.

The picture itself paints an image and leaves an impression that itself is oversized and that demonstrates the humanity of this conflict. You see a child standing in what appears to be a school in an ordinary learning environment that has been rendered unusable by the devastating impact of war.

Now, war does happen. Conflicts do arise. This is one of the reasons why it was built into not only our system of laws but our foundational governing structure in the Constitution. The Founding Fathers understood that war would arise from time to time, but they carefully divided up the power, recognizing how devastating its implications could be, recognizing that bad things are a little bit less likely to happen if you don't allow too much power to be concentrated in the hands of a few.

Over time, Congress and the Presidency have had a little bit of a tug-of-war, as I referenced earlier, about where the Commander in Chief power ends and the war power begins.

In 1973 Congress reasserted its constitutional role and tried to clarify some of what had been described as a gray area by passing the War Powers Resolution. The crisis that led Congress to create this important law in

many ways was reminiscent of the conflict that we are discussing today.

The War Powers Act was passed in response to the Vietnam war. That war began with the insertion of just a small handful of U.S. military advisers in 1950, but their ranks grew and grew gradually but steadily, so that our commitment in Vietnam spiraled into a decades-long, bloodied conflict. Presidents from both parties abused their authority in order to wage this far-off war.

Finally, in 1973, Congress decided it was time to bring our boys home. So it repealed the limited legal authority for the war it had granted to then-President Johnson 7 years earlier.

In defiance of Congress, President Nixon continued the war, citing his authority as Commander in Chief. So Congress drafted the War Powers Resolution to give itself a way to remove our armed services personnel from unauthorized, unlawful, and unconstitutional war zones.

The War Powers Resolution states that the President must notify Congress within 48 hours of committing American troops to "hostilities" or "imminent hostilities." The War Powers Resolution goes on to provide that the President must remove troops from the conflict if Congress does not authorize their presence within 60 days or a maximum of 90 days in the case of certain emergencies.

Congress's passage of the War Powers Resolution was a bold assertion of its constitutional responsibility in the face of a chronically overreaching executive branch. In fact, Congress's desire to uphold the Constitution was so strong that it actually overrode President Nixon's veto of the War Powers Resolution.

Members of Congress today could certainly learn a thing or two from their predecessors' commitment to constitutional duties and to the limited power possessed by each branch of government.

Since the War Powers Resolution was passed in 1973, defenders of a royal executive have tried to go around it and tried to circumvent it altogether by claiming that their unauthorized wars somehow do not qualify as "hostilities."

We heard this claim by President Obama in response to Libya, and we heard it again in response to Yemen. It is the official position of the U.S. Department of Defense that we are not engaged in "hostilities" in Yemen unless our troops "are actively engaged in exchanges of fire with opposing units of hostile forces."

To translate, the U.S. Government really claims that it is not engaged in hostilities unless U.S. troops are on the ground being shot at by the enemy.

It stretches the imagination, and it stretches the English language beyond its breaking point to assert that our

military is not engaged in hostilities in Yemen. Consider for a moment what it is that the U.S. military is doing as part of the Saudi-led coalition effort against the neighbors of Saudi Arabia, the Yemeni neighbors.

U.S. military personnel are assigned to the joint combined planning cell in Saudi Arabia, where they are sharing military intelligence with the Saudis and helping to target enemies within Yemen for attack. Our forces are also refueling coalition bombers in midair on combat missions. If sending our military men and women to foreign lands to fuel a country's bombers and handpick its targets does not qualify as "hostilities," then those words have lost their meaning. What does the word "hostility" mean if it cannot be said to encompass that?

As it happens, the War Powers Resolution was designed to stop secret and unauthorized military activities such as these. So Congress is well within its right to vote on whether these activities should continue.

That is why this joint resolution that is authored by Senator SANDERS and cosponsored by Senator MURPHY, myself, and six others represents a big chance—a significant chance, a constitutional moment—for Congress to do the right thing, for Congress to do its job, and for Congress to represent the American people. After all, this is their blood and their treasure that are being put on the line. That is why the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution alike contemplate actions by Congress and not solely unilateral action by the executive branch.

I ask my colleagues Senator SANDERS and Senator MURPHY: Isn't it arguable that by overreaching in this instance, we might in fact be making matters worse? Couldn't we be putting our country in a position of less security rather than more?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I say to Senator LEE that I think that is an excellent question. That was just the question that I was going to ask of Senator MURPHY, because I think we understand that in recent history, when there is chaos and confusion in a country, it provides an extraordinary opportunity for al-Qaida and their allies to move in.

We have spent billions and billions of dollars fighting al-Qaida and their affiliates, and I fear very much, as you have indicated, that the situation we are creating in Yemen in many ways is making life easier for them.

I would ask this of Senator MURPHY—and maybe listeners might be surprised by this: What side of this battle is al-Qaida on in Yemen right now?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank Senator SANDERS for the question. This is incredibly important to understand.

There was great consternation in the beginning of this civil war, when the United States, under the Obama administration, was beginning to support

the Saudi-led coalition. The Saudis were only targeting the Houthis, and as the al-Qaida wing inside of Yemen was getting stronger and stronger, no matter how much we asked, no matter how much we pushed, the Saudi-led coalition would not drop bombs on al-Qaida and would not send any of their forces near them. They were only focused on the Houthis.

The answer as to why that was happening is very simple. The enemy of your enemy tends to be your ally, and inside Yemen, the Houthis were drawing fire from both the Saudi-led coalition and from al-Qaida. In the early stages of this fight, the policy of the Saudi-led coalition was to have hands off of al-Qaida, and that made al-Qaida stronger and stronger and stronger.

Now, admittedly, recently we have been more successful in getting the Emirates, not necessarily the Saudis, to take on targeted missions against al-Qaida, but that is only a recent phenomenon, and it is frankly belied by the fact that we have new information that at the same time that the Emirates are occasionally taking out operations—and sometimes dangerous operations, with risk of life to their forces against al-Qaida—they are also supporting other militias inside Yemen—Salafist militias—that are in many ways just as radical as al-Qaida is and are recruiting the types of recruits that one day may join ISIS and one day may join al-Qaida, targeting against the United States. So this is a very chaotic space in which very purposefully, for a period of time, the coalition allowed for al-Qaida to grow. Even though that policy has changed recently, there are still signs that there are some people who are very dangerous to the United States who are being supported on the ground by members of our coalition.

I know Senator DURBIN is here, so I want to turn it over to him. I just want to say two more quick things on this point. One is to note that our resolution does continue to allow for the United States to target al-Qaida. We built into this resolution a carve-out for any military activities that are currently authorized by the 2001 AUMF, and the administration interprets that to be al-Qaida and affiliated follow-on organizations. So let's be clear that if you care about the United States targeting al-Qaida, that can continue here.

Finally, to Senator LEE's point about this interpretation of hostilities, let's be clear about how narrow a definition that is. There have to be American troops on the ground exchanging fire in order for the War Powers Act to be triggered. That is not what Congress intended because, in fact, that would then allow the administration to perpetuate an unlimited air campaign, dropping unlimited munitions, devastating, ruining a country, without

any input from Congress. Even if one would say "Well, that does involve U.S. personnel flying overhead, so maybe that is potentially putting U.S. troops in the line of fire," remember, we are also entering an era of robotic warfare, in which U.S. personnel are going to be less instrumental to hostilities that will still have grave consequences for the United States.

Clearly, the notion of war and how you fight it has changed over the years. The Founding Fathers never imagined air campaigns. Yet, the intent and the language of the War Powers Act and of the Constitution are clear. When war is being waged, when hostilities are being entered into, Congress has to have a say. Please, look at any of the pictures that we are putting before you and tell us that the United States is not engaged in hostilities if the effect in the country of Yemen is this.

I thank Senator DURBIN for joining us on the floor today, and I yield to him.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues, Senator SANDERS, Senator MURPHY, and Senator LEE, for this bipartisan effort.

Why are we here today? Why are we discussing wars so far away? We are here because of this book. This is the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution very expressly tells us what we are supposed to be doing here. In article I, section 8, it lays out the things that we, the men and women who serve in Congress, are responsible for. Among the things that Congress shall have the power to do is to "declare war."

Why did the Founding Fathers make certain that it was clear that Congress would be involved in that decision on the declaration of war? When they created Congress, the idea was that the people of this country, far and wide, would at least have a voice in the decision, through the people they elected, and we would be held accountable for our decisions to declare war or to not declare it because we are up for election. So Congress has this responsibility, and over the years, many times, Congress has not exercised its responsibility in a responsible way.

I have a question. I bet that if I brought in every U.S. Senator and asked them the following question, very few would be able to answer it: How many countries is the United States military currently involved in fighting? How many countries are we in today, fighting? Would you guess two? Iraq, Afghanistan—all right, for sure, there. Five? Ten? Twenty?

Brown University's Costs of War Project recently published data saying that the United States fought terror through direct fighting, training, or military support to other forces or through drone strikes in 76 countries between October 2015 and 2017. Is that

the right number today? I am not sure. None of us know.

We are often surprised to learn we are sending our military and fighting in another country. When something awful occurs—Americans are killed, for example—sometimes Members of Congress hear it for the first time: Oh, we are in what country fighting?

I take this pretty seriously, and I have over the years when it comes to the authorization of using force, because it isn't just a matter of projecting American power; it is life and death. These are decisions that will be made by Congress or by the President—sometimes both—and the net result of it, even under the best of circumstances, is that Americans will perish. Funerals will be held in Illinois and in Utah and in Vermont and in Connecticut and in Wisconsin. That is the reality of the decisions we reach.

I can remember the debate right after 9/11 on the floor. It was one of the most important of my career. It was a question about whether we would authorize the President of the United States—President Bush at the time—to use military force to respond to 9/11. If my colleagues remember the debate, there were two real options on the floor. One was to use military force against those responsible for the attack on the United States and to send that force into Afghanistan. The other was to go after the so-called weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. They were two parallel debates, but two debates that I saw very differently.

I was skeptical from the start about this Iraqi invasion. Nobody ever connected the dots between Saddam Hussein and 9/11. We were talking about the threat that he was to the rest of the world. Yet we voted here on the floor of the U.S. Senate in 2002 to authorize the use of military force to go into Iraq. Sadly, we are still there today. Sadly, Iraq is in shambles, politically and physically, and the war continues.

I voted no. I remember that night. It was in October of 2002. I remember that night because the vote was taken very late, and there were two or three of us who stayed on the floor here, including Kent Conrad, as well as Paul Wellstone of Minnesota. Paul Wellstone was up for reelection. We wondered if that vote would affect him in any way, and I remember going up to him and saying: Paul, I hope your vote against the war in Iraq doesn't cost you the election.

Wellstone said to me: It is all right if it does. People know where I stand. They expect nothing less.

He didn't live to see the election. If my colleagues will remember, he died in a plane crash with his wife and staffers just a few days after that vote.

But that is the gravity of this decision. That is the importance of this decision. And that is why I want to thank

my colleagues for bringing us together—just a few of us but enough of us, maybe—in the Senate to remind people of our constitutional responsibility.

The vote on Afghanistan was one I voted for—the invasion of Afghanistan. The message was clear: If you attack the United States, we will come right back after you, al-Qaida, and we did.

I recently asked the Secretary of Defense—when I voted that way in 2002, I did not imagine that 15 or 16 years later, that war would continue. So I asked him: How does this war ever end in Afghanistan? He didn't know the answer. He didn't come up with one. All he could say to me was that if we left, it would be worse.

Well, you can say that about a lot of other countries in the world. But what we are talking about today is what we are going to do in terms of this horrid situation in Yemen. I was in my office looking down on this debate via C-SPAN, and I saw the photos that have been displayed here—the utter human and physical devastation that is taking place.

Senator SANDERS is asking a simple but deeply important question here today, and Senator LEE and Senator MURPHY join him. Here is the question: Who authorized the U.S. military action to help Saudi Arabia fight the Houthis in Yemen? I didn't. I don't remember that there was ever a vote. So how are we doing this? By what authority is our government doing this?

This is not about the merits of the fight or in any way a vindication of the Houthis' troubling role in the horrific Yemeni civil war; it is about whether Congress follows its constitutional responsibilities. It is about whether the American people have a voice in this decision—the same people who will send their sons and daughters to bravely serve in our military.

I am happy to be a cosponsor of this resolution that halts any such U.S. support without any congressional authorization. I call on this Congress to deal with revisiting the 2001 and 2002 authorizations of force that I believe have been stretched by multiple administrations beyond any credible limit.

There are real threats to the safety and security of America out there—al-Qaida and its successors and others. But we in Congress have the responsibility to authorize those conflicts and regularly update them as necessary.

Congress and the Senate have been absent without leave when it comes to article I, section 8, and our authority and responsibility to declare war. We have other looming threats, including North Korea and Iran, but any U.S. war against those countries or others, short of protecting against an imminent attack as allowed for in the War Powers Resolution, requires the vote of Congress, regardless of who the President may be.

When it comes to the declaration of war, we simply cannot see this as an annoyance. We must do our part. We must follow the Constitution, even when it is difficult.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois very much for his perceptive remarks and for reminding us that the time is long overdue for the U.S. Congress to accept its constitutional responsibilities.

I wanted to ask Senator LEE if he—we are running out of time here—has some closing remarks.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont. I appreciate his remarks and his leadership on this, and I appreciate the remarks that Senator DURBIN and Senator MURPHY have added to this discussion.

I want to close by pointing out that in addition to being unlawful and in addition to being unconstitutional, our involvement in Yemen is unproductive in the fight against terrorism. The Houthis we are fighting are a regional force—one that doesn't harbor ambitions of attacking the U.S. homeland. While the Houthis are certainly no friend of ours, neither are they a serious threat to our country. Yet we are diverting considerable resources to fighting the Houthis, resources that would be better spent fighting more substantial threats—threats that harbor, rather openly, ambitions of bringing down the United States, of attacking the United States. These are threats like al-Qaida or ISIS. On that point, the best evidence we have suggests that their involvement in Yemen has arguably undermined our fight against ISIS.

The State Department's most recent study, its most recent "Country Reports on Terrorism"—which, by the way, happens to be the authority on that subject for Congress and the American people—says that we have inadvertently strengthened ISIS by killing off its antagonists, the Houthis. This just reinforces the farcical character that our military excursions in the Middle East have the potential to undertake. We bomb with one hand; we give humanitarian aid with the other hand. We whack a terrorist from one group, and another springs up in its place.

Defenders of our efforts in this war in Yemen often claim that the real reason we are fighting the Houthis is that they are a proxy for Iran, which is the true threat to our Nation and to the world. This would be perhaps a reasonable rationale, but there are conflicting reports about the Houthis and their ties to Iran. Iran has expansionist views; the Houthis do not. Hezbollah is an officially listed as a foreign terrorist organization; the Houthis are not. The Houthis may be a rogue non-State actor, destabilizing their own country, but they are not a threat to

America—at least not yet. By helping the Saudis bomb them, we only give the Houthis reasons to start to hate us. Our involvement in Yemen detracts from our ability to be a diplomatic resource and the peacemaker in the region.

In closing, the substance of the resolution offered by Senator SANDERS and cosponsored by Senator MURPHY, me, and others is simple. It puts our war against the Houthi rebels to a vote. It concerns the Houthis and only the Houthis. If Members are convinced that our fight against the Houthis is worthwhile, then so be it. Congress will have done its part and the fight will go on, but if Members are not willing to pay the heavy pricetag for this war, calculated in dollars and in innocent human lives, then our resolution will bring U.S. operations to a close.

This resolution is an opportunity for Members of Congress to stand up and be counted on a matter of life and death. It is an opportunity to end the Executive's unconstitutional dominance over matters of war and peace and restore in its place a collaborative process whereby Congress declares war and Presidents wage war.

I thank Senator SANDERS.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me conclude by thanking Senator LEE, Senator MURPHY, Senator DURBIN this afternoon, thanking Senator BOOKER, Senator WARREN, Senator LEAHY, Senator MARKEY, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator WYDEN for their cosponsorship of S.J. Res. 54.

Let me summarize it very briefly in this way: Congress cannot continue to abdicate its responsibility on the all-important issue of how and when the United States becomes involved in military intervention. We cannot continue to run away from that issue.

If you think the war in Yemen and siding with the Saudis on this war makes sense, then come down to the floor of the Senate, make your position clear, tell your constituents what you believe, and then vote for the war but have the courage, at least, to accept your responsibility as a Member of the U.S. Congress and not abdicate it to the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we have a series of Senators who are going to be speaking about what is happening as a result of climate change and sea level rise, which is having its effects in my State of Florida, particularly.

Few States are as vulnerable to climate change than what we find particularly in South Florida, Miami Beach being Ground Zero. What is happening as the sea level is rising—and these are not projections, they are not forecasts; these are actually measurements, measurements by NASA and

NOAA over the last 40 years that the sea has risen in South Florida 5 to 8 inches.

We see the effects of that at the seasonal high tides—now, more increasingly, along with the cycles of the Moon each month. Water, typically, is sloshing around in streets and sloshing over the curves. As a result, the city of Miami Beach has had to spend tens of millions of dollars on huge, expensive pumps and has also had to raise the level of the roadbeds.

NOAA's most recent worst-case scenario projections predict a 2-foot sea level rise by 2060 and, if we take it all the way to the end of the century, 6 feet by 2100. Needless to say, in a peninsula that sits in the middle of what we know as Hurricane Highway, 6 feet would inundate so much of the coastal areas. By the way, the population of Florida is 21 million people, and 75 percent is along the coastal regions. That puts all of the entire Nation's low-lying coastal cities at risk of major flooding, not to mention our military installations along the coast.

The seas are not just rising; they are also warming, and they are rising because they are warming. Of course, I have explained this several times on the floor of the Senate: As the Sun's rays come in and hit the Earth, some of the heat is absorbed, but some of it is reflected off the Earth's surface and is radiated out into space.

When you put up an extra abundance of greenhouse gases—mainly carbon dioxide and methane—and they move into the upper atmosphere, they serve like a glass ceiling of a greenhouse; thus, the term, the "greenhouse" effect. Then, as that heat is reflected off the Earth that would normally radiate out into space, it is trapped and, thus, the entire Earth starts to heat.

Two-thirds of the Earth's surface is covered by oceans, and 90 percent of that heat is absorbed into the oceans. What happens to water when it is heated? It expands. So we see the reasons that warmer water means the sea levels rise.

Do you know what else it produces? More frequent and more ferocious hurricanes. After the back-to-back punch of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, imagine how much we would have to spend in Federal disaster aid if we had a hurricane season like last year every year. That is why it is so critical to continue funding climate and weather research and to keep improving NOAA's hurricane models.

This information can make the difference in a life-or-death situation. We saw what havoc the hurricanes visited upon Texas and then Florida after it had already crossed Puerto Rico, but then along comes Maria, and it hits the island directly. As of today, 5, going on 6, months after the hurricane, the poor island of Puerto Rico—our fellow American citizens—17 percent today do

not still have electricity. So, indeed, there has been a lot more loss of life as a result of hurricanes.

Our coastline in Florida is blessed, as a hurricane is approaching, with a natural breakwater. It is called the Florida Reef Tract. It is along the south-eastern coast. Of all the major barrier reefs in the entire world, Florida has the third largest. It starts south of Key West and continues all the way up the Keys, north, up to Fort Pierce, FL.

This Florida reef is the only barrier reef in the continental United States. Healthy reefs are able to reduce storm damage by taking a lot of the impact, but climate change, ocean acidification, and an unprecedented coral disease outbreak are hurting Florida's reefs and diminishing their ability to act as a shoreline buffer. I am not even talking about all the other things that reefs do—which is the natural place for all the fish and critters of the sea to gather, swimming in and around and among all of the coral reefs.

That is why, last week, I wrote a letter to the Secretaries of Commerce, Agriculture, and Health and Human Services calling for an interagency strike team to be formed to finally diagnose the coral disease in an attempt to save the remaining reefs.

I want to show an example of the difference between a healthy reef and a diseased reef. Look at the difference. Here is the healthy coral. Look how the diseased reef has actually been bleached out. So time is running out on this third largest barrier reef on the planet. We have to respond to the causes and effects of climate change now. The longer we put it off, the harder and more expensive it is going to be to mitigate.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE and my fellow colleagues who are speaking out on this critical mission.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my good friend from Florida. His State may be more affected by climate change than just about any other. We hear about water lapping up on the shores of Southern Florida already and the constant flooding. We have seen these amazing pictures that equal 1,000 words about the coral reefs—and he even talked about a word we rarely use in Brooklyn, "critters." We want to save the critters too.

So he has been eloquent—not just today but constantly—on the issue of climate and does it in such a practical perspective that just about every American of every ideology, part of the country, and thought process can understand. So I thank him.

Of course, I thank our great leader on this issue, the Senator from Rhode Island, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE. He is passionate, and his passion carries over into effective action. There has been no

voice more clarion, more constant, more effective in remembering that we cannot ignore this issue, constantly reminding us how important it is. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE not only for pulling us all together tonight but for his great strength and constancy on this issue.

I join my colleagues to shed light on the subject of climate change, which has received scant attention, unfortunately, from President Trump and this Republican Senate. Despite decades of incontrovertible evidence that climate change is harming our planet, President Trump and the Republicans have done nothing about it. In fact, worse than doing nothing, they have actively weakened our environmental laws, decrying the very science that has helped us progress, has helped men and women progress through the centuries.

Republicans in Congress have undone the environmental protections that held corporations accountable for polluting our streams. They have undone the rule that increased transparency in the management of public lands. Through an unrelated tax bill, congressional Republicans opened up the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling.

In the executive branch, EPA Administrator Pruitt has implemented an extreme deregulatory agenda, unwinding the rules that keep our air clear, our water clean, and limit carbon emissions that poison our atmosphere and our planet.

Worst of all, President Trump announced that he will pull the United States out of the Paris climate accord, which would make America the only country in the world that isn't a part of the agreement. While the world comes together to negotiate sensible climate change policies, while other nations and other foreign businesses grab the mantle of leadership on green energy, the United States, which used to be such a leader on so many issues, can only sit and watch from the sidelines—all because President Trump decided to pull out of the Paris accord. What a remarkable mistake. It will go down in history as one of the worst days in American history, as the world gets hotter and climate change takes its toll on our country and the world.

Climate change is real, human activity is driving it, and it is happening right now. These are facts. This is not speculation. This is not someone spinning a tale. These are facts not in dispute. Scientists know it. Businesses know it. The world knows it. The American people know it too.

We in New York learned about the devastating impact of Hurricane Sandy. It took so long to rebuild our coastal communities. All of Long Island understood that climate change is real and devastating when you do nothing about it.

The storms are getting more powerful—storms like Sandy—more frequent,

and there is no doubt that climate change is playing a role. We watched three recordbreaking hurricanes buffet our cities and our coastlines, devastating parts of Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Stronger wildfires have ripped through our Western States. According to NOAA, 2017 was the most expensive year on record for disasters in the United States, costing hundreds of billions of dollars. We are running out of time to do something about this issue.

Together with my colleagues this evening, led by Senator WHITEHOUSE, who will be giving his 200th "Time to Wake Up" speech—what a great accomplishment; I admire it—I urge all Americans—particularly younger Americans, who understand that this planet will decline if we don't do something, and it is their planet—I urge everyone—younger Americans, older Americans, everybody—to contact Republican Senators and Congressmen and tell them to wake up on climate change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the past 6 years, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island has delivered weekly addresses to the Senate Chamber on climate change, telling us that it is time to wake up. That is the sign he posts on the floor each time he comes to discuss the disastrous effects of global warming. Today will mark his 200th speech on the Senate floor on this topic.

The urgency of the topic is real. Climate change threatens our national security and our local communities. Climate change drives global conflict and has far-reaching national security implications.

A report by Oxfam states that there is growing evidence that climate change is making droughts more frequent and more severe.

Drought has contributed to the crisis in Syria, migration from West Africa, and rapid urbanization in Somalia. Just last week, "PBS NewsHour" reported that in the last year alone, more than 1 million Somalis have been forced from their homes because of drought.

Herders and farmers used to live among one another, but increasingly severe drought has led to a scarcity of land and water. Some animal herders now carry weapons and fight over fertile land. Farmers who have fled to the city claim herders burned down their homes and turned their farmland into grassland. The fighting and scarcity of land has pushed both farmers and herders to the cities, and most of them end up in ramshackle camps, burdened by poverty—a tinderbox.

Last March, 110 people died from starvation and drought-related illness in 48 hours, prompting President

Mohamed Abdullahi Farmajo to declare the drought a national disaster. Still, 1.2 million children under the age of 5 are projected to be malnourished in 2018.

Somalia is not the only country where the effects of climate change have created and exacerbated regional conflicts. In a few days, Syria will mark the seventh year of civil war. Research published by the National Academy of Sciences reports that climate change has contributed to the crisis in Syria. Extreme drought in Syria between 2006 and 2009 was most likely due to climate change, and that drought was a factor in the uprisings in 2011, when more than 1 million displaced farmers joined pro-democracy protests.

Just last year, Pulitzer Prize-winning New York Times columnist Tom Friedman wrote about massive migration out of parts of West Africa, through the Sahara Desert, to Libya, where people were hoping to eventually cross the Mediterranean Sea into Europe. The migration is driven in part by drought made more extreme by climate change, which has created widespread humanitarian crises.

As climate instability drives more extreme and frequent droughts and the scarcity of fertile land, water, and food, it will trigger major conflicts over resources, as we have seen in Yemen and Syria. As one of the largest contributors of greenhouse gas emissions, the United States has a moral responsibility to act on this growing crisis.

Here in our country, my constituents in Illinois are already experiencing the adverse effects of climate change. Climate models suggest that if current global warming trends continue, Illinois will have a climate similar to that of the Texas gulf coast by the year 2100. You can't grow a lot of corn in that climate. For Illinois farmers, these changes to the environment have a direct effect on their livelihood—and for all of us, a direct effect on our food supply.

Wetter springs and more frequent flooding will leave farmers struggling to plant their corn and soybeans. Increasingly hot summers and more frequent droughts will stunt the growth and hurt crop yields. This means prices will increase, making it harder for families to put food on the table.

In recent years, Illinois has seen historic storms, floods, and droughts that have caused millions of dollars in damage.

Last week, scientists at the Illinois State Water Survey reported that this February was the wettest on record, beating the previous record precipitation by over half an inch. An average of 5 inches of rain fell statewide. Streator, IL, had over 11 inches of rain, and Aurora had the largest snowfall, with a recorded 26 inches of snow. In the last week of February, rainstorms

and melted snow caused flooding across Illinois, with more than 20 counties throughout the State placed under a flood warning. As the water level of rivers continued to rise, several communities had to evacuate for their safety. Multiple communities were evacuated, and in some areas, residents had to be rescued by boat. Flooded roadways claimed the life of an Illinois resident after her car rolled into a rain-filled ditch.

Climate change is likely to increase the frequency and severity of flooding in Illinois, as well, and my constituents are concerned about their ability to recover from repeated flood events.

How much is flood damage costing us in Illinois? Last July, 3,200 residences were impacted by flooding, including 244 with major damage. This damage costs millions but often doesn't rise to the level where anyone qualifies for Federal aid. From 2007 to 2014, flooding in urban areas has caused \$2.3 billion in damages.

Moving forward, repeated flood events will have a high price tag. In the last decade, extreme weather events and fire have cost the Federal Government over \$350 billion, according to OMB. These costs will rise as the climate changes.

The evidence is clear. We need to get serious about addressing the cause and effect of climate change. Ignoring them threatens our national security and our safety. I believe our generation has a moral obligation to leave the world in better shape than we found it. Let's not run away from our responsibility to our children and grandchildren. Let's work toward solving the challenges of climate change.

This is a hard issue to explain from a political point of view. The only major political party in the world today that denies climate change is the Republican Party of the United States of America.

It is hard to imagine that a great party that once was actively engaged in a positive way in this debate is now absent without leave.

It is hard to explain that the party of Richard Nixon, who created the Environmental Protection Agency, now is in complete denial when it comes to climate change and global warming.

It is hard to understand that they are missing the obvious indicators of evidence from every corner of the world about the impact of global warming.

It is almost impossible to understand how they can ignore the impact this will have on the lives of our children and grandchildren. Is it too much to ask our generation to make a little sacrifice to spare them the devastation that will come from climate change? Is it too much to ask us to be a little more sensitive in our use of energy so that our kids and grandkids can enjoy a good life in their years on Earth? That usually is a responsibility most

generations accept, but we are being told that it is just too much to ask—to ask current Americans to come forward and do something that is thoughtful, meaningful, to reduce energy consumption and reduce emission and pollution. I think that is a horrible situation. I think it is one we shouldn't be proud of at all.

I thank my friend SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for coming to the floor regularly and reminding us of what is happening in this world today and how we each have a responsibility to future generations to alleviate the suffering, the pain, and the damage that has been caused by this global warming.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening inspired by the determined efforts of my colleague SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island.

My colleague has made clear, by delivering his 200th floor speech on climate change, that he is committed to raising awareness about and urging action on this very real threat to our environment.

Let me speak briefly as someone trained in science as a chemist. I am troubled that time and again I am called to this Chamber to defend and advocate for science. We live in a time of unprecedented scientific advances. Throughout our history, we have turned to science to help us solve both domestic and international crises. Science was there, for example, to do battle against the Ebola outbreak, threats from hurricanes and other natural disasters, and the dangers of cigarette smoke and lead exposure. It was scientists who helped find a cure, provide early warning, who educated us, and who influenced politics to lead to policies that led to stronger industry and consumer safety standards in facing all of these threats. The scientific method has saved lives and ensured our survival, so why don't we more widely embrace the science of prediction, mitigation, and adaptation to the effects of climate change?

Climate change is real. We know climate change is already happening, although it is slow, gradual, and often hard to perceive. Its effects will impact human health, agricultural production, national security—an unbelievable range of concerns that should motivate us together. Yet I have colleagues who either aren't convinced or don't understand that climate change is a real and pressing threat.

Let me briefly cite one meta-study of scientific opinion. It surveyed 13,950 peer-reviewed articles and studies on climate change and found that only 24 of them rejected global warming—less than 0.2 percent. Although there is not unanimous opinion, when there is 99.8 percent agreement in the scientific community, we should agree that this

degree of certainty is enough to take action.

“An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure” is an aphorism that dates back to the early 1700s. Why are we waiting? Let's change our ways. Let's work together to lower greenhouse gases, combat pollution, and slow the impact of climate change.

As someone who represents the State of Delaware, I am passionate about this because we are the lowest mean elevation State in America. I have heard from folks up and down the First State—from my colleague Senator CARPER, from our Governor, from our community leaders, and from concerned citizens from Wilmington, to Rehoboth, to Middletown—that they are concerned about sea level rise and its likely impact on our State. We need to do more because, in my small State, sea level rise is happening at twice the national rate. In about 100 years, everyone in Delaware will finally have a beach house—just not the way they want it.

Let me conclude by saying we need to look forward, not backward, when addressing climate change and sea level rise. We need action, not reaction. We need policy, not politics. We should act today, not tomorrow.

Again, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE. It was my pleasure to have him visit my home State of Delaware and see what we are doing to plan for and to combat sea level rise as a result of climate change. It was my honor to join him this evening and lend my support to him, to our environment, and to the fight against climate change.

I yield to my senior colleague from our shared home State of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I am TOM CARPER, and I approved this message.

I have had the privilege of serving on the Environment and Public Works Committee for—oh, my gosh—17 years and now serve as the senior Democrat on the committee. I have had the opportunity of serving with SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for more than half of those years. He is a senior member of our committee, a good friend, and, I think, someone who is respected by Democrats and Republicans and Independents alike here in the Senate. He is the junior Senator from Rhode Island, but he casts a long shadow on a lot of issues, none less than the issue we are discussing here today.

I join my friend Senator COONS in thanking SHELDON sincerely for his passion and for his persistence in highlighting what the vast majority of the world recognizes as the greatest environmental challenge of our time, and that is climate change.

Our friend from Rhode Island is a well-known climate champion, but what some may not know is that SHEL-

DON has spent over 500 hours here on the Senate floor in reminding all of us that it is long past time to wake up, that it is time to wake up and get serious about addressing this ever-growing threat. I learned early on in the Senate that if we want to get anything done, we have to be persistent, and we have to stay on message. He has been staying on that message through 200 floor speeches, and the theme has always been “time to wake up.” For nearly 6 years now, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE has reiterated what his constituents in the Ocean State and what constituents in our State, the First State, see every day—climate change is real, human beings are making it worse, and it is threatening our economy and our way of life. Those of us living in coastal States also know all too well that we can no longer ignore the issue or wait to take real action.

While our friend from Rhode Island is—what they like to say in Rhode Island—wicked smart, you don't have to take his word for it that climate change is a growing threat, for leading scientists in our country and around the world have been saying this not just for a couple of years but for decades. Scientists and medical professionals have also linked climate change to increased air pollution, deadly high temperatures, and more pests in our food and water—all of which negatively impact our health and disproportionately affect the most vulnerable among us.

These days, you don't need a degree in science or medicine to see the disastrous effect of climate change on the world in which we live. Rising sea levels and extreme weather events from climate change are the new norm. In 2017 alone, we had multiple category 5 hurricanes—I think maybe for the first time in history. We had the second hottest year on record, catastrophic fires in the West, and severe flooding in the East. These events place extreme burdens on the American people, on our economy, and on our budget, having cost our Federal Government literally hundreds of billions of dollars not over the last 10 years but last year—in 1 year.

The effects of rising sea levels are even more harmful in low-lying, coastal States, like Delaware. Senator COONS explained that Delaware is the lowest lying State in America, where the highest piece of land in our State is a bridge. There is a combination of things going on in coastal States like ours. In our State, the land is sinking, and the sea is rising. That is not a good combination for Delaware or any other place, and our friends from Rhode Island know of what I speak.

I am delighted that Senator WHITEHOUSE is a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee with many of us because, whether we are discussing environmental policy or infrastructure investments, the Senator

from Rhode Island never fails to remind our colleagues of the unique and significant challenges that coastal States face as a result of climate change.

Many people may not know this, but as I said before, you can go to Delaware, the lowest lying State. You can come with me and drive south on State Highway 1, past Dover Air Force Base, make a left turn on Prime Hook Road, drive to the edge of Delaware Bay, and look across toward New Jersey. There is a concrete bunker—I don't know—maybe 500 feet out in the water, poking up out of the water. What used to be there at the water's edge was a parking lot, where people used to park their trucks and launch their boats and go out and fish or whatever. That concrete bunker out in the ocean, out in Delaware Bay, used to sit 500 feet west of the dune line. It is now out in the ocean and is largely covered when we have high tide.

I invite my colleagues who deny climate change to visit our State. Come to Delaware and see firsthand what I just described at Prime Hook Beach. Come with us to a place called Southbridge, which is just at the southern edge of Wilmington, DE, or to the roads that are washing out in Odesa, which is about 30 miles south of Wilmington, where the strongest storms have ravaged our beaches and the sea level has risen, as I mentioned earlier, at Prime Hook Beach.

One colleague who has been to Delaware more than a few times is SHELDON WHITEHOUSE. I like to call him affectionately "the Whitehouse." A few years back, Senator WHITEHOUSE came to the First State to see a spectacular natural event that Delaware is lucky to host every year—the arrival of the red knots. They fly for literally thousands and thousands of miles, from south to north and north to south. They stop for lunch in Delaware. They eat the eggs of our horseshoe crabs, and they refuel for their journey. Imagine it. They are not this big. They are maybe half the size of the birds that are right here, but they can fly literally thousands of miles—almost 10,000—before stopping to refuel.

Each year, Delaware Bay hosts tens of thousands of tiny but tough birds—the red knots. The red knot regularly migrates some 19,000 miles, it turns out, each year from the southern tip of South America all the way up to the Arctic Circle. It stops in Delaware to feed on horseshoe crab eggs and refuel for the rest of its journey. It is an incredible journey for such a small shorebird. Its arrival on our shores is a must-see event, as our friend from Rhode Island can attest.

You might think that a bird as hearty as the red knot, which flies across the globe every year, might be able to escape the effects of climate change, but warming temperatures,

ocean acidification, and sea level rise are threatening their food supply and their nesting grounds all along their journey. If nothing else, we should be working together to ensure that our children and our grandchildren will be able to experience natural phenomena like the arrival of the red knots for years, for decades, for centuries to come. We should also recognize that we share a home with these creatures. It is not just our planet; it is their planet too. If we allow climate change to determine their fate, it will undoubtedly determine ours eventually.

I will close with this. I know that fighting climate change is a personal matter for me. I also know that the same is true for our friend from Rhode Island. We are fighting for our constituents' way of life, and our Senator from Rhode Island and I will continue to speak truth to power.

To the climate science deniers who are still out there, I borrow the fitting words of our Ocean State colleague: It is really time to wake up. Climate change is no longer in the distant future; it is here, it is now, and we need to meet that challenge head-on.

I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, the news about climate change certainly feels daunting. In the United States, we have historic wildfires, hurricanes, storms, and floods. Severe weather has upended people's lives, destroyed businesses and homes, and is now costing the economy tens of billions of dollars every year. Around the world, it can sometimes seem even bleaker. Cities are running out of water, and drought has distressed entire regions and pushed people out of their homes and fueled conflict.

Meanwhile, here in Washington, DC, the Trump administration is actively undermining our ability to address climate change. At the EPA in particular, Scott Pruitt is allowing polluters to violate the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. He plans to eliminate limits on methane emissions and protections that keep toxic chemicals from polluting our waterways. He is rolling back the Clean Power Plan and fuel efficiency standards that keep too much carbon from polluting the air. He has cut the number of fines for polluters by more than half, and he has reduced the EPA's staff so that it is down to the same level that it was in 1984. There are 700 EPA employees, including 200 scientists, who have left since the beginning of the Trump administration. In other words, this administration is not just ignoring climate change and its impacts, it is actually throwing fuel on the fire.

So is there any reason for hope? Let me give you three reasons to actually be hopeful.

First, the rest of the world is going to move forward with or without lead-

ership. Every single nation in the world is working to lower its emissions and meet its commitments as part of the Paris Agreement. Experts said that even without the United States, the Paris Agreement can succeed if nations follow through, and there are some promising signs that this is happening.

In China, experts predicted that coal consumption would peak between the years 2020 and 2040, but Brookings reported earlier this year that the country's consumption of coal has already peaked. One-third of global investments in renewable energy today come from China. In 2018, they will likely make up half of the entire global market for new solar installations.

China is not the only one making progress here. The world is in a race for clean energy. A coalition of 22 countries and the EU is investing more than \$30 billion a year in clean energy research and development.

That brings us to the second reason to have hope on climate change, and that is economics. Here in the United States, financial incentives remain the law regardless of what Scott Pruitt wants the law to be. We still have the investment tax credit and the production tax credit for solar and wind, and they are pushing us toward clean energy. Last year, more than half of the new energy generation that came online in the United States was that of wind and solar—more than coal and natural gas combined.

The fact is that clean energy is now cheaper than dirty energy. In 2009, coal cost \$111 per megawatt hour, natural gas \$83, wind \$135. Utility-scale solar cost a whopping \$359—about 3½ times the cost of coal. By 2017—listen to these numbers—it was \$102 for coal, \$60 for natural gas, \$45 for wind, and \$50 for utility-scale solar. Now wind and solar are 20 percent cheaper, on average, and coal is twice as expensive as clean energy.

Even the fossil fuel industry understands that we are moving toward a low-carbon economy. That is why their investors are demanding accountability. Last year, a majority of shareholders forced ExxonMobil to start reporting on how the fight against climate change will impact the oil company, which is the largest oil company in the world. TransCanada canceled its plans to build an oil pipeline that would have carried 1.1 million barrels of oil a day because of the changing economic and political calculations.

Third and finally, the United States may not have the President's leadership on climate change, but when it comes to the Paris Agreement, corporations, States, and cities have stood up and declared: We are still in. Thousands of mayors, Governors, CEOs, Tribal leaders, and average Americans are working to meet our commitment to the Paris Agreement. Here is one example at the State level. More than

half of the States have clean energy policies in place, and many have capped emissions. In Hawaii, we will transition to 100 percent clean energy by the year 2045, and analysts are optimistic that we may reach our goal sooner than that. These efforts are making a difference. Researchers at Carnegie Mellon found that the United States can meet our original commitment to the Paris Agreement regardless of what Rex Tillerson, Donald Trump, and Scott Pruitt want. Even if the EPA undermines our effort, we are still on track.

George Washington once said that “perseverance and spirit have done wonders in all ages.” He also said that “it is infinitely better to have a few good men than many indifferent ones.” By these two measures, there is even hope in Congress. Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE will be remembered in history as the epitome of perseverance and spirit when it comes to climate change. He understands the moral urgency of this moment. When we look at the Senators joining him on the floor this evening, it is clear that we have more than a few good men and women working on this issue.

We will continue to shine a light on the many ways that this administration is failing the American people by ignoring climate change. We will also continue to hope because the absence of leadership from this President has not stopped the rest of the country or the rest of the world from acting on climate, and it will not stop us from moving forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to join the citizens of Massachusetts who are making their voices heard and sending a clear message to President Trump: The Commonwealth of Massachusetts stands strong in opposition to his reckless proposal to expand offshore drilling. We stand strong in opposition to yet another handout to Big Oil executives who are willing to put corporate profits ahead of the health of our coastal families. We stand strong in opposition to this administration's willful ignorance of climate change and the world's ongoing clean energy revolution.

President Trump may say that his drilling plan is about growing jobs, but the truth is that this offshore drilling proposal is a slap in the face to every hard-working coastal family. President Trump is willing to put corporate profits for his Big Oil buddies ahead of shipping crews in Boston, ahead of the fishermen from Gloucester to New Bedford, ahead of the mom-and-pop diners all along the Cape, ahead of every tourism industry worker, and ahead of the families of all of these workers. President Trump is willing to gamble with the livelihoods of over 600,000 North At-

lantic coastal and ocean workers. The people of Massachusetts and the people who depend on a clean coast are not willing to take that gamble.

Our coastal communities remember when the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill happened in 2010. One offshore oil well blew and caused Deepwater Horizon's drilling rig to explode. It killed 11 workers, injured 17 others, and unleashed one of the worst environmental disasters in human history. Nearly 5 million barrels of oil gushed into the ocean, contaminating more than 1,300 miles of coastline and nearly 70,000 square miles of surface water. Millions of birds and marine animals died, suffocated by thick coatings of oil and poisoned by other toxic chemicals. The gulf fishing industry lost thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue. The spill devastated the gulf's coastal tourism economy. The environmental and economic devastation hit working families and small businesses across the region.

But the Trump administration insists on padding the pockets of Big Oil while small coastal towns bear all the risks that something will go wrong. The local towns bear the risk of a devastating oil spill. The local towns bear the risk of climate change impact, including increased coastal habitat destruction, fisheries threatened by ocean acidification, and rising sea levels. President Trump and this Republican Congress want to bury their heads in the sand or bury their heads in the big pile of Big Oil money, but the reality is this: Climate change has happened, and the evidence is all around us. The consequences are worsening with every single day of inaction.

Make no mistake. We are in the most critical fight of our generation and we are running out of time. We are in a fight to save our coastal towns, a fight to save our farmers, a fight to save our fishermen, a fight to save good-paying clean energy jobs, and a fight for our children's future.

Will winning the fight against climate change be tough? You bet it will. We will need to retrofit to install offshore wind turbines instead of offshore drilling rigs. We will need to invest in faster clean energy deployment, modernize the electric grid, build sea walls to protect our coastal towns, and much, much more. It is a big job ahead, but there is no country and no workforce in the world that is more willing and more able to tackle the challenges of climate change head-on than the United States of America. Yes, it is hard, but it is what we do. It is who we are.

We are a nation of unrelenting workers who clawed our way out of the Great Depression, who fought two world wars, who put a man on the moon, and who electrified the Nation with 20th century fuels. With a level playing field, we are a nation of work-

ers who can electrify the world all over again with the 21st century fuels of wind, solar, and other clean energy sources.

The American people deserve leadership that understands just how innovative and persistent we are—leadership that knows the fearless strength of the American people; leadership that believes in the innovative, get-it-done attitude of the American worker; leadership that will stand up to Big Oil executives hell-bent on protecting their profits at our expense; and leadership that knows that our best days are ahead of us. But we have to fight for them. They deserve leadership that will not ignore the challenges of climate change; leadership that will not chain our economy to the fossil fuels of yesterday and, instead, will support the good-paying, clean energy jobs of tomorrow; and leadership that refuses to put our coastal families at risk of another devastating oil spill.

The American people deserve leadership that doesn't work for Big Oil. The American people deserve leadership that works for them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I first wish to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE, one of my best friends in the Senate. We came to the Senate on the same day. He will go down in history as the best advocate in this body or perhaps the greatest moralist of our time combatting climate change. He has educated Members of the Senate—some more resistant than others.

He has taken to the floor over and over. He has continued to make sure that people listen to something important, and we all appreciate that leadership.

Climate change affects Ohio jobs that rely on Lake Erie. The Great Lakes are vital to our industrial heartland, as the Rockies are to the West, as the Atlantic coastline is to New England, as the Gulf of Mexico is to the Presiding Officer's own State of Florida. In fact, 84 percent of America's freshwater is in the five Great Lakes. Only polar icecaps contain more freshwater than do the Great Lakes.

Lake Erie is one of the biggest lakes in the world. It is also the shallowest of the lakes. This is an amazing statistic. Lake Erie is the shallowest and among the smallest of the Great Lakes in surface area. Lake Erie contains 2 percent of all the water in the Great Lakes, yet it contains 50 percent of the fish in the Great Lakes because it is

warmer and shallower and conducive to aquatic life and fish life.

Its shallowness makes it particularly vulnerable to storm water runoff and the algae blooms that it causes. The Maumee River runs through Toledo. The Maumee River Basin is the largest drainage basin of any of the Great Lakes, and the largest river that empties into the Great Lakes is the Maumee.

Climate change makes these algae blooms off the coast of Toledo in the western base of Lake Erie. Climate change makes those blooms worse. It contaminates our lakes, and it threatens the Ohio businesses and communities that rely on Lake Erie. Three summers ago, we had to get bottled drinking water to the citizens of Toledo and the surrounding areas of Northwest Ohio because the water was not potable at that time.

According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, we know that one effect of climate change in the Great Lakes region has been a 37-percent increase in the gully washers—the heavy rain events that contribute to algae blooms.

I talked to farmers who have been farming in the Western Lake Erie Basin for decades. Just a few weeks ago I did a roundtable in that part of the State. My staff member Jonathan McCracken has done a number of roundtables before. Since talking to these farmers, they tell us they are experiencing heavier rain events more often and with greater intensity compared to even 15 years ago, let alone in the lifespan of many of these farmers.

Hotter summers and shorter winters make this worse. The effects of algae blooms have a profound effect on the ecosystem. That is why this matters. Protecting our lakes is one of the biggest environmental challenges facing the entire Midwest. It is the biggest challenge facing Ohio.

We have made some progress over the last 8 years, thanks in large part to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. The GLRI is working. Everybody knows it does. Nobody claims it doesn't.

I remember how polluted Lake Erie was when I was growing up. I grew up an hour or hour and a half from there. My family, a week or two in the summer, would drive north to Gem Beach. I remember the dead fish. I remember the smell of the lake. I remember that this lake was in big, big trouble.

We have made progress cleaning up its tributaries. We increased access to the lake. We approved habitats for fish and wildlife. It has been a bipartisan success story, and it took the Federal Government to do it. The city of Cleveland couldn't do it, nor the city of Loraine, the city of Sandusky, the city of Port Clinton, the city of Ashtabula. They couldn't clean up the lake. The State of Ohio didn't have the ability

and the resources to clean this lake up. It took the Federal Government and the U.S. EPA to have the strength and the dollars and the mission to clean up this lake. That is why it has been a bipartisan success story all over our country.

We need to make sure that GLRI has the funding it needs to keep up its work and not eliminate it, as the President again proposed in his budget. Taking a hatchet to GLRI would cost Ohio jobs, and it would jeopardize public health by putting our drinking water at risk.

If you are over 50 years old, you remember what that lake looked like. You remember what that lake smelled like. You remember how people didn't swim there, how people's drinking water was threatened. You remember that before EPA, before there was this bipartisan commitment to clean up one of the greatest of the Great Lakes. You remember that.

Obviously, this President doesn't know this. This President won his election based on winning these Great Lakes States, and he has abandoned these States by drastically cutting funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

Those of us along the Great Lakes didn't stand for a budget that eliminated GLRI last year. Nothing has changed this year. Ohioans on both sides of the aisle will go to the mat for our lake.

I am working with Senator PORTMAN—I am a Democrat; he is a Republican—and my Ohio colleagues from both parties to protect it. Budget cuts are terrible for this; climate change will only make it worse.

When I was young, people wrote off Lake Erie as a polluted, dying lake. As I said, I remember seeing it. I remember smelling it. I remember hearing people talk about it. Many, many people thought that there wasn't much future for this Great Lake, that it would be impossible to clean up.

People in the past have had a habit of not just writing off Lake Erie but also writing off my State. We have proved them wrong time and again. We proved them wrong back then, we proved them wrong today, and we will prove them wrong in the future.

Our lake is improving. It is supporting an entire industry. It supports the jobs it creates. It is providing drinking water and recreation and so much more to communities across our State, and we can't allow climate change to ruin that progress. We cannot write off Lake Erie. We cannot write off the millions of Ohioans and people from Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota who depend on these five Great Lakes.

I see it up close. I live only 5 or 6 miles from the lake. I know what it means for my community. I know how

important this is for the future—the environmental future—of our country, the economic future of my State. It is important for all of us to come together on a bipartisan basis.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today to discuss climate change. I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for being a vocal advocate for addressing this issue.

Climate change is real. It is happening all around us, and we can't afford to ignore this fact any longer.

This past year, global temperatures were up 1.7 degrees Fahrenheit over the historical average. Millions of Americans came face-to-face with extreme weather events like deadly wildfires and powerful hurricanes, and these extreme weather events are only expected to get worse.

If no action is taken to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the world will warm 7 to 8 degrees Fahrenheit by 2100. Rising temperatures will bring increasingly more severe droughts, destructive floods, deadly wildfires, and strong coastal storms. Rising temperatures are also warming our oceans, threatening to melt both polar icecaps.

Last summer, the world watched as an iceberg the size of Delaware broke free from Antarctica's Larsen C ice shelf. Scientists are now studying how the entire shelf may collapse and projecting what that would mean for the even larger West Antarctic Ice Sheet as oceans continue to warm. That sheet—twice the size of Texas—contains enough ice to raise sea levels by more than 10 feet.

That much sea rise would submerge more than 25,000 square miles of the United States that is home to more than 12 million Americans.

Rising seas and the loss of coastal land aren't the only threats we are facing due to climate change. The effects it is having on our water supply is deeply troubling.

California is home to the largest agriculture sector in the United States. Our growers need access to plenty of water to help feed the whole Nation. As temperatures rise, we are seeing fewer and fewer days below freezing, greatly reducing mountain snowpack which is a critical source of water in the West. Extreme heat is also making it harder for agriculture workers to safely work outside. In the Central Valley, average temperatures are projected to rise 6 degrees by the end of this century. It is not just people who work outdoors who are feeling the health effects of climate change. Warmer temperatures are expanding the range of disease-carrying pests such as ticks and mosquitos. Lyme disease cases have tripled in the last two decades, and tropical diseases are now appearing as far north as the Gulf Coast.

Californians know all too well the effects of climate change. We are still recovering from an historic drought and

the most destructive wildfire season on record. But we may be in another drought by next year if we don't get more rain soon.

In the absence of leadership from the Federal Government, California is stepping up and taking action. California is still honoring the Paris Agreement even though the President pulled the United States out.

By 2030, California will reach 50 percent renewable electricity, double energy efficiency, and reduce emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels. California has also grown to become the sixth largest economy in the world, showing you can still grow your economy while making smart investments in clean energy.

President Trump and his allies in Congress need to wake up. We can't afford to ignore an issue as important as climate change any longer.

The American people demand action.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 200th speech the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, will make here on the floor of the U.S. Senate on the need to act on climate change.

When global challenges arise, countries throughout the world look to the United States for leadership. Climate change is an issue that affects billions of people worldwide, and the United States can and should be a leading voice in combating it.

Despite making significant progress under President Obama, President Trump has decided to reverse course and take a backseat while the rest of the world tackles this issue head-on. Over the last year, the United States has pulled out of the Paris Agreement, weakened air and water protections here at home, moved away from renewable energy, and implemented drastic funding and staffing cuts at the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA.

President Trump's decision to retreat from our commitment to combating climate change comes at a critical time for the state of our environment. His abdication of responsibility is calamitous. The vast majority of scientists have concluded that climate change is real and caused by human activity, and Americans are already feeling the effects.

Last year, for instance, our Nation experienced one of the most destructive hurricane seasons on record and a series of deadly wildfires. On top of this, sea levels continue to rise at record pace, posing an existential threat to coastal communities throughout the country. This is especially dangerous for the State I represent, as many Marylanders live in areas that are acutely susceptible to rising tides and flood damage. As such, much of our essential communication, transportation, energy, and wastewater management infrastructure is at risk.

This begs the question: What kind of environmental legacy do we want to

leave for our children and grandchildren? I believe that it is our responsibility to leave our beaches, farms, towns, and wetlands healthier than we found them.

The most recent research suggests that our actions over the next 5 years will shape the course of sea level rise for generations. Therefore, the time is now to take decisive action on climate change. If we fail to do so, we will be left to explain to the next generation why we failed to act in the face of so much incontrovertible evidence.

Some of my colleagues argue that tackling climate change is too costly an undertaking. They claim that any action we take to protect human health and the environment will inevitably cost jobs and hurt the economy. The reality is that nothing poses a bigger long-term threat to our economic and national security than climate change.

As sea levels and temperatures climb higher, so do the costs of doing business. Changing weather patterns increase risk for homeowners. Our attempts to cool a heating planet will strain our energy supply. These are just a few of the economic consequences that we will face if we fail to take action.

The progress we have seen in Maryland demonstrates that we can preserve our environment while maintaining a robust economy. Marylanders have taken decisive action on a range of environmental issues, and the State is currently on track to meet the guidelines established in the Paris Agreement. Thanks, in part, to the partnerships within the Chesapeake Bay Program, the health of the Bay has been steadily increasing for years.

At the same time, Maryland's farming industry, which employs over 350,000 Marylanders, has remained vibrant. Our success in Maryland is a testament to what we can do as a nation on climate change.

The key to our success will depend on the degree to which we are willing to cooperate with each other. This includes interstate partnerships such as the Chesapeake Bay Program, as well as international partnerships like the Paris Agreement. We should not let President Trump's decision to remove the United States from the Paris Agreement discourage us from working together to achieve our goals. In the spirit of collaboration, we should continue to partner with the States, localities, universities, and business that have decided to honor the global commitment we made under President Obama.

I am especially proud to see the city of Baltimore, Hyattsville, Takoma Park, the University of Maryland School System, and all the other localities and organizations lead this effort in Maryland by joining the America's Pledge project.

America's Pledge is a new initiative co-led by California Governor Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown, Jr., and the U.N. Secretary-General's Special Envoy for Cities and Climate Change Michael R. Bloomberg, which aims to assess the scope and scale of climate actions being taken by U.S. States, cities, businesses, and other non-Federal actors. I am proud the Center for Global Sustainability at the University of Maryland is among the institutions providing the project their research support.

I encourage my colleagues to put our planet, our environment, and the future of humanity over partisan politics and President Trump's stubborn insistence on retrograde policies. We must do what is best not just for ourselves, but for future generations, too. The United States of America has been a world leader on so many issues, which redounds to our own benefit. Now is not the time to abdicate that role. The world and our children are watching.

We are fortunate to have climate change leaders like Senator WHITEHOUSE. With a dogged persistence, he has come to this Chamber month after month to educate, to cajole, and to inspire us to take action.

Most of all, he has warned us of the grave danger climate change presents. Will we be like the Trojans of ancient Greek mythology, who ignored the prophecies of Cassandra about the imminent destruction of their city? We do so, like the Trojans, at our own peril. Cassandra's prophecies came true. If we listen to Senator WHITEHOUSE and learn from him and take action now, we can change our fate for the better.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank my friend Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, and congratulations on his long history of action on climate change.

Six years ago, Senator WHITEHOUSE began a campaign to speak every week about climate change. One need only look at the past 6 years of climate impacts to understand just how important the Senator's pledge is.

The planet has been warming for years, but in the last few years, the disturbing trends have accelerated. The last 4 years have been the hottest on record.

The effects of climate change are already obvious, from the eroding coasts off Cape Cod to storm surge in Boston Harbor. January's bomb cyclone in Massachusetts broke the flood record in Boston set by the Blizzard of 1978.

Sadly, this is our new normal. Thirteen of the top 20 biggest flood events in Boston have occurred since 2000. While Massachusetts gets overrun by the impacts of climate change, President Trump has plans to expand offshore drilling off the New England coast. This is the very definition of insanity.

Our communities and our oceans are feeling the pressure of the changing

climate. But what has the Trump administration decided to do about it? Worse than nothing. It has started to withdraw us from the Paris Climate Accord. It has repealed the Clean Power Plan. It has rolled back historic fuel economy standards, loosened standards for hazardous pollutants, and declared all-out war on climate science.

Throughout the administration, there has been an alarming attack on public information about climate change. On the Environmental Protection Agency's website, more than 5,000 pages of information on climate change have disappeared, either relegated to an unsearchable maze far from public view or simply deleted. Fact sheets on public health and climate change are gone. Resources for States and cities have disappeared. Guides for students and teachers are no more. This isn't transparency; it is a transparent attack on climate science.

It is also an attack on our scientists. More than 200 scientists have left the EPA under the Trump administration. Those 200 scientists have been replaced with only seven new hires. Our top climate scientists are telling us that fear is rampant at EPA and across Federal agencies. The EPA's job is to instill fear into the hearts of corporate polluters, not its own scientists.

We need to encourage more science, not less. We need science to inform the policies we need to provide the solutions that could save our planet. That is what Senator WHITEHOUSE has championed for these past 6 years on the floor and throughout his career in public service.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for asking me to stand with him today and for being an environmental Paul Revere, sounding the alarm on climate change. We cannot be silenced, and we will continue to work together to sound that alarm—because that is what is happening, the Earth's alarm clock has gone off and it is telling us all to wake up. There is no one who is more woke to what is happening to our planet's climate than he.

Thank you.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from Rhode Island to talk about climate change, but I first want to make a comment about my good friend and an important Member of this body, Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, and what he has done.

In the 1930s, a lonely voice stood on the floor of the Houses of Parliament,

warning of the impending catastrophe of the rearmament of Germany in the advent of World War II. People didn't listen. Often, he spoke to a lonely House, but his voice was clear, his voice was prescient, and what he said was important. Of course, I refer to Winston Churchill.

Today and over the past many years, Senator WHITEHOUSE has performed that same function of warning us, of trying to wake us up to a challenge that is impending, that is catastrophic, that is significant, and that is also at least somewhat preventable.

Senator WHITEHOUSE has talked about climate change in terms of ocean acidification, temperature changes, sea level rise, drought, famine, and the effects throughout the world. Often this Chamber is empty, but his warnings are important and should be heeded nonetheless.

The first thing I want to do is thank him and compliment him for the work that he has done over these many years and continues to do. I can see his sign—as I see it on C-SPAN and here on the floor—that says “Wake Up,” and wake up is what we need to do.

People often talk about climate change as if it were some abstract thing that is going on, and it is in scientific journals, and it is a kind of environmental movement that doesn't really affect real life that much; it is just sort of something that goes on out there and one of the many issues we have to deal with. But it is real. I will tell you how I know. The fishermen in Maine have told me so.

Just this past Saturday, I spent the evening with a man who has been a fisherman for 40 years in the Gulf of Maine. He said that he has never seen the kinds of changes we have seen in the last 10 years. They are catching fish that have never been seen before in the Gulf of Maine. A lobsterman told me of pulling up a seahorse in his lobster trap. Seahorses aren't supposed to live in the cold water of Maine.

This isn't an abstract question for us. Lobstering is a \$1.7-billion-a-year industry for Maine. Lobstering used to be a major industry in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and now it is largely gone.

There are multiple explanations, but one of them is that the water is warming, and our species, whether they are lobsters or trees or bears, are sensitive to small environmental changes.

We have had record lobster harvests in Maine in the last 5 to 10 years—although I have to say that in the last 2 years, they have been down. We don't know whether the declines are a blip or a trend. We deeply hope that it doesn't represent a trend, but we can't ignore what happened to the lobster population to our south.

The water is getting warmer in the Gulf of Maine. The water in the Gulf of Maine is warming at the fastest rate of

any body of water on Earth, except for the Arctic Ocean, and it has already wrought changes in the nature of our natural resource-based economy.

Maine is a natural resource State, dependent largely upon fisheries, lobster, agriculture, farming, and forestry. That is who we are. Of course, another part of our economy is the millions of tourists who come to Maine each summer to visit our incredible coastline. Climate change isn't an abstract for us; it is a very real phenomenon.

I want to emphasize not only what my friend the fisherman told me this weekend, but also that I have heard from fishermen all over Maine for the last 4 or 5 years about the changes they are seeing. This guy isn't a scientist, but he is out on the water, and he knows what he is catching. He knows he is catching fish he has never caught before. He has never seen the tropical, warm water fish now being caught in the Gulf of Maine.

I think the other factor we need to talk about is a dollars-and-cents question that relates to sea level rise. We are talking about millions of dollars on the part of the U.S. Government to preserve the coastal infrastructure that we have in connection with our Armed Forces.

The city of Norfolk is already experiencing what are called sunny day floods. The city of Miami—the Presiding Officer's hometown—is experiencing sunny day floods. These are floods that aren't caused by great storms, by great perturbations in the atmosphere; they are caused just by a high tide. The cost of dealing with this in Miami, New Orleans, New York, or Maine is going to be enormous.

We tend to think of the ocean as a fixed commodity, as something that has always been the way it is now. It turns out that we have been fooled. We have been lulled into a sense of confidence about the level of the sea because for the past 8,000 years, it has been the same. But this is a chart that shows the depth of the Atlantic Ocean over the past 24,000 years.

It turns out that 24,000 years ago, which was the height of the glacial period, the waters off the coast of Maine were 390 feet shallower than they are today—390 feet shallower. What you see here is the melting of the glaciers and the refilling of the oceans.

From our historic point of view, the problem is that it got to a plateau about 10,000 years ago, and that is all we know. That is human history, right here. We don't remember this very much because it appeared before recorded human history.

Now, there is an interesting moment in this chart, and it is right in this period about 15,000 years ago, and it is called the meltwater pulse 1A. That is what scientists call it. We see a very steep rise in the ocean level during this period. Interestingly, this rise is about

1 foot per decade. That is what happened during that time about 15,000 years ago.

Well, a year and a half ago I went to Greenland with two climate scientists, one of whom focuses almost exclusively on sea level rise. The estimates vary quite a bit, I will concede, but their estimate was that what we are facing now is 1 foot of sea level rise per decade for the rest of this century. Has it ever happened before? Yes. Is that an outrageous estimate? No, because it has happened before. It can happen again. Why? Because the last remnants of the glaciers are in Antarctica and Greenland, and between the ice sheets on those two areas is 260 feet of additional sea level rise. Greenland is melting at an unprecedented rate, and there is a huge ice shelf in Antarctica that is poised to fall into the ocean. If that happens, it will cause sea level rise, just as dropping an ice cube in a glass of water does.

The indications are overwhelming of what this issue means for the future of this country. This is not an academic question.

Here is another example of what is happening in a relatively short period of time. The volume of ice in the Arctic Ocean has fallen by two-thirds since 1979—a 40-year period. The Arctic Ocean is more clear today than it has ever been in human history. Anybody who says nothing is happening or it is just routine or the weather changes all the time isn't paying attention to the facts. Again, my concern about this is practical: the cost of seawalls, the cost of shoring up our infrastructure, just the cost to the government of protecting the naval facilities in Norfolk. Of course, one of the problems in the State of the Presiding Officer is, the rock is porous limestone so it is very difficult to build a seawall because the water will simply come under it. So we are talking about a very serious practical issue that is going to cost our society billions, if not trillions, of dollars.

Can we stop it? Probably not. Can we slow it? Yes, but it is going to take action today, and every day we wait, it makes the action harder and more expensive. If we wait until the waves are lapping up over the seawall in New York City or over the dikes in New Orleans or over the streets of Miami or along the coast of Maine at our marshes and low points, it will be too late. Then all we can do is defend and not prevent.

I believe we can make changes now that are not totally disruptive to our economy but will be protective of our economy and will be much cheaper now than they will be 10, 15, 20, 30, 40, or 50 years from now. What we are doing is leaving the problem to our kids, just like we are leaving the deficit to our kids, just like we are leaving broken infrastructure to our kids.

Tom Brokaw wrote a book after World War II called "The Greatest Generation." That was the generation that sacrificed in World War II, and then they built the Interstate Highway System, paid for it, and paid down the debt that was accumulated during World War II. We are just the opposite. We are increasing our debt on all levels at a time of relative prosperity. The economy is at low unemployment. Yet we are passing trillion-dollar tax cuts that add to the deficit that these young people are going to have to pay off.

We are not attending to the problem of climate change. Who is going to have to pay to build those seawalls? Not us; our children and our grandchildren. I believe this is a moral and an ethical issue as well as a practical issue.

So I will return to where I began: to compliment my colleague from Rhode Island for raising the alarm, for pointing out what we can do, how we can do it, the consensus of scientific opinion, and the reality of what we are facing. We can do better. We don't have to avoid and ignore and waste the resources and the time we have now.

The most precious resource we have now to confront this problem is time, and every day that goes by is a day of irresponsibility. It is a day where our children and grandchildren are going to say: Where were you when this was happening? Why didn't you listen to that guy from Rhode Island who told you what was going to happen, who told you how we could do something about it? Why didn't we listen? I don't want to be a person who says I didn't listen because I was too busy or because it was inconvenient or because I was afraid it might change a little bit about how we powered our automobiles or got electricity.

I think it is a question we can face. This body can solve big problems. It has done it in the past, but recently our pattern has been, instead of solving problems, avoiding problems—putting them off until next year, next month, or decades from now when this problem is no longer a problem but a catastrophe.

So I salute and thank my colleague from Rhode Island for keeping the focus on this issue. I look forward to continuing to work with him, as we will continue to urge and plead with our colleagues to join us in reasonable steps that can be taken to ameliorate what is coming at us. This is a moment in time when we have it within our power to do something important for the future of our country and for the future of our children. I hope we can seize that moment and serve not only the American people today but the American people who will come after us and will judge us by the extent to which we confronted a problem and saved them from having to solve it themselves.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to amplify the efforts of my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE as he gives his 200th climate speech on the Senate floor. He really has become a modern-day Paul Revere on one of the most critical issues of our time that very well dictates the future of our planet and our way of life as we know it. I believe history will record that Senator WHITEHOUSE riveted the attention of the Senate—or attempted, certainly, to do so—and the Nation on the real threat that is climate change. Climate change may be an inconvenient truth to some, but it is a threat to New Jersey, to the United States, and to the security and stability of our world. It is a challenge we cannot afford to ignore.

I agree with my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island that it is well past time for this Congress to wake up and demand climate action from this administration.

We often hear the Trump administration officials, and even some of our colleagues in Congress, suggest that "we don't know enough" about climate change to take action, when the truth is, we know too much not to take action.

We know about the greenhouse effect and how gases like carbon dioxide trap heat in our atmosphere. We know that since 2010, we have experienced the five warmest years on record and that momentary cold snaps in our weather do not detract from the indisputable reality that around the world, temperatures are steadily rising. We know that 97 percent of scientists agree that man-made climate change is real and that the burning of fossil fuels and other human activities have led to unprecedented levels—unprecedented levels—of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere and in our oceans.

We know experts at NOAA have concluded that since the Industrial Revolution, our oceans have become 30 percent more acidic—the greatest increase in 300 million years.

Likewise, we know the Arctic is warming at twice the rate of the rest of the world and that as icecaps melt, our sea levels rise, endangering the coastal communities that drive so much of America's economy.

In New Jersey, we know the real threat posed by climate change, and we know that threat is real. My constituents bore the brunt of Superstorm Sandy when it devastated the Jersey shore. We know rising sea levels and the powerful storms that accompany them jeopardize our coastal communities. From tourism to commercial fishing, to coastal property values totaling nearly \$800 billion, millions of families across New Jersey depend upon a healthy coast and a safe climate. While I may be partial to the

Jersey shore, the reality is, nearly 40 percent of the American people live along a coast. That is 40 percent of our country threatened by rising sea levels, stronger storm surges, and more extreme flooding.

Of course, climate change is far from just a coastal problem. From life-threatening heat waves to crop-destroying droughts, to record-breaking wildfires, the perils of a warming planet are not up for debate. The fact is, climate change will impact every human being and every living thing on this planet if—if—we fail to take action, and the American people know it.

In October of 2017, the Associated Press found that over 61 percent of Americans want us to respond to this historic challenge—61 percent. Even President Trump's Department of Defense gets it. Earlier this year, the Pentagon reported that about 50 percent of all Department of Defense sites already—already—face risks from climate change and extreme weather events. As the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am particularly concerned that we have done little to address climate change's role as a threat multiplier.

Whether it is disruptions to the food supply or forced migration from sea level rise or destruction wreaked by more powerful storms, climate change will likely exacerbate conflict and humanitarian crises around the world. President Trump's willful ignorance of these threats risks leaving the United States unprepared for the 21st century.

There is no question that this willful ignorance is born out of this administration's cozy relationship with the fossil fuel industry. From the Department of Energy to the Environmental Protection Agency, to the Department of the Interior, President Trump has stacked his Cabinet with individuals who seem more concerned about Big Oil profits than the safety of our people and the future of our planet.

Nearly a year ago, the President announced his plan to withdraw the United States from the Paris climate accord, leaving us isolated on the global stage.

Now is not the time to hand our precious waters and protected public lands over to special interests. Now is the time for Congress to incentivize the investments that will modernize our energy infrastructure, create new high-paying jobs, and grow our clean energy economy.

That is why I have introduced the COAST Anti-Drilling Act to permanently ban offshore drilling in the Atlantic and protect the coastal communities so vital to New Jersey and other States. That is why I introduced legislation with 22 of my colleagues to level the playing field and eliminate taxpayer-funded subsidies for the five biggest oil companies. That is why I have worked on the Senate Finance Com-

mittee to extend incentives for wind and solar and other clean energy technologies. That is why I have backed legislation that would help harness the potential for limitless clean wind power off our shores.

These initiatives represent modest, commonsense steps toward a thriving clean energy economy, but, ultimately, it is not enough. We need to think bigger and act boldly. That is why I am here on the floor today with Senator WHITEHOUSE calling for action on climate change. It is time we take action to reduce carbon pollution, create new, high-paying jobs, and accelerate the adoption of innovative clean energy technologies. It is time this administration wake up and put the long-term economic, environmental, and security interests of the United States ahead of fossil fuel profits. It is time the United States reclaims its rightful place as the global leader on climate change.

The American people demand it, and the future of our planet depends on it. That future, to a large degree, is going to be, hopefully, achieved because of individuals willing to stand up for a cause, being principled about it, and willing to fight for it and continue like a laser beam on focusing the attention of the Senate, the Congress, and the American people. Senator WHITEHOUSE is that person, and I salute him as he gives his 200th speech today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the Presiding Officer for recognizing me.

Mr. President, I know the Presiding Officer hasn't been here the whole time, but many Senators have been speaking about climate change. We see in the Presiding Officer's State, in Glacier National Park—which I think kind of tells it all—a national park created around glaciers, and they are disappearing rapidly.

I come to the floor, first of all, to thank SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for his remarkable leadership on the issue of climate change. His weekly wake-up call speeches have inspired a lot of us. Articles have covered his effort on this. This one is titled, "A Climate 'Wake Up' for the 200th Time." He has been down here religiously taking on this issue.

In this article, a major leader in the environmental movement said about Sheldon's speeches, "[His] speeches have been critically important in drawing attention to the need for climate action." She also said, "Demand for climate action is only growing, and certainly we give him credit for his leadership in that effort." Very true.

I remember traveling with SHELDON WHITEHOUSE to Paris, when all of us were very much enthused to see the world come together and sign the Paris climate agreement. We were all very excited. This effort had been going on

for 40 years, and here the countries in the world were finally getting together. I watched Sheldon making those arguments over there. He argued his case persuasively, and he wins converts easily. So we all are here to thank him for his leadership.

In particular, I would also like to talk about climate change, its impact on the Southwest, and where we are headed in my home State of New Mexico and the Greater Southwest. Climate change is here and now. I want to talk about that impact in the Southwest, which is severe. My home State of New Mexico is right in the bull's-eye.

Our Nation and our Earth cannot afford for us to sit back and do nothing for the next 3 years, but this is precisely what is happening under this administration and this Congress. Our executive and legislative branches are not only sitting on their hands in the face of climate change disruption and devastation; they are aggressively halting all progress we are making.

I was so discouraged when I saw the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency take down a climate change website that had gone from a Republican administration to a Democratic administration. I think it had been going on for almost 10 years. This was covered in the Washington Post. Administrator Pruitt, on taking office, took it down and said: We are going to update it. Here we are, more than a year, and if you try to look at that website, it just says: We are in the process of updating it. I don't think we are ever going to see it again, would be my guess.

Let's look at some of the reasons and how the progress is being halted here. There are a number of reasons for this, but I think the biggest and most insidious is money—billions of dollars in campaign contributions.

The President and congressional majority are delaying, suspending, and stopping policies and programs that combat climate change because of the dark money in politics. Oil and gas, coal, power companies, and other special interests feed their campaign and PAC coffers while the clear public interest is ignored. We must reform our campaign finance system or our climate and the American people will pay a greater and greater price.

SHELDON WHITEHOUSE has made a contribution there with his book, "Captured," where he talks about this dark money indepth. That is another piece of scholarship that really adds to what is happening on this campaign finance front.

While the President, his EPA Administrator, and his Interior Secretary are openly hostile to climate change science, career government scientists and professionals are still hard at work doing their jobs evaluating climate impacts.

Last November, the U.S. Global Change Research Program, consisting of 13 Federal agencies, issued volume I of the "Fourth National Climate Assessment." It is the most authoritative Federal Government resource on climate change.

It concludes, "This period is now the warmest in the history of modern civilization" with "record-breaking, climate-related weather extremes," and human activities—especially greenhouse gas emissions—are the "extremely likely" "dominant cause." A pretty strong statement from the scientists.

With climate change, the Southwest is expected to get hotter and much drier, especially in the southern half of the region. In the last 18 years, New Mexico has seen one reprieve from drought, and the trend is unmistakable. We are seeing less snowpack, earlier melting, and less runoff. Even when we do get snow, new research shows we are getting less runoff from it. Our scarce water resources are even more strained.

Here is a drought map of New Mexico from just last week, March 6. Virtually the entire State faces drier conditions. We can see it here, talking about the northern part of the State with extreme drought, most of the middle and northern part of the State in severe drought, and then the southern part of the State in moderate drought. Virtually, the entire State of New Mexico is in a very serious drought situation.

Some experts are saying we need to stop thinking about this phenomenon as a drought but instead as a dry region becoming permanently drier. This is a direct threat to our way of life in New Mexico and the Southwest.

Elephant Butte Reservoir is our biggest reservoir in New Mexico. It was built close to 100 years ago for flood control and irrigation. Its supply comes from the Rio Grande, our largest river in New Mexico and, as we know, a 1,900-mile river that flows through several States. It is a border for close to 1,000 miles or more, and it flows into the Gulf of Mexico, but for the decade ending 2010, on the Rio Grande, flows in the Rio Grande decreased 23 percent—almost one-quarter—from the 20th century average.

Here are photos of Elephant Butte Reservoir from 1994 and 2013. These photos were taken from a satellite. This top photo is from 1994, and we can see a remarkable reservoir and how deep and extended that reservoir is. Now we jump forward about 20 years, and here is Elephant Butte Reservoir in 2013. The picture says a thousand words: The reservoir is rapidly, rapidly disappearing. We can see the dramatic decrease in supply over that short time. Our farmers and ranchers depend on this supply, and they are struggling. This year, the snowpack in the Upper Rio Grande is half of what it should be,

and that will force the reservoir even lower.

Across the Southwest, the average annual temperature has increased about 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit. The last decade, from 2001 to 2010, was the warmest in over a century. Now, New Mexico is really feeling the heat. We are the sixth fastest warming State in the Nation. Since 1970, our average annual temperature increased about 0.6 degrees per decade—or about 2.7 degrees over 45 years—and it is not over. Average annual temperatures are projected to rise 3.5 to 8.5 degrees by 2100.

Difficult-to-control wildfires have multiplied because of dry conditions killing trees and other vegetation, threatening lives, destroying homes, and costing billions of dollars. New Mexico experienced its largest wildfire in 2012—the Whitewater-Baldy Complex fire—that burned almost 290,000 acres. The fire burned in the southwestern part of the State but caused air pollution hundreds of miles away in Las Cruces to the east and Santa Fe to the northeast.

Agriculture is a mainstay for the Southwest's economy. We produce more than half of the Nation's high-value specialty crops, and crop development is threatened by warming and extreme weather events.

Likewise, another key economic sector—tourism and recreation—is threatened by reduced streamflow and a shorter snow season. Ski Santa Fe used to always open Thanksgiving weekend. That hardly ever happens anymore. Reduced snow and higher temperatures have been an economic disaster for the slopes all over New Mexico.

The Southwest's 182 federally recognized Tribes are particularly vulnerable to climate changes such as high temperatures, drought, and severe storms. Tribes may lose traditional foods, medicines, and water supplies.

Similarly, our border communities are in greater jeopardy because they don't have the financial resources to protect against climate change impacts. They are vulnerable to health and safety risks like air pollution, erosion, and flooding.

The President and his administration have taken aim at Federal programs that would address all these impacts to my State and the Southwest. The President unilaterally withdrew from the Paris Agreement. EPA put the Clean Power Plan on hold. Secretary Zinke has done all he can to halt BLM's methane waste prevention rule. Public lands are open for coal and oil and gas drilling. The President's budget slashed climate science funding. The list goes on and on. This is not what the American people want. They believe science, they understand that human activity is causing climate change, and they want robust policies in response.

Climate change presents the greatest threat our Nation and world now con-

front. It is the moral test of our age. We will be judged by future generations by how we respond now. We owe it to our children, our grandchildren, and beyond to meet this challenge head-on. I call upon my colleagues across the aisle to listen to the science and the American people and to work with us to take action.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I believe Senator WHITEHOUSE's colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, is here to speak next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me thank Senator UDALL for his kind remarks and his great leadership.

I rise today to add my voice to his voice and to that of so many of my colleagues in calling attention to the growing threat of climate change, and to encourage the Senate to take meaningful action. First, let me join all of my colleagues in recognizing and thanking my colleague, Senator SHELTON WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island. His tireless work to raise awareness about the devastating impacts of climate change has truly made a remarkable difference in our country and around the world.

Senator WHITEHOUSE comes to the Senate floor every week to tell us why it is "time to wake up," and I am pleased to be able to join him as he gives his 200th such speech. These 200 speeches provide at least 200 reasons why we should be acting quickly and decisively to address climate change. Just one of those reasons, which I would like to highlight, is the impact of climate change on our national security. Climate change acts as a threat multiplier, exacerbating other problems in unstable areas around the world. It is already creating conflict related to a lack of resources, whether it is access to food, water, or energy.

I was just traveling through Djibouti and Somalia—adjacent to Yemen—and one of the great crises in Yemen is not just the conflict on the ground, but it is a water crisis that is causing massive drought. Then I moved on up to Jordan, and there spoke with our representatives. There is a water crisis in Jordan also and another threatened drought.

These national security problems are climate problems, and these climate problems are national security problems. When it comes to our national security, decisions are made through a careful evaluation of risks, and we must be sure to include risks caused by climate change. It is particularly troubling to me to see that the current Administration is instead choosing to ignore the reality of scientific consensus by removing all references to climate change from documents like the "National Security Strategy" and the "National Defense Strategy."

The Department of Defense must be able to execute its missions effectively

and efficiently. So it is disconcerting that climate-related events have already cost the Pentagon significant resources—measured in both monetary costs as well as in negative impacts on military readiness.

In fact, Secretary Mattis, who understands these issues very well, and despite the official publication of the Department of Defense speaks very candidly and directly, has declared the following before the Senate Armed Services Committee:

Where climate change contributes to regional instability, the Department of Defense must be aware of any potential adverse impacts. . . . climate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating today. . . . and the Department should be prepared to mitigate any consequences of a changing climate, including ensuring that our shipyards and installations will continue to function as required.

Across the globe, we see our forces in conflict. They are in the Horn of Africa. They are there facing not just radical fighters, but drought and environmental issues. Here at home, we have shipyards and naval bases on the coast that are seeing rising waters that are going to cost us hundreds of millions of dollars to remediate so they can continue to function. If we don't respond, if we put our heads in the sand on the issues of climate change, our national security will be in endangered.

I was very pleased as the Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee to support my colleagues when they included in the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act a direction that the Department of Defense conduct a threat assessment and deliver a master plan for climate change adaptation. That was a bipartisan bill led by Chairman MCCAIN and supported by vast numbers on both sides of the aisle who understand that climate change must be addressed. It also codified several findings related to climate change and expressed the sense of Congress that climate change is a threat to our national security. We are on record as a Congress saying that national security is jeopardized by climate change. That has to be embraced by the whole of government, not just the Senate or the House acting together.

I must commend our colleague—Sheldon's and my colleague—Congressman JIM LANGEVIN of Rhode Island because he pushed for the same measure in the House of Representatives, and he was successful.

Just like other threats to our national security, it is critical that we recognize, plan for, and take steps to address climate change. Combating climate change may not seem as urgent as other threats we are facing today, but I would argue otherwise. If we don't begin to take aggressive action to protect ourselves from the effects of climate change, we will face ever increasing and severe consequences. Be-

cause of his clarion call to pay attention to climate change, Senator WHITEHOUSE is advancing our national security interests in an important way, and I stand here to commend him and thank him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to join and thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his ongoing commitment to give a voice to the issue of climate change and the threat it poses to our country and, frankly, our world. Senator WHITEHOUSE has provided real, moral leadership on this issue, and I wish to express my gratitude for his unrelenting focus.

Let there be no doubt that climate change is real. The question is not whether it is happening but how we will address it. Are we going to do all that we can to leave the next generation a safer and healthier world?

As my friend from Rhode Island has impressed upon us with due urgency week in and week out, climate change will be tremendously costly to our economy and to our very way of life. The longer we wait to act, the more costly these impacts will be.

The State of Wisconsin has been a proud home to environmental leaders who have worked to pass on a stronger environment to future generations. I think of Aldo Leopold. I think of John Muir. I think of Senator Gaylord Nelson, the founder of Earth Day.

As a Senator for our great State, it is one of my top priorities to follow in this legacy and to preserve our natural resources and quality of life for future generations. It is not hard to see why Wisconsinites deeply value environmental protection. From looking out at the crystal clear waters of Lake Superior from its South Shore to standing atop Rib Mountain and gazing at the forests and farmlands of Central Wisconsin, to casting your fishing rod in the world-class trout streams of the Driftless region in the southwest of our State, there is no question that we are blessed. We are blessed with natural beauty in the State of Wisconsin.

The impact of climate change can already be seen on these very landscapes and the economies they support. We see it in agriculture. Growing seasons are shifting, and extreme weather events are harming our crops. We have increasing concerns about drought and groundwater. In fact, NASA recently warned that droughts will not only become more severe, but our ecosystems will be increasingly slower to recover from those droughts. Decreased soil moisture will put stress on farmers and their livestock, on private wells, and on our municipal drinking water systems.

These prolonged droughts, combined with the increased intensity of storms and changing temperature patterns,

will force farmers to change how and what they grow. It is extremely troubling as agriculture is an \$88 billion industry in the State of Wisconsin.

We also see the negative effects of climate change on our Great Lakes. In Lake Michigan, for example, we see changes in precipitation and evaporation patterns due to climate change that may cause more dramatic fluctuations in lake levels than we have already seen. Data from the Environmental Protection Agency shows that average surface water temperatures have increased in all five Great Lakes since 1995. Warmer surface water temperatures disrupt the food chain and facilitate the spread of invasive species, threatening our native fish with disease. Changing water levels create challenges for property owners and communities along the Great Lakes. Each of these changes will strain our local economies.

Tourism is also a major part of Wisconsin's economy. The Northwoods is a beloved place to fish, camp, hunt, and snowmobile. But last year, for only the second time in its 45-year history, Wisconsin's famous Birkebeiner cross-country ski race was canceled because of warm temperatures and a lack of snow.

The impacts on tourism, recreation, and the landscapes that we hold near to our hearts are already here. They will only become more drastic. The threats may be daunting, but we cannot allow the challenges to overwhelm us into inaction.

Wisconsin's motto is just one word—"forward." The people of Wisconsin have never been afraid of the challenges we face. We have a strong progressive tradition of confronting our challenges and working together to shape our future for the next generation. Many of Wisconsin's most successful companies are leaders in energy efficiency, renewable energy, and clean technology.

In 2014, one of Wisconsin's major healthcare systems became the first in the Nation to use entirely renewable energy. Wisconsin companies are strong innovators and provide opportunities for workers of today and tomorrow as they lead the way.

I believe in smart investments by governments at all levels, by companies and institutions, and by citizens. This will help us confront the challenge of climate change while positioning Wisconsin for economic and ecological resiliency. This opportunity is great, and we must meet the challenge head-on—going forward, the Wisconsin way.

I would like, once again, to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his laser focus on this issue that is so critical to our home States, as well as the Nation and the world, that we will pass on to the next generation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Like Wisconsin, Rhode Island has a one-word motto as well. Hers is "Forward." Ours is "Hope." Together, they point in the right direction.

Americans are dissatisfied. Opinion surveys tell us that only 35 percent of Americans believe our country is headed in the right direction. Why this alarming dissatisfaction? We don't have to guess. Popular opinion tells us quite plainly. In a survey taken after the 2016 election, 85 percent of voters agreed that the wealthy and big corporations were the ones really running the country. That includes 80 percent of voters who supported Trump. It is not just opinion. Academic studies have looked at Congress and confirmed that the views of the general public have statistically near zero influence here—that we listen to big, corporate special interests and their various front groups.

Even our Supreme Court is not immune. In a 2014 poll, more respondents believed, by 9 to 1, that our Supreme Court favors corporations over individuals rather than vice versa. Even among self-identified conservative Republicans, it was still a 4-to-1 margin.

So hold that thought: The wealthy and powerful corporations control Congress, and people know it.

As I give my 200th "Time to Wake Up" speech, the most obvious fact standing plainly before me is not the measured sea level rise at Naval Station Newport; it is not the 400 parts per million carbon dioxide barrier we have broken through in the atmosphere; it is not the new flooding maps that coastal communities like Rhode Island's must face; it is not the West aflame; it is not even the uniform consensus about climate change across universities, National Laboratories, scientific societies, and even across our military and intelligence services, which warn us, as Senator REED indicated, that climate change is fueling economic and social disruption around the world.

No. The fact that stands out for me, here at No. 200, is the persistent failure of Congress to even take up the issue of climate change. One party will not even talk about it. One party in the executive branch is even gagging America's scientists and civil servants and striking the term "climate change" off of government websites. In the real world, in actual reality, we are long past any question as to the reality of climate change. The fact of that forces us to confront the questions: What stymies Congress from legislating or from even having hearings about climate change? What impels certain executive agencies to forbid even the words?

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. No. I intend to give my remarks, but I appreciate the Senator's intervention.

Before the Citizens United decision was delivered up by the five Republican appointees on the Supreme Court—a decision, by the way, that deserves a place on the trash heap of judicial history—we were actually doing quite a lot about climate change in the Senate. There were bipartisan hearings. There were bipartisan bills. There were bipartisan negotiations. Senator MCCAIN campaigned for President under the Republican banner on a strong climate platform.

What happened? Here is what I saw happen: The fossil fuel industry went over and importuned the Supreme Court for the Citizens United decision; the five Republican-appointed judges on the Court delivered the Citizens United decision; and the fossil fuel industry was ready and set at the mark when that decision came down.

Since the moment of that decision, not one Republican in this body has joined one serious piece of legislation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Our Senate heartbeat of bipartisan activity was killed dead by the political weaponry unleashed for big special interests by those five judges.

The fossil fuel industry then made a clever play. It determined to control one party on this question. It determined to silence or punish or remove any dissent in one political party. This created for the fossil fuel industry two advantages.

First, it got to use that party as its tool to stop climate legislation, and it has. Remember the movie "Men in Black"? I would make the analogy that today's Republican Party bears the same relation to the fossil fuel industry as to climate change that the unfortunate farmer in "Men in Black" bore to the alien who killed him and occupied his skin for the rest of the movie—complete occupation with nothing left but the skin.

The second advantage for the fossil fuel industry is that it could camouflage its own special interest special pleading as partisanship and not just the muscle and greed of one very big industry that wanted to have its way.

That is why we are where we are. That is why one's talking to Republicans about climate change resembles one's talking to prisoners about escape. They may want out, but they can't have their fossil fuel wardens find out.

Climate change is a prime example of how our institutions are failing in plain view of the American people. It is a small wonder the public holds Congress in low esteem and thinks we don't listen to them. Frankly, it is amazing that there is any shred of esteem remaining given our behavior.

Congress remains a democratic body on the surface with all the procedural veneer and trappings of democracy as

we hold votes and as there are caucuses and hearings. Yet, on issues like climate change, which most concern the biggest special interests, Congress no longer provides America a truly functioning democracy.

Underneath the illusory democratic surface runs subterranean rivers of dark money. Massive infrastructures have been erected to hide that dark money flow from the sunlight of public scrutiny to carve out subterranean caverns through which the dark money flows.

If you want to understand why we do nothing on climate, you have to look down into those subterranean chambers, understand the dark money, and not be fooled by the surface spectacle. Of course, it is not just the spending of dark money that is the problem. When you let unlimited money loose in politics, particularly once you let unlimited dark money loose in politics, you empower something even more sinister than massive anonymous political expenditures; you empower the threat of massive anonymous political expenditures—the sinister whispered threat. Once you let a special interest spend unlimited dark money, you necessarily let it threaten or promise to spend that money.

Those sinister threats and promises will be harder to detect even than the most obscured dark money expenditures. You may not know who is behind a big dark money expenditure, but at least you will see it. You will see the smear ads. You may not know what is up, but you will know something is up. But a threat? A couple of people, a back room, and a silent handshake are enough. If you give a thug a big enough club, he doesn't even have to use it to get his way. This is the great, insidious evil of Citizens United, and this, I believe, is why we are where we are.

In the Gilded Age, the Senate was described as having Senators who didn't actually represent States but "principalities and powers in business." One Senator represents the Union Pacific Railway system, another the New York Central, still another the insurance interests of New York and New Jersey. We cannot pretend it is impossible for the United States to be disabled and corrupted by special interests. Our history refutes that thought. So, as Americans, we need to keep our guard up against corrupting forces, and this unlimited dark flow of money into our politics is a corrupting force.

Congress's embarrassing and culpable failure to act on climate change is one face of a coin. Turn it over, and the obverse of that coin is corruption exactly as the Founding Fathers knew it—the public good ignored for special interests' wielding power. In this case, it is the power of money—climate failure, dark money; dark money, climate failure. They are two sides of the same evil coin. If that thought is not cheerful enough, wait. There is more.

There is the phony science operation that gives rhetorical cover to the dark money political muscle operation. This phony science operation is a big effort, with dozens of well-funded front groups that participate that are supported by bogus think tanks, well described as the “think tank as the disguised political weapon.”

Today’s phony science operation has a history. It grew out of the early phony science operation run by the tobacco industry, which was set up to create doubt among the public that cigarettes were bad for you. How did that work out? I will tell you how. That effort was so false and so evil that it was determined in court to be fraud—a massive corporate-led fraud.

After the tobacco fraud apparatus was exposed, it didn’t disappear. It morphed into an even more complex apparatus to create false doubt about climate science. The goal, exactly like the tobacco companies’ fraud, is to create something that looks enough like science to confuse the public but which has the perverse purpose of defeating and neutralizing real science. It is a science denial apparatus. By the way, this fossil fuel-funded science denial apparatus has some big advantages over real science.

First, the science denial apparatus has unlimited money behind it. The IMF has put the subsidy of the fossil fuel industry at \$700 billion per year in the United States alone. To defend a \$700 billion annual subsidy, you can spend enormous amounts of money, so money is no object.

Second, the science denial apparatus doesn’t waste time with peer review—the touchstone of real science. Slap a lab coat on a hack, and send him to the talk shows. That is enough. The science denial apparatus is public relations dressed up as science so it behaves like public relations and goes straight to its market—an inept public—to work its mischief.

Third, it has the advantage of Madison Avenue tacticians to shape its phony message into appealing sound bites for the public. Have you read a scientific journal lately? The Madison Avenue message gets through a lot more sharply.

Fourth, the science denial apparatus doesn’t need to stop lying when it is caught. As long as it is getting its propaganda out, the truth doesn’t matter. This is not a contest for truth; it is a contest for public opinion. So debunked, zombie arguments constantly rise from the Earth and walk again.

Finally, it doesn’t have to win the argument. It just has to create the illusion, the false illusion, that there is a legitimate argument. Then the political muscle those five Justices gave this industry can go to work.

I suggest, 200 speeches in, that it is time we stopped listening to the industry that comes to us bearing one of the

most flagrant conflicts of interest in history. It is time we stopped listening to their fraudulent science denial operation. It is time we put the light of day on this creepy dark money operation and stopped listening to its threats and promises.

If we are going to stop listening to all of that, whom should we listen to? How about Pope Francis, who called climate change “one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day.” How about the scientists—we pay hundreds of them across our government—whose salaries our appropriators are funding right now and who, under President Trump, released this report? This report reads that there is “no convincing alternative explanation” for what it calls “global, long-term, and unambiguous warming” and “record-breaking, climate-related weather extremes.” It is our human activity.

How about listening to our intelligence services, whose “Worldwide Threat Assessment,” issued under President Trump and signed by our former colleague, the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, actually has a chapter titled “Environment and Climate Change.” Here are the identified consequences in that report: “humanitarian disasters, conflict, water and food shortages, population migration, labor shortfalls, price shocks, and power outages,” and most dangerously, the prospect of—and I quote the “Worldwide Threat Assessment” here—“tipping points in climate-linked earth systems” that can create “abrupt climate change.”

Or how about listening to Donald Trump, Donald Trump, Jr., and Ivanka Trump, Eric Trump, and the Trump organization in 2009, when they took out this full-page ad in the New York Times saying that the science of climate change was “irrefutable,” and its consequences would be “catastrophic and irreversible.” Donald J. Trump, chairman and president—where did that guy go?

How about listening to our own home State universities. Every one of us can go home to Old Miss or Ohio State, to the University of Alaska or LSU, to Utah State or West Virginia University or Texas A&M. We can each go home to our home State’s State university. They don’t just accept climate change; they teach it. They teach it.

If you can listen quietly, you can listen to the oceans. They speak to us, the oceans do. They speak to us through thermometers, and they say: We are warming. They speak to us through tide gauges, and they say: We are rising along your shores. They speak to us through the howl of hurricanes powered up by their warmer sea surfaces. They speak to us through the quiet flight of fish species from their traditional grounds as the seawater warms beyond their tolerance.

If we know how to listen, through simple pH tests, the oceans will tell us

that they are acidifying. The oceans will tell us that they are beginning to kill their own corals and oysters and pteropods. We can go out and check and see the corals and the oysters and the pteropods corrode and die before our eyes. It is happening.

The fishermen who plow the oceans’ surface can speak for the oceans. As one Rhode Islander said to me: “Sheldon, it’s getting weird out there.”

“This is not my grandfather’s ocean,” said another. He had grown up trawling with his granddad on those oceans.

It is not just oceans. I went on Lake Erie with seasoned, professional fishermen who told me that everything they had learned in a lifetime on the lake was useless because the lake was changing on them so unknowably fast.

We choose here in Congress to whom we are going to listen, and it is time we started to listen to the honest voices and the true voices. If you don’t like environmentalists or scientists, listen to your ski industry. Listen to your fishermen and lumbermen. Listen to your gardeners and birders and hunters. Listen to those who know the Earth and the oceans and who can speak for the Earth and the oceans.

It is an evil mess we are in, and if there is any justice in this world, there will one day be a terrible price to pay if we keep listening to evil voices.

The climate change problems we are causing by failing to act are a sin, as Pope Francis has flatly declared, but that is not the only sin. To jam Congress up, fossil fuel interests are interfering with and corrupting American democracy, and to corrupt American democracy is a second and a grave sin.

The science denial apparatus—to mount a fraudulent challenge to the very enterprise of science, that is a third grave sin.

Perhaps worst of all is that the world is watching. It is watching us as the fossil fuel industry, its creepy billionaires, its front groups, its bogus think tanks all gang up and debauch our democracy.

From John Winthrop to Ronald Reagan, we have held America up as a city on a hill, with the eyes of the world upon us. From DANIEL WEBSTER to Bill Clinton, we have spoken of the power of our American example as greater in the world than any example of our power. Lady Liberty in New York Harbor holds her lamp up to the world, representing our American beacon of truth, justice, and democracy.

I have a distinct memory, traveling with our friend JOHN MCCAIN to Manila and waking up early in the morning to go visit our American military cemetery, the Sun coming up over the rows of white gravestones standing over our dead, the massive, gleaming marble arcade of names, carved on walls stretching high over my head, of the Americans whose bodies were never recovered—over 17,000 in all, remembered in that cemetery.

After their sacrifice, after the accomplishments of the “greatest generation,” can we not do better than to sell our democracy to the fossil fuel industry? What do you suppose a monument to that would look like? I wonder.

America deserves better, and the world is watching us; we, this city on a hill.

With gratitude to the many colleagues who have joined me today, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, when we discuss climate change, we often speak about the future—a future in which rising temperatures and seas displace millions from their homes around the globe, devastate agriculture, and damage critical infrastructure. This future is not far off.

Climate change will impact every State in our country and every country in the world. In island and coastal communities like Hawaii, the impact will be particularly severe.

Climate scientists across the world agree that without decisive action, seas will likely rise by at least 3.2 feet by the end of the century. To put this in context, a child born today will likely experience these effects in their lifetime.

I will focus my remarks today on the foreseeable impact on Hawaii.

The State of Hawaii investigated and issued a chilling report about what a 3.2-foot sea level rise would mean for our State. The report concluded that 3.2 feet of sea level rise would inundate more than 25,000 acres of land across Hawaii. Over 6,500 hotels, malls, small businesses, apartments, and homes would be compromised or destroyed, and 20,000 residents would be displaced in the process.

The economic cost of this damage—\$19 billion. If anything, this is a conservative estimate of the total economic cost of climate change in Hawaii. The State report, for example, doesn’t estimate the total cost of damage to Hawaii’s critical infrastructure.

Climate change and sea level rise would damage sewer lines in urban Honolulu and other low-lying areas across the State. These phenomena would also lead to chronic flooding across 38 miles of major roads, such as the Kuhio Highway on Kauai, Kamehameha Highway on Oahu, and Honoapiilani Highway on Maui.

The State’s report certainly outlines the serious challenges that climate change will pose for the future, but we are already living with its effects.

Each summer and winter, the specific placement of the sun and moon combined with the rotation of the Earth produce extraordinarily high tides. We call them king tides. Most years, scientists can predict when these tides will happen and how bad they will be. Last year’s king tides, however, were

the worst on record. Scientists believe that these historic king tides provide a glimpse of the increasing severity and frequency of the coastal flooding driven by climate change. Hawaii also experienced an exceptionally rare king tide on New Year’s Day, and a larger than normal north swell caused major coastal erosion on Oahu’s north shore.

Coastal erosion is a critical issue for Hawaii, where our beaches draw millions of visitors from around the world every year. According to research from the University of Hawaii Sea Grant College Program, 70 percent of the beaches in Hawaii are eroding, and 13 miles of public beach have eroded completely. In other words, they are gone.

During last year’s king tides, Sea Grant mobilized citizen scientists to document their impact on the State. From Sea Grant’s research we learned that record-high water levels caused localized flooding and erosion across every island in the State. Waikiki Beach was particularly impacted last year when the king tides overwashed the shoreline during peak tourist season. Climate change will make events like this more frequent and severe, adversely impacting our environment and our economy.

Waikiki Beach on Oahu alone generates \$2.2 billion for Hawaii’s economy every year, and it could be completely submerged by the end of the century. There is a clear urgency to act, and we need our President and the Federal Government to acknowledge the threat and to lead.

We need more funding for programs like Sea Grant that help State and local governments develop plans and policies to help our beaches, our coasts, and our economy adapt to climate change. But at a time when we should be increasing funding for Sea Grant colleges, the Trump administration is zeroing out this funding. We were able to protect funding for Sea Grant last year, and I will continue to fight during this year’s budget and appropriations cycle to make sure it receives the money it needs to do its important work.

We also need our Federal agencies to invest in research that will help us better understand climate change’s long-term impact on our States and communities. But Donald Trump has appointed—and his Republican allies in the Senate have confirmed—regressive, dangerous, and extreme nominees who are undermining critical climate change research.

Last May, the Department of Interior under the leadership of Ryan Zinke, put out a news release about a report on climate change-related sea level rise, coauthored by two Hawaii scientists without ever mentioning in their release the words “climate change.”

Earlier today, I asked Secretary Zinke at a hearing to comment on this

incident and to clarify whether it is the Department’s policy to censor announcements about climate change research produced by his Department. Secretary Zinke acknowledged that the content of the press release is his prerogative but that he would not censor the contents of documents and reports themselves. However, by not referencing the term “climate change” in a press release on a report about how climate change drives sea level rise, he is toeing the President’s line that climate change is a hoax. The problem is that press releases from agencies like the Interior Department serve as indicators of the Federal Government’s priorities. By eliminating references to climate change in these releases, the Department is sending a clear signal that climate change is not a priority.

In the absence of Federal action, States like Hawaii are stepping up and taking the lead. Hawaii was the first State in the country to enact legislation to implement the Paris climate agreement after President Trump announced that he would withdraw the United States from this agreement without much reason.

Standing up to the challenge of climate change also means developing our renewable resources of energy and moving away from dependence on fossil fuels. Hawaii has set the forward-thinking goal of generating 100-percent renewable electricity by 2045. Through decisive action, Hawaii is already generating 27-percent renewable electricity while cutting oil imports by 41 percent since 2006. As the most oil-dependent State in the country, this is significant progress.

Over 97 percent of climate scientists agree that the climate is changing due to human activity, and the vast majority of the American public also acknowledges this. Our Nation’s military recognizes the threat that climate change poses to our national security and the urgent need to confront it.

Mr. President, I agree with my colleague from Rhode Island that it is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join my friend and colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE on the day of his 200th weekly climate change floor speech. We came in the same class. So I have been a witness to this. For years he has come to the floor every week that the Senate is in session, often to an empty Chamber, to speak on this critical issue. He has been a leader and an unwavering voice on climate change, calling for action week after week and, I think, that is why so many of us are here tonight. Two hundred speeches is truly a milestone, and you can just look at the wear and tear of his “Time to Wake Up” floor sign to know that this actually happened.

Not only does Senator WHITEHOUSE come to the floor to talk about this issue and to share new data and information with all of us on the need to act now, but I have also seen him take on climate change deniers as a member when I was on both the Environment and Public Works Committee and also on the Judiciary Committee. I have experienced his dedication to moving the needle on this issue as a member of the Senate Climate Action Task Force that he has led for several years.

I have been part of the meetings where he has pulled together Senators and advocacy group leaders to strategize on how to move forward on legislation and meetings where he has brought together Senators and private sector leaders, such as Greg Page, the former CEO of Cargill, to talk about how we change the private dialogue about sustainability in supply chains. He is truly committed to finding solutions, and I am pleased to join him tonight for his 200th speech.

People talk about climate in many places in my State—from hunters and snowmobilers in Northern Minnesota to business leaders in the Twin Cities, to students at the University of Minnesota.

When President Trump announced that the United States would withdraw from the climate change agreement this summer—the worldwide, international climate change agreement—I heard an outpouring of concern. Now, 195 countries made a pledge to come together to combat climate change. In withdrawing, the United States was one of only three countries that wouldn't be in the agreement. The other two were Syria and Nicaragua. Then, Syria and Nicaragua signed the accord. So now the United States is the only country not to sign the accord. It is a big step backward. It is the wrong decision for our economy, and it is the wrong decision for the environment.

As military and security experts have reminded us, climate change is a threat to our national security, increasing the risks of conflict, humanitarian crisis—as we have already seen because of droughts, with subsistence farmers in Africa coming up as refugees—and damage to crucial and critical infrastructure.

I am a former prosecutor, and I believe in evidence. Every week seems to bring fresh evidence of the damage climate change is already causing. Minnesota may be miles away from rising oceans, but the impacts are not less of a real threat in the Midwest—more severe weather, heat waves that could release our water supply, extreme rainfall that could damage critical infrastructure, and a decrease in agricultural productivity. It goes on and on. It has an impact on the Great Lakes and people respond.

We are going to keep talking about the importance of making a global

commitment and an American commitment to address climate change. We should not be the last one in. We should be the first one. This is a great nation with a history of Democrats and Republicans coming together to conserve our land and care about our environment. We are going to keep pushing climate change deniers on their facts, and we are going to keep working on policies that encourage energy efficiency, renewable energy, and a decrease in greenhouse gasses.

Many of the businesses in Minnesota, such as Cargill, which I already mentioned in the lead, have taken on this cause. They know that when they have business all over the world, it matters. They know that it matters to their shareholders, it matters to their employees, and it matters to their customers.

They also know that we deal with the rest of the world, and when businesses go to meetings in other countries, they don't want to hear: Well, I guess your country is not in the climate change agreement and China is; so maybe we will buy our stuff from China. That is what people are hearing at business meetings.

We need to be a part of the Paris climate change agreement, and we need to lead the way in the United States. In the last administration, we had some commonsense policies put forth to reduce greenhouse gasses, but this administration has pulled back on them. I disagree. I think we could have made that work.

Even though we are not seeing the action we would like out of this administration, we are seeing it in cities, in States, in businesses, and universities. They have said: If this administration doesn't do it, we will.

So I wish to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership and let all of those listening to this series of speeches and tributes to doing something about climate change in his 200th speech tonight know that there are those in this Chamber who stand with you and believe in science and believe that we need to do something about climate change.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for laying out the case so clearly on the challenge, as I like to call it, of taking on climate chaos.

My wife Mary comes from Minnesota. I know they value the Land of 10,000 Lakes. Every time I have said that before, I always say the "Land of a Thousand Lakes," and Senator KLOBUCHAR corrects me. I just can't quite envision 10,000 lakes.

Minnesota is a land with incredible wildlife, a land that certainly has seen the impacts of climate chaos, as has

my home State. So thank you so much for your remarks and for being here to help celebrate our colleague and our friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, who spoke tonight just a few minutes ago for his 200th time, to say: Wake up. Wake up, America.

We have a significant challenge, the sort of challenge that you may not notice from one day to the next. We may wake up tomorrow and not realize that the damage being done to our planet is greater than the day before or we may not be able to wake up a week from now and realize that the damage is more. Nonetheless, it is, if looked at over any significant span of time, a huge, huge force wreaking havoc on our planet, and it will just get worse with time if we do not take on this pollution of the atmosphere by carbon dioxide.

Back in 1959, an eminent scientist was asked to speak at the 100th anniversary of the petroleum industry. That scientist was Edward Teller. Edward Teller gave his speech at this 100th anniversary in 1959, but he said to the gathering of the fossil fuel industry: You do realize that you will eventually have to look for a different form of energy to invest in, first, because the amount of fossil fuels in the Earth's crust is limited and it will run out. He said: Second of all, there are some interesting facts that many of you might not be aware of—that when you burn fossil fuels, it creates carbon dioxide, and carbon dioxide might not at first seem like a pollutant because it is invisible and it is odorless, but it has this quality where visible light passes through it, but heat energy is trapped. As a result of trapping heat energy and changing the makeup of our atmosphere, we will start to do major damage to the planet. He talked about how it would affect the melting of ice on the poles, the rising of sea levels, and that humankind lived by the oceans and, therefore, this carbon dioxide would do enormous damage and it would be important to transition off of burning carbon fuels, off of burning fossil fuels. That was in 1959, which is a long time ago that we have had the information about the damage wreaking havoc by this pollutant, carbon dioxide.

Henry David Thoreau, the philosopher, challenged us and said: What is the use of a house if you don't have a tolerable planet to put it on?

Yet everywhere we see our planet crying out for us to pay attention—never as much, however, as in this last year. Here in America, there were fierce forest fires from Montana, across Idaho, into Washington, down to Oregon, and into California clear into December. Smoke covered much of my State for month after month this last summer, having an impact on people's health and certainly having an impact on our economy.

We could look at the storms of last year—the hurricanes of Harvey, Irma, and Maria assailing Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Those storms were unusually damaging, and part of the reason for that is because the energy of those storms is taken from the temperature of the ocean, and the ocean has been collecting 90 percent of the increased heat on the planet from carbon dioxide pollution and, therefore, producing more powerful hurricanes.

So we saw it in the fires, and we saw it in the hurricanes, but you really can start to see it almost everywhere. You can see that the pine beetles are doing much better because the winters aren't cold enough to kill them, and the trees are doing much worse. You can see that the ticks in New England and Maine and on through Minnesota are doing much better because the winters are not cold enough to kill them. Therefore, they are killing the moose. You can see the impact of the rising ocean temperature on coral reefs around the world, which are a small part of the ocean but have a significant role in the fisheries on our planet.

In my home State in Oregon, the warmer temperatures and the acidity in the ocean caused a billion baby oysters to die in 2008. Well, that is quite an impact on our seafood industry. I can tell you that scientists were mystified because they couldn't imagine, at first, that it had to do with the water quality. They thought it must be a virus or it must be some form of bacteria, but it just turned out that the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere not only results in the warming of the ocean, but it is absorbed in the ocean and becomes carbonic acid. That greater acidity of the ocean damages the ability of baby oysters to form shells. So now we have to artificially buffer the ocean water.

We see it in spreading diseases, like malaria, as they follow the mosquitoes, and Zika, as it follows the mosquitoes into greater territory, or leishmaniasis, which is a real diabolical disease that now has come to the United States with sand flies.

My point is that everywhere you look, if you open your eyes, climate chaos is having a big impact and hurting us.

The answer is simple. We have to stop burning fossil fuels. This is where the 100-percent notion comes from, from my bill of last year—100 percent by 50, 100 by 50, or, if you prefer, mission 100. It just means we have to transition from the energy that we gain from fossil fuels to substituting energy from clean and renewable sources—100 percent. Stop burning fossil fuels.

A few years ago, folks said: Well, that will cause great damage to our economy because renewable energy is so much more expensive than cheap fossil fuels. But we have been blessed.

We have been blessed in taking on this challenge because it is no longer true that renewable energy is more expensive than fossil fuel energy.

We have had an incredible drop in the price of solar energy over a short period—from 35 cents per kilowatt hour down to 5 cents per kilowatt hour. Then Xcel Energy in Colorado put out a proposal this year. The proposal came back at 2 cents per kilowatt hour. In other words, it is cheaper to have new and clean renewable energy than to burn coal in an already depreciated fossil fuel coal electric plant. Wind has gone from 13 cents or so per kilowatt hour to 5 cents per kilowatt hour. Xcel Energy in Colorado brought in a bid at 3 cents per kilowatt hour.

As we have seen these prices drop dramatically on solar and wind, we have seen the installations of solar and wind surge. On the solar side, in 2017 we installed about 12 gigawatts of capacity—12 gigawatts, or 12,000 megawatts. That is a lot of energy. To put it differently, one-fourth of the total installed capacity of the United States of America went in just in 2017. That is a dramatic upsurge in installation. Think of a world where we can have every flat business roof and every manufacturing plant with solar rays on its surface or canopies over its parking lot because this energy is so cheap to collect, and we can collect it in places where the grid already exists. For wind, in 2016, 8 gigawatts of new capacity went in. Again, there is a tremendous upsurge in the amount of wind installed.

Now we are seeing roughly half of our utilities scale new capacity with renewable energy rather than with fossil fuel energy. The transition is underway, but we need to accelerate it. We need to move it much more quickly, and then we need to move our consumption of energy over to the electric grid. What does that mean? For example, it means heating your house with a heat pump, which uses electricity, rather than a gas furnace. It means changing the way you heat water from a gas hot water heater to an electric hot water heater. It means getting a plug-in vehicle, an electric vehicle.

Let's stop and talk a little bit about electric vehicles. While we have been seeing the production of carbon dioxide from making electricity come down in America, we are seeing the carbon dioxide from driving vehicles go up, so it is a major area we have to take on.

Five years ago, I bought a Volt, which is a plug-in hybrid. It has a range of about 35 miles of electricity, and it also has a gas backup. That car really worked exceedingly well. We drove 3 out of 4 miles on electricity, even though we used gasoline to drive all the way to South Dakota and back. What we found was that the cost per mile on electricity was only about 3 cents a mile, and the cost of running it

on gasoline—with oil, maintenance, and so forth—was closer to 10 cents a mile. So it is three times cheaper to drive it on electricity. So there is a big incentive.

Unfortunately, my son had an auto accident, and we had to replace that car. Because the range has increased over 5 years, we were able to get a fully electric car, a Nissan LEAF. The range had gone up in 2016 from roughly 80 miles to about 107. That extra 27 miles is enough that my wife could do her work in home hospice, potentially being assigned to a house way on the west side of the Monona County area and then way on the east side and back and forth several times a day and still make it completely on a single-charged battery.

With the proliferation of driving stations, now we are starting to see the ability to operate much more closely to the way we behaved, if you will, previously with gasoline vehicles—being able to drive hundreds of miles and then recharge. We have seen that with the Volt that just came out to replace the Bolt, which now goes over 200 miles on just its battery alone and more if you drive cautiously.

Buses are another big piece of this. I went down to Eugene, OR, a couple of weekends ago and rode on their first electric bus, the first one in the State of Oregon. That bus looked just like the old diesel buses that we have had serving our metro systems across America, but it cost a lot more. It cost \$200,000 more than a diesel bus.

You might say "Well, that is way too much," but here is the interesting thing: It saves about \$40,000 to \$45,000 a year on fuel. It doesn't take a math genius to then realize that after 5 years of service, you have paid off that cost, and after that, you are saving money. We are going to see a huge transition simply on the economics.

This is the challenge before us, that we have been given the gift of affordable solar that is cheaper than fossil fuel energy, affordable wind that is cheaper than fossil fuel energy, a greatly declining cost of battery power to help supply meet demand, but at the Federal level, we are paralyzed.

Unfortunately, the Koch brothers are really the puppet masters of this body, this Chamber I am in. This wonderful Senate is supposed to be the place where we deliberate to have government of, by, and for the people, but right now we have deliberations here that are of, by, and for the Koch brothers; of, by, and for the wealthy and the well-connected. That is not the vision of America. We have to reclaim the vision of America. The people of America understand that we have this enormous challenge that we must undertake to save our beautiful, blue and green planet.

Since the Federal Government isn't operating, we see companies and cities

and places of worship jumping in to fill the gap, adopting 100 percent resolutions—resolutions to transition to 100 percent cleaner renewable energy, to stop burning the fossil fuels that are damaging our planet.

Burlington, VT, is now using a mixture of biomass and hydro wind and solar so that 100 percent of electricity comes from renewable generation. Fifty-eight other cities across America have committed to making that 100 percent transition, and they are handing out an action plan—this year we can do this, and this year we can do that. Families can do the same, places of worship can do the same, and companies are doing the same all across our Nation. We see many of our Fortune 500 companies stepping forward to be real leaders in this. They want to attract employees who know that they care about our planet. They care about stopping this pollution that Edward Teller, an eminent scientist, pointed out in 1959.

When Henry David Thoreau said “What is the use of a house if you haven’t got a tolerable planet to put it on?” he asked a question we should always ask ourselves in terms of the different threats to this beautiful orb that we call home. So let’s fight to save this beautiful planet. It is the only one we have. We have no other. It is under serious threat, and we in this Chamber need to tell the Koch brothers to go and sit on their fossil fuel fortune, invest it as they want somewhere else, but to join us in the most important work they could possibly be part of in the years that they have remaining to live here in America, and that is this fight to take on climate chaos and win.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 298.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gilbert B. Kaplan, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be

considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kaplan nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following statement be printed in the RECORD on behalf of AASA; the School Superintendents Association; Afterschool Alliance; Alliance for Excellent Education; American Association of School Librarians; American Association of School Libraries; American Federation of Teachers; American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; American Library Association; American School Counselor Association; Americans for Democratic Action; Americans United for Separation of Church and State; Association of Educational Service Agencies; Association of Latino Administrators and Superintendents; Association of School Business Officials International, ASBO; Center for American Progress; Clearinghouse on Women’s Issues; Council for Exceptional Children; Council of Administrators of Special Education; CUE; EDGE; Education Networks of America; Every Child Matters; GLSEN; Higher Education Consortium for Special Education; Learning Disabilities Association of America; Learning Forward; MENTOR: The National Mentoring Partnership; National Association of Secondary School Principals; National Association for Bilingual Education; National Association of Black School Educators; National Association of Elementary School Principals; National Association of School Psychologists; National Association of State Directors of Special Education; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Learning Disabilities; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Teachers of English; National Council of Teachers of Mathe-

matics; National Education Association Retirees Organization, NEARO; National Education Association; National PTA; National Rural Education Advocacy Consortium; National Rural Education Association; National School Boards Association; National School Public Relations Association; National Science Teachers Association; Network for Public Education; New Teacher Center; People for the American Way; Project Tomorrow; School Social Work Association of America; Stop Sexual Assault in Schools; Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children; and University Council for Educational Administration.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We issue this joint statement in support of public education and our continued commitment to the highest quality public education for all students in honor of the students, teachers, and communities who work together to support our public schools during Public Schools Week.

Public education is the foundation of our 21st Century democracy. Our public schools are where our students come to be educated in the fullest sense of the word as citizens of this great country. We strive every day to make every public school a place where we prepare the nation’s young people to contribute to our society, economy and citizenry.

Ninety percent of American children attend public schools. We must call on local, state, and federal lawmakers to prioritize support for strengthening our nation’s public schools and empower local education leaders to implement, manage and lead school districts in partnership with educators, parents, and other local education stakeholders and learning communities. This support would also provide for such necessities as counseling, extra/co-curricular activities, and mental health supports that are critical to help students engage in learning.

We must support and value inclusive and safe high-quality public schools where children learn to think critically, problem solve and build relationships. We must support an environment where all students can succeed beginning in the earliest years, regardless of their zip code, the color of their skin, native language, disability, gender/gender identity, immigration status, religion, or social standing.

As advocates for public education, we believe we must promote advancing equity and excellence in public education, and implementing continuous improvement and evidence-based practices. Every child has the right to an education that helps them reach their full potential and to attend schools that offer a high quality educational experience.

We support stable, equitable, predictable and adequate funding for great public schools for every student in America so that students have inviting classrooms and school libraries with up-to-date resources as well as well-prepared and supported educators. These educators include teachers, paraprofessionals and principals who provide a well-rounded and complete curriculum and create joy in learning. Our school buildings should have class sizes small enough to allow one-on-one attention and have access to support services such as health care, nutrition,

and after-school programs for students who need them.

We believe that public tax dollars should only support public schools that are publicly governed and accountable to parents, educators and communities. In no way should local, state or federal funding be taken away from public schools and given to private schools that are unaccountable to the public.

We reiterate our love for public education and pride in our public schools. We will continue to promote the promise and purpose of public education, to elevate the great things happening every day in our public schools, and to engage communities about strategies that help students succeed. We affirm our commitment to fight for resources and supports for public schools, and will be steadfast in our efforts to protect students and their families, public schools, and our communities from any policies that would undermine these values.

PLACEMENT OF STATUE OF MARY MCLEOD BETHUNE IN NATIONAL STATUARY HALL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Florida recently approved the placement of a statue of a truly inspirational woman, Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, in the National Statuary Hall here in Washington, DC.

Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune was an American educator, stateswoman, philanthropist, humanitarian, and civil rights activist. In 1904, Dr. Bethune founded Literature and Industrial Training School for African-American students in Daytona Beach, FL, now Bethune-Cookman University. She founded and was the president of the State Federation of Colored Women's Club, where she led the fight against school segregation and healthcare inequality. Dr. Bethune also served as president of the National Association of Colored Women's Club and founded the National Council of Negro Women.

Dr. Bethune became the first African-American woman to head a Federal agency when President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed her administrative assistant for Negro Affairs of the National Youth Administration. She advised the President on concerns of African Americans and helped deliver his message and achievements with the African American community. Dr. Bethune became known as the First Lady of the Struggle because of her commitment to improve the lives of African Americans.

Dr. Bethune maintained high standards and attracted tourists and donors to Bethune-Cookman College. She was president of the college from 1923 to 1942 and 1946 to 1947, one of the few women in the world to serve as a college president at that time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Acting President pro tempore (Mr. CORNYN) announced that on today, March 13, 2018, he had signed the fol-

lowing enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) of the House:

H.R. 294. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the "Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building".

H.R. 452. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 1208. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the "Converse Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 1858. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office".

H.R. 1988. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the "Merle Haggard Post Office Building".

H.R. 2254. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building".

H.R. 2302. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 2464. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

H.R. 2672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office".

H.R. 2815. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the "Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office".

H.R. 2873. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building".

H.R. 3109. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the "Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building".

H.R. 3369. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the "Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 3638. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the "Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building".

H.R. 3655. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the "Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building".

H.R. 3821. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the "Zack T. Addington Post Office".

H.R. 3893. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the "Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 4042. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building".

H.R. 4285. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, as the "James C. 'Billy' Johnson Post Office Building".

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Report to accompany S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system (Rept. No. 115-213).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 2539. A bill to amend the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015, to reauthorize certain projects to increase Colorado River System water; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 2540. A bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2541. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to authorize spouses of servicemembers to elect to use the same residences as the servicemembers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2542. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2543. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide grants to develop and enhance, or to evaluate, kinship navigator programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 433. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2017 would harm the economy of the United States and place an undue burden on small businesses and multiple States across the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 382

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 804

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the

Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1864

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1864, a bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students.

S. 2046

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2046, a bill to amend titles 5 and 44, United States Code, to require Federal evaluation activities, improve Federal data management, and for other purposes.

S. 2060

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2060, a bill to promote democracy and human rights in Burma, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2060, *supra*.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2109

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2109, a bill to count revenues from military and veteran education programs toward the limit on Federal revenues that certain proprietary institutions of higher education are allowed to receive for purposes of section 487 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2236

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2236, a bill to require covered discrimination and covered har-

assment awareness and prevention training for Members, officers, employees, interns, fellows, and detailees of Congress within 30 days of employment and annually thereafter, to require a biennial climate survey of Congress, to amend the enforcement process under the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights for covered discrimination and covered harassment complaints, and for other purposes.

S. 2263

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2263, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to require base acres planted to fruits, vegetables, and wild rice to be considered planted to a covered commodity for purposes of any recalculation of base acres.

S. 2334

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2334, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide clarity with respect to, and to modernize, the licensing system for musical works under section 115 of that title, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of that title, and for other purposes.

S. 2353

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2353, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes.

S. 2356

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2356, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to address staffing and other issues at facilities, including underserved facilities, of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2383

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2383, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve law enforcement access to data stored across borders, and for other purposes.

S. 2421

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties

for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2500

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2500, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the vehicles, weaponry, and ammunition to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 2525

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2525, a bill to ensure that the Federal Government shall not take any discriminatory action against a person, wholly or partially on the basis that such person speaks, or acts, in accordance with a sincerely held religious belief or moral conviction that marriage is or should be recognized as a union of one man and one woman, or two individuals as recognized under Federal law, or that sexual relations outside marriage are improper.

S.J. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 386

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 386, a resolution urging the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to fulfill its agreement to hold credible elections, comply with constitutional limits on presidential terms, and fulfill its constitutional mandate for a democratic transition of power by taking concrete and measurable steps towards holding elections not later than December 2018 as outlined in the existing election calendar, and allowing for freedom of expression and association.

S. RES. 424

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 424, a resolution honoring the 25th anniversary of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 2107

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2107 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2134

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2134 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2157

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2157 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 433—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2017 WOULD HARM THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES AND PLACE AN UNDUE BURDEN ON SMALL BUSINESSES AND MULTIPLE STATES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 433

Whereas the Internet has continued to drive economic growth, productivity, and innovation over the last several decades;

Whereas the Internet promotes a nationwide economic environment that facilitates innovation, promotes efficiency, and empowers small businesses and entrepreneurs, especially those in rural communities in the United States, to broadly share their goods and services;

Whereas small businesses and entrepreneurs rely heavily on Internet access to provide them with access to new markets, additional consumers, and opportunities to compete in a global economy;

Whereas the exemptions in the Marketplace Fairness Act (S. 976) (referred to in this preamble as the "Marketplace Fairness Act") are wholly inadequate to ensure that small businesses and entrepreneurs are not harmed by the Marketplace Fairness Act;

Whereas it should not be the role of small businesses and entrepreneurs to help shore

up the finances of States and localities through an online sales tax;

Whereas, if enacted, the Marketplace Fairness Act would—

(1) create an online sales tax for all consumers, including consumers in States that have chosen to oppose sales taxes; and

(2) overwhelmingly benefit large corporate entities at the expense of small businesses and entrepreneurs; and

Whereas compliance with the Marketplace Fairness Act would place an undue burden on small businesses and entrepreneurs by—

(1) requiring small businesses and entrepreneurs to remit taxes to nearly 10,000 different tax jurisdictions across the United States and its territories;

(2) exposing small businesses and entrepreneurs to the risk of unnecessary and costly audits in nearly 10,000 different tax jurisdictions; and

(3) forcing small businesses and entrepreneurs to spend time and money purchasing expensive technology and hiring staff to ensure compliance with the Marketplace Fairness Act; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the unique role that the Internet plays in helping small businesses, entrepreneurs, and rural communities in the United States to be economically viable;

(2) declares that enactment of the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2017 (S. 976) would harm the economy of the United States and place burdensome and bureaucratic policies on small businesses and entrepreneurs; and

(3) recognizes that enactment of the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2017 (S. 976) would provide no economic benefit to States that do not have sales taxes or small businesses in those States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2209. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. CORKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2286, to amend the Peace Corps Act to provide greater protection and services for Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2209. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. CORKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2286, to amend the Peace Corps Act to provide greater protection and services for Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 13, line 9, insert "the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives," after "Senate".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "State Fragility, Growth, and Development: Designing Policy Approaches that Work."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The Freedom of Information Act: Examining the Administration's Progress on Reforms and Looking Ahead."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION,
TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND THE INTERNET

The Subcommittee on Communication, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Rebuilding Infrastructure in America: Investing in Next Generation Broadband."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION
AND MERCHANT MARINE INFRASTRUCTURE,
SAFETY AND SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Rebuilding Infrastructure in America: Investing in State and local Transportation Needs."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow in my office, Carissa Cyran, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NICK CASTLE PEACE CORPS REFORM ACT OF 2018

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 308, S. 2286.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2286) to amend the Peace Corps Act to provide greater protection and services for Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

S. 2286

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act of 2018".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER SUPPORT

Sec. 101. Peace Corps volunteer medical care reform.

Sec. 102. Post-service Peace Corps volunteer medical care reform.

Sec. 103. Peace Corps impact survey.

Sec. 104. Extension of positions for Peace Corps employees.

TITLE II—PEACE CORPS OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Sec. 201. Peace Corps volunteer access to Inspector General.

Sec. 202. Consultation with Congress required before opening or closing overseas offices and country programs.

Sec. 203. Publication requirement for volunteer surveys.

TITLE III—CRIME RISK REDUCTION ENHANCEMENTS

Sec. 301. Independent review of volunteer death.

Sec. 302. Monitoring training records.

Sec. 303. Additional disclosures to applicants for enrollment as volunteers.

Sec. 304. Additional protections against sexual misconduct.

Sec. 305. Immediate victim advocacy notification.

Sec. 306. Extension of the Office of Victim Advocacy.

Sec. 307. Reform and extension of the Sexual Assault Advisory Council.

Sec. 308. Definitions.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Peace Corps.

(3) PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER.—The term "Peace Corps volunteer" means an individual described in section 5(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(a)).

TITLE I—PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER SUPPORT

SEC. 101. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER MEDICAL CARE REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 (22 U.S.C. 2504) the following:

"SEC. 5A. HEALTH CARE FOR VOLUNTEERS AT PEACE CORPS POSTS.

"(a) HEALTH CARE MEDICAL OFFICERS SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting medical officers and support staff for overseas Peace Corps posts, the Director shall strive to hire well-qualified and capable personnel to support the effectiveness of health care for Peace Corps volunteers by evaluating each candidate's—

"(1) medical training, experience, and accreditations or other qualifications;

"(2) record of performance;

"(3) administrative capabilities;

"(4) understanding of the local language and culture;

"(5) ability to work in the English language;

"(6) interpersonal skills; and

"(7) such other factors that the Director considers to be appropriate.

"(b) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director, acting through the Associate Director of the Office of Health Services and the country directors, shall review and evaluate the performance and health care delivery of all Peace Corps medical staff, including medical officers—

"(A) to ensure compliance with all relevant Peace Corps policies, practices, and guidelines; and

"(B) to ensure that medical staff complete the necessary continuing medical education to maintain their skills and satisfy licensing and credentialing standards, as designated by the Director.

"(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall include, in the annual Peace Corps congressional budget justification, a confirmation that the review and evaluation of all Peace Corps medical staff required under paragraph (1) has been completed.

"(c) ANTIMALARIAL DRUGS.—The Director shall consult with experts at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention regarding recommendations for prescribing malaria prophylaxis, in order to provide the best standard of care within the context of the Peace Corps environment."

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE PEACE CORPS.—

(1) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.—As promptly as practicable, the Director shall implement the actions outlined in the agency response for all open recommendations of the Inspector General of the Peace Corps set forth in the report entitled "Final Program Evaluation Report: OIG Follow-up Evaluation of Issues Identified in the 2010 Peace Corps/Morocco Assessment of Medical Care" (Report No. IG-16-01-E).

(2) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees

that describes the Director's strategy for implementing the recommendations referred to in paragraph (1).

(B) **SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.**—Not later than 6 months after the submission of the report required under subparagraph (A), and semi-annually thereafter, the Director shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the progress in implementing the recommendations referred to in paragraph (1) until all such recommendations have been implemented in accordance with the agency's response to the report referred to in such paragraph.

(3) **NOTIFICATION.**—After the submission of each report required under paragraph (2), the Inspector General of the Peace Corps may notify the appropriate congressional committees of any recommendations from the report referred to in paragraph (1) that the Inspector General determines remain unresolved.

SEC. 102. POST-SERVICE PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER MEDICAL CARE REFORM.

Section 8142 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) The Secretary shall authorize the Director of the Peace Corps to furnish medical benefits to a volunteer, who is injured during the volunteer's period of service, for a period of 120 days following the termination of such service if the Director certifies that the volunteer's injury probably meets the requirements under subsection (c)(3). The Secretary may then certify vouchers for these expenses for such volunteer out of the Employees' Compensation Fund.

“(2) The Secretary shall prescribe the form and content of the certification required under paragraph (1).

“(3) A certification under paragraph (1) will cease to be effective if the volunteer sustains compensable disability in connection with volunteer service.

“(4) Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize the furnishing of any medical benefit that the Secretary of Labor is not otherwise authorized to reimburse for former Peace Corps volunteers who receive treatment for injury or disease proximately caused by their service in the Peace Corps in accordance with this chapter.”.

SEC. 103. PEACE CORPS IMPACT SURVEY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and once every 2 years for the following 6 years, the Director shall conduct a survey of former Peace Corps volunteers.

(b) **SCOPE OF SURVEY.**—The survey required under subsection (a) shall assess, with respect to each former Peace Corps volunteer completing the survey, the impact of the Peace Corps on the former volunteer, including the volunteer's—

- (1) well-being;
- (2) career;
- (3) civic engagement; and
- (4) commitment to public service.

(c) **REPORT.**—The Director shall submit a report containing the results of the survey conducted under subsection (a) to—

- (1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;
- (2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;
- (3) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and
- (4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(d) **PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT EXEMPTION.**—Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980”), shall

not apply to the collection of information through the survey required under this section.

SEC. 104. EXTENSION OF POSITIONS FOR PEACE CORPS EMPLOYEES.

Section 7(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2506(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) **DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL POSITIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Peace Corps may designate Peace Corps positions as critical management or management support positions that require specialized technical or professional skills and knowledge of Peace Corps operations. Such positions may include positions in the following fields:

- “(i) Volunteer health services.
- “(ii) Financial management.
- “(iii) Information technology.
- “(iv) Procurement.
- “(v) Personnel.
- “(vi) Legal services.
- “(vii) Safety and security.

“(B) **AUTHORITY.**—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), with respect to positions designated pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Director may make or extend renewable appointments or assignments under paragraph (2) notwithstanding limitations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) and paragraph (5).

“(C) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In exercising authority under subparagraph (B), the Director shall ensure that all decisions regarding the appointment, assignment, or extension of employees to any such position—

- “(i) are consistent with Federal law and Peace Corps policy; and
- “(ii) are based upon operational and programmatic factors.

“(D) **DURATION OF APPOINTMENTS.**—The term of any appointment or assignment to any position designated under subparagraph (A) may not exceed 5 years.”.

TITLE II—PEACE CORPS OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 201. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER ACCESS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Section 8 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a), by striking “he” and inserting “the President”; and
- (2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **AVAILABILITY OF THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.**—

“(1) **TRAINING REQUIREMENT.**—As part of the training provided to all volunteers under subsection (a), and in coordination with the Inspector General of the Peace Corps, the President shall provide all volunteers with—

“(A) information regarding the mandate of the Inspector General and the availability of the Inspector General as a resource for volunteers; [and

“(B) the contact information of the Inspector General.]

“(B) the contact information of the Inspector General;

“(C) information regarding the mandate of the Office of Victim Advocacy and the availability of the Office of Victim Advocacy as a resource for volunteers; and

“(D) the contact information of the Office of Victim Advocacy.

“(2) **FREQUENCY OF TRAINING.**—The President shall ensure that volunteers receive the information described in paragraph (1) not less frequently than—

“(A) once during pre-enrollment training; and

“(B) once during each significant training provided by the Peace Corps to volunteers after enrollment.”.

SEC. 202. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED BEFORE OPENING OR CLOSING OVERSEAS OFFICES AND COUNTRY PROGRAMS.

The Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 10 (22 U.S.C. 2509) the following:

“SEC. 10A. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED BEFORE OPENING OR CLOSING OVERSEAS OFFICES AND COUNTRY PROGRAMS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Director of the Peace Corps may not open, close, significantly reduce, or suspend a domestic or overseas office or country program unless the Director has notified and consulted with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(b) **WAIVER.**—The Director may waive the application of subsection (a) if an action described in such subsection is necessary to ameliorate a substantial security risk to Peace Corps volunteers or other Peace Corps personnel.”.

SEC. 203. PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT FOR VOLUNTEER SURVEYS.

Section 8E of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting after the first sentence the following: “The President shall ensure that each performance plan established under this subsection for a Peace Corps representative includes a consideration of the results, with respect to such representative and the country of service of such representative, of each survey conducted under subsection (c).”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The President shall publish, on a publicly available website of the Peace Corps, a report summarizing the results of each survey related to volunteer satisfaction in each country in which volunteers serve, and the early termination rate of volunteers serving in each such country. The information published shall be posted in an easily accessible place near the description of the appropriate country and shall be written in an easily understood manner.”.

TITLE III—CRIME RISK REDUCTION ENHANCEMENTS

SEC. 301. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF VOLUNTEER DEATH.

Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d)(1) Consistent with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Inspector General of the Peace Corps may independently review the facts and circumstances surrounding the death of a volunteer and the actions taken by the Peace Corps in responding to such incident.

“(2) Not later than 10 days after receiving notification of the death of a volunteer, the President shall provide a briefing to the Inspector General, which shall include—

“(A)(i) the available facts and circumstances surrounding the death of the volunteer, including a preliminary timeline of the events immediately preceding the death of the volunteer, subsequent actions taken by the Peace Corps, and any information available to the Peace Corps reflecting on the cause or root cause of the volunteer's death; and

“(ii) a description of any steps the Peace Corps plans to take to inquire further into the cause or root cause of the volunteer's

death, including the anticipated date of the completion of such inquiry; or

“(B) an explanation of why the Peace Corps has determined that no further inquiry into the cause or root cause of the volunteer’s death is necessary, including—

“(i) a description of the steps the Peace Corps took to determine further inquiry was not necessary; and

“(ii) the basis for such determination.

“(3) If the Peace Corps has performed or engaged another entity to perform a root cause analysis or similar report that describes the root cause or proximate cause of a volunteer death, the President shall provide the Inspector General of the Peace Corps with—

“(A) a copy of all information provided to such entity at the time such information is provided to such entity or used by the Peace Corps to perform the analysis; and

“(B) a copy of any report or study received from the entity or used by the Peace Corps to perform the analysis; and

“(C) any supporting documentation upon which the Peace Corps or such entity relied to make its determination, including the volunteer’s complete medical record, as soon as such information is available to the Peace Corps.

“(4) If a volunteer dies, the Peace Corps shall take reasonable measures, in accordance with local laws, to preserve any information or material, in any medium or format, that may be relevant to determining the cause or root cause of the volunteer’s death, including personal effects, medication, and other tangible items belonging to the volunteer, as long as such measures do not interfere with the legal procedures of the host country if the government of the host country is exercising jurisdiction over the investigation of such death. The Inspector General of the Peace Corps shall be provided an opportunity to inspect such items before their final disposition.

“(5) For the purposes of undertaking a review under this section, an officer or employee of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces may be detailed to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps from another department of the United States Government on a nonreimbursable basis, as jointly agreed to by the Inspector General and the detailing department, for a period not to exceed 1 year. This paragraph may not be construed to limit or modify any other source of authority for reimbursable or nonreimbursable details. A nonreimbursable detail made under this section shall not be considered an augmentation of the appropriations of the Peace Corps.

“(6) Upon request, the Peace Corps may make available necessary funds to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps for reviews conducted by the Inspector General under this section. The request shall be limited to costs relating to hiring, procuring, or otherwise obtaining medical-related experts or expert services, and associated travel.

“(7) The undertaking of a review under this section shall not be considered a transfer of program operating responsibilities to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps.”.

SEC. 302. MONITORING TRAINING RECORDS.

Section 8 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507), as amended by section 201, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **TRAINING RECORDS.**—The President shall implement procedures to maintain a written record verifying the attendance of each individual completing the training required under this section and sections 8A, 8B, and 8F.”.

SEC. 303. ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES TO APPLICANTS FOR ENROLLMENT AS VOLUNTEERS.

Section 8A(d) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **INFORMATION REGARDING CRIMES AND RISKS.**—Each applicant for enrollment as a volunteer shall be provided, with respect to the country in which the applicant has been invited to serve, with information regarding crimes against and risks to volunteers, including—

“(1) an overview of past crimes against volunteers in such country;

“(2) the current early termination rate of volunteers serving in such country;

“(3) health risks in such country; and

“(4) the level of satisfaction reported by volunteers serving in such country.”.

SEC. 304. ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS AGAINST SEXUAL MISCONDUCT.

Section 8B(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“[(7) maintains a record of the resignation of any employee or volunteer of the Peace Corps who resigns before a determination has been made regarding an allegation that such person committed a sexual assault or other serious misconduct;]

“(7) *maintains a record documenting the resignation of any employee or volunteer of the Peace Corps who resigns before a determination has been made regarding an alleged violation of the sexual misconduct policy or other serious policy violations;*

“(8) takes into account the record maintained under paragraph (7) before such employee or volunteer is hired, is enrolled, or otherwise work with the Peace Corps; and

“[(9) provides orientation to families who host volunteers regarding the awareness and prevention of sexual assault.]

“(9) *provides orientation or information regarding the awareness and prevention of sexual assault to—*

“(A) *Peace Corps-selected host families; and*

“(B) *a designated person of authority at the volunteer’s initial workplace.*”.

SEC. 305. IMMEDIATE VICTIM ADVOCACY NOTIFICATION.

Section 8B(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507b(a)(3)) is amended by striking “SARLs to immediately contact” and inserting “the Peace Corps to designate the staff at each post who shall be responsible for providing the services described in subsection (c) and for immediately contacting”.

SEC. 306. EXTENSION OF THE OFFICE OF VICTIM ADVOCACY.

Section 8C of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507c) is amended—

(1) in the heading to subsection (a), by striking “VICTIMS” and inserting “VICTIM”; and

[(2) in subsection (e), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.]

(2) *by striking subsection (e).*

SEC. 307. REFORM AND EXTENSION OF THE SEXUAL ASSAULT ADVISORY COUNCIL.

Section 8D of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “not less than 8 individuals selected by the President, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section,” and inserting “not fewer than 8 and not more than 14 individuals selected by the President”; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 308. DEFINITIONS.

Section 26 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2522) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) as paragraphs (1), (6), (2), (3), (8), (7), and (5), respectively, by arranging such redesignated paragraphs in numerical order, and by moving such paragraphs 2 ems to the right;

(2) in paragraph (1), as redesignated, by striking “(1)” and inserting the following:

“In this Act:

“(1)”;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), as redesignated, the following:

“(4) The term ‘medical officer’ means a physician, nurse practitioner, physician’s assistant, or registered nurse with the professional qualifications, expertise, and abilities consistent with the needs of the Peace Corps and the post to which he or she is assigned, as determined by the Director of the Peace Corps.”.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to and the Corker amendment at the desk be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2209) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Director of the Peace Corps to notify and consult with the Committees on Appropriations before opening, closing, significantly reducing, or suspending a domestic or overseas office or country program)

On page 13, line 9, insert “, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives,” after “Senate”.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2286), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2286

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act of 2018”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER SUPPORT

Sec. 101. Peace Corps volunteer medical care reform.

Sec. 102. Post-service Peace Corps volunteer medical care reform.

Sec. 103. Peace Corps impact survey.

Sec. 104. Extension of positions for Peace Corps employees.

TITLE II—PEACE CORPS OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Sec. 201. Peace Corps volunteer access to Inspector General.

Sec. 202. Consultation with Congress required before opening or closing overseas offices and country programs.

Sec. 203. Publication requirement for volunteer surveys.

TITLE III—CRIME RISK REDUCTION ENHANCEMENTS

Sec. 301. Independent review of volunteer death.

Sec. 302. Monitoring training records.

Sec. 303. Additional disclosures to applicants for enrollment as volunteers.

Sec. 304. Additional protections against sexual misconduct.

Sec. 305. Immediate victim advocacy notification.

Sec. 306. Extension of the Office of Victim Advocacy.

Sec. 307. Reform and extension of the Sexual Assault Advisory Council.

Sec. 308. Definitions.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Peace Corps.

(3) **PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER.**—The term “Peace Corps volunteer” means an individual described in section 5(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(a)).

TITLE I—PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER SUPPORT

SEC. 101. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER MEDICAL CARE REFORM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 (22 U.S.C. 2504) the following:

“SEC. 5A. HEALTH CARE FOR VOLUNTEERS AT PEACE CORPS POSTS.

“(a) **HEALTH CARE MEDICAL OFFICERS SELECTION CRITERIA.**—In selecting medical officers and support staff for overseas Peace Corps posts, the Director shall strive to hire well-qualified and capable personnel to support the effectiveness of health care for Peace Corps volunteers by evaluating each candidate’s—

“(1) medical training, experience, and accreditations or other qualifications;

“(2) record of performance;

“(3) administrative capabilities;

“(4) understanding of the local language and culture;

“(5) ability to work in the English language;

“(6) interpersonal skills; and

“(7) such other factors that the Director considers to be appropriate.

“(b) **REVIEW AND EVALUATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, acting through the Associate Director of the Office of Health Services and the country directors,

shall review and evaluate the performance and health care delivery of all Peace Corps medical staff, including medical officers—

“(A) to ensure compliance with all relevant Peace Corps policies, practices, and guidelines; and

“(B) to ensure that medical staff complete the necessary continuing medical education to maintain their skills and satisfy licensing and credentialing standards, as designated by the Director.

“(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Director shall include, in the annual Peace Corps congressional budget justification, a confirmation that the review and evaluation of all Peace Corps medical staff required under paragraph (1) has been completed.

“(c) **ANTIMALARIAL DRUGS.**—The Director shall consult with experts at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention regarding recommendations for prescribing malaria prophylaxis, in order to provide the best standard of care within the context of the Peace Corps environment.”

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE PEACE CORPS.**—

(1) **INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.**—As promptly as practicable, the Director shall implement the actions outlined in the agency response for all open recommendations of the Inspector General of the Peace Corps set forth in the report entitled “Final Program Evaluation Report: OIG Follow-up Evaluation of Issues Identified in the 2010 Peace Corps/Morocco Assessment of Medical Care” (Report No. IG-16-01-E).

(2) **SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.**—

(A) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the Director’s strategy for implementing the recommendations referred to in paragraph (1).

(B) **SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.**—Not later than 6 months after the submission of the report required under subparagraph (A), and semi-annually thereafter, the Director shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the progress in implementing the recommendations referred to in paragraph (1) until all such recommendations have been implemented in accordance with the agency’s response to the report referred to in such paragraph.

(3) **NOTIFICATION.**—After the submission of each report required under paragraph (2), the Inspector General of the Peace Corps may notify the appropriate congressional committees of any recommendations from the report referred to in paragraph (1) that the Inspector General determines remain unresolved.

SEC. 102. POST-SERVICE PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER MEDICAL CARE REFORM.

Section 8142 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) The Secretary shall authorize the Director of the Peace Corps to furnish medical benefits to a volunteer, who is injured during the volunteer’s period of service, for a period of 120 days following the termination of such service if the Director certifies that the volunteer’s injury probably meets the requirements under subsection (c)(3). The Secretary may then certify vouchers for these expenses for such volunteer out of the Employees’ Compensation Fund.

“(2) The Secretary shall prescribe the form and content of the certification required under paragraph (1).

“(3) A certification under paragraph (1) will cease to be effective if the volunteer sus-

tains compensable disability in connection with volunteer service.

“(4) Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize the furnishing of any medical benefit that the Secretary of Labor is not otherwise authorized to reimburse for former Peace Corps volunteers who receive treatment for injury or disease proximately caused by their service in the Peace Corps in accordance with this chapter.”

SEC. 103. PEACE CORPS IMPACT SURVEY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and once every 2 years for the following 6 years, the Director shall conduct a survey of former Peace Corps volunteers.

(b) **SCOPE OF SURVEY.**—The survey required under subsection (a) shall assess, with respect to each former Peace Corps volunteer completing the survey, the impact of the Peace Corps on the former volunteer, including the volunteer’s—

(1) well-being;

(2) career;

(3) civic engagement; and

(4) commitment to public service.

(c) **REPORT.**—The Director shall submit a report containing the results of the survey conducted under subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(d) **PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT EXEMPTION.**—Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980”), shall not apply to the collection of information through the survey required under this section.

SEC. 104. EXTENSION OF POSITIONS FOR PEACE CORPS EMPLOYEES.

Section 7(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2506(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) **DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL POSITIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Peace Corps may designate Peace Corps positions as critical management or management support positions that require specialized technical or professional skills and knowledge of Peace Corps operations. Such positions may include positions in the following fields:

“(i) Volunteer health services.

“(ii) Financial management.

“(iii) Information technology.

“(iv) Procurement.

“(v) Personnel.

“(vi) Legal services.

“(vii) Safety and security.

“(B) **AUTHORITY.**—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), with respect to positions designated pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Director may make or extend renewable appointments or assignments under paragraph (2) notwithstanding limitations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) and paragraph (5).

“(C) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In exercising authority under subparagraph (B), the Director shall ensure that all decisions regarding the appointment, assignment, or extension of employees to any such position—

“(i) are consistent with Federal law and Peace Corps policy; and

“(ii) are based upon operational and programmatic factors.

“(D) **DURATION OF APPOINTMENTS.**—The term of any appointment or assignment to

any position designated under subparagraph (A) may not exceed 5 years.”.

TITLE II—PEACE CORPS OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 201. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER ACCESS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Section 8 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “he” and inserting “the President”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

“(1) TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—As part of the training provided to all volunteers under subsection (a), and in coordination with the Inspector General of the Peace Corps, the President shall provide all volunteers with—

“(A) information regarding the mandate of the Inspector General and the availability of the Inspector General as a resource for volunteers;

“(B) the contact information of the Inspector General;

“(C) information regarding the mandate of the Office of Victim Advocacy and the availability of the Office of Victim Advocacy as a resource for volunteers; and

“(D) the contact information of the Office of Victim Advocacy.

“(2) FREQUENCY OF TRAINING.—The President shall ensure that volunteers receive the information described in paragraph (1) not less frequently than—

“(A) once during pre-enrollment training; and

“(B) once during each significant training provided by the Peace Corps to volunteers after enrollment.”.

SEC. 202. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED BEFORE OPENING OR CLOSING OVERSEAS OFFICES AND COUNTRY PROGRAMS.

The Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 10 (22 U.S.C. 2509) the following:

“SEC. 10A. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED BEFORE OPENING OR CLOSING OVERSEAS OFFICES AND COUNTRY PROGRAMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Director of the Peace Corps may not open, close, significantly reduce, or suspend a domestic or overseas office or country program unless the Director has notified and consulted with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(b) WAIVER.—The Director may waive the application of subsection (a) if an action described in such subsection is necessary to ameliorate a substantial security risk to Peace Corps volunteers or other Peace Corps personnel.”.

SEC. 203. PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT FOR VOLUNTEER SURVEYS.

Section 8E of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting after the first sentence the following: “The President shall ensure that each performance plan established under this subsection for a Peace Corps representative includes a consideration of the results, with respect to such representative and the country of service of such representative, of each survey conducted under subsection (c).”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The President shall publish, on a publicly available website of the Peace Corps, a report summarizing the results of each survey related to volunteer satisfaction in each country in which volunteers serve, and the early termination rate of volunteers serving in each such country. The information published shall be posted in an easily accessible place near the description of the appropriate country and shall be written in an easily understood manner.”.

TITLE III—CRIME RISK REDUCTION ENHANCEMENTS

SEC. 301. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF VOLUNTEER DEATH.

Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d)(1) Consistent with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Inspector General of the Peace Corps may independently review the facts and circumstances surrounding the death of a volunteer and the actions taken by the Peace Corps in responding to such incident.

“(2) Not later than 10 days after receiving notification of the death of a volunteer, the President shall provide a briefing to the Inspector General, which shall include—

“(A)(i) the available facts and circumstances surrounding the death of the volunteer, including a preliminary timeline of the events immediately preceding the death of the volunteer, subsequent actions taken by the Peace Corps, and any information available to the Peace Corps reflecting on the cause or root cause of the volunteer’s death; and

“(ii) a description of any steps the Peace Corps plans to take to inquire further into the cause or root cause of the volunteer’s death, including the anticipated date of the completion of such inquiry; or

“(B) an explanation of why the Peace Corps has determined that no further inquiry into the cause or root cause of the volunteer’s death is necessary, including—

“(i) a description of the steps the Peace Corps took to determine further inquiry was not necessary; and

“(ii) the basis for such determination.

“(3) If the Peace Corps has performed or engaged another entity to perform a root cause analysis or similar report that describes the root cause or proximate cause of a volunteer death, the President shall provide the Inspector General of the Peace Corps with—

“(A) a copy of all information provided to such entity at the time such information is provided to such entity or used by the Peace Corps to perform the analysis; and

“(B) a copy of any report or study received from the entity or used by the Peace Corps to perform the analysis; and

“(C) any supporting documentation upon which the Peace Corps or such entity relied to make its determination, including the volunteer’s complete medical record, as soon as such information is available to the Peace Corps.

“(4) If a volunteer dies, the Peace Corps shall take reasonable measures, in accordance with local laws, to preserve any information or material, in any medium or format, that may be relevant to determining the cause or root cause of the volunteer’s death, including personal effects, medication, and other tangible items belonging to the volunteer, as long as such measures do not interfere with the legal procedures of the host country if the government of the host country is exercising jurisdiction over the

investigation of such death. The Inspector General of the Peace Corps shall be provided an opportunity to inspect such items before their final disposition.

“(5) For the purposes of undertaking a review under this section, an officer or employee of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces may be detailed to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps from another department of the United States Government on a nonreimbursable basis, as jointly agreed to by the Inspector General and the detailing department, for a period not to exceed 1 year. This paragraph may not be construed to limit or modify any other source of authority for reimbursable or nonreimbursable details. A nonreimbursable detail made under this section shall not be considered an augmentation of the appropriations of the Peace Corps.

“(6) Upon request, the Peace Corps may make available necessary funds to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps for reviews conducted by the Inspector General under this section. The request shall be limited to costs relating to hiring, procuring, or otherwise obtaining medical-related experts or expert services, and associated travel.

“(7) The undertaking of a review under this section shall not be considered a transfer of program operating responsibilities to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps.”.

SEC. 302. MONITORING TRAINING RECORDS.

Section 8 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507), as amended by section 201, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) TRAINING RECORDS.—The President shall implement procedures to maintain a written record verifying the attendance of each individual completing the training required under this section and sections 8A, 8B, and 8F.”.

SEC. 303. ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES TO APPLICANTS FOR ENROLLMENT AS VOLUNTEERS.

Section 8A(d) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) INFORMATION REGARDING CRIMES AND RISKS.—Each applicant for enrollment as a volunteer shall be provided, with respect to the country in which the applicant has been invited to serve, with information regarding crimes against and risks to volunteers, including—

“(1) an overview of past crimes against volunteers in such country;

“(2) the current early termination rate of volunteers serving in such country;

“(3) health risks in such country; and

“(4) the level of satisfaction reported by volunteers serving in such country.”.

SEC. 304. ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS AGAINST SEXUAL MISCONDUCT.

Section 8B(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) maintains a record documenting the resignation of any employee or volunteer of the Peace Corps who resigns before a determination has been made regarding an alleged violation of the sexual misconduct policy or other serious policy violations;

“(8) takes into account the record maintained under paragraph (7) before such employee or volunteer is hired, is enrolled, or otherwise work with the Peace Corps; and

“(9) provides orientation or information regarding the awareness and prevention of sexual assault to—

“(A) Peace Corps-selected host families; and

“(B) a designated person of authority at the volunteer’s initial workplace.”.

SEC. 305. IMMEDIATE VICTIM ADVOCACY NOTIFICATION.

Section 8B(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507b(a)(3)) is amended by striking “SARLs to immediately contact” and inserting “the Peace Corps to designate the staff at each post who shall be responsible for providing the services described in subsection (c) and for immediately contacting”.

SEC. 306. EXTENSION OF THE OFFICE OF VICTIM ADVOCACY.

Section 8C of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507c) is amended—

(1) in the heading to subsection (a), by striking “VICTIMS” and inserting “VICTIM”; and

(2) by striking subsection (e).

SEC. 307. REFORM AND EXTENSION OF THE SEXUAL ASSAULT ADVISORY COUNCIL.

Section 8D of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “not less than 8 individuals selected by the President, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section,” and inserting “not fewer than 8 and not more than 14 individuals selected by the President”; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 308. DEFINITIONS.

Section 26 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2522) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) as paragraphs (1), (6), (2), (3), (8), (7), and (5), respectively, by arranging such redesignated paragraphs in numerical order, and by moving such paragraphs 2 ems to the right;

(2) in paragraph (1), as redesignated, by striking “(1)” and inserting the following:

“In this Act:

“(1); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), as redesignated, the following:

“(4) The term ‘medical officer’ means a physician, nurse practitioner, physician’s assistant, or registered nurse with the professional qualifications, expertise, and abilities consistent with the needs of the Peace Corps and the post to which he or she is assigned, as determined by the Director of the Peace Corps.”.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the postcloture time on Senate amendment No. 2151, as modified, expire at 3:45 p.m. on Wednesday, March 14; further, that if cloture is invoked on S. 2155, the time count as if invoked at midnight, Wednesday, March 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2018

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Sen-

ate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 14; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2155 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 13, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

GILBERT B. KAPLAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 13, 2018

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 13, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly a year ago, when the Trump administration came into office and the new Republican majority again elected its leaders, they promised to focus on the forgotten American, the middle class families that have been left behind, according to the speeches that were given at that time.

Well, there is no issue which I think resonates more powerfully with middle class families than the unrelenting rise in the cost of college and higher education.

Again, the numbers surround us: \$1.3 trillion in student loan debt, according to the Federal Reserve Board.

Just a few weeks ago, some colleges and universities, the real flagships of our Nation, the Harvards, the Yales, announced that tuition, room and board now will exceed \$70,000 a year.

Again, not every college charges that much, but, unfortunately, if you look historically, as those colleges and uni-

versities surpass these unfortunate milestones, most colleges follow right in the wake.

We need action and we need change in terms of making sure that that ticket to success, whether it is in science, technology, engineering, and math, for young Americans is actually going to exist, and this Congress has neglected and failed to move forward.

Just within the last month, what we have seen is the following. The IRS just issued their follow-up rules to the Republican tax bill, which clarifies that families can no longer deduct home equity loans to pay for college. So for a family who has diligently paid their mortgages, whose kid has been accepted to a college and university, who doesn't qualify for Pell grants, who has exhausted their Stafford loans, because those are capped, and who wants to actually use the equity in their house to help pay for college, they can no longer deduct the interest on those payments.

I am very much thankful to the Republican tax bill, which, again, took great care of people who earn over \$400,000, whose top marginal rates were drastically cut, or corporations whose rates were drastically cut; but middle class families are, again, now being asked to bear a higher cost for college by cutting off that avenue that, again, millions of families have used over the years in terms of using their home's equity.

In addition, the Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos—400 days in office and she has never stepped foot in the Education and the Workforce Committee, which I sit on—last Friday, issued a rule that basically preempted the ability of States attorneys general to issue rules and regulations to protect students and families from unscrupulous loan servicers.

Again, our offices get flooded with calls with frustrated students who graduated and, again, have loan servicers who lose documents, who lose payments. And, again, what was happening at the State level, both Republicans and Democratic attorneys general were putting into place rules and regulations to protect those people caught in these predicaments.

On Friday, the Secretary of Education, a Republican, who supposedly believes in States' rights, told those States that they will be issuing rules preempting States from protecting those people caught in these situations. Unbelievable.

Lastly, last week, the Office of Inspector General, which is a nonpartisan

arm of government—its job is to look at government negligence and malfeasance and problems—issued a warning that the Republican higher education bill, which was reported out in December, the misnamed PROSPER Act, will, again, lift all the regulations on for-profit colleges, which, again, take advantage of students, overpromising skills and degrees that turn out to be worthless at the end. Again, we know about ITT Tech, Corinthian Colleges, which was shut down by the last administration because of the outrageous practices that they were involved in.

The PROSPER Act basically lifts all of those controls that the Department has over them, and it is open season in terms of students who are going to be subject to that kind of environment.

By the way, the group that is probably the most vulnerable are veterans, because their GI Bill is so rich in benefits, those are the ones that for-profit colleges target.

Why do I know that?

Holly Petraeus, General David Petraeus's wife, who was in charge of warning veterans about these problems a couple of years ago—again, the term that she uses is that for-profit colleges see servicemembers as nothing more than dollar signs in uniforms—again, has warned us that this sector of the higher education community needs more scrutiny in terms of making sure that there is real gainful employment for people who go through these colleges, and to make sure that those colleges actually do not siphon off precious GI Bill dollars, Pell dollars and Stafford loans.

It is time for this Congress to wake up and respond to what was one of the most powerful issues in 2016 about the cost of colleges drowning middle class families. But just again in the last month, we have seen this Republican administration and this Congress go in exactly the opposite direction. We need better.

REMEMBERING GRADY "BUBBER" BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, Grady "Bubber" Brown passed away on February 10, 2018, in Lake Providence, Louisiana.

Born on March 8, 1934, he was the son of the late William Dennis Brown, Jr., and Martha Wyly Brown.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

During college at the age of 19, he and his younger brother, Philip, were given 48 acres of land to farm rice on during their summer break. That year, they made a \$800 profit and immediately spent it on an airplane.

Buzzy Tomlinson had a plane for sale, and they bought it with the agreement that he would teach them to fly, and he did. He gave them about 5 hours of instructions and sent them on their way.

They landed on their own front yard, as proud as they could be to show their parents the new purchase.

Steve Guenard did give them official flight lessons, and both received their pilot's license.

After graduation from LSU, Bubber joined the Naval Aviation Officer Candidate School. He spent the next 4 years flying F-J3s, F-J4s, Chance Vought F8U-1s, and F8U-2s.

He had two Mediterranean tours, one North American tour, and he had a 3-month tour off the coast of Cuba.

He made over 400 carrier landings, both day and night, during his time in service.

His father died in 1961, so he decided to resign his regular commission and return to manage the family Panola farm.

In 1966, his cousin, Brenda Brown, came home from college with her roommate, Jennie Lou Ropp. Bubber and Jennie Lou were married a year later, and they have three children today: Grady, Jr.; Glen; and Katie.

He was always involved with the children's activities. He was president of St. Patrick's school board for 12 years, baseball coach, flight instructor, hunting guide, and more and more.

He not only taught both of his sons to fly, but his nephew, too; and he was very proud of them.

Bubber was an entrepreneur. He was the first farmer in the area to utilize second growth farming. He always came up with new projects.

In 1983, Bubber decided to start a new business, Panola Pepper Corporation, making his mother's recipe for her famous hot sauce. The idea was to employ his farm workers during the winter season. Creating jobs was his passion, and it was his specialty in the Lake Providence, Louisiana, area.

Bubber was on many councils and committees, and received numerous awards. He served on the Louisiana Rice Council for many years and was actively involved in the LSU Rice Research Station.

He was the lifelong member of St. Patrick's Catholic Church, where he was on the church building committee, parish council, finance council, and an active member of the Knights of Columbus.

He was also a lecture, usher, and Eucharistic minister.

In 2003, he received the Louisiana Small Business Award.

In 2005, he was asked by Governor Blanco to travel to Cuba with her delegation to promote Louisiana agriculture.

Bubber had seven grandchildren: Wyly Brown, Lauren Brown, Emma Brown, Carter Coullard, Will Brown, Ben Coullard, and Andrew Brown.

He loved his grandchildren and was very proud of every one of them.

Bubber's legacy is that he taught his family how to be good Christians. He taught them all about goodness, kindness, patience, peace, hospitality, generosity, joy, faithfulness, self-control, and, most of all, love.

Bubber was the epitome of the Southern gentleman. He will be sorely missed.

RECOGNIZING DREW SCOTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, my office is now accepting artwork for the 2018 Congressional Art Competition.

Each spring, the Congressional Institute sponsors a nationwide high school visual arts competition to recognize artistic talent in the Nation and in each congressional district.

In 2017, the winning entry was drawn by Drew Scott from Rockport-Fulton High School. Her piece, "Complementary Calico," along with the other 2017 winning entries from other congressional districts, currently hang in the Cannon tunnel, the walkway that connects the U.S. Capitol to the House office buildings.

The Congressional Art Competition is a great way to encourage artistic abilities and reward talented students for their efforts and gives them an opportunity to compete.

Since the competition began in 1982, more than 6,500 high school students have participated.

Students from the district I represent, the 27th District of Texas, who wish to participate in this competition may submit up to two pieces of artwork to my office by Friday, April 6, 2018, in order to be considered.

I wish all the talented high schoolers of the 27th District of Texas the best of luck.

RECOGNIZING JOYCE HUNSAKER

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Joyce Hunsaker, a 17-year-old from Corpus Christi, who recently won a bronze medal in the International Bunker Trap at the World Shotgun Championship in Moscow.

Joyce has been named a member of the elite 4-person Texas State National 4-H shotgun team. In June of last year, her teammates and her competed in the National Championships in Grand Island, Nebraska, where they took home first place in team skeet shooting and sporting clays, third in trap,

and earned the title of National Champions for 2017.

Joyce also competed and won the Junior Women's gold medal in the 2017 State Junior Olympics international bunker trap competition last year.

Joyce then advanced to the 2017 National Junior Olympic Championships in Colorado Springs, where she took home a bronze medal in the Junior Women's International Bunker Trap event and was selected to represent the United States as a member of the 2017 Junior World Cup Team.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Joyce on all her hard work and success that she is enjoying as a result of it. Keep up the good work.

GUNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to share the words of Geneva Cunningham. She is 15 years old. She is a ninth grader from the Hopkins Grammar School in New Haven, Connecticut.

Geneva witnessed the Sandy Hook Elementary School massacre when she was only in the fourth grade. Geneva's father gave me her poem in the wake of the Parkland, Florida, school shooting, though Geneva wrote it just a few days before the shooting occurred. This is what she wrote:

Pure;
A mother called her child
Kissing his forehead
On his way to school.
For the boy
It was a normal day
Until the darkness came
And swept the light away.
We did not ask for this.
We did not ask to hear gunshots
In slamming doors and dropping books.
We did not ask
To witness the murders
Of the children
We played with at recess.
We did not know
That our teacher
Had taught us our final lesson.
And we believed her
When she said
The red spilling from her foot
Was only paint.
Sweet ignorance
The honey in our poisoned tea
The salt we mistook for sugar.
But where do we draw the line?
Between knowledge and ignorance
When do we know to cover our eyes
When the darkness
Begins to swallow us whole.
We united this country
By stating
"We are one."
And on that principle
Our Forefathers said
You may "bear arms" to fight against them.
You may defend
Against them.

□ 1215

But who is this “them”?
 If we are one
 Who are we fighting against?
 If we are one
 Then who are we defending?
 If we are taking lives to begin with
 Because killing is still killing.
 The number of lives lost
 Is no victory
 On our own soil
 Or on any soil.
 We say we are equals.
 So who gets the power
 To decide
 Who lives and who dies?
 Because by giving open access to these weapons
 We are giving power
 To trembling hands.
 And these hands
 Were the ones to take the life of the little boy
 The day he was learning
 How to read.
 These machines were not designed for play.
 They were designed to kill.
 If we use them on the battlefield
 If they can take a life
 Then they are not worth it.
 Because I promise you
 A life is worth more
 Than any machine
 Used for fun.
 Yet we bear these weapons.
 We claim that we enjoy
 The crack
 At the end of the rifle.
 Yeah, it may seem fun
 On the other side.
 But what if
 You are on the opposite end?
 Begging
 Pleading
 Crying out
 For your life.
 For the lives of your friends
 For the lives of your classmates
 For the life of your teacher.
 We must be sure
 Whose fingers we can trust
 On the trigger
 Because that choice
 May determine
 Your life
 The lives of your friends
 The lives of your family
 And the lives of those you love.

Mr. Speaker, this is the voice of a child who has witnessed murder. How have we allowed this to become normal in America?

Geneva’s poem is beautiful, and she never should have had to write it. But this is the world that we live in: a world where NRA dollars drive decisions, sales for bulletproof backpacks are soaring, and 14-year-olds have seen their teachers and their friends die at school.

We must ban assault weapons. They have no place in our society. And we must ban high-capacity magazines. We need to hold gun manufacturers accountable for crimes committed with their guns and end the de facto ban on gun research. These are commonsense reforms.

As Marjory Stoneman Douglas student Emma Gonzalez said so pointedly: “We are going to be the kids you read

about in textbooks, not because we are going to be another statistic about mass shooting in America, but because . . . we are going to be the last mass shooting.”

I pray that she is right. But it is Congress that needs to provide more than thoughts and prayers for a change. We must take action. That is our moral responsibility.

TARIFFS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the year 1776 marked a turning point not only in American history, but in human history. While brave patriots here in America were affirming their right to equal representation and, ultimately, revolution, a Scottish philosopher named Adam Smith was revolutionizing the way we think about economics.

“The Wealth of Nations” was the book he wrote where he extolled the virtues of free markets and free trade, showing how all benefit from robust competition and an open marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, because of tax cuts and regulatory reform, returning to freer markets in this country, we have this economy off high center and growing at a rate we haven’t seen in over a decade. While some of my friends across the aisle would like to dispute this, the results speak for themselves.

Just last month our economy added over 300,000 new jobs and over 800,000 people joined the labor force, the largest 1-month jump in over 30 years. Mr. Speaker, people are looking for work, and they are finding work.

With the stock market, business, consumer confidence, and the labor participation rate at all-time highs and the unemployment at a 50-year low, the last thing that we need and want to do is impose a new kind of government intervention to diminish the great economic progress we have made.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that these tariffs that the White House and others have talked about, if not appropriately targeted, could do this and could have unintended, negative consequences on the American economy, on American consumers, and on hard-working American families.

The Texas delegation has a unique stake in this issue. For 16 consecutive years, Texas has been the top exporting State in the country with over \$264 billion in exports for 2017. So trade policy has a significant impact on our constituents. That is why last week my colleagues and I sent a letter authored by Ways and Means Chairman KEVIN BRADY to the President urging him to take a more measured and surgical approach in imposing tariffs. And I am glad it looks like that the White House and the President have heard and have heeded our pleas.

I believe in free trade, Mr. Speaker. I believe in open global markets. And it has improved standard of living for everyone. However, free trade only works if everybody plays by the same rules; that is, free trade and fair trade go hand in hand. For years, China has been gaming the system by dumping their product, infringing on our intellectual property rights, manipulating their currency, and circumventing trade agreements for years.

President Trump was right to call them out. He was right to hold them accountable. I am confident that we can work with the White House so that tariffs ensure fair competition and protect our national security interests while also making sure we don’t harm consumers here at home.

HONORING THE TOP 10 FEMALE HIP-HOP COLLABORATIONS OF ALL TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years, artists such as Elvis Presley, Frank Sinatra, and Bruce Springsteen have been recognized on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Today I rise to honor the top 10 female MC hip-hop collaborations of all time.

Number 10: Eve, “My Chick Bad remix.”

Number 9: Monie Love, “My Buddy.”

Number 8: Missy Elliott, “Hot Boyz remix.”

Number 7: Remy Ma, “Ante Up remix.”

Number 6: Lauryn Hill, “Ready or Not.”

Number 5: Nicki Minaj, “Up All Night.”

Number 4: Da Brat, “Da B Side.”

Number 3: Lady of Rage, “G Funk Intro.”

Number 2: Fox Boogie Brown, “Ain’t No.”

Number 1: Representing BK to the fullest, Lil’ Kim, “Quiet Storm remix.”

These extraordinary MCs, along with legendary pioneers such as Queen Latifah, MC Lyte, and Salt-N-Pepa, shattered hip-hop’s glass ceiling with their skill, talent, and lyrical ability.

As we celebrate Women’s History Month here in the United States Congress, these dynamic women are worthy to be praised.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of the week, we use this moment to be reminded of Your presence and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this House to do their work as well as it can be done.

May they be led by Your Spirit in the decisions they make. May their faith in You deliver them from any tensions that might tear the people's House apart and from worries that might wear them out.

All this day, and through the week, may they do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation. Please hasten the day when justice and love shall dwell in the hearts of all peoples and rule the affairs of the nations of Earth.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HONORING GIRL SCOUTS ON ITS 106TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Girl Scouts of the USA as it celebrates its 106th birthday.

I know firsthand the positive impact that Scouting can have on the life of a young person. I have been actively involved with the Boy Scouts of America my whole life.

On March 12, 1912, Juliette Gordon Low founded the first Girl Scout troop

with just 18 girls. Over a century later, more than 50 million American women are Girl Scout alums, and the Girl Scout program reaches 2.6 million members.

Girl Scouts helps girls lead in their own lives and communities. It also positions them to become tomorrow's leaders in our country and the world by encouraging them to dream big and work hard to achieve their goals. Girl Scouts is committed to ensuring all girls develop to their full potential.

This week, as we celebrate Girl Scouts' 106th birthday, I applaud the Girl Scout councils that serve girls in my community for building evermore girls of courage, confidence, and character.

HONORING INDIANA STATE SENATOR DAVID LONG

(Mr. BANKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the 2018 session of the Indiana General Assembly will draw to a close, and with it, so will the career of one of the Hoosier State's most distinguished legislators.

Senate President Pro Tempore Senator David Long recently announced that, after 22 years of public service, he will retire later this year. Under his transformational leadership, our State enacted sweeping education reforms, balanced the budget, delivered historic tax cuts, advanced the cause of life, and passed right-to-work legislation.

Senator Long played a pivotal role in our State's progress over the last decade and a half, and his impact in Indiana will be felt for generations to come.

My wife, Amanda, and I both had the honor of serving with David in the State Senate, and we are proud to call him a mentor and friend. During my time at the statehouse, I learned so much from Senator Long; and in my work here in the Congress, I am constantly reminded of lessons I learned from him when we served together.

Hoosiers deeply appreciate Senator Long's incredible record of accomplishment during his time in office. I wish him; his wife, Melissa; and his family the very best in the years to come.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 9, 2018, at 9:47 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without an amendment H.R. 1177.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Timothy Reitz, Legislative Director, the Honorable JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY REITZ,
Legislative Director.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:45 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1644

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

STATE VETERANS HOME ADULT DAY HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (S. 324) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 324

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “State Veterans Home Adult Day Health Care Improvement Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. PROVISION OF CERTAIN ADULT DAY HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1745 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d)(1) The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with each State home for payment by the Secretary for medical supervision model adult day health care provided to a veteran described in subsection (a)(1) on whose behalf the State home is not in receipt of payment for nursing home care from the Secretary.

“(2)(A) Payment under each agreement between the Secretary and a State home under paragraph (1) for each veteran who receives medical supervision model adult day health care under such agreement shall be made at a rate established through regulations prescribed by the Secretary to adequately reimburse the State home for the care provided by the State home, including necessary transportation expenses.

“(B) The Secretary shall consult with the State homes in prescribing regulations under subparagraph (A).

“(C) The rate established through regulations under subparagraph (A) shall not take effect until the date that is 30 days after the date on which those regulations are published in the Federal Register.

“(3) Payment by the Secretary under paragraph (1) to a State home for medical supervision model adult day health care provided to a veteran described in that paragraph constitutes payment in full to the State home for such care furnished to that veteran.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘medical supervision model adult day health care’ means adult day health care that includes the coordination of physician services, dental services, nursing services, the administration of drugs, and such other requirements as determined appropriate by the Secretary.”; and

(2) in the section heading, by inserting “, adult day health care,” after “home care”.

(b) INITIAL RATE.—Before the Secretary of Veterans Affairs establishes a payment rate under subsection (d)(2)(A) of section 1745 of such title, as added by subsection (a), the Secretary shall pay to a State home that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary for medical supervision model adult day health care (as defined in subsection (d)(4) of such section) an amount equal to 65 percent of the rate the Secretary would pay under subsection (a)(2) of such section to the State home for nursing home care provided to the veteran.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1745 and inserting the following new item:

“1745. Nursing home care, adult day health care, and medications for veterans with service-connected disabilities.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin today, I would like to take a moment to express my deepest sympathies to those affected by last week's tragedy in Yountville, California. I closely followed the situation. I am truly saddened by what has occurred.

All three employees who lost their lives—Christine Loeber and Jennifer Golick from the Pathway Home and Jennifer Gonzales from the Department of Veterans Affairs—were committed to helping veterans struggling with difficulties like post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental problems.

As Secretary Shulkin said: “Caring for veterans and our employees serving them is always important. It is even more critical that we reach out to one another and provide support during painful times like these.”

I think I can speak for myself and the rest of the members on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs when I offer prayers and support during this incredibly difficult and challenging time for these families.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 324, the State Veterans Home Adult Day Health Care Improvement Act of 2017. It is imperative that we ensure that VA is equipped with a variety of geriatric and long-term care programs to best meet the individual needs and goals of the increasing number of veterans who are reaching retirement age.

Current law requires VA to cover the cost of nursing home care in a State Veterans Home for any veteran in need of such care due to a service-connected disability or with a service-connected disability rating of 70 percent or more. However, veterans are increasingly seeking opportunities to get additional care they need as they age while remaining at home rather than in a nursing care facility or other institutional setting. S. 324 would help those veterans by requiring VA to enter into an agreement or a contract with the State Veterans Home to pay for adult day healthcare for veterans who are eligible but not receiving nursing home care.

Adult day healthcare programs provide companionship, peer support, recreation, certain healthcare services, case management assistance with activities of daily living, and more to veterans, and needed respite and relief to caregivers. What is more, adult day healthcare programs are a much less costly alternative to nursing home care, meaning that, with the enactment of this bill, we could grant veterans who desire to age at home the opportunity to do so without sacrificing the care and support services they may need and save taxpayer dollars.

S. 324, which is sponsored by Senator ORRIN HATCH of Utah, is companion legislation to H.R. 1005, which is sponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and passed the House with unanimous support earlier this year. I am grateful to both of them for their leadership on this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 324.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his compassionate words on the tragic loss of three dedicated, selfless servants in care of our veterans. I very much appreciate that, and it is a challenging time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 324, the State Veterans Home Adult Day Health Care Improvement Act. I want to thank Senator HATCH for introducing this innovative and bipartisan bill.

S. 324 directs the VA to enter into an agreement with each State home to pay for medical supervision model adult healthcare for a veteran for whom the home is not receiving VA nursing home payments.

Ensuring that veterans have access to appropriate affordable geriatric and long-term care is becoming increasingly important. In 2017, approximately 9.8 million veterans, or 46 percent, were 65 years or older.

In addition, VA's own Enrollee Health Care Projection Model indicates a further demand on long-term care and support services is coming as the Vietnam-era cohort ages, with most having gone beyond age 75 by 2026.

At present, VA is required to cover the cost of nursing home care in the State Veterans Home for any veteran in need of such care due to a service-connected disability or with a service-connected disability rated 70 percent or more. However, there is increasing demand for VA to offer geriatric and long-term programs for veterans in noninstitutional settings that would allow them to receive the services and support they need to remain in their homes—their preferred venue.

Adult day healthcare programs provide veterans in need of supportive

services with companionship, peer support, recreation, and certain healthcare services, while allowing them to stay and maintain their independence.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Health last year, the National Association of State Veterans Homes claimed that there are a number of State homes across the country interested in providing medical model ADHC services; however, the current basic ADHC per diem paid to the State Veterans Home by the VA is not sufficient for most homes to cover the cost of this program. As a result, only 3 State Veterans Homes out of 153, nationwide, provide this program.

This legislation would correct that imbalance, allowing veterans who would otherwise qualify for more costly VA nursing home care the ability to stay in their home longer, at a reduced cost.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), from the Upper Peninsula, chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 324, the State Veterans Home Adult Day Health Care Improvement Act of 2017.

This is very personal to me. My cousin, a fellow Vietnam vet who served on the DMZ with the Army, is currently in need of and receiving some of that care for some serious health issues he has right now as a result of exposure to Agent Orange.

The bill we are talking about here strikes a responsible balance by promoting access to necessary medical services for veterans, while also improving quality of life by allowing them to return home to their families each night. Adult day healthcare does more than just provide veterans with the medical care that they need; it also offers much-needed relief to their caregivers. Oftentimes, friends and family come together to help with the daily care that these veterans and their families require.

By giving veterans the opportunity to access medical care for up to 8 hours a day through a State veterans home, caregivers will have the opportunity to fulfill their personal responsibilities for themselves and their families. They can get on and get their life in order while still serving their veteran family member.

These folks work day in and day out to provide unparalleled care, loving care to our most vulnerable veterans. S. 324 recognizes their selfless commitment and works to enhance their work-life balance so they can continue to serve veterans.

In my district, folks deal with the circumstances of rural living every

day. This often means limited access to resources and fewer options for receiving the services they need.

The D.J. Jacobetti Home for Veterans in Marquette is a perfect example of what can be achieved when Federal resources are narrowly focused and responsibly applied. Jacobetti Home's ability to create a family environment where veterans can receive the care they need while maintaining quality in their daily lives is a testament to what is possible when the Federal Government helps local institutions provide services for the people they know best.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of S. 324.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), the author of the bill on the House side and also an Iraq war veteran.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very excited to be here because I know just how many disabled veterans in our country are on wait lists for adult day healthcare and now will be getting a service that is just so important and overdue.

I certainly want to thank Chairman ROE and his great staff, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the ranking member and his team as well, everybody coming together working hard on behalf of our disabled veterans who need it most.

I rise in support of S. 324. It is the Senate companion to my bill, H.R. 1005, which is a bill to provide adult day healthcare and save State Veterans Homes for veterans who are 70 percent or more service-connected disabled. This bill is an extension to the Veterans Benefits, Health Care, and Information Technology Act of 2006, which currently provides no-cost nursing home care at any State Veterans Home to veterans who are 70 percent or more service-connected disabled.

Medical model adult day healthcare provides comprehensive medical nursing and personal care services combined with engaging social activities for physically or cognitively impaired adults. Medical model adult day healthcare offers a complete array of rehabilitative therapies, including physical, occupational, and speech therapies, hospice and palliative care, social work, spiritual, nutritional counseling, and therapeutic recreation.

The program is designed to promote socialization and stimulation and maximize the participant's independence, while enhancing their quality of life. The program is staffed by a great team of multidisciplinary healthcare professionals who evaluate each participant and customize an individualized plan of care specific to their health and social needs.

Adult day healthcare is an alternative care setting that can allow some veterans who require long-term care

services to remain in their homes as opposed to being institutionalized in a nursing home. Such veterans typically require support from some, but not all, activities of assisted daily living—ADLs—such as bathing, dressing, or feeding.

In many cases, the spouse or their family member may provide the veteran with much of their care, but they require additional support for some of the veteran's ADLs. By filling these gaps, adult day healthcare can allow these veterans to remain in their homes and communities for additional months, or even years, and thereby lower the financial cost of caring for these heroes.

Adult day healthcare also provides family caregivers support and relief to meet their other professional and family obligations and provides a well-deserved respite while their loved ones are participating in the program.

In addition to thanking Chairman ROE for his leadership and support on this important issue, I also want to thank Senator HATCH for carrying this effort in the Senate, as well as Fred Sganga and the Long Island State Veterans Home in Stony Brook for their great efforts. That is a State Veterans Home located in the First Congressional District of New York, one of three places currently offering adult day healthcare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation that will provide a valuable and necessary service to our Nation's veterans, and I am urging my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

What goes on too often unnoticed in this House is the great staff that we have to help make these efforts possible. So, from the leadership team, I want to thank staff John Leganski and Kelly Dixon, and in my office, as legislative director, Kevin Dowling, and Matthew Scott.

Thank you again to the great House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and we will all greatly miss Chairman ROE as he departs. Hopefully, maybe we will get him to change his mind, but in the meantime, I will just say we enjoyed serving with him, and I hope that he won't go anywhere for a very long time. He is a great leader for our veterans as well as being our ranking member.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has no further speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Long Island—he clearly understands this issue—for his passionate work on this, and we are grateful for it.

I, too, would like to add my voice to this, to the chairman for once again

proving to America that this Congress can work, that there are bipartisan solutions to issues that we care about in serving our constituents and our veterans and others. It is something that we are very proud of here. It doesn't always come easy, but his leadership somehow finds a way to bring us to the table. We get it done, and I am grateful for that.

I urge my colleagues to join us in passing S. 324, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, unless Mr. ZELDIN has talked to my doctor and knows something I don't know, I hope to be here next year. That is my plan.

I appreciate the opportunity to work on this bill with him. He has been a great advocate, as the ranking member has been. This is a bill that is long overdue, much needed, and I give my strong support along with—I think I can speak for them—the entire Veterans' Affairs Committee. We voiced this. I encourage Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 324.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

ENDANGERED FISH RECOVERY PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4465) to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery programs through fiscal year 2023, to require a report on the implementation of those programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4465

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Endangered Fish Recovery Programs Extension Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION TO USE UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND REVENUES FOR ANNUAL BASE FUNDING OF FISH RECOVERY PROGRAMS; REMOVAL OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Section 3(d)(2) of Public Law 106-392 (114 Stat. 1604; 126 Stat. 2444) is amended—

(1) in the fourth sentence—

(A) by striking "2019" and inserting "2023"; and

(B) by striking "except that" and all that follows through "capital projects and monitoring"; and

(2) by striking the fifth, sixth, and seventh sentences.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS.

Section 3 of Public Law 106-392 (114 Stat. 1603; 126 Stat. 2444) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j) REPORT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2021, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that—

"(A) describes the accomplishments of the Recovery Implementation Programs;

"(B) identifies—

"(i) as of the date of the report, the listing status under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) of the Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub, razorback sucker, and bonytail; and

"(ii) as of September 30, 2023, the projected listing status under that Act of each of the species referred to in clause (i);

"(C)(i) identifies—

"(I) the total expenditures and the expenditures by categories of activities by the Recovery Implementation Programs during the period beginning on the date on which the applicable Recovery Implementation Program was established and ending on September 30, 2021; and

"(II) projected expenditures by the Recovery Implementation Programs during the period beginning on October 1, 2021, and ending on September 30, 2023;

"(ii) for purposes of the expenditures identified under clause (i), includes a description of—

"(I) any expenditures of appropriated funds;

"(II) any power revenues;

"(III) any contributions by the States, power customers, Tribes, water users, and environmental organizations; and

"(IV) any other sources of funds for the Recovery Implementation Programs; and

"(D) describes—

"(i) any activities to be carried out under the Recovery Implementation Program after September 30, 2023; and

"(ii) the projected cost of the activities described under clause (i).

"(2) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall consult with the participants in the Recovery Implementation Programs in preparing the report under paragraph (1)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering my bill, H.R. 4465, the Endan-

gered Fish Recovery Programs Extension Act of 2017.

This bipartisan bill extends efforts to promote the dual goals of recovering certain fish species protected under the Endangered Species Act, while ensuring the continued reliability of water and power operations in the West.

I would like to thank the Members of Congress, both Republican and Democrat, who have cosponsored my bill. I also appreciate the work of ROB BISHOP as chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee and his help over the last several months to move my bill through the legislative process.

I think it is also worth mentioning that we have received over 20 letters of support for this bill from a wide range of stakeholders, including water conservation districts, Indian Tribes, conservation organizations, State governments, and more.

With a total water storage capacity of more than 30 million acre-feet and a capacity to generate over 5 billion megawatt hours of energy annually, the Colorado River Storage Project, or CRSP, has been vital to the economics of the Upper Colorado and San Juan River Basin States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, and Arizona.

Four fish species listed under the Endangered Species Act also call the basin home, and the threat of water and power restrictions resulting from these listings prompted the affected States to enter into an agreement with Federal and non-Federal partners to ensure the continued reliability of the water and power operations in the West.

These agreements resulted in the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program and the San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program. In 2000, Congress enacted legislation to establish Federal participation and cost-sharing agreements, including the authority to use CRSP power revenues, to support these two programs.

Congress reauthorized the programs in 2012, but also added necessary oversight and accountability reforms to ensure that funds are going towards recovery.

H.R. 4465 extends the use of CRSP power revenues through 2023, which aligns with the recovery deadline for these programs and does not require any new Federal spending of Americans' hard-earned tax dollars.

In addition, the bill extends the existing transparency improvements and adds a report to highlight the programs' performance. This reauthorization is necessary to ensure that the more than 2,300 water and power projects in the five-State region can continue to operate in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

I am hopeful that at the conclusion of this reauthorization through 2023, these programs will have accomplished

what they are seeking to achieve: the recovery and delisting of four endangered fish species.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is a great example of how Members of Congress can work across party lines to solve an issue facing their respective States. I look forward to working together with my colleagues and solving other problems with a similar commonsense and bipartisan approach.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in supporting this bipartisan legislation and urge its adoption by the House.

H.R. 4465 extends the authorization through 2023 of the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program and the San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program.

These two multiagency partnerships bring together local, State, and Federal agencies; water users; utilities; and environmental organizations to help restore four endangered fish species, while also maintaining water delivery, hydropower generation, and protecting economic development along the Colorado and San Juan Rivers.

This legislation will allow for the continued funding of projects that improve habitat, support crucial research and monitoring, and remove non-native species, which will both benefit endangered fish species and protect the many other uses of the rivers.

Healthy rivers are vital to a region's overall environmental and economic well-being. When our rivers are healthy, our communities are healthy. We all share a responsibility to sustain and preserve the integrity of these resources for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the bipartisan cosponsors of this legislation for this leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4465.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO TRANSFER CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO FACILITATE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain Federal land to facilitate scientific research supporting Federal space and defense programs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1800

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LAND CONVEYANCE, WASATCH-CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, RICH COUNTY, UTAH.

(a) *LAND CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.*—Subject to valid existing rights, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey, without consideration, to the Utah State University Research Foundation, (in this section referred to as the "Foundation") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 80 acres, including improvements thereon, located outside of the boundaries of the Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Rich County, Utah, within Sections 19 and 30, Township 14 North, Range 5 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian for the purpose of permitting the Foundation to use the property for scientific and educational purposes.

(b) *REVERSIONARY INTEREST.*—If the Secretary of Agriculture determines at any time that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in such subsection, all right, title and interest in and to such real property, including any improvements thereto, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to and become the property of the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto such real property. A determination by the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(c) *PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.*—

(1) *PAYMENT REQUIRED.*—The Secretary of Agriculture shall require the Foundation to cover the costs (except any costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the Foundation in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Foundation.

(2) *TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.*—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) *DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.*—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture.

(e) *ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.*—The Secretary of Agriculture may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves 80 acres of land controlled by the Forest Service but not in the actual national forest.

Over the past 50 years, this land has been used by the Space Dynamics Laboratory, by NASA, by the Naval Research Laboratory, and they have a great deal of infrastructure on this land.

Unfortunately, the Forest Service decided to list this as disposable lands without contacting anybody, and now they don't have the ability of going back and delisting it so these groups can actually use this land for what they have been doing for the last 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the cleanest and simplest way of simply transferring control of this land back to the entity which is using it now so they can continue their research, much of which is done in support of our military. It is a simple and easy and correct way to solve an administrative lapse, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and its adoption by the House.

H.R. 1800 authorizes the transfer of 80 acres of Forest Service land to the Utah State University Research Foundation. The land will support ongoing research efforts that support national defense and space programs.

The idea that there should be national public lands that belong to and are managed on behalf of the American people is a value that dates back to the founding of our country and is embedded in our Constitution.

Generation after generation of Americans have endorsed the idea that our public lands should be managed for the benefit of all Americans to support a

wide range of activities. As stewards of this land, we must work to find a balance between compelling yet sometimes competing interests and make sure that the Federal Government is a good neighbor to local communities.

Whenever we decide that it is appropriate to sell or convey these shared resources, we must make sure there is adequate compensation to Federal taxpayers or safeguards in place to guarantee that the land is used for public purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BISHOP for working across the aisle to ensure that we met these goals in this legislation. I support H.R. 1800 and its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1800, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEAN STONE BRIDGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3469) to designate the bridge located in Blount County, Tennessee, on the Foothills Parkway (commonly known as "Bridge 2") as the "Dean Stone Bridge".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3469

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The bridge located in Blount County, Tennessee, on the Foothills Parkway (commonly known as "Bridge 2") shall be known and designated as the "Dean Stone Bridge".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the bridge referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dean Stone Bridge".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, in February of 2016, I spoke on this floor in tribute to Dean Stone shortly after he retired from his full-time position as editor of The Daily Times newspaper in Maryville, Tennessee.

Dean Stone worked for The Daily Times for an astounding 67 years, serving as sports editor; managing editor; and then starting in 1988, until 2016, as the top editor.

He was always very proud that he gave our great Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER one of his first jobs when Senator ALEXANDER was in high school in Maryville.

Dean Stone was the standard of journalistic fairness and integrity in my district and a towering figure in east Tennessee.

Unfortunately, he was unable to enjoy a long retirement, as he passed away several months later at the age of 92.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of a bill that I have introduced to name a very unique 800-foot-long bridge on the Foothills Parkway in his honor.

This bill is a fitting tribute to Dean Stone because his story and that of the Foothills Parkway will be forever linked in history.

First authorized by Congress in 1944, the Foothills Parkway was intended to be the Tennessee companion to the Blue Ridge Parkway, which was built to link the Great Smoky Mountains National Park with the Shenandoah National Park.

Construction on the Foothills Parkway did not begin, however, until 1960; and in the early decades, a few detached sections of the highway were completed.

Despite this progress in the early years, construction of the 16-mile stretch between Walland and Wears Valley, Tennessee, became plagued with problems. A 1.5 mile section in the middle of this segment, which eventually became known as the "Missing Link," featured rugged terrain that was extremely difficult to build upon.

Construction was further complicated by the discovery of minerals in the soil that could cause damage to the environment.

Despite these complications, my staff and I worked hard to keep the project alive. In my early years in Congress, we obtained a \$3 million appropriation to resurface and maintain existing sections of this parkway.

□ 1715

I was pleased that I was able to include \$8.6 million in the Federal highway legislation, T-21, which was signed

into law in 1998, and then the 2005 highway bill contained another \$7.5 billion to continue this project.

In 2016, the Department of Transportation awarded \$10 million toward the completion of the parkway, and the State of Tennessee committed to providing an additional \$15 million match to fund the final paving of this project. During these years, Dean Stone was a key ally in this process. It was then that the histories of the parkway and Dean Stone became permanently linked.

Dean Stone didn't just write in support of the Foothills Parkway. As chairman of the Great Smoky Mountains Park Commission and as president of the Foothills Parkway Association, Dean worked hard to convince people of the need to complete the missing link. Within the next year, the missing link will be no more, and that section of the parkway will finally be open to the public. Dean Stone was probably the indispensable man in getting this section of the road completed.

The Daily Times has stated that one main task remains. What is still needed, according to The Daily Times, is "proper acknowledgment of the Blount Countian who persisted over the years in encouraging, insisting, cajoling, and convincing the powers that be the 'missing link' could be, should be, and would be connected."

My bill, H.R. 3469, would name the longest bridge in the missing link section of the Foothills Parkway as the Dean Stone Bridge. This particular bridge is an 800-foot engineering marvel similar to the famous Linn Cove Viaduct on the Blue Ridge Parkway. New technological advances have allowed the construction of a bridge that floats around the edge of the mountain rather than tearing into it.

There is no doubt that the elegant curves of this bridge will be the iconic feature of the Foothills Parkway. Naming it after Dean Stone is a fitting tribute for all that he did for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and for this region. In fact, it is fair to say that no one individual did more for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park over the years—through many, many years—in promoting the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in many different ways.

I have a beautiful photograph that Dean Stone took of the Cades Cove area of the Smoky Mountains in my office here in Washington even today. My only regret is that Dean Stone did not live long enough to see the completion of the missing link, but I take heart in knowing that soon millions of people will be able to benefit from the fruits of his labors as they drive over the Dean Stone Bridge and see the glories of the Great Smoky Mountains.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As we have heard from my colleague, Dean Stone was a fierce champion of

the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Mr. Stone spent much of his life promoting the long-term preservation of the park and encouraging others to visit this place that he loved so dearly.

Today, the Great Smoky Mountains are one of our Nation's most visited national parks. In fact, the park set a new record of 11.4 million visitors in 2017 and became a destination for tourists from around the world who wanted to witness last summer's total solar eclipse.

I am sure that many of these visitors directly benefited from the decades of work by Dean Stone on behalf of the park and the entire Smoky Mountains region.

Mr. Stone passed away in 2016 at the age of 92. It is a fitting tribute to rename a bridge section of the Foothills Parkway in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3469.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACADIA NATIONAL PARK BOUNDARY CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4266) to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4266

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Acadia National Park Boundary Clarification Act".

SEC. 2. ACADIA NATIONAL PARK BOUNDARY CLARIFICATION.

Section 101 of Public Law 99-420 (16 U.S.C. 341 note) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "In order to" and inserting the following:

"(a) BOUNDARIES.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c)(2), to";

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking "The map shall be on file" and inserting the following:

"(c) AVAILABILITY AND REVISIONS OF MAPS.—

"(1) AVAILABILITY.—The map, together with the map described in subsection (b)(1) and any revised boundary map published under paragraph (2), if applicable, shall be—

"(A) on file"; and

(B) by striking "Interior, and it shall be made" and inserting the following: "Interior; and

"(B) made";

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (1)) the following:

"(b) SCHOODIC PENINSULA ADDITION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Park is confirmed to include approximately 1,441 acres of land and interests in land, as depicted on the map entitled 'Acadia National Park, Hancock County, Maine, Schoodic Peninsula Boundary Revision', numbered 123/129102, and dated July 10, 2015.

"(2) RATIFICATION AND APPROVAL OF ACQUISITIONS OF LAND.—Congress ratifies and approves—

"(A) effective as of September 26, 2013, the acquisition by the United States of the land and interests in the land described in paragraph (1); and

"(B) effective as of the date on which the alteration occurred, any alteration of the land or interests in the land described in paragraph (1) that is held or claimed by the United States (including conversion of the land to fee simple interest) that occurred after the date described in subparagraph (A)."; and

(4) in subsection (c) (as designated by paragraph (2)(A)), by adding at the end the following:

"(2) TECHNICAL AND LIMITED REVISIONS.—Subject to section 102(k), notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this title as the 'Secretary'), by publication in the Federal Register of a revised boundary map or other description, may make—

"(A) such technical boundary revisions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to the permanent boundaries of the Park (including any property of the Park located within the Schoodic Peninsula and Isle au Haut districts) to resolve issues resulting from causes such as survey error or changed road alignments; and

"(B) such limited boundary revisions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to the permanent boundaries of the Park to take into account acquisitions or losses, by exchange, donation, or purchase from willing sellers using donated or appropriated funds, of land adjacent to or within the Park, respectively, in any case in which the total acreage of the land to be so acquired or lost is less than 10 acres, subject to the condition that—

"(i) any such boundary revision shall not be a part of a more-comprehensive boundary revision; and

"(ii) all such boundary revisions, considered collectively with any technical boundary revisions made pursuant to subparagraph (A), do not increase the size of the Park by more than a total of 100 acres, as compared to the size of the Park on the date of enactment of this paragraph.".

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON ACQUISITIONS OF LAND FOR ACADIA NATIONAL PARK.

Section 102 of Public Law 99-420 (16 U.S.C. 341 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "of the Interior (hereinafter in this title referred to as 'the Secretary')";

(2) in subsection (d)(1), in the first sentence, by striking "the the" and inserting "the";

(3) in subsection (k)—

(A) by redesignating the subsection as paragraph (4) and indenting the paragraph appropriately; and

(B) by moving the paragraph so as to appear at the end of subsection (b); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(k) REQUIREMENTS.—Before revising the boundaries of the Park pursuant to this sec-

tion or section 101(c)(2)(B), the Secretary shall—

"(1) certify that the proposed boundary revision will contribute to, and is necessary for, the proper preservation, protection, interpretation, or management of the Park;

"(2) consult with the governing body of each county, city, town, or other jurisdiction with primary taxing authority over the land or interest in land to be acquired regarding the impacts of the proposed boundary revision;

"(3) obtain from each property owner the land or interest in land of which is proposed to be acquired for, or lost from, the Park written consent for the proposed boundary revision; and

"(4) submit to the Acadia National Park Advisory Commission established by section 103(a), the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Maine Congressional Delegation a written notice of the proposed boundary revision.

"(l) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not use the authority provided by section 100506 of title 54, United States Code, to adjust the permanent boundaries of the Park pursuant to this title.".

SEC. 4. ACADIA NATIONAL PARK ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reestablish and appoint members to the Acadia National Park Advisory Commission in accordance with section 103 of Public Law 99-420 (16 U.S.C. 341 note).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 103 of Public Law 99-420 (16 U.S.C. 341 note) is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO ACADIA NATIONAL PARK.

The following are repealed:

(1) Section 3 of the Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1178, chapter 45).

(2) The first section of the Act of January 19, 1929 (45 Stat. 1083, chapter 77).

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF USE RESTRICTION.

The Act of August 1, 1950 (64 Stat. 383, chapter 511), is amended—

(1) by striking "That the Secretary" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 1. CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN ACADIA NATIONAL PARK.

"The Secretary"; and

(2) by striking "for school purposes" and inserting "for public purposes, subject to the conditions that use of the land shall not degrade or adversely impact the resources or values of Acadia National Park and that the land shall remain in public ownership for recreational, educational, or similar public purposes".

SEC. 7. CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN TRADITIONAL USES.

Title I of Public Law 99-420 (16 U.S.C. 341 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 109. CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN TRADITIONAL USES.

"In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall allow for the traditional, non-motorized harvesting of marine worms, clams, other shellfish, and other marine species (as defined in chapter 601 of title 12 of the Maine Revised Statutes (as in effect on the date of enactment of this section)), in accordance with the laws (including regulations and applicable judicial interpretations) of the State of Maine—

"(1) within the boundaries of the Park; and

"(2) on any land located outside of the boundaries of the Park with respect to which the Secretary has or obtains a property interest of any type pursuant to this title.".

SEC. 8. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ACADIA NATIONAL PARK TO THE TOWN OF BAR HARBOR, MAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the Town of Bar Harbor all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the .29-acre parcel of land in Acadia National Park identified as lot 110-055-000 on the tax map of the Town of Bar Harbor for section 110, dated April 1, 2015, to be used for a solid waste transfer facility.

(b) REVERSION.—If the land conveyed under subsection (a) is used for a purpose other than the purpose described in that subsection, the land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for helping bring this very important bill to the floor. I also thank Chairman ROB BISHOP from Utah, who also was very instrumental in bringing this bill to the floor. In addition to that, I thank all of the staff members of the Natural Resources Committee here in the House for all their great work. This is so important to our State.

Mr. Speaker, the great State of Maine is called Vacationland. Now, we have a population of just 1.3 million hardy souls in Maine. However, every year, our population swells to about 40 million vacationers from all over the world. We have such stunning natural beauty in Maine in a pristine natural environment in all these welcoming small towns that it is no wonder that people flock to Maine.

Now, right smack in the middle of midcoast Maine is our crown jewel called Acadia National Park, and we just love Acadia National Park in Maine. We are so proud of this. If you happen to vacation in Maine—if you haven't, you and your family deserve a vacation to Maine. If you drive up to Cadillac Mountain, you see this panoramic view of Penobscot Bay, and coming out of those sparkling waters of the Atlantic are these green-topped islands. You might rent a bike and go to these terrific, groomed historic carriage trails that wind through the woods of Acadia. Take your kids down to Sand Beach, right in Acadia National Park, and when their toes hit

that ice-cold water, they shriek with joy. This is Maine. We are very proud of Acadia National Park.

Mr. Speaker, I do have to say that a couple of years ago, unfortunately, Acadia National Park expanded beyond its boundaries. This is because there was conflict in a couple laws that date back quite some time. Now, I am very happy that my bill that I worked on with great help from my fellow Member of Congress, Congresswoman CHELLIE PINGREE from the First District, clarifies this boundary for Acadia National Park. It also closed a few loopholes but still allows the boundaries to be adjusted in very minor ways with abutting pieces of property.

Now, I made it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I would not sign on to this boundary clarification issue until one more thing is done, and that is to protect the livelihoods of hundreds and hundreds of hardworking Mainers who harvest bloodworms, sandworms, clams, and periwinkles along the mud flats around Acadia National Park.

Now, those folks who visit Maine from Utah or Kansas and spend a lot of money to come up and vacation in Maine expect to see the great ocean in front of them, Mr. Speaker. But because the Moon revolves around the Earth and the gravitational pull of the Moon causes one of the unique things in Maine, we have big tides. So if you are vacationing in Maine and you find out when you wake up in the morning the water is gone, don't worry about it. Six hours later, it will come back.

Now, the ebb and the flow of the tides in Maine along the coastline create what we call the intertidal zone. It is a zone between the high watermark and the low watermark.

Now, in the State of Maine, we are very clear that this land is owned by the people of Maine, not by the Federal Government. So I was alarmed a couple of years ago when some of the people called me up and said: Mr. POLIQUIN, we worked an entire tide, and someone from Acadia National Park didn't understand the rules and asked us to turn over our bucket.

Now, we have hundreds and hundreds of families that rely on harvesting in the intertidal zone, and we have to make sure that we have corrected this problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Now, this is a clear example of what we call the public trust doctrine. This common-law document, which we adopted from the British ancestors, gives public access to this land between high and low waterlines for the purpose of "fishing, fowling, and navigation."

Now, unlike some States, Mr. Speaker, some property owners in Maine own

to the low watermark of the tidal range, so this doctrine is incredibly important for the public to have access to our flats for these purposes.

This bill that we are passing today codifies the unique ownership and public access rights of Maine fishermen on the intertidal who have worked on this for hundreds of years. Traditional harvesting is meant to include the harvesting of clams and worms, which are harvested by hand with a rake at low tide, and the collection of periwinkles. It also includes accessing intertidal areas by boat at all tides for the purpose of harvesting these species.

Now, to be clear, the intent of this bill is for "traditional harvesting." By doing so, this will ensure that our wormers, clammers, and others who live in the area will continue to be able to do what they have been doing for many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate again CHELLIE PINGREE, my compatriot from the First District who did a great job on this, our staffs, and the staff of the Natural Resources Committee. We extended ourselves, Mr. Speaker, in a bipartisan way to all the stakeholders in the area, including the Acadia Advisory Commission, the Maine Marine Worm Harvesters, the Maine Clammers Association, the National Park Service, the Friends of Acadia, and all those who want to make this right for the boundary of Acadia National Park forever to be cemented in law.

At the same time, we protect the livelihood of some of the hardest working people you will ever find in this country, Mr. Speaker. These individuals will rake and dig for these worms in the summertime, in the hot weather, and in the wintertime when the snow is blowing sideways.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everybody to vote for this bill.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), who is one of the sponsors of H.R. 4266.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise today in support of H.R. 4266, the Acadia National Park Boundary Clarification Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bipartisan bill, which was introduced by my colleague from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

While you have already heard from Mr. POLIQUIN a lot about the importance of the intertidal zone, about the livelihood of clam diggers and wormers, and about the Acadia National Park, because our State is so important and we love our park, I am pretty much going to say it all again.

Maine is very proud to be home to Acadia National Park. This national treasure is a place where the mountains actually meet the sea. When you climb those mountains, you see miles

of clear, blue ocean dotted with literally some of the hundreds and thousands of islands off the coast of Maine, one of which I am lucky enough to live on, not the one where Acadia National Park is.

But millions of people visit Acadia National Park every year to experience the incredible natural attractions, the hiking, and the climbing. But they also come there to be in downeast Maine. Downeast Maine is full of very many tight-knit communities, and those tight-knit communities are full of hardworking men and women, many of whom make their living on the water; and it is really hard work. Some of them are hauling lobster traps every day so that we can enjoy the wonderful lobster that is only delicious if you get it from the State of Maine. But many of them are bent over digging in the mud for clams, for other species, and for bloodworms; and it is really hard work.

□ 1730

H.R. 4266 would clarify a number of points to strengthen the park's relationship with the surrounding communities that we have been talking about. Most importantly, this bill will ensure that clambers, wormers, and other traditional harvesters can continue to work in the places where, frankly, they have worked for generations, many of them working alongside their sons or daughters when they go out every day.

In the spring of 2016, the harvesters were shocked when the park staff began prohibiting them from working along the coastline within Acadia's boundaries. There was no warning about changing a practice that had, frankly, gone on for decades. I appreciate the fact that park officials quickly ended their enforcement, but the actions sent shock waves throughout the area.

Washington County is the poorest county in Maine, and families there simply just can't afford to lose any source of income. H.R. 4266 would give the communities a sense of security by very explicitly stating that harvesters have a right to work within the park. It is a critical step to ensuring that Acadia National Park remains an attraction not only for its natural beauty, but for its unique way of life.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. POLIQUIN, for recognizing the issue, for working with his harvesters, and for moving this forward. I am proud to be an original cosponsor. I urge its passage and urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank both Mr. POLIQUIN and Ms. PINGREE for introducing this legislation to protect a true New England treasure, Acadia National Park.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yea" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4266.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFYING THE BOUNDARY OF VOYAGEURS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1350) to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1350

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MODIFICATION OF VOYAGEURS NATIONAL PARK.

(a) BOUNDARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(a) of Public Law 91-661 (16 U.S.C. 160a-1(a)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "the drawing entitled" and all that follows through "February 1969" and inserting "the map entitled 'Voyageurs National Park, Proposed Land Transfer & Boundary Adjustment', numbered 172/80,056, and dated June 2009 (22 sheets)"; and

(B) in the second and third sentences, by striking "drawing" each place it appears and inserting "map".

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 102(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 91-661 (16 U.S.C. 160a-1(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking "paragraph (1)(C) and (D)" and inserting "subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1)"; and

(B) in the second proviso, by striking "paragraph 1(E)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(E)".

(b) LAND ACQUISITIONS.—Section 201 of Public Law 91-661 (16 U.S.C. 160b) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through "(a) The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 201. LAND ACQUISITIONS.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking "When any tract of land is only partly within such boundaries" and inserting the following:

"(2) CERTAIN PORTIONS OF TRACTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which only a portion of a tract of land is within the boundaries of the park";

(B) in the third sentence, by striking "Land so acquired" and inserting the following:

"(B) EXCHANGE.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Any land acquired pursuant to subparagraph (A)";

(C) in the fourth sentence, by striking "Any portion" and inserting the following:

"(ii) PORTIONS NOT EXCHANGED.—Any portion";

(D) in the fifth sentence, by striking "Any Federal property" and inserting the following:

"(C) TRANSFERS OF FEDERAL PROPERTY.—Any Federal property"; and

(E) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:

"(D) ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Effective beginning on the date of enactment of this subparagraph, there is transferred to the National Park Service administrative jurisdiction over—

"(i) any land managed by the Bureau of Land Management within the boundaries of the park, as depicted on the map described in section 102(a); and

"(ii) any additional public land identified by the Bureau of Land Management as appropriate for transfer within the boundaries of the park.

"(E) LAND OWNED BY STATE.—

"(i) DONATIONS AND EXCHANGES.—Any land located within or adjacent to the boundaries of the park that is owned by the State of Minnesota (or a political subdivision of the State) may be acquired by the Secretary only through donation or exchange.

"(ii) REVISION.—On completion of an acquisition from the State under clause (i), the Secretary shall revise the boundaries of the park to reflect the acquisition."; and

(3) in subsection (b), by striking "(b) In exercising his" and inserting the following:

"(b) OFFERS BY INDIVIDUALS.—In exercising the".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Voyageurs National Park, established in 1975, is a 218,200-acre national park located on the northern border of Minnesota. The name "Voyageurs" commemorates the French-Canadian fur traders who were the first European settlers to frequent the area. The park has remarkable water resources and islands and is popular with canoeists, kayakers, other boaters, and fishermen.

The Bureau of Land Management currently manages lands within the boundaries of the park that were not transferred to the National Park Service at the park's establishment. H.R. 1350 formally transfers these Bureau of Land Management lands to the National Park Service. Enactment of the legislation is expected to save taxpayer money and agency time by eliminating duplicative land management.

In addition, this legislation resolves an outstanding land management issue faced by the State of Minnesota and a county by authorizing a land exchange between the State and the National Park Service. Certain State tax-forfeited tracts within the boundaries of Voyageurs National Park will be traded for a National Park Service-owned tract outside the park boundary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), the bill's sponsor. I thank him for his excellent work on this issue.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear friend and colleague from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for his distinguished service. I thank Mr. CURTIS for his distinguished service as well. I also thank Mr. BISHOP, all the members of the committee, and the staff, of course, for the wonderful work they have done on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here to join in support of H.R. 1350.

Basically, as was explained by Mr. CURTIS, the bill authorizes a land transfer between the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service, a move that would greatly improve the overall land management and efficiency within the Voyageurs National Park in my district in northern Minnesota. I might add, we are very proud of that accomplishment.

Specifically, the bill permits the transfer of 49 acres of land within the park from the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management to the National Park Service, as was originally intended by the original legislation for the park when it was signed into law; but, for a variety of reasons, these 49 acres, including 61 separate tracts of land, were not included in the original Federal legislation that established the park in 1975.

It may interest some of my colleagues to know that I was here in 1975 and was able to, of course, register my support for the establishment of that park.

Now, to be clear, the National Park Service administration already manages the 49 acres; but without a change in the law that permanently transfers the lands, a cumbersome and duplicative renewal process is required every 20 years. The procedure involves a notice, a publication in the Federal Register, and a review of comments, all of which are, essentially, a waste of taxpayers' money and everybody's time within the government who has to deal with it.

So make no mistake about it, as Mr. CURTIS pointed out, this bill saves the taxpayers' money and the bureaucracy time.

In addition, the bill would also authorize the National Park Service to

acquire and integrate new land into Voyageurs National Park through land exchanges with the State and local governments that own land within or adjacent to the park's boundaries.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this bill would eliminate any future concerns related to the Department of the Interior's ownership and jurisdiction, facilitating the ease of management for the National Park Service, the State, and the county; and it would do so at no cost, in addition, of course, to saving money for the Federal Government as determined by the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt the measure.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1350 is a commonsense, good governance measure, and I want to congratulate Mr. NOLAN for his hard work in getting this bill through the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1350.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK MONGIELLO, JORDAN McLINN, AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT TO TRY ACT OF 2018

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5247

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. USE OF UNAPPROVED INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS BY PATIENTS DIAGNOSED WITH A TERMINAL ILLNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter E of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 561A (21 U.S.C. 360bbb-0) the following:

"SEC. 561B. INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS FOR USE BY ELIGIBLE PATIENTS.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'eligible patient' means a patient—

"(A) who has been diagnosed with an eligible illness;

"(B) who has exhausted approved treatment options and is not eligible to participate in (for a reason such as the patient not meeting inclusion criteria) a clinical trial designed to evaluate an investigational drug for the treatment of such eligible illness with which the patient has been diagnosed, including one involving the eligible investigational drug, or for whom participation in such a clinical trial is not feasible (for a reason such as a lack of geographic proximity to the clinical trial), as certified by a physician, who—

"(i) is in good standing with the physician's licensing organization or board; and

"(ii) will not be compensated for so certifying; and

"(C) who has provided to the treating physician written informed consent, as described in part 50 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), regarding the eligible investigational drug, or, as applicable, on whose behalf a legally authorized representative of the patient has provided such consent.

"(2) The term 'eligible investigational drug' means an investigational drug (as such term is used in section 561)—

"(A) for which a phase 1 clinical trial has been completed;

"(B) that has not been approved or licensed for any use under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act;

"(C)(i) for which an application has been filed under section 505(b) of this Act or section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act, as applicable, that is active; or

"(ii) that is under investigation in a clinical trial that—

"(I) is intended to form the primary basis of a claim of effectiveness in support of approval or licensure under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act; and

"(II) is the subject of an active investigational new drug application under section 505(i) of this Act or section 351(a)(3) of the Public Health Service Act, as applicable; and

"(D) the active development or production of which—

"(i) is ongoing;

"(ii) has not been discontinued by the manufacturer; and

"(iii) is not the subject of a clinical hold under the regulations implementing section 505(i) or section 351(a)(3) of the Public Health Service Act, as applicable.

"(3) The term 'phase 1 trial' means a phase 1 clinical investigation of a drug as described in section 312.21 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

"(4) The term 'eligible illness' means—

"(A) a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months; or

"(B) a disease or condition that would result in significant irreversible morbidity that is likely to lead to severely premature death.

"(b) ALTERNATIVE PATHWAY FOR ELIGIBLE PATIENTS WITH A TERMINAL ILLNESS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Eligible investigational drugs provided to eligible patients in compliance with this section are exempt from sections 502(f), 503(b)(4), and subsections (a) and (i) of section 505 of this Act, and section

351(a) of the Public Health Service Act so long as the conditions specified in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) are met with respect to the provision of such investigational drugs.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN REGULATIONS.—The conditions specified in this paragraph, with respect to an eligible investigational drug referred to in paragraph (1), are that—

“(A) the eligible investigational drug is labeled in accordance with section 312.6 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations); and

“(B) the provision of such eligible investigational drug occurs in compliance with the applicable requirements set forth in sections 312.7 and 312.8(d)(1) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) that apply to investigational drugs, subject to paragraph (5).

“(3) NOTIFICATION.—The condition specified in this paragraph, with respect to an eligible investigational drug referred to in paragraph (1), is that the sponsor of such eligible investigational drug notifies the Secretary of the provision of such eligible investigational drug for use by an eligible patient pursuant to this section. Such notification shall be submitted within 7 business days of the provision of such eligible investigational drug as correspondence to the investigational new drug application described in subsection (a)(2).

“(4) ADVERSE EVENT REPORTING.—The condition specified in this paragraph, with respect to an eligible investigational drug referred to in paragraph (1), is that the sponsor or manufacturer of such eligible investigational drug has required, as a condition of providing the drug to a physician for use by an eligible patient pursuant to this section, that such physician will immediately report to such sponsor or manufacturer any serious adverse events, as such term is defined in section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), associated with the use of the eligible investigational drug by the eligible patient.

“(5) APPLICATION.—For purposes of this section, the requirements set forth in sections 312.7 and 312.8(d)(1) of title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) are deemed to apply to any person who manufactures, distributes, prescribes, dispenses, introduces or delivers for introduction into interstate commerce, or provides to an eligible patient an eligible investigational drug pursuant to this section.

“(c) USE OF CLINICAL OUTCOMES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Public Health Service Act, or any other provision of Federal law, the Secretary may not use a clinical outcome associated with the use of an eligible investigational drug pursuant to this section to delay or adversely affect the review or approval of such drug under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act unless—

“(A) the Secretary makes a determination, in accordance with paragraph (2), that use of such clinical outcome is critical to determining the safety of the eligible investigational drug; or

“(B) the sponsor requests use of such outcomes.

“(2) LIMITATION.—If the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall provide written notice of such determination to the sponsor, including a public health justification for such determination, and such notice shall be made part of the administrative record. Such deter-

mination shall not be delegated below the director of the agency center that is charged with the premarket review of the eligible investigational drug.

“(d) REPORTING.—The manufacturer or sponsor of an eligible investigational drug that provides an eligible investigational drug pursuant to this section shall post on the same publicly available internet website used by the manufacturer for purposes of section 561A(b) an annual summary of any provision by the manufacturer or sponsor of an eligible investigational drug under this section. The summary shall include the number of requests received, the number of requests granted, the number of patients treated, the therapeutic area of the drug made available, and any known or suspected serious adverse events, as such term is defined in section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), associated with the use of the eligible investigational drug.

“(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Secretary to require manufacturers or sponsors of investigational drugs to review and report information relevant to the safety of such investigational drug obtained or otherwise received by the sponsor pursuant to part 312 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).”

(b) NO LIABILITY.—Section 561B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LIABILITY.—

“(1) ALLEGED ACTS OR OMISSIONS.—

“(A) MANUFACTURER OR SPONSOR.—No manufacturer or sponsor (or their agent or representative) of an investigational drug shall be liable for any alleged act or omission related to the provision of such drug to a single patient or small group of patients for treatment use in accordance with subsection (b) or (c) of section 561 or the provision of an eligible investigational drug to an eligible patient in accordance with this section, including, with respect to the provision of an investigational drug under section 561 or an eligible investigational drug under this section, the reporting of safety information, from clinical trials or any other source, as required by section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(B) PHYSICIAN, CLINICAL INVESTIGATOR, OR HOSPITAL.—

“(i) No licensed physician, clinical investigator, or hospital shall be liable for any alleged act or omission related to the provision of an investigational drug to a single patient or small group of patients for treatment use in accordance with subsection (b) or (c) of section 561, as described in clause (ii), or the provision of an eligible investigational drug to an eligible patient in accordance with this section, unless such act or omission constitutes on the part of such physician, clinical investigator, or hospital with respect to such investigational drug or eligible investigational drug—

“(I) willful or criminal misconduct;

“(II) reckless misconduct;

“(III) gross negligence relative to the applicable standard of care and practice with respect to the administration or dispensing of such investigational drug; or

“(IV) an intentional tort under applicable State law.

“(ii) The requirements described in this clause are the requirements under subsection (b) or (c) of section 561, including—

“(I) the reporting of safety information, from clinical trials or any other source, as required by section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

“(II) ensuring that the informed consent requirements of part 50 of title 21, Code of the Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) are met; and

“(III) ensuring that review by an institutional review board is obtained in a manner consistent with the requirements of part 56 of title 21, Code of the Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(2) DETERMINATION NOT TO PROVIDE DRUG.—No manufacturer, sponsor, licensed physician, clinical investigator, or hospital shall be liable for determining not to provide access to an investigational drug under this section or for discontinuing any such access that it initially determined to provide.

“(3) LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2), nothing in this section shall be construed to modify or otherwise affect the right of any person to bring a private action against a manufacturer or sponsor (or their agent or representative), physician, clinical investigator, hospital, prescriber, dispenser, or other entity under any State or Federal product liability, tort, consumer protection, or warranty law.

“(B) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify or otherwise affect the authority of the Federal Government to bring suit under any Federal law.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the patients who face terminal diagnoses but have exhausted all available treatment options. These are patients like Jordan McLinn, who is with us today.

Jordan is a tireless fighter who self-advocates for others living with Duchenne muscular dystrophy. He is a namesake of this bill we are considering, like Matt Bellina, who testified before the Health Subcommittee last year. Because of folks like Jordan and Matt, we have a chance to increase patient access to experimental therapies.

Thirty-eight States across our great land have right-to-try laws, including my home State of Oregon. Wisconsin, with a bill on its way to Governor Scott Walker's desk, will soon make it 39. While the State policies vary, they have a common goal: helping vulnerable patients.

President Trump praised the movement during the State of the Union, saying: "People who are terminally ill should not have to go from country to country to seek a cure. I want to give them a chance here at home."

Now, today, there is an existing process for patients to access unapproved drugs. The FDA oversees expanded access, commonly known as compassionate use. This program has been critical in helping patients access experimental drugs.

Commissioner Scott Gottlieb and the Agency, the FDA, should be commended for their continued work to improve the expanded access program for patients.

To improve this successful program, the bill before us today also provides liability protections for manufacturers, sponsors, physicians, clinical investigators, and hospitals that participate in the existing expanded access program and the new alternative pathway created under this legislation.

This provision removes one of the biggest hurdles that patients have faced in getting access to these medicines, in gaining access to experimental therapies, as identified by the Government Accountability Office: manufacturer hesitancy to participate. That is the big hurdle. We seek to overcome it with this legislation.

The bill also creates a new alternative pathway for patients who do not qualify for a clinical trial. This legislation strengthens patient protections with clearer informed consent and adverse event reporting.

The bill also ensures the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, is notified when a patient receives an unapproved drug through the new alternative pathway to ensure there is proper oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House sponsors of this legislation who have worked tirelessly to bring this to a good place today: BRIAN FITZPATRICK, our colleague from Pennsylvania; ANDY BIGGS from Arizona; and MORGAN GRIFFITH from Virginia. I also thank the Vice President, with whom Jordan and I met today. I am grateful for their work on behalf of these courageous patients, and I urge all my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5247, or the Right to Try Act of 2018. Supporters of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, have claimed that it will provide seriously ill patients, who have exhausted all of their available treatment options, access to experimental therapies free from the barriers of FDA oversight.

While it is understandable that someone suffering from a disease who has no

more options would want to try anything that could help them fight their disease, this legislation delivers the false hope to patients and their families that they will receive a cure to their underlying disease or condition.

In fact, this legislation provides patients and their families nothing more than the right to ask a manufacturer for access to early stage, unproven treatments. Like other so-called right-to-try proposals, H.R. 5247 is based on the false premise that patients are not receiving access to the investigational treatments as a result of the Food and Drug Administration, and this simply not the case.

Through the FDA's existing expanded access program, seriously ill patients are able to request access to investigational products. The FDA approves 99 percent of all requests for investigational drugs or biologics that it receives through this program.

Last year, FDA received more than 1,500 requests, and only 9 were not approved. Despite this high-approval rate, supporters of right-to-try laws have argued that the process is too slow and burdensome, but I have not seen evidence that this is the case, Mr. Speaker. In fact, FDA often grants emergency requests for expanded access immediately over the phone, and nonemergency requests are processed in an average of 4 days.

FDA has even made improvements to streamline the process. For example, FDA has revised the application for physicians to ensure that it now takes less than an hour to complete. FDA has also released additional guidance to industry, outlining the expanded access program's requirements and addressing common questions related to the different programs and submission process, and how outcomes will be considered as part of the review process.

Last fall, FDA Commissioner Gottlieb testified on right-to-try efforts and told our committee that: "There is a perception that certain products that aren't being offered under FDA expanded access . . . will be offered under right-to-try. I don't see that," the commissioner said. As I have said, the review process is working well, but this legislation would completely take FDA out of the review process. This is dangerous and could put patients at serious risk.

FDA is part of the process for a reason. It protects patients from potentially bad actors or from experimental treatments that might do more harm than good. While FDA approves 99 percent of the treatments it reviews, it also revises applications for 11 percent of patients to improve patient safety protections.

In order to protect patients, this review should continue. We must protect patients from bad actors or from dangerous treatments that would make their lives worse. I am extremely con-

cerned that the legislation we are considering today is advancing a solution to address barriers to investigational treatments that do not exist and could expose seriously ill patients to greater harm instead of the greater access that they are looking for.

The true barrier to any expanded access is the determination by the manufacturer as to whether or not they will provide access to their products that are under development. But nothing in the legislation before us today would compel a manufacturer to grant access upon request.

Further, H.R. 5247 would allow patients access to investigational treatments that have only completed a phase I clinical trial. That is an extremely small trial. It does not determine the effectiveness, or the potential side effects of a drug. Access at this stage in the development could expose patients to untested products, further harm, and result in delaying access to a treatment that may be more appropriate and more beneficial for their underlying disease or condition.

H.R. 5247 also erodes important patient safeguards. It limits FDA's ability to use clinical outcomes associated with the use of an investigational product when reviewing a product for approval if it could adversely impact its review. It also prevents any entity from being held liable for use of the treatment.

And while I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill, I can't support it. The last thing I want to do is give patients false hope and to potentially put them at risk by completely removing FDA from the review and approval process.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous, in my opinion, that a bill of this magnitude is being considered under a suspension of the rule. As my Republican colleagues well know, bills considered under suspension are traditionally bipartisan bills that have worked their way through the appropriate committees with overwhelming bipartisan support.

This bill was never considered by the Energy and Commerce Committee. In fact, it was only introduced today. A bill with such critical patient safety implications should not be considered in this fashion. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation and stand with the more than 100 organizations that have come forward expressing their concern for patients and the unnecessary risk this legislation could expose our Nation's most vulnerable to.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I now have the honor of yielding 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who has been, even before he got to the Congress, an extraordinary advocate for this cause and for

the patients with terminally ill conditions.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WALDEN; Mr. BURGESS; Mr. GRIFFITH; my friend, ANDY BIGGS; and Senator RON JOHNSON for their resolute commitment to see the Right to Try Act brought to a vote today.

Mr. Speaker, each year, thousands of Americans receive the devastating diagnosis of a terminal illness. And even with the amazing work done in American medical research and development, for too many families, access to these potentially lifesaving treatments will come too late or not at all. As their Representatives, we should each endeavor to support these individuals in their time of need as well as support new pathways to potentially lifesaving treatment.

That is what the right to try is all about. As the chairman indicated, 38 States have passed this bill with near unanimous, bipartisan support. A version of this bill unanimously passed the United States Senate.

However, we know Congress cannot legislate miracles. That is why, when talking about the right to try, we are careful not to represent it as a cure itself. The reality is that, while passing this measure is a step, the families and advocates we have worked closely with for years know that the right to try isn't a guarantee. It is about protecting hope and protecting opportunity—hope and opportunity for those like my constituent, Lieutenant Commander Matthew Bellina, a retired naval aviator and father of three, who was diagnosed with ALS in 2014.

Following the onset of his symptoms, Matt was grounded from flying. He eventually moved back home to Bucks County with his wife, Caitlin, and his three children to be surrounded by family and friends.

Although this disease stopped Matt's military service, he quickly picked up the fight with his new battle, involving himself in the ALS community and becoming a strong advocate for right-to-try legislation. Together with Jim Worthington and the Have a Heart Foundation, Matt advocated for the right to try across the Nation.

While the FDA has a program that allows terminally ill patients to apply for early access to promising treatment, the right to try is needed because the FDA's compassionate use process doesn't help enough people. Only about 1,200 people a year can make it through the current time-consuming and expensive application process. Comparatively, Mr. Speaker, in 2014, more than 12,000 people in France were using investigational treatments through that government's equivalent program.

If a country with one-fifth of the population of the United States can help 900 percent more people, the FDA pro-

gram clearly is not working. This bill does not gut the FDA or fundamentally change the relationship between doctor and patient. What it does is give Americans facing a terminal diagnosis a new pathway for treatments undergoing clinical trials.

I want to read something in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I received from Matt Bellina, who is with us today. "Please let them know that I have had ALS too long to meet the exclusion criteria for any promising trials. No drug company will offer me treatments under the current EAP guidelines. Two reputable companies have already indicated that they would try to treat me under the rules of this bill. A vote against this is essentially a vote to kill me. It is a vote to make my wife a widow and leave my boys fatherless. I can't stop anyone from voting that way, but please ask them to have the respect to look my family in the eye when they cast" that vote.

Mr. Speaker, when a life hangs in the balance, the Federal Government should not stand in the way of access to potentially lifesaving treatment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), who is the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member for allowing me to speak tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Right to Try Act, legislation that would bypass the Food and Drug Administration's longstanding review and oversight of drug treatments and endanger patients with life-threatening diseases.

My heart goes out to the families of loved ones who are terminally ill and desperate for a breakthrough treatment. I, too, have lost loved ones and wished there was an experimental therapy available to save them.

FDA has decades of experience dealing with experimental therapies that have not received final approval. In 1987, the FDA created expanded access, better known as compassionate use, and gives terminally ill patients access to therapies still under clinical trials. FDA approves nearly all requests for investigational drugs. For the last 5 years, the FDA approval rate for this expanded access is over 99 percent. In fact, FDA physicians are available 24 hours a day to approve emergency requests.

My daughter is an infectious disease physician at the University of Nebraska Medical Center. They used the FDA's compassionate pathway to provide experimental therapy for an American doctor, a U.S. citizen, who had contracted Ebola while in Africa in 2014. FDA approved that request for that experimental treatment over the telephone in less than 24 hours. There is a solution other than this bill.

The new path created in this legislation is not necessary, and, in fact, may endanger the health and safety of terminally ill patients by bypassing FDA's oversight and expertise.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to speak on the importance of following regular order. The House Energy and Commerce Committee has been working with stakeholders and Federal agencies for years on creating incentives and pathways for the new generation of breakthrough therapies.

Two years ago, these efforts culminated with the passage of the 21st Century Cures Act, which I am proud to be a champion of. The 21st Century Cures Act went through regular order, including hearings; Member discussions; and compromises between regulators, stakeholders, and regulators.

It is not easy or quick, but regular order works because it gives the committees of jurisdiction the opportunity to debate and refine the legislation. This legislation we are currently considering did not go through regular order. In fact, it was just introduced earlier today, purposely avoiding consideration before our Energy and Commerce Committee due to its shortcomings.

I hope we can agree on the importance of following regular order and observe our Chamber's rules and traditions. The American people deserve nothing less. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for Americans facing these serious and life-threatening diseases by opposing this unnecessary and potentially dangerous legislation.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the former chairman of the full committee and the current vice chairman.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to my friends on the minority talk about the reasons they are opposing this bill, and a normal piece of legislation that would have some merit didn't go through regular order, things of this sort. But, Mr. Speaker, when the house is burning down and you need the fire department, you don't ask if they followed proper procedure to get somebody out there to put out the fire.

My brother had liver cancer at the age of 44. He had tried every conventional therapy known to modern medicine, and it wasn't working. Now, he had a brother, myself, who was a subcommittee chairman of the committee of jurisdiction over the FDA. I contacted the FDA, and we got him in a special protocol for an investigational drug that was under approval. It wasn't approved. And the doctors and the people at the FDA told my brother and his family: If it works, it is going to really help you. But if it doesn't, you are going to die sooner.

Well, he was going to die anyway, Mr. Speaker. So he signed the informed

consent and he took the drug and it didn't work, but he had that last shot. Now, I don't know what this debate about false hope is. When you have no hope, perhaps false hope is better than none at all.

All this bill does is let people who have no other hope for conventional therapy, if a drug has at least passed stage one at the FDA approval process, and their doctor thinks it will help them, if they give an informed consent, they can try it.

Now, my friends on the Democratic side are correct that, most of the time under the existing protocol, the FDA approves it without a problem. But why should the FDA approve it if you are about to die anyway? That is what this bill does. By the way, it passed the Senate with unanimous consent. Now, that is a miracle in itself.

Let's pass it here in the House and give hope a chance for these patients who are terminally ill and have no hope at all today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this proposed right-to-try legislation. This bill offers patients false hope. It proposes a pathway to experimental drugs that offers absolutely no guarantee of access, while stripping patients of any legal or financial recourse, and places clinical trials at risk.

□ 1800

Last week, I am sure like everyone else, I heard from many constituents on behalf of their families and communities with devastating diseases, like multiple sclerosis.

When a family member is faced with a devastating diagnosis, you would do anything and try anything to improve their quality of life. I know. I have been there with family members in such heartbreaking situations. But this bill would not necessarily make it easier to get experimental treatments and it would definitely make it harder for patients in the future to get treatments. We need clinical trials to ensure drugs are safe and effective and to find real cures and treatments for these patients.

Because this bill would be dangerous for patients both today and in the future, many disease groups oppose the bill, including the National Organization for Rare Disorders, the American Cancer Society, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, and more.

Rushing this bill without proper bipartisan oversight places the American people in the way of real harm. Rescinding FDA oversight on unproven therapies is a perilous proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the last two speakers from California and Texas, two of our biggest States, a grand total of two legislators voted "no." Otherwise, it was unanimous in both those States to do what we are doing here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), an incredible advocate of this legislation.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WALDEN for yielding. I am grateful for the work he has done on this. I am also grateful to my friends, Representatives FITZPATRICK and GRIFFITH, as well as Senator JOHNSON, for their advocacy here.

I don't want to get this crucial point lost: it is not us; it is the courageous patients and their friends and their families who deserve the most recognition about how far we have come to get this bill passed. Today is for them, not for us.

Thirty-eight States, soon to be 39 States, have passed this bill. That is enough to amend the U.S. Constitution, but here we stand because some have come and said we shouldn't give people false hope.

There is no such thing as false hope. You either have hope or you have no hope. In this instance, this bill gives tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, or millions even, the hope that they can avail themselves of medication that might prolong their life or maybe even be a cure. These people who have advocated are fighters.

I hear about patient groups who oppose this, yet the States, our employers, they approve this. Every day, Laura McLinn, the mother of Jordan McLinn, receives countless emails from people similarly situated, saying: We need to pass the Right to Try Act. I need that right to try.

I am told: Oh, well, we take care of 1,500 a year.

Mr. Speaker, 1,500 a year, when there are literally tens of thousands of people who need their opportunity.

We are not mandating even. We are providing an opportunity. We are providing an option both for the patient and even the pharmaceutical company.

Now, I heard in the opening statement from my friend across the aisle that we are not compelling them to do it.

Would he feel more comfortable if we compelled pharmaceutical companies to provide those potential lifesaving medications?

We need to recognize that this bill is not for us in this Chamber. It is for Matt Bellina, Jordan McLinn, and Laura McLinn. It is for those who are similarly situated.

We have waited long enough. Let's get this done.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5247 because it actually creates a dangerous back door around the Food and Drug Administration approval process and it ignores that there is a safe pathway for terminally ill patients to get the treatment that they need.

This bill denies patients what they really need, which is safe and effective treatments.

This bill strips away important safeguards in the name of helping patients. It is not patient friendly. That is why 78 patients and doctor groups are all opposed to this legislation, like the American Cancer Society, the National Brain Tumor Society, the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society, and the Vietnam Veterans of America.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this 5-page list of the opposing groups.

GROUPS OPPOSED TO RIGHT TO TRY LEGISLATION,

ADNP Kids Research Foundation, AIDS Action Baltimore, Alliance for Aging Research, Alliance for Regenerative Medicine, American Academy of Neurology, American Association of Justice, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, American Lung Association, American Society of Clinical Oncology, American Syringomyelia and Chiari Alliance Project, Amyloidosis Support Groups, Association for Creatine Deficiencies, Benign Essential Blepharospasm Research Foundation, Biomarin, Bonnie J. Addario Lung Cancer Foundation, Breast Cancer Action, Bridge the Gap—SYNGAP Education and Research Foundation, CancerCare, Cancer Prevention and Treatment Fund, Charlotte and Gwendyth Gray Foundation to Cure Batten Disease, Children's Cause for Cancer Advocacy, Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation, Congenital Hyperinsulinism International, CurePSP.

Cutaneous Lymphoma Foundation, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Defeat MSA, The Desmoid Tumor Research Foundation, The Disability Rights Legal Center, Dupl5q Alliance, Dysautonomia Foundation, Equal Access for Rare Disorders, Fight Colorectal Cancer, FORCE: Facing Our Risk of Cancer Empowered, Former FDA Commissioner Margaret Hamburg, Former FDA Commissioner Robert Califf, Friedreich's Ataxia Research Alliance (FARA), Friends of Cancer Research, Georgia State University College of Law, The Global Foundation for Peroxisomal Disorders, Glut1 Deficiency Foundation, The Guthy-Jackson Charitable Foundation, Hemophilia Federation of America, Hematology/Oncology Pharmacy Association, HLRC Family Alliance, Hope for Hypothalamic Hamartomas, Hyper IgM Foundation, Inc., International Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva (FOP) Association, International Myeloma Foundation.

International Pemphigus and Pemphigoid Foundation, International Society for Stem Cell Research, International Waldenstrom's Macroglobulinemia Foundation (IWMMF), The Isaac Foundation, Jack McGovern Coats' Disease Foundation, The LAM Foundation, The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Lymphoma Research Foundation, Li-Fraumeni Syndrome Association (LFS Association / LFS), LUNGevity Foundation, Max Cure Foundation, M-CM Network, Mattie Miracle Cancer Foundation, MitoAction, MLD Foundation, Moebius Syndrome Foundation, The MSA Awareness

Shoe, Mucopolidosis Type IV Foundation, The Myelin Project, Myotonic Dystrophy Foundation, National Brain Tumor Society, National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship, National Comprehensive Cancer Network, National Consumers League, National Health Council.

National MPS Society, National Niemann-Pick Disease Foundation, National Organization for Rare Disorders (NORD), National Patient Advocate Foundation, National Physicians Alliance, National PKU Alliance, National PKU News, National Women's Health Network, Neurofibromatosis Northeast, NYU Langone Health, Operation ASHA, Our Bodies Ourselves, PRP Alliance, Inc., Prevent Cancer Foundation, Public Citizen, Rare and Undiagnosed Network (RUN), Sarcoma Foundation of America, Scleroderma Foundation, The Snyder-Robinson Foundation, Sofia Sees Hope, SSADH Association, Susan G. Komen, TargetCancer Foundation, Treatment Action Group, The Turner Syndrome Society.

TMJA (Temporomandibular Joint Disorders patient organization), United Leukodystrophy Foundation, United Mitochondrial Disease Foundation (UMDF), University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Veterans Health Council, Vietnam Veterans of America, VHL Alliance, Washington Advocates for Patient Safety, Woody Matters, Worldwide Syringomyelia & Chiari Task Force, Yale School of Public Health.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it opens the door for bad actors to take advantage of terminally ill patients. It is the FDA's job to ensure that drugs are safe and effective. We can't trust manufacturers to act as a gatekeeper.

The important thing to know is there is already a safe process for terminally ill patients to access experimental treatments. Under the Expanded Access Program, 99 percent of applications are approved, and they are done in a speedy way.

This process is not merely a rubber stamp. The FDA plays a vital role in ensuring these experimental treatments are safe.

Even more important, in 19 States that have passed right-to-try laws, patients using an investigational drug can lose their hospice care; and in 6 States, they can be denied home healthcare. These are the very people who depend on hospice and home care, and they could lose those services.

This is not a humane, patient-centered bill for people who are facing death. It is just a dangerous pathway for bad actors to exist.

Let's go with the positive ability right now that we have. Ninety-nine percent of those desperate people looking for hope will get it from the Food and Drug Administration. So I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5247.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, when Illinois took this up, they approved it 169-1 in their assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WALDEN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard people say that this bill gives folks a false hope. There is no false hope.

They know it is a Hail Mary pass. They know it is unlikely to succeed, but they are willing to make the decision and the choice to take that chance.

I have heard that patients will be at risk, that they lose their safeguards. They have received a terminal diagnosis. They know they are at risk. They don't care about safeguards. They want to fight for life. They know they have that terminal disease or diagnosis and they may lose a few weeks, as we heard from my colleague, but they may gain years, and they are willing to take that risk.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, if I had a terminal diagnosis, I would even consider injecting monkey urine if I thought it would give me a few more months or a few more years with my children, who are currently 18, 12, and 10. Others may choose not to try something. They may not want the right to try. They may not want to try the Hail Mary pass, but they should have the choice. They should have the right to try.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I have great concerns that H.R. 5247 would expose our most vulnerable and desperate patients to unnecessary risk.

Supporters of this legislation have argued that those patients who are suffering from a terminal illness deserve the right to take their health and treatment into their own hands, as they are faced without any other treatment options. Some have even asked: What risk could be worse than the risk of death?

As Arthur Caplan, a bioethicist from NYU, has pointed out: "There are things worse than death; being made to die faster, being made to die more miserably."

These are all very real scenarios that patients could be exposed to under the misleading and ill-conceived right-to-try pathway.

As I stated before, while the FDA approved 99 percent of the requests it received, of those, they revised 11 percent in order to protect patients. If this bill becomes law, the FDA no longer will have the opportunity to make those revisions and to protect vulnerable patients.

We must protect patients from bad actors or from dangerous treatments that might make their lives worse. That is why more than 100 organizations have written in opposition to this legislation, including 83 patient organizations like the National Organization for Rare Disorders, the Friends of Cancer Research, the American Cancer Society, Cancer Action Network.

In a letter to the Speaker and the Democratic leader, the patient organizations noted that "the alternative pathway in the latest version of the legislation is still less safe for our pa-

tients than the current expanded access process" that the FDA uses.

Dr. Ellen Sigal, the chair and founder of Friends of Cancer Research, said: "In its current form, the proposed legislation does nothing for patients other than provide false hope by allowing them to request a drug with no evidence of efficacy they may never receive and, should they receive it, may do more harm than good."

So I think we should all be concerned about protecting patients. Rather than rushing this bill through today, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and to come back to the table to find a solution that will streamline Expanded Access Programs while protecting patients from unnecessary harm.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the chair of our Health Subcommittee. Texas voted unanimously for the Right to Try Act.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, just a little over a month ago, President Trump stood here at this podium behind me and told us: "People who are terminally ill should not have to go from country to country to seek a cure."

Along with President Trump, I want to give patients a chance right here at home.

A little over a year ago, this House passed the 21st Century Cures Act, made unprecedented acceleration of discoveries. Thanks to our researchers and our academic institutions, and those working in the pharmaceutical and medical device companies, Americans have access to more and more innovative treatments. However, I continue to hear from patients with serious life-threatening conditions, including my constituents in north Texas, who are frustrated with what they see as regulatory barriers from trying and experimenting with new therapies when everything else has failed.

When potentially lifesaving treatments exist but remain unavailable to patients, we have an opportunity to move past what has long been a dilemma towards delivering a hopeful message.

Since 2014, 38 States, including Texas, have passed a version of right-to-try laws.

I am pleased that the House of Representatives is considering right-to-try legislation that gives patients a chance at life by improving access to experimental treatments.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people deserve thanks for getting this bill to us today, but, in particular, I want to thank the President of the United States, President Trump, and Vice President PENCE for their leadership in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Members to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of reasons to oppose this bill today, and I have given a number of them, but the primary reason being the need to continue protecting patients by ensuring that the FDA remains a part of the process.

While we are speaking about process, I have to also oppose this legislation based on the inappropriate way the Republican majority is bringing this bill to the floor. Bills considered under suspension have traditionally gone through the committee process with overwhelming bipartisan support, and neither of those things is the case with this bill.

It was introduced today.

Does the majority really believe they are giving Members the appropriate time to view this bill when it was introduced at 2 p.m.?

Patient access and patient safety should be shared goals among Democrats and Republicans, goals that could be achieved if this legislation was not being rushed to the floor under an arbitrary deadline.

Legislation such as this, that carries such great risk of patient harm, should be considered carefully, with attention paid to the unintended consequences that could follow.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this unnecessary and risky legislation, and to return to the regular order of the committee to consider legislation that would protect both patients from harm and the FDA from the weakening of the agency's role in our drug approval process.

We should not be voting on a bill of this consequence that was introduced this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Mr. WALDEN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a distinguished member of our committee and a pharmacist by training and trade.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Right to Try Act because this legislation will improve access to potentially lifesaving treatments for patients with terminal diseases or conditions.

Currently, patients can only receive drugs that are undergoing FDA review through clinical trials, through compassionate use, or expanding access. They access these unapproved treatments exclusively through the FDA but not through the drug sponsor. This critical legislation would establish informed consent for patients to access unapproved drugs that could save their lives.

This bill still guards patients from manufacturers misbranding or mislabeling drugs and specifies that

any unapproved drug used in the alternative pathway must have an active application and is not the subject of a clinical hold.

I thank my good friend Chairman BURGESS and the rest of my colleagues on the committee for moving this legislation forward and working with the administration and stakeholders on all sides of these issues. This is a great step forward towards ensuring our patients get to take advantage of the incredible pharmaceutical therapies that our manufacturers are known for.

I applaud the Energy and Commerce Committee for their work in moving this legislation forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman how many speakers he has left.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, we have two, I believe, left.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk about two other aspects of this bill that I haven't so far. One is the fact that States have actually implemented right-to-try laws that have done little to expand access to investigational treatment. Although 17 States and the District of Columbia have enacted right-to-try laws, there is no evidence that anyone has obtained an investigational treatment via these laws that couldn't have been obtained through FDA's expanded access program.

Right-to-try laws do not compel companies to provide patients access to investigational treatments. Therefore, under these State laws, patients still do not have a right to try, only the right to request the treatment from the company. State right-to-try laws do not address the fundamental barriers of cost and accompanying restrictions.

Neither the FDA nor States require insurers or pharmaceutical companies to cover the cost or reduce the cost of these expensive treatments. Instead, these laws put patients at a higher risk by prohibiting or weakening FDA oversight of investigational treatments.

With regard to clinical trials, the legislation could also expose patients to unnecessary risk by allowing access to investigational drugs that have only completed a phase I clinical trial. Phase I trials are extremely small trials, in the range of 20 to 80 patients, and are used primarily to determine toxicity. They do not determine effectiveness or potential side effects. Patients could suffer from harmful side effects or delay enrolling in a clinical trial program for a treatment that actually has evidence of efficacy for their disease or condition.

Finally, the bill would weaken the FDA's ability to oversee the adverse events or other clinical outcomes from the use of investigational drugs and provide broad liability protections for

manufacturers, leaving patients with no recourse in the case of an adverse effect.

I just wanted to mention those.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Right to Try Act.

When those we hold dearest are diagnosed as terminally ill, the last thing we want to hear is that all treatment options have been exhausted. This is why I have been a longtime supporter of the Right to Try Act. Currently, 38 States have already passed right-to-try legislation to assist vulnerable patients, including my home State of Georgia.

By allowing terminally ill patients the access to unapproved drugs and therapies, we are giving them a fighting chance for their God-given right to life. Although these drugs cannot guarantee a road to recovery, they can provide a better alternative in many hopeless situations and pave the way for more scientific breakthroughs.

Congress should keep breaking down regulatory barriers. Like the bill's name says, patients have a right to try. All Americans should have the right to choose.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Energy and Commerce Committee for passing this important legislation out of committee, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill on the House floor.

How in the world could anyone oppose the right to choose life?

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains for each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The gentleman from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude, if I could, in opposition to this bill by quoting some of the former FDA Commissioners.

This is from Dr. Margaret Hamburg, who said:

I am deeply concerned by the draft legislation being considered to remove the FDA from the proposals around right to try. Excluding the FDA will not benefit those patients and would be a mistake. There is no need to create a new potentially dangerous paradigm by passing this legislation which does not address the real issues at hand and could have unintended negative consequences, leading to a possible impediment of the development and approval of safe and effective therapies.

And then, finally, is the former FDA Principal Deputy Commissioner, Joshua Sharfstein, who said:

FDA review allows doctors and patients to tell the difference between a medication that

works and one that does not. Evidence also orients the pharmaceutical market towards developing products that produce meaningful benefits for patients instead of just hope. Undermining FDA review by giving a right to patients to try anything at any time will leave more patients in desperate situations with fewer options and less understanding of what could really make a difference.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would urge opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when the Energy and Commerce Committee took up this issue in its broadest form, we heard from the FDA Commissioner, we heard from patients, we heard from family members, and what we heard was that there are barriers in States that preclude these State laws from working.

That is what the Government Accountability Office told us. They identified two issues—liability and use of outcomes—as the two barriers as to why these laws passed in 38, soon to be 39, States. And in many cases—most cases, I would say—these laws have passed unanimously, with Republicans and Democrats back home supporting them, including in my own State. I think it was unanimous in both the house and the senate, all controlled by Democrats, in Oregon.

We have listened to our constituents; we have observed what has happened in our States—great laboratories—and we are acting here today to allow those who have been given this wretched, wretched prescription that their life is about to end to have a chance and a choice. That is what we are doing today. We are overcoming the barriers that exist at the State level. We are doing it in a reasonable and thoughtful way that protects patient safety and creates this new alternative pathway for them.

This is important legislation. It is not often in this body we get this opportunity to make this kind of a change and provide chance and hope for those who see their loved ones dying before their eyes.

I met with Jordan McLinn and his mother, Laura, earlier today. They have been incredible advocates for this cause. And they had just come from a meeting with Vice President PENCE, who, with the President, has been an extraordinary supporter of this effort.

From his Bible, Jordan showed me the Parable of the Lost Sheep, which is one of his favorites. It is a parable he had shared with the Vice President.

That Parable of the Lost Sheep tells us that not a single sheep should be lost, that the shepherd cares about them all. That same sentiment is what brings us here to right to try today.

Every opportunity to save a life matters, and every patient deserves that right to try. That is the legislation before us today, Mr. Speaker. It is well

conceived, it is well thought out, and it will make a difference in saving lives.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” and pass this legislation and give people a right to try.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5247.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4545, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION FAIRNESS AND REFORM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1116, TAKING ACCOUNT OF INSTITUTIONS WITH LOW OPERATION RISK ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4263, REGULATION AT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-595) on the resolution (H. Res. 773) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4545) to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1116) to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4263) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE PETE AGUILAR, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Teresa Valdez, District Director, the Honorable PETE AGUILAR, Member of Congress:

Washington, DC, March 1, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules

of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena for documents and a separate subpoena for testimony, issued by the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

TERESA VALDEZ,
District Director,
Congressman Pete Aguilar.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 13, 2018, at 9:53 a.m.:

That the Secretary of the Senate request the House to return the official papers to the Senate H.R. 1207.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REQUESTING RETURN OF H.R. 1207, TILDEN VETERANS POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged message from the Senate:

In the Senate of the United States, March 12, 2018.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 1207) entitled “An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, as the ‘Tilden Veterans Post Office’.”

Attest:

JULIE E. ADAMS,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5247, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 4465, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK
MONGIELLO, JORDAN McLINN,
AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT
TO TRY ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 259, nays 140, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—259

Abraham	Curtis	Jenkins (WV)
Aderholt	Davidson	Johnson (LA)
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)
Amash	Delaney	Johnson, Sam
Amodei	Denham	Jones
Arrington	Dent	Jordan
Babin	DesJarlais	Joyce (OH)
Bacon	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Banks (IN)	Donovan	Kelly (MS)
Barletta	Duffy	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Kind
Barragán	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Barton	Dunn	King (NY)
Bergman	Emmer	Kinzinger
Biggs	Estes (KS)	Knight
Bilirakis	Evans	Kustoff (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Farenthold	Labrador
Bishop (MI)	Faso	LaHood
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	LaMalfa
Black	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Lance
Blum	Flores	Larson (CT)
Bost	Fortenberry	Latta
Brady (TX)	Fox	Lawson (FL)
Brat	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (MN)
Bridenstine	Gaetz	LoBiondo
Brooks (AL)	Gallagher	Loeb
Brooks (IN)	Garrett	Lofgren
Brown (MD)	Gianforte	Long
Buchanan	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Buck	Gohmert	Love
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Lucas
Budd	Gosar	Lujan Grisham,
Burgess	Gottheimer	M.
Byrne	Gowdy	MacArthur
Calvert	Granger	Maloney, Sean
Carbajal	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	Marino
Carter (TX)	Graves (MO)	Marshall
Chabot	Griffith	Masie
Cheney	Grothman	Mast
Coffman	Guthrie	McCarthy
Cohen	Hanabusa	McCauley
Cole	Handel	McClintock
Collins (GA)	Harper	McHenry
Collins (NY)	Harris	McKinley
Comer	Hartzler	McMorris
Comstock	Hensarling	Rodgers
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	McSally
Cook	Hice, Jody B.	Meadows
Cooper	Higgins (LA)	Messer
Correa	Hill	Mitchell
Costa	Himes	Moolenaar
Costello (PA)	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Cramer	Hollingsworth	Mullin
Crawford	Hudson	Newhouse
Crist	Huizenga	Noem
Cuellar	Hultgren	Norman
Culberson	Hurd	Nunes
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	O'Halleran

O'Rourke	Ross	Tipton
Olson	Rothfus	Trott
Palazzo	Rouzer	Turner
Palmer	Royce (CA)	Upton
Pearce	Russell	Valadao
Perlmutter	Rutherford	Veasey
Perry	Sanford	Wagner
Peterson	Scalise	Walberg
Pittenger	Schweikert	Walden
Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Walker
Poliquin	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Polis	Sessions	Walters, Mimi
Posey	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Ratcliffe	Shuster	Webster (FL)
Reichert	Sinema	Wenstrup
Renacci	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Rice (SC)	Smith (NE)	Williams
Richmond	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Roby	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Roe (TN)	Smucker	Womack
Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Woodall
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Yoder
Rokita	Stivers	Yoho
Rooney, Francis	Suozzi	Young (AK)
Rooney, Thomas	Taylor	Young (IA)
J.	Tenney	Zeldin
Rosen	Thompson (PA)	
Roskam	Thornberry	

NAYS—140

Adams	Gomez	Nolan
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Bass	Green, Al	Panetta
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Bera	Grijalva	Paulsen
Beyer	Hastings	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck	Pelosi
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Bonamici	Hoyer	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Huffman	Pocan
F.	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Jayapal	Quigley
Bustos	Jeffries	Raskin
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Sánchez
Castro (TX)	Kihuen	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kilmer	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Clarke (NY)	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Lawrence	Serrano
Clyburn	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Levin	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Sires
DeGette	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lowe	Soto
DeBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Demings	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Takano
Deutsch	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McEachin	Titus
Ellison	McGovern	Tonko
Engel	McNerney	Torres
Eshoo	Meehan	Torres
Españillat	Meeks	Vela
Esty (CT)	Meng	Visclosky
Foster	Moore	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Wasserman
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Gabbard	Nader	Waters, Maxine
Gallego	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Neal	Welch

NOT VOTING—31

Brady (PA)	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Capuano	Keating	Rush
Crowley	Kennedy	Scott, David
Cummings	Langevin	Simpson
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
DeFazio	Luetkemeyer	Tsongas
DeSantis	Lynch	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Norcross	Velazquez
F.	Reed	Wilson (FL)
Gutiérrez	Rice (NY)	Yarmuth
Hunter	Rohrabacher	

□ 1855

Messrs. BERA, McEACHIN, Mses.
CLARK of Massachusetts, EDDIE BER-

NICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr.
GALLEGO, Ms. BASS, Messrs.
CLEAVER, RASKIN, and SCHRADER
changed their vote from “yea” to
“nay.”

Messrs. BROWN of Maryland, RICH-
MOND, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRIS-
HAM of New Mexico, Messrs. COHEN
and DELANEY changed their vote from
“nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the af-
firmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

ENDANGERED FISH RECOVERY PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-
finished business is the vote on the mo-
tion to suspend the rules and pass the
bill (H.R. 4465) to maintain annual base
funding for the Upper Colorado and San
Juan fish recovery programs through
fiscal year 2023, to require a report on
the implementation of those programs,
and for other purposes, on which the
yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the motion offered by
the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS)
that the House suspend the rules and
pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—yeas 392, nays 6,
not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—392

Abraham	Budd	Culberson
Adams	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Aderholt	Bustos	Curtis
Aguilar	Butterfield	Davidson
Amodei	Byrne	Davis (CA)
Arrington	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Babin	Carbajal	DeGette
Bacon	Cárdenas	Delaney
Banks (IN)	Carson (IN)	DeLauro
Barletta	Carter (GA)	DeBene
Barr	Carter (TX)	Demings
Barragán	Cartwright	Denham
Barton	Castor (FL)	Dent
Bass	Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Beatty	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bera	Cheney	Deutch
Bergman	Chu, Judy	Diaz-Balart
Beyer	Cicilline	Dingell
Biggs	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Bilirakis	Clarke (NY)	Donovan
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Duffy
Bishop (MI)	Cleaver	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Clyburn	Duncan (TN)
Black	Coffman	Dunn
Blackburn	Cohen	Ellison
Blum	Cole	Emmer
Blumenauer	Collins (GA)	Engel
Blunt Rochester	Collins (NY)	Eshoo
Bonamici	Comer	Españillat
Bost	Comstock	Estes (KS)
Boyle, Brendan	Conaway	Esty (CT)
F.	Connolly	Evans
Brady (TX)	Cook	Farenthold
Brat	Cooper	Faso
Bridenstine	Correa	Ferguson
Brooks (AL)	Costa	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Costello (PA)	Fleischmann
Brown (MD)	Courtney	Flores
Brownley (CA)	Cramer	Fortenberry
Buchanan	Crawford	Foster
Buck	Crist	Fox
Bucshon	Cuellar	Frankel (FL)

Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gotthelmer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin

Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.

Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—32

Brady (PA)
Capuano
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeSantis
Doyle, Michael
F.
Gutiérrez
Hunter
Issa
Keating
Kennedy
Langevin
Lieu, Ted
Lowenthal
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Marchant
Norcross
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Simpson
Slaughter
Tsongas
Vargas
Velázquez
Wilson (FL)
Yarmut

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1903

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE THREE VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE AT THE VETERANS HOME OF CALIFORNIA-YOUNTVILLE

(Mr. THOMPSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a very sad and heavy heart to ask that we stand for a moment of silence for three of my constituents who were murdered in another senseless act of gun violence, three women at the California Veterans Home in Napa Valley, California, Yountville—a veterans home, the largest in the country, serving the most veterans in the country.

This was a particular program designed to help Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who were coming home with serious problems.

These three women got up every morning, they put on their clothes, they kissed their families good-bye, they walked out the door to do one thing and one thing only, and that was to help troubled veterans.

And on Friday, they were murdered. They were held hostage and gunned down in cold-blooded murder. One more senseless act of gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, I would like this body to recognize a moment of silence for Christine Loeber, the executive director of The Pathway Home program at the California Veterans Home in Yountville; Dr. Jennifer Golick, the clinical director and staff psychologist; and Jennifer Gonzales, the clinical psychologist with the San Francisco Department of Veterans Affairs, who was on assignment at The Pathway Home and was also pregnant.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 50 AND H.R. 60

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my

name as cosponsor on H.J. Res. 50 and H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

THE SAVANNAH HOPE STILLBIRTH CHILD TAX CREDIT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the author of the Savannah Hope Stillbirth Child Tax Credit Act, which would allow a one-time refundable tax credit after the stillbirth in a family, the same amount that is given for the existing child tax credit.

The bill is named after Savannah Schumacher, a baby that Steve and Jill Schumacher from Eden Prairie, Minnesota, lost at 33 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, families of stillborn children not only face medical expenses that aren't always covered by insurance, but they face burial, cremation, and grief counseling costs that add up to be very significant expenses.

Minnesota is among the States that have already enacted these credits at the State level. And while a tax credit can't make up for the loss of a child, it does acknowledge that child's existence, even though he or she passed away before birth, and it will hopefully help support grieving families that have gone through the unthinkable.

CONGRATULATING IMPACT CHRISTIAN TV NETWORK

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the country's only African-American owned Christian television network, the IMPACT Christian TV network.

Over the weekend, at Metropolitan Baptist Church in Newark, New Jersey, I joined IMPACT for the celebration of their launch onto the Altice family of programming. The launch is a big step for Altice and people across the Nation.

The partnership between IMPACT and Altice means that the country's only African-American owned and operated Christian television network will now reach more than 85 million homes around the world.

As we have seen with the "Oscars So Black" movement and spotlight on inequality in film and television, people across the country are demanding increased diversity in programming.

IMPACT's launch on Altice is another step in the right direction. It is a historic pairing that will bring diversity and ministry to millions of homes.

I would like to point out that, in my district, the 10th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey, I want

NAYS—6

Allen
Amash
Massie
McClintock

Rice (SC)
Sanford

to commend two local heroes for helping move this effort forward.

I want to commend Reverend Dr. David Jefferson of Metropolitan Baptist Church and the IMPACT team, and Marilyn Davis and the Altice team for what they did to make this launch happen.

THE TOMPKINS FALCONS ARE WINNERS

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1898, the Katy school district opened. In those 120 years, no Katy team ever played in the Texas Men's Basketball Championship.

The Tompkins Falcons have only been around for 5 years. Yet, 4 days ago, those 5-year-old Falcons led Katy to its first Texas 6A finals. They came up 1.1 seconds short, losing by 2 points in overtime.

There is an old saying in Texas: You see the true character, the true heart of a team, in defeat, not victory. That means the Tompkins Falcons have the biggest hearts in Texas.

The best example is the words of the Falcons star senior Jamal Bieniemy: "We still have life after basketball. We still have to wake up. We still have to breathe and live for each other."

I will close with words from Falcons head coach Bobby Sanders: "It was gratifying we got this far. I am proud of them."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 850,000 Texans in Texas 22, I want to say: Darn straight, coach. Darn straight.

□ 1915

AUSTIN BOMBINGS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as the senior member on the Judiciary Committee, I remember dealing with church bombings some few years ago. So I rise today to acknowledge my colleagues in Austin and to express my sympathy for the bombing deaths that occurred with a nondescript package being left at the homes of African Americans and a Hispanic.

I believe action is needed now, and I certainly thank law enforcement for engaging ATF and the FBI. But I think it was important that when the first bombing occurred, notice generally should have been made about nondescript packages at the homes of individuals.

We know the facts are not all in. The investigation is ongoing. However, the Federal Government can be of help to local law enforcement that I know is working hard. We want to be there for

them. But it is important to take note, and I want my constituents to be aware, that nondescript packages, until this dastardly individual is found, please call the police in whatever jurisdiction you are in in the State of Texas, and let's hope that we can find this person as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, my deepest sympathy and prayers are with those who already lost their life.

LEGAL IMMIGRATION

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to commend and welcome President Trump to California, where, amongst other things, he is looking at the technology with which to control our borders, an obligation we have as a State, but more so as a country whose jurisdiction it is.

We welcome legal immigration to our State and to our country, not illegal immigration or the other euphemisms that are used, undocumented immigrants, what have you.

Indeed, if we don't have borders, we don't really have a nation. So let's get cracking on controlling our borders and having a legal immigration process. It is better for the immigrants, it is better for the security of our Nation, and it is better for its people. That is all it is about. It is really that simple.

EXPERIMENTAL DRUGS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the Right to Try Act.

It sounds compassionate, but it only offers fake hope. An FDA process already exists to allow terminally ill patients to try experimental drugs at no charge. But the difference is that the proposal that we just voted on strips consumer protections and charges patients.

The FDA program receives about 1,000 requests each year and responds in a few days, often recommending changes to enhance safety for the patient. Removing the FDA from the approval process does not add value and could instead be detrimental.

The bill would open up access to drugs after phase I trials, which are very small and, more often than not, unsuccessful. This bill allows pharmaceutical companies to profit off of experimental drugs that could ruin the quality of life that is left.

This bill creates the wrong incentives and pushes care for the terminally ill in the wrong direction, which is why I join patient and consumer advocates in their strong opposition to this bill.

This was under suspension and, therefore, did not pass. I remain opposed to the bill.

FIRST FEMALE FIREFIGHTER

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding member of my community, Mary View from Ilion, New York. Mary recently made history by becoming the first female firefighter in the Village of Ilion.

Mary was raised in a family of firefighters. Her father, Ed View III, is currently the deputy chief of the Herkimer Fire Department; and her grandfather, Ed View II, also served in the Herkimer Fire Department and is now happily retired.

As a young girl, she would spend a lot of time at the fire station. She remembers being in the car with her father when he would receive emergency calls, and she would be happy to join along with him to respond.

Serving in the fire department is a bit of a legacy, as we described, for the View family. Mary always thought she would grow up to become a firefighter, and despite a brief time thinking she was going to take up a career in criminal justice, the urge to become a firefighter was irresistible, and Mary ended up doing just that.

Mary is not only making history, but also living her lifelong dream. She hopes to be an inspiration to all women who want to pursue the same career in the fire service.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mary View on making history as the first woman firefighter in the Village of Ilion. She is part of the next generation of women leaders, and I know she will do an amazing job.

REMEMBERING OFFICER GREGORY JONATHAN CASILLAS

(Mrs. TORRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I report to you an incident that occurred the evening of March 9.

Officers of the Pomona Police Department were involved in a short pursuit that resulted in a 15-hour-long standoff. At the onset of that standoff, Officer Gregory Jonathan Casillas was killed in the line of duty.

Officer Casillas was at the beginning of his career in law enforcement. He was a dedicated public servant. He was young, energetic, and honest. He never lost hope or sight of his dreams.

Officer Casillas joined the Pomona Police Department in December of 2014, working his way up as a records specialist, jailer, recruit, to his graduation in 2017 from the San Bernardino

County Sheriff's Academy Class No. 207. He died doing what he loved: serving our community.

He is survived by his wife and his 5-month-old and 4-year-old sons.

Officer Casillas, your memory and spirit will live on. May you rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANGIE GOMEZ

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Angie Gomez. Angie visited Las Vegas on October 1 for the Route 91 music festival.

Angie is described by her friends as a natural-born caregiver. It was only natural for her to want to get certified as a nursing assistant, so she did. Outside of caring for others, she loved theater and choir, participating in both throughout middle school and high school.

Angie loved nothing more than to spend time with her two nieces, whom she adored. Friends and family remember her as a team player who wasn't afraid of being herself. She was fun-loving, sweet, and had a great sense of humor.

I would like to extend my condolences to Angie's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a very important day. Students in my district are walking out of school because they expect their leaders to do something about this problem of gun violence. For years, this body sadly has failed to act; and because we failed to act, our young people are acting tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, 2,808 people have died in 2018 already because of this scourge of gun violence.

Why isn't that enough for us to act?

It is only March, and already we have almost 3,000 people dead. I guess that is not a surprise because at least 15,549 people died from gun violence in 2017 last year.

Isn't that enough?

We know why this is going on: powerful commercial interests in Washington—gun manufacturers led by their lawyer, I guess the NRA—are preventing basic, commonsense approaches to safety.

You can't even study it. The Centers for Disease Control is prohibited from studying gun violence. We don't have enough resources to really make a true

database so that you can find the people who are, in fact, legally prohibited from getting guns, so they sneak through the holes. There are many other problems.

Now is the time, Mr. Speaker. We have to act with those young people who are walking out tomorrow.

NATIONAL K-9 VETERANS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, in my previous life, before Congress—I am a veterinarian in the practice for 30 years—I have had the pleasure of taking care of all of God's creatures. It has been a privilege, a pleasure, and an honor.

So much is going on in Washington and the world, and we hear a lot of bad things going on, so tonight we are going to do a Special Order honoring K-9 Veterans Day, March 13. This evening, my colleagues and I would like to take a moment and pay tribute to the thousands of working dogs that serve our Nation.

They serve in the military. They serve in the fire department, the police department, and the Drug Enforcement Agency. They serve in your neighbor's house next door to alert people of intruders, maybe a fire, or finding a lost child. There is a group of people who do search and rescue only on a volunteer basis.

These unsung heroes, our K-9s, serve our Nation in many ways. Their contributions to our neighborhoods, communities, towns, cities, States, and even Nation cannot be overstated.

The biggest thank-you goes out to all of these K-9s serving our Nation's military and working to keep the homeland safe both here and abroad, as well as our local law enforcement K-9s. Tonight we honor you.

Over the past few months, I have had the honor of getting to know the working K-9s and their handlers that serve Florida's Third Congressional District. After great visits, demonstrations, discussions—and I even had the experience yesterday with our team in our district; I experienced the subdued tactics of these dogs, wearing protective gear, of course—I am convinced more than ever that these amazing animals and their handlers need support and recognition for the incredible work that they do.

It is not just in north central Florida and northeast Florida. You can find these selfless heroes in all districts all across our great country. Whether it is checking the stadiums top to bottom, which, incidentally, yesterday, when we got to talking to the different sheriff's organizations, they said, at every Gator game at the University of Florida, the dogs check the entire stadium.

For those who have been to Gator Nation and seen our stadium there, it is a huge stadium, as all are, and they check it before every game, every basketball game, every big venue, and these dogs are out there working to keep Americans safe. Whether it is checking, as I said, the stadiums top to bottom for explosives or narcotics prior to big sporting events or helping find a missing person or being there at just the right moment when an officer is in need of backup, these K-9s deserve to have their stories heard tonight.

Tonight we celebrate National K-9 Veterans Day. My colleagues and I intend to do just that. While we celebrate their services tonight, I want to encourage all Members to do what they can to support these K-9s, their handlers, and the departments they represent.

National K-9 Veterans Day began in World War I, when the most famous K-9, Sergeant Stubby, shined a spotlight on the incredible working dogs and the value they bring to our national service. Brigadier General SCOTT PERRY is going to talk about Stubby more tonight, so I will leave that for him.

□ 1930

In Vietnam, nearly 4,000 dogs actively served, and in Iraq, these dogs were critical in sniffing out deadly IEDs. Since then, these dogs have served in our military and law enforcement, working hard to keep Americans safe. We owe not just today to these K-9s, but a thanks every day for their service.

To begin tonight, I would recognize the K-9 teams that serve in my home district and will share many of their stories here tonight. However, I want to start with one of my favorites from the Alachua County Sheriff's Office.

In December 2017, in the far northern reaches of rural Alachua County, a previous victim of domestic violence and battery was walking out to meet detectives when she heard the voice of her assailant calling to her from the darkness. Terrified, she ran back inside, called 911, and deputies responded in an effort to catch the suspect with active warrants that included kidnapping and sexual assault.

Deputy Sheriff Chris Drake and K-9 Rous arrived, knowing full well that the suspect had not only stolen the victim's car with a gun inside earlier, but dug a hole and buried himself to elude a helicopter searchlight and a floor camera the night before. With that information, Chris and his dog, Rous, began to track the suspect.

Lifting K-9 Rous over some fences and cutting their way through others, Deputy Drake and others continued following the suspect's scent until, as Drake's report reads: "Rous . . . still smelling human odor . . . ears forward, and staring intently . . . identified something lying in the water . . . the

man stood up from the water . . . turned north into the woods and disappeared.”

Continuing their track, K-9 Rous and Deputy Drake again found the suspect hiding in a separate swamp, with only his back exposed. That is not a good thing with a catch dog.

When challenged, the felon fled again, and K-9 Rous was released to catch him. K-9 Rous ran into the water, swam briefly, and apprehended the suspect on the arm, enduring punches to the head and holding on until deputies could arrive and assist, placing the suspect in handcuffs for a trip to the hospital and then jail.

These deputies and their K-9 partners are on the road every day, working 12-hour shifts, 24 hours a day, supporting every local law enforcement patrol task and providing mutual aid to our neighboring jurisdictions when called upon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM), another veterinarian.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today is National K-9 Veterans Day. As a member of the Veterinarian Caucus, I rise to commemorate the service of our four-legged friends who assist our military and police force in keeping our Nation and our communities safe.

Though the War Dogs program, or K-9 Corps as it is commonly known, was first established during World War II, dogs have been assisting our soldiers since pit bulls were used for security during the Civil War.

On March 13, 1942, the K-9 Corps was officially born and became immediately effective. Dogs were used in the Pacific theater, where it has been said that the Japanese never ambushed or made a surprise attack on a patrol led by one of these dogs. It is estimated that the Army employed 1,500 dogs in the Korean war and 4,000 dogs during the Vietnam war.

With noses 100,000 times as sensitive as humans, our soldiers continue to use them today to sniff for bombs in places like Iraq and Afghanistan. One named Cairo was even used to sniff for bombs around Osama bin Laden's compound during the raid to take him down.

Just like soldiers, these dogs go through rigorous training to serve our Nation. Their courage, loyalty, and acumen have saved countless lives. We appreciate their service and the service of their trainers and the soldiers who use them on the battlefield.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, next I yield to the gentleman from my Pennsylvania, Brigadier General SCOTT PERRY, my good friend.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I also want to join my friends in honoring National K-9 Veterans Day.

Every March 13, we commemorate the United States Army's first K-9 Corps training program. While this program began in 1942, the history of our

“best friend” engaging in training and combat with us extends well beyond that date.

Today, we commemorate the iconic Sergeant Stubby. If you don't know about Stubby, Sergeant Stubby was a brindle bull terrier mutt from New Haven, Connecticut. Stubby was adopted by U.S. Army Private Robert Conroy, who stowed him away on a ship bound for France in the First World War, where his service was integral to saving American lives. Stubby was allowed to join our soldiers on the front lines after he was discovered by Private Conroy's commanding officer. Because Stubby rendered a salute to the commander, he was allowed to stay.

While on the front, he was once injured during a gas strike and developed a unique sensitivity to the smell of chemical weapons used at that time. His sensitivity was used to alert sleeping troops to another gas attack. He rescued them on numerous occasions from an ill and very painful fate.

Sergeant Stubby also thwarted a German spy attempting to map out the battlefield of the Allied trenches. He did that by grabbing onto the German soldier, biting him and subduing him until the American soldiers could arrive.

Sergeant Stubby served in 17 separate battles during World War I. Private Conroy's grandson, Curt Deane, recalled stories about Stubby:

“My grandmother was always clear: he was a service dog. He gave the troops comfort . . . and support. He used to run through the trenches and warn them about gas attacks. He used to go outside of the trenches and into this sort of no man's land between the U.S. and the German trenches and stand by soldiers who had been injured until the medics could come and get them.”

Sergeant Stubby became a lifetime member of the American Legion and was recognized as the mascot of Georgetown University in the 1920s, where Private Conroy then studied law. In 1921, Stubby was awarded the Humane Education Society's Hero Dog gold medal and earned the honor of meeting General John “Blackjack” Pershing, the highest ranking service-member since General George Washington, at that time.

Sergeant Stubby died in Private Conroy's arms on March 16, 1926.

Today, Sergeant Stubby is set to be immortalized in an animated film premiering next month. That will be great for us all to see. His loyalty, bravery, and selflessness is the legacy for thousands of service dogs being trained at any given time in all branches of our military, as well as our local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies.

While we aren't yet able to measure the exact number of lives saved by

service dogs, one thing is certain: dogs really are a man's and woman's best friend. We are forever grateful and indebted to these animals and applaud them, their handlers and caretakers for their tireless service and devotion to duty and showing us the true meaning of “battle buddy.”

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania, Brigadier General SCOTT PERRY, for sharing that story.

The attitude and loyalty of the dog is amazing, as well as the singularity of purpose in their drive and ambition.

Like I said, yesterday, we got to experience police K-9 dogs going after a victim. I was the victim. I had a glove on my arm. But we saw the intent and the way those dogs focus. They showed us a demonstration of sniffing out gunpowder. They hid it in a big room with all sorts of explosives. These dogs just go to task and don't complain. I think there is a lesson we all can learn from.

I thank the gentleman for his participation and for his story. I look forward to that movie. It is funny how people say dogs can't talk, but we know they do through their body language. That is why movies like that that highlight the actions of an animal, especially dogs, do so well. I know that will be a blockbuster.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting this tonight for us to talk about the importance of these dogs. They are more than dogs; they are buddies to our men and women in uniform who have been fighting for America.

Mr. Speaker, in the year 2000, I had the honor and the pleasure of meeting John Burnam, retired United States Army combat infantryman and dog handler during the Vietnam war. He approached me with the idea of a War Dog Memorial to honor our great K-9 veterans.

John shared with me the impact that these animals had on him and his fellow handlers in the sixties. They are forever emotionally grateful for their K-9 buddies.

Through this relationship, as we began to work on a War Dog Memorial in 2007, which took several years, a marine named Dustin Lee was killed in the Iraq war. John had written a story. He wanted me to read the story and then speak out and reach out to General Regner, United States Marine Corps, and ask him to please retire this wonderful animal named Lex, a German shepherd, who had also been wounded with his master, and ask General Regner to reach out to the Air Force to retire Lex.

I want to read briefly the story that John had written and given to me. I will read five paragraphs from the article, “My Partner Dustin.”

“I'm a U.S. Marine and the primary element of a two-member team trained

to hunt and locate explosives. My partner and I trained as a team for many months honing our expertise to save American lives in the war on terrorism in Iraq.

"It's March 21, 2007, and I'm on the job in Fallujah, Iraq, when an enemy-fired rocket propelled grenade explodes in our midst. I'm blasted to the ground and stunned. My head is ringing and my body feels numb. My eyes can't quite focus on anything.

"My partner is lying next to me severely wounded and bleeding. I move to him and touch him, but he's not responding. I feel sharp pains in my side and back. I'm bleeding but deal with it and concentrate on comforting my partner and protecting him from further harm.

"Everything's happening so fast that I'm disorientated and confused. My senses pick up the lingering smell of burnt powder and smoke from the explosion. I hear lots of American voices and heavy boot steps hurrying all around us. They reach our location and immediately attend to my partner, then carry him away. I'm separated from my partner for the first time. I'm not clear of thought, and then I, too, am carried away but to a different hospital.

"I'm in a building lying on a table with lights above and people talking. Still dazed and confused, I hear a strange voice saying my name, 'Lex.' I gesture a slight reflex of acknowledgement. 'Lex, you are going to be okay buddy. Just lay still. We are going to take care of your wounds, so stay calm okay, Lex?' My eyes dart around the room searching for my partner, but he's not there and no one can interpret my thoughts."

The partner died.

I was called by John Burnam to read this story. I sent this story to General Mike Regner. I said: Mike, we need to retire this dog for the family.

Mr. Speaker, the family lived in Mississippi. I didn't know them.

This story, which I include in the RECORD, touched my heart.

"MY PARTNER DUSTIN"

(By John C. Burnam, December 21, 2007)

I'm a U.S. Marine and the primary element of a two-member team trained to hunt and locate explosives. My partner and I trained as a team for many months honing our expertise to save American lives in the War on Terrorism in Iraq.

It's March 21, 2007 and I'm on the job in Fallujah, Iraq when an enemy fired Rocket Propelled Grenade (RPG) explodes in our midst. I'm blasted to the ground and stunned. My head is ringing and my body feels numb. My eyes can't quite focus on anything.

My partner is lying next to me severely wounded and bleeding. I move to him and touch him but he's not responding. I feel sharp pains in my side and back. I'm bleeding but deal with it and concentrate on comforting my partner and protecting him from further harm.

Everything's happening so fast that I'm disorientated and confused. My senses pick

up the lingering smell of burnt powder and smoke from the explosion. I hear lots of American voices and heavy boot-steps hurrying all around us. They reach our location and immediately attend to my partner, then carry him away. I'm separated from my partner for the first time. I'm not clear of thought and then I too am carried away but to a different hospital.

I'm in a building lying on a table with lights above and people talking. Still dazed and confused I hear a strange voice say my name, "Lex!" I gesture a slight reflex of acknowledgement. "Lex! You are going to be okay buddy! Just lay still. We are going to take care of your wounds, so stay calm okay, Lex?" My eyes dart around the room searching for my partner, but he's not there and no one can interpret my thoughts.

Later, I'm released from the hospital and well enough to travel so they transfer me from Iraq to a U.S. Marine Corp base in Albany, Georgia. I really miss my partner, Dusty. I know something has happened to him because he would never have left me alone for so long.

Yes, my name is Lex. I'm a seven year old German shepherd Military Working Dog, service number E132. My master and loyal partner is Corporal Dustin Jerome Lee, 20 year old U.S. Marine Corps canine handler from Quitman, Mississippi. I'm well disciplined to my master's commands and expertly trained to sniff out bombs and explosives. Where's my master, Dusty, my partner? No one can understand me but Dusty. Where's Dusty?

Iraq was to be my last combat tour before retirement. Dusty talked to me all the time about going home and adopting me. I sure do miss him. He is the best friend I've ever had. I love that crazy Marine from Mississippi!

No one can measure the love and unconditional loyalty I have for Dusty. I'd sacrifice my own life for him and he knows it. I just wish I could have stopped that RPG or pushed Dusty away from that powerful blast. It all happened in a blink of an eye and I didn't see it coming until it was too late. Now I sit alone in my kennel-run waiting for the day Dusty shows up.

The U.S. Marines are treating me very well. I get enough food and water and exercise each day. And the veterinarian comes by to examine my wounds on a regular basis. I just can't sleep well at night. I wake up to every little noise and I think about Dusty. Where can that Marine be?

The nights are long. The days turn into weeks. Still no Dusty! My wounds are healing and my hair is growing back. The pain is still in my back but I can walk okay. I have a piece of shrapnel near my spine that the veterinarians avoid removing for fear of worse complications. I have spent twelve weeks in rehabilitation after my surgery and declared physically unable to perform in a combat zone.

One of the dog handlers gave me a real good bath and grooming. I felt so refreshed because I was on my way to meet Dusty's family. Maybe Dusty will be there waiting for me. When I arrived I sensed something was not quite right. Dusty wasn't there and everyone was sad, but very happy to greet me. I then realized that I was attending Dusty's funeral. Everyone showed up to pay their respects.

Dusty is a real American hero and he was buried with full military honors. I was so proud to have been his last best friend and partner. At one particular moment of total silence during the ceremony, I sniffed a slight scent in the air that was very famil-

iar. It smelled like Dusty. I figured he sent me a signal that he knew I was there! I wagged my tail and moaned a sigh of grief that he would only hear and understand. I just about lost my tail in that horrible explosion and the veterinarian fixed it so it still wags okay.

I was greeted by the Lee family with joy in their hearts. The picture is of Dustin's mom, Rachel, and me in church. It felt so warm and comfortable to be with my partner's loving family. I wanted to stay but I was escorted away after the funeral and back to Albany, Georgia. What is going to happen to me now?

Wait a minute! I was due for retirement, right? Why did the military take me to see Dusty's family and not leave me there? I belong with them in Mississippi not here in Georgia.

The Lee family adopting me would not be too much to ask considering they will never again see their son, grandson, brother, nephew and friend. Adopting me will keep a big part of Dusty's life alive for them and for me. I will enable Dusty's family to experience what he already knew about me. I loved and protected him everywhere we went and even on the battlefield in Iraq. It's time the U.S. Marine Corps allowed Dustin's family to adopt me. I'm not a young pup anymore, you know! I'm a senior of retirement age. I want to spend last years of my life with the Lee family. It's where I now belong!

It's been eight long months since we buried my partner, Dustin, and all attempts by the Lee family to adopt me have failed. The Marines have placed me back on duty training new recruits. My back bothers me some but I'm an expert on the job. It's the recruits that have a lot to learn about keeping their eyes on me and understanding my body language. Dustin and I bonded as a team and our minds were always in sync.

There has been a turn of events in my adoption. U.S. Congressman Walter B. Jones of North Carolina heard my story and immediately contacted the U.S. Marine Corps Commandant at the Pentagon in Washington D.C. requesting my urgent release.

The Marines really showed off their compassion for the Lee family and me too! They even dispatched a veterinarian to give me a complete final medical examination. I feel a sense of excitement I haven't felt in a very long time. I even have a prance in my step!

That's a Christmas picture of me and Dusty in Iraq, December 2006. That's me smiling with the Lee family and some of Dusty's Marine pals at the funeral in Quitman, Mississippi, April 2007.

The top Marine brass and the veterinarian signed the official papers saying I'm A-OK to be adopted. I got an honorable discharge from the U.S. Marine Corps on December 21, 2007, the anniversary day of Dustin's death. I will be home with the Lee family for Christmas.

That's a picture of me greeting the Lee family at my retirement ceremony at the U.S. Marine Corps base, Albany, Georgia, December 21, 2007. The news media was everywhere! My adoption even made the nightly news on national television. I'm the first Marine Corps combat veteran working dog to ever be retired to the family of a fallen Marine.

Dusty? I'm sure you had a lot to do with all this from heaven. And I can hardly wait to visit your room and lie down on your bed and sniff your boots and clothes. Living with your family will be like having you around again, Dusty!

Always Faithful,
LEX (E132),

*German Shepherd,
Military Working
Dog, U.S. Marine
Corps Veteran (Retired).*

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I called him and I said: Mike, this family has lost everything, their son. They want Lex to retire and live out the rest of his life.

He had shrapnel in his back.

So, the Air Force agreed with General Regner and retired the dog. That dog spent 8 years with the family of the marine who was killed.

I went over to Walter Reed on a regular basis during the Iraq war, and I never will forget a young Army guy who had lost his leg. He told me the story. He was a dog handler of a platoon and waiting for the dog to go out and sniff an IED. The dog goes out, finds the IED, and turns around and looks at the platoon. Then the IED exploded.

There are so many of these stories that it is hard to even get a record of them.

□ 1945

In closing, I wanted to thank former President George W. Bush. He signed the bill to erect a War Dog Memorial at Lackland Air Force Base. John Burnam deserves so much credit. He got the private sector to pay for the memorial at Lackland Air Force Base. So the dogs that Mr. YOHO and others have spoken about tonight will never be forgotten. There is a memorial for them and the work they have done for this country.

I want to say that, to me, of all the things—I have been in Congress 20 years—but when you touch a dog, you touch a child. These dogs have done so much to save the children who are now soldiers, marines, airmen, and sailors, to save those people from being killed by IEDs and the enemy.

So, again, I thank Mr. YOHO very much for putting this together, and I thank God that we can always remember that an animal is a gift from God as much as we are as human beings.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from North Carolina. And I love that story. That is a great story. What you touched on is the loyalty, the trust, the integrity of these working dogs—not only in the work they do, but when they come back to the home—of what they do. It is unconditional love and unconditional loyalty.

We should take a lesson from that as humans, shouldn't we?

Mr. JONES. Amen.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to tell a story from my district, and this deals with seizing the drugs and profits that arm criminals: As part of their regularly assigned duties with the Gainesville-Alachua County Drug Task Force, Sergeant Bryan Jones and K-9 Jerry responded to assist another agent with a traffic

stop on Interstate 75. Despite a series of efforts by the suspect, like those seen on television to hide contraband in hidden compartments, K-9 Jerry couldn't be fooled—locating nearly \$100,000 in cash and over a kilogram of narcotics. It is just amazing how these dogs know what to do and they are so good at it. They smell things that we can't even think about with their sensory perception.

Another story is rescuing those that need our help: In February 2018, the Florida Highway Patrol contacted the Alachua County Sheriff's Office after finding an abandoned vehicle along Interstate 75 near San Felasco Hammock Preserve State Park. It appeared as though the driver, diagnosed with a mental illness and having fled his home in south Florida, may have wandered into the park and its over 7,000 acres of forest, sinkholes, rattle snakes, ponds, alligators, and trails.

Deputy Sheriff Lloyd O'Quinn and K-9 Eins began tracking the subject through the woods until becoming physically exhausted in the heat. Deputy Sheriff James Riley and K-9 Knight, Deputy Sheriff Esau Bright and K-9 Rosco, Deputy Sheriff Chris Drake and K-9 Rous, and Sergeant Michael Hurlocker and K-9 Havok all responded and relieved one another with tracking throughout the park.

After tracking and searching the wooded area for several hours, and with the help of the prison bloodhounds sent to assist from the Florida Department of Corrections, the driver was safely located and was provided the treatment he needed at an area hospital to the relief of his family and friends far away.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, TOM GARRETT, a good friend of mine that served in our military in the Army.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), on this day when we honor dogs that serve honorably, just like the women and men who serve our country, for putting on this Special Order.

Anyone who has ever had a dog understands the depths of the bonds that can develop between human beings and their four-legged friends. I can remember every single dog that we have ever owned. I can remember how each one died. I can remember being there when two died. I never had the discipline or the opportunity or honor to serve with the working dogs that defend not just our country abroad, but also here at home. But as I say, of my time in the military, I am not a hero, but I have gotten to meet some.

In researching for this opportunity to honor those four-legged heroes and those with whom they work, I had the opportunity to read about some books: "Always Faithful," a book about Marine Corps working dogs by William Putney; "The Dogs of War" by Lisa

Rogak; "War Dogs" by Rebecca Frankel; and "Sergeant Rex" by Mike Dowling, among the most highly commended; as well as "Unconditional Honor" primarily by Cathy Scott, which recognizes the fact that those of you watching at home, and this RECORD, might not contemplate, and that is the role that dogs play, not just on the battlefield and in finding missing people, and fighting crime here at home, but also when helping our servicemen and -women recover from wounds visible and invisible when they return to this country.

Indeed, thousands of servicemembers, welcomed by a climate that is shifting as it relates to service dogs, take the definition of working dog beyond the battlefield and outside of the field of crime and punishment into bedrooms and living rooms, and they help our brothers and sisters heal from wounds that most of us, praise God, will never be able to imagine.

As I think has been noted, at any given time, there are more than over 2,000 military working dogs with roughly 700 working overseas. These specially trained dogs can cost anywhere from \$5,000 to \$30,000 to procure and train, and about 30 service dogs annually are killed in the line of duty.

When I was in the military, we always looked with admiration upon the individuals who had the decorations and the pins and an adornments that very few people would earn. One was HALO wings. That stands for high altitude low opening. That is when you jump out of an airplane so high that someone couldn't possibly imagine that there might be someone inserting via this mechanism. Well, indeed, we have military dogs that insert this way, as well as strapped to their handlers via helicopter, and every other imaginable circumstance.

In fact, as I look at history, the oldest documented accounts of dogs either being used as accoutrements to defend their people or accompanying their masters onto the field of battle are almost 3,000 years old, and this is about as long as we can go back into documented written history. But tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly about a personal friend and hero.

In early 2006, Patrick Sheridan of the Louisa County Sheriff's Office procured Magpie Electric Potential from a bloodhound kennel in New Jersey and began working very hard with what I believe was the second dog that Lieutenant Sheridan would train. In fact, Lieutenant Sheridan and his K-9 team have become so successful in working K-9 operations and scent tracking, specifically, that they have tracked individuals on multiple continents and in multiple nations. And over the course of Magpie Electric Potential's, aka Maggie's, 6-year career, she worked almost 350 calls for service.

In 2010 alone, her duties ranged from trailing breaking-and-entering suspects and suspects in violent crime cases to helping locate a missing 5-year-old child before that child succumbed to the elements.

On December 12, 2011, Maggie and Lieutenant Sheridan were not engaged in chasing down a drug dealer or finding some horrific individual and preventing them from visiting domestic violence on someone once too frequently victimized, but, instead, searching for an individual who had been reported missing and suicidal. I make this point to note that these dogs defend the people with whom they serve and the people of our communities.

On this occasion, Maggie, while trailing again on nearly her 350th working call, encountered a pit bull and ultimately was attacked and succumbed to her injuries. Her end of watch on December 12, 2011, represents one of hundreds of working dog deaths just this century.

I, too, commend former President Bush for the establishment and the use of private citizen dollars to do such of a War Dog Memorial and hope that we will see something similar done as it relates to those working dogs who defend us not in the military, but in law enforcement here at home, not only by pursuing and apprehending criminals, but also by finding missing children and those who might harm themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would commend to those viewing and to the Members of this body, when they find a dog handler or someone who had worked as a dog handler in the past, please say “thank you” for the dedication, time, and loyalty that is, indeed, reciprocal and unconditional because we need never fathom how many lives have been saved.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Virginia. The gentleman brought up some great things there, the dedication of the handlers. Here we have got the Clay County Sheriff's Department with Diesel, a bloodhound that these guys are so dedicated with the dogs that they work with. It is unbelievable, the good they do, the search and the rescue that they do. And you brought up on Maggie how she had—the 350th working call that Maggie had performed for the people of our country.

And this is something people don't realize, the amount of calls these dogs go on and the amount of work that they do. The average lifespan or service of these dogs is anywhere from 7 to 9 years, and people wonder about the cost of the dog, the cost of a program. Yeah, it is expensive to keep these dogs, but what we have found is so many people out there who are good-hearted who realize the benefit of the working K-9 that they donate the cost of the dog. Many times the cost of the

dog can run from \$5,000 to \$9,000 by the time you get it trained, and \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year to maintain these. And there is a lot of community help to make sure this gets done.

Mr. Speaker, I will now talk about another dog at the Gainesville Police Department: Justice is a German Shepherd that worked for the Gainesville Police Department starting in September 2006. During his career, Justice was responsible for locating hundreds of—hundreds of offenders. He assisted several other agencies throughout his career to include the Florida Highway Patrol, the Alachua County Sheriff's Office, the Putnam County Sheriff's Office, the University of Florida Police Department, the City of Alachua Police Department, and the City of High Springs Police Department.

Justice was credited with saving a life. The incident involved a suicidal person who had taken a deadly amount of prescription pills, left a suicide note, and walked off into the woods. After 2 hours of officers trying to locate the person, Officer Owens and Justice were called to the scene while off duty. Justice was able to track and locate the person who was passed out by the effects of the pill and clinging to life. EMS was called, and the person was taken to the hospital. Doctors stated that if the person was not located when they were, the medications taken would have, no doubt, ended in their death and another suicide.

Justice received a lifesaving award through the department. On the last night of his career, Justice was called to locate a suspect that fled from an officer who recognized him as a felony habitual traffic offender and a drug dealer. The officer tried to conduct a traffic stop on the vehicle being driven by the suspect. When the officer activated his overhead lights, the suspect turned off his headlights, accelerated to a high speed, fleeing through a neighborhood. The officer did not pursue the vehicle. Another officer located the abandoned vehicle minutes later. A perimeter search was established.

Officer Charles Owens and Justice responded to the scene. Justice began a track from the driver's side door. The track led through several backyards and for several blocks. Justice's track led into a wooded area where the suspect was located by Justice trying to conceal himself under a fallen tree. If not for Justice, the suspect would have eluded capture. Justice was sent to retire at the end of the shift, which ended at 4 a.m. He captured his last suspect just in the nick of time at 3 a.m. Officer Owens took possession of Justice after his retirement, and they have been with each other since.

Justice turns 15 on March 15 of this year and is still as active as he can be in his seasoned age. And I think, again, that is a model for all of us to follow.

Another story, Mr. Speaker, K-9 deputy successfully talks down an armed

suicidal subject: The Marion County Sheriff's Office deputies responded to the 17,800 block of County Road 25 in reference to a domestic altercation. It was learned that the suspect battered and strangled a female victim. The suspect fled the area, just prior to the deputy's arrival. K-9 Deputy Jeremie Nix and K-9 Drago tracked and located the suspect in a wooded area, at which time the suspect advised he was armed with a firearm and a knife and threatened suicide.

□ 2000

Deputy Nix was able to create a dialogue with the suspect and persuaded him to surrender peacefully. He did not have a firearm, but he was armed with a knife. The suspect was arrested and charged with domestic battery by strangulation and is being held in the Marion County Jail on \$10,000 bond.

During this standoff, Deputy Nix and K-9 Drago accidentally stepped into a yellow jacket nest and were stung over 20 times. K-9 Drago was taken to the veterinarian's office to be checked out after the call, and he and Deputy Nix recovered and are back to work. Great job for everyone.

The K-9 team locates burglar, recovers approximately \$3,500 of stolen property: On the morning of Thursday, February 1, 2018, Marion County Sheriff's Office deputies responded to Ernie's Auction Center, located at 5305 South Pine, in reference to a burglary that just occurred.

As employees were opening the business, it was observed that the front door had been forcibly entered and suspects were observed running through the inside of the business.

Deputy Branden Donahue and his K-9 partner, Tipster, and Deputy Nickolas Frost immediately tracked the suspect and located him within 30 minutes. During the track, two different locations were found where the suspects were stashing stolen items from the business. The stolen property, valued at \$3,500, was recovered and returned to the businessowner.

People just don't realize the acute sense that these dogs have and why they are so valuable.

Another story is about Deputy Brian Litz. On February 7, 2004, Deputy Brian Litz and another deputy responded to the Pine Run subdivision in reference to a well-being check on a 74-year-old individual.

When the deputies arrived at the house, the individual met them at the door with a handgun. Deputy Litz was attempting to pass under the front window of the home to get a better visual on the individual with the gun. Unknown to Deputy Litz, this person was watching from the window, and he then shot and killed Litz.

Today, a statue in honor of Deputy Litz and his K-9 stands proudly in Florida's capital. In a tragic twist, Deputy

Litz' call sign was Batman. Today, visitors of this statue at the Florida capital can find the Batman emblem on the bottom of his K-9's foot.

Just an amazing story and, again, a great example of the ability of these dogs and their success in helping out with people, whether it is the person in need, the lost individual, search and rescue, the drug dealer, and just people who want to do other people harm in domestic violence.

I just want to briefly talk about dogs and handlers. The Putnam County Sheriff's Office has five dogs: Aries, handled by Sergeant Randy Hayes; Judo, handled by Blaine Moody; Zeke, handled by Jerry Gentry; Halo, handled by Josue Garriga; and Putnam, named after the county, handled by Emmett Merritt.

Bradford County Sheriff's Office: Deputy Brandon Shoup and K-9 Grim.

Ocala Police Department: Officer King and K-9 Zorba; Officer Burgos and K-9 Babbo; Officer Arnold and K-9 Senior.

The Marion County Sheriff's Office, again, yesterday, we had the privilege of going down and presenting all the working dogs and their handlers with our Congressional Challenge Coin. As you can see, that dog looks rather well the way he is wearing that. At the Marion County Sheriff's Office, where we were yesterday, we got to have the demonstration on the catch dogs, or attack dogs, and we got a great demonstration. There are: Sergeant Daniel Trammell and K-9 Nitro; Deputy Alan Lee, who handles K-9 Zeus; Deputy Timothy Fretts with his dog, K-9 Robo; Deputy Colton Sullivan with his dog, K-9 Adelmo; Deputy Matt Bowers with K-9 Otow, which is named after a retirement village that donated the money for their dog; Deputy Jeremie Nix with his dog, K-9 Drago; Deputy Branden Donahue with his dog, K-9 Tipster; and as we just heard the story, Deputy Matt Hopper with K-9 Rambo.

The Gainesville Police Department: Corporal Jeff Kerkau with his dog, K-9 Roo; Corporal Dylan Hayes-Morrison and his K-9 Ares; Officer Rob Rogers and K-9 Nero; Officer Ed Ratliff and his dog, K-9 Ace; Officer Josh Meurer and his dog, K-9 Ranger.

And the Alachua County Sheriff's Office:

Deputy Sheriff Lloyd O'Quinn and K-9 Eins. We just heard a story about them. A Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and tracking.

Deputy Sheriff Esau Bright and K-9 Deacon, a Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and trafficking.

That is what a lot of people don't realize. These dogs are trained in multiple disciplines and just work their hearts out.

Deputy Sheriff Mikell McKoy and his dog, K-9 Kaos, a Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and trafficking.

Deputy Sheriff Brian Ritter and his dog, K-9 Kolt, a Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and trafficking.

Deputy Sheriff Chris Griseck and his dog, K-9 Mack, a Malinois working in patrol, bombing, and tracking.

Then there is Deputy Sheriff Bill Arnold and his dog, K-9 Wick, a Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and trafficking.

I think we are getting the point here of how valuable these dogs are. I would recommend to people, if you want to see the value and why we want to spend money and allow these dogs to be in our law enforcement, military, DEA, then watch demonstrations of these dogs and the acuteness of them.

There is Deputy Sheriff Chris Drake and his dog, K-9 Rous, a Malinois working in patrol, bomb, and tracking.

Sergeant Michael Hurlocker, who we heard the story of, and his K-9 partner, Havok, a Malinois working in patrol, bomb, and tracking.

Deputy Sheriff Adam Diaz and his dog, K-9 Shiloh, a Labrador Retriever working with the Drug Task Force.

Sergeant Bryan Jones and K-9 Jerry, a Malinois working with the Drug Task Force.

And then there is Sergeant Nigel Lowe and K-9 Zoey, a mixed breed working narcotics detection in our schools; and K-9 Malzi, a Malinois just joining the sheriff's office as a gun detection dog in our schools.

It is interesting, after the Parkland shooting on February 14, we had a roundtable of law enforcement, county sheriffs, city police chiefs, superintendents, school resource officers, and one of the things that came out of there is how the resource officers in our schools act as a deterrent for a lot of the kids. They are there. They see a person of authority.

One of the sheriffs brought up what I thought was a great suggestion that a lot of people also thought was a great suggestion, and that is a dog that can detect gunpowder in our schools. Let them tour the schools, let them show what the policemen can do beneficially to all of us.

It is a shame that we are in a time in society where we have to worry about guns going off in school, but until we rectify the underlying cause of that, I think we need to do what we can to keep our schools safe so our kids feel safe going to school.

I just want to end with this picture. Again, this is the Clay County Sheriff's Office with their dog, Diesel, who proudly took our Congressional Challenge Coin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give a shout-out to all the offices that participated and shared stories with us. We are proud of them. We are proud of their K-9s. I don't want to say we are more proud of the K-9s than we are of them, but we are proud of all of them for the work that they do to keep us safer as citizens of the Third Congressional District, but also around the country and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

STANDING UP FOR THE UNBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I would say in defense of the K-9 Corps—and I appreciate the presentation delivered by Dr. Yoho and my great friend from Florida, who gets common sense right in this Congress—that I am a fan of the K-9 Corps.

I am also a fan of the "benign corps." And I want the "benign corps" to be thinking about what that means. It is not just a bingo game, but it is bingo for a cancer patient. So when you get the diagnosis of K-9 or benign, I am taking benign over K-9 because that is the thing that we celebrate more than anything else, is that lease on life, that if it goes 5 years, you are cancer-free. Benign cancer-free for 5 years, that gets the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for standing up for the K-9 Corps, and I am now going to stand up for the "unborn corps."

Mr. Speaker, I came here to the floor to speak this evening about this Nation and about a nation that has granted to its Supreme Court—sometimes just because we weren't paying attention or we didn't have the confidence of our convictions—I suppose there was a time when Americans were no better informed on constitutional principles than we are today. Over 216 or so years, we have had this experience of accepting the idea of *Marbury v. Madison*, a Supreme Court decision that over time, with accumulated decision by decision rooted back in *Marbury*, that the Supreme Court of the United States was the final word on what the Constitution says.

The Constitution doesn't say to the Supreme Court that they have the final word. Instead, it is court precedence, case precedence, that laid the foundation in about 1802 that has been built upon ever since.

The longer we accept the tradition of a Supreme Court decision being the final decision on what the Constitution says, the more deeply ingrained is the commitment to that decision and the less our Constitution itself means and the more the traditions of the acceptance of a decision of the Supreme Court means. So here we are today.

Mr. Speaker, if people aren't quite understanding what that means, I would describe it a bit of another way. There is a practice in this country called birthright citizenship.

There is nothing in the Constitution that requires that a baby born in the United States is an automatic citizen. In fact, the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, ratified in 1868, says: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States. . . ."

Well, in post-Civil War, they knew what they were doing. They didn't think we would confuse it over the years the way we have, but they wanted to make sure that the babies born to the newly freed slaves as a result of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Civil War would be American citizens.

They expected that those babies born to the former slaves would be full-fledged citizens with all the rights of citizenship bestowed upon them as those created in the image of God, just like everyone else. But what happened was, even though the amendment was there that said all persons born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are American citizens, over time, in the latter part of the 19th century, they began to bestow citizenship on any baby born in the United States. And it wasn't successfully challenged, neither is any case on point in all of the full history of the litigation that has taken place that has found its way to the Supreme Court. There is no on-point precedent case that determines that the Constitution requires that a baby born in America be automatically an American citizen, but the practice has prevailed.

The practice has prevailed along the way that a baby born on U.S. territory, with certain exceptions, is an American citizen, even though the Constitution doesn't require it, because the "subject of the jurisdiction thereof" clause that is in there meant a number of things.

First, that meant loyalty. Where is your allegiance.

There were Native American Tribes—called Indian Tribes at the time and still today—that if the children born on that reservation were American citizens automatically, they were automatically removed from membership in the Tribe. So the folks who drafted the 14th Amendment wanted to exempt them. That is one of the reasons they inserted the clause, "subject to the jurisdiction thereof," because the allegiance of those born on reservations wasn't viewed to be equivalent to that of those born in the other territorial areas of the United States of America.

Then, of course, they wanted to exempt the children born to ambassadors, the children born to diplomats, the children born to their staff.

Could you imagine if there was an invading army and babies were born to the folks who followed along on that army, that they would be American citizens?

No. They weren't subject to the jurisdiction thereof. They didn't owe their

allegiance to the United States. It was clear they owe their allegiance to other foreign princes and potentates, to borrow a phrase from the naturalization oath.

So the clause, "subject to the jurisdiction thereof," exempted those who were not obligated to owe allegiance to the United States, but the practice persisted. It persisted to this day. In fact, some years ago, about a decade ago, we had hearings. In those hearings, the research, at least the testimony, said that somewhere between 340,000 and 750,000 babies were born in the United States where both parents, the mother and the father, were illegal, yet they have been bestowed an automatic citizenship.

□ 2015

And it has created this birth tourism where, back during that testimony time—now the price has surely gone up—if there is a pregnant mother in China, she could buy a \$30,000 ticket to fly into the United States, be smuggled into the United States, get her OB care, live in an apartment next to the hospital, deliver the baby, and have that little baby's feet stamped on the birth certificate. And that little birth certificate made that baby an American citizen. Then they loaded the baby up and flew the mom and baby back to China, and 18 years later that baby could begin to petition to bring in the family reunification plan.

That is how a practice gets started that hasn't been successfully blocked because of litigation that would go to the Supreme Court with a decision made based upon justice.

So this situation persists. Three-quarters of a million babies a year, or more—I mean, the entire population of the Dreamers, every single year—born in America to illegal parents, granted automatic citizenship and the ability, once they reach of age, to begin the family reunification process and bring in the whole kit and caboodle of family into America and start them on a path to citizenship.

What kind of nation would do that?

A nation that is steeped in a precedent of habit—a bad habit—that persists in delivering a policy that is not constitutional but rooted in a murky understanding of what the Constitution actually says; I wouldn't say a dishonest, but a misunderstanding of what the Constitution actually says.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I think sets the foundation for the decisions on *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* and a number of Supreme Court precedents that built us up to this situation that we have today.

And I am speaking of abortion in America, abortion on demand in America, babies who have a chance to live outside the womb being killed because they are inconvenient. They may be, at

the time, not wanted by the mother. We are seeing data that shows that a significant percentage of mothers who have abortions are coerced into that by the biological father who doesn't want to carry that responsibility.

And what is this based upon?

Supreme Court precedents that are—looking back on it, how did they ever build to the position that we are in today?

Back in the sixties, there was a case known as *Griswold v. Connecticut*. That case was one where a family in Connecticut, a husband and a wife—I don't know if they were parents—wanted to be able to buy contraceptives. And because of the Catholic influence in Connecticut, they had outlawed contraceptives in Connecticut. So they went to the Supreme Court, the *Griswolds*, and said: We have a constitutional right to purchase contraceptives. It is not the business of the State legislature to tell us that we can't purchase contraceptives. We want to take care of our own reproductive rights by managing our contraception.

So the Supreme Court stuck their nose in what should have been a States' rights issue and came down with a decision that created, manufactured out of emanations and penumbras—not even whole cloth, but the imagination that there was some cloth there to manufacture it out of—the right to privacy. The Supreme Court concluded that the right to privacy would guarantee the privacy for the *Griswolds* to be able to purchase contraceptives even though the State of Connecticut said it is against the interests of the people in the State of Connecticut that we control birth through contraceptives.

That was their decision in Connecticut. If people wanted to vote with their feet, they could have left Connecticut. But, instead, the United States Supreme Court decided they had the power and the authority to manufacture a whole new right that doesn't exist in the constitution, a right to privacy; and a right to privacy guaranteed the ability for the married couple to purchase contraceptives.

Well, that was sometime in about the mid-sixties, and not very long after that the *Eisenstadt* case came up. It was this: An unmarried couple said: Why are we excluded? We have the same constitutional rights as the married couple has. If they have a right to purchase contraceptives because they have a right to privacy, unmarried people have also a right to privacy.

So the Supreme Court decided: We had started down the slippery slope and had granted this right to privacy and a right to purchase contraceptives and keep the government out of the private lives, especially the reproductive lives, of people, consenting adults. How can we deny the unmarried couple the manufactured constitutional right that we have always granted to the *Griswolds*?

So the Griswold case became the Eisenstadt case, and the non-married couples had the same rights as the married couples.

Along came 1973. Two cases came before the Supreme Court: *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*.

Roe v. Wade took that concept of a right to privacy that was manufactured, not out of the Constitution, manufactured out of thin air—out of the emanations and penumbras, which means in the shadows of, where the text of the Constitution is—and they decided that a woman had a right to abortion, and it was an inherent right rooted in a right to privacy: You have a right to a contraceptive. You have a right to put an end to the life of that innocent, unborn baby under the same standards of privacy.

Who gets to take the life of a baby, or a child, or a young adult, or a mature adult, or a senior adult? Who gets to do that by saying, It is only my business; I control that; it is my right to privacy?

But the Supreme Court concluded exactly that. But they did say that it could only happen in the first trimester.

But the simultaneous case that came down was *Doe v. Bolton*. And in the *Doe v. Bolton* case, they gave exceptions, Mr. Speaker, and said: Well, we are going to restrain this right to an abortion that we have created and manufactured in *Roe v. Wade*; but we really can't say that if the woman has danger to her life, she shouldn't be able to get an abortion. Sure. We will give her the right to abort her baby if it risks her life.

How about if it risks her health? What if it damages her health? What if it affects her psychological health? What if her familial relationships are going to be upset if she doesn't abort the baby? In other words, what if a young lady doesn't have a husband and it would be disturbing to her family for her to have the baby? We want to give her the right to abort the baby because it would upset her familial health, her family life.

And, of course, if it affects her economically and it affects her psychologically, it might affect her familial life as well. So if it affects her economics, her psyche, her physical health, risks her life, then abort the baby. She has a right for all that.

So when you take them together—*Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*—it was abortion on demand, manufactured by the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Speaker, not written into the Constitution, but pulled out of the emanations and penumbras, the shadows of, that little shadow around the cloud out there that maybe we can't see it because we are just laypeople with normal perceptive abilities. We might have the best eyesight. We could have 20/20 vision. Well, we could even

have 20/20 rear vision to see what is going on, but the Court put on their black robes, they looked up at the sky and they decided: We know what is written in that place around the edges of the clouds in the emanations and penumbras. We know that it is there because we want it to be there. And we can't read it exactly into the language in the Constitution, but we want it, we see it, and we are going to shape society around it. And they did.

And they came down with the *Roe v. Wade* decision and the *Doe v. Bolton* decision the same day: January 22, 1973. Abortion on demand. And how many of us at that time knew what that would mean, Mr. Speaker? How many of us understood the devastating debacle that was served up to the American people?

I remember those times. I remember those years. Marilyn and I were married in 1972. As we looked around at our friends, our contemporaries, there were young couples who were getting started and starting with their families at the time. We knew a decision came down, but we had no idea how bad it would be; and no one in 1973 would have predicted that, 45 years later, we would have experienced 60 million abortions in the United States of America, 60 million babies whose precious lives—perfect little babies, little babies created in God's image. No one would have expected that there would be 60 million on the conscience of America.

No one would have expected that we would hear the business community clamoring for labor saying: We don't have enough people to go to work in America; we have to go to foreign countries and bring in millions of people to do this work.

Nobody out here is even doing the math to say: What happens when 60 million babies are gone, ripped out of the generations over the last 45 years? What does that do to society? What does it do to our mortality, the conscience, the guilt of America, the sins on the soul of the United States of America? What does it do to all that?

But what does it do also to the next generation and the next generation? What about the guilt that is carried by the people who stepped in and took the advice of Planned Parenthood and decided it really isn't a life and there aren't any repercussions—I can be free of the burden of raising a child that I had not planned to raise and walk away and life will be fine again?

What has happened to the people who bought into that story? What has happened to the—let's just say—family force, the workforce of America?

Sixty million babies ripped out of America, ripped out of the womb, ripped apart out of the womb, ripped out of America. Sixty million babies. Forty-five years.

Mr. Speaker, if you do a back-of-the-envelope calculation and you think, of

those little girls who were aborted, many of them would be mothers again today, would be mothers by now—and I did a back-of-the-envelope calculation, and I will say that I just figured that, if each little girl that had been aborted since 1973, in those years that they would be of reproductive age—and some of them wouldn't be of that age yet; but if each of those who would be had had three babies, as Marilyn and I have had, that is another 60 million babies. Sixty million.

So now the hole in our society is 60 million babies plus another 60 million babies: 120 million Americans. You could dial it down a little bit. You could say, well, they aren't going to average 3. That is probably true. They could average maybe 2½ or a little better. If you take the 120 million and you dial that down a ways—I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, what the population of America was 100 years ago.

Let's pick the 1920 census. Mr. Speaker, 106 million Americans was the total population of the United States of America in the census of 1920, which comes up in a couple of years. It will be a century in a couple of years. 106 million Americans. That is how many we are missing today, all of that many babies, all of that many million developed adults, young people who would have lived, loved, learned, laughed, played, raised families of their own, gone to school and gotten educated, started businesses, created jobs, improved the quality of life of all of us, enriched our lives.

The love that would flow from over 100 million babies growing up in America who were denied the right to life, the right to live, and were taken from this world before they ever had a chance to fill their own lungs with air and scream for their own mercy, that is the burden that America is carrying today.

Mr. Speaker, when that day comes that abortion is over in America and we respect and we revere life again, as it once was and one day ever shall be, when we reach that point, that doesn't mean that America is absolved from this sin on our Nation. What it really means is we can begin to put our pieces back together and build a history and a legacy of a love and a respect and a reverence for life. All life. Life from the moment of fertilization until natural death.

□ 2030

By the way, that life, from moment of fertilization till natural death, is the mission statement of the National Right to Life. The National Right to Life's mission statement—and I am not reading it; I am going from memory, so if I miss a word—says they are dedicated to protecting life from the beginning of life until natural death.

I embrace that mission statement. I embrace that ideology and that philosophy that shaped that mission statement for the National Right to Life,

the country's oldest and largest pro-life organization. But I did ask the question: How do they define the beginning of life?

I looked down through their website, and it is defined from fertilization. Life begins at fertilization. That is the mission of National Right to Life, and we agree. I applaud that position, and I applaud the work that they have done over the last more than 45 years, because they formed themselves before *Roe v. Wade*, I believe, 1968. So they should be applauded for the work that they have done over the years.

But National Right to Life is married to a concept of incrementalism; and when you read through the statements, the testimony that they have supported before various State legislatures, the positions that they have taken, Mr. Speaker, become—and as I have done, sat down and talked with their leadership and tried to convince their leadership to be stronger, more bold, the same answer came back from each one of them that I talked to at National Right to Life, and it is this: they are committed to doing what can be done around the edges.

The Supreme Court has built a fence around what they call a right to abortion. There is no right to abortion. There is no constitutional right to abortion. It is manufactured, as I said earlier.

But National Right to Life, the Nation's oldest and largest pro-life organization, has built a fence around the Supreme Court decisions, and they are working with incrementalism to try to get as close to that fence around the Supreme Court decisions as they can without being reversed by a decision of the Court.

That is their strategic approach, and they have been granted a *de facto* veto power to any legislation that would come to the floor of the House of Representatives that doesn't have their support. I said "*de facto*." That is the net result of it. In fact, that is the result of it.

So we have 170 cosponsors on the Heartbeat Protection Act, the piece of legislation that says, before a doctor can perform an abortion, commit an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat, and if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected.

We know, if there is a beating heart, there is life. And if there is a beating heart and you go in and stop the beating of that heart, you have ended that life. The most innocent lives that there are are those unborn little babies; and if there is a heartbeat that can be detected, the baby must be protected. That is the bill. That is the Heartbeat Protection Act.

But National Right to Life doesn't support, and they say it this way, Mr. Speaker. National Right to Life, they say: National Right to Life does not oppose the Heartbeat bill—does not op-

pose—which is a little bit of semantics, Mr. Speaker.

So I struck through the "does not oppose," and I will put it there in exactly the same meaning: they do not support.

If you are the National Right to Life and you are committed to protecting life from the moment of fertilization till natural death, how do you not step up to support the Heartbeat bill that protects babies? From the moment a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected.

The rationale is: our strategy is not here on Heartbeat; their strategy is try not to ever challenge the Supreme Court of the United States.

So how can we have the Nation's oldest and largest pro-life organization that is entrenched in a philosophy and a legislative strategy that says that they are never going to challenge the Supreme Court of the United States? If you are not going to challenge the Supreme Court of the United States, then it is on your head and on the conscience of anybody, not just National Right to Life, but anybody who says: I am not willing to challenge the Supreme Court of the United States; I am not willing to challenge *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, or *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. Then you are *de facto* accepting the idea that there will be—no, accepting the actual reality of a million abortions a year, as far as the eye can see.

This language here that says the National Right to Life does not oppose the Heartbeat bill, I say they do not support the Heartbeat bill. Both statements are true, but opposing challenging the Supreme Court decisions of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* guarantees a million abortions a year as far as the eye can see over the horizon of history and out of sight, a million a year.

We have seen 60 million abortions in the United States of America in the last 45 years. This ratio that we are on today, if the population doesn't grow and if the ratio stays the same, and it sure looks to, unless we do something, we are looking at a million a year and, 45 years from now, another 45 million abortions. In another 15 years, we are back another 60 million, and then it is 120 million babies, and we know how that works.

Then those babies not born to the mothers who would have been giving birth to them, you can double the number again. But already we are missing the entire population of the United States of America of 100 years ago as a result of the abortions since 1973.

This Nation must step up to the moral principle that every human life is sacred. They are sacred in all of their forms. In fact, Governor Bob Casey, Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania, since passed away, God rest his soul, said: "Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure, itself,

against which all other things are weighed."

Well, I am prepared and at least 170 House Members are prepared to go to the Supreme Court again if challenged. Pass the Heartbeat bill out of the House. Pass it out of the Senate. Send it to the President's desk. The President will sign it. The other side, the pro-abortion people, will litigate it, and it will end up in the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court needs to decide are they going to reflect and honor life. The 14th Amendment requires that we protect life, life over liberty; and, in fact, there are prioritized rights of life, liberty, and property in the 14th Amendment. In the Declaration of Independence, it is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but always life is number one, Mr. Speaker. Life is always number one.

This country must step up and defend human life. And I want to, from the floor of this Congress tonight, put a shout-out out in congratulations to the Iowa Senate, who moved a very similar Heartbeat bill by a vote of 30-20, passed it off the floor of the Iowa Senate with a 24-minute debate was all the longer it took, 24 minutes, and a 30-20 bipartisan vote came off the floor and got messaged over to the Iowa House of Representatives.

There they are in serious deliberations today. I don't know the results of those discussions. I left there last night with optimism that the Heartbeat bill in Iowa would come to the floor there soon, perhaps as early as next week. And should it pass, then it is likely to go to the Governor's desk.

I do not have her public statement, but I will just say that I have confidence that Governor Reynolds will sign the Heartbeat bill if it gets to her desk. She is a solid, principled, clear-thinking leader who is also pro-life, Mr. Speaker.

So we are doing the things that we can do to protect the lives that we can protect, but it is not good enough to play a perpetual strategy of incrementalism. Incrementalism of a little bit here, a little bit there, try this, try that, what has it done for us?

It has saved a few lives, it really has, and every life is precious and worth saving, but it is not good enough. It is not good enough to accept the idea that we are going to see a million babies aborted in America every year as far as the eye can see.

So that is why the House of Representatives needs to get the Heartbeat bill to the floor where I believe the votes are there for it to pass. National Right to Life needs to lead, follow, or get out of the way.

Right now, the number one entity in the entire United States of America that is holding the Heartbeat bill off the floor of the House of Representatives is right here, the Nation's number

one pro-life organization, the National Right to Life.

Justice Kennedy has announced—it is announced, at least, and not by Justice Kennedy yet, that he is likely to retire midsummer. We will have a pro-life Court by September, and it is time to move now.

That is my message, Mr. Speaker, and I ask all of us to stand up and protect innocent, unborn human life, and let's start to cleanse, again, the soul of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through March 16.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delay.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4219. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighing Services Under the United States Grain Standards Act (USGSA) received February 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4220. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4221. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's March 2018 Chemical Demilitarization Program Semi-Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(j); Public Law 99-145, Sec. 1412 (as amended by Public Law 112-239, Sec. 1421(a)); (126 Stat. 204); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4222. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral Michael S. Rogers, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-

513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4223. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Sean B. MacFarland, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4224. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III Fund for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 4534(f)(3); Sept. 8, 1950, ch. 932, title III, Sec. 304 (as added by Public Law 111-67, Sec. 7); (123 Stat. 2017); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4225. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interpretation — Updates to Commission Guidance Regarding Accounting for Sales of Vaccines and Bioterror Countermeasures to the Federal Government for Placement into the Pediatric Vaccine Stockpile or the Strategic National Stockpile [Release Nos.: 33-10403; 34-81429; IC-32785] received March 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4226. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Office's report on discretionary appropriations legislation within seven calendar days of enactment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 901(a)(7)(B); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 251(a)(7)(B) (as amended by Public Law 114-113, Sec. 1003); (129 Stat. 3035); to the Committee on the Budget.

4227. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priorities and definitions — Secretary's Final Supplemental Priorities and Definitions for Discretionary Grant Programs [Docket ID: ED-2017-OS-0078] (RIN: 1894-AA09) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4228. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications [WC Docket No.: 14-58]; Rural Broadband Experiments [WC Docket No.: 14-259]; Connect America Fund Phase II Auction [AU Docket No.: 17-182] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4229. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Electric Storage Participation in Markets Operated by Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators [Docket Nos.: RM16-23-000; AD16-20-000] March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4230. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Essential Reliability Services and the Evolv-

ing Bulk-Power System — Primary Frequency Response [Docket No.: RM16-6-000; Order No.: 842] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4231. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4232. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Iran, originally declared on March 15, 1995, by Executive Order 12957 is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2018, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—101); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4233. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4234. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-02, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4235. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-79, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4236. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on data mining activity in the Department of State for calendar year 2017, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-3(c)(1); Public Law 110-53, Sec. 804(c)(1); (121 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4237. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination for a drawdown under section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to provide much-needed assistance to Iraq through USACE and their work at the Mosul Dam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4238. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4239. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4240. A letter from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, transmitting three (3) notifications on

a notification of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4241. A letter from the Senior Regulatory Analyst, Office of Policy, Regulation and Analysis, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf-Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments [Docket No.: BOEM-2017-0079; MMAA104000] (RIN: 1010-AD99) received March 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4242. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0024; Product Identifier 2018-NM-002-AD; Amendment 39-19171; AD 2018-02-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4243. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0707; Product Identifier 2016-NM-014-AD; Amendment 39-19185; AD 2018-03-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4244. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0076; Product Identifier 2013-NM-227-AD; Amendment 39-19194; AD 2018-03-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4245. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0068; Product Identifier 2017-CE-049-AD; Amendment 39-19176; AD 2018-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4246. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped With BRP-Rotax GmbH & Co KG 912 A Series Engine [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1078; Product Identifier 2017-CE-038-AD; Amendment 39-19178; AD 2018-03-05] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4247. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31178; Amdt. No.: 3786] received March 5, 2018, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4248. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31177; Amdt. No.: 3785] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4249. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; North Central United States [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1082; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-22] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4250. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace for the following Missouri Towns; Cape Girardeau, MO; St. Louis, MO; and Macon, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9559; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ACE-11] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4251. A letter from the Management Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Pulaski, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0818; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-19] received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4252. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress "Administering Section 113 of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act", pursuant to Public Law 113-183, Sec. 113(e); (128 Stat. 1929); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4253. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 2018 Trade Policy Agenda and the 2017 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program as Prepared by the Administration, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(c); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 163(c) (as amended by Public Law 100-418, Sec. 1641); (102 Stat. 1271); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4254. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Health Insurance Providers Fee [TD 9830] (RIN: 1545-BM52) received March 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4255. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Presence of Certain Individuals in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or the United States Virgin Islands Under Section 937(a) Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria [Notice 2018-19] received March 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4256. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress, entitled "The Medicare Secondary Payer Commercial Repayment Center in Fiscal Year 2017", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ddd(h)(8); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1893(h)(8) (as amended by Public Law 109-432, Sec. 302(a)); (120 Stat. 2992); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4293. A bill to reform the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review process, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Test process, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1093. A bill to require the Federal Railroad Administration and the Federal Transit Authority to provide appropriate Congressional notice of safety audits conducted with respect to railroads and rail transit agencies; with amendments (Rept. 115-594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 773. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4545) to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1116) to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4263) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-595). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PAULSEN: Joint Economic Committee. Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 2018 Economic Report of the President (Rept. 115-596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DUNN, Mr. FASO, Mr. HILL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. HANDEL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. YODER,

Mr. HARPER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER);

H.R. 5247. A bill to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEBSTER of Florida (for himself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. BILIRAKIS);

H.R. 5248. A bill to amend and enhance the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act to improve the conservation of sharks; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FASO (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER);

H.R. 5249. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a report to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs on the use of a Federal standard of identity for olive oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FASO (for himself and Mr. WELCH);

H.R. 5250. A bill to reauthorize the Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones Program through fiscal year 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5251. A bill to make demonstration grants to eligible local educational agencies or consortia of eligible local educational agencies for the purpose of increasing the numbers of school nurses in public elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan);

H.R. 5252. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize a grant to protect young athletes from abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT);

H.R. 5253. A bill to amend section 552(h) of title 5, United States Code, to require agencies provide records to the Director of the Office of Government Information Services; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 5254. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the feasibility of expanding eligi-

bility for enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans to individuals enrolled under the Medicaid program or enrolled under a group health plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5255. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a Department of Homeland Security Reserve Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Ms. NORTON);

H.R. 5256. A bill to direct the Attorney General to acquire data, for each calendar year, about sexual offenses, including rape, that occur aboard any mode of transportation over which the Federal Government exercises jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DEMINGS (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi);

H.R. 5257. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to prohibit the expenditure of certain grant funds to purchase firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility to receive refundable tax credits for coverage under a qualified health plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FASO, and Mr. NOLAN);

H.R. 5259. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to reauthorize the farm and ranch stress assistance network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5260. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out demonstration projects relating to advanced nuclear reactor technologies to support domestic energy needs; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Mr. TONKO);

H.R. 5261. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for regional centers of excellence in substance use disorder education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. KING of New York);

H.R. 5262. A bill to redesignate the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area as the Maurice D. Hinchey Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. KING of New York);

H.R. 5263. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the "Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHN-

SON of Georgia, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN);

H.R. 5264. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, provide grants to States to facilitate the acquisition of land, water, and interests therein, made to substantially improve, preserve, or maintain water quality for an area in perpetuity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5265. A bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to eliminate the applicability of such Act to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. WAGNER);

H.R. 5266. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to make the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection an independent Financial Product Safety Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Ms. JUDY CHU of California);

H.R. 5267. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify the process for denying, revoking, or suspending a registration to manufacture, distribute, or dispense a controlled substance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. POCAN);

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution recognizing the contributions of the public elementary schools and secondary schools in the United States as an investment in our country's future and expresses the position of Congress that public funds should be spent to strengthen public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania);

H. Res. 771. A resolution honoring and recognizing the 40th anniversary of Cheyney University's historic, momentous, and epic 1978 NCAA Division II Basketball Championship win; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself and Mr. GOHMERT);

H. Res. 772. A resolution condemning Louis Farrakhan for promoting ideas that create animosity and anger toward Jewish Americans and the Jewish religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARTON, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. DONOVAN, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. BACON, Mr. CUREBELO of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MAST, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. KATKO);

H. Res. 774. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MAST, Mr.

DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GAETZ, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H. Res. 775. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 11, 2018, through March 17, 2018, as National Women Veterans Recognition Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H. Res. 776. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first Saturday in October as "National Animal Rescue Day" to create awareness of the importance of adoption, educate on the importance of spaying and neutering animals, and the encouragement of animal adoptions throughout the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 777. A resolution strongly reaffirming support for the Good Friday Agreement, urging the British and Irish Governments to vigorously implement certain aspects of the Agreement, and urging the Secretary of State to appoint a Special Envoy for Northern Ireland and to continue to promote full implementation of the Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FASO, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 778. A resolution honoring Erin Hamlin of Remsen, New York, for proudly representing the United States in four consecutive Winter Olympic Games; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WEBSTER of Florida:

H.R. 5248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 5249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

[Page H132]

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 5250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

[Page H132]

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 5253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 5254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 5256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. DEMINGS:

H.R. 5257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 5259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S.C. Art. I, Sec. 8 Cl. 18

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 5261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 5264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 5266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 291: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 394: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 502: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 592: Mr. GARRETT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 785: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 824: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 845: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 846: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 911: Mr. POSEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 959: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1017: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1057: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 1102: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1243: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. TIPTON, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1267: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1291: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MENG, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1444: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 1612: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1617: Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. AMODEI, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1663: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1666: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1772: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1828: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1832: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1850: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1876: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1889: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1903: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1928: Mr. RUSSELL and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1953: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2004: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 2050: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2077: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2212: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2225: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2285: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2290: Ms. BASS and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2293: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 2315: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 2322: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2589: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2598: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2599: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2633: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2652: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2740: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2829: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2856: Mr. BANKS of Indiana and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2913: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2943: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3011: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3107: Mr. KHANNA and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3197: Mr. CRIST, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 3265: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3272: Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 3415: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3528: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 3605: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 3642: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 3654: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3738: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3742: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3751: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3767: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 3871: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3894: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3913: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 3940: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3941: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3976: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BIGGS, and Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 3994: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3996: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4024: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4083: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4099: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ROSS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4192: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4223: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 4229: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4253: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 4256: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MAST, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 4265: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4275: Mr. ROUZER and Mrs. HANDEL.
H.R. 4277: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4308: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4369: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 4392: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4421: Mr. SIRES and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4426: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4444: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 4473: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4493: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 4548: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4575: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4604: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 4608: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4635: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4655: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 4668: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4681: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 4706: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4719: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 4720: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4743: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 4744: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 4760: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4811: Mr. OLSON and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4828: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4843: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 4846: Mr. POLIS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4886: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4888: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 4897: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 4909: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4912: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4932: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 4953: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4954: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 4958: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 4967: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 4983: Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 5038: Mr. HARPER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JONES, Mr. BACON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GONZÁLEZ of Texas, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KIND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5041: Mrs. HANDEL.
H.R. 5057: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 5083: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5085: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5102: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 5103: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 5123: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 5127: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 5135: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5150: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 5162: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5163: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5164: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5167: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5171: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 5173: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SIRES, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 5180: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5185: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 5187: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5192: Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 5199: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 5223: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5244: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. SOTO and Mr. DEFazio.
H.J. Res. 102: Mr. KHANNA.
H.J. Res. 129: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. WALKER.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. KHANNA.
H. Con. Res. 109: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. DEMINGS.
H. Res. 188: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H. Res. 401: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 529: Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 556: Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 686: Mr. HECK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 763: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. TURNER.
H. Res. 768: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H. Res. 770: Mr. O'ROURKE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative MAXINE WATERS (CA) or a designee to H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examinations Fairness and Reform Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ANGELINA APODACA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angelina Apodaca for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Angelina Apodaca is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angelina Apodaca is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Angelina Apodaca for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARBON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the people of Carbon County as that county celebrates its 175th Anniversary of incorporation. On March 13, 1843, Carbon County was created by combining parts of Northampton and Monroe Counties. The County was named for the vast abundance of anthracite coal found in the region.

Carbon County consists of land originally obtained from the Delaware Tribe during the Walking Purchase of 1737. The first settlement established in the area was Gnadenhutten. Set up by twelve German monks of the Moravian order in 1745, today, the town of Lehigh stands in its place. During the Industrial Revolution, Carbon County was the home of the first railroad in America that was built on any large scale, known as "The Switchback." Carbon County is also the location of the trials and executions of the infamous Molly Maguires, a secret organization whose members were accused of targeting mine company representatives with violence during early struggles over the treatment of miners.

Carbon County spans over 500 square miles in the Pocono Mountain region of Pennsylvania. Over two-thirds of the county is state

game and park land. Because of its strategic location in the Poconos, its natural beauty, and its rich history, the county attracts many hikers, cyclists, history buffs, and people seeking adventure. With its seat located in Jim Thorpe, Carbon County has twenty-three municipalities, several unincorporated communities, and close to 64,000 residents. The county is generally considered a bellwether county for statewide elections.

It is an honor to recognize Carbon County as its residents observe the 175th Anniversary of incorporation. I take great joy in joining celebration of such an important milestone. I wish everyone in the county all the best as they continue to make history.

USS "COLORADO" COMMISSIONING

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Colorado's 4th Congressional District I am delighted to recognize the commissioning of the USS *Colorado* (SSN-788.)

Since the time of the Civil War, U.S. Navy vessels named after the magnificent state of Colorado have proudly served our great nation. The commissioning ceremony will be held on Saturday, March 17th, which will be a special day for Coloradans as the United States Navy officially welcomes the fourth U.S. Navy vessel to bear the Colorado name.

We rest assured in the knowledge that the crew of the USS *Colorado*, part of the Virginia-class of attack submarines, is equipped with the most advanced capabilities and sophisticated technology needed to maintain the strength of the U.S. Navy and the security of America's shores. Coloradans are proud as USS *Colorado* and her crew joins forces in the endeavor to ensure security for all Americans.

A relationship will be established between the USS *Colorado* and her remarkable service men and women. May that bond reach far beyond Saturday's ceremony and remain throughout the span of the USS *Colorado*'s lifetime of service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to return from my home district in time for votes on Monday, March 5 or Tuesday, March 6.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 092; YEA on Roll Call No. 093; NAY on Roll Call No. 094; and YEA on Roll Call No. 095.

JALISSA ARCHULETA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jalissa Archuleta for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jalissa Archuleta is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jalissa Archuleta is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jalissa Archuleta for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. JOE G. WRIGHT, JR.

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Joe G. Wright, Jr. of Raleigh, North Carolina. On behalf of the people of North Carolina, I would like to thank Mr. Wright for almost 30 years of service to our communities and congratulate him on his upcoming retirement.

Joe Wright began his career in emergency management as an Emergency Services Director for Caswell County in 1990. He began working with the North Carolina Division of Emergency Management as an Area Coordinator in 2004, became a Central Branch Manager in 2009, and rose to the position of Deputy Director in 2013. Over the course of his career, Mr. Wright has aided in twenty-two FEMA disaster declarations, including deploying to New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina and assisting the state during Hurricane Matthew. Mr. Wright was instrumental in the development of a Field Standard Operational Guide that received a national best practice during accreditation inspections. He also chairs the Urban Search and Rescue Task Force Leaders Advisory Group.

Mr. Wright is the 2010 recipient of the Colonel William A. Thompson Award for Outstanding Achievement in Emergency Management. Over the course of his career, Mr.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Wright has successfully led local and state operational responses to disasters such as hurricanes, tornadoes, winter storms, wildfires, public disturbances, and hazardous material events.

Joe Wright has earned the respect and friendship of the people of North Carolina through his hard work and wide-ranging involvement throughout the state. For his service to North Carolina, I am honored to express to Mr. Wright the gratitude and best wishes of the people of North Carolina on his retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE OKAWVILLE
BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2018 Class 1A Illinois basketball champions the Okawville boys' basketball team.

Okawville won the title game 59–48 thanks to a record breaking barrage of three-point shots, with Okawville making eight out of their 14 attempts. Behind the shooting of junior guard Wyatt Krohne, who scored 18 points to lead the team, Okawville seized its first ever state basketball title. With the game deadlocked at halftime, Okawville broke it open with a 19–point third quarter blitz that decided the outcome. Just as impressive as the team's third quarter offensive output was its stingy defense, which yielded a scant six points during the deciding stanza.

I would like to congratulate the entire Okawville boys' basketball team on their victory: Payten Harre, Lucas Frederick, Caleb Frederick, Will Aubel, Jordan Green, Wyatt Krohne, Luke Hensler, Carter Killion, Drew Riechmann, Tyler Parsley, Tyler Roesener, Payton Riechmann, Lane Schilling, Tom Segelhorst, and Jackson Heckert, as well as Head Coach Jon Kraus, on a superb end to a great season.

Mr. Speaker, today it is an honor for me to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the Okawville boys' basketball team in winning the 2018 boys' basketball championship, and I wish the team, and their coach, all the best in the future.

EMILY BISHOP

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emily Bishop for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Emily Bishop is a student at Everitt Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Emily Bishop is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and

perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Emily Bishop for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING DAVID, JIMMY AND
SUSAN SCOTTON

HON. STEVE SCALISE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the release of the short documentary film, *I Lived On Parker Avenue*, and recognize adoptee David Scotton and his family, and to celebrate their inspirational story highlighting adoption.

I Lived on Parker Avenue follows the story of David Scotton, currently a law student at Louisiana State University, on his journey to meet his birth parents for the first time and thank them for the gift of his life. Through God's grace, David's birth mother walked out of an Indianapolis abortion facility at the last moment and lovingly placed David up for adoption, answering the prayers of Jimmy and Susan Scotton who adopted David at birth.

To honor them for their work to better the lives of Louisiana children through adoption, David, Jimmy and Susan Scotton were awarded by the Louisiana Institute for Children in Families as a Louisiana Angel in Adoption. I ask that my colleagues join me today in celebrating their story and recognizing their contribution to promoting the blessing of adoption.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF COLONEL
DWIGHT LAWRENCE TAYLOR

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Colonel Dwight Lawrence Taylor. Colonel Taylor served the nation as a bombardier in the Army Air Corps during World War II. After the war, Colonel Taylor entered the Air Force Reserves, retiring in 1984 as a Colonel.

Colonel Taylor took great pride in his involvement in the community. He was a member of Coan Baptist Church in Heathsville, VA where he was a past Deacon. Additionally, he served as a past Master Mason of Heathsville Masonic Lodge number 109 AF and AM and was a member of Westmoreland Royal Arch Chapter number 41. He belonged to many civic organizations including the Northumberland Lions Club and Historical Society. Colonel Taylor had a deep love of the Northern Neck and spent many years at his beloved home, "Wheatland," where he loved to garden and work on preserving the historic antebellum

home. Colonel Taylor typified a genuine Virginia Gentleman in his character and charity to others. Colonel Taylor continued to serve his community as Chairman of the Northumberland County Republican Committee and as a member of the First Congressional District Committee. Colonel Taylor is a graduate of The College of William and Mary.

I had the pleasure of knowing Colonel Taylor for many years and witnessed his contributions to the community. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in extending thoughts and prayers to his wife, Catherine; daughters Mary Catherine and Jennifer; five grandchildren; and their families during this difficult time.

ISABELLA BROWN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Isabella Brown for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Isabella Brown is a student at Arvada K–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Isabella Brown is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Isabella Brown for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INCORPORATION OF CARBON COUNTY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to join the residents of Carbon County, Pennsylvania in celebrating the county's 175th anniversary of its incorporation.

The last 175 years have proven transformative for the county, demonstrating its vitality and strong sense of community. Located in the northeastern corner of the state, approximately 90 miles west of New York City and 90 miles northeast of Philadelphia, Carbon County covers over 500 square miles and is known for its scenic mountains and rivers. It truly carved out its place in the Commonwealth's history when it became the home of the first railroad in America built on a large scale, called the Switchback. Construction of the Switchback railroad helped bring a thriving coal industry to Pennsylvania, which in turn brought businesses, schools, and a growing population to the region.

While the Switchback railroad was retired in the 1920s, Carbon County still attracts thousands of visitors each year due to its attractive rural landscape that is rich in heritage and history. With the northern and eastern portions of the county being part of the Pocono Mountain region, and over two thirds of the county being State Game Land and State Park Land, there is no shortage of families and businesses attracted to Carbon County's quality of life. I am truly honored to represent this county in Pennsylvania and take great pride in its history, success, and sense of community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 175th anniversary of the incorporation of Carbon County.

DEPUTY JACOB PICKETT

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Deputy Jacob Pickett, who was killed in the line of duty in Lebanon, Indiana on March 2, 2018.

Deputy Pickett was born on December 20, 1983 to Marlin and Rebecca Pickett in Columbus, Ohio. He graduated from Brownsburg High School in Brownsburg, Indiana and started on his path to a career in law enforcement. He graduated from Marion County Sheriff's Office Training Academy in 2010 and the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy in 2014. After graduating, he went on to work at the Marion County Sheriff's Office from 2010 to 2013 as a detention deputy and participated on the sheriff's presentations corps. In 2013, he started working for the Tipton County Sheriff's Department and served as the Deputy until 2015. He then went on to serve with the Boone County Sheriff's Department as a Taser Instructor and K-9 Team Leader.

Deputy Pickett had a profound impact on those he served, evidenced by the outpours of support by Hoosiers across the state since his passing. He is remembered for his kind-heart, loyalty, selflessness and willingness to serve others, but most of all as a loving husband and father.

Deputy Pickett is survived by his wife, Jennifer Pickett, his two sons; Wade Matthew Pickett, Lincoln David Pickett, parents; Marlin and Rebecca Pickett, sister, Kristi M. Woo, niece; Hannah N. Woo, his K-9 partner, Bri, parents-in-law; Jon and Carol Lindstrom, brothers-in-law; Jeremy Lindstrom, Christopher Lindstrom and a host of other relatives and friends.

On behalf of all Hoosiers, I thank Deputy Pickett for his service and sacrifice to our great state. He represented his community, state, and country, with honor and dignity. We continue to pray for his family, friends, and all who knew him. Our hearts are with you. His service and sacrifice will always be remembered.

HONORING FETZER VINEYARDS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague, Representative JARED HUFFMAN, to honor Fetzer Vineyards upon the occasion of its 50th anniversary in operation.

Fetzer Vineyards was founded in 1968 by Barney and Kathleen Fetzer of Mendocino County, California. The couple produced wine under the company's flagship Fetzer label with the help of their eleven children. Though the family sold the business in 1992, Fetzer Vineyards has carried on its founders' legacy of social responsibility. It is now the world's largest winery certified as a B Corporation, meaning the company meets high standards for environmental and labor practices.

For decades, Fetzer Vineyards has been a leader in organic farming and sustainability. In the 1980s, the winemaker converted all of its Mendocino County vineyards to organic methods. Of the 960 acres Fetzer Vineyards has in cultivation today, 700 are certified as organic and the other 260 are biodynamic, which means no chemicals are used in the grape-growing process. In 1999, Fetzer Vineyards became the first vineyard to operate on 100 percent green power. It reported and verified its greenhouse gas emissions to The Climate Registry, a non-profit, as early as 2005. By 2014, Fetzer Vineyards had become the first winery to achieve TRUE Zero Waste certification. These achievements and others are a shining example for the agricultural community. They prove that economic success and environmental conservation go hand in hand.

Fetzer Vineyards knows that a business only thrives when workers do too. The company is enormously proud of its diverse management team, half of which is made up of women or people from underrepresented groups. All 300 of the vintner's employees earn above a living wage, receive health care benefits and are incentivized to volunteer in the community. In addition, Fetzer Vineyards encourages worker initiative. Many of the company's landmark environmental achievements were made possible by employee projects like internal waste audits. In this way, Fetzer Vineyards shows what can be accomplished when businesses do more than take care of the bottom line. Fetzer Vineyards' workforce investment pays for itself through the ingenuity of its employees.

Mr. Speaker, Fetzer Vineyards is the type of socially responsible company that every American business should strive to be. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Fetzer Vineyards here today.

ALLY BUCKNER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ally Buckner

for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ally Buckner is a student at Ralston Valley High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ally Buckner is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ally Buckner for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY J. WALZ

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the vote on the Passage of H.R. 4607 (Roll Call No. 95). Had I been present, I would have voted no.

I was also absent for the vote on the Passage of H.R. 1119 (Roll Call No. 101). Had I been present, I would have voted no.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2018

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Home Rule Non-Discrimination Act of 2018 to end the unique applicability of the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA) to the District of Columbia. My bill will protect the District's right to self-government, as well as LGBTQ and reproductive rights in D.C.

RFRA, which provides more protection for religious exercise than the First Amendment, applies to the federal government, the D.C. government and the territorial governments, but not to state governments. As RFRA does not apply to the states, under the principles of home rule, it should likewise not apply to the District.

While RFRA was designed to be a shield to protect religious freedom, it is being used, as evidenced by the Supreme Court's 2014 Hobby Lobby decision, as a sword to discriminate against the LGBTQ community and women. Members of Congress have used RFRA as a justification for trying to overturn D.C. antidiscrimination laws. Republicans have voted three times since 2015 to nullify or block the District's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act (RHNDNA), which prohibits employers from discriminating against employees and their families based on reproductive

health decisions, claiming, in part, that it violates RFRA. However, it appears that no one has challenged RHND's legality under RFRA in court.

My bill ensures that District residents are treated the same as residents of the states under RFRA. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAMES JAY DELANEY, RECIPIENT OF THE 2018 GREATER PITTSSTON FRIENDLY SONS' SWINGLE AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize James Jay Delaney, who will receive the W. Francis Swingle Award from the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. Jay will be honored formally during the Friendly Sons' 104th annual celebration on March 17, 2018. He has been part of the Wilkes-Barre Fire Department since 1981 and has served as the city's fire chief for the past 13 years.

Chief Delaney is a longtime resident of Avoca, Pennsylvania and a graduate of St. John the Evangelist High School. He attended Luzerne County Community College to study Fire Science Technology. He has completed advanced course work at the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, Maryland and at the Center for Domestic Preparedness in Anniston, Alabama. He is also a certified paramedic.

In addition to his role as chief, Delaney serves as Wilkes-Barre's Emergency Management Coordinator. Under Chief Delaney's leadership, the Wilkes-Barre Fire Department's ISO Public Protection Classification was elevated to Class 2, which put Wilkes-Barre in the top 1 percent of fire departments in Pennsylvania. He has been responsible for securing a substantial amount of federal support and has made multiple upgrades to the city's emergency response operations and equipment.

Chief Delaney has earned appointments by Governor Ed Rendell to the Pennsylvania Game Commission Board of Commissioners and by Governor Tom Wolf to the Governor's Advisory Council for Hunting, Fishing, and Conservation.

He resides in the Miners Mills section of Wilkes-Barre with his wife, the former Valerie Sakaduski. They have three children, Sarah, Jamie and Megan and seven grandchildren.

It is an honor to recognize Chief Delaney as he accepts the W. Francis Swingle Award. I am grateful to him for having spent his entire career in service to the people of Northeastern Pennsylvania. His 37 years as a fire fighter is an outstanding contribution to the community. I wish him all the best this St. Patrick's Day.

ROWANCHAYSE CLEVELAND

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rowanchayse Cleveland for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Rowanchayse Cleveland is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rowanchayse Cleveland is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rowanchayse Cleveland for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

AVERY HUDDLESTON

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Avery Huddleston, a first grader in my district from Mechanicsburg, Illinois.

Avery, along with his classmates at Tri-City Elementary School, collected more than twenty pounds of school supplies for students in Puerto Rico—where schools are still recovering after Hurricane Maria.

Avery was so excited to help students in Puerto Rico that he asked his friends to bring school supplies instead of gifts to his seventh birthday party. Soon, his whole class got in on the fun.

When Avery's mom learned that local Ameren crews were scheduled to go to Puerto Rico, she arranged for Ameren to take the box of donations with them. But when the crews dropped off the donations, they discovered that the school was still experiencing problems with electricity. Within thirty minutes, Ameren workers were able to restore the school's light and air conditioning after nearly six months without power.

Thanks to the kindness of a special seven year old and his classmates, students in Rio Grande not only have new school supplies, but now have their lights back on.

I'm very proud of Avery and inspired by his ambition to help others. He's a perfect example of the kindness we should show our neighbors every day.

Keep up the good work, Avery.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY GREEN, HOUSTON CITY COUNCILMAN AND A SPECIAL HUMAN BEING WITH AN UNSURPASSED EXUBERANCE AND PASSION FOR THE PEOPLE OF HOUSTON

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Houston City Councilmember Larry Green who passed away suddenly on March 6, 2018, at the age of 52.

I was shocked and saddened to learn of the death of my dear friend, Councilman Larry Green, and my heart goes out to his family and loved ones.

Although the years of his life were short, the life lived in those years by Councilman Larry Green was vibrant, dynamic, purposeful, and directed toward service to others.

Larry Green was an extraordinary human being with an unsurpassed exuberance and passion for our city, its neighborhoods, its future, and most of all, its people.

Councilman Larry Green was devoted to providing opportunities for his constituents, indeed all Houstonians, to realize their potential and their dreams.

Larry Green worked as my District Director, and in this role he helped me to serve the constituents of the 18th Congressional District.

I am proud to have served as one of his mentors.

In fact it was during this service to my office that I observed first hand his dedication to the community that claimed him, because he was one of Houston's own.

But as anyone who knew Larry Green can attest, you also learned a lot from him because he was so generous with his knowledge and expertise.

Larry Green was a lifelong Houstonian.

You often hear it said that greatness is measured by the magnitude of one's service.

By that measure there is no greater public servant than Larry Green, whom we lost entirely too soon.

Larry Green proudly served the citizens of District K on Houston's City Council for almost six years.

Larry Green was a native Houstonian; a graduate of Madison High School, the University of Houston, and the Thurgood Marshall School of Law.

It was in my office that Larry Green honed the skills for which he is well known for: hard work, long hours, attention to details regarding the lives of those he serves, getting the job done, and making sure that the needs and interests of the poor and vulnerable would never be forgotten.

As the shock and grief over his untimely death recedes, left in its place is our memory of his dedication as a public servant; his sense of humor when faced with a challenge; his tireless work for the people of District K, and omnipresence at community meetings was legendary.

In fact, it was at those community meetings where his love for his constituents shined brightest.

As members of the community attested after he passed: "Larry was everywhere—he's at the civic club meetings; the coalition meeting; he was like your friend. I'd call him all the time."

The loss of Larry Green's leaves is heart breaking.

I am reminded of the common refrain that "all death teaches us is that nothing is promised, but only that life was worth it."

Larry Green lived that wisdom and always sought to give back and live a life worth it.

Among his numerous contributions and accomplishments, it is Larry Green's dedication to his constituents that stand tallest, and will stand the test of time.

Larry Green knew the value of viewing neighborhoods and towns as communities—rather than districts—and sought to make the everyday lives of people better.

Larry Green educated people about how to become citizen activists so that they could improve the quality of their communities or their own lives.

Larry Green sought to remedy blighted neighborhoods by attracting development; he helped neighbors set up civic clubs and taught them how to beautify their neighborhoods.

And as the rough waters of life have stilled his body, his soul lives on and his legacy will not be diminished.

Larry Green will be remembered always as a fearless advocate; a tireless champion; a true friend; a man whose passion for Houston was contagious.

Scripture teaches us that blessed are those that mourn, for they will be comforted.

To his entire family, who shared him with us for 52 years, on behalf of all Houstonians, we thank you.

To his brother, two nieces and a nephew, all of whom survive him, we pray that God will deliver you from the pain that his passing has visited on you.

To those he was honored to serve as a proud representative of District K: all of us in public life are inspired by his example and his fortitude and while we know he is looking down on us, we can only seek to honor his time on Earth by emulating his service.

In a time of wanting leadership, let those of us still on this Earth be inspired by Larry Green's example and his service and strive to be worthy of his legacy.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of the beloved Larry Green, who as much as anyone reflected the heartbeat of Houston.

JORDAN CROSS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jordan Cross for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jordan Cross is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jordan Cross is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jordan Cross for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

VIRGINIA KINCH

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the generosity of Virginia Kinch and her family in Longmont, Colorado.

Last year during the holiday season, Virginia and her daughters were preparing to deliver Thanksgiving meals to the homeless. They were shocked to hear about a family living in a broken down school bus behind a truck stop, so they went to deliver food to them. They discovered that this struggling family had three young daughters—a 5 year old, a 14-month old, and a 4-week old. After providing the family with a hot meal, Virginia wanted to do more to help. Fortunately, the Kinch's had just completed renovations on a house in Greeley that they planned to rent out or sell. Instead, Virginia went above and beyond and decided to invite the struggling family to move into that home rent-free.

The kindness and selflessness displayed by the Kinch family is truly remarkable. They fully embody the Christmas spirit of giving, and are an inspiration to us all. For that, I am pleased to honor and recognize their outstanding act of kindness.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTIAN OAKES FOR HIS EXTRAORDINARY HUMANITARIAN AND RELIEF EFFORTS TO HURRICANE VICTIMS

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Christian Oakes of Walton County, for his success and remarkable relief efforts to reach those devastated by hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria.

Weathering through the storm to reach those previously deemed "unreachable," Christian Oakes defied all odds. His leadership and persistence represent what Northwest Florida is all about—helping those in times of need.

Christian and Cass Oakes were married on August 21, 2017. Four days later, they exchanged their honeymoon for a rescue mission. Without a second thought, they loaded up donated supplies that Christian miracu-

lously accumulated by reaching out to business partners and clients, and headed to help Harvey victims in Texas.

Mr. Oakes' relentless spirit in helping the people of Texas is a spirit that I hope everyone can look to and admire. He proved nothing would stop him from doing everything he could to help, when he offered the very shoes off his feet. He traveled from truck to foot to boat and finally had to be airlifted by a Blackhawk—which he thought was pretty cool. Christian extended his hand to people he had never met before. He simply wanted to help.

When Hurricane Irma hit south Florida, Christian and Cass immediately began planning and executing. Using only their Excursion and U-Haul trailer, they delivered over 5,000 cubic feet of supplies in Collier County, Florida alone. Christian was so incredibly dedicated to this mission, he passed up an opportunity to meet the President so he could immediately begin preparation for the next relief effort.

Following the aftermath of Maria in Puerto Rico, Mr. Oakes' rose to overcome many challenges. One of those being the need to administer vaccines to those affected by the flu. After running into some issues, he contacted my office for assistance and throughout the night, together, through many phone calls and emails, we were able to successfully get those vaccines to the proper destination in time for most to be administered.

I am very proud of Christian, his wife Cass and their incredible team for the phenomenal aid for victims in Texas, Florida and Puerto Rico. This spirit of duty to help others during times of disaster should inspire and be emulated by every American.

Cass Oakes summed up their mission statement well as she stated, "I never want to buy anything for myself again, I just want to help others. Everything you work so hard for in life can just be taken away in an instance."

Christian and Cass Oakes continue to give of themselves on a daily basis to assist those in need. I look forward to partnering with them in the future and I am honored to be their Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Christian and Cass Oakes for their extraordinary humanitarian and relief efforts across our state of Florida and around the United States of America.

RUBY EAMES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ruby Eames for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ruby Eames is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ruby Eames is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all

levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ruby Eames for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

REMEMBERING DANN SPEAR

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Dann Spear, a 40-year resident of Yuba County, who passed away unexpectedly on February 22, 2018.

Dann was born to William C. "Doc" and Margie Spear in Ventura, California in 1954. He grew up around horses and livestock, and worked at the family business at the Ojai Valley Inn Riding Stables and Matalija Ranch in his youth. He graduated from Nordhoff High School in 1972, and while attending Cal Poly S.L.O., he competed in college rodeo and went on to compete successfully in professional rodeo in the team roping event.

He married the love of his life, Roberta Eskew Spear, in 1974. After attending Cal Poly, they moved back to Ojai, where Dann began working in the construction industry. After two years, they realized their dream of owning a small ranch and moved to Marysville, California, where Dann continued to compete in professional rodeo and continued his construction career. Dann worked in the Public Works Department of Sutter County for 30 years, where he loved helping the people of Sutter County. Dann also had a strong faith and love for the Lord in a quiet way and always treated people like family.

Dann and Roberta had two sons, Carson and Brandon. They were involved in 4-H, little league, and high school rodeo, and they never missed a game of Wheatland Pirates football. Dann's boys grew up to become a Captain in the Army and Iraq War Veteran and a Sergeant in the Yuba County Sheriffs Department. Dann dearly loved his daughters-in-law, Erin, who is an estate planning attorney at Guth & Changaris, and Cotie, who is the Nursing Administrator for Yuba County Corrections.

While raising his family, Dann founded the Museum of the Forgotten Warriors in 1983. Dann had always been interested in military history, and after meeting several World War Two Flying Tigers Veterans, it inspired the start of his military memorabilia collecting. Dann's collection and passion for telling veterans' stories continued to grow and shape the museum.

Dann enjoyed every minute of life and I know that his spirit and his memory will be cherished by his family, friends, and many others throughout the community.

WINGS UP

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to not only congratulate the Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU) women's basketball team as they head to the NCAA tournament for the fifth time in seven seasons, but also to wish them continued success throughout the tournament.

The Eagles fought hard to beat Jacksonville and clinch the Atlantic Sun Conference Tournament Championship. I congratulate Coach Karl Smesko and all of the players for their hard work this season—best of luck and continue to make us proud. Wings up.

DARRIEN ESPINOZA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Darrien Espinoza for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Darrien Espinoza is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Darrien Espinoza is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Darrien Espinoza for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING AND CONGRATULATING RANDY AND DIANE FRYKBERG FOR THEIR SERVICE WITH THE NATIONAL SKI PATROL

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize Randy and Diane Frykberg for their retirement from the National Ski Patrol after a combined 103 years of service. Through their exceptional leadership and steadfast devotion to their community, Diane and Randy have become an indispensable part of Northern Michigan.

Since its founding in 1938, the National Ski Patrol has dedicated itself to serving the public and ensuring the safety of those who seek to enjoy outdoor recreation. It is currently com-

prised of more than 26,000 members serving in over 600 different patrols. With 52 and 51 years of service respectively, Randy and Diane are one of only 14 husband-wife pairs to each devote over half a century to the safety of their local community.

Under the service of Randy and Diane, the team at Boyne Highlands was named the Outstanding Large Ski Patrol 2015–16, ranked first out of 127 patrols in the region and second nationally. Serving as Patrol Director at Boyne Highlands since 2012, Randy's innovative leadership has led to wide success and recognition. Among these innovations include the Boyne Highlands Host Program—the first such program in the nation. He also created a relationship with Michigan State University College of Medicine, providing the opportunity for 3rd year students to shadow patrollers to study the field techniques and outdoor emergency care. Additionally, Randy was instrumental in ensuring guest safety during an arson fire at the Highlands Lodge in December of 2016. Outside of their service with the National Ski Patrol, Diane and Randy have two sons and own and operate a floral shop in Boyne City.

Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to congratulate Randy and Diane Frykberg for their combined 103 years of service to the people of Northern Michigan with the National Ski Patrol. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such devoted individuals. On behalf of my constituents, I wish Diane and Randy all the best in their future endeavors.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MARTIN MACDONALD FOR HIS INDUCTION INTO THE MISSOURI SPORTS HALL OF FAME

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Martin MacDonald for his induction into the Missouri Sports Hall of Fame.

Mr. MacDonald serves as the Director of Conservation for Bass Pro Shops, seeking to connect those who love the outdoors with the ideals of protecting wildlife and the habitat in which they live. He has worked with and assisted in the founding of several organizations that strive to promote conservation based policies, including the Upper White River Basin Foundation. He serves on the James River Basin Partnership and is a board member at the Wonders of Wildlife National Museum and Aquarium. Being a prominent member of the conservation community, Mr. MacDonald works closely with the National Association of Fish and Wildlife agencies to determine how best to preserve and protect Missouri's outdoor resources. His record over the course of a twenty-plus year career has earned him special recognition from the National Association of State Park Directors as someone who is deeply committed to promoting the outdoors. This commitment to the ideals of conservation has now earned him a much-deserved spot in the Missouri Sports Hall of Fame.

My highest appreciation goes to Mr. MacDonald for all the fine work he has done for southwest Missouri and to all the efforts he has made in the conservation and wildlife communities. My district is one that many folks enjoy hunting, fishing and the beauty of the outdoors and I know they join me in thanking Mr. MacDonald for all the great work he has accomplished throughout his career.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY RESERVE SERVICE ACT

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Department of Homeland Security Reserve Service Act, a bill that establishes a reserve service for five agencies within the Department of Homeland Security: the United States Secret Service, Federal Protective Service, Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the Transportation Security Administration.

Personnel shortages in each of these agencies are well documented. Many current or former directors have made public statements linking personnel shortages to gaps in hiring processes, issues with retention of employees, and temporary or ongoing surges in need. The Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General, the U.S. Government Accountability Office, and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform have issued reports spotlighting these issues.

The implication is clear. Many agencies within the Department of Homeland Security lack the workforce necessary to carry out their critical missions during surges in need. These shortages are a matter of national security.

By way of example, the United States Secret Service has faced hiring and retention issues for years. In August 2017, the Director asked Congress for additional funds because these shortages, coupled with surges in need, caused more than 1,000 agents work hundreds of hours of uncompensated overtime. Representatives JON KATKO (R-New York) and ELIJAH CUMMINGS (D-MD) subsequently introduced a bill allowing the Secret Service to raise special agents' salaries and overtime caps for 2017 and 2018. While I support the measure, it does not solve the larger issue. Also, repeatedly increasing and lowering salary caps is inefficient and costly.

There is precedent for reserve services in the Department of Homeland Security. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) responded to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, Hurricane Jose, and Hurricane Maria by mobilizing temporary on-call reservists and Cadre On-Call Response/Recovery (CORE) personnel to assist with rescue and recovery.

The Department of Homeland Security Reserve Service Act establishes adapts this model for other pervasive, yet unpredictable national security requirements. The bill establishes a reserve service, comprised of skilled,

ready-to-work former employees, including retirees that can be temporarily mobilized to fill personnel shortages and meet emergent demands.

This reserve service allows components to be innovative in structure and application. While some positions could mirror existing ones, components are encouraged to find new ways to call upon a reservist's skill set, in whole or in part.

For example, if a retired United States Secret Service agent has expertise in planning for the United Nations General Assembly, but is not able or does not want to carry a gun and/or meet the physical demands required in some protective missions, they could fill a critical planning role, freeing permanent personnel or other gun carriers for other assignments. Under this bill agencies are urged to find innovative approaches that decouple skills held by reserve service members from those required of full-time employees.

Rather than maintaining the status quo, this program represents an opportunity to curb costs by capitalizing on investments taxpayers and agencies have already made in the human capital of former employees while simultaneously preserving institutional knowledge and experience.

I urge my colleagues to join me in helping the Department of Homeland Security perform their mission critical duties of investigation, patrol, response, security, protection, recovery, and inspection by supporting this act.

MARIAH FERNANDEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Mariah Fernandez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Mariah Fernandez is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Mariah Fernandez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Mariah Fernandez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO CITY OF FLORENCE, ALABAMA COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the great City

of Florence, Alabama, as it celebrates its 200th Anniversary. I am honored to serve the people of Florence, which is located in Alabama's 5th District.

By way of background, on March 12, 1818, General John Coffee saw the potential for a settlement on the banks of the Tennessee River, and he founded Florence, Alabama. General Coffee led the Cypress Land Company, and these visionaries established what they envisioned as a bold, new prosperous settlement.

At this time, these founding fathers of Florence commissioned an Italian surveyor named Ferdinand Sannoner. In deciding on a name for the new settlement, he named it Florence after the beautiful and historic city of Florence, Italy.

Through the years, the city grew steadily and many businesses and educational institutions were established in Florence. The city became known for having a legacy of industry, music and the arts, education, and architecture.

Today, Florence stands as a testament to the Tennessee Valley's rich heritage, and I am proud to celebrate Florence today. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the City of Florence on this momentous occasion of its 200th Anniversary and wish the city the best for another 200 years.

IN HONOR OF DOROTHY R. (DOTTIE) SPINDLE

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Fairfax County's leading citizens, Dottie Spindle, who is retiring as Secretary of The 123 Club after 27 years of service.

The 123 Club was formed over 30 years ago by a group of Northern Virginia Business Leaders who were interested in promoting economic development in Northern Virginia and George Mason University. Since that time, Fairfax County has blossomed into one of the most vibrant business corridors in the nation, and George Mason University has grown to house over 35,000 students at the graduate and undergraduate level, making it the largest University in Virginia.

Through the last 27 years, Dottie Spindle has served as Secretary (a volunteer position), coordinating meetings, reaching out to speakers, and keeping the books on an evolving membership of movers and shakers across Northern Virginia. The 123 Club has hosted Governors, Senators, Congressmen, State Legislators, Cabinet officers and leaders in economic academia. Though membership has changed, along with a growing and diverse business establishment, Dottie Spindle has been the one constant, holding together a band of eclectic community leaders and scheduling meetings, ensuring quorums and keeping the group together.

A long time employee of Dewberry, a large engineering firm in Fairfax, Dottie has announced her well-earned retirement, and will

be stepping down this spring from both entities. The 123 Club and the citizens of Fairfax County will greatly miss her, as she has made a substantial mark serving behind the scenes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Dottie Spindle for her contributions to our community.

COMMEMORATING WOMEN'S
HISTORY MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 31st observance of March as Women's History Month.

I want to list several women who made history with their election to the U.S. House of Representatives:

1. Congresswoman Jeanette Rankin of Montana who was the first elected woman member of the House of Representatives;

2. Congresswoman Patsy Mink of Hawaii was the first woman of color and the first Asian American woman elected to Congress;

3. Congresswoman Shirley Anita Chisholm of New York who was the first African-American Congresswoman member of the House of Representatives; and

4. Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN whom we have the honor of working with is the first Hispanic woman elected to serve in Congress;

5. Senator TAMMY BALDWIN of Wisconsin is from the LGBTQ community to serve in this body and the first to serve in the United States Senate; and

6. NANCY PELOSI, the first woman elected Speaker of the House of Representatives.

National Women's History Month can be traced back to March 8, 1857, when women from New York City factories staged a protest over working conditions.

International Women's Day was first observed in 1909.

In 1981, Congress passed a law authorizing the President to proclaim March 7, 1982 as "Women's History Week."

It was a modest beginning, but very significant to women because it started a societal and cultural change in how women—and especially young girls—saw themselves within American society.

In 1987, Congress expanded the week to a month and every year since, Congress has passed a resolution for Women's History Month, and the President has issued a proclamation.

This month we recognize Women's History Month by noting the fundamental role women have played in shaping America's history.

But a month is not enough to make known the significant contributions of women to the success of the United States of America.

We taught our girls about 'Rosie the Riveter' who represented the millions of American women who went to work on assembly lines to manufacture tanks, planes, and weapons for the defense of this nation during World War II.

America has been blessed to have the contributions of American women heroes in the

fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM).

Women like Sally Kristen Ride, the first woman sent into space; Eileen Marie Collins, the first woman space shuttle pilot; and Grace Murray Hopper, an American computer scientist and United States Navy rear admiral.

Admiral Hopper developed the first compiler for a computer programming language, which made it possible to program computers without using punch cards.

There are many women in the State of Texas and in the city of Houston who have made significant contributions to the American story:

1. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas was the first African American woman elected to the House of Representatives;

2. Kathryn "Kathy" Whitmire was the first woman elected to serve in the Houston City government; and

3. Mae Carol Jemison was the first African American woman astronaut.

I was proud to have been a cosponsor of the "National Women's History Commission Act," signed into law by President Barack Obama in December 2014 and which established a commission to study the potential for creating a National Women's History Museum and submit to the President and Congress a report containing recommendations on a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Women's History Museum in Washington, D.C.

The Commission delivered its report to Congress in November 2016 which contains the following recommendations:

1. America deserves a physical national museum dedicated to integrating women's distinctive contributions into our culture and history.

2. The Museum should be built on a highly prominent location close to other museums on or very close to the National Mall.

3. The Museum should be composed of a strong permanent collection with supplemental exhibits or objects on loan from other museums and archives, including components of the Smithsonian.

I agree and that is why I strongly support and am an original co-sponsor of H.R. 19, the "Women's History Museum Act," which establishes a comprehensive women's history museum within the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC to provide for the collection, study, and establishment of programs related to women's contributions that have influenced the direction of the United States.

A National Women's History Museum is needed to ensure that when the story of our nation is told that the role of women is represented in the narrative of our nation.

But there is much that remains to be done to ensure that women receive the same opportunities as their male counterparts and are equally represented in the public, civic, and economic life of the nation.

Women represent more than 50 percent of the population and cast more than 50 percent of the votes in the last several national elections but no woman has yet been elected to serve as President or Vice-President of the United States, although Hillary Clinton made history by becoming the first woman to win the nomination of a major political party and won

65,853,516 votes, nearly 3 million more than her opponent, the current President.

Today, on average women still make only 77 cents for every dollar made by men and this gap is wider for African American and Hispanic women.

Nearly two-thirds of minimum-wage workers are women.

The poverty rate—14.5 percent for women—remains the highest in two decades.

Family and medical leave protections fail to cover nearly half of full-time employees.

Women-owned businesses continue to lag behind men-owned businesses. The average revenue of women-owned businesses is only 27 percent of the average revenue of men-owned businesses.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats know that when women succeed, America succeeds.

That is why in July 2013, House Democrats unveiled "When Women Succeed, America Succeeds: An Economic Agenda for Women and Families."

This agenda addresses the need to ensure that women get equal pay for equal work.

It helps ensure work and family balance by allowing working parents to support their families and care for their children.

And it recognizes that expanding educational opportunities, increased job training, and investments in women entrepreneurs are essential for women's success in our economy.

American women have made great strides over the last 100 years—but the fight for equal opportunity and to provide women with the economic security and opportunities they deserve and their families need is far from over.

We cannot rest until all of America's mothers, wives, and daughters truly have the same opportunities as America's fathers, husbands, and sons.

STATE OF MINNESOTA RESPONDS
TO PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR
2019 BUDGET PROPOSAL

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I recently held a hearing in St. Paul, Minnesota's capital city, to receive feedback on President Trump's fiscal year 2019 budget proposal. I am deeply appreciative for the input from the State of Minnesota, the University of Minnesota, Ramsey County, Washington County, the City of Saint Paul, and vital nonprofits like Lutheran Social Services, Clean Water Action, the Alzheimer's Association, Habitat for Humanity, Community Action Agencies, the Sierra Club, and the Minnesota Council on Nonprofits.

The testimony I heard was clear and unambiguous, the President's budget will harm every aspect of our community—students, seniors, low-income families, housing, the environment, refugees, and the list goes on and on. If a White House intentionally wanted to write a budget that shredded vital services to communities and essential services to school districts, local governments and state agencies this is that destructive, dangerous document.

As this Republican Congress limps along trying to finish work on the fiscal year 2018 federal budget (nearly six months past the start of the fiscal year), we are now starting appropriations work for 2019. I expect there to be largely bipartisan agreement that President Trump's budget will be largely rejected in favor of some bipartisan common sense, if such a thing exists anymore.

I include in the RECORD the following testimony from Eric Hallstrom, Deputy Commissioner, Minnesota Management and Budget and it clearly articulates what is at risk in our state if Mr. Trump's backwards agenda is advanced:

Good Morning. For the record, my name is Eric Hallstrom and I am Deputy Commissioner at Minnesota Management and Budget, the state's budget agency. On behalf of Governor Dayton and the State of Minnesota, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the president's budget proposal.

Federal budget decisions have a direct impact on the services Minnesotans receive. In considering the budget proposal, we appreciate your attention to the profound effects federal budget and fiscal policy decisions have on the State of Minnesota. The president's budget contains deep cuts in programs that have a disproportionate impact on the most vulnerable Minnesotans, including children, the elderly, and those living in poverty.

As you are aware, at the state government level we adopt balanced budgets on a two-year cycle. We make budget decisions based on revenue projections that look out two and four years into the future. Governor Dayton has spent the last seven years working hard to right out state's fiscal ship by ensuring Minnesota's budget is balanced. Under Gov. Dayton's leadership, we corrected the 6 billion dollar deficit left by the previous administration. We restored the state's credit ratings to be some of the highest in the nation. And nine out of the last ten budget forecasts showed positive balances, compared to the decade of deficits before Governor Dayton took office. While we always face risk that our revenue projections will fluctuate, we are seeing more uncertainty and risk at what we can expect in federal funding levels than at any other point in recent history.

The President's Fiscal Year 2019 budget cuts domestic programs by a total of \$3.6 trillion. In the absence of substantial new spending by the State, the consequences of these cuts would be an increase in hunger, poverty and inequality in Minnesota. The President's budget cuts would undermine the well-being of children and families, lead to increases to Minnesota's uninsured rate and homeless population. These cuts will result in our land and waterways being less clean, our economic progress will be slowed, and education opportunities will be denied to many Minnesotans. In order to avoid these outcomes, the cuts would shift costs to the state. Yet even if the State of Minnesota attempts to bear as much of the burden as it can, we will simply not be able to make up for the cuts outlined in the president's draconian proposal.

With the limited time I have, I'd like to discuss a few major areas of the state budget that will experience the most severe impacts. First I will start with health and human services.

Health and Human Services: Over the next decade, the president's budget calls for cutting more than \$800 billion from Medicaid—

the federal health program for lower income and persons with disabilities—as well as \$192 billion from nutritional assistance and \$272 billion over all from anti-poverty programs. These cuts create an enormous shortfall in Minnesota's state budget, taking away billions of dollars per year in federal Medicaid matching funds.

The budget would rescind the ACA's Medicaid expansion and replace it with a plan similar to the Graham-Cassidy bill that failed in the Senate last year. These changes would create Medicaid block grants to states and a per person spending cap-in effect cutting spending and taking billions of dollars per year away from Minnesota in federal Medicaid matching funds. To make up for these losses, the state would be faced with making difficult decisions to reduce health care eligibility or benefits to make up for the shortfall. These options make coverage uncertain for over 1 million Minnesotans currently under Medical Assistance (MA), Minnesota's Medicaid program, and the 100,000 Minnesotans who purchased low-cost coverage through MinnesotaCare.

Medicaid cuts of this level will also have a significant impact on Minnesota schools. School districts and charter schools rely heavily on Medicaid reimbursements to provide federally mandated services to students with disabilities. An estimated \$46 million of federal reimbursements is paid to Minnesota for these services annually. Any reduction will be absorbed by a reallocation of school district general education revenue or through increased burden on the state budget or local tax payers.

The President's budget cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, by 30 percent, or \$213 billion over ten years. SNAP is the most effective anti-hunger program in our country and provides food to more than 645,000 low-income Minnesota children, seniors, people with disabilities, and working families. Minnesota would lose \$150 million per year and over a billion dollars over 10 years, causing low-income Minnesotans to lose or reduce their nutrition benefits.

The President's budget cuts Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) by 10 percent, resulting in a loss of \$25 million per year for some of the lowest income Minnesota families. In 2017, an average of 95,000 people—more than 70 percent of them children—in 34,000 families are receiving assistance from the Minnesota Family Investment Program, our state's TANF program.

The following programs in the area of health and human services are completely eliminated by President Trump's budget. To continue any of the services they provide, the state will have to backfill all of the funding.

Social Services Block Grants (SSBG), a program that funds child and adult protective services in Minnesota, is eliminated. Minnesota receives \$31 million from this program annually, 95 percent of which is provided to counties and tribes for direct services for vulnerable children and adults.

Community Services Block Grants (CSBG) is eliminated. The program funds community action programs that serve every county in Minnesota by providing locally-defined solutions to address poverty. In 2015, more than 514,000 Minnesotans were served by these funds. Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) is eliminated. In federal FY 2017, Minnesota received \$114 million in federal funds from LIHEAP and served nearly 320,000 Minnesotans.

The impact of these cuts on the most vulnerable Minnesotans cannot be emphasized

enough. However, for the sake of time, I will now briefly touch on the budget proposal's impact on the state in several critical areas, including education, infrastructure, housing, the environment, and agriculture.

Education: All children in Minnesota depend on access to a great education for good jobs and a bright future. Governor Dayton has prioritized investments in education every year he has served as governor, including paying back our schools, increased investments in the K12 funding formula, funding all-day kindergarten across the state, funding pre-K programs for our youngest learners, and investing in our institutions of higher education.

Once again, the president's budget threatens to undo much of this progress. The proposal includes an \$8 billion or 12 percent cut from FY18 continuing resolution to the U.S. Department of Education. These cuts include:

The elimination of 29 programs with an annual reduction of \$5.9 billion (from FFY 17)

The cancellation of \$1.6 billion of unobligated balances in the Pell Grant program.

A few of the programs that the president's budget completely eliminates include:

Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants: Which provided Minnesota \$31.5 million that went to Minnesota schools.

21st Century Community Learning Centers: Minnesota currently receives about \$12.2 million that programs programming at 108 community and school-based centers. In the 2015-16 school year the programs service 23,517 students attending 384 different schools, including public, private, charter, and BIE schools.

Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (FSEOG) Program, a campus-based federal grant for undergraduates with exceptional financial need. In Minnesota in 2014 through 2015, approximately 27,000 post-secondary students received approximately \$19 million of these funds:

Department of Education GEAR UP Program, which provides funding for services at high-poverty middle and high schools to help students succeed and prepare for college. In Minnesota, over 61,000 students would lose valuable support for postsecondary preparation and access, 158 schools and over 40 higher education partners would be impacted, and about 20 full time employees would be out of a job.

Again, this list is not exhaustive, but instead only illustrates some of the crucial social and economic programs that the president's budget eliminates.

Infrastructure/Transit: Turning to Infrastructure and Transportation. Throughout his time as governor, Mark Dayton has proposed honest, straightforward policies to fix Minnesota's aging and under-funded transportation systems. The economic success of the state hinges on long-term vision and planning of our infrastructure. The governor welcomes a discussion on increased investments in infrastructure and the state stands ready to use increased funding on worthy projects.

However, the president's budget is short-sighted and would significantly underfund critical projects. The budget flips the traditional source of federal funding for capital construction from a 20 percent state match to an 80 percent state match. Under this scenario, Minnesota would have trouble finding competitive projects.

Critical to several ongoing transit projects across the metro area, the President's budget proposes to fund only those projects within the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grant Program (CIG) that

already have existing full funding grant agreements. This policy would prohibit the extension of the Green Line (Southwest LRT), the Blue Line (Bottineau LRT) and Orange Line (Bus Rapid Transit). The CIG program supports and generates regional economic growth, connects workers to employers, relieves congestion, and improves urban air quality. The President's FY2019 budget proposal would essentially stop any of these projects from moving forward by eliminating funding for projects that are in the Capital Investment Grant pipeline but have not yet secured federal funding agreements.

Housing: More than 554,000 Minnesota households struggle to afford quality housing, a 58 percent increase since 2000. Under Governor Dayton's leadership, public and private investments totaling more than \$5 billion has helped nearly 325,000 low-and moderate-income households. He established a task force on housing and has worked to find consensus on policies to help alleviate Minnesota's housing challenges. Significant work has yet to be done and the cuts to affordable housing that are outlined in the president's budget would take us backward. They would significantly impact the stability of the most vulnerable households in Minnesota and would increase the state's homeless population.

The President's budget includes an 11 percent decrease in Section 8 program funding. Minnesota Housing manages Section 8 project-based rental assistance on behalf of the federal government. In FY 2016, this funding assisted nearly 32,000 households with median incomes of \$12,000, 48 percent who are seniors, and 22 percent are families with children. Housing choice vouchers assist another 31,000 households. In addition to cuts, the budget proposal would significantly strain low-income households by increasing the share of income paid towards rent and eliminating utility reimbursements.

The president's budget completely eliminates the several programs that provide funding for affordable housing services, primarily within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). A few examples include:

The HUD HOME Investment Partnership, the Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program at the Department of Energy, and as mentioned earlier, the Community Development Block Grant. These programs have collectively provided roughly \$68 million to Minnesota for affordable rental housing, home rehabilitation, and energy efficiency improvements for low-income family homes.

In addition, the Interagency Council on Homelessness would be eliminated, which would jeopardize Minnesota's recent successes in effectively ending veteran's homelessness as well as our 17 percent drops in family homelessness between 2014 and 2015.

Environment: In the area of environmental policy, Governor Dayton has been consistent and outspoken in advocating for climate change prevention, the importance of clean water, and the adverse impacts President Trump's presidency has been on recent progress. The budget's attempt to gut the EPA and funding to states is another step in the wrong direction.

Even as the Trump Administration continues to roll back a decade of hard-fought progress, Governor Dayton has made it clear that Minnesota will not flinch. We will show the nation what can be achieved by working together to solve the challenges facing our people, our economy, and our environment.

We will share best practices with other states, and work with them to mitigate the damaging impacts of the President's dangerous and divisive policies.

As the ranking member of the Interior-Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, we sincerely appreciate your efforts to relay Governor Dayton's concerns over the president's enormous cuts to the EPA and programs it supports.

The Environmental Protection Agency is cut by 23 percent in the President's budget, which equates to a severe 54 percent cut to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA). The impact to the state would be a loss \$11.1 million in the 2019 federal fiscal year. These grants provide continuing environmental program funding for all areas of work at the MPCA. Programs proposed for elimination at EPA include the Nonpoint Source Implementation Program which targets local watershed studies and implementation projects to reduce or eliminate sources of water quality pollution from diffuse sources; Pollution Prevention Program which targets source reductions; and Underground Storage Tank (UST) Program that targets permitting and compliance activities for regulated USTs.

Included in the cuts to the EPA, the President's budget reduces the Brownfield programs by 33 percent, limiting redevelopment and restoration of land to commercial uses.

The president's budget also cuts the EPA's Great Lakes Restoration Initiative by 90 percent. The program supports restoring and protecting watersheds in eight states surrounding the Great Lakes that provide drinking water for over 40 million Americans and drives a \$62 billion annual economy of fishing, boating and recreational activities. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency receive Restoration Initiative funding for the following activities:

Annual grants for prevention and management of Aquatic Invasive Species in the Great Lakes Basin (\$800,000),

Habitat restoration and remedial action plan implementation activities in the St. Louis River Area of Concern Project (\$4.5 million grant), and

Lake management activities to protect water quality in Lake Superior Basin through efforts to reduce impairments and toxic chemicals (\$896,000).

In addition, the Coastal Zone Management program through National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is cut by 20 percent. The program funds \$972,000 annually for protecting streams and rivers in the Great Lakes area.

Agriculture: Agriculture is a cornerstone of Minnesota's economy, providing more than 400,000 jobs and \$121 billion in economic activity. The President's FY2019 budget proposes a 16 percent reduction in USDA discretionary spending and showcases a lack of understanding about what is important to rural America and the agriculture economy. The budget seeks to weaken the safety net of crop insurance during a time of low commodity prices putting our rural economies at risk. Crop insurance provides farmers with the security they need to increase yields, improve efficiencies, and stay competitive in world markets. The President's budget calls for steep cuts to premium subsidies and excludes producers with an Adjusted Gross Income of more than \$500,000.

These budget and policy changes will harm Minnesota's agricultural economy. We are hopeful that the next Farm Bill will focus on fostering a robust farm and rural economy,

maintaining a strong nutrition title, and prioritizing conservation and water quality programs.

On behalf of Governor Dayton, the executive branch of the State of Minnesota, and the millions of Minnesotans served by the state, please voice your opposition to these cuts in the President's budget, as well as any other draconian cuts to programs that Minnesotans rely on. Moving forward, we are available to work with you and others to ensure that the 2019 federal budget is a fair approach for the services upon which Minnesotans depend. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these remarks.

FINDLAY NAMED TOP MICROPOLITAN COMMUNITY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Findlay, Ohio for being named the 2018 Top Micropolitan Community in the United States. Awarded by Site Selection magazine, Findlay has now received this recognition as the top city for business for four straight years.

To qualify, a micropolitan city must have a population ranging from 10,000 to 50,000. Site Selection judged 575 of these cities on business growth and sustainable success. In total, Findlay listed 21 projects that met Site Selection's criteria leading to its fourth straight first-place finish.

It is a team effort top to bottom that has led the way to Findlay's consistent success. I commend Mayor Lydia Mihalik, the Findlay-Hancock County Economic Development office, the Hancock County Commissioners, and the entire community for everything they've done to top the charts once again.

Mr. Speaker, the 'Findlay Formula' has an established track record that meant to cultivate growth and prosperity for the community. With their business-friendly environment, I have no doubt that Findlay will be at the top again next year.

Congratulations once again to Findlay for being named the country's No. 1 Micropolitan Community.

CENTENNIAL OF UPPER ARLINGTON, OHIO

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Ohio's 15th Congressional District to recognize the centennial of Upper Arlington, Ohio. Since King and Ben Thompson formed the Upper Arlington Company and purchased the original 840 acres, Upper Arlington has been a hub of activity in Central Ohio, reminding us of much of our nation's history and entrepreneurial spirit.

In 1913, the Thompson brothers saw the value of the Country Club District—as it was originally named—and believed it to be the ideal location for a residential community. The

brothers were not alone in their assessment, and their efforts were temporarily halted in 1916 when the National Guard employed the area as a training camp, Camp Willis. Despite this, they persisted, and the village was incorporated in March of 1918.

Following its incorporation and based on its strategic location east of Columbus, the area grew rapidly in its earliest years. In the 1920s, Upper Arlington reaffirmed its commitment to the entrepreneurial spirit, and the Mallway business district was developed. Professional office spaces and retail businesses sprung up along Upper Arlington Avenue.

Today, Upper Arlington remains a wonderful place to work, live, and raise a family. I am grateful for the leadership of Mayor Kip Greenhill, the Members of the City Council, and all of the neighbors and friends who have maintained Upper Arlington's strong commitment to community.

I am honored to represent this city, where the core values of our nation are exemplified. This is a place with a Cherished Past and a Golden Future, and I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the centennial of Upper Arlington, Ohio.

IN HONOR OF SPRING GARDEN
WINNING AHSAA CLASS 1A HIGH
SCHOOL BASKETBALL TITLE

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Spring Garden High School Varsity Girls for winning the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 1A basketball state title.

The Panthers beat the Phillips Bears 52–38 on March 1, 2018 at the Legacy Arena at the BJCC in Birmingham, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the students and faculty of Spring Garden High School, the coaches, the players and all the Panthers fans on this exciting achievement! Go Panthers.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING
OF THE USS "HOUSTON"

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring your attention to a memorial ceremony for the men who served aboard the USS *Houston* (CA-30) held this month in Sam Houston Park in my hometown of Houston. Descendants of the sailors and Marines of the "Flagship" of the U.S. Asiatic Fleet that was sunk by Imperial Japanese Naval forces on March 1, 1942 which honored their bravery and determination.

Seventy-six years ago, the American heavy cruiser USS *Houston* (CA-30) and Australian light cruiser HMAS *Perth*, outnumbered and

outgunned by an Imperial Japanese Navy Battle Fleet, fought to the last in the Sunda Strait between Sumatra and Java. Both went down with their captains aboard and their guns still firing. Nearly 1,000 Allied servicemen perished. It marked the end of the U.S. Asiatic Fleet and the naval forces of the American-British-Dutch-Australian (ABDA) Command.

As the crews abandoned the sinking ships, Japanese sailors machine-gunned the decks and the men in the oil-soaked sea. Only 368 sailors and Marines, including four Chinese stewards and mess attendants from the *Houston*, made it to shore where they were taken as POWs of Japan. Some were held in a POW camp on Java, eight officers were sent to Japan to corporate POW camps, and others to the infamous Changi Prison in Singapore. Most, 220 of the survivors were shipped to Burma to be slave laborers constructing the Thai-Burma Death Railway.

For the next three and one-half years, the surviving men of the *Houston* and *Perth* suffered together through humiliation, degradation, physical and mental torture, starvation and horrible tropical diseases. Only 291 men from the *Houston's* complement of 1008, and 214 of the *Perth's* complement of 681, returned home after the War. This shared history speaks to the American spirit and grit as well as to our enduring alliance with Australia.

Back in Houston, Texas, news of the destruction of the warship hit the city hard. The result was a mass recruiting drive for volunteers to replace the lost crew. On Memorial Day 1942, a crowd of nearly 200,000 witnessed 1,000 "Houston Volunteers" inducted into the Navy. An accompanying bond drive raised over \$85 million, enough to pay for a new cruiser and an aircraft carrier, the USS *San Jacinto*.

According to a 1949 Houston Chronicle article commemorating the event, word of the ship's fate "aroused a fever pitch of patriotism" in the city. "Her loss made the war something more of a personal conflict to more than half a million people," the article reads. "Official news of her destruction . . . slapped the city squarely between the eyes, and set off a series of events that stands unequaled in the nation."

So this week, we pause to remember the brave men of the USS *Houston* (CA-30) who inspired their country and who gave so much to fight tyranny in the Pacific. They who "Still Stand Watch Over Sunda Strait" represent our enduring commitment to liberty. And I thank the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor Memorial Society and the USS *Houston* CA-30 Survivors' Association and Next Generations for ensuring that the sacrifice and lessons of this greatest generation is remembered and honored.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE ROTARY CLUB
OF LANCASTER, OHIO

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Ohio's 15th Con- gress-

sional District to celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the Rotary Club of Lancaster, Ohio.

From its founding in 1918 in the parlor of the New Martens Hotel, countless members of our Lancaster community have been called by the Club's motto "Service above Self," to spread goodwill to their neighbors. The impact of this organization throughout the 15th District is immeasurable; like a pebble dropped in a pond, the ripples are far-reaching.

Over the past century, the Lancaster Rotary Club has been involved in numerous initiatives and projects benefitting not only their community, but the furthest corners of the globe. From supporting local students with a scholarship fund that honors the late Dr. Jacob Sims, to fundraising for PolioPlus and supporting the development of Operation Smile, the Lancaster Rotary Club has made the Fairfield County community and the world a better place.

Today, the Lancaster Rotary Club works to foster cultural understanding and bring people together. Each year, the Rotary hosts and helps to subsidize foreign exchange students who attend Lancaster area high schools, and promotes Group Study Exchanges between international Rotary Districts. I am extremely grateful to all those involved for their continued efforts.

Again, I wish to congratulate President David Uhl and the entire Lancaster Rotary Club upon this historic milestone, and convey my most sincere appreciation for their ability to place "Service above Self."

AMERICAN HELLENIC INSTITUTE
LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMP
REGARDING TURKEY'S CONTIN-
UED AGGRESSIVE ACTIONS IN
THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Hellenic Institute regarding Turkey's continued dangerous actions in the eastern Mediterranean and broader region that threaten regional security and U.S. interests. As one of the co-chairs of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus, I have advocated for the rights of Greece and Cyprus against the intimidating actions of Turkey. Since Turkey's Presidential referendum vote, Erdogan's government continues to ignore and violate long-standing international law and treaties—a threat to regional security and an impediment to regional interests, stability, and prosperity.

As we have done times before, we must continue to condemn these acts of aggression and renew our call for President Erdogan's government to demonstrate to the international community that it is committed to all international laws and agreements. Additionally, the United States and our strategic regional allies must be better prepared to respond quickly and forcefully to transgression of international law from any nation including NATO ally Turkey through targeted sanctions and foreign aid restrictions.

President DONALD J. TRUMP,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the nationwide membership of the American Hellenic Institute (AHI), I write to urge the U.S. government to condemn strongly the acts of Turkish provocation and aggression in the eastern Mediterranean and broader region that have dire implications to U.S. security interests.

During this month alone, Turkey's antagonistic behavior—or "gunboat diplomacy"—in the Aegean Sea against NATO partner Greece, and bellicose threats to EU member Republic of Cyprus' sovereign right to explore for natural gas with its exclusive economic zone (EEZ), were taken to new dangerous heights. In fact, Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan threatened Greece, Cyprus, and international oil and gas companies, warning them not to "step out of line." Furthermore, Turkey's acts of provocation have also been directed at the United States. With regard to the Aegean Sea, a Turkish coastguard vessel collided with a stationary Greek coastguard vessel near the Greek island of Imia, on February 12, 2018. Video footage of the incident has since been released and shows damage to the Greek vessel's stern. In addition, Turkey continues to violate Greece's airspace. According to press reports, 33 Turkish aircraft have violated Greece's airspace during the first twelve days of February 2018. Combined with what

transpired on the seas, these are very serious incidents that risk placing lives in harm's way and violate international law.

With regard to Cyprus and implications to the potential for energy security, Turkish warships harassed the surveying vessel of Italian oil company Eni and threatened on February 23, 2018 to sink it in the exclusive economic zone of Cyprus. According to press reports, Eni's ship was forced to make maneuvers to avoid a collision after the Italian captain's request to the Turkish vessel to change course went unanswered.

The Republic of Cyprus has the sovereign right under international law to explore and exploit its natural resources within its exclusive economic zone. The United States has stated repeatedly it supports Cyprus' sovereign right to explore energy in its offshore areas, most recently by a State Department Spokesperson earlier this month. "The United States recognizes the right of the Republic of Cyprus to develop its resources in its Exclusive Economic Zone," the spokesperson said, adding, "the island's oil and gas resources, like all of its resources, should be equitably shared between both communities in the context of an overall settlement. Furthermore, Turkish aggression in Cyprus' EEZ presents an endangerment to U.S. companies, such as ExxonMobil and Noble Energy, who have been, or will be, working to explore for hydrocarbons in the eastern Mediterranean.

Moreover, Turkey continues to demonstrate it is not a true and dependable U.S. and NATO ally. President Erdogan threatened United States military forces with an "Ottoman slap" if they continued to partner with Syrian Kurds. Turkey's military campaign against the Kurds in Syria places U.S. troops in Manbij at risk of peril at the hands of a NATO partner. Further, Turkey's \$2.5 billion purchase of four divisions of S-400 surface-to-air missiles from Russia has raised concern among NATO partners and potentially subjects Turkey to U.S. sanctions based upon the recently-enacted Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA), according to a U.S. administration official.

Mr. President, Turkey is a significant force of instability and a failed U.S. ally. Historically, this has been the case; however, Turkey demonstrated this yet again in the short span of three weeks this month. Turkey's aggressive and provocative actions directed at the United States and U.S. allies, Greece and Cyprus, are overt, egregious and dangerous. I urge the administration to act to uphold the rule of law and to call on Turkey, the provocateur of these tensions, to cease and desist with its aggressive actions that are a threat to peace and stability and are not in the best interests of the United States.

Sincerely,

NICK LARIGAKIS,
President.

SENATE—Wednesday, March 14, 2018

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, increase our faith until we are no longer awed by life's challenging seasons. Direct our Senators in their work, using them to fulfill Your Divine purposes. Lord, remind them that all things are possible to those who believe in Your prevailing providence. We acknowledge this day our great need of Your sustaining power so that we can walk without stumbling or slipping along life's pilgrim pathway. Help us to remember that faith without works is dead.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

HONORING OFFICER SCOTTY HAMILTON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, hearts are heavy in Pikeville, KY, this

morning. Last night, Officer Scotty Hamilton, a 12-year veteran of the Pikeville Police Department, was shot and killed in the line of duty.

The investigation is ongoing. My Kentucky staff and I are monitoring the situation closely.

For now, our sincere condolences go out to his family, friends, and colleagues at the Pikeville Police Department.

Officer Hamilton leaves behind a wife, a young daughter, and a community that is safer for his service.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, this will be a busy day for the Senate. Today, Senator THUNE and our colleagues on the Commerce Committee will continue their hearings on rebuilding America's infrastructure.

Notably, five Cabinet Secretaries will testify: Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, Energy, Agriculture, and Transportation will all share the administration's ideas for cutting redtape, streamlining permitting, and aligning Federal resources with local needs.

I am grateful for the Trump administration's commitment to this issue, and I hope this week's hearings, along with the ongoing work of our colleagues on Environment and Public Works, Appropriations, and other committees, will keep building momentum.

Bipartisan results are achievable this year, starting with billions of added funding for infrastructure improvements in the budget agreement, and extending to the work of many committees in the months ahead.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will also finish considering the bipartisan banking reform bill championed by Senator CRAPO. The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act is co-sponsored by a quarter of the Senate—split down the middle between Republicans and Democrats—and was advanced earlier this week by two-thirds of our colleagues. That is because this modest but essential bill tackles a problem that hurts communities in red States and in blue States. It hurts rural areas, farm towns, suburbs, and urban neighborhoods.

The problem is this. The Dodd-Frank Act has proven to be far too blunt of an instrument for regulating our financial

system. Regulations meant for Wall Street are crushing Main Street.

Community banks and credit unions play a vital role in our economy. Smaller lenders provide more than 50 percent of small business loans and nearly 80 percent of agricultural loans, but they are struggling to keep their heads above the tide of complicated regulations and compliance costs. Many are going under, and when they do, research shows that access to capital shrinks for small businesses, farmers, ranchers, and low-income Americans.

Senator CRAPO's legislation helps to fix this. It streamlines regulations and tailors the rules so smaller lenders aren't caught up in the web of regulations aimed at the biggest banks.

Senators had and still have a wide diversity of views on Dodd-Frank, but all of us should at least agree that Wall Street and Main Street are very different, and that one-size-fits-all is a poor way to address this issue.

I look forward to voting to pass this bill later on today.

TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, this afternoon President Trump will visit a Boeing production facility in St. Louis. He will hear from local business leaders about how tax reform is giving them room to invest more and hire more.

Missouri's senior Senator tried to block tax reform on a party-line vote. Fortunately, their Republican Senator voted to let them realize this prosperity.

For months now, the headlines have been filled with businesses large and small using tax reform to give workers bonuses, pay raises, and new benefits. But raises and bonuses aren't the only ways that tax reform will help hard-working families.

Thanks to the efforts of Senator HELLER and others in the committee, tax reform doubled the child tax credit and extended it to more middle-class families. When they file their taxes next year, families will be able to take \$2,000 off of their tax bill for every qualifying child.

My friend the Democratic leader said repeatedly that tax reform would do nothing to help American workers. The Democratic leader in the House said the law would bring about "Armageddon." I am not sure where they get their predictions, but I don't think they will carry much water with middle-class families in Missouri or Indiana or West Virginia or certainly in Kentucky.

For brand-new parents facing one expense after another, the \$2,000 credit will more than cover the cost of a brand-new washer and dryer set or a new refrigerator. For a middle-class family of four, the credit is \$4,000. That more than covers the standard down payment on a used car, priced at the national average, or it could kick off a college savings fund.

Just “crumbs”—really? Maybe adding thousands of dollars to family budgets looks like crumbs in New York or San Francisco, but to most Americans around most kitchen tables, that is real money, and so is the adoption tax credit, which keeps the IRS’s hands off more of the hard-earned money that adoptive families need to cover expenses.

Last autumn, I met a wonderful family from Franklin, KY, who adopted their son from Ethiopia in the face of many hurdles and difficulties. His mother wrote my office. She told me:

Our sweet boy is worth every dime and tear.

They were counting on that tax credit, as were many other families. Republicans made sure this credit was preserved.

Here is how that Kentucky mother described the impact. She said:

The tax credit we will receive . . . has allowed us to pay off the last remaining debt we owed. Such a weight lifted off our shoulders.

New pro-family tax cuts and new pro-family tax credits, all while protecting existing pro-family provisions that Americans rely on—that is what every Democrat voted against, but fortunately, it is what every Senate Republican voted for. So the American people won in the end.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2155, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2155) to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 2151, in the nature of a substitute.

Crapo amendment No. 2152 (to amendment No. 2151), of a perfecting nature.

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, at this moment all across the country, students are walking out of school for 17 minutes in memory of the 17 Americans who died at Stoneman Douglas High School 1 month ago today.

Here on the floor of the Senate, I join with those students in remembering the fallen students and teachers of Stoneman Douglas. I join with them in remembering the beautiful children who died at an elementary school in Newtown. I join with them in remembering a long line of American children who perished in the slow-moving tidal wave of gun violence that is consuming our country—all the unopened presents and uncelebrated birthdays, all the empty chairs at dinner tables, graduations, and holidays. These kids had their whole lives ahead of them.

This has gone on for too long. When a disease plagues our people, we seek a cure. When we see drug addiction stealing the lives of our youth, we get together here in Congress and try to do something about it. Why is it that when it comes to gun violence—which is responsible for just as many, if not more, deaths—we throw up our hands and pretend there is no solution?

We know there are commonsense things we could do. Close the dangerous loopholes in the background check system; ensure that anyone with a criminal history or history of mental illness can’t get their hands on a gun; and, yes, we should debate the assault weapons ban because weapons of war have no place on our streets and no place in our schools.

While so many students today are mourning their friends and classmates, we in Congress are in a unique position. We alone have the ability to change our laws to make America safer and, God willing, prevent another one of these massacres—these horrible, horrible massacres.

What will we do with that awesome responsibility? I was here on the floor of the Senate when this body failed to advance any legislation in the wake of Sandy Hook. The shame we all felt, and America felt, as this body was unable to act because a powerful special interest seems to have its grip on too many of our colleagues. Well, let this time be different. Let this time be different.

In a moment, I will read the names of 17 Americans—14 children—who were killed in the horrific attack at Stoneman Douglas High School. I am joined by a good number of my colleagues who wish to read the names of children and other victims who died at the hands of gun violence in their States. May their memories—may their memories—inspire us to act.

Alyssa Alhadeff, Martin Duque Anguiano, Scott Beigel, Nicholas Dworet, Aaron Feis, Jaime Guttenberg, Christopher Hixon, Luke Hoyer, Cara Loughran, Gina Montalto, Joaquin Oliver, Alaina Petty, Meadow Pollack, Helena Ramsay, Alex Schachter, Carmen Schentrup, Peter Wang.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues today to give the country a sense of the scope of this epidemic. We have tried every means to move our colleagues to action, but in remembering the names of people who have been lost, it is a reminder that there is a human face behind every single one of these numbers, and behind that victim there is a trail of trauma—family members, friends, classmates—that is difficult to unwind.

On December 14, 2012, armed with a tactical semiautomatic weapon with clips of 30 bullets, a gunman walked into Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT, and killed 20 children, 6 adults, and himself.

Among them were Rachel D’Avino, 29, a teacher’s aide; Dawn Hochsprung, 47, the principal; Anne Marie Murphy, 52, a teacher’s aide; Lauren Rousseau, 30 years old, a teacher; Mary Sherlach, 56 years old, a school psychologist; Victoria Soto, a 27-year-old teacher.

The students were Charlotte Bacon, 6 years old; Daniel Barden, 7 years old; Olivia Engel, 6 years old; Josephine Gay, 7 years old; Dylan Hockley, 6 years old; Madeleine Hsu, 6 years old; Catherine Hubbard, 6 years old; Chase Kowalski, 7 years old; Jesse Lewis, 6 years old; Ana Marquez-Greene, 6 years old; James Mattioli, 6 years old; Grace McDonnell, 7 years old; Emilie Parker, 6 years old; Jack Pinto, 6 years old; Noah Pozner, 6 years old; Caroline Previdi, 6 years old; Jessica Rekos, 6 years old; Avielle Richman, 6 years old; Benjamin Wheeler, 6 years old; Allison Wyatt, 6 years old.

I have a 6-year-old, and yesterday he and 24 of his classmates were locked in a tiny bathroom for several minutes for an active shooter drill. When he came home last night, he said: Daddy, I didn’t like it.

Since Sandy Hook in Connecticut, there have been hundreds more: Lisa Infante, 52, of Shelton; Antoine Heath, 29, of New Haven; Jonathan Aranda, 19, of New Haven; Miguel Arguelles, 22, of Bridgeport; Cameron Chapman, 25, of Waterbury; Sherrie Blount, 31, of Danbury; Ebony Swaby, 22, of Waterbury;

Daniel Joseph Caron, Sr., 63, of Bristol; Michael Watkins, 26, of Bridgeport; Keon Huff, Jr., 15, of Hartford; Joshua Rivera, 28, of New Haven; Deon Rodney, 31, of Bridgeport; Khali Davis, 22, of Bridgeport; Norris Jackson, 36, of Bridgeport; Eduardo Anes, 37, of Hartford; Alfanso Anderson, 49, of Bridgeport; Guy Moore, 26, of Waterbury.

That is just the tip of the iceberg as to what has happened since Sandy Hook, just in my State of Connecticut—representing only 1 percent of the population.

A 6-year-old shouldn't be locked into a bathroom, smushed together with 24 of his classmates, preparing for the day when a shooter potentially walks into his public elementary school. We have a duty to act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues today, I rise to address what has unfortunately become the norm for our kids in schools and across the country.

On October 1 in Las Vegas, we saw the worst mass shooting in the history of this country—innocent concertgoers attending an entertainment venue outdoors. There were 58 killed and 500 injured at the hands of a madman with an assault weapon.

In the past 5 years, we have lost an average of 10 children each year to gun violence in Nevada alone. Today I speak in memory of the 50 children from my home State who will never get the chance to grow up and graduate from high school, pursue their dream job, or even have children of their own.

The names I am about to read aloud were beloved sons, daughters, friends, and classmates whose lives were tragically cut short in the last 3 years:

Clemente, 17 years old, from Las Vegas; Jovanni, 16 years old, from Las Vegas; Terry, a 17-year-old from Reno; Tiris, 17 years old, lived in Las Vegas; Marcus, 3 weeks old, lived in Las Vegas; Anthony, 17 years old from Laughlin; John, 11 months old, from Las Vegas; Anthony, 16 years old, from Las Vegas; Bradley, 4 years old, lived in Las Vegas; a young male victim, 16 years old, from Reno; Giovanni, 14 years old, Las Vegas; another young victim, 16 years old, lived in Las Vegas; Luis, 16 years old, from Las Vegas; another young victim, 15 years old, from West Wendover; Sincere, 12 years old, from Las Vegas; Ethan, 17 years old, from Las Vegas; Angelo, 15 years old, lived in Las Vegas; Benjamin, 17 years old, lived in Las Vegas; a young female victim, 3 years old, from Las Vegas; another male victim, 4 years old, lived in Las Vegas; Jhronne, 17 years old, from Las Vegas; Joshua, 17 years old, from Las Vegas; Xonajuk, 14 years old, from Las Vegas; Anhurak, 9 years old, from Las Vegas; Dalavanh, 15 years old, from Las Vegas; Robert, 17 years old,

from Las Vegas; another young female victim, 17 years old, from Reno; and Fabriccio, 13 years old, from Las Vegas.

Across the country students are saying "Never again" to another child lost to gun violence, and I ask that this Congress do the same thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today to remind all of us of those who have been lost due to gun violence from Washington State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names be printed in the RECORD to remind all of us that this is just a fraction of those we know have been lost.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Carrie Parsons, Sam Strahan, Deputy Daniel McCartney, Officer Jake Gutierrez, Sergeant Mark Renninger, Officer Ronald Owens, Officer Tina Griswold, Officer Greg Richards, Deputy Anne Jackson, Trooper Troy Giddings, Army Sergeant Timothy Hovey, Michelle Vo, Denise Burditus, Sarai Lara, Shayla Martin, Chuck Eagan, Belinda Galde, Beatrice Dotson, Joe Albanese, Andrew Keriakedes, Kimberly Layfield, Donald Largen.

Gloria Leonidas, Anna Bui, Jordan Ebner, Jake Long, Zoe Galasso, Shaylee Chucklunaskit, Gia Soriano, Andrew Fryberg, Pam Waechter, Frank Cohens, Jr., Thomas Ianniciello, Erick Valdez-Herrera, James Smith, Michael Clayton, Demonte Young, Karen Perez-Placencia, Carl Phelps, Junior, Justin Love, Brandon Perry, Trina Bolan, Eddie Holmes, Jenna Carlile, Ava Field.

Ashen Field, Tiana Montgomery, LeRoy Lange, Wayne Anderson, Judy Anderson, Scott Anderson, Erica Anderson, Olivia Anderson, Nathan Anderson, Paul Lee, Maxine Harrison, Samantha Harrison, Jayme Harrison, Heather Harrison, James Jr. Harrison, George Brown, Davary Hicks, Jeffrey McLaren, Alex Kelley, Wesley Gennings, Tabitha Apling, Adam Gutierrez, Dennis Sloboda.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in recognizing that we must take action to protect the safety of our communities.

Senator VAN HOLLEN and I are on the floor, proud of the Maryland students who are here today to speak in solidarity with the students from Parkland, FL, in recognizing and remembering the 17 victims of that tragic episode. We also wish to point out that so many others have lost their lives to gun violence.

In the State of Maryland, we have not been spared. Just Monday night, 10 people, including 2 teenage boys, were wounded in 5 separate shootings in Baltimore. They are the lucky ones who will likely survive their injuries.

Two men killed in separate shootings on Monday were Montrel Rivers, age 20, and Ronald Preston, age 30, both from East Baltimore.

On March 5, 23-year-old Devonte Rhodes was lost to gun violence in Baltimore. One day earlier, Jashawn Ivory, also of Baltimore, was the fatal victim of a shooting.

In February, 28-year-old Jasmine Chandler and her pregnant friend, Mia Robinson, who was also 28, were shot as they sat in a parked car in Northwest Baltimore. Also last month, off-duty Prince George's County Corporal Mujahid Ramziddin lost his life to gun violence.

Fatal victims of gun violence in Maryland include young people like Tre'Quan Bullock, age 18, the first of seven students at Excel Academy in West Baltimore shot and killed since October 2016.

Lavar Douglas, age 18; Bryant Beverly, age 18; James Martin, age 55; "Sonny" Buchanan, age 39; Prenkumar Walekar, age 54; Sarah Ramos, age 34; Laurie Ann Lewis-Rivera, age 25—the list goes on and on and on.

In memory of all of those who have lost their lives to gun violence, it is imperative that we speak out and act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the young people throughout this country who have the courage to do what the U.S. Congress is not doing; that is, to lead us forward in a way to lower the slaughter we are seeing from coast to coast in terms of gun violence.

The bad news is that people continue to be killed every day. The good news is that the American people have come together around commonsense solutions to lower the level of gun violence we are experiencing. The American people know that we need to expand and improve background checks, that we need to do away with the gun show loophole, and that we need to do away with the straw man provisions. More and more Americans understand that we should ban the sale and distribution of military-style weapons.

In my small State of Vermont between 2011 and 2016, 42 people were killed by guns. Some of them are Lara Sobel, Julie Falzarano, Regina Herring, Rhonda Herring, Molly Helland, Molly McLain, Kevin DeOliveira, Rhonda Gray, Marcus Austin, and Obafemi Adedapo. These are just some of the people who lost their lives to gun violence in Vermont.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today many of us will join with Maryland students and other students throughout this region to demand that this Senate and the House of Representatives take commonsense action to reduce gun violence in America—gun violence that has resulted in massacres at concerts, slaughters in churches, and, of course, mass deaths

at schools throughout the country, and the death toll we see in the streets of America every day.

I am going to read the names of 17 Maryland young people, people under age 20, who have died just in the last year as a result of gun violence in Maryland.

Andre Galloway, 16 years old; Lavander Edwards, 16 years old; Dashanae Woodson, 17; Shaquan Trusty, 16; Thomas Johnson, 16; Anthony Cheeks, 17; Tyrese Davis, 15; Jeffrey Quick, 15; Xavier Cole Young, 14; Kymici Brown, 17; Larry Aaron, 19; Terry Joseph Bosley, 17; Iyanni Nachae Watkins, 13; Shadi Adi Najjar, 17; Artem Ziberov, 18; Dustin Khoury, 17; and Laila Goodwin, 4 years old. That is not the entire list of people under age 20 who were shot and killed in Maryland. In the State of Maryland, in 2017, 481 souls were lost to homicide, and in 2016, 436 Marylanders were lost to homicide, in all cases by gun violence.

The time to act has long passed, but for goodness' sake, let's join with the students and Americans crying out throughout this country to say enough is enough and enact commonsense gun safety legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, these are the names of 17 children who were killed with guns in my State. I will read their first names only because it makes us remember they could be anyone's children.

Lisa Marie, age 15; William Robert, age 15; Anthony, age 16; Jacob Alexander, age 14; Joseph Anthony, age 17; Terrell, age 3; Joshua Albert, age 15; Alisha, age 17; Jesse, age 18; Cedric, age 18; Darion Joseph, age 15; Justin Daniel, age 17; Jennifer Ellen, age 17; David Andre, age 17; Tabitha Lee, age 16; Terrence, age 16; Anthony Michael, age 3.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Congress does not have the courage to act on gun violence, but young people across this country are showing the way. They are speaking up, and they are demanding action. I honor them, and I commit to fight alongside them.

I am going to read the names of some of those lost from Massachusetts. They didn't get a chance to join this fight before they died from gun violence, so I take this opportunity to join them to the young people who are fighting today for sensible gun reforms.

Gerrod Brown, 16 years old; Anthony Scaccia, 6 years old; Angel Suazo, 16 years old; Alejandro Lorente, 11 years old; Tenzin Kunkhyen, 16 years old; Janmarcos Pena, 9 years old; Chantal Matiyosus, 16 years old; Latoya Graham, 15 years old; Brian Crowell, 12 years old; Ross Mathieu, 12 years old; Liquarry Jefferson, 8 years old.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today is a momentous one in the Capitol because the students of America are giving us a real life lesson in the American Constitution. Their energy and passion are a civics lesson for America. What a proud and wonderful moment today is for our democracy. It is sad—indeed, tragic—that this lesson must concern gun violence that has taken such a devastating toll, most recently in Parkland, FL, but literally that toll is true of America every day. We can never become numb to the catastrophic costs of gun violence in America today.

I have the honor to read the names of some of those victims of gun violence; indeed, the Sandy Hook victims. Their deaths are still in our hearts. Their lives are still with us. Their memories are alive today. My friendships with their loved ones, particularly their parents, inspire me to continue this fight against gun violence in America. Their courage and strength have inspired so many of us in this country, and their names deserve to be remembered and read again in this Chamber.

Noah Pozner, age 6; Charlotte Bacon, age 6; Jack Pinto, age 6; Olivia Engel, age 6; Dylan Hockley, age 6; Catherine Hubbard, age 6; Avielle Richman, age 6; Jessica Rekos, age 6; James Mattioli, age 6; Josephine Gay, age 7; Caroline Previdi, age 6; Benjamin Wheeler, age 6; Chase Kowalski, age 6; Ana Marquez-Greene, age 6; Grace McDonnell, age 7; Emilie Parker, age 6; Madeleine Hsu, age 6; Allison Wyatt, age 6; Daniel Barden, age 7; Jesse Lewis, age 6. And their teachers: Victoria Soto, age 27; Lauren Rousseau, age 30; Anne Marie Murphy, age 52; Rachel D'Avino, age 29; Mary Sherlach, their psychologist, age 56; Dawn Lafferty Hochsprung, the principal of the school, age 47.

All of them died in December of 2012. All of them will be remembered not only on this day but forever, not only in Connecticut but around the world. We must always keep them in our hearts as a reason to keep this fight against gun violence going.

In the hearing presently underway in the Judiciary Committee, as I speak, there is testimony from members of the government investigative agencies which have responsibility for stopping gun violence. My fear is, this hearing will be an excuse for inaction and continued complicity by Congress in the failure to act. The complicity in those deaths is on our hands in this body by failing to take action.

There are actions we can take that will help to save lives—commonsense, sensible action—that Congress has failed to take: universal background checks, ban on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines, a red flag

statute that will prevent people who are dangerous to themselves or others from having or buying guns. Many of these measures are bipartisan, and we can come together with the lesson from the students and young people who are in the streets coming to the Capitol today. That lesson should be a reminder that the right side of history is in favor of preventing gun violence.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today is 1 month to the day from a tragic shooting in Parkland, FL, where 17 high-school-aged students lost their lives. As so many of my colleagues have done, I come to the floor to remember them, to honor their loss, to speak to their classmates, colleagues, and families, and to share from the experience of my own home State of Delaware.

This morning, today, there are high school students across our country and across my home State of Delaware who are walking out of class to try and draw the attention of those of us in Washington to the urgent need that we work across the aisle to tackle the plague of gun violence that affects communities all over this country. That is why we see young people not just across the country but including in my home State of Delaware demanding that we take action. We need to answer their call.

Let me speak to my hometown of Wilmington, DE. Just last month, 5 people—5 people, last month—under the age of 21 were shot in Wilmington, and 2017 ended as one of the worst years ever for gun violence and homicides—197 individuals shot, 32 wounded fatally.

If I could, I wish to read the names of 31 individuals who were victims of gun violence in the city of Wilmington in 2017. We are working—Federal, State, and local officials; police departments and community and civic leaders—to try to tackle these challenges, but some of the core causes can only be addressed here. We need to find a way to work together, to respect each other, to compromise, and to tackle the very real epidemic of gun violence in our country.

These 31 Delawareans lost their lives in the city of Wilmington to gun violence in the year 2017: Dariberto Velazquez Mendez, age 32; Santanu Muhuri, age 64; Jermaine Francois, age 34; Charles Mays, age 66; Jamiere Harris, age 21; Kayden Young, age 21; Ainsley Cumberbatch, age 23; Jamiel Congo, age 23; Kevan Hale, age 38; Tajane

Helton, age 41; Richard Crosby, age 30; Yaseem Powell, age 18; Tyree Robinson, age 23; Bryan Brooks, age 29; Tynesia Cephas, age 16; Joquon Coverdale, age 22; Derrius Jackson-Paul, age 23; Sherman Pride, age 22; Shamar Lindsay, age 25; Cyree Watson, age 22; David Bailey, age 23; Nycire Mills, age 23; Kai'Mel Ennals, age 20; Barry White, age 19; Allen Melton, age 28; Albert Hazzard, age 33; Dwayne Grimes, age 19; Justin McDermott, age 18; Andrew Pennewell, age 25; Shawn Lockhart, age 29; and Keanan Samuels, age 20.

The facts of all of these different episodes of violence and loss vary widely, but the conclusion must be the same: We have to find ways to listen to each other, to work across the aisle, and to stop deadly shootings in our country.

I am encouraged that many of my colleagues today have introduced legislation that would take meaningful steps to tackle gun violence and make all of us safer. We must act. We must listen to the voices of young Americans demanding that we do our job and make our country safer.

I yield floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, in every corner of our country today and across my State in Washington, countless students are taking part in a walk-out in support of reforms to combat gun violence. I stand in solidarity with these students who are trying to provide an example of why we must make progress on this issue. No student should fear for their life while attending school, and I will continue to work on solutions here to curb gun violence.

We in Washington State have been able to make progress by passing initiatives to close gun show loopholes and to move forward on extreme person legislation. I should say that that was passed by the citizens of our State. We should look at the example of Washington's initiatives and the success we have had in our State in curbing gun violence as commonsense solutions that should be considered here in Washington, DC.

When we look at these issues, I am reminded of the tragic shootings in our State—of Sam Strahan, from Spokane, who was killed, and individuals who were killed in Washington in a Marysville-Tulalip shooting when Jaylen Fryberg, at just 15 years old, opened fire on students and killed Gia Soriano, Andrew Fryberg, Shaylee Chucklunaskit, and Zoe Galasso and wounded Nathan Hatch.

These tragedies are more than we can take at our schools. These tragedies are something that we need to address here in Washington. So I stand in solidarity with our students who are trying to address these issues and address our Nation's need to come together and provide better solutions to protect our students.

We are still heartbroken about this shooting in the sense of it being an example of the challenges we face—a young man who took his father's gun. He was a father who never should have had the gun to begin with because he was on a domestic violence restraining order. Yet he was still able to go to a store, get the gun, and keep the gun in the home. Then the young student was able to take that to school.

I want all of these families to know that we still think of them, that we are still mourning the loss of these individuals, and that we are working very hard with our colleagues to come to some resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to talk about the legislation before us, which is the banking legislation that has been reported out of the Banking Committee on a bipartisan vote and awaits our attention here today.

Mr. President, like my colleague from Washington State, I will also speak briefly to the issue that is being raised in States across America and in schools across America, where students are demonstrating their support and their solidarity with the folks in Parkland, FL, where 17 kids were lost earlier this year.

My dad was a hunter, grew up in West Virginia. I was born in West Virginia and grew up in Virginia. I bought my first BB gun when I was 10 years old, and I still have the shotgun that my grandfather gave me just before he died, when I was just a pup of a teenager. In my family, we are big believers in Second Amendment rights—to own and bear arms. We are also big advocates of using common sense with respect to weapons.

My dad was not only a hunter, he was also a gun collector. He would buy and sell guns to other people whom he knew. From the time my sister and I were little kids, my dad would always say to us, "Just use some common sense." He said it a lot to us when we were growing up. We must not have had much of it because he said it very often. My dad said that it didn't make common sense for somebody who had serious mental health problems or a felony record to be able to go to a gun show and buy a weapon. It also doesn't make a lot of sense for people who can't fly on airplanes because they are on a terrorist watch list to be able to buy guns. My dad would have said that didn't make a lot of sense.

What is happening across the country is that the kids are leading us. In a verse in the Bible, it reads that the "child shall lead them." I think that is really what is going on here, and I think States are already starting to address this issue in a more constructive way than we have done thus far.

My hope is that the children will lead us and that the States will lead us as well. Maybe we will be able to come to agreement on some of these issues that are respectful of our Second Amendment rights in the Constitution but that are also consistent with the kind of common sense that my dad always talked about with respect to everything, including the buying and selling of weapons.

Mr. President, I remember standing on this floor—I think it was about 8 years ago—when we debated the Affordable Care Act. That was at a time when we were spending about 18 percent of the GDP for healthcare in this country—18 percent. The Japanese were spending 8 percent. They had better results in Japan for their healthcare than we had, and they covered everybody. Think about that. We had been spending 18 percent, and they had been spending 8 percent. They had gotten better results in healthcare—in life longevity for adults and in lower rates of infant mortality. They covered everybody. When people went to bed in this country at that time, 40 million people went to bed without having any healthcare coverage. I think most of us realized at the time that that was not a good thing. I used to say that the Japanese can't be that smart and we can't be that dumb.

We passed the Affordable Care Act. There was a lot of debate and a lot of amendments offered in committees, including in the Finance Committee on which I served, Republican amendments and Democratic amendments. As we know, the final vote here on the floor was not a bipartisan vote. It was a huge issue that we were trying to address—delivering healthcare to 300 million Americans.

For those who supported the legislation, even they realized that it was not perfect and that we were going to have to come back at some point in time and make changes to it. The Democrats felt that way. The Republicans and Independents felt that way as well. We ended up not coming back and offering modest amendments or making tweaks to the legislation. At the end of the day, we ended up with a battle here, initially over the repeal of the ACA and later over repealing and replacing it.

I felt proud of the work we had done on the ACA. In my knowing it was not perfect, I always looked forward to coming back shortly after we had adopted it, actually, and making some tweaks. I felt the same way about Dodd-Frank, the banking legislation

that we passed after the great recession about 7 or 8 years ago.

I will just remind everybody, especially our young pages here today, who were probably about 7 or 8 years old at the time, that we didn't fall into a burning ring of fire—we fell off a cliff. The unemployment rate shot up to 10 percent, and banks stopped lending money to send kids to school or to allow people to buy a car or a house. Credit was shut off for businesses as well. The unemployment rate skyrocketed. Our economy was locked up, and we felt that we had to do something.

What we tried to do was to figure out how we ended up in that mess in the first place. What had gone on is that the people who wanted to buy houses, who were not creditworthy, ended up being loaned money by banks across the country to buy houses. In many cases, the appraisals for the houses were not worth the paper they were written on. The creditworthiness of the buyers was not worth the paper it was written on as well. We had unqualified people who were trying to buy property. They were unable, realistically, to repay their loans. It all worked just fine until we went into a slump. As the unemployment rate started to go up, people found it more and more difficult to make their payments.

In the olden days, I remember the first house I lived in when I was a kid. My parents borrowed money from a bank for a mortgage, and then they paid it off to that bank. I remember, when they paid off the mortgage to the house they owned in Danville, VA, it was a big deal. My dad actually took the mortgage and burned it up outside, not inside our house.

Yet, 7 or 8 years ago, for a lot of people, after they borrowed money from banks, the banks sold those mortgages to somebody else, oftentimes to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would package those mortgages into mortgage-backed securities—into a security that could be sold to investors in this country and to investors around the world. As long as housing prices continued to rise, everything worked fine. When they stopped rising and started falling, a number of those mortgage-backed securities were riddled—almost like Swiss cheese—with bad mortgages. As more and more people failed to be able to pay their mortgages, the mortgage-backed securities lost their value. Those investors around the world who had invested seriously in mortgage-backed securities got scared, and it started to spiral down from there.

That was not really the only reason we got into a burning ring of fire all those years ago, but it was a big reason. Part of what we decided to do with Dodd-Frank was to make sure that didn't happen again. We would make other mistakes, but we were not going to make that mistake again.

The legislation was passed. Again, not everybody was for it. I voted for it and helped to write some of the provisions in the bill. I knew at the time, as I think we all did, that anything that big—a massive change in our banking regulatory approach in this country—was going to have to be tweaked and revisited just like the Affordable Care Act. It has taken a while.

For the most part, our Republican friends—not all and probably not including the Presiding Officer—were interested in repealing Dodd-Frank. I and, I think, the majority of folks on our side were interested in fixing the provisions that needed to be fixed but not in throwing the baby out with the bath water.

The legislation before us today was reported out of the Banking Committee but not unanimously. It was reported out, I think, last fall, by the chairman of the committee, MIKE CRAPO from Idaho, whose name is on the bill. I am going to spend some time here today talking about what it does and what it doesn't do.

If the bipartisan bill before us becomes law, 90 percent of Dodd-Frank will remain unchanged. Let me say that again. If the banking bill before us today becomes law, 90 percent of Dodd-Frank will remain unchanged.

The legislation that has been authored by Senator CRAPO and others does not touch some of Dodd-Frank's most important reforms. Some of those most important reforms include the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It remains. The Financial Stability Oversight Council remains. It is affectionately known as FSOC, and it works to identify and to address overarching threats to the financial system. The regulations that crack down on risky derivative trading remain, and the ability of the FDIC to wind down failing complex institutions through an orderly liquidation authority remains.

Under this legislation, the Federal Reserve would retain the authority to apply enhanced standards to any bank with over \$100 billion in assets. In addition, banks with over \$100 billion would still be subject to numerous regulatory requirements. Those requirements include, one, meaningful stress tests; two, increased capital requirements to provide a cushion in tough times and bad times; and, third, vital international reforms to leverage in liquidity standards.

I have a number of charts. I have more charts today than I think I have ever brought to the Senate floor. I promise we will be done by sundown. It will seem that long, but in reality it will not be.

Let me start off, if I could, with a couple of claims made about the bill and, then, talk about the reality.

One of the claims is that this bill would gut Wall Street reform that was passed after the financial crisis to prevent another global meltdown.

That is the claim. Here is the reality. This bipartisan bill makes targeted, commonsense fixes that will provide tangible relief to community banks and credit unions, while leaving in place the rules and regulations that will keep Wall Street accountable.

Before we look at the next claim, like the Presiding Officer, I do customer calls all over my State. The Presiding Officer has a big State, and I have a little State. I visit businesses, schools, hospitals—you name it. I do customer calls literally every week, including the credit unions and small community banks. Sometimes they come to see me, and oftentimes I go to see them. For years, during those customer calls, visiting credit unions and community banks, especially in the central and southern part of our State, they would say to us: We didn't create the financial meltdown that led us to the great recession. Yet we bear the burden of the regulatory reform for that meltdown.

It wasn't their fault. We need a lot of the regulation that is adopted in Dodd-Frank, but keep in mind that credit unions and community banks didn't cause the problem but yet they bear a big part of the burden of fixing it.

Another claim is that this bill rolls back stress test requirements for all big banks. I will say it again. This bill rolls back stress test requirements for all big banks. That is the claim.

Here is the reality. This bill continues to require stress tests for all banks over \$100 billion in assets. That would be the largest financial institutions. That is the reality.

The claim is that this bill does nothing to protect consumers. That is the claim—that the bill does nothing to protect consumers.

Here is the reality. This bill actually creates new protections. It provides free credit freezes and allows year-long fraud reports. It allows parents to turn credit reporting on and off for minors. It provides free credit monitoring for all Active-Duty servicemembers.

I am a retired Navy captain. Our Presiding Officer is a colonel—Navy salute.

It was one of the things that Senator COONS and I insisted on in order to support this legislation, and that was to provide free credit monitoring for all Active-Duty servicemembers as part of the bill.

Another reality in terms of new protections is that it encourages banks to report suspicious behavior they become aware of.

That is a little bit of the claims and the reality. I can go on with that, but I will not. I will actually turn to the words of other people, starting off with questions from Senator JON TESTER of Montana, a senior member of the Banking Committee. The first question he asked last November was to a fellow who had been nominated to be Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jay Powell, who was confirmed on this floor

with 80 or 90 votes—a big bipartisan vote.

Senator TESTER asked Mr. Powell, who was a Governor, if I am not mistaken, at the time within the Federal Reserve System. He asked:

Part of that bill—

The bill before us today—

is eliminating the Volcker Rule compliance for community banks that have less than \$10 billion, as long as they have less than 5 percent, trading assets and liabilities. Any concerns there?

The witness, Federal Reserve Chairman Jay Powell, said: “None.”

Senator TESTER went on to ask the Federal Reserve Chairman—I think this was in February of last year. Senator TESTER, my colleague, is a farmer out in Montana. He asked Jay Powell, who was not yet the Chairman of the Federal Reserve:

But I’m a dirt farmer, OK? I just, kind of, read things as they are and don’t read a lot of extra stuff into it. You’re the—you’re the man on the Fed and so I need to know your opinion. Does 2155 require the Federal Reserve to weaken any of the Dodd-Frank enhanced prudential standards for . . . [foreign banks] such as Deutsche Bank, UBS or Barclays?

This was the response of Chairman Jay Powell of the Federal Reserve:

It does not, according to my reading of the text.

I will just add that this is the text of the bill.

Senator CRAPO, the chairman of the Banking Committee, has put together this bipartisan legislation, with a lot of help from JON TESTER and others. In a hearing last July, he questioned the woman who was then-Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Janet Yellen. I think she did a very good job. She stepped down, and I thank her for her service and leadership.

Senator CRAPO said:

There appears to be growing consensus that Congress should consider changing the \$50 billion SIFI threshold [for big banks]; also, changing the Volcker rule, exempting certain institutions from company-run stress testing requirements and reducing the burdens on community banks and credit unions.

He went on to ask:

Do you agree that it would be appropriate for Congress to act in each of those areas?

He asked: Do you believe it would be appropriate for Congress to act in each of those areas—changing the SIFI threshold, changing the Volcker rule, exempting certain institutions from stress test requirements, reducing the burdens on community banks and credit unions.

Do you agree that it would be appropriate for Congress to act in each of those areas?

She said four words: “I do—I do.”

Again, in February of last year, Federal Reserve Chairman Janet Yellen, on the Volcker rule, said:

So, yes, let me reiterate what I said there. It’s important to look for every way we can to mitigate the regulatory burden. What

we’ve suggested previously and I would reiterate with respect to Dodd-Frank is that Congress might want to consider exempting community banks from the Volcker rule. . . .

That is what she said last February, a year ago.

Then, former Federal Reserve Governor Daniel Tarullo spoke. I think his position is held now by Andy Cohen. Last year, Daniel Tarullo said:

We have found that the \$50 billion in assets threshold established in the Dodd-Frank Act for banks to be “systemically important,” and thus subject to a range of stricter regulations, was set too low. . . .

He went on to say:

The fact that community banks are subject at all to some of the Dodd-Frank Act rules seems unnecessary. . . .

I will say it again.

The fact that community banks are subject at all to some of the Dodd-Frank Act rules seems unnecessary to protect safety and soundness, and quite burdensome on the very limited compliance capabilities of small banks.

Dan Tarullo said that last April.

Here are the words of former Federal Reserve chairman Paul Volcker, whom I got to know and work with when I was in the House of Representatives. He was Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and I was on the Banking Committee. He was a giant then and still is—literally and figuratively.

Here are his words in February of this year. He said:

I am pleased that the Senate Banking Committee has forged ahead with meaningful bipartisan financial reform to ease the unnecessary regulatory strain on small banks, helping them to flourish as an engine of economic prosperity. . . .

He goes on to say that he doesn’t agree with every single word of the legislation before us today, but he concluded by saying:

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important piece of legislation and look forward to its swift passage.

This is in a letter to Senator BROWN, I believe. It doesn’t mean he agrees with every single sentence and paragraph, but he looks forward to it.

Former Congressman and former Banking Committee chairman and my colleague Barney Frank, spoke on whether Dodd-Frank needs reforms in a CNBC interview last February. He was asked if Dodd-Frank needed reforms, and he said: “Of course.”

On the \$50 billion SIFI threshold, he said: “I think it should be changed,” and he went on to say: “It’s too low, I believe it is.”

Again, former Congressman Barney Frank on November 27 of last year said:

If this bill became law tomorrow, well over 90 percent of the Wall Street reform bill would be unchanged. . . . The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; the strict regulation of derivative trading; the orderly liquidation authority; the risk retention requirements on securitizations and most

other provisions would remain in full force. . . .

In full force.

We are almost done here. I thank my colleague from Vermont for his patience.

This is former Congressman Barney Frank on relief for community banks. These words are from the CNBC interview last February, a year ago.

With regard to banks under \$10 billion, some of them are spending more money than they should complying with provisions that were never really intended to apply to them and I understand that. The Volcker Rule which says that large banks should do more lending and less derivative trading, which I think is a wholly good thing, a number of small banks which never did much derivative trading are overdoing the effort to show [that] they aren’t there. I would exempt some of the banks under \$10 billion from some of those rules and I would agree to raise the \$50 billion threshold.

Last but not least, a couple of comments more—one from the Bipartisan Policy Center recently; the words of two of the folks from there:

As U.S. politics descends ever further into partisanship, there are still signs that old-fashioned legislating is not dead. This week, the Senate Banking Committee will mark up one of the first significant pieces of financial regulatory legislation in years with real bipartisan support. . . .

These are not major changes. Yet taken together, they are constructive and should provide greater incentives to extend credit, particularly to Main Street small businesses, without undermining the progress made since the crisis in making the financial system safer.

This statement is from the president and CEO of the Independent Community Bankers of America:

The markup of S. 2155 is a rare opening for real, impactful relief that will strengthen economic growth, job creation, and consumer protection. It is the culmination of years of collaborative effort to achieve consensus among Members of Congress across the spectrum and community bankers in their home States and districts. Community bankers urge all members of the Senate Banking Committee to vote YES on S. 2155.

This is from the president and CEO of the Credit Union National Association, or CUNA:

This bill includes credit union-specific provisions that provide meaningful regulatory relief, a sign that policymakers are paying close attention to the needs of credit union members. We thank Senator CRAPO and his colleagues for working across party lines to advance regulatory relief legislation that benefits community financial institutions, and look forward to continuing to work closely with them as the bill moves through the legislative process.

I hope we will keep these words in mind in the hours and days ahead as we take up this important legislation.

I have no interest in undoing Dodd-Frank. I am a strong supporter of Dodd-Frank. I helped to write some of the provisions in Dodd-Frank, and I have no interest in pulling the plug on Dodd-Frank.

Can we make some reasonable changes? Yes, we can. I felt the same way about the Affordable Care Act.

With that, I yield the floor to my friend from Vermont, and I thank him for his patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I was just at a hearing in the Judiciary Committee, and we were talking about what continues to happen, over and over again in this country—mass shootings. We are an outlier in this country, as we have far more shooting deaths per capita than any other similar country in the world, and we heard some of the things that make it difficult to attack the problem.

For example, Congress has passed legislation that cripples the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. When ATF is asked to perform a trace on a gun involved in criminal activity, they have to go to a warehouse with stacks of papers to do a physical search of records. They search warehouses that contain the amount of information I can store on an iPhone and find in a matter of seconds. This physical search is something Congress has required them to do.

We heard about the fact that you can buy magazines carrying 15 or 20 rounds, even though many states including my own State of Vermont, limit the number of rounds you can have in your weapon for deer season.

We want to give the deer a chance, but we don't want to give children in school the same chance. This is the world upside down. We limit what you can buy and use to go deer hunting but not what can be sold to people who want to shoot children.

Outside the Capitol right now, there are young students who have brought their powerful message to those of us inside the Capitol. They say thoughts and prayers are welcome, but what the United States needs right now is action.

I said this morning at the hearing that I am tired of people saying: "Oh, this is not the time to talk about taking steps. This is the time for prayer and reflection," as though it is an either/or thing. It is getting kind of weary to hear that refrain over and over again—this is not the time for action. Tell that to the parents, tell that to the other children, tell that to their siblings when they are at the funeral because somebody shot them.

Now, I am very, very proud of those students in Vermont whose voices are joining this nationwide chorus of student voices. We have Vermonters showing up, even though we have had 10 to 20 inches of snow in some towns in Vermont in the last day or so, and it is still snowing heavily there now. We know that in Washington, half an inch of snow would close the place down but not in my State. These Vermont students are not going to use a heavy snowstorm as an excuse for not show-

ing up to deliver their message. We are here in comfort in a secure building. We ought to act in solidarity with these students and with the students who put shoes out here on the lawn of the Capitol—rows and rows and rows of shoes—symbolizing children who have died.

Now, I remember a little over a year ago, millions of women across the Nation brought their energy into the halls of government. In my own hometown of Montpelier, VT, where I was born, our State's capitol, there are only 8,500 people. We had 19,000 to 20,000 show up on the statehouse lawn for the women's march there. Brave and strong, they were speaking out. My sister was one of those joining them. In fact, some had to park their cars on the interstate; they caused such a traffic jam just to be there.

I remember the hundreds and hundreds of Vermonters who came here to Washington. My wife Marcelle and I hosted them before the march with coffee and doughnuts, and we had to keep sending out for more coffee and more doughnuts because of the number of people there.

We marched with them alongside our daughter and granddaughter. We saw people of all races, all backgrounds, all across the economic and political spectrum marching for women's rights. They made a difference, and now our students are doing the same thing. Our students are acting as a catalyst to break the inertia that has prevented Congress from dealing with the plague of gun violence.

When I was chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee, we brought several pieces of gun legislation here, and even those that got 50-plus votes were blocked from going further. There was heavy pressure from powerful lobbyists. The lobby that wasn't heard, though, were the children who were facing this danger. Now they are being heard. Now they are being heard.

The question is, does Congress have the courage to listen? The strength of our democracy is citizen engagement. At a time when it has never been more important to protect and engage in our democracy, I am deeply moved by the students who are making their voices heard today. I think of those students in Florida and elsewhere who faced a horrendous thing that most of us will never see, even if we have been in combat, but they had the courage to go back to school after the shooting. They saw this tragedy, they faced the danger, they saw their classmates and teachers killed, and they still had the courage to go back to school.

Well, I would ask: does Congress have the courage to do something? That is the question they are asking. If we can't answer it positively, then we in Congress have failed these students.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, time and again, President Trump and Vice President PENCE have made clear they will put extreme ideology ahead of women's health and constitutional freedoms. We have seen it in their efforts to undermine women's ability to get reproductive healthcare from providers they trust. We have seen it in their efforts to let employers deny women birth control coverage based on what they believe and regardless of what the women who work for them believe. We have seen it in the administration's close coordination with a hate group on tailoring policies to undermine Planned Parenthood. We heard it loud and clear when Vice President PENCE laid out his far-right vision that women's freedom to have safe and legal abortions could end in our time. We have also seen it implemented to an appalling extreme in Scott Lloyd's inexcusably harmful and ideologically driven actions as Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

The Office of Refugee Resettlement is a little-known but very important office inside the Department of Health and Human Services. They are supposed to be helping resettle refugees who are fleeing violence, to resettle and integrate Iraqis and Afghans whose lives are actually in danger because they work for the U.S. Government. They provide rehabilitative, social, and legal services to survivors of torture, and they are charged with overseeing a network of providers across the United States who care for unaccompanied children who arrive at our Nation's borders—children and youth—seeking safety in our country.

However, under Director Lloyd, it has become a testing ground for the radical Trump-Pence agenda to interfere with women's health choices. Repeatedly, under the supervision of Director Lloyd's office, when young women—some of whom are survivors of sexual abuse—have sought safe and legal abortions, his response has been to personally step in and put up barriers to their care. He worked to prevent young women in his custody from speaking with lawyers about their rights. He personally interfered to try to pressure women out of their decisions to have abortions. Director Lloyd even had his office explore the possibility of reversing an abortion once the

medical procedure was underway—a practice that the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has noted is “unproven and unethical.”

A deposition from ongoing litigation shows just how reckless and irresponsible Scott Lloyd has been. In emails, he admitted he was making these decisions on an ad hoc basis. In other words, Director Lloyd wasn’t concerned with fulfilling his duty as the head of the Office of Refugee Resettlement. He wasn’t concerned with the well-being of women. He wasn’t concerned with their personal decisions or their freedoms. He was only concerned with furthering an extreme, ideological agenda.

Women and men across the country are not having it. They are standing up and standing against Scott Lloyd’s extreme policies. Many have signed a petition calling for his removal, and they are just the latest addition to a growing outcry against Director Lloyd’s willful disregard for women’s rights.

Many Senate and House Democrats have called for him to step down. I am again calling on Secretary Azar to fire Scott Lloyd as Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement because Scott Lloyd’s actions and his personal beliefs about what women can and can’t do with their bodies show a fundamental disrespect for the rights and equality of women, as does setting policy that has huge implications for women’s health and lives through an “ad hoc” process.

Scott Lloyd’s actions to undermine women’s health and to deny women’s rights are utterly unacceptable, and they cannot go unchecked. We cannot permit bullies to try to intimidate vulnerable young women who are making the healthcare decisions that are right for them—not President Trump, not Vice President PENCE, and not Scott Lloyd.

I am going to keep standing up and fighting for the rights of these women and immigrants across the country and for the rule of law that ensures those rights. I am going to keep fighting against those who think they are above the law and who want to roll back the clock on these freedoms. I urge my colleagues to join me today in standing with women, standing for the rule of law, and calling for Scott Lloyd’s immediate removal from office.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Washington to talk about the challenge that women both here in the United States and across the world are facing from the excesses of this administration.

What we have seen time and again is that the Trump administration has exhibited a dangerous obsession with

rolling back women’s reproductive rights here in the United States and abroad. Just in the past 14 months in office, this administration has launched a multipronged and aggressive assault on women’s rights. One of President Trump’s first acts in office was to reinstate and greatly expand the global gag rule, which prohibits U.S. funding for international women’s health organizations that so much as mention abortion. What they did was to say that this is not going to just affect those organizations but any health organization that the United States puts funding into. This action will cause a significant increase in unsafe abortions and maternal deaths across the developing world. The administration has proposed budgets that would eliminate all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, and, going even further, would prohibit States that on their own would direct Federal funds to Planned Parenthood for those same health services. They would prohibit States from doing that.

Most recently, the State Department reportedly removed data on reproductive healthcare from its annual human rights report. So is the idea that if you don’t give people access to data, then it doesn’t happen? The administration instructed career employees at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to remove words such as “fetus,” “diversity,” “evidence-based,” and “science-based” from their official vocabulary.

Well, if we are not basing decisions at the CDC on evidence-based and science-based data, then what are we basing it on? As Senator MURRAY says, they are basing it on ideology. Well, that is a lousy way to make a decision about where to put our healthcare money.

This administration has even attacked women’s access to birth control, issuing new rules that allow almost any company to opt out of the birth control benefit in the Affordable Care Act.

Simply put, you cannot support women’s empowerment unless you support women’s access to family planning. Recently, the United Nations Population Fund’s “Family Planning 2020” report explained why women’s access to all healthcare services, including abortion, is so vital both to women’s advancement and to their country’s economic development. The report says:

Every woman and girl must be able to exercise her basic human right to control her own reproductive health. Access to safe, voluntary family planning is fundamental to women’s empowerment. It’s also fundamental to achieving our global goals for a healthier, more prosperous, just, and equitable world.

The report goes on to say:

Rights-based family planning programs have a greater ripple effect than almost any other development investment, from saving lives and improving health to strengthening

economies, transforming societies, and lifting entire countries out of poverty. It is the surest path to the future we want.

Well, I couldn’t agree more. Study after study demonstrates that access to comprehensive healthcare services is closely correlated to the economic success of women and their families. By contrast, lack of access to basic healthcare services, including family planning counseling and all birth control options, is a major factor in perpetuating the dangerous, life-threatening cycle of poverty.

Now, I think it is really ironic that those who seek to outlaw abortion do so under what they say is the pro-life banner. I think it is ironic because we know from experience that outlawing abortion doesn’t end abortion, it simply drives it into the shadows and unsafe conditions. Like many in this Chamber, I remember the days before 1973, when abortion was against the law. An estimated 1.2 million women each year resorted to illegal abortions, typically performed in unsanitary conditions by unlicensed practitioners and often resulting in infection, hemorrhage, and even death. Just about every woman of my generation has a story about a friend or an acquaintance who had to resort to this kind of risky, dangerous abortion or who thought she had to resort to that.

Well, I don’t think we want to go back to those days. We know that right now in the United States, we have the lowest level of abortions that we have had since 1973. That is a success that is directly attributed to the increased access to contraception that is in the Affordable Care Act.

We know that again and again, studies have found that policies to limit or ban abortion outright have the unintended consequence of dramatically increasing abortion overall. Conversely, when family planning services are accessible, the rates of unplanned pregnancies and abortion go down. Again, according to the Guttmacher Institute, we are seeing success in terms of reducing the number of abortions and unintended pregnancies.

Now, what we have seen internationally is that the global gag rule has had especially lethal consequences. It denies access to safe abortions and, in doing so, it dramatically increases abortions overall. A Stanford University study of implementation of the global gag rule during the George W. Bush administration found that the number of women having induced abortions more than doubled in countries that were most impacted by the policy.

Today, in Nigeria—which is the one country we have data on to date, based on the expansion of the global gag rule in the Trump administration—health workers on the ground estimate that because of the administration’s new global gag rule, there will be an additional 660,000 abortions in Nigeria from

now through 2020, and that could result in nearly 10,000 additional maternal deaths.

The Trump administration claims it wants a smaller government. The President ran on a platform promising to get the government out of people's lives. Yet it is doing everything possible to inject the government and law enforcement into some of the most intimate, difficult, and personal decisions a woman has to make.

This is not only insulting, but it is condescending to all women. We don't need guidance from the government for an adult. We need to be able to consult those we choose to consult and make our own decisions about the healthcare we need.

To take away women's access to full reproductive health services, including abortion, is demeaning and unacceptable. We cannot allow the Trump administration to turn back the clock and put women's lives at risk.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, first of all, I wish to commend my Pacific Northwest colleague Senator MURRAY for taking this time to talk about these exceptionally important issues. I had a chance to listen to the thoughtful remarks of our friend from New Hampshire—3,000 miles away from the Pacific Northwest—and she has been, as usual, extraordinarily eloquent and passionate about the cause of women's health, and it is great to be able to follow her.

We can sum up the healthcare policy of the Trump administration in just one word: discrimination. I am here with my colleagues today to discuss a particularly alarming example of the Trump agenda of healthcare discrimination and an example of where the administration is working overtime to make women's healthcare worse.

What is particularly frustrating about this is we are dealing with a bureaucracy run amok. The Office of Refugee Resettlement, which is part of the Department of Health and Human Services, has made a critical judgment. They will put ideology over the law of the land when it comes to the medical care available to the young women in its custody.

Under Director Scott Lloyd, the office has attempted to block several immigrants from exercising their freedom of choice with respect to reproductive health. It has no legal right to do so. This issue is settled law, but this hasn't stopped the Director and its agency from dragging young women into prolonged, taxpayer-funded court battles.

There are roughly 5,000 young people in the Office of Refugee Resettlement's custody. Most of them are from Central American countries. Many of these

young women are survivors of sexual violence. They are on their own, and they didn't come here to have somebody else's ideology dictating their medical care. In my view, this office ought to uphold its duty to provide all the care these young women have a right to receive, and it ought to check the ideology at the door.

That is not how the Office of Refugee Resettlement is working under Mr. Lloyd. According to a recent report from VICE News, "Mr. Lloyd receives a spreadsheet every week containing information on every pregnant teen in their custody."

He reportedly sought to interfere in a young woman's medical procedure that was actually already underway. In another case, the report says he put a young woman at further risk by directing staff to inform her parents—against her wishes—that she had an abortion.

Last fall, an HHS official was asked about Mr. Lloyd's direction of the office and the matter of interfering in the medical care of young women. Here is what that spokesman said: "He by law has custody of these children, just like a foster parent, he knows that that's a lot of responsibility and he is going to make choices that he thinks are best for both the mother and the child."

I say to my colleagues, that is just rampant government paternalism summed up in just one sentence.

Now, it ought to be no surprise, given his background, that this is the direction the office is taking. This is a gentleman who has made a career out of opposing the right of women to make their own judgments about their own healthcare choices. He has fought access to contraception and to a variety of healthcare services that are important to women. His views are right in line—right in line—with this administration's agenda of healthcare discrimination against women.

Right out of the gate, the administration and Republicans in Congress pushed for legislation that would have deprived hundreds of thousands of women the right to see the doctor of their choosing. They made it harder for many of those women to obtain routine, vital medical care from providers like Planned Parenthood, including cancer screenings, prenatal care, preventive services, physicals, and a whole host of preventive services that have absolutely nothing to do with abortion—nothing to do with abortion.

Then the Trump administration sought to deny women guaranteed, no-cost access to contraception. When women have guaranteed access to contraception, it means healthier pregnancies, healthier newborns, a lower risk of cancer, and, particularly, economic fairness for women of modest means, but the Trump administration wants to unravel that guarantee as well.

Then, the Trump team is green-lighting junk insurance policies that drive up the cost of healthcare for women with preexisting conditions, and they are involved in very elaborate—as my colleague knows—discussions with the State of Idaho. People ought to understand exactly what the Trump administration is saying to Idaho because they are going to say it to other people. The Trump administration is saying to Idaho: You can discriminate, just don't be too obvious about it. That is their position with respect to these junk insurance policies.

The administration is exploring ways to place lifetime limits on the care people can get from Medicaid, and that is a frightful proposition for the millions of older women who count on Medicaid to pick up the tab for their nursing and home-based care.

These are serious healthcare problems around this country. By the way, we never heard anything in the campaign of 2016 about how we were going to turn back the clock on older women for whom Medicaid is often a lifeline for long-term care, but that is what we are dealing with now. These are serious healthcare challenges women face right now—on top of it, a raging epidemic of opioid misuse and abuse and the skyrocketing cost of prescription medicine. When we are talking about the Office of Refugee Resettlement, as my colleagues talked about so eloquently, there is also a lot to be done to fix our broken immigration system.

Finally, it is important, as we get into these issues, to recognize how deep-seated this policy of healthcare discrimination is. The example my colleagues are talking about here today is an example of massive ideological overreach and paternalism. It is happening at the Office of Refugee Resettlement, but it is not the only example. This is behavior that ought to stop.

I thank my colleague, Senator MURRAY, who has been our go-to person for years and years on women's healthcare. I want her and our colleagues to know that I will be doing everything I can to be a part of their efforts to push back on these policies that turn back the clock and particularly discriminate against the rights of women.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

BUDGET REFORM

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, when I was in college, I remember watching a State of the Union speech by President Reagan in which he took a 43-pound stack of papers and set them on the podium. As he was giving his State of the Union Address, he said: This is the budget bill that has been given to me—43 pounds of it, all stacked up. It was a famous moment when the President said: Do not send this to me again.

Republicans and Democrats alike stood and cheered. They said: That is a terrible way to do government.

For 5 of the next 6 years there were no more Omnibus appropriations bills, but that did not last. Since 1986, there have been 22 Omnibus appropriations bills. People may ask, what is that?

By law, Congress is to do 12 appropriations bills. Each part of that has a section of the budget, and each one of those is passed as a stand-alone. First, they go through subcommittee, then committee, then to the full floor, and then they pass. But 17 times since 1998 and 22 times since 1986, all of those bills were just looped together to make one giant document—the 43-pound document that President Reagan dropped in 1988.

What is going wrong? We have another one of those omnibus bills next week, in which all of the appropriations bills have been looped together to try to simplify the process, but this actually provides even less transparency. What do we do with this? How did we get here?

The short story is that the Budget Control Act of 1974 was created right after Watergate in a fight between Congress and President Nixon over the fact that President Nixon was told that Congress wanted to be able to spend certain amounts of money in certain areas, and President Nixon basically didn't want to spend it. So Congress pushed back and put additional requirements on him to actually do what Congress was compelling him to do in that 1974 Budget Act, to try to create more transparency and provide greater leadership for Congress. Out of that was born this Budget Act, but also the House and Senate committees and the Congressional Budget Office were born.

All of those things were to create more input and create a system in which, each year, the President would create a budget and would submit that budget to Congress. Then that budget would lead to authorizing bills from the different committees. And then, from the authorizing, it would lead to appropriations bills and final passage.

Well, how is that working for us? It is not. It created a process so complicated and so slow that, although it makes sense on paper and in legislative language, it doesn't actually work year to year, and it pushes us into what is called continuing resolutions—or, as is commonly thrown around here, CRs. Every year since 1995, Congress has had at least one CR—one continuing resolution; that is, taking last year's appropriations bill, just changing the date on it, and moving it over. There is no strategic planning, nothing. That is a problem for us.

The budget process itself has broken down and has fallen into omnibus spending bills, with 12 bills, all combined. Some years, we fail to get budget bills done at all.

The authorizing process that is supposed to go between the budget and the appropriations process has completely collapsed for us. In fact, in the 2017 appropriations, it happens that there were 256 expired authorizations in the final appropriations bills. About \$310 billion of what was appropriated was not authorized even last year. Some of those things hadn't been authorized for more than a decade. Finally, we have passed all appropriations bills only four times in the last 44 years.

We have a major problem with the way we do budgeting. Year after year, people visit me or people bring this to me in townhall meetings or at the grocery store or at Taco Bell; people catch me and say: What is going on with the budget process?

I can tell you that if it sounds as if you say that every year, it is because you have said that every year now for a couple of decades.

How do we get out of this? There is a bipartisan, bicameral committee that has been put together and met for the first time last week. There are 16 total—8 Democrats and 8 Republicans, 8 from the Senate and 8 from the House. Our mission is to revise the way we do budgeting. A lot of Americans probably will not watch this process, but it will be extremely important that we actually fix it.

I am convinced that we are not going to get a better budget product until we get a better budget process. This committee itself is designed in such a way that it takes out the partisanship, not just with equal numbers on both sides, but the agreement from the very beginning is that if we don't have a majority of Democrats and a majority of Republicans signing off on the final proposal, we will not bring it to the floor. If we do, we hope to fix the budget process itself.

The budget process is set up to create gimmicks in the budgeting rather than to fix them. We have a 10-year budget window, and there are all these gimmicks that have been created to try to move spending outside the 10-year budget window to make things look as though they are actually going to balance when they actually don't balance. I would like for us to consider some things like biennial budgeting. Twenty States budget every 2 years. It gives budget certainty for 24 months. We should get that. That helps our economy. That helps our businesses. That helps our agencies. That helps in contracting. That helps us avoid these continuing resolutions—if we can actually do budgeting in 2-year cycles.

I would like to get out of the perpetual focus on government shutdowns and the countdown clocks that happen. I proposed a bill 5 years ago called the Government Shutdown Prevention Act. It is designed to get us to a spot where we actually put the pressure on Congress to get the job done but hold agen-

cies and hold the American people harmless while we work through the process.

Quite frankly, I think the President's budget is a meaningless document. It has never been passed by any President of any party. I don't mind the Presidents releasing their budget priorities—ways we can save money, duplication that they see, key aspects. That is entirely appropriate. But the President's budget every year just becomes a big fight, and when it is late, it throws the process off even more and gives Congress one more reason to say that they are not getting their job done because someone else was late in doing theirs. We should reform that.

We should reform the way we do debt limits. We are the only country in the world that does this. We have had some kind of debt limit since the 1920s, actually. But originally, when it went to the form that it is in now in the late 1930s, it was established as a way to protect us from adding more debt, and it did work for decades.

It has not worked for decades. It has been another fiscal cliff out there that has not resolved anything. We have to fix that so it does what it is supposed to do or take it away, but we can't destabilize international economies because we can't get our job done here.

We have to have some sort of focus on both revenue and spending. We should deal with real consequences when we don't get things done on time. We have to build internal processes that actually get things done. We have to pay attention to \$20 trillion, and growing, in national debt.

These are things we can get done, but they will not get done if we don't actually fix the process. There is no moment to actually get the big things and hard things done.

My hope and my commitment, with this body and with this group of 16 of us who have grouped together from the House and the Senate—Republicans and Democrats—is this: Bring a proposal to us that is a fair, nonpartisan proposal that is not focused on what party is in power at that moment but looks at the fiscal health of the Nation, how we can plan for the future, and how we can actually get off this endless cycle of nonaction and get back to a process of predictable budgeting and appropriations. We will bring some of those solutions in the days ahead.

Right now we are meeting and talking. I invite any Member of this body who wants to contribute to catch any one of us in this group. We are not saying that the 16 of us are exclusive to solving the problems.

I also say the same thing to the American people: Anyone in my State or anyone around the country who wants to contribute good ideas, bring them. Let's add these good ideas together. Let's fix the process. Let's get back to actually talking about how we

solve the budget issues rather than how we solve our internal processes in the House and the Senate. That is the last thing we should be arguing about and the first thing we should fix.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, according to the latest Gallup poll, 81 percent of the American people disapprove of the way Congress is doing its job—81 percent. I suspect the other 19 percent are not really paying attention. If you want to know why the American people have so much anger and contempt for what goes on in Congress, it is because, time after time, what we are seeing is Congress under the Republican leadership doing exactly the opposite of what the American people want.

This week could mark a new low for the Republican leadership in the Senate in terms of ignoring what the American people want and doing what they don't want. Today marks the 1-month anniversary of the tragic mass shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL. I just had the opportunity to be outside, in front of the Capitol, with thousands of beautiful, beautiful young people from all over—I think all over the country. The young people are saying to the Congress: Do something about the gun violence.

Everyone knows there is not an easy solution; this is not an easy problem to solve. There are hundreds of millions of guns in this country. There are 5 million assault weapons. The young people are saying: Do something. Have the courage to take on the NRA.

The American people overwhelmingly want to expand and improve background checks. They want to do away with the gun show loophole. They want to do away with the straw man provision. More and more people think we should be banning military-style assault weapons—whatever. The American people want us to do something. I don't see anything happening here. The American people want it. It is not happening.

The American people want us to deal with the high cost of prescription drugs. In the State of Vermont, elderly people are cutting their pills in half. I don't see any legislation to deal with the high cost of prescription drugs, to have the courage to take on the pharmaceutical industry.

The American people, overwhelmingly—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—want to raise the minimum wage to a living wage. I don't see anything happening on that issue.

On issue after issue, the American people want action, and they are not getting it. What they are getting is exactly what they don't want but what powerful special interests do want.

This month marks the 10th anniversary of the collapse of Bear Stearns,

one of the largest investment banks in America, whose greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior triggered the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. What is the response of the U.S. Senate to that? Are we talking about breaking up the large banks that have become much larger? Is that what we are talking about? Are we talking about protecting consumers who are paying 20 percent, 25 percent in interest rates on products they buy at a department store? Are we talking about taking on the payday lenders who are squeezing the lifeblood out of poor people who, in desperation, have to borrow money from them? No, that is not what we are talking about. We are not talking about the need to guarantee healthcare to all people. We are not talking about the affordable housing crisis. We are not talking about the fact that millions of moms and dads in this country can't afford childcare. We are not talking about the global crisis of climate change. We are not talking about our crumbling infrastructure, our rigged trade deals that have resulted in the deindustrialization of America. That is not what we are talking about.

What we are talking about at this particular moment, right here in the U.S. Senate, is the deregulation of some of the largest banks in America, some of the very same banks that nearly drove the economy off a cliff in 2008. That is what we are talking about.

Just last week, the Congressional Budget Office told us that the legislation on the floor right now will "increase the likelihood that a large financial firm with assets of between \$100 billion and \$250 billion would fail."

We are not talking about protecting consumers. We are not talking about breaking up large banks. We are not talking about taking on the power of Wall Street.

What we are talking about is deregulating some of the very same banks that drove this economy into the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. In other words, this legislation will make it more likely that we will see another financial crisis, another taxpayer bailout, and massive dislocation of our economy.

What CBO tells us is that this legislation will increase the deficit by more than \$450 million over the next decade—\$450 million. This bill, which benefits some of the largest banks in America, will cost us over \$450 million. Who is going to pay for that? The big banks? No. It will be the American taxpayers who will be picking up this tab.

The question we have to ask ourselves, which we don't very often—although the American people, I think, understand this emotionally in their guts—is this: How does it happen that a bill like this gets to the floor while we are not dealing with the issues the American people are concerned about,

whether it is gun safety, whether it is DACA and protecting the 1.8 million young people who are eligible for that program, whether it is the high cost of prescriptions? How does this particular bill get to the floor of the Senate? The answer is pretty obvious. Follow the money.

Since the 1990s, the financial sector has given more than \$3.2 billion in campaign contributions. Let me repeat that. Since the 1990s, the financial sector—Wall Street, other parts of the financial sector—has given over \$3.2 billion in campaign contributions. Last year alone, the financial sector spent over \$200 million on lobbying. That is why Congress is spending day after day trying to make life easier for large financial institutions while continuing to ignore the needs of working families.

Instead of listening to lobbyists in Washington, maybe, just maybe—I know it is a very radical idea, but maybe, just maybe, we might want to listen to the American people. The American people believe, as I do, that we should strengthen, not weaken Wall Street regulations.

Now is not the time to be talking about deregulating large financial institutions. Now is the time to take on the greed and power of Wall Street, break up the large financial institutions in this country, and stop big banks from ripping off the American people by charging outrageous and usurious levels of interest rates. That is why I have submitted two amendments to this bill that I would like the Senate to vote on this afternoon.

The first amendment would break up large financial institutions so that the taxpayers of this country will never have to bail them out again. The second amendment would establish a 15-percent cap on the interest rates private banks charge their customers on credit cards and other consumer loans.

Before I talk about these amendments, let's be clear. Fraud is the business model of Wall Street. It is not the exception to the rule; it is the rule. Since 2009, major banks in this country have been fined more than \$200 billion for reckless, unfair, and deceptive activities. By the way, those fines take place within a very weak regulatory climate, but here are just a few examples of the kinds of activities that large banks have engaged in.

In August 2014, Bank of America paid \$16 billion to settle charges that it lied to investors about the riskiness of the mortgage-backed securities it sold during the runup to the financial crisis.

In November 2013, JPMorgan Chase settled for \$13 billion for lying to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac about the quality of the mortgage-backed securities it sold them. Settlement documents revealed how every large bank in the United States committed mortgage fraud.

In April of 2016, Goldman Sachs reached a \$5 billion settlement for marketing and selling fraudulent mortgage-backed securities that were the foundation of the housing crisis.

In July of 2014, Citigroup reached a \$7 billion settlement for mortgage fraud. Then-Attorney General Eric Holder said that Citigroup's "activities contributed mightily to the financial crisis that devastated our economy in 2008."

If you are thinking that the illegal behavior of Wall Street executives was limited to the housing crisis, that it was a one-time thing, guess again. Let me give some more examples.

In May of 2015, five banks, including JPMorgan Chase and Citigroup, paid \$5.4 billion in fines after pleading guilty to "a brazen display of collusion and foreign exchange rate market manipulation," according to then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch.

In March of 2014, the FDIC accused 16 large banks, including Bank of America, Citigroup, and JPMorgan Chase, of fraud and conspiracy in an epic plot to manipulate bank-to-bank interest rates that underpinned at least \$350 trillion in global financial transactions.

In April of 2011, Wachovia was fined for laundering billions of dollars in illegal drug money. The Federal prosecutor said, "Wachovia's blatant disregard for our banking laws gave international cocaine cartels a virtual carte blanche to finance their operations." That was from the Federal prosecutor. The fine was less than 2 percent of the bank's \$12.3 billion profit.

On and on it goes. Mortgage fraud, money laundering, currency manipulation, bribery, conspiracy, rate tampering, and collusion are the routine practices of Wall Street; they are not the exception. This is their business model.

Our country can no longer afford to tolerate the culture of fraud and corruption on Wall Street. Let us never, ever forget—although, I fear many people have already here in Congress—that during the financial crisis of 2008, the American people were told that they needed to bail out huge financial institutions because those institutions were too big to fail. Do people remember that? They were just too big to fail. If they had gone down, the whole economy would have gone down with them. Yet the four largest financial institutions in this country—JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, Bank of America, and Wells Fargo—are, on average, 80 percent larger today than they were before we bailed them out. Today, they are 80 percent larger than they were before we bailed them out because they were too big to fail. Does that make sense to anybody? Left alone, that is not even an issue that will be talked about here on the floor of the Senate.

Incredibly, since the financial crisis, JPMorgan Chase has increased its as-

sets by more than \$1 trillion. Bank of America has seen its assets grow by more than \$800 billion. Citigroup has grown by over \$547 billion. After Wells Fargo acquired Wachovia, it nearly tripled in size.

No single financial institution should be so large that its failure would cause a catastrophic risk to millions of Americans or to our Nation's economic well-being. No single financial institution should have holdings so extensive that its failure would send the world economy into crisis. If an institution is too big to fail, it is too big to exist, and we should break it up.

Let me be very clear. We should not just be concerned about the danger these institutions pose to taxpayers. The enormous concentration of ownership within the financial sector is harming the middle class and damaging the economy by limiting choices and raising prices for consumers and small businesses.

Today—and it is important that people understand this, but unfortunately it is not an issue that is discussed at all, not here in Congress and not much in the media—the six largest banks in America have over \$10 trillion in assets, equivalent to 54 percent of the GDP in America. When we talk about having the United States move in the direction of an oligarchy, when we talk about a handful of institutions and billionaires controlling the economic and political life of this country, this is what we are talking about.

Let me repeat. The six largest banks in America have over \$10 trillion in assets, equivalent to 54 percent of our GDP. The top six banks hold more than half of all credit card debt, control over 90 percent of all bank derivatives, underwrite about a third of all mortgages, and control over 40 percent of all bank deposits.

If Teddy Roosevelt were alive today, I have a sense about what he would be saying. He would say break them up, and he would be right. That is exactly what my first amendment would do.

Specifically, this amendment would require the Federal Reserve to break up any financial institution whose total exposure is greater than 2 percent of our Nation's GDP over the next 2 years. These banks would include JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs, Bank of America, Morgan Stanley, U.S. Bancorp, PNC Financial Services, Capital One, and the TD Group—financial institutions that have a combined total exposure of more than 77 percent of our Nation's GDP. None of these institutions would be able to receive a taxpayer bailout from the Federal Reserve or gamble with the federally insured bank deposits of the American people. Under this amendment, no financial institution could have a total financial exposure above \$398 billion.

Call me old-fashioned, but I believe the function of banking should be bor-

ing. The function of banking should not be about making as much profit as possible in gambling on derivatives and other esoteric financial instruments. The function of banking should be to provide affordable loans to small businesses in order to create jobs in the productive economy. The function of banking should be to provide affordable loans to Americans to purchase their homes and their cars. Wall Street cannot be an island unto itself, and I hope very much that my colleagues will support this important amendment.

Not only do we have to break up these very large banks, but we also have to stop them from ripping off the American people by their charging outrageous interest rates and fees, and that is exactly what my second amendment would do.

Incredibly, since the Wall Street crash, credit card companies have raked in over \$1.2 trillion in revenue from interest and fees they charge consumers, including over \$160 billion in 2016 alone. That is unacceptable. At a time when the American people hold a recordbreaking \$1 trillion in credit card debt and desperately need some relief on that debt, my second amendment would establish a national usury rate of 15 percent on credit cards and other consumer loans.

In America today, incredibly, millions of our people are now paying credit card interest rates of 20, 25, or even 30 percent. I am not just talking about the payday lenders who are acting in a way that is totally unbelievable in ripping off the poorest people in our country. Let's be clear. When credit card companies charge over 20 percent in interest on credit cards, they are not engaged in the business of making credit available; what they are involved in is extortion and loan sharking. That is what they are engaged in.

Interestingly enough, if you read the religious tenets of the major religions throughout history, whether it be Christianity, Judaism, or Islam, what you will find is a universal objection and disgust to usury. This has existed for thousands and thousands of years. People know that it is immoral to lend money to poor people, struggling people, and then charge them excessive interest rates. That is in the religious teachings of Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and other religions.

In the "Divine Comedy," Dante reserved a special place in the Seventh Circle of Hell for people who charged usurious interest rates. Today, we don't need the hellfire and the pitchforks, and we don't need the rivers of boiling blood, but we do need a national usury law that caps interest rates on credit cards and consumer loans at 15 percent.

Despite the fact that banks can borrow money today at less than 1.5 percent from the Fed, the average credit

card interest rate today for consumers is now 16.84 percent. Borrow money at 1.5 percent from the Fed, and then charge consumers an average of 16.84 percent.

Further, if you get a credit card from a store like Macy's, Kohl's, Lowe's, or Sears, interest rates are even higher. Stores like these are charging customers an average interest rate of 26 percent, and many of the stores rely on these high interest rate cards for more than a third of their revenue. They are making money not just by selling clothing or washing machines or shoes; a substantial part of their profit scheme comes from the high interest rates they are getting on these financial transactions. What that means is, if you buy a \$500 refrigerator from Lowe's, Home Depot, or Sears on one of their credit cards, you will likely owe an additional \$130 in interest on a \$500 refrigerator. How is that? Do you think that is an issue we might want to talk about just for a moment? I know the consumers of this country don't pour hundreds of millions of dollars into lobbying or billions of dollars into campaign contributions. I understand that. But maybe, just maybe, we might want to remember the folks back home.

Establishing a usury law is not a radical concept. Up until 1978, about half of the States in our country had usury laws on the books that capped credit card interest rates, but those States' interest rates were obliterated by a 1978 Supreme Court decision, that of *Marquette National Bank v. First of Omaha Service*, which concluded that national banks could charge whatever interest rates they wanted if they moved to a State without a usury law. So all of these credit card companies moved to South Dakota. They moved to Delaware, which had no interest rate caps, and they charged people in Vermont or in Kansas—or in every other State in the country—interest rates of 20 to 30 percent.

This has to stop. The American people are sick and tired of being ripped off by the same financial institutions they bailed out 10 years ago—what a world. We bail out the crooks—taxpayer money bails them out—and they charge the same people who bailed them out 20 to 30 percent interest rates on loans.

This amendment simply applies the same statutory interest rate cap on credit cards that Congress imposed on credit unions in 1980, capping interest rates at 15 percent, except under extraordinary circumstances. In other words, if you get a credit card through a credit union, you are going to be paying, in almost every case, no more than 15 percent. That is mandated by Federal law. By and large, that law has worked for about 40 years. Unlike big banks, credit unions do not come begging the American taxpayer for huge bailouts. Ten years ago they didn't

come for a huge bailout. Credit unions have survived and thrived on a 15-percent cap, and the time has come to extend that cap to private banks as well. There is nothing radical about that. It exists for the credit unions in this country, and it should exist for the large banks.

There has even been support for this concept in the Senate. In 1991, former Senator Al D'Amato offered an amendment to cap interest rates at 14 percent that passed on a vote of 74 to 14. It was not a radical idea, and it passed by a huge vote in 1991.

Here is what Al D'Amato, the Republican chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, said in 1991:

Fourteen percent is certainly a reasonable rate of interest for banks to charge customers for credit card debt. It allows a comfortable profit margin but keeps banks in line so that interest rates rise and fall with the health of the economy.

That was an accurate statement in 1991. It is even more accurate today.

Let's be clear. Credit cards are no longer used just to buy luxury items. We all know that. All over this country, people are buying their groceries, their food, and other basic essentials with credit cards. Commuters are paying for the gas they put into their cars on their credit cards. Young people are paying their college expenses with credit cards.

According to the Federal Reserve, 44 percent of the American people could not pay for a \$400 emergency expense, like a car accident, if they could not charge it on their credit cards or borrow money from a payday lender, a friend, or a family member. That is the reality of America today. It is not a reality we discuss here in the Senate, but that is the reality, nonetheless.

Given that reality, it seems to me that if we are going to respond to the needs of the American people, we need to deal with the issue of usury and stop large financial institutions from ripping off the American people.

Madam President, with that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up and reported by number: the Sanders amendment No. 2114 and the Sanders amendment No. 2155; further, that the Senate vote on the Sanders amendment No. 2114 without intervening action or debate; and that following disposition of the Sanders amendment No. 2114, the Senate vote on the Sanders amendment No. 2155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I am distressed, although not surprised, by the objection. Apparently, the consumers of this country don't have the financial support to get their concerns

onto the floor. So apparently we are not going to be discussing these items.

Madam President, I raise a point of order that the pending measure violates section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of S. 2155, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I am asking my colleagues to waive this budget point of order.

In order to offset the Congressional Budget Office's estimated increase in Federal deficits due to the enactment of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, the bill contains a provision that reduces the amount of discretionary surplus the Federal Reserve may maintain from \$7.5 billion to \$6.825 billion.

The Federal Reserve surplus funds have been used in the past to pay for bipartisan legislation emanating from committees that do not have jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve. Unlike those past instances, these funds will be used to offset costs of legislation emanating from the Banking Committee.

In order to provide meaningful relief for consumers, community banks, credit unions, mid-sized banks and regional banks, I urge my colleagues to waive this point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues for support on the point of order, not only from the deficit perspective but to tell the Republican leadership here in Congress that we want a serious debate on the serious financial issues facing the American people; that we want the ability to bring forth amendments, not just my amendment—there are a lot of good amendments on both sides—that at this particular moment, rather than just deregulating some of the largest banks in America, we need to protect consumers, we need to protect ordinary Americans, and we need to have a real debate. So I would hope very much that Members of the Senate would support my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I spent 28 years in the private sector before entering public service. In fact, in 2010 I

was working at RightNow Technologies in my hometown of Bozeman, MT. We were growing a technology company there. We were creating good, high-paying jobs in Montana—in fact, about 500 jobs there.

While I was working to grow jobs back home in Montana, President Obama and a Democratic majority in the House and the Senate were passing legislation that stifled job creation—in fact, costing our economy billions of dollars and penalizing small local banks and credit unions for the wrongdoings committed by bad actors on Wall Street.

I am talking about Dodd-Frank. Since Dodd-Frank's passage, the number of federally insured credit unions in Montana fell by over 10 percent. The number of Montana State chartered banks fell over 34 percent, from 64 to 44. This is no surprise because Dodd-Frank empowered more than 10 Federal agencies to write more than 400 new rules, imposing 27,000 mandates, many of which fell on these local banks and credit unions.

These small community businesses don't have the ability to keep up with the onslaught of these new rules, new regulations, and guidance constantly coming out of Washington following Dodd-Frank, and the customers are suffering.

Small local banks and credit unions are uniquely capable of knowing their customers and providing tailored financial services to meet their customers' individual circumstances. Dodd-Frank stripped this customer advantage away by making prohibitively difficult any loans that don't comply with the cookie-cutter regulations.

It is interesting that in that debate back in 2010, many Republicans warned our colleagues on the Democratic side about this, but virtually every Democratic Senator then voted for Dodd-Frank. This difficulty fell particularly hard on Montana's entrepreneurs, who are self-employed and don't typically have wage income. Entrepreneurship runs deep in Montana. These banks and credit unions are truly part of our community. They know their customers, and they are able to make loans for their needs. They can determine the risk and make sure they are making good loans. They serve up-and-coming small business owners, moms and dads working to keep the family business afloat, and countless farmers and ranchers across Montana.

Dodd-Frank has suffocated Montana's rural banks and credit unions and, ultimately, it is the people of Montana who use these banks and these credit unions, and they are the ones who have been hit the hardest.

I wasn't here in 2010 when this bill was passed. Let me just state that had I been on this floor then, I would have voted no on Dodd-Frank's passage. Unfortunately, the vast majority of

Democratic Senators voted yes—virtually every one of them. But I will state that I am really happy to be here now to help undo some of the damage caused to our rural communities and the people of Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, on Friday I held a townhall in Springfield, MA. On Saturday we had another townhall, this time in Weymouth, MA. I met with kids at Weymouth High School who are forming a "Never Again" group and who want to pass some sensible gun regulations. I met with Dreamers who want to pass DACA. I met with people who fled the hurricanes in Puerto Rico and who want to get a comprehensive plan for rebuilding the island. I met with people who live along the South Shore and are deeply worried about rising oceans and the need for building resilience into our coastline housing and infrastructure. I met with people alarmed by the rising cost of healthcare and about Republican efforts to roll back ObamaCare, Medicaid, and Medicare. I met someone who wants to see us focus more on criminal justice reform.

There is so much Congress could do. There are so many problems the American people are asking us to solve, but not one single person at any of my townhalls, meetings, press interviews, or picking up pizza at Armando's asked for Congress to work on rolling back the rules on some of the biggest banks in the country so they will have a chance to crash the economy again, and that is what the bill on the floor of the Senate does—really. Don't just take my word for it.

The Congressional Budget Office experts say the bill will increase the chances that taxpayers will have to bail out the big banks again. CBO also says the bill could allow Wall Street banks, like Citigroup and JPMorgan Chase, to significantly reduce their capital requirements. Professor Jeffrey Gordon, an expert in financial regulation at Columbia Law School, says the bill "will produce a race-to-the-bottom dynamic that will dramatically increase the chance of another financial crisis." The Wall Street Journal and Bloomberg both editorialized that the bill includes dangerous giveaways to big banks. Nobody back in Massachusetts asked for that.

Buried down in the details of the bill are even more landmines for American families. The bill guts protections for families who buy traditional and mobile homes, and it undermines our ability to enforce civil rights laws—and for what? So banks that are already making record profits can tack on a little more to their bottom line?

If the Senate is going to spend 2 weeks dealing with the big banks, we should be making the rules tougher, not easier. Today, I introduced the

Ending Too Big to Jail Act, which would help make sure that big bank executives are hauled out of their corner offices in handcuffs the next time they break the law. That would do more for America's working families than anything in this bill, and I am going to fight to help make it law.

What does it say about Washington Republicans and Democrats who can't come together to support commonsense gun reforms or solutions for working families but can come together to deregulate big banks on the 10th anniversary of the start of the 2008 financial crisis?

Here is what I think it says: Washington has become completely disconnected from the real problems in people's lives. This place works great for people who can hire armies of fancy lobbyists and write big checks, but it doesn't work for anyone else.

This is personal for me. I grew up in Oklahoma on the ragged edge of the middle class. My family struggled, and when it looked like things were getting a little bit better, my daddy had a heart attack and he lost his job and we nearly lost our home. I was 12 years old, and I know what it feels like to hear your mother cry every night. I know what it feels like to wonder if you will have to change schools or move to another town because the bank is going to take your house away. I know it because I lived it.

When the economy collapsed 10 years ago, I would go to bed at night thinking about the millions of people across this country who worked hard, who played by the rules, and then had their dignity stripped away because somebody they never met gambled with their family's future and lost. I wondered back then about the kids. I wondered about their mothers. I wondered about their daddies. A foreclosure isn't just some dry financial transaction; it is the kind of event that can tear a family apart.

The American people aren't going to stand by while big banks and other giant corporations run this economy and this Congress for their own benefit. Soon—maybe not today, maybe not next week, maybe not even in the next election, but soon they will demand a government that works for the people.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 10 years ago this month, we saw the first domino fall toward the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Some of our country's largest financial institutions were facing capital and liquidity crises, and it became clear that many of the biggest banks would need a massive injection of capital, in the form of a taxpayer bailout, to prevent what then-Chairman Bernanke called the "chaotic unwinding" of financial markets.

The near collapse of the U.S. financial system had a real and lasting impact on the prosperity of the United States, reaching the pocketbooks and kitchen tables of every American family and the stability of the world's economy across all sectors. We—and I do mean we—you, me and all tax-paying U.S. citizens footed the bill for the risky and cavalier behavior of our country's biggest banks, allowed largely by a poorly regulated system that brought our economy to its knees. American taxpayer dollars propped up our financial system to prevent its catastrophic failure, an economic collapse that would have wrought even more damage and misery on tens of millions of American households.

The crisis clearly exposed deep flaws in our regulatory system and a serious lack of oversight of the financial sector. It taught us that looking the other way and trusting the system to check and right itself will always result in a race to the bottom in terms of capitalization, risk-taking, transparency, and, too often, casual lending practices.

Big Banks and their executives took on untold and unnecessary risks, hid their financial well-being and, at best, misinformed their investors and, at worst, downright lied. This behavior was supported and left unchecked by a regulatory regime without the oversight to identify and teeth to prevent rampant risk-taking in the name of short-term profit.

We vowed we would never again put American taxpayers on the hook to bail out Big Banks. To that end, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Act, the most sweeping, comprehensive reforms to our financial system since the 1930s. These changes, including new regulations and enforcement mechanisms, were necessary to prevent the recurrence of the systematic profit-driven actions of bad actors throughout our financial system. Dodd-Frank required Big Banks to meet capital requirements, pass stress tests, and make plans for their orderly liquidation in case of failure. All of these requirements were designed to prevent another taxpayer bailout, and they are working. By design, these standards are difficult to meet, but they have not prevented banks from profiting. Big Banks, in fact, are thriving. They continue to protect American taxpayers who are, rightly, wary of the behavior of Big Banks. Now is not the time to roll back these protective rules for Big Banks. They don't need it. No one except these big banks will benefit, and it would all be at the risk of future bailouts. Without these standards, we will again see bank executives influenced by compensation packages that favor risky short-term profits over sound investments and loan quantity over quality. If we roll back commonsense oversight of Big Banks, we should expect banks to take advantage of their new-

found flexibility and reintroduce risky practices like failing to ensure they are adequately capitalized and mitigating risk.

Like most sweeping reforms, some pieces of the Dodd-Frank Act had unintended consequences. We talk a lot about banks that are too big to fail, but not about banks too small to succeed or perhaps too small to comply with the new regulatory regime. Authority was granted to new and existing agencies to mandate certain regulatory requirements intended to safeguard our financial system. Our small community banks and credit unions have done their best to comply with these one-size-fits-all regulations and rules, often to the great detriment to their businesses, their bottom lines, and their relationships with their community and customers. I have heard from community bankers who, instead of focusing on Vermonters' needs and tailoring their financial services in the honest and professional way that is a hallmark of doing business in a small community, must spend much of their time crossing Ts, dotting Is, and collecting data for fear of the consequences of minor errors. That is not how small community bankers should be spending their time and not how they maintain the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of their communities.

Our community banks and credit unions did not cause the financial crisis; yet they are still paying the price for it, and by extension, the consumers they serve. I am glad that this bill provides some regulatory relief for smaller and community banks. If regulatory relief for community banks and credit unions were its own bill, we would be lining up to support it—or even more likely, pass it by unanimous consent.

But what started out as an effort to help small community banks has been hijacked by Big Banks and their supporters in Congress. I am extremely disappointed that this essential relief has been coupled with some very significant changes to regulations on the biggest banks, banks that took hundreds of billions of dollars in taxpayer bailouts. This is the handiwork of savvy lobbyists pushing a deregulatory agenda and hiding it behind relief for our community bankers. They know community banks are the backbone of our communities and that they enjoy the support of their representatives. It is frustrating that we could not consider, debate, and pass a bill that would responsibly allow community banks to better serve and revert to relationship lending in their communities without revisiting these additional oversight measures on Big Banks that our constituents demand and deserve.

All told, this bill will substantially deregulate some 25 of the largest 38 banks and will require fewer stress tests which are effective ways to meas-

ure a bank's ability to withstand sudden or prolonged economic downturns. I do not believe this is an appropriate way to relieve our community banks and credit unions, and I am concerned that instead of safeguarding our economy, this legislation will instead open up our taxpayers to even more risk at the hands of bank executives. For these reasons, I cannot support the Big Bank protection act that this bill has become. I am disappointed that instead of passing what we said we wanted—relief for small banks that are being punished for something they did not cause—this bill will roll back the very rules that hold Big Banks accountable and that protect our economy and the American people.

To conclude, I ask unanimous consent that an opinion piece by Vermont Law School Professor Jennifer Taub, which appeared online at CNN.com, be printed in the RECORD. In it, she discusses the troubling flaws of this proposed legislation. Her words would be instructive to the Senate as we are poised to roll back some of the strongest protections we have against another financial crisis.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From CNN, Mar. 5, 2018]

MITCH MCCONNELL'S BIG GIFT TO THE BANKS
(By Jennifer Taub)

This month marks the tenth anniversary of the \$29 billion US government-backed bailout of Bear Stearns. The collapse of this giant investment bank in March 2008, under the weight of its bad mortgage-linked bets, marked the beginning of the global financial crisis.

To commemorate it, the US Senate plans to deliver a big gift to the banking sector by removing several safeguards for American families put in place after the meltdown.

Tin is the traditional tenth wedding anniversary gift. A bank deregulatory bill on the crisis anniversary is a fitting present from someone with a tin ear.

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has announced that this week the Senate, rather than respond to the plague of gun violence by considering gun law reforms after the Parkland shooting, will begin debating the rollback of financial reforms.

The bill, S. 2155, would considerably weaken the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, the law President Barack Obama signed in 2010, which was designed to tame Wall Street, protect consumers and make our financial system less fragile.

Lifting the sensible limits imposed by Dodd-Frank would be a dream come true for the banking sector, but eventually a nightmare for the rest of us. This bill will hurt homeowners and allow giant banks once again to take big risks with taxpayer-backed, FDIC-insured customer deposits.

Who is calling for this bank deregulation? The pressure is not coming from clamoring constituents. Instead, it is the bank lobbyists, outside the public eye, who quietly orchestrated this effort. Acknowledging this provenance, the growing opposition has dubbed S. 2155 "The Bank Lobbyist Act."

To pass it, McConnell needs 60 votes, so he will require more than just his party's support. The bill already has 11 Democratic co-

sponsors. Unless the public speaks up, he may get those votes.

Here's why. The bill's sponsors on both sides of the aisle are counting on our fading memories. They think we have forgotten the terrible years after the toxic-mortgage-backed meltdown, when many millions of families lost their homes to foreclosure. The bill's sponsors believe that the pain previously inflicted upon us by the financial sector is buried in the past. They are wagering that we have forgotten both the 1980s Savings and Loan debacle and its repeat performance in the more recent 2008 global financial crisis.

That is a bad bet. We remember.

We remember that banks and borrowers got into trouble with unaffordable mortgages. Yet this bill would essentially encourage banks with up to \$10 billion in assets to once again offer predatory mortgage loans to millions of borrowers. This includes making mortgage loans to homeowners based on their ability to pay just an initial "teaser" rate, not the fully-amortized rate. This puts borrowers at risk of losing their homes if they cannot afford the higher long-term payments. It also puts banks at risk when these loans default.

As Boston College law professor Patricia McCoy detailed in the *American Banker*, Dodd-Frank "required lenders to first determine that loan applicants are able to repay before making them home mortgages. Lenders who fail to make this assessment can be liable to borrowers." Yet the bill "permits banks with total assets of up to \$10 billion . . . to make unaffordable mortgages, with no liability to borrowers, so long as the banks hold the loans on their books." She adds that "if the bill becomes law, Congress will excuse over 97% of US banks from having to verify applicants' income, assets and debts for mortgages they keep on their books."

We remember that big banks got taxpayer-funded bailouts. That is why Dodd-Frank automatically subjects bank holding companies with more than \$50 billion in assets to enhanced supervision by the Federal Reserve. Yet, under the Bank Lobbyist Act, that threshold would be raised to \$250 billion. This is too great a risk. As former Fed lawyer Jeremy Kress explained in *The Hill*, raising the threshold to \$250 billion is "effectively deregulating 25 of the 38 biggest banks in the United States, accounting for nearly one-sixth of the assets in the banking sector." We remember that in 2008, several banks with under \$250 billion in assets, including Countrywide, received billions in bailouts during the 2008 crisis. And even before the bailout funding was available, when IndyMac with just \$32 billion in assets went bust, it cost the FDIC deposit insurance fund about \$9 billion.

We remember that regional and community banks can cause a national meltdown. The bill's proponents are positioning it as harmless regulatory relief for regional and community banks. But we remember that during the savings and loan crisis during the 1980s, risky practices—including poor real estate loan standards, thin capital, risky assets, and dependence on short-term funding—led to the collapse of hundreds of savings banks. The resulting S&L bailout cost taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars. As George Washington University law professor Art Wilmarth explained in the *American Banker*, "Big regional banks and the largest money center banks have held highly correlated risk exposures during every US banking crisis since 1980. Those correlated expo-

sures resulted from very similar business strategies that many large banks pursued during the boom leading up to each crisis." Yet this new Senate bill would allow regional and community banks to avoid prudential supervision, and also engage in high-risk trading with customer deposits.

We remember the bailout oath of "never again." Upon signing Dodd-Frank, President Obama vowed we would "never again be asked to foot the bill for Wall Street's mistakes," but that "for these new rules to be effective, regulators will have to be vigilant." Yet with President Donald Trump's appointment of Mick Mulvaney to head the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the deliberate gutting of consumer protections began.

Now with the "Bank Lobbyist Act," our senators have a choice. Will they pile on with the Trump Team and pummel the already weakened financial reform law into submission? Or will they honor their promises made to the American people and protect us from a future financial meltdown?

Time will tell. We will remember.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the SeniorSafe Act, which I am pleased is included in the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. My good friend Senator CLAIRE McCASKILL and I have been working on SeniorSafe for several years now. This bill originated with testimony offered by Maine Securities Administrator Judith Shaw in a hearing before the Senate Aging Committee in 2015. I am the chairman of that committee, and Senator McCASKILL was the ranking member at that time. We introduced the bill that year, and reintroduced it in January of 2017. Today, the bill is cosponsored by almost a third of this body, balanced nearly evenly on both sides of the aisle.

I am disappointed to learn that my colleague Senator WARREN has filed an amendment that would seriously undermine the SeniorSafe Act by restricting its provisions just to liability that may arise under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. If this amendment were to pass, financial service providers that report suspected frauds against seniors could still face liability under other laws or causes of action, which would discourage providers from making these critical reports. I understand that the proponent of this amendment contends that SeniorSafe could somehow shield a financial service provider from its own fraud. That is simply not correct.

In order to receive the protections of the SeniorSafe Act, financial service providers must train their employees to spot suspicious activity that may indicate fraud targeting seniors, and make good faith, reasonable reports of that suspicious activity to the proper authorities. The bill is clear that it only shields reporting a suspected fraud; there is no protection for committing a fraud.

Combating financial abuse of seniors requires consumers, regulators, law enforcement, and social service agencies

at all levels of government to work collaboratively with the private sector. The stakes could not be higher. According to the GAO, financial fraud targeting older Americans is a growing epidemic that costs seniors an estimated \$2.9 billion annually. Stopping this tsunami of fraud is one of the top priorities of the Aging Committee. Over the years, we have held numerous hearings exposing an endless variety of financial abuses targeting our Nation's seniors. These range from the notorious IRS phone scam that burst onto the scene in 2015, to the incredible "drug mule" scam, where trusting seniors have been tricked by international narcotics traffickers into unwittingly serving as drug couriers, and then find themselves arrested and locked up in foreign jails.

Just last week, our committee heard the story of Stephen and Rita Shiman from Saco, ME, who lost more than \$1,200 in the notorious grandparent scam. In this scam, fraudsters call a senior pretending to be a family member, often a grandchild, and claim to be in urgent need of money to cover an emergency, medical care, or a legal problem.

Sadly, not all scammers are strangers to their victims—in too many cases, seniors are exploited by someone they know well. Sometimes, that abuse is perpetrated by "friends" or family members who are handling the victim's affairs informally. Other times, the abuse is committed under the color of a fiduciary relationship, such as a power of attorney or guardianship.

No matter the scheme, one factor is common to all: The fraudsters gain the trust and cooperation of their victims. Without this, their schemes would fail. The scammers also push their victims to act fast and not to tell anyone what they are doing.

Unfortunately, due to the ruthless cunning of the scam artists, many seniors do not see the red flags that signal fraud. Sometimes they are too trusting or are suffering from diminished capacity, but just as often, they miss the signs because the swindlers who prey on them are extremely crafty and know how to sound convincing. Whatever the reason, a warning sign that can slip by a victim might trigger a second look by financial service representatives trained to spot common scams, who know enough about a senior's habits to question a transaction that doesn't look right. In our work on the Aging Committee, we have heard of many instances where quick action by bank and credit union employees has stopped a fraud in progress, saving seniors untold thousands of dollars.

Let me give you an example. In 2016, an attorney in the small coastal city of Belfast, ME, was sentenced to 30 months in prison for bilking two elderly female clients out of nearly a half a million dollars over the course of several years.

The lawyer's brazen theft was uncovered when a teller at a local bank noticed that he was writing large checks to himself on his clients' accounts.

When confronted by authorities, he offered excuses that the prosecutor later described as "breathhtaking." He submitted bills for "services," sometimes totaling \$20,000 a month, including charging her \$250 per hour for 6 to 7 hours to check on her house, even though his office was just a 1-minute drive down the road.

In another example, a senior citizen in Vassalboro, ME, was looking to wire funds from his account at Maine Savings Federal Credit Union to an out-of-State location, supposedly to bail out a relative who was in jail. Something about this transaction did not sound right to the credit union employee. She asked the customer, and he said he had received a call from an "official" at the jail, but that official had instructed him not to speak to anyone about this. The official, of course, turned out to be a con artist.

Fortunately, the credit union worker recognized this as a scam, and her quick thinking saved her customer from falling victim and losing his savings.

These stories demonstrate the critical nexus that financial institutions occupy between fraudsters and their victims. Their employees, if properly trained, can be the first line of defense protecting our seniors from these criminals. Regrettably, various Federal laws can inadvertently impede efforts to protect seniors because financial institutions that report suspected fraud can be exposed to litigation. The SeniorSafe Act encourages financial institutions to train their employees and shields them from lawsuits when they make good-faith, reasonable reports of potential fraud to the proper authorities.

There is no doubt that financial fraud and scams targeting seniors is a growing problem. In 2016, the Aging Committee heard testimony from Jaye Martin, the executive director of Maine Legal Services for the Elderly, who told the committee that her organization had seen a 24-percent increase in reports of elder abuse in just 1 year. Many of these cases involve financial fraud.

In a letter describing her support for the SeniorSafe Act, Ms. Martin said that:

In a landscape that includes family members who often wish to keep exploitation from coming to light because they are perpetrating the exploitation, the risk of facing potential nuisance or false complaints over privacy violations is all too real. This is a barrier that must be removed so that financial institutions will act immediately to report to the proper authorities upon forming a reasonable belief that exploitation is occurring. These professionals are on the front lines in the fight against elder financial exploitation and are often the only ones in a

position to stop exploitation before it is too late.

I ask unanimous consent that Ms. Martin's letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Our bill is based on Maine's innovative SeniorSafe program, a collaborative effort by Maine's regulators, financial institutions, and consumer and legal organizations to educate bank and credit union employees on how to identify and help stop financial exploitation of older Mainers. This program, pioneered by Maine Securities Administrator Judith Shaw, also serves as the template for model legislation developed for adoption at the State level by the North American Securities Administrators Association, or NASAA. The SeniorSafe Act and NASAA's model State legislation are complementary efforts, and I am pleased that NASAA has endorsed our bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from NASAA regarding the SeniorSafe Act of 2017 be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

I am pleased that our bill has received bipartisan support in both houses of Congress. Besides receiving broad support in Congress, our bill has the support of a wide range of stakeholders, ranging from the State securities administrators and insurance commissioners to advocates for seniors, such as AARP.

The SeniorSafe Act encourages financial institutions to train their employees and shields them from lawsuits when they make good-faith, reasonable reports of potential fraud to the proper authorities.

I am pleased the SeniorSafe Act is included in the bill currently before the Senate, and I look forward to it finally becoming law.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY,
Augusta, ME, December 5, 2016.

Re SeniorSafe (S 2216).

Senator SUSAN COLLINS,
Chair, Senate Special Committee on Aging,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: I want to thank you for inviting me to speak with the Senate Special Committee on Aging about the serious problem of financial exploitation of seniors by guardians and others in a position of power. I also want to thank you for your leadership in working to ensure there is training of financial institution employees in reporting elder abuse and an improvement in the timely reporting of financial exploitation when it is suspected through passage of the SeniorSafe Act. I strongly support this legislation that is based upon work done here in Maine.

I served for over two years on the working group that developed Maine's SeniorSafe training program for financial institution managers and employees. It is a voluntary training program. Through that work I came to fully appreciate the very real concerns of the financial industry regarding the consequences of violating, or being perceived as violating, the broad range of state and fed-

eral privacy laws that apply to their industry. I also came to appreciate that absent broad immunity for reporting of suspected financial exploitation, privacy regulations would continue to be a barrier to good faith reporting of suspected financial exploitation. In a landscape that includes family members who often wish to keep exploitation from coming to light because they are perpetrating the exploitation, the risk of facing potential nuisance or false complaints over privacy violations is all too real.

This is a barrier that must be removed so that financial institution employees will act immediately to make a report to the proper authorities upon forming a reasonable belief that exploitation is occurring. These professionals are on the front lines in the fight against elder financial exploitation and are often the only ones in a position to stop exploitation before it is too late.

I want to add that tying the grant of immunity to required training for not just supervisors, compliance officers, and legal advisors, but to all who come in contact with seniors as a part of their regular duties, will have the direct result of bringing more cases of exploitation to the timely attention of the proper authorities because it will significantly increase the knowledge and awareness in the industry of the red flags for elder abuse. In Maine, where our training program is entirely voluntary and carries no legal status or benefit, we have already seen what a difference training can make.

SeniorSafe is a much needed step in the fight against financial exploitation of seniors and there is no doubt it will make our nation's seniors safer. I thank you again for your leadership in this important area.

Sincerely,

JAYE L. MARTIN,
Executive Director.

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES
ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2017.

Re The SeniorSafe Act of 2017.

Senator SUSAN COLLINS,
Chair, U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the North American Securities Administrators Association ("NASAA"), I am writing to express strong support for your work to better protect vulnerable adults from financial exploitation through the introduction of the SeniorSafe Act of 2017. Your legislation will better protect persons aged 65 and older from financial exploitation by increasing the likelihood it will be identified by financial services professionals, and by removing barriers to reporting it, so that together we as state securities regulators and other appropriate governmental authorities can help stop it.

Senior financial exploitation is a growing problem across the country. Many in our elderly population are vulnerable due to social isolation and distance from family, caregiver, and other support networks. Indeed, evidence suggests that as many as one out of every five citizens over the age of 65 has been victimized by a financial fraud. To be successful in combating senior financial exploitation, state and federal policymakers must come together to weave a new safety net for our elderly, breaking down barriers for those who are best positioned to identify red flags early on and to encourage reporting and referrals to appropriate local, county, state, and federal agencies, including law enforcement.

The SeniorSafe Act consists of several essential features. First, to promote and encourage reporting of suspected elderly financial exploitation by financial services professionals, who are positioned to identify and report “red flags” of potential exploitation, the bill would incentivize financial services employees to report any suspected exploitation by making them immune from any civil or administrative liability arising from such a report, provided that they exercised due care, and that they make these reports in good faith. Second, in order to better assure that financial services employees have the knowledge and training they require to identify “red flags” associated with financial exploitation, the bill would require that, as a condition of receiving immunity, financial institutions undertake to train certain personnel regarding the identification and reporting of senior financial exploitation.

The SeniorSafe Act’s objectives and benefits are far-reaching. Older Americans stand to benefit directly from such reporting, because early detection and reporting will minimize their financial losses from exploitation, and because improved protection of their finances ultimately helps preserve their financial independence and their personal autonomy. Financial institutions stand to benefit, as well, through preservation of their reputation, increased community recognition, increased employee satisfaction, and decreased uninsured losses.

In conclusion, state securities regulators strongly support passage of the SeniorSafe Act of 2017. Please do not hesitate to contact me, or Michael Canning, NASAA Director of Policy, if we may be of any additional assistance.

Sincerely,

MIKE ROTHMAN,
NASAA President and Minnesota
Commissioner of Commerce.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to speak on the importance of helping our community banks and credit unions. These institutions are on the ground daily helping our families and small businesses. They deserve recognition. They also deserve our careful consideration of regulatory adjustments that will help them continue their work.

Let me be clear: There are parts of S. 2155 I disagree with, as do many of my colleagues, but what I think that we can all agree on is the good works that our local credit unions and banks do for our communities.

Community banks and credit unions anchor our towns, helping our workers and businesses. These institutions provide more than just savings and checking services. Many provide credit counseling and financial management. They help individuals save for education or for a financially secure retirement. They provide the mortgage loans that make homeownership a realistic goal for many families. They get to know our small businesses and provide them with much-needed financial support. Most importantly, they do so in a way that is tailored to their communities.

I would like to emphasize the role that community banks and credit unions play with respect to small businesses especially. We talk a lot about Main Street businesses in this body. As

the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, I am keenly aware of the need to provide our small businesses with adequate resources and support, including through access to capital. This is especially the case for underserved communities, where the bigger banks simply don’t have a presence.

There are provisions in this bill that will help. For example, for credit unions, the bill changes the designation of certain real estate loans which have previously been classified as business loans. This will free up capital for small business lending. It is through changes like these that we can carefully tailor regulations, address regulatory unfairness or duplication, and help our local lenders.

In Maryland, we are fortunate to still have a good number of these local institutions. We have almost 90 credit unions in Maryland who have about 1.9 million members. These credit unions serve many of the Federal workers that we in Congress work with every day. They provide services and support for our Department of Defense employees, our Library of Congress employees, our National Institutes of Health employees, and our State and county workers who keep our communities going. Because of their close ties with their membership, these credit unions and others like them are able to offer special services that big banks may not have the incentive to provide.

Similarly, our community banks remain strong. There are 54 community banks chartered in the State. Our community banking sector employs over 35,000 Marylanders. These banks have withstood the Great Recession and even the Great Depression. For instance, Eastern Savings Bank in Baltimore was established in 1905, pulled through the chaos of the Depression in 1929, and still operates four service branches throughout Maryland today, with a customer base of primarily local residents. All of our Maryland community banks are essential to our urban, suburban, and rural communities. They are critical to economic growth in my hometown of Baltimore. They provide nearly half of the industry’s small business loans, despite making up less than 20 percent of the banking industry’s assets.

It would be naive to ignore the fact that the number of these institutions is shrinking. They have a difficult market to navigate. One-size-fits-all regulations can exacerbate this trend. This doesn’t mean that we should not provide oversight of this sector of our economy; however, I think carefully considering “tailoring” our approach to regulating is more than appropriate here. I think we can all agree on this principle. Many of the credit union and community bank provisions we are considering, standing alone, have broad bipartisan support. If those provisions

stood alone, my vote on such a bill would be a yes.

S. 2155, of course, contains more than community bank and credit union provisions, and I share some of the concerns voiced by my colleagues on this bill, especially regarding consumer protections in certain industries. At the same time, I cannot stress enough how important it is to strengthen our credit unions and community banks. I look forward to continuing to work on these issues, especially on small business lending, with my colleagues going forward.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

While I would welcome regulatory reform for the small banks and credit unions in Minnesota that didn’t cause the financial crisis, I’m concerned that this bill is a missed opportunity to improve consumer protection and that it reduces the regulatory oversight of larger banks, which could increase systemic risk in the financial system and put taxpayers on the hook for future bailouts.

I have long believed that Minnesota’s community banks and credit unions play a vital role in our communities and are deserving of regulatory relief. I was one of the first Democrats to support legislative action in past Congresses and helped develop and champion numerous proposals for reform for the community banks and credit unions.

Unfortunately, title IV of the bill, especially section 401, which raises the asset threshold for enhanced supervision from \$50 billion all the way to \$250 billion, goes too far and threatens to increase systemic risk. The community banks and credit unions in Minnesota with which I have spoken in recent weeks have acknowledged they would have preferred a bill that was limited to regulation that directly affected them, and I would have welcomed the opportunity to cast a vote in favor of such a bill, but I will not vote in favor of this bill.

Thank you.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today I wish to speak about some specific provisions S. 2155.

I was proud to be one of the original drafters of Dodd-Frank legislation. We didn’t get everything right in that bill. With the benefit of 8 years of hindsight, we have been able to see what has worked and what hasn’t.

Most of what hasn’t worked well has been the excessive burdens put on community banks. The bill the Senate considered today, one that I am a proud cosponsor of, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, does a lot of good for community banks and many regional banks by reducing some of the compliance costs these banks face, so that

they may better compete and end the phenomenon of “too small to survive.”

Since the crisis, however, what has worked best is increased capital requirements and an updated capital planning regime for medium and large-sized banks. Put simply, no amount of prudential regulation on products or business lines can substitute for requiring banks to keep robust capital cushions. Ensuring that banks hold significant loss absorbing, capital is the best protection we have against the failure of banks during a crisis. It is also the best tool we have to make sure that even in an economic downturn, banks still have the ability to lend to credit-worthy borrowers, so that we can rebound quickly from a downturn.

Critically, S. 2155 makes no changes to the risk-based capital regime for regional and large banks that has been the centerpiece of the Federal Reserve’s post-crisis work.

The international Basel III capital accord was agreed by banking regulators in 2010 to 2011. As implemented in the US, Basel III requires a minimum Common Equity Tier 1, CET1, ratio of 4.5 percent, up from 2 percent in Basel II. Minimum tier 1 capital increased from 4 percent in Basel II to 6 percent in Basel III, which includes additional 1.5 percent on top of the required CET1 ratio. The U.S. has finalized rules to implement two additional capital buffers on top of this 6 percent baseline tier 1 capital requirement: a mandatory capital conservation buffer, as adjusted by a risk-weighted capital surcharge on U.S. G-SIBs, and a discretionary countercyclical buffer, which the Fed can use to require additional capital during periods of high credit growth.

These risk-based capital requirements, as implemented by the U.S. banking regulators, have formed a core part of the U.S. bank regulatory response to the financial crisis. S. 2155 changes none of these requirements for regional and large banks.

An important complement to risk-based capital requirements is supervisory stress testing. Stress tests help make sure that banks have adequate capital to absorb losses and more still to lend even in a serious recession so that they will be able to continue to lend to households and businesses. S. 2155 did not modify the requirement that banks larger than \$250 billion must continue to undergo annual supervisory stress tests. Regional banks between \$100 billion and \$250 billion must also continue to undergo what Chair Powell called before the Banking Committee meaningful, strong, and frequent stress tests.

Let me make clear: S. 2155 uses the same language as Dodd-Frank to describe the stress test that should apply to banks between \$100 billion and \$250 billion because we believe the stress tests applied to those banks should

continue to be meaningful assessments of the capital adequacy of those institutions under severely adverse conditions. The requirement in section 401 to conduct stress tests of those banks would be satisfied by continuing to apply the section 165 supervisory stress tests to those banks. We have chosen to single out stress tests for banks between \$100 billion and \$250 billion because we believe it is the most important enhanced prudential standard in section 165 of Dodd-Frank.

We believe it is prudent for the Federal Reserve to have discretion to apply the other enumerated enhanced prudential standards in section 165 to those or a subset of those banks as part of the strong and tailored regime that should apply to those banks going forward. Indeed, under the bill, the Fed can apply an enhanced prudential standard to those banks for financial stability reasons or simply to “promote the safety and soundness” of a bank, which is a low standard. Although the Fed is the entity that is best positioned to make the determination for many enhanced prudential standards, Congress believes that meaningful, strong and frequent stress tests are non-negotiable.

Supervisory stress tests alone, however, do not set any capital ratios or limit any capital actions by the banks. The Federal Reserve’s Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review, CCAR, framework, however, integrates supervisory stress testing with risk-based capital requirements to assess the overall capital adequacy of banks, making it the most important supervisory tool the Federal Reserve has for larger banks. Specifically, CCAR requires evaluations of whether each bank’s capital provides an adequate buffer for the losses that would be incurred during the stress scenarios, whether its risk management and capital planning processes are appropriately well-developed and governed and how its dividend or buyback plans could affect its ability to remain viable in stressed conditions. The Federal Reserve may object—and has objected—to a capital plan based on quantitative or qualitative concerns. If it does, the bank is not permitted to make any capital distribution without Fed authorization.

The Federal Reserve, without direction from Congress, has taken actions under both former Chair Yellen and Chair Powell to refine the CCAR process to reduce regulatory burdens. For example, in 2016, the Fed announced that smaller banks subject to CCAR would not need to be subject to the same qualitative requirements as larger, more complex banks. That was a sensible change.

Congress has shown it knows how to exercise its article I prerogative in many places in S. 2155 to adjust, tailor, and modify thresholds for applicability

for rules that apply to banks that have \$50 billion or more in assets, but Congress has not made any changes to CCAR in S. 2155. The omission of CCAR and the capital plan rule from the changes that S. 2155 has made to section 165 and some regulations affecting some banks is intentional and reflects the continued importance this Congress places upon the continued existence of a robust CCAR process and the premise that the Fed will continue to use this most important supervisory tool appropriately.

That covers risk-based capital, but let me reiterate a point I made in my prior floor speech on this bill, about the importance of the leverage ratio. Basel III requires 3 percent tier 1 capital divided by the bank’s average total consolidated assets. The U.S. implementation goes further and requires a minimum leverage ratio of 6 percent for SIFI banks and 5 percent for their bank holding companies. That is generally a good thing. One of the many lessons of the financial crisis was that regulators and bankers alike should approach risk modeling with a degree of humility. A strong leverage ratio is an important backstop to risk-based requirements that depend on banks and regulators’ abilities to predict the future.

Current and former Federal Reserve officials from Governor Tarullo, to former Chair Volcker, and former Chair Yellen, to Chair Powell have said that the leverage ratio should in general not be the binding capital constraint for banks, as it tends to be for the custody banks today. The leverage ratio is meant to be, in the words of Jay Powell, “an important backstop to the risk-based capital framework,” but noted that “it is important to get the relative calibrations of the leverage ratio and the risk-based capital requirements right” because “doing so is critical to mitigating any perverse incentives and preventing distortions in money markets and other safe asset markets.”

Let’s be clear. Section 402 provides relief to only three banks: Bank of New York Mellon, State Street, and Northern Trust. I have seen some raise the concern that the language in section 402 could be read to provide relief to a broader set of banks. That is not a credible reading of the statutory language or our legislative intent. Section 402 says that, in order to receive relief, a “custody bank” must be “predominantly engaged in custody, safekeeping, and asset servicing activities” to gain the benefit of this provision. This provision does not mean that, if a bank has a large custodial business, it should get relief, nor is this an invitation to exclude other assets from the calculation of total assets for purposes of the leverage ratio. This is a targeted fix for a narrow problem.

So what is the net result of all this technical capital planning and stress

testing work that the Federal Reserve and other banking regulators have developed since 2008? Today, U.S. G-SIBs are have two times the amount of capital than they had precrisis. Even if we went through an economic downturn worse than the financial crisis, banks would have 50 percent more capital after absorbing losses than they did in 2008. The substantial increase in capital extends to banks that are smaller than the G-SIBs. The common equity capital ratio of the 34 bank holding companies in the 2017 CCAR has more than doubled from 5.5 percent in the first quarter of 2009 to 12.5 percent in the first quarter of 2017. This reflects an increase of more than \$750 billion in common equity capital to a total of \$1.25 trillion by the first quarter of 2017.

That is exactly where we should be.

I am proud to have contributed significantly to both Dodd-Frank and the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. S. 2155 is in many ways as notable for what it doesn't do, particularly with respect to capital requirements, as much as what it does do.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today I want to make a few remarks on S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

Section 213 of S. 2155, making online banking initiation legal and easy—the intent of this provision, which I introduced as an amendment during Committee consideration of S. 2155, is to facilitate the ability of financial institutions to reach new and potentially underserved consumers by making it possible to offer products and services to consumers through online and mobile applications. I would like to clarify that, with respect to references in this provision to “copies,” “scans,” or other reproductions of a consumer's government-issued identification, this is, intended to apply to all methods of obtaining information from an identification card, including color and black-and-white copies.

Section 215 of S. 2155, reducing identity fraud—with respect to section 215 of the bill, “reducing identity fraud,” the intent is to provide options for permitted entities to crosscheck consumer information with the Social Security Administration, SSA, in such a way that is efficient for those entities, as well as the SSA. In particular, the intent of this provision is to allow a service provider or other permitted entity to contact the SSA's Consent Based Social Security Number Verification database pursuant to appropriate consent provided to a permitted entity—such as a creditor—and to then provide the “yes/no” response from SSA to permitted entities who request such information in the future. In this way, creditors can receive the important validation of a name, date of birth, and Social Security number as part of the

consumer report they receive when underwriting a credit application. This would result in fewer inquiries made to and received by the SSA. Furthermore, as mentioned, this provision would require consumer consent as part of the normal credit application process, similar to how creditors request consumer consent to obtain consumer credit reports in connection with an application. Under section 215, consumer consent can now be given via electronic signature obtained by the creditor or other permitted entities. Nothing in this provision would require consumers to fill out extra forms, provide extra signatures, or do anything that would significantly alter their expectations for a seamless application experience. The goal is to inform consumers of the possible inquiry to the SSA and allow them to provide consent via the chosen method by the creditor, which now includes electronic signature.

The second point I would like to clarify regarding section 215 is the importance of ensuring the SSA will implement this section with all deliberate speed, with no unreasonable delay to the process. As the author of this provision, it is my expectation that the SSA will have the database described in this section operational within 1 year of the bill's enactment, assuming the appropriate reserve of user fees. Every day that goes by without the SSA implementing the changes called for in section 215 will lead to more children unknowingly becoming victims of synthetic identity theft and having their credit ruined.

Section 310 of S. 2155, credit score competition—the word “competition” in the title of section 310, “credit score competition,” is the heart of the intent of this part of the bill.

When enacted into law, Section 310 will put in place a mechanism by which credit score model developers may submit their models to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac for validation for use by the enterprises, if the models meet validation criteria that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have established. Lenders will be able to choose the model that they wish to use. The end result of enactment of section 310 of S. 2155 will be a competitive market between the developers of empirically derived, demonstrably predictive, and statistically sound credit scoring models, with appropriate regulatory oversight from the Federal Housing Finance Agency under which both consumers and lenders would benefit. A lack of such a market thus far in the mortgage finance arena has stifled innovation in credit scoring.

Section 310 allows for more than one credit score model provider to have a validated model for use by the enterprises. The Director of the FHFA is given the responsibility to see that the validation process is undertaken in a

timely manner for all applicants and that the methodology and results behind each validation decision is released to the public.

Unlike the request for input the FHFA issued in December 2017 on this subject, section 310 does not make specific reference to any credit score model provider. That is deliberate. Section 310 opens the enterprises up to use any model that is able to pass the validation process.

Some critics have raised the specter that providing mortgage lenders the opportunity to choose among credit scoring models validated and approved by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac might trigger “a race to the bottom.” That is prohibited under section 310, as validated models are first deemed to not threaten the safety and soundness of the enterprises in order to be used.

Ms. WARREN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the devastating impacts of climate change in my home State of New Hampshire and across our country. I want to start by commending our colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE, who has been a fierce advocate for this issue and, as of yesterday, had taken to the floor 200 times to call on Congress to wake up and protect our environment.

I am proud to represent a State whose beautiful natural resources strengthen our economy, create jobs, and support our high quality of life, but we are already seeing the real impacts of climate change in New Hampshire—impacts with major consequences.

Last year, the “National Climate Assessment” report reinforced what has long been clear: Human activity is the driving force behind our changing climate, and the United States is experiencing more extreme weather events, including dangerous heat, heavier rainfall and more flooding, and larger wildfires as a result, threatening both our long-term economic growth and the well-being of our citizens.

Many people in New Hampshire, particularly on our sea coast, are concerned about what these stronger and more frequent storms will mean for their families, their homes, and their businesses. Rising sea levels and greater precipitation have heightened the risk of flooding on our coasts. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association estimates that New Hampshire sea levels are expected to rise between six-tenths of a foot and 2 feet by 2050

and between 1.6 feet and 6.6 feet by 2100. In just the last 2 weeks, our State has been hit by three nor'easters. This is not normal.

You can see here, the flooding that impacted streets and homes in Portsmouth, NH, during one of these storms. This chart depicts a photo. We have to help our people adapt to these changes, these direct threats they face. This starts with focusing on efforts like coastal resiliency to help vulnerable communities prepare, improving our infrastructure, and developing resilience strategies to help plan ahead of storms and extreme weather events. At the local level, people on New Hampshire's seacoasts are already doing great work to be proactive and address these challenges head-on, so we must support their efforts.

We must also keep working to mitigate climate change, which is why I am continuing to push to cut carbon emissions, conserve and protect our natural resources, and build a stronger clean energy future.

Unfortunately, President Trump has been focused on an agenda that is based on climate change denial and has stacked his administration with climate change skeptics who have placed the priorities on big oil companies over the protection of our natural resources.

According to a recent Politico report, President Trump has chosen at least 20 people to serve as agency leaders and advisers who have publicly disagreed with the settled science on climate change. He has left key positions vacant, including a science adviser at the Office of Science and Technology Policy—an unprecedented move over the last several decades in which the office has existed. This clear disdain for science and failure to acknowledge the reality of the dangers of climate change are seen throughout the administration's policies.

Last year, President Trump recklessly withdrew the United States from the Paris climate agreement—failing to listen to the voices of environmental and business leaders who supported this agreement. The United States of America now has the distinction of being the only country in the world that is not supporting it.

EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt is working to repeal the Clean Power Plan, which is critical to reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and helping our citizens, our businesses, and our economy thrive. We have seen several clean air and clean water protections rolled back.

In addition to reversing environmental protections, the administration is taking further steps that can carry extreme risk for our environment. This includes the irresponsible plan to open up 90 percent of our Nation's coastal waters—including New Hampshire's seacoast—to the dangers of offshore drilling.

We are clearly seeing the impacts of climate change. Our citizens are calling on us to act, but the lack of leadership from this administration and the actions they have taken that exacerbate our climate and environmental challenges are—to put it mildly—irresponsible.

We need to take proactive steps to protect our environment, not roll back key protections. We need to help communities threatened by a changing climate, not put the profits of Big Oil first. We need to stand up for science, not deny it.

I will keep working to address climate change and to achieve a cleaner environment and stronger energy future that will help our citizens, our economy, and our businesses thrive. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

RECOGNIZING SPAULDING HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. President, I am proud to recognize not just an individual but the entire Spaulding High School community as our Granite Stater of the Month for the compassion and commitment to helping others that they displayed following the horrific shooting in Parkland, FL.

In the wake of the senseless violence in Parkland, Spaulding music staff and students met to discuss how they could help survivors and memorialize the 17 lives which were taken at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

During this dark time, the Spaulding students wanted to focus on expressing their love and how to best send comfort to their peers in Florida. This led Spaulding students, teachers, and faculty to start an initiative—with the members of the band, the color guard, and the Junior ROTC playing a leading role—to collect money to support the Stoneman Douglas community.

In the days that followed, students passed around buckets to collect donations, with each student giving what he or she could. In an enthusiastic show of support, the Spaulding community raised \$3,271 in just 2 days.

Students wanted to do more, so they also presented the Spaulding High School Music Department Glass Eagle Leadership Award to the Stoneman Douglas Music Department, as that is also the mascot of their school. The Junior ROTC group also sent one of its Challenge Coins to acknowledge the Parkland students' bravery and resolve.

Two of the school's music teachers—Joanne Houston and Cheryl Richardson—recently flew to Florida to present the gifts to Stoneman Douglas's principal and vice principal.

The selfless support for Stoneman Douglas by the Spaulding High School community exemplifies the compassion of the Granite State.

In New Hampshire and throughout our country today, school communities are engaging in walkouts and demanding action to prevent future acts of gun

violence. I know members of the Spaulding student body are planning a walkout, too, and I am profoundly grateful to see our young people speaking out and being powerful forces for change.

I am incredibly proud of these young leaders. We, as a country, must meet them in this moment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this week we are debating an important piece of legislation that is going to streamline and simplify government regulations. We are going to make it easier and cheaper for families to get access to loans from their local banks. This legislation is good for communities, and it is good for the American economy.

This is just the latest action we have taken in Congress over the past year to help give the American economy a boost. The economy is responding, and the American people are doing better because of it.

Here is a headline from the New York Times on Friday: "The Economy is Looking Awfully Strong." That is the headline in the New York Times—"The Economy is Looking Awfully Strong." This article was about the jobs report that came out last week. It said that the report "can be summed up in four words: The economy is humming."

The U.S. economy has already created over 552,000 new jobs in just the first 2 months of this year—over half a million new jobs in the first 2 months of this year. There are half a million more people working today compared to when Republicans passed this tax relief law. If we want to go back a little, there are more than 3 million new jobs since President Trump was elected in November of 2016. That is a real number to look at. That is the moment when people said they had enough of slow-growth policies from the Democrats in Washington and elected Donald Trump President. That is the moment when businesses realized things were going to be different with Republicans in charge.

More people are working now. And do you know what else? They are being paid more. According to the Commerce Department, the take-home pay of working people in America increased by \$40 billion in January. They say it is directly because of the tax relief law that Republicans passed last December.

More than 4 million workers are also getting a bonus or a pay increase. Four

hundred companies have said that is because taxes went down. They are sharing the savings with their workers. These are people who work at Home Depot, Lowe's, Walmart, Starbucks, and other businesses that have familiar names all across America. They are also people who work in smaller businesses, like the Jonah Bank in Wyoming, at branches in Casper and in Cheyenne. It is not a nationally known bank, but it is very important in our State and in our communities. Some people who are getting bonuses work at places like Taco John's. That is another business that is important to the people of Wyoming. When I was in the State senate, Taco John's was a place I went regularly to eat lunch. It is one of many Taco John's facilities around the State of Wyoming and around the West. Republicans cut taxes, and working Americans are seeing more money in their paychecks as a result.

This is what we see in terms of confidence. This new survey came out recently where they talked with the heads of mid-sized companies all around America, and this is what they say: 89 percent of the business leaders are confident in the U.S. economy and the economy's prospects for the year. U.S. economic confidence soars—in 2016, 39 percent; in 2017, 80 percent; and in 2018, now 89 percent. The American people realize we have now beaten back 8 years of bad policies from Democrats in Washington. As soon as President Trump took office, we saw confidence soar, and I don't know that it has ever been higher.

Americans are feeling better about the U.S. economy. They are also feeling better about their own personal situations. That is the key—people's own personal situations. That is certainly the case in my home State of Wyoming.

The polling company Gallup looked at overall economic confidence State by State. They found that Wyoming is the most confident State in the country when it comes to America's economy. Attitudes about the economy turned positive immediately after Donald Trump was elected President in 2016. You could feel it. You could feel the confidence. You could feel the optimism. You could feel the positiveness in the people of Wyoming. People living in 43 out of the 50 States now have a positive view of the economy, and Wyoming, of course, is No. 1.

People I talk to at home—I was in Cody, WY, this past weekend, as well as in Sheridan and Riverton and Casper and around the State talking to people in various communities. The people I talked to about the economy will tell you it is because businesses are hiring again. People are doing better. They see their take-home pay going up. They see their taxes going down. They see that Republican policies are making their lives better. They see that Repub-

lican policies are also making the economy stronger. They see that Republican policies are making it easier for people to achieve their dreams and to enjoy their lives. It comes from tax relief. It comes from cutting regulations, as we are doing this week.

What are the Democrats offering? Well, last week, the Democratic leader came to the floor and said he wants to raise taxes by \$1 trillion. That is what the leader of the Democratic Party said on the floor of the Senate last week. He wants to raise taxes by \$1 trillion. Is he serious? A trillion dollars? Raising taxes? Taking away from people the tax cuts they have just started to enjoy?

More people have jobs. The economy is humming. The New York Times says the economy is humming. Ninety percent of working Americans have increases in their take-home pay. That is because of the tax cuts this body passed. Democrats want to reverse it all. That is what we hear on the floor of the Senate. They want to take back the money. They want to roll back the progress we have made. That is their plan—raise taxes. That is what we hear from the Democrats.

Senator SCHUMER came to the floor of the Senate, and he said: "There are much better uses for the money." That is what he said on the floor of the Senate. That is what the Washington Democrats always say. They have better uses for the money than the American people do. They have a better idea, they always say, about how to use somebody else's money. They want higher taxes. They want more Washington spending because they think they know best. They don't think the money should go to pay increases or bonuses for working Americans. Really? They think it should go to Washington? I think American families know how to spend their paychecks better than any Washington Democrat ever will.

Democrats say they want to use this \$1 trillion in new taxes to pay for infrastructure. We all know that America's infrastructure—our roads, our bridges, our dams, our waterways—are in desperate need of attention, but as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I can tell you that I am committed to improving this situation by working with the President and working on both sides of the aisle. If Democrats want to talk about a robust and fiscally responsible infrastructure plan that is going to help the American economy, then I am ready to have that conversation, but if all they want to do is talk about raising taxes on American families, they are wasting their breath.

There is a very big difference between Republicans and Democrats in Congress: Republicans want the American people to keep more of their hard-earned money. Democrats want Wash-

ington to take more of people's money. Republicans want new policies that grow the economy, create jobs, and inspire confidence in a brighter future. Democrats want the same old tax-and-spend policies that have failed for years. Their policies have led to slow growth, stagnant wages, and a terrible lack of confidence in our economy.

Republicans promised that our ideas will do better, and the results from the tax cuts and the tax relief speak for themselves. The economy is strong. Confidence is off the charts.

The American people deserve this chance to have a brighter future. That is what Republicans are offering, and that is also what Republicans are delivering.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the comments of the esteemed Senator from Wyoming. I think he described very well the extremely positive impact that tax relief is having on our country, on economic growth, on job creation, and on higher wages and incomes for hard-working Americans.

I rise today, however, to talk about the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act and the important reforms we are making to spur economic development, facilitate more lending, and reduce burdensome regulations on our community banks and credit unions.

The Dodd-Frank Act was enacted in 2010 following the financial crisis in an attempt to reduce systemic risks the financial sector posed to the economy. This far-reaching law touched every aspect of the financial system, including many small community banks and credit unions around the country and in my home State of North Dakota and across this Nation, in North Carolina and in every State in the Union. These community banks and credit unions are not what pose the systemic risks that Dodd-Frank was passed to address.

At almost 850 pages long, Dodd-Frank required more than 10 regulatory agencies to write almost 400 new rules, which added more than 27,000 new Federal restrictions on American businesses. Think about that regulatory burden—more than 27,000 new Federal restrictions on American businesses.

Compliance costs to implement these Dodd-Frank rules have exceeded \$36 billion—I repeat, \$36 billion—which is ultimately passed on to consumers. It required nearly 73 million paperwork hours. In fact, agencies were still writing Dodd-Frank regulations after the law was passed. These costs hit small banks and credit unions especially hard, harming the driving forces of economic growth in rural areas and in our

underserved areas. These financial institutions provide critical funding for credit for families and small businesses, especially in rural areas and in underserved areas. Rural States particularly feel that impact, like my home State of North Dakota.

Because of their small size, community banks and credit unions have a more difficult time complying with excessively complex reporting and paperwork requirements. Compliance costs have hastened bank closures in small towns, leading to a growing number of places with no bank branches—meaning, not having financial services for consumers.

Nationwide, more than one in five U.S. banks have disappeared; that is more than 1,700 institutions—or more than one small bank or financial institution every business day—that have shut down since Dodd-Frank was enacted. That means less access to financial services for consumers across this country, particularly those who don't live in our large urban areas.

Since Dodd-Frank was signed into law, North Dakota has lost over one-fifth of its credit unions, with the number of credit unions in North Dakota declining from 47 in 2010 to 35 today. The number of community banks in North Dakota similarly dropped from 90 in 2010 to 74 today. These institutions have been forced to merge and consolidate due to the overly burdensome regulatory compliance costs associated with Dodd-Frank.

The ultimate loser, of course, from these increased regulations, compliance costs, and the subsequent consolidation ends up being the very consumer that Dodd-Frank was intended to protect. Whether you are shopping for a loan to fund an innovative start-up business, operating capital for your family farm, or seeking a mortgage to purchase your first home, fewer banks and fewer credit unions means fewer options for consumers.

In North Dakota and in rural communities Nationwide, our community banks and credit unions serve just that—the communities. They serve their local communities. They are not only savings and lending institutions for hard-working neighbors, local businesses, farmers, ranchers, and community members, but they are willing to work with borrowers facing circumstances unique to their rural community. They know their customer. They know their community. They know their service area.

Rural community banks and credit unions typically make loans that don't fit the standard mortgage mold. Properties that are not cookie-cutter residential properties are very common in rural markets. Rural lenders tend to use their knowledge of the market and the customer to structure loans that work for both the borrower and the bank. In other words, they make a loan

fit the customer, rather than trying to make the customer fit a one-size-fits-all loan program with too much regulation. That might require using multiple pieces of property as collateral for the loan or utilizing a short-term loan to assist with a renovation that is paid off with the sale of a crop.

Documenting assets and cash to close a loan may look very different. For example, livestock in a feedlot waiting for sale or crops ready for harvest or in storage silos may substitute for cash in the bank that would typically get a borrower to qualify for a loan under the standardized approach where one size is supposed to fit everyone.

The fundamental purpose of community banks and credit unions is to serve their local communities. In North Dakota, they do this by forging personal relationships with the small businesses, farmers and ranchers, and individuals in their communities. By knowing their customers, they are able to offer products tailored to each individual who comes into the bank.

Dodd-Frank undermines this fundamental purpose by forcing banks and credit unions to fit their customers into a one-size-fits-all mortgage lending product called “qualified mortgages.” While this may work for urban and suburban lenders who sell their mortgages to the largest Wall Street banks, we have seen that it does not work in our rural States and our rural areas.

The bill we are now considering provides relief to rural customers by deeming certain mortgages held by lenders with less than \$10 billion in assets as qualified mortgages, allowing community banks and credit unions to expand the types of mortgages they offer while maintaining critical consumer protections—meaning more choice and more opportunity for financing for consumers across the country. This means that our community banks and credit unions in our State and across the Nation will be able to offer a wider range of credit products and better serve the small businesses, farmers and ranchers, and hard-working individuals in our communities.

Another important issue facing our rural communities is a critical shortage of appraisers. The appraisal is a key component of the home-buying process and is important to both borrowers and lenders. The bank wants to know that the home financing they provide can be supported by the collateral, and the borrower wants to make sure they are not paying more than the home is worth.

In rural areas, including my State and many others, conducting appraisals can be more complex than in suburban and urban areas because there are fewer sales and fewer comparable properties. This makes it vitally important that there are local appraisers who are familiar with the area they are work-

ing in. However, we are seeing a dramatic shortage of appraisers right now in our State and I know in other States as well. For example, of the 53 counties in our State, 29 have no resident appraisers. This means that all properties sold in those counties are appraised by appraisers from outside the county, sometimes from across the State. This can lead to significant wait times for an appraisal to be completed, as well as the potential for inaccurate appraisals.

This bill provides relief for home buyers in rural areas by exempting rural mortgage portfolio loans of less than \$400,000 from being required to have a certified appraisal if the lender is unable to find a State-certified or licensed appraiser to perform that certified appraisal within 5 days. This will help reduce the cost to consumers and streamline the already time-consuming home-buying process.

Additionally, this bill helps further protect consumers from identity theft and other predatory practices by requiring credit bureaus to provide consumers with one free freeze alert and one free unfreeze alert per year. These tools will empower consumers to take more control over their credit and better protect themselves from potential fraud.

This legislation also includes a provision I cosponsored that would provide protections for bank employees who disclose the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen to a regulatory or law enforcement agency. This will encourage whistleblowers to come forward and protect senior citizens from financial exploitation.

Additionally, I have filed an amendment, which I am urging my colleagues to support, that would help our farmers weather the low commodity prices and economic downturns in farm country. I have heard from many farmers and bankers across the country that the current Farm Service Agency, or FSA, loan program levels are outdated and do not reflect the current ag economy.

My amendment would increase the maximum direct loan amount for the Farm Operating and Farm Ownership Programs to \$600,000 from the current level of \$300,000. It would also increase the maximum guaranteed loan amount for these programs from \$1.39 million to \$2.5 million. This would allow new and beginning farmers to purchase land and equipment or provide necessary operating capital to help farmers endure through the downturn in commodity prices. I will continue to work with my colleagues on that amendment.

In conclusion, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act provides real regulatory relief to our community banks and credit unions. I believe this will benefit consumers across this country. It empowers lenders to sell products tailored to

their customers, assists rural communities impacted by the shortage of certified appraisers, and provides enhanced consumer protections from identity theft, fraud, and predatory practices.

It is past time that we provide regulatory relief to the community banks and credit unions across this Nation. Passing this bill will further economic development, increase lending in rural communities, and alleviate the onerous requirements placed on our small community financial institutions by Dodd-Frank. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield the floor to the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today, as my colleague from North Dakota has just done, to speak in support of Senate bill S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

In response to the 2008 financial crisis, many individuals overreacted to the role that smaller institutions played. In the rush to react, these institutions became overregulated. But since the drafting and enactment of Dodd-Frank nearly 10 years ago, Congress has looked for ways to lessen the damaging effects it has had on our financial system in America. As a result of the Dodd-Frank Act, thousands of pages of Federal mandates were imposed upon even the smallest of financial institutions.

Community banks all across the country are the key source of lending and other financial services on Main Street throughout this Nation. I believe we should not, and must not, continue to require them to comply with the same regulations as our largest financial institutions that are, perhaps, subject to systemic risk.

This bill before us today fixes that by offering a commonsense approach to ensure that our small and medium-sized financial institutions are no longer subject to excessive regulation that has choked the life from them in the country.

Senate bill S. 2155 is a result of almost 10 years of negotiations among Members of both parties. This legislation was negotiated in good faith between Republicans and Democrats to find common ground. In a time when partisan politics have derailed many efforts, the bill before us moved through regular order out of the Banking Committee, where a lengthy and robust amendment debate occurred. Many of us in this body, including the Presiding Officer, have spent hours upon hours negotiating since the enactment of Dodd-Frank to get to this point today. This is a bipartisan bill. This is a good product.

Time and again, I have advocated for conducting thorough cost-benefit anal-

ysis on financial regulations. I believe it is Congress's role, when tasked with oversight authority, to ensure that the costs of rules from Washington do not outweigh the benefits for consumers. However, even a simple examination of the activities of small and medium-sized banks shows that their practices provide no systemic risk to our financial system.

Many Dodd-Frank regulations are inappropriate for these institutions in the country. This has become abundantly clear to most of us. As regulatory overreach progressed, community banks and, in turn, local economies began to fall on hard times.

In the 115th Congress, I believe the dynamics have shifted. Beginning with our work to reform our Nation's tax system, the economy has been performing well. Unemployment has dropped; the total number of individuals returning to the workforce has increased. In the Senate, we now have a unique opportunity to unlock the chains of stagnation that have halted the growth of a lot of our small business.

Community financial institutions provide more than 60 percent of small business loans in this country. Too often, it is easy to forget that the personalized touch of community banks has been what started the process for success of some of the most accomplished businesses in the United States of America. I believe we must pass this bill if we want that to continue—if we want to keep creating jobs in this country and opportunities for our people.

In response to my friends from the other side of the aisle who oppose our efforts here, I have one simple message: The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act—the bill we have before the Senate now—is a thoughtful, bipartisan effort to correct and rightsize regulations that were hastily prepared. This product is designed to help Main Street, not Wall Street.

This is a good bill. I hope my colleagues will join me and others in support of it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to address two issues today. One, briefly, is the issue of guns about which many of our Democratic colleagues have come down to speak. Then I want to speak about the financial services regulatory reform bill we will be voting on later today.

GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. President, first, on the former topic, a number of our Democratic colleagues have been down here, and we have heard a real passion and concern about the victims of gun violence in our country. I certainly understand and respect their passion. I have spent a lot of time working to find sensible measures that will help address this in ways that do not infringe on the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. It does feel like we are at a somewhat different moment here, so I hope we can choose to get something done—something constructive—and stop talking past each other and find where there is common ground. I suggest four steps by which we ought to be able to find reasonable consensus in the Senate, ought to be able to get to 60 votes, and be able to at least modestly make some progress in this space.

One is a bill that has been introduced by Senators CORNYN and MURPHY, a bipartisan bill that is called Fix NICS. The fact is, our background check system is only as good as the data that is in the system, and we have an inconsistent quality of data. The data is provided, generally, by the States. Some States provide excellent, comprehensive, up-to-date data—other States, not so much. The Cornyn-Murphy bill would encourage better compliance and better data from the States. Better data means we would have a better NICS system.

A second piece of legislation is a bill I have introduced with Senator COONS, and the sort of nickname for this legislation is “Lie and Try.” Our legislation would make it possible for more States to prosecute people who commit felonies when they attempt to purchase firearms; that is to say, it is those people who knowingly lie about their own criminal backgrounds—who deny their criminal histories—in the hope that they will be able to somehow circumvent the NICS system and buy firearms. It actually happens every day in America that convicted felons, who obviously know they are convicted felons, deny that and attempt to buy firearms they are not entitled to.

Our legislation would simply require the FBI, when it discovers that someone has committed this sort of felony, to inform the law enforcement in the State from which that person comes so the State would be able to prosecute, if it would choose to. It is only about enforcing the laws on the books. I often hear from my friends who are Second Amendment supporters, as I am, that we ought to do a better job of enforcing the laws on the books. This is an opportunity to do exactly that.

A third opportunity for us is to recognize that the people whom we deem to be so dangerous that we will not allow them to fly on planes—the people on a terrorist watch list who could show up at airports with valid IDs and

boarding passes, and we will not let them get on a plane as we think they are that dangerous—should also not be allowed to walk into gun stores and buy firearms. Senator COLLINS and Senator HETTKAMP have introduced legislation. I am a cosponsor of it. It states that if someone is so dangerous that we believe them to be a terrorist and we won't let them fly, then we also will preclude them from legally buying a firearm.

Lastly, Manchin-Toomey is legislation that Senator MANCHIN and I introduced some years ago, and the idea behind this legislation is simply to require a background check on commercial gun sales. Whether they occur at a gun show or over the internet, these commercial-scale transactions ought to be subject to a background check so that we can determine whether the prospective buyer is somebody who we all agree shouldn't have a firearm—a dangerously mentally ill person, someone who has committed a violent criminal act, someone who is otherwise simply disqualified from having a firearm. The only way we can actually achieve that is if we have some mechanism to determine whether a person is disqualified in this fashion. So Senator MANCHIN and I have legislation that will do that without infringing on the absolutely essential constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens.

These four items would be very constructive—fix NICS, “Lie and Try” legislation, a “No Fly, No Buy” bill, and the Manchin-Toomey legislation. I hope we are going to make some progress in this space, and those would be candidates for doing so.

Mr. President, let me shift to S. 2155, the legislation we will be voting on later today. This legislation is long overdue.

Let me be very clear about this. The financial crisis we experienced is a decade behind us now. The Dodd-Frank financial services regulatory bill—a massive construct that wildly overregulates financial services—was signed into law 8 years ago, and we have done nothing really meaningful to roll that back over these last 8 years.

This bill is the result of years of bipartisan work, an untold number of hearings, and an extraordinary amount of testimony, and now we have a product that we are going to, I hope, pass later today to begin to roll back some of this excessive regulation.

I thank all the Democratic and Republican Members who worked to get this product to where it is today. Senator SHELBY, when he was chairman of the Banking Committee, laid much of the groundwork for this. Chairman HENSARLING in the House, the chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, has done great work in this space. Of course, Chairman CRAPO, as chairman, has done an outstanding job.

We are at a point where we are very close to finally making some progress on this overregulation.

I will disclose up front that I have my own personal experience and bias in this space, having worked with a great group of men and women in eastern Pennsylvania and western New Jersey. We launched a community bank back in 2005, and it was an amazing experience, a great experience. It was a very successful bank.

Back in 2005 when we launched, I was shocked to learn how heavily regulated a small, tiny, startup, brandnew community bank was. It seemed to me that we needed permission from the regulators to change the color of the drapes in the lobby of the bank, and this was all before Dodd-Frank was passed. Dodd-Frank came along several years later and made things much, much worse—way too prescriptive, way too much discretion of power in the hands of regulators, a terrible trickle-down effect whereby extensive regulations that were purportedly meant to constrain large financial institutions also imposed huge costs on small banks. We have gotten to the point where, arguably, small banks are now too small to succeed.

Thirty years ago we had 14,000 banks in America, and today we have fewer than 5,000. The trend toward consolidation in banking was underway before Dodd-Frank, but Dodd-Frank dramatically worsened it. One data point makes it very clear. Before the financial crisis, before Dodd-Frank came along, we used to routinely launch, on average, over 100 banks per year across America. It was an ordinary thing for a group of business folks to come together and decide they were going to launch a bank to serve their community. It is a great thing when people do that because it introduces new competition, new choices for consumers, and new access to capital. There were over 100 per year routinely for decades. From the time that Dodd-Frank was passed up through to this year, we have had five new banks start up in America. We have completely destroyed the entire *de novo* banking industry, and there is a price for that. There is a price to communities, there is a higher cost of credit, there is less available capital, and that doesn't serve anyone well.

Our legislation, this bill we are going to vote on later today, is going to improve the overall regulatory environment. At the same time, it is going to make improvements for consumers. Let me touch on a few of the features.

One is designed to improve access to mortgage credit. Section 101 of the bill provides regulatory relief for financial institutions if they originate a mortgage and keep that mortgage on their portfolio.

When a financial institution originates a mortgage and sells it, which is

a very common practice, there is this sense that the financial institution doesn't care about the borrower's ability to repay. It happens not to be true, but there are very, very extensive regulations that are very onerous, and they make it more difficult for borrowers to meet the criteria that are acceptable. Well, if the bank is keeping the loan on its own books, then it should be obvious to everyone that the bank has every incentive to make sure the loan is made to someone who can repay it. So this section provides some relief and some more flexibility so that the bank can actually make a loan that works for that consumer rather than one that works for whatever bureaucrats have decided.

Section 107 allows relief from some of the regulations in the manufactured housing space. It is based on legislation that I introduced with Senator DONNELLY. This will help consumers who are using manufactured housing, which is one of the most affordable ways of having a home.

There are consumer protections like section 301, which protects consumers' credit by giving consumers greater control over their credit reports.

There is section 302, which protects veterans' credit by helping prevent medical debt from improperly harming a veteran's credit report.

There is help for community banks—the very small banks that are not systemically important to their neighborhood, much less the entire economy. They are wildly overregulated. This diminishes that burden modestly. It simplifies, for instance, their capital requirements.

Section 202 exempts very small community banks from the Volcker rule. Why would we need to exempt them from it? Not so they can engage in the proprietary trading or the kinds of investments that the Volcker rule precludes, but it recognizes that community banks don't do that anyway. They have never done that. They end up, instead, having to spend a whole lot of money proving that they don't do that which they have never done. It doesn't make any sense. This regulation relieves them of some of that burden.

Section 210 will allow very small banks to have a little bit more time between the onerous exams they are subject to periodically. It is still very onerous, but at least there is some relief here.

There is a change in how we treat bank holding companies. We have, unfortunately, as a result of Dodd-Frank, this concept of too big to fail. We have enshrined it in law by creating what we call SIFIs, or systemically important financial institutions. These are officially designated “too big to fail.”

Frankly, no institution should be too big to fail, but it happens under Dodd-Frank automatically when a bank hits \$50 billion. That is a ridiculously low

threshold, so this bill takes that automatic SIFI designation up to \$250 billion. Frankly, it shouldn't be automatically based on the size of the institution; it should be driven by the conduct of the institution, the kind of business they do. But at least we are raising the threshold from \$50 billion to \$250 billion.

By the way, this is problematic, actually, for banks that are a little larger than \$250 billion. They still have this onerous, complex, expensive regime that they have to comply with, while their competitors, which might be just a few billion dollars smaller, are relieved of this burden. So there is an unfairness in this. I intend to work with regulators to basically have this SIFI designation reflect the activity of the institution rather than just the size.

There is another provision, section 402, which deals with the supplementary leverage ratio, which goes by the acronym SLR. The SLR is basically a minimum capital ratio. It takes a look at the entire balance sheet of a bank and says: Regardless of what those assets consist of, we are going to have a minimum capital requirement. That, of course, is in addition to all the specific capital requirements that are associated with the various category of assets. That whole regulatory regime remains in place, so we have both simultaneously.

This legislation has a very, very narrow exception for this secondary SLR capital requirement. It simply holds that for those handful—there are really only three custody banks, banks that have as their principal activity the custody of securities for other financial institutions. When they take custody-related cash and they put it on deposit with the Fed or another central bank, that is a risk-free transaction. There is no risk to an American bank having a dollar-denominated deposit with the Fed; therefore, this legislation recognizes that you should not have to be hit with an additional capital requirement for such a transaction. That is a constructive feature.

Some have mischaracterized this and suggested that, oh my goodness, we could have deposits with the Turkish central bank or the Greek central bank. That is clearly factually wrong. The criteria for eligibility is very, very narrow, and it is only at the most secure central banks in the world, and by the way, mostly it is the Fed.

A quick additional word about this too-big-to-fail doctrine. I feel very strongly that no institution should be too big to fail, and no institution should get a taxpayer bailout. Some of my colleagues seem to agree with that and have been very critical of a bailout that would occur for a financial institution.

I would suggest that the best way to avoid taxpayers having to bail out a fi-

nancial institution is not to attempt to prescribe every conceivable activity through massive regulation but, rather, have a bankruptcy code that allows the failure to be resolved in bankruptcy. The people who should be wiped out in the event of a failure of a financial institution are the shareholders and unsecured creditors, not taxpayers.

So for those of my colleagues who have come down here and expressed great concern about potential bailouts, join me in my legislation, which adds a chapter to the Bankruptcy Code so that we can successfully resolve even a very large and complex financial institution where we should, which is in bankruptcy, and not pose a risk to American taxpayers. Senator CORNYN and I have legislation that would do that. It really, over time, can completely end the debacle of too big to fail, and that would be a very constructive development as well.

Let me conclude by saying that this bill, S. 2155, which is called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, is very aptly named. The goals expressed in the title are actually achieved in this legislation. I am confident we will make progress on all of these fronts if and when—and I think we will—we pass this legislation later today.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support this, but my last plea is that this not be the last word on financial regulatory reform. This is a constructive step in the right direction, but it is a modest step forward. Much more needs to be done if we are going to have a safe but robust competitive financial system that is capable of fueling the economic growth that our economy is capable of.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, most people cannot remember what happened in the first grade—I have vague memories of being a first grader—but there are certain things that may happen even at a young stage in your life that will be remembered.

My 6-year-old granddaughter, who attends first grade in Brooklyn, NY, a few weeks ago was told by her teacher what to do if a shooter, if a gunman came into the first grade classroom. My little granddaughter was told: Don't stand by the window; you could get shot. If they enter the classroom with a gun, get down on the floor.

Is there any sane person in America who believes that is what the Founding Fathers had in mind when they wrote the Second Amendment to the Bill of Rights—the right to bear arms—that we would have reached a point in America where the prospects of gun violence in the first grade classrooms and all the way through school,

through high school, and college would become a reality in America? I can't imagine anyone in their wildest dreams would have imagined that possibility.

Today is March 14. On February 14, a gunman went into a high school in Parkland, FL, and killed 17 people—14 students and 3 members of the faculty. It is not the first, by any means. Ten years before it, at Northern Illinois University, a gunman killed five there and injured many others. The list goes on and on and on.

This gunman who went into Parkland, FL, wasn't carrying a handgun. He was carrying an AR-15. It is a semi-automatic weapon that he was able to embellish with a high-capacity magazine that could kill 30 people at a time.

Why? Why on Earth would that man, 19 years of age, be allowed to buy a weapon that was created to be used by the military—a military assault weapon, a weapon that sometimes our police may need, but hardly ever an individual American could need or want to buy for a legitimate sporting or hunting purpose?

But he did, and 17 were dead after that rampage.

There has been a lot of reaction to that—more than I expected, I will be honest with you, because mass killings have become way too common in America. Something happened there—something we saw across America today. High school students in that high school came out and said: Enough, we are fed up with the laws of this land and the politicians who refuse to change them. We are fed up with the fear that comes with just going to school in America. We are fed up with those who say the Second Amendment requires us to live in fear.

They have marched in towns across America today. They have marched on Washington. They have come to my office and visited with me. I believe they have become a major force in the national debate. I commend them. I encourage them. I hope they will continue.

What can we do? You know, politics is tough. It ain't beanbag, as they used to say. There are forces like the National Rifle Association and the gun lobby that threaten the political existence of Members of Congress if they vote the wrong way. I know they came after me when I was a Member of the House. They almost got me. It was a tough election year. I managed to survive it, but they poured money in and tried to beat me. I have never had their support since, and that is OK with me. But for a lot of Members of Congress, they are just not willing to risk it, not willing to anger the National Rifle Association.

Do you remember when President Trump had the meeting 2 weeks ago? He called in the students and parents and others. He let the cameras roll, and they continued the meeting so America

could witness it. He admonished the Members of Congress there: Don't be scared of the National Rifle Association. Don't be petrified by the NRA. We have to do something.

President Trump came out for universal background checks. In a way, it is not a very bold and courageous position because 97 percent of the American people agree with it. Even gun owners agree with the premise that we should do everything in our power to have a background check to keep guns out of the hands of convicted felons and mentally unstable people. The President came out for that 2 weeks ago, and he also said: Why in the world do we let someone 19 years of age buy a military assault weapon? We don't need these assault weapons.

I thought to myself: What a break; here is a Republican President who is finally standing up to the gun lobby and supporting positions that are overwhelmingly supported by the American people.

My fellow Senator who is now presiding over the Senate has shown that on a bipartisan fashion we can move forward on universal background checks. He came together with Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia on a measure that I supported and one that I think we should revisit. I felt so encouraged 2 weeks ago.

Well, what has happened since? That group left the White House and a couple of days later, the National Rifle Association came in for lunch and the President reversed his position. It is nothing new. I saw him do exactly the same thing on DACA and Dreamers. He reversed his position and now, instead of universal background checks that will keep guns out of the hands of those who would misuse them, they are supporting a bill that is good but is not all we need, called Fix NICS, which fills some of the information in the background checks for purchasing firearms.

The 17 lives in that high school in Parkland, FL, are worth more than this weak response by President Trump and by some in Congress. We must do better.

Let me tell you that the issue here is more than just the safety of high schools. A few weeks ago—in fact, a day before the shooting in Parkland, FL—an amazing member of the Chicago Police Department, Commander Paul Bauer, was downtown for a training session and heard on his radio an alert that there was a fugitive escaping. Being a man of duty, he responded to join in the pursuit and was cornered in a stairwell by a man who pulled out a gun with a high-capacity magazine, shot him six times, and killed him right in that stairwell. This was an amazing police officer with a great wife and daughter, from Bridgeport, in the city of Chicago. Our whole city was in grief over that loss.

They tried to figure out where the gun came from? Where did that criminal get that gun? It was purchased legally outside Madison, WI. It was then sold, without a background check, to another person who, in turn, sold it on the internet with no background check to a person with a record of felony arrests and convictions. It completely defied the system and made the argument again, sadly, of why universal background checks—not just at Federal licensed dealers but also at gun shows and on the internet—are absolutely essential. The Fix NICS bill does not solve that problem. We must solve that problem.

Secondly, on the military assault weapons, today at the Senate Judiciary Committee, we talked about the impact of an assault weapon and a bullet that is fired. Senator BILL NELSON of Florida, who has followed this terrible incident in Parkland and has spoken out so eloquently, reminded us that firing a bullet in a handgun may mean that that bullet passes through your body and injures an organ. Firing a long gun, a rifle, or a semiautomatic weapon like the AR-15 does dramatically more damage. The bullet may enter your body in a small way, but it comes out on the other side with a wound the size of an orange and, in the process, tumbles through your body, ripping through tissue, ripping through arteries, ripping through organs, and creating a situation that is difficult and sometimes impossible to repair.

Why would anyone need a weapon like that? You sure don't need it to go hunting. If you need an AR-15 to go shoot a deer, for goodness sakes, you ought to stick to fishing. You obviously don't have the skill necessary. To own it just to own it? Some do. They are collectors, I imagine. But opening those sales to 18-, 19-, or 20-year-olds makes no sense whatsoever, and that is what the students from Parkland and around the country are saying today. I couldn't agree with them more.

As for high-capacity magazines, why do you need 30 rounds? Why do you need 60 rounds? What is that all about? It is being used in weapons that are designed to kill other human beings—not just a few, but many.

As for bump stocks, I never heard of a bump stock until a few months ago, when the Las Vegas mass shooting occurred, killing innocent people at a country and western concert. We have banned machine guns in America for decades. Well, leave it to the firearm manufacturers. They found a way to create a mechanism that takes a semiautomatic weapon—meaning that you have to pull the trigger each time for each round—and turns it essentially into an automatic weapon, where you can hold the trigger and use the recoil and it just sprays the bullets until you empty the magazine, with something called a bump stock.

I can't imagine why we haven't just flat out passed a bill to ban bump stocks after what happened in Las Vegas, but this Congress, this Senate is frozen by the gun lobby.

All across America today, young people are stepping up. I asked a teacher, Ms. Posada, who testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee today: What is it about the students in your school? Why have they become such national leaders, outspoken on this issue and inspirational on this issue to me?

She said: That is the way we trained them, to be part of an America where they can participate and be a leader, and they are.

I encourage them to continue to put the pressure on all of us, starting with President Trump, who may switch his position again. He went from all for gun safety to the gun lobby position in a matter of days. Maybe he will come back again to some more reasonable position.

Put the pressure on Congress too. We have run out of excuses, haven't we? More and more innocent Americans have been killed, and the best we can come up with is that over 200 years ago, when some men sat down to write our Bill of Rights, that Second Amendment gave the authority to individuals to buy any and everything they want to buy in the name of the right to bear arms. I don't think that is what they had in mind at all.

We cannot continue to let the NRA and the gun lobby have veto power over gun policy in America. We are facing an epidemic of violence with hundreds of Americans shot every day—from Commander Bauer in Chicago; to the kids in Parkland, FL; to Las Vegas; to DeKalb, IL. The list goes on and on and on. We have to put the safety of our kids and our neighborhoods ahead of the gun lobby's agenda, which is just to sell more guns.

We have to have the courage as a Senate to bring a bill to the floor and to open it to amendments. We don't do that anymore in the Senate. There was a time when the Senate was a great deliberative body, and now the Senate is not. The silence of the Senate, when it comes to this gun safety issue, is deafening. Americans know it well, and the question now is whether we will do everything within our power to reduce the number of shootings, to keep our communities safe, and to spare more 6-year-old first graders that horrible lesson they may remember forever—to hit the floor when the shooter comes in the classroom.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Texas.

FIX NICS BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks of our distinguished colleague from Illinois who is the Democratic whip. I agree with a

number of things he says and disagree with some others, but I do think we need to keep this in the appropriate context. We are, in fact, talking about a provision of the Bill of Rights, the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and I hope we would never treat any of those essential guarantees of American rights that precede the creation of our government casually. It is important that we protect all of our rights. The right to worship according to the dictates of our conscience, the right to petition our government for the redress of just grievances, the freedom of association, and the freedom of the press are also part of the Bill of Rights, just like the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

There are a number of things that we can agree on, and I have been talking about one of them for some time now—the so-called Fix NICS bill. It is probably not very well-labeled or branded because “NICS” is short for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Basically, what it does is fix the broken background check system to make sure that convicted felons, people who have been dishonorably discharged from the military, people who have been adjudicated mentally ill, people who have committed acts of domestic violence—and a number of other categories—cannot legally purchase firearms. Why? Because current law prohibits it.

We have already passed those laws, but as we saw in Sutherland Springs, TX, one Sunday morning not long ago, 26 people lost their lives and 20 additional lives were forever changed when they were shot by a gunman who had lied and obtained firearms when he was disqualified under the law from purchasing them.

The FBI maintains the background check system, and it wasn't their fault because the background check system is only as good as the information that is uploaded into the background check system. When somebody goes into a store and tries to purchase a firearm and lies, the background check system catches them and they are denied that purchase. That is how it is supposed to work.

Recently, the attitude among some here in Washington seems to be that this bill somehow doesn't go far enough. There are other ideas I am more than willing to debate and vote on, some of which I actually agree with, but none have the bipartisan consensus and support that this particular Fix NICS bill has.

I was just told that now we are up to 70 bipartisan cosponsors. In other words, 70 out of 100 Senators, on a bipartisan basis, support this fix to our broken background check system because they know that if it had been working the way Congress had intended, 26 people would still be alive in Sutherland Springs, TX, and 20 more

who were shot and wounded would not have had to suffer those grievous injuries and the painful recovery.

For example, as the Democratic leader—as well as some others—has said: “If we only pass Fix NICS, we'll be right back here after the next shooting, in nearly the same place.” He said that “we won't have done our job.”

Well, as I said, if there are other things that enjoy broad bipartisan consensus, let's get them done. But if the attitude is that we will not even vote on what we agree on because we want to do more, we will never get anything done around here. Why not vote on what we have agreed on, what people are supporting, and then, in addition, we can work on other ideas.

As I said, at least 36 Senate Democrats have already cosponsored the Fix NICS bill. That is 75 percent of the Democratic caucus, and the numbers have been steadily rising. I hope they will go even higher.

I am grateful to the Democratic leader from New York, He, himself, is a cosponsor of the bill, as is the Senate majority leader, Mr. MCCONNELL. I have never seen a piece of legislation involving a controversial subject like gun rights get such broad bipartisan support. It is truly unique. We ought to be grateful we have found a place where we have such broad bipartisan agreement and, more important than that, a provision that will save lives in the future.

If the shooter at Sutherland Springs had gone into the gun store to purchase a gun and he lied, had the background check system worked as it was supposed to work, he would not have been able to legally purchase a gun because it would have revealed the fact that he was disqualified from doing so.

Each of these tragedies involves different circumstances. The shooters are always different. They obtain firearms in particular ways and use them to perpetrate their crimes according to different plans and in different settings.

I have already talked about the shooter in Sutherland Springs, who actually was convicted of a felony after choking and kicking his wife and cracking his stepson's skull. He was discharged dishonorably from the military. He was detained in a mental health facility because he was mentally ill. Yet he was able to lie his way into possession of these firearms, forever changing the world of innumerable families in Sutherland Springs, TX.

Under Federal law, he should have been prevented from purchasing these firearms. Were it not for the breakdown in our background check system, he wouldn't have obtained them. He would have been caught lying when trying to buy these firearms and possibly prosecuted, and 26 people would still be living their lives, and the people who were worshipping that Sunday

morning at the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs would still be doing so in that same location. It has now been turned into a memorial for those who lost their lives that day.

This is preventable loss of life. That is more than enough reason to pass Fix NICS. I disagree with those who say that it doesn't do much. If it saves lives, it does plenty. If our system had worked properly—and ensuring it does in the future is what my bill aims to do—Annabelle Pomeroy, the 14-year-old daughter of the pastor at First Baptist, would still be here, and Ryland Ward, a 6-year-old boy who survived, would not have been shot five times.

It is simply incorrect to characterize this bill as a pittance. It is inaccurate to suggest that it really wouldn't do anything, that it somehow is just window dressing or maybe a political fig leaf. That is demonstrably false. Tell that to the families who lost loved ones that day. They wish our background check system had stopped the gunman. Each of them suffered a terrible trauma because it didn't.

It is also not true to say that Washington has been feckless or absent in the wake of not only Sutherland Springs but Las Vegas, Parkland, and all the rest.

On the issue of bump stocks, I agree with the Democratic whip, the Senator from Illinois. These attachments to a semiautomatic rifle turned it into an automatic rifle. I have never heard of such a thing before, but if automatic weapons are already illegal, why in the world would we want to allow an appliance attached to a gun to turn a semiautomatic weapon into an automatic weapon? I am glad the President has said that those should be regulated by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms and be unavailable.

We know that a lot of people lost their lives in Las Vegas; 58 concertgoers in Las Vegas lost their lives because of a man in a hotel room, shooting down into a country music concert. There were 851 people injured. The scope of the carnage was unbelievable.

We have also learned that mental health problems are some of the reasons people do these sorts of things. We passed a law, most notably last December, called the 21st Century Cures Act, which provides new authority for families, when their loved ones are becoming a danger to themselves or others, to apply to a court to get assisted outpatient treatment to make sure they follow their doctors' orders and take their medications. Then we train law enforcement on how to save lives in the event of an active shooter incident.

We know the problem at Sutherland Springs was that the Federal Government hadn't uploaded the information into the background check system, which would have prevented the purchase of the firearm. But we know the

problem is present, as well, in the States.

In Ohio, we learned that there have been failures to upload conviction records from at least 90 municipal courts—one that may have allowed those barred from owning weapons to purchase them in violation of the law.

Since the shooting in Texas, the Department of Defense has retroactively uploaded 4,000 additional records of those dishonorably discharged from the military into the background check system. Under current law, these are people already prohibited from purchasing firearms, but, of course, if the military didn't upload them, no one would ever know, and they would be able to lie and purchase firearms.

One news account stated that since 2015, the number of people barred from owning firearms because they were dishonorably discharged has hovered at around 11,000 people, according to FBI statistics. Now it stands at over 15,000. It is clear evidence that the background check system isn't working the way it is supposed to. We need to make sure that Federal agencies are uploading these records in real time, as they are required to do.

We are taking action in other ways. I am also cosponsor of a bipartisan bill called the NICS Denial Notification Act. It is sponsored by a bipartisan pair of Senators—the Senators from Pennsylvania and Delaware. This bill will alert State law enforcement about people who lie and try to buy guns. If people go in and lie, the background check system catches them, and then they are turned away. Under current practice, that is never reported to the law enforcement agencies, but it would be if that legislation were passed. When people do this, their actions may be indicative of criminal behavior. That is why the bill would insist that Federal authorities notify State police within 24 hours if it is determined a person has lied in an attempt to buy a gun.

Meanwhile, the Attorney General has announced that U.S. attorneys will be instructed to more aggressively enforce laws that criminalize gun buyers who lie on their background checks. I think all of this will help be a deterrent, and, yes, I do think it will contribute to the saving of lives.

The Justice Department will also increase the presence of law enforcement officers at schools and review the way they respond to public tip-offs with regard to safety threats.

We know the shooting in Parkland, FL, was a catastrophic failure at almost every level—from the public education system, to local law enforcement, to the FBI, to mental health providers. Looking back at this shooter, local law enforcement actually intervened with him about 40 times. This was a blinking red light. People should have paid attention and done something about it. We are now trying to

make sure they have the resources and the training necessary to intervene when people are obviously a danger to themselves and others.

One way we are going to do that is with the bill offered by the senior Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH—the STOP School Violence Act. This bill would authorize \$50 million annually for safety improvements, including teacher training and training students on how to prevent violence and developing anonymous reporting systems for threats of school violence. It would give schools money for physical improvements, such as metal detectors or bulletproof windows or doors. This is a great step. It is not controversial, and we ought to get it done and get it done now.

As the President has said: “We cannot merely take actions that make us feel like we are making a difference. We must actually make a difference.” One way we can do that is by passing Fix NICS.

Just this afternoon, a diverse community of victims' rights groups, law enforcement officers, gun violence prevention groups, and prosecutors sent a letter to the minority and majority leaders, asking them for a vote on a clean version of Fix NICS before the upcoming Easter recess. They said it would “improve key elements of the background system, particularly domestic violence criminal history and protective order records.” That is really an important point because so much of the gun violence we see in America is in the context of domestic violence—people violating protective orders, people assaulting the person they are married to or living with. We need to focus on this and do something about it.

This group of victims' rights advocates, law enforcement officers, gun violence prevention groups, and prosecutors call the Fix NICS bill a bipartisan, bicameral, commonsense, and non-controversial bill. So why can't we pass it? Why can't we do it today?

They made a point to note in their letter that the vote should be clean; in other words, not conditioned upon or attached to other controversial measures we can't pass. I think they are absolutely right. I hope all of us will listen to this good advice and get this done.

We tried to get an agreement a couple of weeks ago to take up the bill and vote on it. If we did it today, it would pass this afternoon, but there was an objection to doing so, saying, well, there are other things we need to do too. Perhaps that is true, but to condition what can pass—what does enjoy broad bipartisan support and what will save lives—on things that will not pass and that aren't achievable means we have a strategy of either everything or failure. That usually ends up with us going back home emptyhanded, having nothing to show for our efforts.

The people we represent deserve better. This institution should step up and listen to those who are calling upon us to do something, and doing something that will save lives, while respecting the rights of all Americans under the Constitution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, 10 years ago today, March 14, Bear Stearns was on the verge of collapse. Despite its 85-year history, despite its relationship with nearly every bank on Wall Street, the bank suddenly found itself on the brink. On this very day, March 14, Bear Stearns lost \$3.5 billion in market value. The bank was in the midst of a free fall. In the course of one week, Bear Stearns went from trading for \$65 per share to being bought for \$2 a share in a sweetheart deal orchestrated by the Fed over the course of a weekend. Nearly overnight, one of Wall Street's most prestigious, almost 100-year-old banks fell apart.

Across the country, families sat at their kitchen tables and started to wonder: Will one of us lose our job? Will we have to move? Will we be able to retire? Will we lose our house? Will we be able to send our kids to college? On this day 10 years ago—March 14, 2008—a headline from CNN read: “Job Losses: The Worst in Five Years.” The story talked about how the economy was hemorrhaging jobs. The article warned that the crisis was building, quoting one analyst who said the real estate and credit crunch “was whipping its way through the U.S. economy like a Midwestern tornado.”

In hindsight, we know that things would get a lot worse before they got better.

Some people say nobody could have possibly seen this coming. Some people say the 2008 financial crisis was like the weather—like that Midwestern tornado—something out of control that we wouldn't have seen, but we know better.

Advocates in communities—the people who are actually dealing with the consequences of this crisis—were sounding the alarm. For years before the crisis, they predicted what would happen if Washington didn't rein in Wall Street, and clearly they were right.

A few people in Washington, like Ned Gramlich, saw the problem for what it was; that Washington didn't stop the crisis, after it began, after it intensified—Congress at least responded. We passed a law that created important protections for the financial system, for taxpayers, for homeowners to hold banks and watchdogs accountable to prevent another crisis, but Wall Street wasn't even close to being ready to quit. There was no contrition. Nobody went to jail. In fact, on the day that President Obama signed Wall Street reform—what we know as Dodd-Frank—

on the day that bill was signed into law, the top financial service lobbyists in this town said: Now it is half time.

Now, what would that mean: Now it is half time? It meant they lost the first half. They lost the battle where people in this Congress actually had the guts and the backbone and sloughed off their campaign contributions and were unwilling to listen to bank lobbyists tell them what to do. They stood up to the bank lobbyists and stood up to Wall Street and they did the right thing, but this lobbyist said it was half time. So the lobbyists lost the first half, but they were back at it, going to the regulators, trying to convince the regulators to weaken the rules and not implement the bill.

Not long ago, another bank lobbyist told us their game plan: "We don't want a seat at the table, we want the whole table." This bill gives them that. The same group that warned us about the last crisis—this is what I ask my colleagues to listen to. The same group that warned us about the last crisis or that were the regulators who tried to fix the last crisis—those same people are opposed to the bill the Senate is considering today. That doesn't seem to matter to about 65 of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of the range of civil rights, labor, and consumer advocacy groups that oppose S. 2155.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF CURRENT AND FORMER REGULATORY OFFICIALS AND EXPERTS OPPOSED TO S. 2155

Former Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee Chairman Christopher Dodd,

Former Federal Reserve Chair Paul Volcker,

Former Federal Reserve Governor Daniel Tarullo,

Former Federal Reserve Governor and Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Treasury Sarah Bloom Raskin,

Former FDIC Chair Sheila Bair,

Former Department of the Treasury Assistant Secretary for Financial Institutions Michael Barr,

Former Special Advisor for Regulatory Policy to the Department of the Treasury Under Secretary for Domestic Finance Saule Omarova,

Former Counselor to Secretary of the Department of the Treasury Antonio Weiss,

Former Deputy Governor of the Bank of England Paul Tucker on behalf of the Systemic Risk Council,

FDIC Vice Chair Thomas Hoenig,

Former Commodity Futures Trading Commission Chair Gary Gensler,

Former Chairman of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission Phil Angelides.

LIST OF LABOR, CONSUMER, AND CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO S. 2155

AFL-CIO;

AFSCME;

Americans for Financial Reform;

Better Markets, Part I and Part II;

Center for American Progress;

Center for Popular Democracy;

Center for Responsible Lending;

Consumer Federation of America;

Consumers Union;

CWA;

Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights;

Mortgage Coalition (Center for Responsible Lending, National Community Reinvestment Coalition, National Consumer Law Center);

NAACP;

National Association of Consumer Advocates;

National Community Reinvestment Coalition;

Prosperity Now;

Public Citizen;

UAW;

Unidos;

Urban League;

US PIRG.

Mr. BROWN. People who cleaned up the last crisis are warning us not to pass this bill. Experts from both parties are warning us, the authors of Wall Street reform. Barney Frank said he would vote no if he were in the Senate. Chris Dodd, in an op-ed today, writes that the bill's changes amount to "chipping away at the ability to conduct comprehensive and effective oversight."

Now, people are saying this isn't a major scale-back of Dodd-Frank, but Senator Dodd and Congressman Frank both say they would vote no because they recognize it as damaging to the work we all did.

Experts like Paul Volcker, head of the Federal Reserve; Sheila Bair, head of FDIC, Republican appointment by President Bush, used to be chief of staff for Senator Bob Dole; Dan Tarullo, who was effectively the head of supervision of regulation for the Federal Reserve, wants us to vote no. Sarah Bloom Raskin, who was at the Federal Reserve and then Deputy Secretary of the Treasury; Gary Gensler, who is head of the Commodities Future Trading Commission; Tom Hoenig, a Republican who is at FDIC and earlier was the Fed president; Antonia Weiss at the Treasury Department; Paul Tucker, international banker from England—international regulator; Phil Angelides, a former California State Treasurer who ran the Commission that examined what happened in the bank crisis—they all wrote to the Senate. They all outlined a combined 28 pages' worth of concerns about this bill, and my colleagues just say: Oh, this is just helping the small community banks and some of the regional banks a little bit.

Well, not exactly. That is what happens here. We start off wanting to help the small banks; we start off helping some of the mid-sized regional banks that generally do a good job—banks like Huntington and Fifth Third and Key Bank—but then Wall Street gets involved, and Wall Street drives a bigger and bigger hole in this bill and gets more and more help and more and more breaks and look where we are.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD let-

ters from two of these financial experts.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VOLCKER ALLIANCE,
WORKING FOR EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT,

February 21, 2018.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: I appreciate your letter seeking my views on the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief and Consumer Protection Act, S. 2155. I am pleased that the Senate Banking Committee has forged ahead with meaningful, bipartisan financial reform to ease the unnecessary regulatory strain on small banks, helping them flourish as an engine of economic prosperity. I appreciate your leadership and dedication, and that of Senator Crapo, to this bill over the last two years and congratulate the bipartisan coalition of senators on the Committee who have worked diligently to advance this legislation.

Your letter sought my views on three sections of the bill. Specifically: (1) Section 401, which would exempt some important banks from stringent prudential standards, such as those for capital, leverage, stress testing, and resolution planning; (2) Section 402, which would relax leverage limitations on custodial banks; and (3) Section 203, which would exempt small banks from the Volcker Rule ban on proprietary trading. I offer the following observations and possible alternatives for your consideration.

First, section 401 would raise from \$50 billion to \$250 billion the asset threshold at which banks begin to face increasingly tougher prudential standards. Eight years following the passage of Dodd-Frank, it is appropriate to reexamine whether the \$50 billion asset threshold is set too low. Indeed, there may be an opportunity to raise it without endangering financial stability. However, an increase to \$250 billion would go too far. It would have the effect of substantially reducing the regulation of 25 of the 38 largest banks to which these standards now apply, notably including the operating subsidiaries of several large foreign banks.

Clearly the distress or failure of some of these banks could trigger reactions spreading broadly to the financial system. To take specific examples, Countrywide, National City, and GMAC, standing well below the \$250 billion mark, in fact, required billions of dollars in official capital assistance and debt guarantees either for themselves or their acquiring institutions. Failure of the large U.S. operating subsidiaries of foreign banks could pose similar risk. I urge consideration of raising the threshold to, say, \$100 billion but building in additional flexibility for regulators to implement the standards below that.

Second, section 402 is a highly technical provision that relates to so-called custodial banks, institutions that specialize in safeguarding assets of their clients, including mutual funds, pension funds, asset managers, and other institutions. Given their size and importance to the financial system, some such banks, of which the sizable BNY Mellon and State Street stand out, are required to maintain a minimum supplementary leverage ratio ("SLR"), a measure of equity capital to total exposure.

Section 402 would mandate bank regulators to amend their regulations to allow "custodial banks" to exclude deposits they hold at the Federal Reserve and certain other central banks when calculating their SLR. While there may be reasons to adjust the SLR calculation for custodial banks, including during a crisis to facilitate the banks'

ability to serve as a safe-haven for deposits, regulators already have broad authority to make those adjustments. They also are best positioned to decide how and when to exercise that discretion.

Section 402 does so preemptively, reducing leverage capital requirements for at least two of the most systemically important custodial banks by as much as 30 percent at a time when they should be building their capital cushion. It also would put Congress under pressure to expand the exclusion. Claims will be sure to arise that other banks in competition with the big custodial banks should have similar capital relief: that temptation should be resisted.

Finally, section 203 would exempt from the Volcker Rule banks with assets of less than \$10 billion and whose trading assets and liabilities are no more than five percent of total assets. I'm in strong agreement with the aim of reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens on traditional community banks, not just from the Volcker Rule, but also more broadly. Community banks play a vital role in serving the needs of small businesses and do not require the full panoply of regulation or frequent full-scale examination.

An alternative to section 203 would be to simply relieve small banks from demonstrating compliance with the rule, while, at the same time tasking the bank regulators in their normal supervisory roles to detect persistent violations and demand remediation. This would have the advantage of preventing a small bank or a group of small banks protected by the Federal bank "safety net" from benefitting from risky proprietary trading activity. I know from my long experience in banking and savings and loan regulation that plausibly small loopholes can be "gamed" and exploited with unfortunate consequences.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important piece of legislation and look forward to its swift passage.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. VOLCKER.

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL,
Cambridge, MA, March 5, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL CRAPO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CRAPO AND SENATOR BROWN: As we approach the tenth anniversary of the height of the financial crisis, it is critical that we not lose sight of the core concerns that rightly motivated members of both parties to seek regulatory mechanisms to guard against systemic risk and to promote financial stability. With the pending consideration of S. 2155 by the full Senate, I wanted to take this opportunity to reiterate some of the points about the regulatory structure we have discussed in the past, especially as they apply to this bill.

While S. 2155 begins from the sound premise that some refinements are desirable in the way various statutory requirements have been tailored, I have a number of disagreements with specifics of the bill. Rather than rehearse all of those, I want to focus on the three features that raise particular concerns about financial stability, in hopes that they could be omitted or at least clarified. As I will explain in more detail below, I would urge the following changes:

1. Clarification that banking organizations with assets between \$100 and \$250 billion will

continue to be subject to the annual stress test and CCAR process of the Federal Reserve;

2. Clarification that the higher section 165 threshold established by the bill applies to the worldwide assets of foreign banking organizations; and

3. Deletion of Section 402 of the bill, which would make certain changes to leverage ratio requirements.

With respect to the first two of these changes, while there is widespread—though by no means universal—agreement that the \$50 billion level is too low a threshold for many of the section 165 requirements, there is considerable disagreement over how much it should be raised. There is a case to be made for the \$250 billion level chosen in S. 2155, though personally I think that is too high. In considering how to raise the threshold, the most important consideration is to align enhanced prudential standards with the risks to safety and soundness and financial stability actually associated with various groups of banks.

As you know, I have for several years advocated a limited number of changes to the statutory thresholds established in the Dodd-Frank Act for certain additional regulatory requirements. My reason for suggesting these changes was my conclusion, both from my own analysis and from discussions with supervisory staff when I was still a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, that the benefits of some of the important prudential requirements added by Dodd-Frank were considerably less significant for the smaller banks within the range established by the different thresholds. In these instances, it seems better policy to allocate more of the risk management and compliance resources of banks, and of the supervisory resources of the banking agencies, to the important risks actually faced by banks of a certain size and activity mix. For instance, the expense incurred by small banks with minimal trading assets and liabilities just to ensure that they are complying with Volcker Rule regulatory exemptions seems quite disproportionate to any safety and soundness benefits.

When it comes to the threshold for the more stringent prudential standards mandated by Section 165 of Dodd-Frank, this same calculation should apply. That is, which of these requirements deliver significant safety and soundness benefits for particular sizes of banks? The answer, I concluded after several years of experience, is that the 165 requirements deliver relatively small benefits for the safety and soundness of banks that currently have between \$50 and \$100 billion in assets, and many deliver only moderate benefits for banks somewhat above that size. For example, special liquidity requirements (on top of normal supervisory assessments of liquidity management) seemed of limited prudential utility for medium-sized commercial banks engaged in the conventional business of taking deposits and making loans.

But S. 2155 calls into question the post-crisis prudential measure that is essential for the safety and soundness of these banks, and for the stability of the financial system in the face of major asset shocks. Section 401(e) of the bill as reported out of Committee instructs the Federal Reserve to conduct supervisory stress tests of banks with between \$100 and \$250 billion "on a periodic basis." This provision is obviously meant to indicate that these banks are not exempted from the stress testing requirements created by Section 165. Yet the provision is quite vague,

with little indication of what kind of test is contemplated for these banks. This language might be interpreted benignly, simply to indicate that this set of banks will remain in the stress testing program even though they will have been removed from other section 165 requirements. Of more concern is an interpretation that these banks not be in the stress test every year, though the results of the test—whenever it is conducted—could still be used as the analytic basis for the general authority of federal banking agencies to set capital requirements on a bank specific basis. And then there is a very troublesome interpretation that these banks not be in the current Federal Reserve stress testing process, including the Comprehensive Capital Annual Review (CCAR). Instead, they would be in some different, ill-defined kind of stress testing program.

Although liquidity and concentration limits beyond those applicable under pre-existing statutory requirements for insured depository institutions are only obliquely related to the risks faced by banks currently in this size range, capital shortfalls are a risk. Loans gone bad, with the resulting impairment of capital positions, are the principal risk associated with the traditional lending that dominates the activities of most of these banks.

A number of banks of this size received TARP funds in late 2008 in order to buttress their capital positions. While other, smaller banks also received TARP funds, the difference is precisely in the aggregate size of this group of banks. Together, just the domestically owned firms falling in this range hold \$1.5 trillion in assets (compared to less than \$300 billion in assets for those between \$50 and \$100 billion). There is good reason to believe that these regional lending institutions share the risks associated with shocks to commercial real estate prices, residential real estate prices, and the financial situation of consumers. Thus there could also be systemic implications of stress among this group of banks. The current CCAR program of the Federal Reserve helps build the resiliency of banks to these serious problems, thereby decreasing the chances of systemic stress or the unavailability of lending to even creditworthy businesses and households that results when the capital positions of banks are compromised.

To remove this protective measure would be to undermine a key achievement of the post-crisis period. Accordingly, as the first feature of the bill that should be changed, I urge the Senate, should it proceed with this legislation, to remove any ambiguity as to whether these banks will remain in the quantitative side of the CCAR program on an annual basis. The Federal Reserve has already exempted these banks from the qualitative part of the CCAR and has taken steps to simplify some of the procedural and reporting requirements associated with it. I suspect the Board of Governors would be amenable to doing more along these lines. But we should not risk the improvement in the resiliency of the U.S. financial system that the stress testing program has brought about by ensuring that regulatory capital requirements take into account the changing economic and financial risks faced by sizeable banks that together provide credit to large proportions of American households and businesses.

The second feature of the bill that raises concerns of a systemic nature is also related to the \$250 billion threshold, as it applies to foreign banking organizations operating in the United States. As you know, since the financial crisis the Board of Governors has required certain foreign banking organizations

with more than \$50 billion in assets other than branch assets to establish intermediate holding companies in the United States. (Some foreign banking organizations already had such holding companies.) In raising the \$50 billion threshold to \$250 billion, the bill may raise the question as to whether foreign banking organizations with less than \$250 billion must now be excluded from the application of section 165 requirements.

I should say first that I do not think this is the best reading of the wording of S. 2155. That is, I think the best reading is that worldwide assets of large foreign banks are the basis for determining if they are covered by section 165, with the Board of Governors having continuing authority to determine what level of U.S. assets of these large global banks is the appropriate threshold for section 165 regulatory measures promulgated in its regulations. I understand that Chairman Powell indicated something along these lines in his Senate testimony last week. However, it does appear that there are other interpretations being advanced, including by Secretary Mnuchin, whose testimony before the Senate Banking Committee in January seemed to suggest that foreign banking organizations with between \$50 and \$250 billion in assets in the United States would be exempted from Section 165 prudential measures by S. 2155.

This result would be a grave regulatory mistake, one that is almost incomprehensible in light of experience during the financial crisis and the profile of many large foreign banking organizations in the United States today. As I explained above, many of the special section 165 requirements are not especially relevant to nearly all the U.S. banks currently holding less than \$250 billion in assets. But that is precisely because they are traditional commercial banks, taking deposits and making loans. The U.S. operations of many foreign banking organizations, on the other hand, contain substantial proportions of assets in broker dealers and other non-traditional-banking operations, where funding runs, cross-activity counterparty exposures, and resolution challenges are very significant risks. Indeed, the broker-dealer operations of many of these banks are more significant in the United States than in their home countries. They are also susceptible to having their parents seek dollars from them in order to meet obligations of parts of the foreign banking organizations outside the United States.

Moreover, in sheer dollar terms, the group of foreign banking organizations with between \$100 and \$250 billion is a very important part of the U.S. financial system, holding about \$1.4 trillion in assets. Some of the foreign banking organizations falling in this category are among those that were most affected by the financial crisis; some have encountered significant problems since then. U.S. regulators do not have a window into the global liquidity positions, or authority over the global risk management practices, of these firms.

Again, like Chairman Powell I believe the best reading of S. 2155 is that it does not affect the authority of the Federal Reserve to apply section 165 standards, as appropriate, on foreign banking organizations with over \$250 billion in worldwide assets—the change from current law being that it would not be required to do so for foreign banking organizations with between \$50 and \$250 billion in worldwide assets. But, given the enormous gap in the regulation of systemically important foreign banking operations in the United States that would result from a dif-

ferent interpretation by a regulator or court in the future, it is very important that this ambiguity be clarified. In an environment in which judicial deference to the interpretation of a possibly ambiguous statute by the administering agency is no longer so predictable, it is incumbent on Congress to eliminate such ambiguity wherever possible.

The third feature of the bill that raises potentially systemic concerns is section 402, which contains an oddly and, I think, inappropriately targeted change in the leverage ratio applied by the banking agencies. Removing funds deposited with central banks from the denominator of the leverage ratio only for banks “predominantly engaged” in the custody business is troublesome for at least two reasons.

First, removing any assets from the denominator risks sliding down the slippery slope of removing others. While central bankers may argue their interests in not having monetary policy affected at all, treasuries and finance ministries may then argue their interests in not having sovereign debt included. And, as we have already seen in the Treasury Department’s report in June 2017, some will go even further, such as by arguing that margins posted in central clearing facilities should be excluded, presumably to encourage more central clearing. While these proposed exclusions may be justified on the ground that the assets in question are utterly risk-free (a clearly incorrect proposition for central clearing margin), that argument misconstrues the rationale of a leverage ratio, which is precisely to serve as a backup mode of capital regulation by measuring and controlling total leverage, not riskiness. Going down this path of excluding assets from the denominator would, in addition to being ill-advised legislative policy, threaten the post-crisis improvement in the leverage of major U.S. banks.

Second, it is hard to see the rationale for excluding a particular type of asset from the denominator of the leverage ratio only by reference to a bank’s dominant form of activity in “custody, safekeeping, and asset servicing.” Banks other than custody banks engage in this activity. Taking this kind of approach is very much out of keeping with the traditional—and wise—practice of Congress in avoiding legislating the details of capital requirements. It will invite lobbying efforts for changing other details and, thereby, risk both the coherence and the integrity of regulatory capital requirements.

As I think you know, I am sympathetic to the situation of State Street and Bank of New York. But, as I have suggested previously, there is a much sounder way to address that situation. Their difficulties stem from the fact that the 2% enhanced supplemental leverage ratio add-on is applicable to all eight systemically important U.S. banks, whereas the risk-weighted capital surcharge varies based on the systemic importance of each bank. Thus State Street and Bank of New York have, in effect, higher leverage ratio “surcharges” than they do risk-weighted surcharges. This reverses what should be, and has been, the traditional role of the leverage ratio as a back-up to guard against excessive leverage build up in good economic times that can come to grief in bad ones (though the crisis revealed the pre-crisis leverage ratio requirement, like risk-weighted capital requirements, to be insufficiently robust). Modifying the enhanced supplemental leverage ratio requirement by stipulating that it would not exceed the risk-weighted surcharge, or by making it proportional to that surcharge would be a much more defensible policy approach.

My understanding, based on public statements from Federal Reserve officials, is that the banking agencies are planning to make changes to the leverage ratio. I anticipate that those changes will relieve the State Street and Bank of New York situations, though I hope without going so far as to erode the value of the leverage ratio more generally by encouraging the untrammelled growth of repo and other short-term, runnable funding back closer to pre-crisis levels. In any case, this anticipated action by the regulatory agencies should address the situation of the clearings banks without the damage to the framework for capital regulation which that Section 402 would entail.

To recapitulate: In the interests of protecting financial stability and guarding against systemic risk, I would urge the Senate to:

1. Make clear that banks with between \$100 and \$250 billion in assets will continue to subject to CCAR stress testing and resulting capital distribution constraints;
2. Make clear that foreign banking organizations with \$250 billion or more in worldwide assets are subject to more stringent prudential restraints within the discretion of the Board of Governors; and
3. Remove Section 402.

Thank you for your consideration of these admittedly lengthy comments on S. 2155. As always, please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

DANIEL K. K. TARULLO.

Mr. BROWN. So the question is, Why do we ignore these pleas? Let’s recap the problems with this legislation.

First, the bill puts American taxpayers at risk of another bank bailout. It weakens stress tests for all large banks. In spite of what my colleagues say, everybody that has commented on this bill—so many experts that have commented on this bill understand that this is not just about community banks; it is not just about the regional mid-sized that go up to \$250 billion. We can stress test for all large banks; JPMorgan Chase, \$2.5 trillion in assets; Bank of America, \$2.3 trillion; Wells Fargo, \$1.9 trillion. As if they haven’t had enough—done enough, made enough mistakes, violated the public trust enough times. Citigroup, \$1.9 trillion. These four banks—JPMorgan, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, and Citigroup—hold 51 percent, more than half of all industry assets, \$8.6 trillion.

These banks have had a really good run since the crisis, since the bailout. Remember, people didn’t go to jail even though people in my ZIP Code, in my community, in my State and in Pennsylvania and all over the country—people lost savings, their homes, and their jobs. These banks, which are more profitable than they have ever been in the last couple of years, got a huge tax break just last December, and now we are doing them a favor by weakening the stress test. All the country’s biggest banks took about \$239 billion in taxpayer bailouts. Without rigorous annual stress tests, taxpayers can once again be on the hook if too-big-to-fail banks collapse and we don’t have the right tools in place to see it coming.

Second, this bill opens the door to weaker oversight of foreign megabanks operating in the United States, the same banks that repeatedly violated U.S. law. These are banks like Deutsche Bank in Germany, the Trump business organization's personal bank; Santander in Spain, Barclays in Britain, Credit Suisse, and UBS in Switzerland. These are banks that violated Iran sanctions. They are banks that repossessed cars from American service men and women who were serving overseas. These are banks that were fined by the Federal Government, and we are doing these foreign banks a favor in this bill.

Third, with the change of just one word, this bill forces the Fed to weaken the rules even for the largest banks with more than \$250 billion in assets. Former CFTC Chair Gary Gensler wrote to the Senate this month and said this change "may subject the government to additional lobbying and possible litigation from individual banks seeking specially tailored rules."

We know all of these regulators put in place by the Trump administration—most of them with ties to Wall Street, and we know the White House now looks like an executive retreat for Wall Street executives—we know these regulators are going to bend over backward for the big banks, and if they don't, they are going to be sued by the foreign banks and by other big banks to open up those loopholes even more.

Senator Dodd, one of the authors of the original bill, identified this \$250 billion threshold as the No. 1 reason he can't support the bill. He said: "It raises the danger of a cascading economic effect."

Fourth, this bill makes another change to allow big banks to borrow more money than they can afford, which, once again, puts taxpayers and our economy at risk. The New York Times described this provision as weakening rules "aimed at keeping banks from being able to take big risks without properly preparing for disaster."

The Washington Post reported that JPMorgan Chase and Citigroup may get a combined \$30 billion windfall—\$30 billion windfall—if this provision passes. I am not making this up. This is what analysts are saying this bill will do.

Fifth, this bill chips away at key mortgage rules put in place after the last crisis. It includes provisions that weaken transparency, inclusiveness, and fairness in mortgage lending. The bill makes it easier for lenders to mislead families into mortgages they can't afford, and takes away those families' right to take the bank to court. It strips away key data used to monitor trends in mortgage lending and spot discrimination against communities of color.

There was an amendment to fix that from Senator CORTEZ MASTO that the Republicans will not allow us to offer.

We know that in too many places across the country, people of color are far more likely to be turned down for a loan for no good reason. Without this data, we will not know when that redlining is happening.

Sixth—and this may be the most awful of all. For reasons I can't even pretend to understand, this bill helps Equifax. It is the same Equifax that let hackers steal 148 million Americans' personal data. More than half the adults in this country had their personal data breached because of Equifax—their birth dates, Social Security numbers, and addresses—the same Equifax whose former executive was just today charged with insider trading for dumping his stocks just before the company announced its data breach failure.

In exchange for a small provision helping servicemembers watch their credit, this bill forces them to give up their right to take Equifax to court the next time the company's recklessness exposes sensitive financial data.

If that weren't bad enough, the bill also gives Equifax a big new business opportunity. This will give a company that put half the American population at risk of identity theft the power to decide who can get a mortgage.

What do the American people get in exchange for these goodies to big banks and to Equifax? They get to pick up the check. The Congressional Budget Office confirmed that this bill would increase the probability of a big bank failure and a financial crisis adding to the deficit. Even after the addition of language offsetting some of the costs of this bill, the legislation would increase the deficit by \$455 million. Let me repeat that. The bipartisan Congressional Budget Office found that this bill will increase the probability of a big bank failure and a financial crisis. So don't tell me this bill doesn't roll back Dodd-Frank for the biggest banks.

In this town, no one seems to be able to find a single dollar when we need to solve our pension crisis or invest in infrastructure or remove toxic lead from kids' homes, but when the Big Bank lobbyists come calling, the Senate waives its budget rules to do Wall Street's bidding.

Let me also remind my colleagues how hard it was to enact the reforms we passed after the last crisis.

Do you remember that lobbyist said that it was only halftime after one of the few times in this body's recent history that Wall Street actually lost, when we did the right thing 10 years ago?

In the move up to that bill, the Senate considered 14 separate Republican amendments, where there were votes taken, to Dodd-Frank and another 12

from Democrats. Of those 26 amendments, 5 of them were adopted, 5 Republican amendments, 10 Democratic amendments. They were voted on in a Senate where the Democrats were in the majority and gave both parties the opportunity to amend the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. During the conference committee, televised live on C-SPAN for 48 hours, 17 Senate Republican amendments were accepted and 22 amendments from Senate Democrats. Contrast that with today: No subsequent amendments were adopted. I credit Chairman CRAPO for at least allowing amendments, but that is as far as it went. On the Senate floor, it has been worse. Democrats and Republicans alike were completely shut down, not able to offer a single amendment.

We know how this place has worked the last year. All decisions are made down the hall in the majority leader's office. The tax bill was written there. The healthcare bill was written there. This bill was written in a way that there are no amendments allowed on the floor, no debate, no deliberation, no changes.

Lastly, fundamentally, the problem with this bill is that we are entrusting the profiteers from the last crisis, the deniers of the last crisis, with implementing big-bank giveaways. I am not willing to put blind trust in the people who failed us before. Regulators Quarles, Mulvaney, Otting, and Mnuchin are the people we are expecting to regulate and save us from another bailout, save us from another financial crisis, and save us from another implosion in our economy. These are the people who failed us so spectacularly in the past, with such grave consequences, and we are expecting them to protect us the next time. Nothing in their public record has earned them this trust.

This is the collective amnesia crowd—the crowd who forgets what I talked about at the beginning of the speech about what happened 10 years ago—but Ohio families haven't forgotten. People across this country still struggle. People who have lost savings haven't been able to entirely rebuild them. People who lost jobs are often in lower paying jobs as a result. People who lost their homes—in my part of Cleveland, I still see the devastation caused by this financial crisis, the tens of thousands of homes in Greater Cleveland that were foreclosed on. These are the people we are sent here to serve. What this bill does for them and the issues facing their lives is impossible to see.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill. I urge my colleagues to fundamentally ask themselves whose side they are on. Are you going to vote yes on this and side with special interests and Wall Street, or are you going to vote no and side with taxpayers and homeowners and students and workers?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, the time to vote has come, and we are a few minutes over. This is one of those times when the Senate is on a very tight timeline, so I will have the majority of my speech put into the RECORD. I just wanted to respond in one quick way to some of the comments my colleague from Ohio has just made.

A lot of attacks on this floor have been made saying that this bill rolls back the regulatory authority of the Federal Reserve and exposes all of our large banks to much greater risk or much less supervision than they would have had before and on and on. We knew these attacks were coming. They came in the Banking Committee when we had the markup on this bill.

Basically, I want to read a series of questions and answers I had with the current Chairman of the Federal Reserve about these types of allegations being made about the bill—a bill which is designed to deal with credit unions and community banks and the smaller sector of our economy, not the big banks—all these attacks about rolling back the protections against big banks.

I asked Federal Reserve Chairman Jay Powell whether it was accurate, if this bill were passed, that the Federal Reserve would still be required to conduct supervisory stress tests for any bank with total assets between \$150 billion and \$250 billion to ensure that it has enough capital to weather economic downturns.

He answered: Yes, it is.

I asked, if this bill were passed, whether it was accurate that the Federal Reserve would still have sufficient authority to apply any prudential standard—let me repeat that—any prudential standard to a bank with between \$100 billion and \$250 billion in total assets if the Fed determined that was appropriate.

He answered: Yes, that is true.

I asked whether it was accurate that this bill does not weaken oversight of the largest globally systemic banks.

He answered, correctly, that yes, that was correct.

Then I asked whether it was accurate that the Federal Reserve applies enhanced standards to international banks based on their global total consolidated assets—meaning that our bill would not exempt banks like Deutsche Bank and Santander from section 165 of Dodd-Frank.

He answered: That is correct.

I want to repeat this, because this keeps coming up. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve said that this bill does not exempt G-SIB foreign banks, such as Deutsche Bank and Santander, and that we do not eliminate the ability of our Federal Reserve to correctly and properly supervise our banks.

We are going to go back and forth over this, but this bill is designed to protect community banks and credit unions. That is why we have such bipartisan support for it.

Mr. President, we have been able to highlight the benefits of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act on the Senate Floor over the last week, and I am glad we have the opportunity to continue that discussion this week.

I have been very encouraged by my colleagues' support for this critical piece of legislation. I thank each of those Senators, including many members of the Banking Committee, for their support, interest, and involvement in the many discussions, hearings, and personal conversations we have had to improve this bill. I also thank all those who voted on the motion to invoke cloture on substitute amendment No. 2151, as modified, to S. 2155.

Since the bill passed out of the Banking Committee, supporters have worked in good faith to include provisions that different Members have offered, including those who do not support the bill.

The substitute amendment we offered last week reflects the additional provisions that the bill's supporters were able to agree on, collectively.

To ensure that everyone understands what the substitute amendment does, let me take a few minutes to explain the changes from the bill that passed out of committee.

This amendment makes both technical and substantive changes to further improve economic growth, regulatory relief, and consumer protections.

This substitute makes changes to the appraisal provision in our bill to add definitions and provide detail on criteria for efforts to document and contact appraisers.

It also strengthens the HMDA provision by adding a "bad actor" prohibition, limiting the universe of lenders who can take advantage of the relief to those that do not have ratings of "need to improve" on their last two CRA exams or one rating of "substantial non-compliance" on their last CRA exam.

It adds further consumer protections on who can take advantage of transitional licenses and adds liability protections for government officials who carry out their official duties.

It modifies a provision by raising the threshold from \$15 billion to \$20 billion for those Federal savings associations

that wish to take advantage of charter conversions.

It modifies the existing provision dealing with applying the Expedited Funds Availability Act, which governs bank deposit holds, to add Guam to the list of American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands which would receive the benefit.

It clarifies the current international insurance provision so that the Treasury, Fed, and Federal Insurance Office report to Congress on studies regarding consumer and market impact of international insurance capital standards is only required with respect to final standards.

It also changes the date at which point Treasury and Fed reporting requirements on international insurance regulatory and supervisory forums terminate from December 31, 2022, to December 31, 2024—this aligns with the International Association of Insurance Supervisors' planned timeframe for implementing its insurance capital standard.

It promotes construction and development on Main Street by ensuring that the Federal Reserve appropriately treats certain commercial real estate loans in its rules.

It helps reduce identity fraud by directing the Social Security Administration to accept electronic signatures as consumer consent for financial institutions trying to verify customer ID and root out synthetic ID fraud.

It uses part of the Fed's discretionary surplus as a pay-for.

It expands the existing credit freeze provisions by increasing the circumstances where Americans can get a free credit freeze, and clarifies that an incapacitated person receives the same protections as a minor under the age of 16.

It also adds a provision that gives free and ongoing credit monitoring to Active Duty servicemembers who are serving and sacrificing for our country.

It adds a provision which helps protect veterans from predatory lending by requiring VA lenders to demonstrate a material benefit to consumers when refinancing their mortgages.

It adds a section requiring Fannie Mae and Freddy Mac to establish a process for validating and approving credit score models, and requires FHFA to establish standards and criteria for such processes.

The language requires that any credit score model must meet a series of criteria related to predictiveness, accuracy, safety and soundness, and other metrics in order to be approved, to ensure that this will not undermine the quality of underwriting at Fannie and Freddie.

The substitute adds important reports: a GAO report on Puerto Rico foreclosures; and a report on children's lead-based paint hazard prevention and

abatement, which is a serious issue in many of our States.

It also makes permanent certain protections for members of uniformed services under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

It also makes further clarifications to the section about enhanced supervision and prudential standards for certain banks, by lowering the asset threshold above which banks have to pay assessments and requiring the Fed to adjust such charges to reflect the fact that the cost of supervision and regulation of certain institutions will be reduced as a result of this legislation.

It also clarifies that this bill does not affect the legal effect of the Federal Reserve's final rule on foreign banking organizations, and the bill does not limit the Federal Reserve's legal authority to require intermediate holding companies, apply enhanced prudential standards, or tailor regulations for certain foreign banking organizations.

The amendment also adds a new Encouraging Capital Formation title, which includes five capital formation and securities bills that passed the Senate by unanimous consent last year, as well as a bill to help companies take advantage of further ways to raise capital and ease burdens on certain publicly traded investment companies.

Lastly, the bill provides additional protections for borrowers and cosigners of private student loans, and requires the Treasury Department to study and promulgate best practices for higher education financial literacy.

All of these additions improve the bill and strengthen the core themes of the existing provisions; namely, improving economic growth, regulatory relief, and consumer protections.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2152 WITHDRAWN

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, before I yield, I withdraw my amendment No. 2152.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The amendment is withdrawn.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2151, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 2151, as modified.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Carper	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Shaheen
Coons	Jones	Shelby
Corker	Kaine	Stabenow
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	King	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	
Flake	Nelson	

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Sanders
Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Leahy	Udall
Cardin	Markey	Van Hollen
Casey	Menendez	Warren
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich McCain

The amendment (No. 2151), as modified, was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Bob Corker, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Rounds, Jeff Flake, John Kennedy, Johnny Isakson, James Lankford, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes, as amended, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senator in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Carper	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Shaheen
Coons	Jones	Shelby
Corker	Kaine	Stabenow
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	King	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	
Flake	Nelson	

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Sanders
Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Leahy	Udall
Cardin	Markey	Van Hollen
Casey	Menendez	Warren
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 31.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Idaho.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 5:45 p.m. today; that when the Senate reconvenes, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate vote on the motion to waive; and that following the vote on the motion to waive, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 5:45 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:48 p.m., recessed until 5:45 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HELLER).

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes before we begin voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, we are about to witness a rare bipartisan moment in the Senate that has been years in the making. We have had the opportunity to highlight this bill over the last 2 weeks, and I have been very encouraged by my colleagues' support for its critical results.

Again, I thank each of the Senators who support this bill—including many members of the Banking Committee—for their interest, involvement, and the many discussions, hearings, and personal conversations we have had to get to this point.

I want to stop at this point and give a special thanks to my staff, who has spent countless hours, weeks—actually months and years—getting us to this point on this legislation, and the staff of the other Members who have worked so closely with us as we worked to find a yes to difficult problems and solutions that we are facing.

Since the bill passed out of the Banking Committee, supporters have worked in good faith to include provisions that different Members have offered, including those who do not support the bill. The substitute amendment we introduced last week reflects the additional provisions that the bill supporters were able to agree to.

The final bill we are about to vote on today is the product of careful negotiations and good, old-fashioned statesmanship. The majority of us in this body recognize that our community financial institutions have been struggling to keep up with the regulatory demands coming out of Washington and that it was time to revisit current law and make changes where necessary.

While there are certain provisions that I would like to have included in this bill, I believe the package on which we were able to reach consensus is an important step in the right direction and will deliver much needed relief and economic growth to Main Street America.

When this bill is signed into law, it will right-size regulation for financial institutions, including community banks and credit unions, making it easier for consumers to get mortgages and to obtain credit. Those are the real victims of this regulatory overreach—individuals who find it difficult to get access to credit, to get a loan for college, to get a mortgage for a house, or small businesses seeking to start up or to expand that cannot get necessary access to capital not because they are

not creditworthy but because the system we have created makes it so that our smaller financial institutions that do the relationship banking throughout so much of America don't have the ability to serve them anymore. It also increases important consumer protections for veterans, senior citizens, victims of fraud, and those who have fallen on tough financial times.

This bill has received widespread support for good reason. The cycle of lending and job creation has been stifled by onerous regulation. Absent excessive regulatory burdens, local banks and credit unions will be able to focus more on lending and in turn propel economic growth and create jobs.

Not to be overlooked, this is also an important moment for bipartisanship and working across the aisle to legislate. Many people are worried about the gridlocks in Congress. This bill shows that we can work together and can do big things that make a big difference in the lives of people across this country.

Those who support this bill have recognized that, with the right regulation, tailored regulation, we can promote local economic growth through our Nation's smaller financial institutions.

I will end with this: This bill was a bipartisan compromise. The changes are common sense, and it will allow financial institutions to better serve their customers and communities, while maintaining safety and soundness and important consumer protections. At a time of intense political polarization, we have proven that we can work together to get things done.

This is good for small financial institutions, good for small businesses, and good for families across America, and I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

I yield back my time.

VOTE ON MOTION TO WAIVE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Capito	Corker
Barrasso	Carper	Cornyn
Bennet	Cassidy	Cotton
Blunt	Cochran	Crapo
Boozman	Collins	Cruz
Burr	Coons	Daines

Donnelly	Kaine
Enzi	Kennedy
Ernst	King
Fischer	Lankford
Flake	Lee
Gardner	Manchin
Graham	McCaskill
Grassley	McConnell
Hassan	Moran
Hatch	Murkowski
Heitkamp	Nelson
Heller	Paul
Hoeven	Perdue
Inhofe	Peters
Isakson	Portman
Johnson	Risch
Jones	Roberts

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Sanders
Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Leahy	Udall
Cardin	Markey	Van Hollen
Casey	Menendez	Warren
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich	McCaIn

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 31.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to and the point of order falls.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Cruz	Isakson
Barrasso	Daines	Johnson
Bennet	Donnelly	Jones
Blunt	Enzi	Kaine
Boozman	Ernst	Kennedy
Burr	Fischer	King
Capito	Flake	Lankford
Carper	Gardner	Lee
Cassidy	Graham	Manchin
Cochran	Grassley	McCaskill
Collins	Hassan	McConnell
Coons	Hatch	Moran
Corker	Heitkamp	Murkowski
Cornyn	Heller	Nelson
Cotton	Hoeven	Paul
Crapo	Inhofe	Perdue

Peters	Scott	Tillis
Portman	Shaheen	Toomey
Risch	Shelby	Warner
Roberts	Stabenow	Wicker
Rounds	Sullivan	Young
Rubio	Tester	
Sasse	Thune	

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Sanders
Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Leahy	Udall
Cardin	Markey	Van Hollen
Casey	Menendez	Warren
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich	McCain

The bill (S. 2155), as amended, was passed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, Richard C. Shelby, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, Jeff Flake, Cory Gardner, Ron Johnson, Michael B. Enzi, John Kennedy, Susan M. Collins, James Lankford.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hassan	Reed
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Brown	Heitkamp	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Cantwell	Hirono	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Scott
Casey	Isakson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Jones	Smith
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Coons	King	Sullivan
Corker	Klobuchar	Tester
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Warner
Cruz	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Donnelly	Moran	Wyden
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Murphy	
Fischer	Nelson	

NAYS—19

Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 79, the nays are 19.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, all postcloture time on the McAleenan nomination be considered expired and the Senate vote on the nomination at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 19; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 1865.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, H.R. 1865, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, H.R. 1865, an act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Kennedy, John Cornyn, Dan Sullivan, Joni Ernst, James Lankford, Richard Burr, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, Patrick J. Toomey, Mike Rounds, Rob Portman.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: PN1357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey DeWit, of Arizona, to be Chief Financial Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the

Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the DeWit nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY FIRST PREVENTION SERVICES ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today with my good friend Senator WYDEN, to acknowledge a major accomplishment of this body and to thank those who were instrumental in helping us achieve it. Last month, after years of work and decades of effort by many groups across the country, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Family First Prevention Services Act.

This effort is an example of bipartisanship at its best, and we are proud to have stood with members on the other side of the Capitol in seeing this through to the finish. In particular, we acknowledge Ways and Means Chairman KEVIN BRADY, Ranking Member RICHARD NEAL, former Ranking Member SANDER LEVIN, Speaker PAUL RYAN, Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI, and Congressmen VERNON BUCHANAN, ADRIAN SMITH, and DANNY DAVIS for their work to make sure more families stay safely together—not to mention the many other Members of the House who also supported this effort. In this Chamber, we particularly extend our gratitude for the leadership of Senators CHARLES GRASSLEY and MICHAEL BENNET and to the many others who supported this work since Senate legislative efforts first began on this issue in 2013.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this new law has the power to better the lives of hundreds of thousands of children and their families. It will for the first time allow States to invest Federal foster care dollars in evidence-based services, like substance use treatment and mental health and parenting programs, to prevent the need for foster care by keeping families safely together. It will provide critical new opportunities for families adopting children and relatives caring for kin by making these

same services available when a child is at risk of reentering foster care. It will also support investments in Kinship Navigator programs to help grandparents and other relative caregivers who often take on the parenting role at a moment's notice.

The opioid crisis is showing why these investments are absolutely critical. After years of decline in the number of children in foster care, we have begun to see a steady increase, which many attribute to the opioid crisis. According to Federal data, at least 34 percent of foster care entries are attributed to parental substance use. Family First will be a game changer when it comes to fighting addiction, as States will now have many more tools to address these issues without breaking families apart. These tools will not only help with the current opioid epidemic, but they will position our Nation's child welfare system to respond to this crisis and any others that families may face in the future.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this new law will also give children and youth already in foster care new protections by making sure children get the services they need in the setting best suited for them. It creates robust standards for foster care providers operating group homes, congregate care, and residential treatment facilities. It will require these types of facilities to be equipped to meet children's needs and provide services that help address the trauma they have faced so they can return to live with family or be placed with a caring foster family as soon as possible. It will also promote a model where children are placed in these types of facilities only when they need specific services that cannot be provided in another setting. Too often, children who can and should be living in families end up in group care simply because it is what is available, not because it is the best place for the child. This law helps tip the scales toward placing more children in family settings where children do best.

This new law amounts to the most significant changes to our child welfare system in decades, and it simply would not have been possible without the hard work, dedication, perseverance, education, and technical assistance of so many advocates and experts across the Nation. Today, we would like to acknowledge several such individuals, including: Akin Abioye, MaryLee Allen, Schylar Baber, Lauren Behsudi, William Bell, Mary Bissell, Celeste Bodner, Laura Boyd, Donna Butts, Christine Calpin, JooYeun Chang, Hope Cooper, Kristi Craig, Nicole Dobbins, Kay Farley, Ruth Friedman, Ami Gadhia, Rob Geen, Elizabeth Rigby Gibson, Christen Glickman, Lexie Gruber, Jesse Hahnel, Ron Haskins, Megan Hauck, Anne Heiligenstein, Jeremy Kohomban, Joe Kroll, Sherry Lachman, Zachary Laris, Brooke Leh-

mann, Jaia Lent, Rricha Mathur, Melanie Nathanson, Barbara Pryor, Lindsay Punzenberger, Rebecca Robuck, Jennifer Rodriguez, Marci Roth, David Sanders, John Sciamanna, Stefanie Sprow, Becky Weichhand, Nancy Young, and Megan Zuckerman.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would also like to acknowledge the dedication of key congressional staffers, including those at the Congressional Research Service, the Congressional Budget Office, and with House and Senate legislative counsel's office. These staffers pour immense time, effort, and expertise into turning concepts into legislation and are the epitome of dedicated public servants. In particular, we would like to acknowledge and thank Emilie Stoltzfus, Ruth Ernst, Jim Grossman, Susanne Mehlman, Sheila Dacey, and Jennifer Gray. We would like to thank key congressional and administration staffers, including Ryan Martin, Laura Berntsen, Anne DeCesaro, Morna Miller, Becky Shipp, Scott Raab, Veronica Duron, Ted McCann, Stephanie Parks, Wendell Primus, Samantha Offerdahl, Rafael Lopez, Jeff Hild, Jenny Delwood, Rose Hacking, and Sonja Nesbit.

We recognize there is not the space to acknowledge all of the countless individuals who made this law a reality, but we honor the contributions of those individuals and their organizations across the country as well. Opportunities for reform like this do not materialize out of nowhere; they are the result of hard work and perseverance by many committed to a cause. These individuals' vision for a better world for vulnerable children and families guided our work and we will be forever grateful for their commitment and dedication.

RECOGNIZING VERMONT ATHLETES IN THE 2018 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, late last month, as I watched Olympic Gold Medal winner Jessie Diggins carry our flag in the Pyeongchang closing ceremonies, I was overcome with pride—pride in Vermont and pride in our great country. Throughout the games, athletes raised in Vermont and those who choose to train at Vermont's world-class winter academies and programs showcased the very best of our winter wonderland. Vermont, ranked 49th in population among the States, sent the most athletes per capita to the games. While there, they showcased Vermont values, including respect, personal achievement and excellence, civility and good sportsmanship.

Vermont athletes were also incredibly successful during these games, bringing home three gold medals. Montpelier native Amanda Pelkey and the U.S. Women's Hockey Team capped a year battling for equal pay and treatment with a gold medal performance,

stunning Canada in a thrilling final match. Burke Mountain Academy graduate Mikaela Schiffrin continued her stunning success, bringing home gold in the giant slalom and silver in the alpine combined. Jessie Diggins, from Stratton Mountain School's T2 elite team, lunged across the finish line in an exciting end to the women's cross-country skiing team sprint to grab the gold, the first cross-country gold medal ever for the United States.

Between the golden moments of triumph, we also saw the grit and determination of Vermont athletes to simply compete at the highest levels of their sport. In the slalom, Ryan Cochran-Siegle demonstrated his ability to overcome injuries and the odds as he enjoyed—and then gracefully ceded—the lead to his fellow athletes. His teammate, UVM alpine racer Tommy Bisemeyer, had the courage to speak honestly about the profound disappointment of suffering a training injury that cut short his second Olympic attempt. Other Vermont Olympians include Sophie Caldwell, cross-country skiing, from Peru; Caroline Claire, freestyle skiing, from Wilmington; Kelly Clark, snowboarding, from West Dover; Emily Dreissigacker, biathlon, from Morrisville; Susan Dunklee, biathlon, from Barton; Lindsey Jacobellis, snowboarding, from Stratton; Nolan Kasper, alpine skiing, from Warren; Devin Logan, freestyle skiing, from West Dover; Kaitlynn Miller, cross-country skiing, from Elmore; Andy Newell, cross-country skiing, from Shaftsbury; Ida Sargent, cross-country skiing, from Craftsbury Common; Emerson Smith, freestyle skiing, from Dover; and Liz Stephen, cross-country skiing, from Montpelier.

We as Vermonters are so proud of each and every Vermonter who went to Pyeongchang to represent the Green Mountain State and our country. Each of them competed fiercely and truly represented the Olympic values of friendship, respect, and excellence—which also happen to be some of our cherished Vermont values. I congratulate each and every one of them.

MICHIGAN PTA CENTENNIAL

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today I wish to pay special tribute to the Michigan Parent Teacher Association, which this year is celebrating 100 years of advocacy on behalf of Michigan's children and families.

A lot has changed since the Michigan PTA was first established in Battle Creek on May 19, 1918. Parents today are as likely to learn school news via Facebook or text messages as they are from notes sent home, and students are as likely to learn their lessons on laptops and tablets as they are on the chalkboard.

However, one thing hasn't changed at all: Michigan PTA members are still

working together every day to provide a quality education and nurturing environment for every Michigan child.

They do that in the best way possible, by bringing together families, educators, school boards, nonprofit organizations, businesses, community leaders, and elected officials around a common cause: promoting the welfare of Michigan children in school, at home, and in the community.

It has been said that it takes a village to raise a child, and the PTA is building that village.

They are building that village by offering parents resources on important topics like teen driving, bullying prevention, online safety, and career planning.

They are building that village by presenting the Fran Anderson Michigan PTA Scholarship to high school seniors who have demonstrated leadership and advocacy skills through their involvement in PTA.

They are building that village through Advocacy Day and advocacy training that gives members the tools they need to speak up for policies that benefit students, families, and schools.

They are building that village by ensuring that parents remain strong partners in the education of their children.

For a century, the Michigan PTA has made sure that the voices of our parents are heard and that the needs of our children are not forgotten. I have been honored to join them in this effort and look forward to continuing our work together.

Michigan's future is found in our children. Thanks to the Michigan PTA for 100 years of making that future a bright one.

Thank you.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:20 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 324. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1350. An act to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1800. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain Federal land to facilitate scientific research supporting Federal space and defense programs.

H.R. 3469. An act to designate the bridge located in Blount County, Tennessee, on the Foothills Parkway (commonly known as "Bridge 2") as the "Dean Stone Bridge".

H.R. 4266. An act to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4465. An act to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan

fish recovery programs through fiscal year 2023, to require a report on the implementation of those programs, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Clerk of the House be directed to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 1207) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, as the "Tilden Veterans Post Office", in compliance with a request of the Senate for the return thereof.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1800. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain Federal land to facilitate scientific research supporting Federal space and defense programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 4266. An act to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4465. An act to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery programs through fiscal year 2023, to require a report on the implementation of those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1350. An act to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4562. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the National Organic Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Organic Program (NOP); Organic Livestock and Poultry Practices" ((RIN0581-AD75) (Docket No. AMS-NOP-15-0012)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4563. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting proposed legislation entitled "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4564. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of four (4) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4565. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 on March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4566. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4567. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alternatives to References to Credit Ratings With Respect to Permissible Activities for Foreign Branches of Insured State Nonmember Banks and Pledge of Assets by Insured Domestic Branches of Foreign Banks" (RIN3064-AE36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4568. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electric Storage Participation in Markets Operated by Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators" ((RIN1902-AF18) (Docket Nos. RM16-23-000 and AD16-20-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4569. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About 10 CFR Part 36 Irradiator Licenses" (NUREG-1556, Volume 6, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4570. A communication from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Arms Export Control Act (OSS-2018-0217); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4571. A communication from the Management Analyst, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates—Passport Services Fee Changes" (RIN1400-AD81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2018; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4572. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4573. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Silicon Dioxide as a Carrier for Flavors" ((21 CFR

Part 573) (Docket No. FDA-2017-F-5528)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4574. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's activities under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4575. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's activities under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4576. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) for two reports entitled "2017 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts" and "Judicial Business of the United States Courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4577. A communication from the Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Amendments" (RIN2900-AQ22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4578. A communication from the Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reimbursement of qualifying adoption expenses for certain veterans" (RIN2900-AQ01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-181. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico requesting the United States Congress to extend the unemployment and the Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) benefits for an additional twenty-six (26) weeks, due to the catastrophic impact of Hurricanes Maria and Irma on Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 50 STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

Only two weeks after Hurricane Irma hit the Island, on September 20th, 2017, Hurricane Maria struck Puerto Rico. The eye of this Category 4 hurricane made landfall in the municipality of Yabucoa.

Puerto Rico suffered damages estimated in at least ninety billion dollars (\$90,000,000,000), and a never-before-seen devastation. The power grid as well as the telecommunications and drinking water systems were down. One month after landfall, a mere eighteen percent (18%) of the population had power service, fifty-nine percent (59%) had telecommunications service, and seventy-

three percent (73%) had drinking water service.

Many businesses have been unable to operate due to the lack of these services. Consequently, a significant number of employees have lost their jobs or their work hours have been reduced considerably.

Through a contribution based on a percentage of payroll expenses, employers participate in a program where job-seeking unemployed persons are able to receive financial assistance and labor advisory from the Government.

Workers who have been wrongfully discharged may receive the following benefits:

Unemployment compensation equivalent to a percentage of the salary earned up to one hundred thirty-three dollars (\$133.00) a week. Such compensation may be extended for an additional twenty-six (26) weeks, if eligible.

Job search assistance through their job center locations.

Furthermore, the Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) is available for employed and self-employed persons who have been determined not otherwise eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. This program provides unemployment benefits to individuals who have become unemployed as a direct result of a major disaster. Just as the unemployment benefit, this assistance is available for twenty-six (26) weeks.

Hurricanes Irma and Maria have had a major impact on the economy. Countless Puerto Ricans have lost their jobs, either temporarily or permanently. The lines at the regional offices of the Department of Labor are endless.

Moreover, it has been estimated that more than sixty thousand (60,000) Puerto Ricans have left the Island over the thirty (30) days following Hurricane Maria, forty thousand (40,000) of which have relocated to Florida.

If the U.S. Congress approves the unemployment benefit extension it will greatly contribute to the recovery of the People of Puerto Rico and prevent many others from making the difficult decision of moving from Puerto Rico.

This is not the first time that such a request is made. The U.S. Congress approved a similar extension in 2006 after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita struck Louisiana and Texas, respectively.

For all of the foregoing, this Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico deems it meritorious to request the Congress of the United States of America to extend the unemployment and the Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) benefits for an additional twenty-six (26) weeks, due to the catastrophic impact of Hurricanes Maria and Irma on Puerto Rico.

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—To request the Congress of the United States of America to extend the unemployment and the Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) benefits for an additional twenty-six (26) weeks, due to the catastrophic impact of Hurricanes Maria and Irma on Puerto Rico.

Section 2.—It is hereby directed that a copy of this Concurrent Resolution, translated into English, be delivered to the leadership of the Congress of the United States of America, including the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, D.C., the President of the United States of America, and the U.S. Secretary of Labor.

Section 3.—This Concurrent Resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

POM-182. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado

relative to the fiftieth anniversary of the capture of the U.S.S. Pueblo by North Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 18-1004

Whereas, The U.S.S. Pueblo was originally launched as a United States Army cargo ship in 1944 but was transferred to the United States Navy and renamed the U.S.S. Pueblo in 1966; and

Whereas, The U.S.S. Pueblo was named for the city of Pueblo, Colorado, and the county of Pueblo, Colorado, and was the third ship in the naval fleet to bear the name Pueblo; and

Whereas, After leaving Japan in early January 1968 on an intelligence mission, the U.S.S. Pueblo was attacked by the North Korean military on January 23, 1968; and

Whereas, According to United States Naval authorities and the crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo, the ship was in international waters at the time of the attack; and

Whereas, One crew member of the U.S.S. Pueblo was killed during the attack, and eighty crew members and two civilian oceanographers were captured and held for eleven months by the North Korean government; and

Whereas, This year marks the fiftieth anniversary of North Korea's attack on the U.S.S. Pueblo and her crew; and

Whereas, The U.S.S. Pueblo is still in commission in the United States Navy but continues to be held by the North Korean government and is currently a museum in Pyongyang, North Korea; Now, therefore; and be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-first General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

(1) That we, the members of the General Assembly, recognize the bravery and sacrifice of the crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo;

(2) That we take pride in the fact that the U.S.S. Pueblo bears the name of a city and a county in Colorado, and, therefore, the citizens of Colorado should be aware of the incident that occurred with the U.S.S. Pueblo fifty years ago;

(3) That we continue the call for Kim Jong Un and the North Korean government to return the U.S.S. Pueblo to the people of the United States; and

(4) That we hereby designate January 23 each year as "U.S.S. Pueblo Day" as a day to remember and honor the brave crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Joint Resolution be sent to President Donald J. Trump, Governor John W. Hickenlooper, President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate Orrin Hatch, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives Paul D. Ryan, and the members of Colorado's Congressional delegation.

POM-183. A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Syracuse, New York urging the federal government to pass legislation in support of a national revenue-neutral carbon fee and dividend in order to help slow climate change; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Mark Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Institute of Edu-

cation Science, Department of Education for a term of six years.

*Frank T. Brogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

*Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2022.

*John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2022.

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Hannibal Ware, of the Virgin Islands, to be Inspector General, Small Business Administration.

*David Christian Tryon, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 2544. A bill to stop financial institution crime, require certain officers of companies to certify that they have conducted due diligence relating to criminal conduct or civil fraud, create accountability in deferred prosecution agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 2545. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a special behavioral health program for Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2546. A bill to provide grants to States to encourage the implementation and maintenance of firearms licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2547. A bill to provide assistance for educational facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2548. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish mental health care to certain former members of the Armed Forces who are not otherwise eligible to receive such care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2549. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, as the "Major Robert Odell Owens

Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2550. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the "Tuskegee Airman Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 2551. A bill to modernize United States international food assistance programs made available through the Food for Peace Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2552. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the maximum amounts of Farm Service Agency loans for years in which those maximum amounts are insufficient to satisfy demand, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2553. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit health plans and pharmacy benefit managers from restricting pharmacies from informing individuals regarding the prices for certain drugs and biologicals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2554. A bill to ensure that health insurance issuers and group health plans do not prohibit pharmacy providers from providing certain information to enrollees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 2555. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to establish the Dairy Farm Sustainability Price Loss Coverage Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. REED, Mr. HATCH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TESTER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 434. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. WICKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 435. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the 85th anniversary of the Ukrainian Famine of 1932-1933, known as the Holodomor, should serve as a reminder of repressive Soviet policies against the people of Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 436. A resolution recognizing the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on its 106th birthday and affirming the importance of leadership development for girls; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 384

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 455

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 455, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count resident time spent in a critical access hospital as resident time spent in a nonprovider setting for purposes of making Medicare direct and indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 833

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 833, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand health care and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1084, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 1301

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1301, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2147

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2147, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2314

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2314, a bill to increase the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations officers and support staff and to require reports that identify staffing, infrastructure, and equipment needed to enhance security at ports of entry.

S. 2353

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2353, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes.

S. 2468

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2468, a bill to provide access to counsel for unaccompanied alien children.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2507

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2507, a bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such coverage at the option of the enrollees.

S.J. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 424

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 424, a resolution honoring the 25th anniversary of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program.

S. RES. 426

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 426, a resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 432, a resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence.

AMENDMENT NO. 2180

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2180 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 434—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. REED, Mr. HATCH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY,

Mr. TESTER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 434

Whereas, since its inception in 1994, the AmeriCorps national service program has proven to be a highly effective way to engage the people of the United States in meeting a wide range of local and national needs and promote the ethics of service and volunteerism;

Whereas, since 1994, more than 1,000,000 individuals have taken the AmeriCorps pledge to “get things done for America” by becoming AmeriCorps members;

Whereas, each year, AmeriCorps, in coordination with State service commissions, provides opportunities for approximately 75,000 individuals across the United States to give back in an intensive way to communities, States, Tribal nations, and the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps members have served more than 1,480,000,000 hours nationwide, helping—

- (1) to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people of the United States;
- (2) to protect the environment;
- (3) to contribute to public safety;
- (4) to respond to disasters;
- (5) to strengthen the educational system of the United States; and
- (6) to expand economic opportunity;

Whereas, since 1994, more than \$9,200,000,000 in AmeriCorps funds have been invested in nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based groups, and those funds leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in outside funding and in-kind donations each year;

Whereas AmeriCorps members recruit and supervise millions of community volunteers, demonstrating the value of AmeriCorps as a powerful force for encouraging people to become involved in volunteering and community service;

Whereas AmeriCorps members serve at more than 20,000 locations across the United States, including at nonprofit organizations, schools, and faith-based and community organizations;

Whereas AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps campuses in the States of Mississippi, Maryland, Iowa, California, and Colorado strengthen communities and develop future leaders through team-based service;

Whereas AmeriCorps members nationwide, in return for the service of those members, have earned more than \$3,500,000,000 to use to further their own educational advancement at colleges and universities across the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps members, after their terms of service with AmeriCorps end, have been more likely to remain engaged in their communities as volunteers, teachers, and nonprofit professionals than the average individual;

Whereas AmeriCorps is a proven pathway to employment, providing members with valuable career skills, experience, and contacts to prepare them for the 21st century workforce and to help close the skills gap in the United States;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460), which authorized the expansion of national service, expanded oppor-

tunities to serve, increased efficiency and accountability, and strengthened the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of people in the United States in results-driven service in the most vulnerable communities of the United States, providing hope and help to individuals with economic and social needs;

Whereas national service and volunteerism demonstrate the best of the spirit of the United States, with people turning toward problems and working together to find community solutions; and

Whereas AmeriCorps Week, observed in 2018 from March 11 through March 17, is an appropriate time for the people of the United States to salute current and former AmeriCorps members for their positive impact on the lives of people in the United States, to thank the community partners of AmeriCorps for making the program possible, and to encourage more people in the United States to become involved in service and volunteering: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages the people of the United States to join in a national effort—

(A) to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni; and

(B) to raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the members, alumni, and community partners of AmeriCorps;

(3) recognizes the important contributions made by AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals of all ages to consider opportunities to serve in AmeriCorps.

SENATE RESOLUTION 435—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UKRAINIAN FAMINE OF 1932–1933, KNOWN AS THE HOLODOMOR, SHOULD SERVE AS A REMINDER OF REPRESSIVE SOVIET POLICIES AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF UKRAINE

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. INHOFF, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. WICKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 435

Whereas 2017–2018 marks the 85th anniversary of the Ukrainian Famine of 1932–1933, known as the Holodomor;

Whereas, in 1932 and 1933, millions of Ukrainian people perished at the will of the totalitarian Stalinist government of the former Soviet Union, which perpetrated a premeditated famine in Ukraine in an effort to break the nation's resistance to collectivization and communist occupation;

Whereas the Soviet government deliberately confiscated grain harvests and starved millions of Ukrainian men, women, and children by a policy of forced collectivization that sought to destroy the nationally conscious movement for independence;

Whereas Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin ordered the borders of Ukraine sealed to pre-

vent anyone from escaping the manmade starvation and to prevent the delivery of any international food aid that would provide relief to the starving;

Whereas numerous scholars worldwide have worked to uncover the scale of the famine, including Canadian wheat expert Andrew Cairns, who visited Ukraine in 1932 and was told that there was no grain “because the government had collected so much grain and exported it to England and Italy,” while Joseph Stalin simultaneously denied food aid to the people of Ukraine;

Whereas nearly a quarter of Ukraine's rural population perished or were forced into exile due to the induced starvation, and the entire nation suffered from the consequences of the prolonged famine;

Whereas noted correspondents of the time were refuted for their courage in depicting and reporting on the forced famine in Ukraine, including Gareth Jones, William Henry Chamberlin, and Malcolm Muggeridge, who wrote, “They (the peasants) will tell you that many have already died of famine and that many are dying every day; that thousands have been shot by the government and hundreds of thousands exiled . . .”;

Whereas title V of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-180; 99 Stat. 1157), signed into law on December 13, 1985, established the Commission on the Ukraine Famine to “conduct a study of the Ukrainian Famine of 1932–1933 in order to expand the world's knowledge of the famine and provide the American public with a better understanding of the Soviet system by revealing the Soviet role” in it;

Whereas, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, archival documents became available that confirmed the deliberate and premeditated deadly nature of the famine, and that exposed the atrocities committed by the Soviet government against the Ukrainian people;

Whereas Raphael Lemkin, who devoted his life to the development of legal concepts and norms for containing mass atrocities and whose tireless advocacy swayed the United Nations in 1948 to adopt the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, authored an essay in 1953 entitled, “Soviet Genocide in [the] Ukraine,” which highlighted the “classic example of Soviet genocide,” characterizing it “not simply a case of mass murder [but as] a case of genocide, of destruction, not of individuals only, but of a culture and a nation”;

Whereas Ukraine's law N 376-V “About the 1932–1933 Holodomor in Ukraine” of November 28, 2006, gave official recognition to the Holodomor as an act of genocide against the Ukrainian people;

Whereas President George W. Bush signed into law Public Law 109-340 on October 13, 2006, authorizing the Government of Ukraine “to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor the victims of the Ukrainian famine-genocide of 1932–1933,” which was officially dedicated in November 2015;

Whereas the Government of Ukraine and the Ukrainian communities in the United States and worldwide continue their efforts to secure greater international awareness and understanding of the 1932–1933 tragedy; and

Whereas victims of the Holodomor of 1932–1933 will be commemorated by Ukrainian communities around the globe, and in Ukraine, through November 2018: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) solemnly remembers the 85th anniversary of the Holodomor of 1932–1933 and extends its deepest sympathies to the victims, survivors, and families of this tragedy;

(2) condemns the systematic violations of human rights, including the freedom of self-determination and freedom of speech, of the Ukrainian people by the Soviet government;

(3) recognizes the findings of the Commission on the Ukraine Famine as submitted to Congress on April 22, 1988, including that “Joseph Stalin and those around him committed genocide against the Ukrainians in 1932–1933”;

(4) encourages dissemination of information regarding the Holodomor of 1932–1933 in order to expand the world’s knowledge of this manmade tragedy; and

(5) supports the continuing efforts of the people of Ukraine to work toward ensuring democratic principles, a free-market economy, and full respect for human rights, in order to enable Ukraine to achieve its potential as an important strategic partner of the United States in that region of the world, and to reflect the will of its people.

SENATE RESOLUTION 436—RECOGNIZING THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON ITS 106TH BIRTHDAY AND AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT FOR GIRLS

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 436

Whereas the Girl Scout movement began on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Georgia, by Juliette “Daisy” Gordon Low—

(1) whose life mission was to build girls of courage, confidence, and character who make the world a better place; and

(2) through whose legacy the Girl Scouts of the United States of America (referred to in this preamble as the “Girl Scouts organization”) continues to have an extraordinary influence on the lives of millions of girls across the country;

Whereas the Girl Scouts organization is—

(1) recognized as a national leader in providing the best leadership development experience in the world for girls, bringing time-tested methods and research-backed programs that speak to the strengths of girl leadership development; and

(2) backed by more than 100 years of experience and expertise in the field;

Whereas the Girl Scouts organization—

(1) offers hands-on, girl-led, girl-centered learning in—

(A) science, technology, engineering, and math;

(B) the outdoors;

(C) entrepreneurship; and

(D) other subjects; and

(2) helps girls develop invaluable life skills and take the lead early and often;

Whereas the Girl Scouts organization continues a legacy of creating gender-balanced leadership in the United States and the world in its second century of service to girls by providing girls with the tools to become leaders dedicated to making the United States and the world a better place;

Whereas the Girl Scouts organization has been instrumental in developing female lead-

ers in government, business, and public service;

Whereas 55 percent of female Members of Congress, 73 percent of women in the Senate, and 80 percent of female governors are alumnae of the Girl Scouts organization;

Whereas today more than 50,000,000 American women are alumnae of the Girl Scouts organization and 2,600,000 girls and adult volunteers are active members;

Whereas, while the Girl Scouts organization has evolved over the years, the fundamental experience of being part of the Girl Scouts organization connects generations of women;

Whereas only the Girl Scouts organization offers girls a one-of-a-kind opportunity to earn the Gold Award of the Girl Scouts by engaging in leadership at the highest levels while addressing issues they care passionately about;

Whereas the Gold Award of the Girl Scouts, the highest honor a Girl Scout can earn, acknowledges the power and dedication of each recipient to not only bettering herself but to making the world a better place for others;

Whereas from the boardroom to the courtroom to the caucus room, the need for female leadership has never been clearer or more urgent than it is today; and

Whereas the Girl Scouts organization has the expertise to give girls and young women the tools they need to empower themselves and assume their rightful role as leaders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the remarkable impact that 106 years of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America have had on life in the United States, our communities, and our world; and

(2) joins the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in ensuring that all girls get the support and tools they need to succeed and become the future leaders of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have 12 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “Rebuilding Infrastructure in America: Investing in Next Generation Broadband.”

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “The Agriculture Creates Real Employment (ACRE) Act.”

THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 4:05 p.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, Frank T. Brogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, and Mark Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Institute of Education Science, both of the Department of Education, Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and other pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “Opioids in Indian Country: Beyond the Crisis to Healing the Community.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “See Something, Say Something, Oversight of the Parkland Shooting and Legislative Proposals to Improve School Safety.”

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, after the first vote to conduct a hearing on S. 526, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, S. 791, to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, S. 1538, to amend the Small Business Act to establish awareness of, and technical assistance for, the creation of employee stock ownership plans, S. 1961, to amend the Small Business Act to temporarily reauthorize certain pilot programs under the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, S. 1995, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, S. 2283, to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management within the Small Business Administration, S. 2419, to amend the Small Business Act to

improve the technical and business assistance services under the SBIR and STTR programs, S. 2527, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies, and the nominations of David Christian Tryon, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, and Hannibal Ware, of the Virgin Islands, to be Inspector General, both of the Small Business Administration.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a joint hearing.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SOLVENCY OF MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

The Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCE

The Subcommittee on Strategic Force of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

The Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Somalia's Current Security and Stability Status."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

The Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy and Environmental Policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Why Food Security Matters."

RECOGNIZING THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON ITS 106TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 436, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 436) recognizing the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on its 106th birthday and affirming the importance of leadership development for girls.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 436) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ELIMINATING GOVERNMENT- FUNDED OIL-PAINTING ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 188.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 188) entitled "An Act to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government," do pass with amendments.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDWARD T. SCHAFER AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2154 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2154) to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2154) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, March 15; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, H.R. 1865.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 15, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate on March 8, 2018:

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 47:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. CHARLES W. RAY

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 14, 2018:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

JEFFREY DEWIT, OF ARIZONA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 14, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 14, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

EDINA GIRLS HOCKEY CHAMPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Edina High School girls hockey team for winning the State hockey championship, their second consecutive championship they have won in a row.

The bar was set high for the girls from Edina after last year's championship win, but they proved to be up to the challenge. Impressive wins over Brainerd/Little Falls and Eden Prairie were a prelude to a showdown in the finals with the Centennial Cougars, who, in December, defeated Edina in one of only two losses they suffered all season.

There is no doubt the game was tense, and the teams entered the third period tied at 1. It was there in the third that the Hornets snuck one past Centennial's defense. Edina never looked back, holding a 2 to 1 lead until time expired.

Mr. Speaker, the hard work and determination of these student athletes

is impressive. Congratulations again to the players, the coaches, the fans, and the parents on winning the State championship. The entire community is proud of their effort.

CONGRATULATIONS, MERCY HOSPITAL

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mercy Hospital in Coon Rapids for being honored with the 2018 Distinguished Hospital Award for Clinical Excellence from Healthgrades.

Healthgrades measures hospitals across the country and awards this honor only to hospitals that achieve outstanding patient outcomes. Patients treated in these facilities achieve better clinical results than 95 percent of hospitals across the country, and that means that more of Mercy's patients make it home to their families healthy and free of complications.

In addition to the Distinguished Hospital Award, Mercy Hospital also earned recognition for its quality critical care, gastrointestinal care, and general surgery. Patients who have treatments or surgeries in these areas have a lower risk of mortality and also of experiencing a complication during their treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the many doctors and nurses and staff who support Mercy Hospital work hard to provide world-class care to their patients, and I am really pleased to see them recognized for their dedication and their diligence. Patients in our community can be confident that they are receiving the highest quality of care.

MINNETONKA HOCKEY CHAMPS

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Minnetonka High School boys hockey team on winning the State championship title, their first State championship in program history.

Minnetonka claimed their title with an impressive 5 to 2 victory over Duluth East in front of 18,000 fans in the Xcel Energy Center. Duluth East was on the board first with a goal early in the first period, but the Skippers came back to tie the game, scored a second goal in short order, and never trailed for the remainder of the game.

Mr. Speaker, the road to the championship is not easy, and these student athletes also had to balance their time in the classroom with their sports and training schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Coach Sean Goldsworthy for bringing the team to a State championship in his inaugural season as head coach, and to all of the players, families, and friends of the Minnetonka High School boys hockey team.

PRECISION MEDICINE

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to support the Increasing Access to Precision Medicine Act, legislation that I am coauthoring with my colleague Congressman SWALWELL.

Precision medicine is care that is tailored to a specific patient's genetics, environment, and lifestyle, an emerging field that is showing tremendous promise. It gives providers a better ability to diagnose and treat genetic disorders like cancer, and it helps identify individuals at risk of disease.

Precision medicine also allows providers to reduce healthcare costs and improve outcomes for their patients through better testing and analysis, but today, many of these tests are not covered by insurance providers.

Our bill will have the Department of Health and Human Services and the National Academy of Medicine study the effects and cost savings of precision medicine and offer suggestions for ways to cover the costs of genetic and genomic tests for Medicaid beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, the Increasing Access to Precision Medicine Act will increase the quality of care while finding ways to lower costs for patients.

WE NEED A BUDGET THAT INCLUDES THE DREAM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 5 of last year, the day after Labor Day, the temperature was 86 degrees in Washington, D.C., so that was a long time ago. On that date, President Trump and his henchmen announced that they were killing the DACA program.

The next day, meeting with my Democratic colleagues, I said I would not support any spending or budget bills that didn't include a Dream Act or some other serious attempt to put Dreamers with DACA in a safe place. That was 6 months ago, and we are right back where we started.

The Republicans have a bill to cut legal immigration and abandon the Dreamers in some semilegal limbo, and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee had a press conference about it yesterday and is touting his bill as the last chance to get something done about DACA.

No, this will not resolve DACA. We will not support it in exchange for it.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

What the chairman did not mention is that his bill is actually about something else: it is about changing the racial makeup of America's immigrants so that more of them are White and fewer of them are from countries in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and Latin America.

Analysis by the Center for Global Development of Goodlatte's proposal states the following: "Hispanic and Black immigrants would be roughly twice as likely to be barred by the immigration cuts as white immigrants."

The legal immigration cuts would bar the majority of Muslim and Catholic immigrants from coming legally to the United States of America.

While the President keeps saying that he wants a better class of immigrants coming to America, the cuts would actually substantially reduce the number of university graduate immigrants.

The Goodlatte bill would expand some work visas, but we would only add one university graduate for every seven workers removed by eliminating the family visas and diversity visas.

Now, tell me, how does cutting out hardworking immigrants and guaranteeing that the only available avenue to come and work in America is an illegal one, how does that protect Dreamers? It doesn't.

We are once again chasing bad policies down a rabbit hole, because the real agenda on the other side of the aisle is to leverage the national concern over the plight of Dreamers into a radical reordering of legal immigration to make it whiter.

Sorry. That is not the agenda of my party and, frankly, not the agenda of my fellow Americans. So, with more than 80 of my colleagues, we will release a letter today at a press conference we wrote to the leaders of both parties in the House and the House appropriators. It echoes what I started saying 6 months ago: we need a budget or spending measure that includes the Dream Act, a clean Dream Act, and that is it.

This week or next week, we all know we need to pass a budget to keep the government open, and Democrats are clear: our country, our Congress, and our leaders need to figure out how Dreamers get to live in the country they grew up in, the country they love, the country that has invested so much in them and received so much from them.

Don't be lulled into a false sense of security. The Federal courts didn't settle this or give us a permanent solution. They just gave a lot of lawmakers a convenient excuse for inaction.

I am not buying it and neither should you, because also in the spending bill there are likely to be billions of dollars for deportation, detention, breaking up families, and breaking down doors in neighborhoods across the country.

That is why our letter says we do not only want a clean Dream Act included in the omnibus, but we want to reduce funding appropriated to DHS' detention and deportation machine, specifically funding for detention beds, deportation agents operating under ICE or CBP, and an end to border militarization.

We oppose any funding that expands the construction of walls or fencing at the southern border. We should, instead, allocate border security resources to modernize the infrastructure and technology at our ports of entry, which would actually benefit our country and our economy.

Mr. Speaker, 6 months after Donald Trump and Jeff Sessions instigated this crisis by proclaiming their desire to deport Dreamers and kicking their safety and security in our Nation to this do-nothing Congress, we now have what could be the last opportunity to actually take permanent legislative action.

Do not be distracted by the President's nativist agenda or the bills in Congress that seek to implement his nationalist view. Do not give up on taking action that is serious and will actually protect Dreamers and the communities that they live in, and do not allow the deportation and family destruction machine to thrive and grow on our watch.

We must take a stand right here, right now, and stand up for what is right and what is beneficial for our Nation. I am proud to stand with the majority of Americans and 83 colleagues who have joined me on this letter. The time is now.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 83 Members to House leadership and appropriators.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NITA LOWEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, LEADER PELOSI, CHAIRMAN FRELINGHUYSEN, AND RANKING MEMBER LOWEY: With the newest government funding deadline on March 23, 2018 looming, tens of thousands of Dreamers continue to lose their protection from deportation since President Trump rescinded the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program on September 5, 2017. And while numerous stopgap measures to fund the government have been enacted since September of last year, zero legislative action has been taken to protect Dreamers permanently. Congress is long overdue in acting on this issue, and the failure to pass the Dream Act has resulted in countless lives put in peril. Meanwhile the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) tears families apart by tar-

geting Dreamers, long-term residents, asylum-seekers, families and children for detention and deportation. As the negotiations for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 Omnibus Appropriations bill are ongoing, we urge you to:

(1) include the bipartisan Dream Act;
(2) reduce funding appropriated to DHS's detention and deportation machine, specifically funding for detention beds, deportation agents operating under Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and border militarization; and

(3) oppose any funding that expands the construction of walls or fencing at the southern border, and to instead allocate border security resources to modernize the infrastructure and technology at our ports of entry.

The appropriations for ICE and CBP have come at significant, detrimental cost to our communities throughout the country because all immigrants are in the crosshairs of the Trump Administration's mass deportation agenda. When agents for both ICE and CBP operate without any discretion or regard to length of residence in the U.S. and deep ties in our communities, the fear and mistrust in our neighborhoods is heightened. It is an abuse of ICE and CBP funds to rip fathers from U.S. citizen children and tear severely ill children or young infants from their parents' arms. Now more than ever, we cannot fund the detention and deportation of valued members of our communities on the border and in the interior and vulnerable individuals and families seeking refuge in our country, especially when the key components of DHS that enforce our nation's immigration laws operate with negligible oversight.

As Congressional leaders, we must exercise our powers responsibly to protect the Dreamers through legislative action and to wield our power of the purse to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security does not make immigrant families and communities casualties of a reckless, indiscriminate detention and deportation machine.

Sincerely,

Luis V. Gutiérrez; Adriano Espallat; Raúl M. Grijalva; Jerrold Nadler; Zoe Lofgren; Michelle Lujan Grisham; Judy Chu; Joe Crowley; Jan Schakowsky; José E. Serrano; Steve Cohen; Eliot L. Engel; Ted Deutch; Dina Titus; Nydia M. Velázquez; Lloyd Doggett; Carolyn B. Maloney; Linda T. Sánchez; Gene Green; Paul D. Tonko; Alcee L. Hastings.

Al Green; Albio Sires; Peter Welch; Barbara Lee; Adam Smith; Keith Ellison; Gwen Moore; Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr.; Ben Ray Lujan; Maxine Waters; Bobby L. Rush; Elijah Cummings; Danny K. Davis; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Yvette D. Clarke; Robert A. Brady; Hakeem S. Jeffries; Grace F. Napolitano; Jared Polis; Norma J. Torres; Juan Vargas; Bonnie Watson Coleman.

Donald Norcross; Tony Cardenas; Kathleen M. Rice; Mark Pocan; Mark Takano; Darren Soto; Michael E. Capuano; Ed Perlmutter; Nanette Diaz Barragan; Grace Meng; Robin L. Kelly; Jimmy Gomez; Bill Foster; Joaquin Castro; Ruben Gallego; Brenda L. Lawrence; Robert C. "Bobby" Scott; Brendan F. Boyle; Donald S. Beyer, Jr.; Earl Blumenauer; Dwight Evans.

J. Luis Correa; Pramila Jayapal; Ro Khanna; Suzanne Bonamici; James P. McGovern; Joseph P. Kennedy, III; Jamie Raskin; Colleen Hanabusa; Jacky Rosen; John Lewis; Mark DeSaulnier; Val Butler Demings; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Ted W. Lieu; Alma S. Adams, Ph.D.; Salud O. Carbajal; Donald M. Payne, Jr.; John Yarmuth; Alan Lowenthal.

CELEBRATING PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week our Nation celebrates Public Schools Week. It is a time when we acknowledge the diversity and success of our public schools and the sound education that they provide.

Strengthening America's public schools is the best way to ensure our children's future success and our country's prosperity. Ninety percent of American children attend public schools.

This week, supporters across the country will share stories of the many students, schools, and professionals who make public schools such a vital component of our communities. This includes parents who are working hard to improve educational outcomes for children. Advocates nationwide will share scores of stories about public school students and their successes.

Mr. Speaker, public school teachers truly make a difference in the lives of our students. They prepare them for a bright and successful future. It is their dedication to our students that builds strong public schools and, therefore, strong communities.

As a senior member of the Education and the Workforce Committee and a product of public schools, I know the incredible role our schools play in communities across the Nation. Public schools today have much good news to share, from increasing graduation rates and reduced dropout rates to improved ratings given by communities on school performance.

In fact, public school graduation rates have risen from 79 percent in 2010–2011 to 83 percent in 2014–2015. This increase of the measured 5 years reflects that four out of five public school students receive a regular high school diploma within 4 years of starting ninth grade.

While the graduation rates varies among States, 34 States have reported graduation rates between 80 and 89 percent, with the highest being 91 percent in Iowa, followed by 90 percent in New Jersey. Based on data from the current population survey, the dropout rate has steadily decreased, from 10.9 percent in 2000 to 7.4 percent in 2010 and 5.9 percent in 2015.

Last year, 69 percent of recent high school graduates enrolled in a 2-year or 4-year college.

We are making progress, but we can do more.

In many communities, the school district is the largest employer. Teachers, busdrivers, administrators, cafeteria workers, coaches, and facilities management all depend on the school district, and all of these jobs contribute

to the fabric of a community. Communities are stronger and schools are better when we all work together to support public education.

Public schools also make sure our kids receive at least one nutritious meal a day. More than 30 million school lunches are served each day, including 20 million free and 2 million reduced price lunches. For some students, it may be the only meal they receive will be the one at school.

Mr. Speaker, a child's opportunity for success should not be left to chance. Every child needs a quality, well-equipped school right in their neighborhood where they can learn, be inspired, and thrive.

Public education has always been the great equalizer in the United States, and I am grateful for the contributions of our public schools. I know that, together, we will continue to work to strengthen them for our most precious resource: our children.

Happy Public Schools Week.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today, thousands of students across the Nation are walking out of their schools to demand real action to end the tragedy of gun violence. Young men and women across the country—children, really—from coast to coast and in the heartland of America are standing up and speaking out for change. Members of Congress will meet some of them on the west front lawn to join them in saying this: Enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for his extraordinary leadership, whether it is with the students, with legislation on the floor, or in the community at large to help make the difference.

□ 1015

Here we are, community after community, reeling from the horror of gun violence, perpetrated against our children, our families.

Our hearts ache for those in Orlando, San Bernardino, Mother Emanuel Church, Las Vegas, Sutherland Springs, Parkland, Newtown. The list is a very long one, and it is, in addition, on the streets and in the homes across our country.

There has been too much violence and too much pain. This should not be a political issue. The American people overwhelmingly want action. A full 97 percent of Americans support requiring background checks for all gun buys, including 97 percent of gun owners. There is a commonsense, bipartisan path forward in the Congress. We can take action today on comprehensive background checks without the dangerous

Concealed Carry Reciprocity bill, allowing the CDC to study gun violence, and gun violence restraining orders that empower law enforcement to intervene when someone is a threat to themselves or others.

We should all be listening to the American people on both sides of the aisle, and we should allow the House to vote on bipartisan gun violence solutions. The families and students suffering from the heartbreak of gun violence deserve real leadership in this body, not a Republican White House and Congress that are saying one thing and doing another. It is deeply disappointing that, just days after embracing the need for commonsense, bipartisan gun violence prevention, still we have nothing coming forward.

House Democrats have filed discharge petitions to force votes on the Thompson-King bipartisan background check bill with 200 cosponsors. Two hundred cosponsors for a background check bill. That is a start. That is remarkable. And also the Background Check Completion Act. Democrats will continue to press for bipartisan progress to reduce the epidemic of gun violence in our Nation.

Let me say, as we go out in a little bit to join the students who are doing their walkout across the country, an enormous thank-you to them. An enormous thank-you to them. While we have sympathy for everyone who has loss of life because of gun violence across the country—they are always in our prayers, in our thoughts, and in our determination to make a difference—the eloquence, the courage, the determination of these young people in Florida to come forward in such an eloquent and articulate way. They have been on the other side of a gun. That shouldn't happen to our children.

So while we all respect the Second Amendment and what that means for our country, and while we all want to do something very important, we must listen. And what the kids are doing is on top of a lot of positive action taken by the Bradys, taken by every town, taken by our former colleague Gabby Giffords and her initiative, The Promise of Newtown, and all over the country. So much activity has happened, and now it has hopefully culminated at a place where the children, with how savvy they are about social media and the rest, identifying with each other across the country, will be the tipping point that will make the difference to make our country safer.

We thank them for what they are doing, for their leadership. We also thank them for taking their grief and turning it into action to save lives. And to remember how important, in all of this, the vote is.

And so I say to my colleagues, there isn't one of us in here whose political survival compares in the slightest bit to the survival of our children. These

kids have the courage to come forward. We have to have the courage to vote and take action to save lives. Ninety-five percent of the American people support us supporting legislation to do just that.

As we pray and have our moments of silence, let's act upon those sentiments with real action, again, to make a difference. Again, I salute the kids, the young people. I look forward to seeing them on the steps outside on the west lawn. We will gather in the rotunda. All Members are invited to gather in the rotunda, to go outside and associate ourselves and sing the praises of these young people for their courage.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MIKE MABIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a man who touched so many lives in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Mike Mabin, a lifelong resident of lower Bucks County, Pennsylvania, was a man who took immense pride in his community and selflessly gave back to it every chance he could. A successful businessman, Mike was the president and CEO of PennFab, Inc., in Bucks County. And as a member of the St. Mary Hospital Advisory Board and the vice chairman of the Bucks County Industrial Development Authority, Mike cared deeply about and worked tirelessly for all of his neighbors in our community.

A proud veteran of the U.S. Coast Guard, Mike was proud to be an American and deeply valued service to country. His advocacy was instrumental in making sure that Congress passed the Fairness to Veterans Act, as he wanted to make sure that all those who courageously served our Nation were given opportunities here back home.

I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in sending our deepest condolences to Mike's wife, Marion, along with his children: Heather, Michael, and Jillian. May they take comfort in knowing that Mike made a positive and significant difference in so many lives, and he will be remembered for his patriotism, his loyalty, and his friendship.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are so many important issues and such little time, but today I want to stand in solidarity with my colleagues, with parents, with students, and with Americans across the

country who are calling for action to address the crisis of gun control.

Over the weekend, I had the opportunity to connect with nearly 150 students and their parents in my district at a townhall meeting. I listened to their personal worries and worst fears. I heard their thoughts and the solutions they want decisionmakers here in Washington to consider. I felt the emotional strain of wondering if their own classrooms were safe.

Above all else, I heard the question: Why? Why can't we limit access to military-style weapons specifically built to maximize damage? Why can't we improve the background check process? Why won't Congress act? Why? Why?

The President recently set forth a series of empty proposals that continue our practice of shrinking away from these questions. Arming teachers, school personnel, and volunteers is dangerous, ill-conceived, and does nothing to solve the problems we have with gun violence. To keep our children safe, we need fewer guns, not more.

And in backing away from his initial pledge to limit access, the President again prioritized the interests of the National Rifle Association over the pleas of countless students, teachers, and parents. In fact, he is the one who has demonstrated that he is afraid of the NRA.

The wish for safe spaces to learn was clear in the comments I heard from my constituents on Saturday: young people who want to walk through the hallways of their schools feeling nurtured instead of afraid. Stashing pistols in their teachers' desks will not bring them that feeling.

If the administration or the leaders controlling what we debate here on the floor of Congress were actually interested in protecting our schools, we would be debating legislation to strengthen background checks, we would be working on increasing the firearms purchasing act to the age of 21, we would be banning assault rifles, we would be limiting and tracking excessive ammunition purchases, and much, much more.

There are bills in our hopper to do all of these things. They are ready, and they are waiting for debate, including my own bill. All we need is for the Speaker of this House to show the will, determination, and courage to put young lives ahead of the gun lobby.

While much of my townhall meeting was centered on anxiety and fear, I left the event filled with an overwhelming sense of pride and hope, pride in a generation of future leaders who have endured an endless and unbearable stream of school shootings and are stepping up to the plate to hold their leaders accountable. Some of these students were born at a time when that is all they have seen in their lifetime are these mass killings at schools.

I hope that we can finally agree on a path of action and their voices will be heard. I will continue to lift these voices here with my colleagues and fight with them for action and change because that is what a better deal is for all Americans.

REMEMBERING PEARSE LYONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of Dr. Pearse Lyons of Lexington, Kentucky, who passed away on Thursday of last week at the age of 73.

Dr. Lyons was a pioneer, the ultimate dreamer and innovator, a larger-than-life contributor to human progress, and his legacy will forever be remembered. Dr. Lyons, originally from Ireland, is truly the embodiment of the American Dream. He came to the United States in the late 1970s and launched his own business in Lexington in 1980, named after the initials of his daughter, Aoife. Alltech was founded with an initial investment of just \$10,000.

Today, Alltech is a multibillion-dollar international business with operations in animal feed, meat, brewing, and distilling with more than 5,000 employees worldwide. Dr. Lyons was honored as the Business Person of the Year by Business and Finance magazine. He received the Ireland-U.S. Council Award for Outstanding Achievement, and Irish Prime Minister Enda Kenny recognized him with a St. Patrick's Day Science Medal in recognition of creating a global business based on scientific research.

As impressive if not more so is the impact Dr. Lyons and Alltech have had on Kentucky and, in particular, central Kentucky. Dr. Lyons was the driving force behind bringing the Alltech 2010 World Equestrian Games to Lexington, the first time the games had been held outside of Europe. Due to Dr. Lyons' vision and drive, the 2010 Lexington Games were considered to be the most successful in the event's history.

Dr. Lyons also established ONE: the Alltech Ideas Conference, which has been held in Lexington for more than three decades. The conference is now the city's largest annual room booking, attracting nearly 4,000 attendees from over 70 countries to the bluegrass. It is often said that through the World Equestrian Games and the Alltech Ideas Conference that Dr. Lyons brought the world to Lexington. This is undeniably true, but it is also true that he brought Kentucky to the world.

In addition to its animal feed and agricultural products, Alltech reopened the Lexington Brewing Company in 1999 and launched Kentucky Ale, which can now be purchased across the United States and in many countries

across the world. Alltech also opened the Town Branch Distillery in Lexington, which produces a line of spirits including its signature Town Branch Kentucky Bourbon.

He and his beloved wife, Deirdre, have also given back directly to many causes. Dr. and Mrs. Lyons built more than a dozen state-of-the-art science labs in primary schools in Kentucky and in Ireland. They also established the Alltech Young Scientist program, the largest global agriscience competition for university students, and the Alltech Vocal Scholarship Competition awards for more than half a million dollars in scholarships annually to promising young vocalists.

On a personal note, I will miss Pearse's friendship; his kindness to me and my family; and his extraordinary ideas, passion, and vision. I will never forget the time that I went to the Nicholasville headquarters of Alltech, where Dr. Lyons educated me about how world population growth would put immense pressure on food production requirements and how Alltech scientists were investigating and developing nutritional and agricultural products and techniques to meet the future food needs of the human race.

The problem and challenge he described was daunting, but with that infectious smile and with a sparkle in his eye, this innovator told me that there was no limit to what we could do and no limit to what Alltech could do. Pearse was a dreamer, and he also lived life to the fullest. I will always cherish and remember those Alltech ONE conferences where he stood in front of 4,000 people from 70 different countries in Kentucky with the Kentucky Bourbon and the Kentucky Ale and he sang "Molly Malone" in honor of his home country.

My wife, Carol, and I extend our deepest condolences to Deirdre; their two children, Aoife and Mark, with whom I grew up; the extended Lyons family; Alltech and its many employees; and all those touched by Dr. Lyons.

Pearse Lyons loved his family, both his own family and his Alltech family. He loved music. He loved science and innovation. He loved his native home of Ireland. He loved America. And he loved Kentucky.

And for all of his achievements, for his contributions to science and human progress, his philanthropy, and the mark he left on Kentucky, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in honoring the extraordinary life and work of Dr. Pearse Lyons.

□ 1030

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans and the students who are walking out today and who are saying enough is enough for the gun violence in America.

Seventeen families in Parkland, Florida, are living a nightmare, and our hearts ache for them and the Parkland community. They join a growing club of grieving families all over this Nation because their loved ones were massacred in a place we expected to be safe: a concert in Nevada, a nightclub in Florida, a college in Virginia, an elementary school in Connecticut, a church in Texas, a McDonald's in California. The list goes on.

Last year there were 346 mass shootings in this country, making it the deadliest year of mass killings in a decade. Ninety Americans a day are killed by gun violence. These are not just statistics. Ninety Americans a day means 33,000 grieving families, heartbroken families who lose a child, a parent, in a click of a trigger.

We have had enough thoughts and prayers for grieving parents and enough thanks for the first responders that answer the call. The time now is for action.

I want to especially thank the young people in south Florida and now across the Nation for their courage, their passion, and persistence.

Students today are demanding we do more than shed a tear and wring our hands saying it is too complicated. Students are walking out today because they know there are too many guns in the hands of the wrong people; too many guns on the street that are made for war, not for civil society. They know that is why we should ban the sale of assault rifles and high-capacity magazines and bump stock devices, expand our background check laws, and reinstate Federal funding for gun research. There is not just one solution, but it is not so complicated that we do nothing.

So today I am going to join America's students and I will be walking out because Americans deserve a better deal, and because enough is enough.

GUN VIOLENCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the courageous students in Sacramento, California, and across America who are saying enough with this country's epidemic of gun violence.

Last week, I held a gun violence prevention student townhall in my district, and we were fortunate enough to be joined remotely by Skype by two students from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida: Adam Alhanti and John Barnitt.

They inspired us all with their dedication to a future without a fear of gun violence.

The students that filled the auditorium of Kennedy High School in Sacramento to listen to Adam and John were fully informed, passionate, and focused on the future. They wanted to know how we can enforce stronger background checks, ban assault weapons, change a culture of guns in this country, and how they can amplify their voices.

After hearing their thoughts and questions, I know one thing for sure: these amazing young people are not going to back down from achieving progress on this issue. I believe it would be incumbent upon all of us to listen to their voices. They are the voices of the future.

As Adam from Parkland said during our townhall, this issue of gun violence affects all of us. No one wants to live in fear about going to school, work, the movies, church, a concert, or just walking on the street; so no one can afford to sit on the sidelines and do nothing to reform gun laws in this country. We owe it to these students, to our children, our grandchildren, and all future generations to come together and take action on commonsense legislation.

Many of the things we want to see reformed are largely supported by the American people. In fact, one high school student in Sacramento pointed out to me that policies like universal background checks have widespread support from the public. It is true. Polls indicate that over 90 percent of the American people support stronger background checks.

Under current Federal law, people who purchase firearms at a gun show, through classified ads, or on the internet bypass a background check. There is no excuse not to act to close those dangerous loopholes.

It is our job to represent and act on the will of the citizens of this country. We can by voting on solutions like the bipartisan Thompson-King legislation that would expand and strengthen the current background check system. Yet another week in Congress and here we find ourselves without a vote on real gun violence reform legislation.

At one point during my townhall last Friday, Adam from Parkland said: "We are heard. There is no more, 'Can we be heard?' It is now. People hear us. They ask, 'What's next?'"

These young people are rightfully going to keep up their demands until we make significant reforms that make a lasting impact. I ask my Republican colleagues to not only listen to these students, but to also take meaningful action to address the gun violence epidemic in this country. Words are not enough. We must move forward.

THE DO-NOTHING REPUBLICAN CONGRESS IS MISSING IN ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 month ago, 14 innocent students and 3 innocent teachers were massacred at a high school in Parkland, Florida.

We are in the midst of a gun violence epidemic in this country; mass shooting after mass shooting after mass shooting; massacre in the workplace in San Bernardino, California; massacre at a nightclub in Orlando, Florida; massacre at a concert in Las Vegas, Nevada; massacre in churches down in Charleston, South Carolina and in Texas; massacre in schools, in Newtown, Connecticut, and Parkland, Florida.

We are in the midst of a gun violence epidemic in this country, yet the do-nothing Republican Congress is missing in action.

The overwhelming majority of the American people support universal background checks. The overwhelming majority of the American people support limiting access to weapons of war. The overwhelming majority of the American people support raising the age of purchase from 18 to 21. Yet the do-nothing Republican Congress is missing in action.

Our students should be able to go to school and focus on reading, writing, and arithmetic; but, instead, they are often in school with their hands in the air, participating in active shooting drills. Yet the do-nothing Republican Congress is missing in action.

All throughout the country today, tens of thousands of students in blue States and red States; students in urban America, rural America, and suburban America; students in the North, the South, the East, and the West, are walking out of class for 17 minutes to demand that Congress pass commonsense gun violence prevention legislation.

I salute your courage. I salute your conviction. I salute your determination to make a difference.

The students of this great country have stepped up. Now it is time for Congress to do the same. It is time for Congress to choose. We can either stand with the students, or you can stand with the NRA. History will judge us all.

The students of this country are being cut down in the classroom in cold blood, yet the do-nothing Republican Congress is missing in action.

We don't work for the NRA. We don't work for the gun manufacturers. We don't work for the merchants of death. We work for the American people, and it is time for us to finally address the gun violence epidemic in America.

Enough is enough. The American people deserve a better deal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to direct their

remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

WE NEED RESPONSIBLE GUN SAFETY LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago today, a man brutally murdered 17 children and educators in Parkland, Florida. He killed these innocent people using a semiautomatic, assault-style weapon. These weapons, designed for the battlefield, are easily available across this country.

It has been 19 years since the Columbine school shooting. That massacre shocked America. Our country debated that shooting and the causes for months, for years. But in what has become an all-too-familiar pattern, Congress did nothing to address the factor that makes these massacres so deadly, the easy access to guns.

You see, after Columbine, the gun lobby knew that they were in trouble, so they put a whole lot of time and a whole lot of money into confusing the issue. They said: "It's not guns. It's bullying. It's not guns. It's the lack of school security. It's not guns. It's our violent culture, music, and video games."

Well, other countries have all of these things, but other countries do not have mass shootings like ours because other countries have responsible gun safety laws.

Today, 1 month after the Parkland shooting, we are, once again, discussing guns. Today, as after Columbine, the gun lobby knows that they are in trouble because this time these children who survived the Parkland shooting are not trying to return to the way life was before the shooting. They are taking a stand. And, yes, we do stand with them.

See, these children believe that they can change the world. They should, and they are. I mean, after all, isn't that what we taught them: that when they see something wrong, they do something about it?

So the gun lobby is going back to their same old tactics: It is not guns; it is the fact that the teachers don't have guns.

□ 1045

How surprising that the gun lobby solution to school shootings is to buy more guns. But as a former law enforcement officer who has been trained in active shooter situations, I can tell you that arming teachers is a dangerous and disturbing idea. We should prevent mass shootings and not complicate them.

I can tell you that having multiple armed individuals present in an active shooter situation only complicates the response. Arming teachers would lead

to taxpayer-sponsored shootouts, endangering outscaled and outgunned teachers, putting our children at risk.

We already ask our overworked and underpaid teachers to do too much. A national survey of teachers found that, if offered the choice to carry a firearm, most would refuse. Many have said they would quit.

The solution to gun violence is not shootouts between teachers and school shooters. Instead, we can finally take serious but real measures addressing gun safety.

We should stop this absurd idea before it becomes reality. Congress should move swiftly to prevent the administration from shifting tax dollars meant for antiterrorism programs to buying guns for teachers. I had hoped to incorporate this commonsense idea in a bill scheduled to come before the Homeland Security Committee last week, but I was blocked for doing so, and that is why, last night, I introduced a new bill to put the idea into law. Money for fighting terrorism should stay where it is, and our teachers should be allowed to teach.

We saw that in my own congressional district in Orlando, Florida, the result of lack of action where 49 people were killed and 58 still suffer life-changing injuries when they were gunned down in a nightclub. See, everybody, living in a country that we say is the greatest country in the world should have the right to go to church, to go to school, to go to a mall, to go to a movie theater without being gunned down.

Mr. Speaker, we should take action after this shooting and do our jobs to protect our children and serve our communities.

TAKING A HARD LOOK AT GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning because the camera of history is rolling. It is rolling and it is recording. It is recording the fact that the NRA continues to distort the meaning of the Second Amendment, that the NRA continues to incite its members with propaganda and then threatens my Republican colleagues, and that my Republican colleagues, in fear, hover down to their wishes and do nothing to prevent mass shootings in the United States of America.

The camera of history is rolling, Mr. Speaker, and the camera will record the fact that we have a President of the United States who believes in reality TV shows. In fact, he had an open press reality show-type meeting where he made big promises of improving gun safety. The President declared, in that meeting, that Republican lawmakers are so scared of the NRA. He said that

and admitted that the Republican lawmakers are scared of the NRA, but he said that he was not.

Then, just a short time thereafter, what did he do? He didn't have an open show meeting with the NRA. He didn't want the American public to see how he hovered down and gave in to the wishes of the NRA. It wasn't an open press meeting.

If he was so strongly against the NRA or could stand up to them, he should have had a meeting in the Oval Office and had the same press coverage so that we could hear what he was saying to them and they were saying to him. But all we know is what the results were.

The results were that, after he had this behind closed doors meeting with NRA, he didn't come out so strong anymore. He started to back down. He started to say—well, he was so strong about, hey, it didn't make sense about 18 to buy a gun, 18 to 21. That was not in his plans anymore. We saw that he had changed his whole demeanor. Something took place.

We say, Mr. President, if you are not afraid of the NRA, then you do an open meeting with the NRA with the same press as you have done with Members of Congress.

This is the 30th day since we have had that terrible shooting in Florida, and we have got young people now outside who are saying enough is enough. Some think young people don't have an effect on American history and the camera. Well, I dare say to you, I can recall a young person who was only about 17 years old who stood bravely and took beatings to say he wanted America to go in a different direction. That young man is now a Member of Congress and someone whom we admire. He goes by the name of JOHN LEWIS. He was only 16, 17 years old, and it changed America.

And I dare say, there are some 16- and 17-year-olds who are outside today who will change America and make it a better place, and we need to join them. We have got to stop the kinds of letters that I have been receiving in my office.

I have been receiving letters from individuals from the Jack and Jill Association, a large association of young people who want a better America, one named Jeremy Chavez, who said: "My mother has been forced to discuss with me my fear of safety while at school in light of the mass murder of children our age in a place that should be a safe haven for our education."

This is a conversation that neither Jeremy's mother nor any mother should need to have. Yet, with 7,000 innocent children killed since Sandy Hook in 2012, it is one that parents across America are forced to have with their children.

Parents have to instruct their kids to hide under the desk as I did as a child when I was afraid or we were afraid of

a nuclear weapon when we were in the arms war. We used to have to have shelter drills. Here we are, in 2018, and our children have to have shelter drills because of Americans and others who can come in with an assault rifle and take lives in a matter of seconds.

No, that is not the United States we want. That is not the United States that these young people want to live in, and they will stand and fight and change the course of America.

DEMANDING VOICES BE HEARD ON GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, students from across the Nation, including from my Ninth District in Michigan, are demanding that their voices be heard on the issue of gun violence. They are upset with the carnage they have witnessed. They are fearful for their safety, and they are tired of excuses and inaction.

But 1 month after the tragedy in Parkland, Florida, not to mention so many prior school shootings, Republican leaders in Congress have failed to bring up any legislation that might meaningfully control the weapons that are being used to kill and wound so many Americans. So all of us Democrats are coming here today, many of us. On the Republican side—I am not sure the screen can show—we see empty seats. No bill on assault weapons, no bill on improving background checks, no bill to ban bump stocks, nothing—this is a terrible moment of silence when we desperately need a moment of action.

While there is no single answer to gun violence, any credible response must address the weapons of war that are turning our schools, houses of worship, movie theaters, and concerts into battlefields. Assault weapons with magazines holding 30 bullets are not needed by hunters nor are they required for self-defense. They are killing machines, and increasing numbers of our fellow Americans have become their victims.

Congress must stand up to the NRA and say, "Enough." Even President Trump called out Republican Members of Congress for being too afraid of the NRA to act, saying the NRA has "great power over you people; they have less power over me."

But ever since, President Trump has been backtracking, showing he, too, is more scared of the NRA's political muscle than he is of the public's demand for change. This outcome is depressingly familiar.

Fifty years ago, 1 week after Bobby Kennedy was assassinated, I spoke on the issue of gun violence at Wayne State University. I felt compelled to speak about the myths that the NRA

was spreading regarding any effort toward sensible gun control. In my 1968 speech, I said: "One of the favorite sayings of the NRA and the rest of the gun lobby is that 'guns don't kill people; people kill people.' The figures show the inaccuracy of the statement. The truth is that 'people with guns kill people.'"

This remains as true today as it was 50 years ago, and yet we still remain paralyzed by the NRA. And what is its solution to gun violence? More guns. More guns in the classroom by arming teachers, more guns on the streets through lax concealed carry laws, and more guns crossing State lines by over-riding local laws. In this deranged math, more guns somehow equals less violence.

Grieving parents and terrified students deserve so much better. They are tired of the stonewalling, the diversion, and the deception. They are demanding real action to stop gun violence. Let us act now.

THOUSANDS GATHER TO PROTEST GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARPER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, as we speak, thousands of young people from across the country are gathered outside to protest gun violence and to ask, to beseech, to demand that we take action.

Mr. Speaker, we know what to do. We know that we ought to amend the law to provide effective background checks before people can purchase guns—not just background checks when you purchase from a licensed dealer, but background checks when you purchase a gun anyplace.

We know that we ought to eliminate the 3-day limits so that, if they don't finish the background check within 3 days, you can't get your gun.

We know that we should renew the assault weapons ban that was in effect from 1994 to 2004 so you can't buy military killing machines in this country for civilian use.

We know we ought to ban the high-capacity magazines that can convert guns into killing machines for large numbers of people that have no other purpose. You don't hunt a deer with a high-capacity magazine.

We know we ought to ban bump stocks, and we know the other things we ought to do.

But we are, too many of us, cowards. We quell before the National Rifle Association.

We know the fact is that it is guns in the hands of people that kill people. Compared to every other country in the world, every other industrial country in the world, we stand out like a sore thumb.

If you look at other statistics, this country—Great Britain, 75 people killed by guns in a year; another country, 142. No country is in more than three digits except the United States at 33,000.

They tell it is mental health. The American people do not have mental health rates or lack of mental health 1,000 times or 10 times or 20 times or 40 times more than people in Western Europe or Japan or Australia. You cannot explain a difference of 75 or 150 to 33,000 by mental health.

They tell us we should arm teachers, but we know that trained police officers hit their targets about a third of the time when they fire a gun and, in a gunfight, when the adrenaline is running, 13 percent. If we arm the teachers, we will have more teachers and more students killed.

We have a President who has shown cowardice. He criticized Senator TOOMEY for being afraid of the NRA, and then he, after meeting with the NRA, backed down on everything he said he would do.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we know what to do. We are the only country in the world with the kind of gun murder rates that we have.

The Republicans have opposed all the measures that we ought to take, but the Republicans have a choice. They can continue to be complicit in their repeated slaughter in our schools, in our churches, in our concert halls, and in our streets by continuing their cowardly subservience to the NRA, or they can act to protect us and our children. They know how to do it. They cannot have it both ways. Let's see what they do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1100

IN SUPPORT OF GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the NRA—the NRA—the NRA stands for “No Republican Action.”

It has been a month since 17 children and their teachers were gunned down while at school in Parkland, Florida. It has been more than 5 years since 26 children and their teachers were slaughtered in Sandy Hook.

In both of these instances, the same weapon was used: an AR-15 semiautomatic assault rifle.

And Congress still has taken no action to end gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, there have been more than three dozen moments of silence related to gun violence since the Sandy Hook massacre. There have been zero moments of action.

As those of us who are married or have children know, the silent treat-

ment doesn't work at home. Well, it surely isn't working in Congress. There are dozens of reasonable gun safety bills pending in this esteemed legislature, but the majority party is giving the American people the silent treatment.

NRA: No Republican action.

Meanwhile, between the moments of silence, around 7,000 children have been killed by guns since 2012.

NRA: No Republican action.

Let us take action on Mr. CICILLINE's assault weapon ban to end the flood of new semiautomatic assault weapons onto the streets.

Let us take action on Mr. THOMPSON's bill to strengthen the background checks.

What is the problem with making sure that we check each person's background? Does the NRA say that that is wrong, too?

There is no Republican action.

Let us take action on my Safer Neighborhoods Gun Buyback Act to encourage people to safely, freely make the economic decision to self-disarm and dispose of most of their violent weapons.

Mr. Speaker, the NRA spends tens of millions of dollars in our elections. I received a grade of F. It is the first F that I have ever gotten that I was proud of.

What do the American people get?

They get no Republican action. Let us end the silence of inaction.

GUN VIOLENCE SURVIVORS HELP CHANGE THE DIRECTION OF OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today marks 1 month since the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida; 1 month since we lost 14 students and 3 teachers in yet another senseless act of gun violence; 1 month since the survivors inside those hallways have seen their lives changed forever.

The survivors and the grieving families are not just grieving their loss. They are helping to change the direction of this Congress and the direction of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am leaving from here to go join the thousands of students who have descended upon the Capitol today, whose leadership will help guide the direction of this country, and who understand that 1 month after the horrific shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School—1 month in—and this Congress has failed to act.

There are thousands out there today. There will be hundreds of thousands and millions more in the weeks ahead.

The community that I represent, Mr. Speaker, will not be defined in the future by the tragedy that happened at

Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. It will be defined by the leadership of the student survivors who are inspiring a nation and helping to take us to a place where children can feel safe going to school in the morning and parents can know that when they take their kids to school in the morning, they will be able to pick them up safely at the end of the day.

That is the result of this tragedy. That is what this is going to mean for our country. We are going to follow the lead of these student leaders. They are an inspiration to us. They are an inspiration to all of us, and I am off to join them now.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Pastor Rodney David Cannon, Frostproof Church of God, Frostproof, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Creator God in Heaven, we thank You for this great Nation and for placing us in it for such a time as this. We humbly ask for Your wisdom and guidance in leading as we lay down our titles and take up the servant leader's towel. May we honor You by serving those across the aisle, across the street, and those around the world.

Protect those who are protecting us.

In the name of Your Son, Jesus, who taught us to pray by saying:

Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in Earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING PASTOR RODNEY DAVID CANNON

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome Rodney David Cannon as our congressional guest chaplain today, not only one of our prominent pastors in the district, but also our mayor in Frostproof, Florida.

Born in Kansas, raised in Fort Meade, and having lived all over Polk County, Rodney settled down in his new hometown of Frostproof, where he lives with his wife, Lindsey, and their children.

As a child, Rodney lived in Highland City, Bartow, and eventually Fort Meade, where he graduated high school in 1995. After graduation, Rodney accepted a music scholarship and began his higher education journey. First he attended Brevard Community College, then transferred to Lee University in Cleveland, Tennessee.

Throughout their 15-year marriage, Rodney and Lindsey have lived in various places. Rodney served as a youth pastor in Fort Meade, Winter Haven, Lakeland, Tampa, and Englewood before planting a church in the Daytona area. After 2 years there, the opportunity came for Rodney to become a senior pastor in Frostproof.

It was also in 2015 that Rodney decided to run for city council. He won the seat that year by only 20 votes. In his first city council meeting, he was elected by his peers to serve as vice mayor. During that first year on the council, Rodney was able to save the city residents and businesses hundreds of thousands of dollars by working hard to keep the volunteer fire department open.

In 2016, he was elected to serve as mayor after only 1 year on the council, and the next year, reelected to serve another 1-year term as mayor.

Thank you, Pastor Cannon, for all you do for the Frostproof community.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLORES). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING ATHLETIC TRAINERS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, March is National Athletic Training Month, and I rise today to honor these healthcare professionals who provide care for athletes and patients, soldiers, workers, and performers.

Athletic trainers are committed to providing compassionate care for all in work, life, and sport. Anyone who has been sidelined with an injury can tell you how important their athletic trainer has been in helping them make a full recovery.

Athletic trainers provide medical services to all types of patients, not just athletes participating in sports, and can work in a variety of job settings. They are instrumental in relieving widespread and future workforce shortages in primary care support and outpatient rehab professions, and they provide an unparalleled range of care for the patients. They also improve functional outcomes and specialize in patient education to prevent injury or reinjury.

As a former athlete, therapist, and rehabilitation services manager, I know just how valuable our athletic trainers are, and I thank them for the work they do to care for so many patients in various industries.

SCHOOL SHOOTING BILL

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it has been 1 month since the tragic shooting in Parkland, and today students in Hawaii and all across the country are joining hands and raising their voices to honor the 17 lives lost on that day and the 7,000 children whose lives have been lost since the 2012 shooting at Sandy Hook. They are walking out today to demand action that will help to prevent these horrific tragedies and improve the safety and security of our schools.

Later today, we are going to be voting on a bill that I have cosponsored, the STOP School Violence Act. This bill or any other single bill is not going to solve everything, but it will help prevent school violence by implementing measures developed after Sandy Hook that support training for teachers, students, school personnel, and local law enforcement to better identify early warning signs of violence and increase coordination between schools and local law enforcement.

In addition, we also need to take action on things like closing the gun show and online loopholes and requiring universal background checks for anyone seeking to purchase a gun. These are provisions that have overwhelming bipartisan support both here in Congress and across the country.

The time for action is long overdue. Let's bring these bills to the floor for a vote.

AUSTIN, TEXAS, IS THE NUMBER ONE PLACE TO LIVE IN AMERICA

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize a city in Texas' 25th Congressional District for being named the number one place to live in all of America. That city would be none other than our great State's capital, Austin, Texas.

Cities from all over the Nation are scored based on their job market, their value, quality of life, desirability, and net migration. With a population of almost 2 million people and an additional 50 new residents every single day, Austin is one of the fastest growing cities. It is no wonder Austin secured the number one spot.

In addition to its unleashed economic potential, young families are relocating to central Texas for something they can't get anywhere else: the ability to experience living in a big city with a booming economy that also provides the warmth and friendliness of a small town is what makes Austin one of a kind.

Mom-and-pop shops down the road are able to open their doors, hire more Texans, and pay their employees more due to an overhaul of our Nation's Tax Code. The truth is Austin is just now seeing the fruits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and I am excited to watch Austin continue to thrive because of it.

Texas is the greatest State in America, and Austin is its leadoff hitter.

May God bless Texas. May God bless this great Nation.

IN APPRECIATION OF TERRY MICHALSKE, DIRECTOR OF THE SAVANNAH RIVER NATIONAL LABORATORY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate Dr. Terry Michalske, who is the Executive Vice President and Director of the Department of Energy's Savannah River National Laboratory, located at the Savannah River site in South Carolina's Second Congressional District.

Today is Dr. Michalske's last day as director. I am grateful to thank him for his leadership of this critical national laboratory.

The Savannah River National Laboratory conducts research and development, focusing on legacy waste clean-up, national security, and clean energy. Dr. Michalske has more than 30 years of experience in these fields. He holds seven patents, has authored 90 journal publications, and also collaborated on several books.

Dr. Michalske also coordinates with the Department of Energy to support

the Savannah River site as a leading national laboratory and regional producer of jobs.

Also, congratulations to Dr. Vahid Majidi, who will succeed Dr. Michalske.

As a former staff member at the site myself, I am grateful for the opportunity to represent the Savannah River site in Congress.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Secretary Rex Tillerson for his service, and best wishes for continued success for Secretary of State designate Mike Pompeo.

RECOGNIZING MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week, which is March 11 through 17.

Each year, activists, physicians, and policymakers come together to spread awareness about this disease and to salute the healthcare professionals and researchers who are dedicated to finding treatments and a cure for this debilitating disease.

Since 2008, I have introduced a bipartisan resolution recognizing the goals and ideals of MS Awareness Week. That is H. Res. 176.

MS is an unpredictable and incurable disease that my family and hundreds of thousands of families across our Nation experience every day.

My sister, Mildred, has lived with MS for more than 40 years. Her courage and the courage of 2 million people living with MS around the world inspire my efforts to bring more research for treatment and a cure.

As a member of the House Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee, I promise to continue fighting for increased funding to find a cure, and I hope all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, help us in this effort.

HONORING HEROISM DURING WORLD WAR II

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Granville Crane of Gulfport, Mississippi, and the rest of the crew onboard the USS *Indianapolis* for their acts of heroism during World War II.

The USS *Indianapolis* received secret orders in July of 1945 to proceed to Tinian Island, transiting the Pacific unaccompanied, carrying components of the Little Boy atomic bomb.

Leaving Tinian, a Japanese submarine spotted the *Indianapolis* steaming towards Guam and fired two torpedos, striking and sinking the *Indianapolis* within 12 minutes. Approximately 300 crewmen went down with the ship, and the rest spent the next 3½ days in the water. Of the 1,200 crewmen, there were only 317 survivors.

On behalf of Mr. Granville Crane and the rest of the USS *Indianapolis* crew, I encourage my fellow Members to support H.R. 4107, the USS *Indianapolis* Congressional Gold Medal Act, which honors the crew of the USS *Indianapolis* with Congressional Gold Medals for their important role and dedicated service to our country during World War II.

CALLING FOR ACTION ON GUN SAFETY

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from outside these doors where there are thousands of young people who are calling for action on gun safety.

I marched out with my Democratic colleagues, and I really wish that my Republican friends across the aisle had joined us in this, but I will describe what I saw.

I saw a lot of very, very upset young people who are begging this House and the Senate to make change to protect them. They no longer want to live under this threat.

There was one sign in particular that caught my eye. A young girl was standing there with a sign, quietly, and it said, "Am I next?"

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to ask ourselves that question: Are we next?

They don't want another moment of silence. They want action. They want it now.

I congratulate them for their efforts. When 18-year-olds are leading the country with moral courage, I think it is time for us to respond in kind.

□ 1215

ACTIVIST JUDGES ABUSE THEIR AUTHORITY

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, activist judges have joined liberal Democrats to stop President Trump's policies. Federal trial judges have abused their authority by issuing almost two dozen nationwide injunctions to block the Trump administration's actions. According to Attorney General Jeff Sessions, these injunctions have far exceeded their historic use. In fact,

the number of injunctions surpasses all those approved in the past 200 years.

Nationwide injunctions encourage forum shopping by opponents of the President's policies who file claims in courts with liberal judges. These judges place their personal views and politics above the rule of law. They do a real disservice to the justice system.

It is time to rein in these activist judges. The people's respect for the law is at stake.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BALTASAR CORRADA DEL RIO

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and honor the life of Baltasar Corrada del Rio, Puerto Rico's 13th Resident Commissioner in Congress who passed away this Sunday at 82 years old.

Mr. Corrada del Rio was born and raised in Puerto Rico and was a founding member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. He served in this body from 1977 to 1985. He also served as mayor of San Juan, secretary of State, and associate justice for the Puerto Rico Supreme Court.

Baltasar Corrada del Rio was a true statesman. His career exemplifies the qualities we all seek in our public servants: dedication, honesty, and love of our country. His life will be remembered for his unwavering support for American citizens of Puerto Rico and our quest for equality.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge to continue Baltasar Corrada del Rio's work during my time in Congress and ask the House to join me in expressing condolences to his family and our profound gratitude for his years of service to Puerto Rico and in this Congress.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4545, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION FAIRNESS AND REFORM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1116, TAKING ACCOUNT OF INSTI- TUTIONS WITH LOW OPERATION RISK ACT OF 2017; AND PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4263, REGULATION AT IM- PROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 773 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 773

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4545) to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other

purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1116) to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4263) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. The rule makes in order three bills reported favorably by the Committee on Financial Services. All three bills were the subject of multiple hearings before the Committee on Financial Services. All three bills were reported favorably by a bipartisan majority without amendment. The rule ensures that each of these provisions are fully paid for and makes in order an amendment offered by the Democrat ranking member on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of working with Chairman HENSARLING to bring many Financial Services Committee bills to the floor for debate. I will be here again tomorrow doing the same thing. I am always amazed at how bipartisan these votes are in the Financial Services Committee.

Once again, we have before us today components of the Financial CHOICE Act. As I have already noted, each of these bills received bipartisan support in the committee. I anticipate that these bills will receive a bipartisan vote on the House floor as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to hear that the Senate is working hard toward their own bill overhauling Dodd-Frank. It is about time. The House has already done its work under the leadership of Chairman HENSARLING. We passed the Financial CHOICE Act nearly a year ago. But I certainly understand that the Senate has its own ideas about financial reform.

I would encourage the Senate to look at the roster of bills that we have passed unpacking the CHOICE Act, as they demonstrate a clear bipartisan roadmap to overhauling our financial regulatory reform effort. We continue to provide that roadmap today.

The first bill made in order by this rule is sponsored by my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TIPPON. H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act, is commonsense legislation that I am pleased to cosponsor.

One of the biggest complaints I hear as I travel the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado is how the Federal Government stamps out cookie-cutter regulations without a thought as to how much variation occurs in industries from State to State. For example, how do Washington regulators take into consideration the unique business model of AMG National Trust headquartered in Colorado? Do they

know better than my good friend Earl Wright, who cofounded the bank in 1972, about the banking needs of his customers? Are they able to differentiate between AMG's needs and the needs of a bank in another State or on Wall Street? Typically, the answer is no.

They do not model banking regulations to the particular differences from State to State. But even inside a State there is diversity within industries. The needs of AMG National Trust's customers vary from the needs of other community banks in my district; such as, the Bank of Burlington or Community State Bank, both of which are on the Eastern Plains.

The TAILOR Act solves this problem. It requires regulatory actions to take into account each particular institution's business model and risk profile. Mr. Speaker, this change would be an innovative regulatory reform. It would ensure that overarching goals of accountability to investors and depositors are maintained while providing flexibility in the application of the regulations to each institution.

Independent community banks and credit unions have been hit hard by Dodd-Frank's wrong-headed approach to financial services regulation. In 2016, former Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen said: "... when it comes to bank regulation and supervision, one size does not fit all"—and—"rules and supervisory approaches should be tailored to different types of institutions such as community banks."

The TAILOR Act will do just that. It will reorient our regulatory structure and free up our community lending institutions to increase their investments in our communities, creating jobs and opportunities for Americans.

This rule also makes in order H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act. This regulation was the result of the JOBS Act passed by Congress in 2012. While Regulation A had been around for many years, it caused startups to enter into a cumbersome process for raising money from certain types of investors. The process is so inefficient that most startups avoided it altogether.

Regulation A+ revamped the regulation and raised the amount of money that entrepreneurs could raise in their startup fundraising round. Crucially, it also changed the type of investor who could invest in a startup. Prior to the JOBS Act, essentially only accredited investors could participate in the first fundraising round.

The problem is that, according to research done by Forbes magazine, accredited investors only made up 1 percent of the population, thereby excluding 99 percent of Americans. The JOBS Act changed the regulation to allow nonaccredited investors to participate in a startup's initial fundraising round. Expanding the pool of investors has

proven to be a success, and the Regulation A+ Improvement Act continues reforming this area of investment regulation by further increasing the threshold investment amount. This bill will ensure greater access to capital for entrepreneurs seeking investors in their startup.

Finally, this rule makes in order H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act. This bill establishes deadlines by which certain regulatory decisions must be made and provides for a more transparent appeals process. Under current law, financial institutions may appeal regulatory determinations to an intra-agency appellate process. The Financial Services Committee found during hearings that the appeals process was not as impartial as it was intended to be.

This bill removes the appeals process from the original examining agency and creates an independent examination review director who is able to review regulatory determinations. To ensure timeliness of regulatory reviews, the bill requires the final reports from agencies are completed within 60 days.

The combination of a better appeals process and deadline for agency action gives community financial institutions certainty as a regulator evaluates their practices.

□ 1230

Certainty in the regulatory arena will ensure that lending institutions do not needlessly restrict capital investments due to the unpredictability of a regulatory agency's decisionmaking process.

These three bills continue to advance smart financial regulatory reforms that the Committee on Financial Services has been known for under Chairman HENSARLING. Washington's cookie-cutter approach to regulation hinders investments in Colorado and across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I support these measures, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. This rule provides for the consideration of three bills out of the Financial Services Committee. Before I turn to the bills, I want to talk about the urgent issues that are not scheduled for floor time this week.

Why aren't we debating appropriations bills to keep the government funded through the end of this fiscal year?

Just 2 weeks away from another government shutdown, yet, instead of discussing how we can keep government open through the end of the year, we are debating unrelated bills.

We are halfway through the current fiscal year and we are forcing a month-

after-month crisis of government funding. This is no way to run a government or a business. Agencies need certainty. Our constituents need to know that they can rely on government services and the security of our Nation. We should be discussing appropriation bills now.

In addition, there are over 800,000 DACA recipients, or Dreamers, that don't have any certainty, whose ability to work legally hinges upon a court decision that is on appeal.

In my home State of Colorado, there are over 15,000 Dreamers from countries far and wide, young, aspiring Americans who grew up in our country and know no other country, who are able to work legally today, but who risk the expiration at any moment by the whim of a court.

Every day, over 100 DACA recipients lose their protected status or it expires. We need to take up, in this body, a permanent solution for Dreamers, a pathway to citizenship so that they don't have to rely on the whims of the court system to protect them.

Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have demanded that Speaker RYAN bring an immigration bill to the floor. In fact, in the past, he said he would do so—last week, the week before. Yet we still haven't brought forward the Dream Act, or the Hope Act, or any of the bills that I am proud to cosponsor, that are bipartisan, that would address the urgent issue of how we can ensure that Dreamers are able to work legally.

Even as we speak now, there are students on the Capitol lawn participating in an organized walkout in support of ending school gun violence. Students in Colorado are joining as well. I sent a letter to be read to the students who are doing that because I hope that we agree that no young person should have to fear going to school, nor should any parent have to fear sending their child to school.

I strongly support sending more resources to schools that create supportive environments, that foster emotional and mental health. And, yes, we need to do more on gun violence, including universal background checks.

So why aren't we discussing those bills here today?

In addition, the administration's budget eliminated title IV-A of the Every Student Succeeds Act, which is the very kind of support and enrichment grant that helps schools support health and mental health services and counseling. So in the administration's own budget, it would undermine our ability to keep schools safe.

School safety funding is not a replacement for gun safety measures, but it can help reduce violence by supporting our children in school and creating a safe learning environment.

Those are some of the pressing issues that we could be considering; I dare say

that our constituents are demanding that we consider. I dare say our continued ignoring of these issues is one of the reasons that the congressional approval rating is so low. Nobody is calling my office asking for these obscure bills today on regulations of big banks.

I am getting calls from constituents about reducing gun violence in schools; finding a permanent solution for DACA recipients; keeping government open, and protecting the integrity of our elections from foreign interference.

My colleagues must have short memories because we just forget how hard the financial meltdown of 2008 was on the country's middle class. While Wall Street banks were getting taxpayer bailouts, nearly 7 million Americans lost their homes, workers lost thousands of dollars in retirement accounts, and our unemployment rate spiked to 10 percent.

Since Dodd-Frank was signed into law, we have avoided another major meltdown. The banking system is strong again because of the Dodd-Frank reforms, yet my Republican colleagues continue to bring bills to the floor that are aimed at crippling financial regulators to put banks ahead of the safety of the financial system, consumers, and the economy.

H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act, would require that Federal regulators tailor any action to limit the burdens on financial institutions. What this bill does is force Federal regulators, those in charge of protecting consumers and our system from risk, to conduct a time-consuming re-analysis limiting what they look at to the burdens on financial institutions, the very protections that were put in place in Dodd-Frank and, instead, change those to financial institutions, not to ensure consumer protection, to reduce costs rather than ensure protection.

It is almost like you are giving such authority to the tailors that they cut up your whole suit, and that is not what we want. If there are adjustments that need to be made, we should make them through statute, not give broad authority to government regulators to shred consumer protections.

H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act, would establish a new Office of Independent Examination Review, yet more bureaucracy and paperwork, and have financial institutions appeal and postpone supervisory determinations, creating yet more Republican red tape, more big government committees that the Republicans seem so fond of at the cost to taxpayers.

This is, again, one of those bills that could have been easily tailored to provide targeted improvements to the exam process, but, instead, the Republicans want to set up more government committees and more red tape.

H.R. 4545 takes away the financial regulators' ability to supervise financial institutions, instead, creating new

government panels that risk putting consumers at additional risk.

The last bill being considered under this rule is H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act. This bill would increase the annual exemption threshold under the SEC's Regulation A+ for companies to sell initial public offerings while being exempt from registration and disclosure requirements.

The purpose of the JOBS Act, as my colleague from Colorado mentioned, is to help startups and small businesses access capital by easing some security regulations. Regulation A+, unlike these other two proposals, actually reduces regulations, so it is a good bill. I plan on supporting it. It would make it easier for smaller, nonpublic companies to access capital by allowing them to offer shares to the general public.

So two bills setting up new bureaucracies and new Republican red tape commissions that tie up government, and one that actually reduces regulation, which I think will have more Democratic support.

Currently, a company offering up to \$50 million in securities is exempt from SEC registration requirements. This bill is very simple. It just raises the threshold from \$50 million to \$75 million. Compliance costs are very expensive. So for a company in that range, they are often prohibited from accessing capital markets.

The SEC has the authority to raise the offering limit, something that Congress gave the SEC the authority to do. The JOBS Act requires the SEC to review the limit every 2 years, and if they decide not to increase it, the SEC has to report to Congress.

According to the Kauffman Foundation, startup activity has increased steadily over the past 3 years. Startups are a major job creator in our communities. Reducing red tape and bureaucracy is a good idea. Startups create 3 million jobs annually, and we need to continue to find ways to support startups and entrepreneurs.

So, again, the biggest problem with all of these bills is that they have nothing to do with what the American people are demanding Congress act on. Two of them create more Republican red tape, bureaucracy, give more power to the Federal Government. One of them helps small businesses raise capital by reducing regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have two other speakers. Neither of them are here at this point in time. I would be glad to listen to more of the things that the House should be doing, if Mr. POLIS would like to engage in that discussion. But at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

President Trump's March 5 deadline ending DACA has come and gone, and

all we got out of the White House was tweet after tweet, a stifling of bipartisan proposals in the Senate, and a continued failure to lead.

President Trump tweeted: "Total inaction of DACA by Dems. Where are you? A deal can be made."

Mr. Speaker, has the President forgotten that it was his decision to suddenly end the DACA program that has thrown the system into chaos?

Well, to answer his question, the Democrats are right here. My colleague is right here with a motion to solve DACA right now. Let's do it. Let's rumble. This is actually the 25th time that we have attempted to bring the bipartisan bill, the Dream Act, for a vote on the floor of the House, while it is Republican colleagues who have stood by ignoring the will of this House and the Nation and refusing to let us vote on a bill that would fix DACA.

The Democrats have been and are making our position clear. We want immigration policies that make America safer and that reflect the fact that we are a nation of laws and a nation of immigrants. It is time that President Trump and my colleagues on the other side work with us to ensure that.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help hundreds of thousands of young people who are American in every way except for on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I stand on this floor to speak about our Dreamers.

Again, I must ask very simply: What happened?

For months, Washington refused to pass a budget. We had many continuing resolutions. Again, one of the issues was Dreamers.

After spending caps were raised for both military and nonmilitary expenditures, we got a budget and both Democrats and Republicans voted for that budget. Yet, still, no action for the Dreamers.

Eighty percent of the public wants a fix. We recognize that Dreamers are soldiers, teachers, police officers. They are our friends. They are our neighbors. The President has said he wants also a fix to the Dreamer issue, yet here we are again, one more time, and, again, the Dreamers face a very uncertain future.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop using Dreamers as pawns in a bigger political chess game. At the State of the Union Address here on this floor, my guest was a Dreamer, a young lady studying chemistry at one of my local universities. She wants to be a scientist, and I know she is going to be a very good scientist. That is what chemistry majors do.

You know, America is the land of immigrants, and we have many, many hardworking immigrants. That is what Dreamers are. They work hard. They study hard. They pay taxes. They follow the law. They have been fully vetted. Yet, today, again, we ask: What happened to the Dreamers?

I ask my colleagues, let's give Dreamers the opportunity to earn the American Dream. Let's give them the opportunity to earn citizenship. And let's not live with regrets. Let's not look back 20, 30 years from now and say what we could have, should have, would have. Now is the time to act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring up the Dream Act to the floor and give relief to almost a million young people who want nothing but to earn the American Dream.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), the sponsor of H.R. 4263.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were here to debate a rule on the Regulation A+ Improvement Act. As much as I also want to do things regarding the Dreamers, the issue at hand is a bill that is meant to help those who are creating jobs.

I want to thank my cosponsors, Representatives Sinema and Gottheimer, for cosponsoring the bill. Any time we can do a bill together on a bipartisan basis, I think it is a better bill.

□ 1245

The purpose of this bill is pretty simple. Seven out of ten jobs in this country, new jobs, come from the 28 million small businesses. I used to run one of those businesses and grew it to be a larger national business, and I know from experience that you have to have capital to grow businesses.

If we help companies raise capital, then we help them create jobs. Biopharmaceutical companies in my State of New Jersey are perfect examples. These are growing companies. They are capital intensive. They need help. The government can't do everything, but the Federal Government can play a role in helping these companies access capital, and that is what this bill is about.

Regulation A+ of the 1933 Securities Act, the very first securities law in this country, Federal law, allowed companies to offer shares on public exchanges. It required that any company

that engaged in interstate commerce had to register with the SEC.

They made two exceptions: Regulation A+, which was for Main Street investors, but it put a cap on the amount that could be offered; and Regulation D, which allowed an unlimited offering to companies that were only selling to accredited investors. It has been really helpful in creating jobs and giving companies access to capital.

This bill is a modest improvement. Over time, Regulation A+ has gone from a small limit to, most recently, a \$50 million limit under the JOBS Act of a few years ago, and it is time to raise that limit again.

There is good precedent for this. The JOBS Act actually required that the SEC raise it within 2 years of 2015, when the JOBS Act took effect, or they had to explain to Congress why they didn't. Well, they haven't. They haven't raised it.

We have an interest in making sure that we help our companies in this country create new jobs, and so this bill would raise that limit from \$50 million to \$75 million and allow companies to make offerings to Main Street investors, everyday people trying to find good companies so they can build a future for their families.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been through committee markup. It was open to amendments. It is a bipartisan bill. It has gone through the Rules Committee. It is in order for this bill to move to the floor, and I urge that the rule be passed.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any remaining speakers?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have one remaining speaker.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for our all-Colorado lineup.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of H.R. 1116 and H.R. 4545.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for the time, and I appreciate consideration of the rule here today.

Mr. Speaker, both of the bills being considered under this rule amount to real relief for our Nation's community banks and credit unions.

H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act, which passed out of committee with bipartisan support, will direct Federal financial regulators to tailor their regulations to the risk profile and business model of our institutions, meaning that regulation intended for the largest financial institutions will no longer burden the smallest of our institutions.

Our community banks and credit unions have long suffered the consequences and costs of complying with extensive heavyhanded and onerous regulations. They were created after

the 2008 financial crisis. While many of these regulations are necessary for financial institutions of all sizes, many are not.

Complying with manifold regulations has significantly hampered the ability of our community institutions to offer credit to small businesses, help families get a mortgage, and extend loans to retirees and the recently employed. As one community banker wrote to me: "We have seen time and again the impact of this regulatory environment consume many hours and resources of our compliance, credit, and audit teams despite the relatively simple business model we follow."

By requiring financial regulators to consider the cost of compliance on smaller institutions as well as whether or not a regulation is necessary for an institution based on the size and risk profile of that institution, the TAILOR Act will go a long way to alleviate the burden of heavy regulation on our community banks. In turn, this will lead to renewed economic growth for our local communities that rely heavily on the presence of community banks and credit unions in their own hometowns.

The other bill being considered under this rule, H.R. 4545, which also came out of committee with bipartisan support, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act, will provide certainty for community banks and credit unions that they will have independent recourse should a bank examination result in a determination that they disagree with.

If a bank or a credit union receives an examination decision that it finds unfavorable, the only recourse it has under the current structure is to appeal that decision directly to the same regulator that arrived at that decision in the first place. The Exam Fairness bill included in this rule will change that reality by creating a new Office of Independent Examination Review that will serve as an independent appeals office, providing banks and credit unions with uniform and predictable avenues to appeal examination determinations of significant consequence.

At this independent office, sober review of the agency's determination, transparency, and timeliness will be paramount, meaning that financial institutions will no longer have to wade through long delays in their appeals process and will no longer have to fear retaliation from a financial regulator because they appealed the examination results. Mr. Speaker, this amounts to new assurances to community banks and credit unions that they will have fair recourse in the examination process should they disagree with an examiner's findings.

I would like to thank the Speaker for advancing this rule.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that our community banks and credit unions can realize real relief.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Once again, Congress is spending our limited time here on the floor debating issues that are not being asked for by our constituents, creating new government commissions and Washington red tape that gets in the way of our economic growth and success.

We have spent countless hours debating bills that the Senate probably won't even take up instead of the items we need to do like appropriations bills, where we are 2 weeks from the expiration of government funding.

Apparently, these bills are rushed to the floor to score political points for special interests instead of dealing with the over 800,000 Dreamers whose ability to work legally hangs in the balance of a court decision.

We are considering legislation that creates new commissions and red tape instead of focusing on how to put more money in the pockets of the middle class.

I strongly urge my colleague to vote "no" on the rule and the previous question so we can bring the bipartisan Dream Act forward and finally show that, yes, the House of Representatives can do its job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It really is fairly simple. Washington's regulations tend to strangle economic growth. What usually starts as a do-good effort quickly devolves into a "Washington knows best" regulatory regime. Instead of recognizing the unique needs of businesses around this country, the Federal Government usually stamps out a cookie-cutter regulation that purports to be the solution to a problem but, in reality, almost always has unintended consequences that reduce the freedom of Americans and reduces economic activity in our communities.

The bills before us today take a balanced approach to regulation, maintaining overarching safeguards while making commonsense reforms that free our community banks and credit unions to increase investment in our communities.

I promised Coloradans that I would work to reduce the role of Federal Government in their lives. These three bills today do just that.

I thank my fellow Coloradan, Mr. TIPTON, for introducing two of these measures. I thank Chairman HENSARLING for bringing these bills to the floor.

I urge passage for the rule and the underlying rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 773 OFFERED BY
Mr. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Rep-

resentatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

□ 1300

STUDENT, TEACHERS, AND OFFICERS PREVENTING SCHOOL VIOLENCE ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4909) to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4909

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Student, Teachers, and Officers Preventing School Violence Act of 2018" or the "STOP School Violence Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL SECURITY.

Part AA of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10551 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2701 (34 U.S.C. 10551)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking "Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services" and inserting "Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance"; and

(ii) by striking "including the placement and use of metal detectors and other deterrent measures" and inserting "through evidence-based strategies and programs to prevent violence, which may include the use of appropriate technologies, including the placement and use of metal detectors and other deterrent measure and emergency notification and response technologies";

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting after "through" the following: "evidence-based school safety programs that may include"; and

(ii) by striking paragraphs (1) through (6) and inserting the following:

"(1) Training to prevent student violence against others and self, including training for local law enforcement officers, school personnel, and students.

"(2) The development and operation of anonymous reporting systems for threats of school violence, including mobile telephone applications, hotlines, and internet websites.

"(3) The development and operation of—

"(A) school threat assessment and intervention teams that may include coordination with law enforcement agencies and school personnel; and

"(B) specialized training for school officials in responding to mental health crises.

"(4) Coordination with local law enforcement.

"(5) Placement and use of metal detectors, locks, lighting, and other deterrent measures.

"(6) Security assessments.

"(7) Security training of personnel and students.

"(8) Subgrants to State or local law enforcement agencies, schools, school districts, nonprofit organizations, or Indian tribal organizations to implement grants awarded under this section.

"(9) Acquisition and installation of technology for expedited notification of local law enforcement during an emergency.

"(10) Any other measure that, in the determination of the Director, may provide a significant improvement in security.";

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking "and has" and inserting "has"; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and will use evidence-based strategies and programs, such as those identified by the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative of the Department of Justice"; and

(D) in subsection (d)(1), by striking "50 percent" and inserting "75 percent";

(2) in section 2702 (34 U.S.C. 10552)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “child psychologists” and inserting “mental health professionals”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “this part” and inserting “the STOP School Violence Act of 2018”;

(3) in section 2704(1) (34 U.S.C. 10554(1)), by striking “a public” and inserting “an”;

(4) in section 2705, by striking “\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009” and inserting “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2028, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available in each such fiscal year for grants for the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (4) of section 2701(b)”;

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 2706. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

“(a) **NO FUNDS TO PROVIDE FIREARMS OR TRAINING.**—No amounts provided as a grant under this part may be used for the provision to any person of a firearm or training in the use of a firearm.

“(b) **NO EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.**—Nothing in this part may be construed to preclude or contradict any other provision of law authorizing the provision of firearms or training in the use of firearms.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4909, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 4909, the STOP School Violence Act of 2018. Violence at our schools makes students feel vulnerable in a place where they should feel comfortable to learn, grow, and be happy.

To curb violence at our Nation's schools, the STOP School Violence Act provides a multilayered approach to identify threats and prevent violence from taking place on school grounds.

It provides much-needed resources to train students, teachers, and law enforcement officers on how to recognize and quickly respond to warning signs, and provides funding for technology to keep schools safe.

Eighty percent of school shooters told someone of their violent plans or exhibited warning signs. The bill before us today will ensure that students, teachers, and law enforcement will learn how to identify at-risk behaviors, properly assess threats, and intervene appropriately before a tragedy strikes.

The STOP School Violence Act provides funding for training to prevent student violence against others and self, including training for local law enforcement officers, school personnel, and students.

Prevention training gives students and school personnel the ability to recognize and respond quickly to warning signs of school violence and includes active shooter training.

The bill provides funding for technology and equipment to improve school security and prevent attacks. This includes the development and operation of anonymous reporting systems, such as mobile apps, a hotline, and a website. Funding may also be used for metal detectors, locks, lighting, and other technologies to keep schools safe.

The bill also supports the acquisition and installation of technology for expedited notification of local law enforcement during an emergency.

The legislation also contains funding for school threat assessment and crisis intervention teams so that school personnel can respond to threats before they materialize.

Finally, the STOP School Violence Act provides funding to support law enforcement coordination efforts and, in particular, those officers who already staff schools.

The version of the bill before us today is the result of a collaborative effort of many of my colleagues who worked with Mr. RUTHERFORD to incorporate many of their ideas.

I would like to point out the important contributions of Representatives SUSAN BROOKS, COFFMAN, CHABOT, GRANGER, RODNEY DAVIS, MESSER, and BOST, including many key elements of legislation that they have introduced into this bill that have made the bill stronger.

Finally, I want to thank Mr. RUTHERFORD and the bipartisan group of cosponsors for their work on this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4909.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4909, the STOP School Violence Act, as amended. But I do so with serious concerns about some of its provisions, and mostly about what the bill fails to do.

H.R. 4909 would authorize \$50 million annually for grants administered by the Department of Justice to fund various training and other initiatives intended to enhance school safety. It would authorize another \$25 million annually to be used for other related purposes, including physical improvements, such as metal detectors, better locks, and systems for schools to notify law enforcement of emergencies.

The bill is fine as far as it goes, and we should certainly do more to make

our schools safer, but it is shameful that we must do so because of our failure to reduce the threat of gun violence to children.

It should be unacceptable to all of us that we must take steps to train staff and students to protect themselves against these types of incidents instead of spending more money on actually educating our young people.

This bill does not include any provisions to strengthen our gun laws or to help keep guns out of the hands of those who should not possess them.

Evidence and experience tell us that we must establish universal background checks instead of the flawed system we now have.

We should encourage States to adopt laws providing for extreme risk protection orders, and we must ban assault weapons and high-capacity ammunition magazines. These steps would help prevent not only school shootings, but would reduce the daily toll of gun violence in our communities.

None of these critical provisions are included in this bill, which was never examined by the Judiciary Committee either through a hearing or a legislative markup session. Had we taken these steps, which we could have done quickly in the exactly 1 month since the tragic Parkland, Florida, shooting, we might have produced a much better bill for floor consideration.

The suspension version of the bill does include an explicit prohibition against the funds being used on firearms or firearms training. Because President Trump and others in the administration have indicated that they believe arming teachers is part of the solution to this problem, it was important to my colleagues and to me that we be assured that this program, at least, will not be used for such a purpose which would actually endanger students, not make them safer.

However, we should have addressed serious concerns that have come to our attention with respect to the anonymous tip reporting systems and threat assessment and intervention teams that would be funded by this bill. We want people to report information about someone who may present a danger to students, but the bill does not include requirements that these systems provide adequate due process protections for students against whom a report is made.

I have longstanding concerns about the increased use of law enforcement in schools. History tells us that, without proper training, use of such policies can have a disproportionate impact on students of color and students with disabilities.

In the decades since Columbine, when the Nation rushed to increase school-based law enforcement efforts, thousands of vulnerable students have entered the school-to-prison pipeline for conduct that should be treated as routine behavior violations.

I fear, therefore, that efforts to increase school-based law enforcement without guardrails to ensure it is done well and based on strong evidence may repeat the risks of the past. My concern is only heightened by the Trump administration's ongoing efforts to remove important tools to ensure States and school districts understand their civil rights obligations when disciplining students.

I urge Secretary DeVos and Attorney General Sessions to maintain current discipline and school resource officer guidance to ensure implementation of this bill does not exacerbate the school-to-prison pipeline.

We should have had the opportunity to address these important issues through consideration in committee, but we did not.

Like the sponsors of this bill, I want Congress to do more to make our schools safer. Therefore, I will support this bill today, notwithstanding the serious concerns I have outlined, with the hope that we will address these concerns going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives has a chance to take an important first step towards keeping our students and our teachers safe by passing the STOP School Violence Act.

This bill is the result of bipartisan work of Representative HAL ROGERS, Representative TED DEUTCH, and also Representative KILMER. We also incorporated, as we mentioned earlier, excellent ideas and key elements from legislation by Chairwoman GRANGER, Representatives SUSAN BROOKS, CHABOT, RODNEY DAVIS, MESSER, and BOST. I want to thank all of them for their work and commitment to this very important issue.

I would also like to recognize in a very special way the dedication and passion of the parents and members of Sandy Hook Promise, who have been integral to us moving this bill forward. I really cannot say enough about that organization.

As a career law enforcement officer and sheriff for 12 years in my hometown of Jacksonville, Florida, I know firsthand the importance of communities working together to spot early warning signs of violence.

This is why this bill invests in early intervention and prevention programs in our local schools, so that our communities and law enforcement can be partners in preventing these horrific acts from occurring.

We need to give students, teachers, and law enforcement the tools and

training they need to identify warning signs and to know who to contact, and provide them an anonymous tip source to provide that information.

Now, I should point out here that those receiving the tips, the agencies that are charged with providing due process, are the ones who should provide due process here, not the tipster, not the child who may be calling in to talk about an issue that he thinks is important to law enforcement.

□ 1315

That is their responsibility to provide due process to the individuals involved.

This bill also gives funding for physical enhancements to help harden the target on our school campuses. I know from my law enforcement experience that security does require a multi-layered approach. Our bill supports one very important layer of security for our schools. There is still much more work to be done, but the best way to keep our students and teachers safe is to give them the tools and the training to recognize those warning signs to prevent violence from ever entering our school grounds. This bill aims to do just that, Mr. Speaker.

As I used to tell my community in northeast Florida when I was sheriff, I do not want to be the best first responder to an active shooter event. I want to prevent that occurrence before it happens, and that is the goal of the STOP School Violence Act.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4909, the STOP School Violence Act.

Mr. Speaker, we have a fundamental responsibility to protect our young people from violence, and this package of school security improvements is an important step. In particular, this bill includes a bipartisan provision that I introduced with my friend and colleague from Illinois, Congressman MIKE BOST, to help schools acquire and install panic buttons in classrooms for use in emergency situations.

Mr. BOST and I first introduced the Securing Our Schools Act in January, and I am proud of the support we have built from both sides of the aisle which helped get this provision included in today's school safety package.

This technology will ensure students and teachers have a more immediate method of notifying law enforcement and first responders in case of a medical emergency, active school shooter incident, or natural disaster. All congressional offices have similar emergency buttons. If this technology is good enough for Members of Congress, we should be doing the same to keep our young people safe where they learn.

While this bill represents progress, it is far from an adequate solution to the

threat of gun violence. We now need to build on this bipartisan momentum for other urgent solutions to improve gun safety and reduce gun violence. This includes universal background checks; restrictions on the sale of bump stocks, assault weapons, and high-capacity magazines; and research into the causes of gun violence.

Here in this Congress, we have the ability to save lives with commonsense legislation. We must act, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a good start.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), who is a cosponsor of this legislation and former chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the STOP School Violence Act. I want to congratulate Sheriff RUTHERFORD, the original sponsor of the bill, for his dedicated work on this project, among others.

In the immediate wake of last month's tragedy in Parkland, more than 15 students in my home district in eastern Kentucky were arrested. Thankfully, our students and local law enforcement acted swiftly to prevent a copycat event in our own schools. As our Nation battles this epidemic of school violence, it is imperative that we utilize our available resources to stop tragic events before they occur. But, unfortunately, too many students and officials don't have the tools they need to successfully act under similar situations.

This bill takes necessary and commonsense steps to prevent school bullying, suicide, and violence, providing grant funding to States to implement proven and evidence-based trainings that detect threats before they come to fruition. In most cases of school suicides and shootings, at least one other person knew of the plan and failed to report it. So these appalling events are avoidable, but we must give our schools the tools and resources they need, and this bill would do just that.

Enhancing early detection, prevention, and coordination with law enforcement will save lives. There may not be one single answer to preventing all future violence in schools, but this effort is very much a part of the solution.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join my colleagues in introducing this bipartisan legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the STOP School Violence Act. Mark Barden and Nicole Hockley each had a child killed in the

first grade classroom at Sandy Hook Elementary School in the district where I live 5 years ago. They and other parents took their grief and formed a group called the Sandy Hook Promise. That group has been working tirelessly for over 5 years now, and the bill we address here today is largely a testament to the hard work that they have put in working with mental health professionals, school officials, and law enforcement to come up with real steps that will help save lives.

The STOP School Violence Act will not save every life threatened by gun violence, but it will save some, and we need to do what we can. But let me be very clear. This needs to be the first step of many steps we can and should be taking in this House to address the scourge of gun violence. We have enormous support for bipartisan comprehensive background checks, for a Fix NICS bill, and for banning of bump stocks. This needs to be the first of a long line of steps that this Congress owes to the American people and owes to the students gathered on the lawn of the Capitol today and in every classroom throughout America.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, and Congressman RUTHERFORD for their leadership on this important legislation.

Over the years, our Nation's schools have become soft targets for any would-be killer who has gotten access to a gun. We need to do a better job of protecting both students and faculty from these increasingly frequent threats.

This legislation combines school safety provisions included in two bills, one originally introduced by Mr. RUTHERFORD, and the other by me. Together this proposal represents a collection of commonsense solutions to better help protect our students, our teachers, and other faculty in our schools.

H.R. 4909 reauthorizes the COPS Secure Our Schools grant program and more than doubles its annual budget from \$30 million to \$75 million annually. Of that \$75 million, not less than \$50 million per year will be made available for evidence-based strategies and programs to prevent violence in public or private schools over the next decade.

Among the security measures for which these grants may be used include additional training to ensure the health and well-being of students, the development of more robust threat reporting systems, and investments in more advanced security technologies.

Additionally, the COPS Secure Our Schools grants can be used in conjunction with the COPS Hiring Program to ensure that our schools have both the

security measures and personnel in place to prevent future violence. On Monday, U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the Department of Justice will use the COPS Hiring Program to increase the number of school resource officers nationwide. The legislation we are considering today could help that effort by allowing schools to hire retired police officers to provide security if the Department of Justice determines that such plans would provide a significant improvement in school security.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dan Hils, president of the Cincinnati FOP, for actively engaging on the issue of school safety and for bringing these types of forward-thinking solutions to my attention. He has been a tremendous resource throughout this process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleague to support this measure.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), who is a sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. Speaker, the trauma that my community in Parkland, Florida, experienced was not unique. Gun violence tears apart American communities on a daily basis. So, no, what happened on February 14 when 14 students and three teachers were hunted in their schools with an AR-15 assault rifle by a former student, that wasn't unique.

But the problem of gun violence in America is a uniquely American problem. It is an epidemic. It is a complex problem. There are many facets. But we know what we need to do, and I am committed to taking any step to getting any new policy across the finish line that will make our kids safer.

This bill, the STOP School Violence Act, is a good bill. It will not solve our gun problem. It won't ban bump stocks or require Americans to be 21 to buy a gun, fix our broken background check system, or get weapons of war—the weapons of choice for mass shooters—off our streets and out of our communities. But it will help troubled students who need help get help, and it will help teachers and law enforcement identify potential threats before it is too late.

Before we vote, I would like to make a few things clear. First, this isn't a response to the tragedy at Marjory Stoneman Douglas. In fact, Congressman RUTHERFORD and I introduced this bill a week before the shooting. The programs in this bill are based on rigorous, evidence-based evaluation. They are proven to help reduce isolation and identify kids who need help.

We had no idea at the time that we wouldn't be able to move fast enough to stop this tragedy. We had no idea that we would have an urgent need to help get more American schools access

to these programs. But since Congress has failed the American people by ignoring the deadly scourge of gun violence, since we failed the families of Stoneman Douglas just like we failed the families of Sandy Hook, Columbine, and so many others, we owe it to students and teachers across this country to at least give them tools to help identify dangerous behavior.

The failure of Congress to take action in response to gun violence has left the American gun violence debate in a ridiculous place. Armed teachers in every hallway? Is that what we want education to be in America? No. I am glad this bill includes a specific prohibition against the use of grant dollars to arm school personnel, including teachers, or to train school personnel to use firearms.

Since Congress has failed the American people by ignoring the scourge of gun violence and failed the families of Stoneman Douglas, the failure of Congress to take action has left us in this position of debating gun violence where we are hesitant to even take small steps. This is a small and important step.

I have heard civil rights concerns related to racial profiling and discrimination associated with threat assessments in anonymous reporting, and I am sensitive to those. Congress should never be in a position to make this serious problem worse with new programs to expand the discrimination already entrenched in our school system and society as a whole.

I know the evidence shows that discriminatory discipline in schools can have dramatic, long-term effects on academic performance and wide-ranging impact. But this bill, Mr. Speaker, does not perpetuate discriminatory policies. Zero tolerance and other questionable discipline policies are not evidence based, and, as such, would not be considered a proper use of grant funds.

STOP School Violence program grants are not intended to be used to discipline students. Instead, threat assessment intervention protects potential victims and addresses the underlying problems to make schools safe for everyone. Finally, studies on evidence-based school threat assessment intervention practices have shown that these programs actually decrease racial profiling, bullying, suicides, and suspensions.

I am proud of the bipartisan work that has gone into this bill, and once we have taken this step—this astonishingly modest yet important first step—we must finally do our jobs and work together to make meaningful changes toward stopping the epidemic of gun violence in this country. I know that this does not go far enough in terms of what we need to do. I understand that. I believe it deeply. But it is an important, bipartisan step that we should take today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I joined my colleagues from the Kentucky delegation here on the House floor to lead a moment of silence for the victims of a tragic school shooting at Marshall County High School in my district in Kentucky on January 23.

Today I am proud to rise in support of the STOP School Violence Act, which I believe will be a critical step forward in preventing future school shootings like the tragedies we witnessed in Marshall County, Kentucky, and, of course, at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

□ 1330

In the wake of the Marshall County shooting, I heard from the families of victims and other members of the community that their top priority was enhancing physical security, whether that means installing metal detectors, hiring school resource officers, or making other evidence-based improvements to prevent and mitigate school violence.

This bill will provide resources to schools so that they can do just that while also supporting training for students, teachers, and local law enforcement to identify and prevent violence in our schools.

The Marshall County community is resilient. As we continue to mourn the loss of two young lives in our community along with those in Parkland, we will also fight to protect our students, educators, and communities. I believe the STOP School Violence Act will help defend our schools from those who wish to inflict harm on others, and I urge my colleagues to support this important and bipartisan bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4909, the STOP School Violence Act, which includes my bipartisan legislation to increase access to emergency panic buttons in the classroom.

I want to thank Mr. RUTHERFORD for his bill before us today, and my friend from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for partnering with me on the school safety language we had included in this bill.

As a father and a grandfather, I know firsthand how important it is that our

Nation's children have a safe environment to grow and learn. As a former first responder, I know that response time is vitally important during any emergency situation. This bill makes it much easier for schools to increase their security and provide lifesaving technology to contact first responders immediately when violence or any other emergency occurs.

We already have panic buttons to protect our investments at our banks. Well, there is no greater investment in the country than our children. We should be doing the best to protect them, too, and this legislation is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member, the chairman of the committee, and the proponents of this bill. I acknowledge their commitment and certainly their sincerity.

Mr. Speaker, I joined the thousands of young people today on the west side of the Capitol as they came from schools throughout this region to stand for 17 minutes to acknowledge those who lost their lives in Florida at a high school.

That should not have been their destiny. It should not have been their destiny to die in a bloody massacre in their school. It should not have been the destiny of those in the Pulse nightclub, Sutherland Springs, Columbine, Las Vegas, Texas Tech, the streets of Houston in my district, Chicago, or any other place.

This bill is not about preventing the unsafe use of guns. Guns kill. The young people today made it very clear that they will not stop until we have real gun safety legislation barring the AR-15 and we have universal background checks.

At the same time, I believe these bills of our colleagues are important legislative initiatives. So, in tribute to these individuals who have passed, but also the Members, I believe the STOP School Violence Act of 2017 is a ready response to aspects of school safety and security that are very important.

One of the unique aspects of this bill that I think should be noted is the language in the bill itself that indicates it is through evidence-based strategies and programs to prevent violence, which may include the use of appropriate technologies. The bill readily acknowledges many aspects of school safety.

The AFT and the National School Boards Association are two of the supporters of this legislation. But it does not answer totally the question of the

parent who said: "I didn't get a chance that morning to say good-bye to my daughter."

We must address the question of gun violence. I believe it is important that we put a stop to children evacuating schools, like this one, and for us to be able to address a real, nonpartisan, bipartisan response to the proliferation of guns, whether it means enforcing gun laws, lifting the age to 21, or banning bump stocks, all points we thought the President was supporting but, unfortunately, he is not.

I do want to raise the point of the tip line. I think it is extremely important, as long as it is guided by teachers, counselors, and mental health experts. We must be very sure that we do not have racial disparities where the largest percentage of individuals impacted by the tip line may be African-American youth, Hispanic youth, or Muslim youth.

We know that racial disparities are real because the largest percentage of those who are sent to detention or juvenile centers happen to be African-American children, young boys and girls, which I really believe is something that has to stop.

In addition, it is important that we comply with civil rights law. I think the advocates of civil rights organizations like the Legal Defense Fund are absolutely right. There must be a standard where the civil rights of these children are not violated on this tip line and that due process is provided for them.

We must make a statement here today that, as we support this legislation, we do not intend to support legislation that we skew to be biased toward these young people. These young people in impoverished neighborhoods and schools, Mr. Speaker, deserve to learn as well. But we want safe schools. Those safe schools can be had with the beginning of this infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Texas has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. We can begin with this question of school safety and a tip line and best evidence and best practices. We can begin with grants to ensure the safety of our schools. We can allow schools to make choices about what will make them more safe.

At the same time, we must safeguard our children and their rights. We must answer the cry of the children. We will not finish our task until we have real gun safety legislation.

Enough is enough. It is time to act now. I need my Republican brothers and sisters to work with me.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Legal Defense and Education Fund and a news article published in the New York on March 13, 2018.

NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE AND
EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC.,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2018.

Re H.R. 4909, the STOP School Violence Act of 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (LDF), we write to express our concerns with H.R. 4909, the Student, Teachers, and Officers Preventing School Violence Act of 2018 (the STOP School Violence Act or Act). This bill will fail to achieve its goal of improving school safety and will instead create more dangerous conditions for students, especially students of color.

Founded in 1940 by Thurgood Marshall, LDF is the nation's oldest civil rights law organization. For almost 80 years, LDF has relied on the Constitution and federal and state civil rights laws to pursue equality and justice for African Americans and other people of color. Since the historic U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which LDF litigated and won, we have continued to represent students of color to ensure they receive quality and equitable educational opportunities.

Unfortunately, we all have too much experience dealing with the aftermath of school shootings. After the incidents in Columbine, CO and Sandy Hook, CT, families, school districts, and lawmakers took a variety of actions intended to prevent future tragedies. In studying these actions and their consequences, we can see which efforts work, and which do not. The STOP School Violence Act does not do enough to ensure that effective methods that protect all students are used by our nation's schools and risks furthering racial disparities in education.

The U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Secret Service have published a guide (the ED/SS Guide) to maintaining safe schools, recommending the following steps:

1. Systematically surveying students, teachers, and other stakeholders about the emotional climate of a school to be able to continuously assess and improve school climate;
2. Encouraging students and teachers to respectfully listen to each other;
3. Ensuring that students feel comfortable speaking with adults in the school community;
4. Preventing and addressing bullying through promotion of pro-social behaviors;
5. Involving students and staff in the maintenance of a culture of safety and respect;
6. Ensuring all students have a trusting relationship with at least one adult at school; and
7. Creating mechanisms for developing and maintaining safe school climates.

The ED/SS guide emphasizes that safe and secure school environments are created only through focusing on maintaining a respectful and supportive school environment where students' emotional and academic needs are met, with things like effective threat assessment only a small part. These recommendations are supported by other experts.

To effectively make schools safer, the STOP Schools Act should provide grants to states and districts to help cultivate these positive environments. To do this, the Act should focus on expanding resources, such as school counselors, mental health services,

social workers, and proven programs, such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and restorative practices, and prohibit assigning law enforcement to schools. Instead, the Act provides grants to states and school districts to improve school security by providing training to prevent student violence, including for law enforcement officers, school personnel, and students; developing and operating anonymous reporting systems for threats of school violence; developing and operating school threat assessment and intervention teams that may include coordination with law enforcement agencies and school personnel, and specialized training for school officials in responding to mental health crises; coordinating with law enforcement; using metal detectors, locks, lighting, and other deterrent measures; implementing security assessments and training; installing technology for expedited notification of law enforcement during an emergency; and taking "any other measures that . . . may provide a significant improvement in security." These provisions are only a small part of the strategy that experts recommend for maintaining safe school environments, and as written, the provisions have a high risk of exacerbating race-based disparities in how students are treated by school police and staff.

The Act's language regarding coordination with law enforcement and allowing any measures that "may" provide more security will allow school districts to use the grant funding to increase law enforcement presence rather than on evidence-based interventions. Research has shown that having more police in schools does not make schools safer, but, results in an increasing number of students being led from schools to the justice system. Although Black and Latinx students do not misbehave more than White students, students of color make up over 58% of school-based arrests, but only 40% of public school enrollment. Black students are more than twice as likely as their White peers to be referred to law enforcement or arrested at school. Additionally, research shows that police officers perceive Black youth as older and more culpable than they do similarly-situated White youth, and this bias leads to the over-criminalization of Black students. Furthermore, the presence of police in schools makes Black students and students who have been victims feel less safe, which would negatively affect school climate.

To address these disparities, a clause should be added to the Act requiring that data be collected on any activities undertaken with grant funding to determine whether they are disproportionately affecting students of color or other at-risk groups. Any districts that are discriminating against students should not receive federal funding.

Moreover, the Act's anonymous reporting system does not have prescribed due process or civil rights protections and could lead to more racial disparities in how students are treated at school. As the ED/SS Guide cautions, anonymous systems could lead to individuals reporting false and malicious information. It will be an easy vehicle for students or staff who hold implicit or explicit biases against students of color to report those students as being a danger to themselves or others based on discriminatory reasons. In order to protect students, the tip system should be implemented as recommended in the guide: it should be housed within a wider system of trust amongst students and staff so that all feel comfortable filing reports and providing any required ad-

ditional information in assessing threats. In addition, the communications should be tracked and data disaggregated and assessed for racial disparities in threat reporting.

Finally, the STOP Violence Act does not restrict its funding to public schools and does not state that all recipients of funds must comply with existing civil rights laws. The Act should include a statement that any school receiving funds under this Act complies with all federal law, including civil rights laws protecting students on the bases of race, color, national origin; sex; disability; and age.

All students deserve to attend safe and welcoming schools, and we encourage you to provide states and districts with additional resources to achieve this goal. Unfortunately, the STOP School Violence Act as currently written will not improve school safety and will risk further harm to students who are already disserved by the system. Thank you for considering this letter. If you have any questions, please contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

TODD A. COX,
Director of Policy.

MONIQUE L. DIXON,
Deputy Director of Policy.

NICOLE DOOLEY,
Policy Counsel.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 2018]
TRUMP FINDS UNLIKELY CULPRIT IN SCHOOL
SHOOTINGS: OBAMA DISCIPLINE POLICIES

(By Erica L. Green)

WASHINGTON.—After a gunman marauded through Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School last month, conservative commentators—looking for a culprit—seized on an unlikely target: an Obama-era guidance document that sought to rein in the suspensions and expulsions of minority students.

Black students have never been the perpetrators of the mass shootings that have shocked the nation's conscience nor have minority schools been the targets. But the argument went that any relaxation of disciplinary efforts could let a killer slip through the cracks.

And this week, President Trump made the connection, announcing that Education Secretary Betsy DeVos will lead a school safety commission charged in part with examining the "repeal of the Obama administration's 'Rethink School Discipline' policies."

To civil rights groups, connecting an action to help minority students with mass killings in suburban schools smacked of burdening black children with a largely white scourge.

"Yet again, the Trump administration, faced with a domestic crisis, has responded by creating a commission to study an unrelated issue in order to ultimately advance a discriminatory and partisan goal," said Sherrilyn Ifill, the president and director-counsel at NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund Inc.

"School shootings are a grave and preventable problem, but rescinding the school discipline guidance is not the answer," she said. "Repealing the guidance will not stop the next school shooter, but it will ensure that thousands more students of color are unnecessarily ushered into the school-to-prison pipeline."

The issue of the Obama-era discipline guidance was raised formally by Senator Marco Rubio, Republican of Florida, who, after seeing a flurry of conservative news media reports, wrote a letter to Ms. DeVos and Attorney General Jeff Sessions questioning whether the guidance allowed the shooting suspect, Nikolas Cruz, to evade law enforcement

and carry out the massacre at Stoneman Douglas High.

It was, on its face, an odd point: Mr. Cruz is white, and far from evading school disciplinary procedures, he had been expelled from Stoneman Douglas.

"The overarching goals of the 2014 directive to mitigate the school-to-prison pipeline, reduce suspensions and expulsions, and to prevent racially biased discipline are laudable and should be explored," Mr. Rubio wrote, asking that the guidance be revised. "However, any policy seeking to achieve these goals requires basic common sense and an understanding that failure to report troubled students, like Cruz, to law enforcement can have dangerous repercussions."

Broward County educators and advocates saw Mr. Rubio's letter as an indictment of a program called Promise, which the county instituted in 2013—one year before the Obama guidance was issued—and has guided its discipline reforms to reduce student-based arrests in Broward County, where Stoneman Douglas is.

The N.A.A.C.P. said that Mr. Rubio "notably backs away from raising the purchase age for assault-style rifles and restricting magazine capacity," and instead focuses on a system that once sent one million minority students to Florida jails for "simple and routine discipline issues ranging from talking back to teachers to schoolyard scuffles."

The program was praised by former Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, and echoes the goals of the 2014 Obama guidance in discouraging schools from using law enforcement as a first line of defense for low-level offenses.

In the days before making his request, Mr. Rubio released a proposal that he said would remedy lapses in the Promise program and the 2014 guidance.

In a tweet on Tuesday, Mr. Rubio noted that the gunman was not in the Promise program, but had displayed violent and threatening behavior.

"The more we learn, the more it appears the problem is not the program or the DOE guidance itself, but the way it is being applied," Mr. Rubio said, referring to the Education Department. "It may have created a culture discourages referral to law enforcement even in egregious cases like the #Parkland shooter."

Long before the attack in Parkland, Fla., the 2014 discipline guidelines, which encouraged schools to examine their discipline disparities and to take stock of discriminatory policies, were already on Ms. DeVos's radar—but not because they were seen as a possible culprit in the next school shooting. Conservatives were using the Trump administration's effort to rein in federal overreach to reverse policies designed to protect against what the Obama administration had seen as discriminatory practices.

The "Rethink Discipline," package that Mr. Trump's commission will examine includes guidance that the Obama administration issued on the legal limitations on the use of restraints and seclusion, corporal punishment and equity for special education students.

In recent months, educators and policy experts from across the country have traveled to Washington to voice support for and opposition to the disciplinary guidance, in private meetings with officials at the Education Department and in a series of public forums.

At a briefing hosted by the United States Commission on Civil Rights, dozens of policy experts, researchers, educators and parents sounded off on the Obama-era discipline pol-

icy in a meeting that became so racially charged that some black attendees walked out.

Since the discipline guidelines were issued, conservatives have blamed the document for creating unsafe educational environments by pressuring schools to keep suspension numbers down to meet racial quotas, even if it meant ignoring troubling and criminal behavior. Teachers who sought suspensions or expulsions of minority students were painted as racists, conservatives maintained.

"Evidence is mounting that efforts to fight the school-to-prison pipeline is creating a school climate catastrophe and has if anything put at-risk students at greater risk," said Max Eden, a senior fellow at the conservative Manhattan Institute, who argued that teacher bias was not the driving force behind school discipline.

But proponents argued that racial bias was well documented.

When the guidance was issued, federal data found that African-American students without disabilities were more than three times as likely as their white peers without disabilities to be expelled or suspended, and that more than 50 percent of students who were involved in school-related arrests or who were referred to law enforcement were Hispanic or African-American.

"Children's safety also includes protection from oppression and bigotry and injustice," Daniel J. Losen, director of the Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the University of California at Los Angeles's Civil Rights Project, wrote in testimony to the Civil Rights Commission. "Fear-mongering and rhetoric that criminalizes youth of color, children from poor families and children with disabilities should not be tolerated."

The Education and Justice Departments wrote in a 2014 Dear Colleague letter that discipline disparities could be caused by a range of factors, but the statistics in the federal data "are not explained by more frequent or more serious misbehavior by students of color." The departments also noted that several civil rights investigations had verified that minority students were disciplined more harshly than their white peers for the same infractions.

"In short, racial discrimination in school discipline is a real problem," the guidance said.

In recent months, Ms. DeVos has said change will be coming. She has already moved to rescind a regulation that protects against racial disparities in special education placements. Her goal, she said last month, was to be "sensitive to all of the parties involved."

In a bruising interview on "60 Minutes" on Sunday, Ms. DeVos said that the disproportionate discipline issue "comes down to individual kids." She declined to say whether she believed that black students disciplined more harshly for the same infraction were the victims of institutional racism.

"We're studying it carefully and are committed to making sure students have opportunity to learn in safe and nurturing environments," she said.

Ms. DeVos's office for civil rights also announced that it would scale back the scope of investigations, reversing an approach taken under the Obama administration to conduct exhaustive reviews of school districts' practices and data when a discrimination complaint was filed.

But Ms. DeVos's own administration has continued to find racial disparities. In November, the Education Department found that the Loleta Union Elementary School

District in California doled out harsher treatment to Native American students than their white peers. For example, a Native American student received a one-day out-of-school suspension for slapping another student on the way to the bus, in what was that student's first disciplinary referral of the year. A white student received lunch detention for slapping two students on the same day—the student's fifth and sixth referrals that year.

While Mr. Cruz was repeatedly kicked out of class and ultimately expelled, it is unclear whether he was ever referred to the police for his behavior in school. However, Mr. Cruz was known to law enforcement, which never found cause to arrest him, and a report of troublesome behavior to the F.B.I. went unheeded.

The Broward County superintendent, Robert Runcie, said that Mr. Rubio's effort to connect the district's discipline policies to the Stoneman Douglas shooting was misguided.

"We're not going to dismantle a program that's been successful in the district because of false information that someone has put out there," Mr. Runcie said on Twitter. "We will neither manage nor lead by rumors."

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 4909, the "STOP School Violence Act of 2017."

This important bipartisan legislation comes before us today on the one month anniversary of a senseless and tragic school massacre, which claimed 17 lives.

On February 14, 2018 our world lost Alyssa Alhadeff, Martin Duque, Nicholas Dworet, Jaime Guttenberg, Luke Hoyer, Cara Loughran, Gina Montalto, Joaquin Oliver, Alaina Petty, Meadow Pollack, Helena Ramsay, Alex Schachter, Carmen Schentrup, and Peter Wang.

Also lost, were three coaches: Chris Hixon, Aaron Feis, and Scott Beigel, who was also a biology teacher.

Today, in their honor, you, the students organized a nationwide school walkout for gun violence prevention. Parkland wants to go down in history as more than just survivors. We in Congress can help make that happen.

I was proud to stand in solidarity with you all this morning, hand-in-hand as you were armed with passion and vision; unapologetic about your stance on these issues as you continue to display your advocacy as bold, relentless and engaged leaders of our future.

Mr. Speaker, they want universal background checks, and sensible legislation that will curtail gun violence, thereby, keeping guns out of their schools and out of the hands of those that threaten to take lives and wreak havoc in our churches, theatres, concerts and schools.

"When will it all stop," they asked. We too in Congress must evaluate ourselves and ask: when will we respond adequately?

My heart goes out to students and parents all across America who find themselves routinely faced with these tragic incidents of great proportion; from Columbine to Virginia Tech, Sandy Hook, and Parkland; and our cities like Chicago, Baltimore and the rest of America.

These are the faces of our children as they were leaving Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Fla., after the Valentine's Day deadly shooting.

"I didn't get a chance that morning to say goodbye to my daughter, but I'm here today to

make sure that I'm one of the last fathers that ever has to bury their daughter or son or loved one from a senseless act of violence in a school," said Ryan Petty, whose daughter Alaina Petty was among the 17 killed.

Mr. Petty, I hear you. I agree with my colleagues, that school safety is paramount and that is why I signed onto this bill following the Parkland school shooting.

This bill is not perfect and I will address my concerns. But it is a good first step.

As Ranking Member of the Judiciary Crime Subcommittee, I caution any measure that could adversely impact our constitutional rights.

Had this bill went through regular order, I would have amended it with a clause that would prescribe due process or civil rights protections in the anonymous reporting system. This would allow the accused with notice and an opportunity to respond with representation.

As written, this bill is amenable to abuse where false and malicious information can be reported by any staff or student who may have a bias against the accused but alarmingly, the accused has no avenue for a remedy in defending him/herself.

I want to ensure that the current race-based disparities in how students are treated by school police and staff are not further exacerbated by this bill as written.

H.R. 4909 provides that there be coordination with law enforcement in providing security, which will increase law enforcement presence in schools rather than use evidence-based interventions.

I would like to add to this bill, a clause requiring that data be collected of any activities undertaken with grant funding to determine whether they are disproportionately affecting students of color or other at-risk groups.

Research has shown, when law enforcement engage minority students, there is a high likelihood of increasing the 'schoolhouse to jailhouse' track.

Students of color make up over 58% of school-based arrests, but only % of public school enrollment. A judicious approach is therefore warranted in implementing this bill.

Finally, any recipient of federal grants should be required to comply with all federal laws, including civil rights laws protecting students based on race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability and age.

In our quest for school safety we must always exercise due care in balancing a benefit against the backdrop of our civil liberties so that we do not repeat incidents like North Carolina, where a young girl was grabbed around the neck with one arm, by school resources officer gripping her arm with his other hand and flipping her backward out of her chair.

I stand firm with students everywhere because they "all" are the future of America. And standing with them all no matter where they are from is a net positive for us all.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know I am not supposed to be able to recognize people in the gallery because it is a breach of the House rules, so I won't mention to the view-

ers that there are a lot of students in the gallery today seeing the political process at work.

This is an opportunity for everyone to get to understand what it means to affect public policy in this great country. We are glad. We want to hear more from students throughout this Nation about what they think our government can do to make this country better.

I just want to come here to talk about today being exactly a month since a parent's worst nightmare came true for many in Parkland, Florida: the school they send their kids to was attacked.

This issue is personal for me, as a parent and also as somebody who has experienced gun violence on a baseball field less than a year ago. I think about the same fear, the same smells, sounds, and now the same healing process that those survivors will be going through. But I can only imagine how processing those things as a teenager feels or the pain that their parents, especially those who lost a child that day, are feeling right now.

I believe the only reason all of us on that baseball field are still here today is because we had someone there who was protecting us and firing back. Boy, did David Bailey, Crystal Griner, and the Alexandria Police fire back.

That doesn't mean I believe all schools need the same kind of security measures, but I do believe all of our schools need to look closely at their security protocols and policies, and Congress should help them make the changes that they deem necessary.

There wasn't just one failure on February 14, and as such, there can't be just one solution. This bill is one part of addressing this issue, and it is something we can and should do right now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. This week, I met with Central A&M High School in my district to discuss school safety and what they need to make schools more secure. Following the tragedy at Parkland, they sent a letter to parents and students. It had a line that stood out to me, "Safety is everybody's responsibility."

They are right. Let's pass the STOP School Violence Act. It is only part of the solution. There are other issues we still need to address. But if you believe in helping to make our schools safer, you should vote for this bipartisan bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised not to refer to occupants of the gallery, under the House rules.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my coming over to the

floor, we heard a comment, which I intend to check, of an accidental discharge of a firearm by a resource officer in a school in Virginia. The gun went off.

I just want to conclude by saying that we have brought people together in that nothing in this bill will allow for Federal funds to be used in these grants for the arming of teachers. I think the AFT has evidenced their support for that.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, today, young people across the country are taking a stand and calling upon this Congress to do something about the scourge of gun violence that has terrorized our schools and streets for too long. This bill fails to do so, and it should not and cannot be our only response to these demands.

We must make schools safer. But the best way to do that is to do more to prevent gun violence from occurring in the first place. Congress must do more to stop gun violence. Congress should pass an assault weapons ban. Congress should pass an effective background check. Congress should ban high-capacity magazines.

Congress should do a lot more. It is not enough to say that staff and students must do more to protect themselves. Mr. Speaker, it is time to take decisive action to stop gun violence in our communities.

You are faced with a simple choice, Mr. Speaker: Will you stand with these young people who are demanding action or will you stand with the NRA and be complicit in the continuing violence in our schools and in our streets?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership, and I thank the Members who have come before us today to speak about their experiences, like my colleague who suffered from a horrific act of gun violence last year.

I also want to speak on behalf of the thousands of students who stood up all around the country. They have asked us to take action to address gun violence.

Our children do deserve to be safe while they are at school, to feel safe and to be safe. I am the mother of a teacher, sister of a teacher, and daughter of a new teacher. We want our schools to be safe.

We in this country have focused on violence in our communities for a very long time. When I was deputy mayor of Indianapolis in the late nineties, we were very focused on reducing gun violence and homicides of all kinds in the city of Indianapolis.

□ 1345

Later, as U.S. attorney in the southern district of Indiana, I led what was called Project Safe Neighborhoods, which I understand that Attorney General Sessions is reinvigorating to reduce the gun violence in all of our communities, which includes our schools.

As our colleague from Florida just said, this is a very complex problem. This is something that we have been paying attention to for many years and, in fact, decades. It is going to take complex solutions, but this bill is a very important part of the solution.

In fact, last year, my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee worked to enact 21st Century Cures Act, which included a number of mental health provisions. One of those reforms ensured that State and local governments can use grant funding from the Department of Justice to develop and operate school-based mental health crisis intervention teams. Today we will reauthorize that Department of Justice program for another 10 years with this bill.

I read this morning in The Indianapolis Star, the new movement about walk up, not just walk out. It is important for students and everybody to walk up to those people who they have concerns about in their schools or those people who are lonely, and those people who need help or who just need a friend.

The STOP School Violence Act authorizes \$75 million in annual funding to support increased security and training and increase the use of anonymous reporting systems. In one school in my district, over 100 tips were sent into that school system with the anonymous reporting on the night of the Parkland shooting, and teachers worked around the clock on shifts all night to run down all of those tips. That is what is critically important, that people continue to report and that law enforcement working with school officials continue to investigate.

These tips come from outside the school. They come from inside the school. This is critically important. They come from social media. They come from conversations. It is important to share. This bill increases the amount of funding that can go to schools for anonymous reporting systems. That is just one of the things it does.

This bill will add more resources. It is not enough. I am not saying that it is enough. It is one of the many steps. In fact, in this appropriations bill, I want to encourage my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to continue to increase funding for school safety and mental health programs in the omnibus bill and in budgets going forward.

We know this bill is one important step. I want to applaud one of my colleagues, Sheriff Rutherford, a Member

from Florida. He and another Member from Florida introduced this bill 1 week before the shooting. They, along with many colleagues, have focused on school security for many years. We do have to do more. This is an important step. It is a critical step. And when men like Sheriff Rutherford have devoted his life to protecting and serving his community and his schools in his community, we need to listen to him.

This is a very important step. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." We will not stop. We have heard the young people. We have heard their families. We are going to continue to listen. We will continue to fight for safety in schools in our communities.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4909, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1416

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 773;

Adopting House Resolution 773, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4909.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4545, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION FAIRNESS AND REFORM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1116, TAKING ACCOUNT OF INSTITUTIONS WITH LOW OPERATION RISK ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4263, REGULATION A+ IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 773) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4545) to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1116) to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4263) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—234

Abraham	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Comer	Gosar
Allen	Comstock	Gowdy
Amash	Conaway	Granger
Amodei	Cook	Graves (GA)
Arrington	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Babin	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Bacon	Crawford	Griffith
Banks (IN)	Culberson	Grothman
Barletta	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Barr	Curtis	Handel
Barton	Davidson	Harper
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Biggs	Denham	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Dent	Hensarling
Bishop (MI)	DeSantis	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hice, Jody B.
Black	Diaz-Balart	Higgins (LA)
Blackburn	Donovan	Hill
Blum	Duffy	Holding
Bost	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Brat	Dunn	Huizenga
Bridenstine	Emmer	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Estes (KS)	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Hurd
Buchanan	Faso	Issa
Buck	Ferguson	Jenkins (KS)
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Budd	Fleischmann	Johnson (LA)
Burgess	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fox	Jones
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Carter (TX)	Gaetz	Joyce (OH)
Chabot	Gallagher	Kelly (MS)
Cheney	Garrett	Kelly (PA)
Coffman	Gianforte	King (IA)
Cole	Gibbs	King (NY)
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Kinzinger

Knight	Nunes	Shuster	Shea-Porter	Takano	Velázquez	McKinley	Roby	Stewart
Kustoff (TN)	Olson	Simpson	Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	McMorris	Roe (TN)	Stivers
Labrador	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Sinema	Thompson (MS)	Walz	Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
LaHood	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Sires	Titus	Wasserman	McSally	Rogers (KY)	Tenney
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)	Tonko	Schultz	Meadows	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)
Lamborn	Pearce	Smucker	Soto	Torres	Waters, Maxine	Meehan	Rokita	Thornberry
Lance	Perry	Stefanik	Speier	Vargas	Watson Coleman	Messer	Rooney, Francis	Tipton
Latta	Pittenger	Stewart	Suoizzi	Veasey	Welch	Mitchell	Rooney, Thomas J.	Trott
Lewis (MN)	Poe (TX)	Stivers	Swalwell (CA)	Vela	Yarmuth	Moolenaar	Roskam	Turner
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Taylor				Mooney (WV)	Ross	Upton
Long	Posey	Tenney				Mullin	Rothfus	Valadao
Loudermilk	Ratcliffe	Thompson (PA)	Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Smith (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Rouzer	Wagner
Love	Reed	Thornberry	Davis, Danny	Pelosi	Tsongas	Newhouse	Royce (CA)	Walberg
Lucas	Reichert	Tipton	Frankel (FL)	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)	Noem	Russell	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Trott	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen		Norman	Sanford	Walker
MacArthur	Rice (SC)	Turner	Kennedy	Slaughter		Nunes	Sebelius	Walorski
Marchant	Roby	Upton				Olson	Schneider	Walters, Mimi
Marino	Roe (TN)	Valadao				Palazzo	Schweikert	Weber (TX)
Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Wagner				Palmer	Scott, Austin	Webster (FL)
Massie	Rogers (KY)	Walberg				Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Wenstrup
Mast	Rohrabacher	Walden				Pearce	Sessions	Westerman
McCarthy	Rokita	Walker				Perry	Shimkus	Williams
McCaul	Rooney, Francis	Walorski				Pittenger	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Rooney, Thomas J.	Walters, Mimi				Poe (TX)	Simpson	Wittman
McHenry	Roskam	Weber (TX)				Poliquin	Woodall	Womack
McKinley	Ross	Webster (FL)				Posey	Yoder	Woodall
McMorris	Rothfus	Wenstrup				Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Rodgers	Rouzer	Westerman				Reed	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Meadows	Royce (CA)	Williams				Reichert	Smucker	Young (IA)
Meehan	Russell	Wilson (SC)				Renacci	Stefanik	Zeldin
Messer	Rutherford	Wittman				Rice (SC)		
Mitchell	Sanford	Womack						
Moolenaar	Sebelius	Woodall						
Mooney (WV)	Schweikert	Yoder						
Mullin	Scott, Austin	Yoho						
Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)						
Noem	Sessions	Young (IA)						
Norman	Shimkus	Zeldin						

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cabajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.

Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)

Lujan Grisham, M.

Luján, Ben Ray

Lynch

Maloney,

Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean

Matsui

McCollum

McEachin

McGovern

McNerney

Meeks

Meng

Moore

Moulton

Murphy (FL)

Nadler

Napolitano

Neal

Nolan

Norcross

O'Halleran

O'Rourke

Pallone

Panetta

Pascarell

Payne

Perlmutter

Peters

Peterson

Pingree

Pocan

Polis

Price (NC)

Quigley

Raskin

Richmond

Rosen

Roybal-Allard

Ruiz

Ruppersberger

Rush

Ryan (OH)

Sanchez

Sarbanes

Schakowsky

Schiff

Schneider

Schrader

Scott (VA)

Scott, David

Serrano

Sewell (AL)

[Roll No. 105]

AYES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Arlington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson

NOT VOTING—13

Lieu, Ted
Pelosi
Rice (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Slaughter

□ 1443

Mrs. BLACK changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 182, not voting 13, as follows:

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cabajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.

NOES—182

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore

Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Allen
Cumings
Davis, Danny
Graves (MO)
Katko

Kennedy
Lieu, Ted
Rice (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Slaughter

Smith (MO)
Tsongas
Wilson (FL)

□ 1451

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING MARCY KAPTUR AS THE LONGEST SERVING WOMAN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today, we in Congress have the honor of recognizing an outstanding leader and an esteemed colleague, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR. We have the esteemed honor of recognizing MARCY KAPTUR as she becomes the longest serving woman in the history of the House of Representatives. And it is not just about the longevity of her service, but the quality of her leadership in the House of Representatives in so many ways.

It is fitting that we should recognize her outstanding leadership during Women's History Month. Thank you for giving us the privilege of doing that.

I know that the people of Ohio and our colleagues from Ohio here take great pride in their association with MARCY KAPTUR, as with the rest of us, and are honored to call her "colleague."

She has left her mark in so many ways. She is the first woman ever to be assigned to serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. In addition to protecting the American people, honoring our first responsibility to protect and defend, she is the champion for the World War II Memorial and a determined defender of all who served there and their legacy.

Thank you, MARCY KAPTUR, for that.

MARCY KAPTUR has taken great pride, serving as a constant, unwavering voice for the American heartland in the U.S. Congress.

Her faith is important to her: her faith in God, her faith in her community, and her faith in our country. As a leader on the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans, for example, she is a strong champion for retirees and their endangered pensions.

The list goes on and on. From childhood to pensions, MARCY has been there in the lead on the Appropriations Committee.

By the way, she is the longest serving woman on the Appropriations Committee, as well.

Later today, at a reception to which you are all invited in the Rayburn Room, I will read a letter of congratulations from Barbara Mikulski, the longest serving woman in the Congress and MARCY in the House.

It is really important to know the impact that MARCY has had on all of us. She is a person of the greatest integrity and sincerity. She knows her purpose. She knows her subjects. Her judgment is respected, and she always has a plan. Therefore, as I have said so many times, if you want to save yourself some time, just do what MARCY asks you to do the first time around.

As a granddaughter of Polish immigrants, she takes great pride in her heritage, and as with most families taking pride in their heritage, she is fiercely patriotic and loves America and works every day for all families pursuing economic opportunity and the American Dream.

MARCY, thank you for your outstanding leadership on behalf of Ohioans for sure, for all Americans, and on behalf of women, girls, and families across the country and across the world. It is an honor to serve with you, a privilege to call you "colleague," and a joy to call you "friend." Thank you, MARCY KAPTUR.

HONORING MARCY KAPTUR AS THE LONGEST SERVING WOMAN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker. I rise to wholeheartedly agree with the Democratic leader. I am not sure I have ever said that before. Look, this is truly an impressive milestone.

I have got to say, MARCY, the lawmaker that you are surpassing, Edith Nourse Rogers, famously summed up her time in office by saying this: "The first 30 years are the hardest. . . . You start it, and you like the work and you just keep on."

MARCY, you have certainly kept on. The leader mentioned it, the World War II Memorial. This started in 1987 as an exchange that you had with a veteran at a fish fry back in Jerusalem Township in your district. I mean, it took, what, 6 years to get a bill into law, then another 11 years to get the memorial built? That certainly is what it looks like when you are keeping on.

Now, MARCY and I served together on the Budget Committee. What serving together on the Budget Committee means is, between the two of us, we pretty much disagreed on everything we talked about on the Budget Committee.

But I have got to say, I have always had great respect for how you engage in the battle of ideas and how you stay

true to your principles, and you do it in such an uplifting way.

Passion is not hard to find in our politics today. There are no two ways about that. But passion sustained over a long time, over the long haul, without fail, takes an enormous amount of commitment.

No matter which side of the aisle we are on, we can all take something from your example. You have been a tireless advocate for your principles, your point of view, and you have done it with honor and distinction. And that is a phenomenal example for all of us.

It is truly fitting that this is happening during Women's History Month as well. But this milestone, I would say, is not so much about days served; it is a testament to the endless possibilities that are in front of us.

I think of my own daughter, Liza, who was elected vice president of her class last year, which goes to show that at least somebody in our family can get elected to vice president.

Her generation is just so fortunate to have all these pioneers to look up to, to have stories to hear from and to learn from; whether it is MARCY KAPTUR or NANCY PELOSI, our first woman Speaker of the House; or CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, the longest-serving conference chair since my mentor Jack Kemp; or ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the first Hispanic woman ever elected to Congress; or ELISE STEFANIK, the youngest woman ever elected to this Congress. Every day we get to work with leaders who are making history and inspiring generations now and to come.

So, MARCY, thank you for keeping on for all 12,858 of these days. Thank you for your service. Congratulations on this great distinction and honor.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate my good friend from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR.

On this historic occasion—as MARCY becomes the longest-serving woman in the history of this House—I am honored to stand by her side.

As Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have seen firsthand the personal passion MARCY brings to protecting democracy and freedom around the globe.

Nowhere is this more evident than in her work on behalf of the people of Ukraine and the diaspora here in America.

As co-chair of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, she has been a tireless advocate for the democratic transition in Ukraine—and especially championing the rights of Ukrainian women. She has sponsored legislation supporting freedom and human rights in Ukraine, in addition to promoting the important role that women play in Ukraine's economy.

This is because MARCY understands the critical role that Ukrainian women can and must play in their country's future—as educators, leaders, entrepreneurs, and peacemakers.

Likewise, she wants to see more opportunity for women all around the world. I am particularly grateful for her support for my Committee's efforts to ensure that women and girls

are empowered by, and included in, U.S. diplomatic efforts abroad, including legislation to promote the inclusion of women in peace negotiations and peacekeeping efforts. MARCY has also long been supportive of the Committee's efforts to promote girls' access to education.

Here in the United States, of course, MARCY has proven her commitment to promoting women's rights. I am proud to join her in sponsoring the Smithsonian Women's History Museum Act, aptly numbered, H.R. 19. Alongside our good friend from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY, we are, as MARCY put it, seeking "to record the history of over half of our citizenry in a way that brings them into full view."

I have no doubt that when we succeed in building the first National Women's History Museum, MARCY KAPTUR will be prominently represented.

MARCY is an inspiration to women and girls across the country who aspire to lead—who aspire to participate in their democracy.

I am proud to have partnered with her on these and so many other issues, and am thankful for her years of service.

STUDENT, TEACHERS, AND OFFICERS PREVENTING SCHOOL VIOLENCE ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4909) to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 10, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—407

Abraham	Blackburn	Calvert
Adams	Blum	Capuano
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Aguilar	Blunt Rochester	Carter (GA)
Allen	Bonamici	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Bost	Cartwright
Arrington	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Babin	F.	Castro (TX)
Bacon	Brady (PA)	Chabot
Banks (IN)	Brady (TX)	Cheney
Barletta	Brat	Chu, Judy
Barr	Bridenstine	Cicilline
Barragán	Brooks (AL)	Clark (MA)
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Brown (MD)	Clay
Bera	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Bergman	Buchanan	Clyburn
Beyer	Buck	Coffman
Biggs	Bucshon	Cohen
Bilirakis	Budd	Cole
Bishop (GA)	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Bishop (MI)	Bustos	Collins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Butterfield	Comer
Black	Byrne	Comstock

Conaway	Hice, Jody B.	Meng
Connolly	Higgins (LA)	Messer
Cook	Higgins (NY)	Mitchell
Cooper	Hill	Moolenaar
Correa	Himes	Mooney (WV)
Costa	Holding	Moore
Costello (PA)	Hollingsworth	Moulton
Courtney	Hoyer	Mullin
Cramer	Hudson	Murphy (FL)
Crawford	Huffman	Nadler
Crist	Huizenga	Napolitano
Crowley	Hultgren	Neal
Cuellar	Hunter	Newhouse
Culberson	Hurd	Noem
Curbelo (FL)	Issa	Norcross
Curtis	Jackson Lee	Norman
Davidson	Jayapal	Nunes
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	O'Halleran
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	O'Rourke
DeFazio	Jenkins (WV)	Olson
DeGette	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo
Delaney	Johnson (OH)	Pallone
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Palmer
DelBene	Johnson, Sam	Panetta
Demings	Joyce (OH)	Pascarell
Denham	Kaptur	Paulsen
Dent	Keating	Payne
DeSantis	Kelly (IL)	Pearce
DeSaulnier	Kelly (MS)	Pelosi
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Perlmutter
Deutsch	Kennedy	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Khanna	Peters
Dingell	Kihuen	Peterson
Doggett	Kildee	Pingree
Donovan	Kilmer	Pittenger
Doyle, Michael	Kind	Pocan
F.	King (IA)	Poe (TX)
Duffy	King (NY)	Poliquin
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger	Polis
Duncan (TN)	Knight	Posey
Dunn	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)
Ellison	Kuster (NH)	Quigley
Emmer	Kustoff (TN)	Raskin
Engel	Labrador	Ratcliffe
Eshoo	LaHood	Reed
Españillat	LaMalfa	Reichert
Estes (KS)	Lamborn	Renacci
Esty (CT)	Lance	Rice (SC)
Evans	Langevin	Richmond
Farenthold	Larsen (WA)	Roby
Faso	Larson (CT)	Roe (TN)
Ferguson	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Fitzpatrick	Lawrence	Rogers (KY)
Fleischmann	Lawson (FL)	Rohrabacher
Flores	Levin	Rokita
Fortenberry	Lewis (GA)	Rooney, Francis
Foster	Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Thomas
Fox	Lipinski	J.
Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Rosen
Frelinghuysen	Loeb	Roskam
Fudge	Lofgren	Ross
Gabbard	Long	Rothfus
Gaetz	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Gallagher	Love	Roybal-Allard
Galleo	Lowenthal	Royce (CA)
Garamendi	Lowe	Ruiz
Garrett	Lucas	Ruppersberger
Gianforte	Luetkemeyer	Russell
Gibbs	Lujan Grisham,	Rutherford
Gihmert	M.	Ryan (OH)
Gomez	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez
Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch	Sarbanes
Goodlatte	MacArthur	Scalise
Gosar	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Gottheimer	Carolyn B.	Schiff
Gowdy	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
Granger	Marchant	Schrader
Graves (GA)	Marino	Schweikert
Graves (LA)	Marshall	Scott (VA)
Graves (MO)	Mast	Scott, Austin
Green, Al	Matsui	Scott, David
Green, Gene	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Griffith	McCaul	Serrano
Grijalva	McClintock	Sessions
Grothman	McCollum	Sewell (AL)
Guthrie	McEachin	Shea-Porter
Gutiérrez	McGovern	Sherman
Hanabusa	McHenry	Shimkus
Handel	McKinley	Shuster
Harper	McMorris	Simpson
Harris	Rodgers	Sinema
Hartzler	McNerney	Sires
Hastings	McSally	Smith (NE)
Heck	Meadows	Smith (NJ)
Hensarling	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Smith (WA)

Smucker	Trott	Weber (TX)
Soto	Turner	Webster (FL)
Speier	Upton	Welch
Stefanik	Valadao	Wenstrup
Stewart	Vargas	Westerman
Stivers	Veasey	Williams
Suozzi	Vela	Wilson (SC)
Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez	Wittman
Takano	Visclosky	Womack
Taylor	Wagner	Woodall
Tenney	Walberg	Yarmuth
Thompson (CA)	Walden	Yoder
Thompson (MS)	Walker	Yoho
Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Walters, Mimi	Young (IA)
Tipton	Walz	Zeldin
Titus	Wasserman	
Tonko	Schultz	
Torres	Waters, Maxine	

NAYS—10

Amash	Jordan	Sanford
Cárdenas	Lee	Watson Coleman
Johnson (GA)	Massie	
Jones	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—13

Bass	Lieu, Ted	Smith (MO)
Carson (IN)	Rice (NY)	Tsongas
Cummings	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (FL)
Davis, Danny	Rush	
Katko	Slaughter	

□ 1510

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 2018 I missed Roll Call Vote No. 106. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

No other developed nation on the planet experiences gun violence with the frequency that we do in the United States. The gun homicide rate in our country is more than seven times that of Sweden, six times that of Canada, and twenty-one times that of Australia. On average, 93 Americans die every day from gun violence and 222 people are shot and survive, including 40 children and teens. And since 1970, more Americans have been killed by guns than Americans killed in all of our nation's wars combined.

The numbers are simply staggering.

H.R. 4909 will help schools develop violence prevention strategies, strengthen school security, and help educators and law enforcement prevent students from hurting themselves or others. But Congress should be doing much more to prevent gun violence. The majority of the American people—and the majority of gun owners—want Congress to take action.

The American people deserve open floor debates or straight up or down votes on commonsense measures such as banning "bump stocks" which make guns more lethal, forming a select committee on gun violence, requiring background checks for all gun sales, and allowing the Centers for Disease Control and other federal health agencies to conduct crucial gun violence research.

Americans deserve a society that is free from the regular threat of gun violence. The status quo is unacceptable. We have a responsibility to pursue change.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR
OF H. CON. RES. 79

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H. Con. Res. 79, a bill originally introduced by Representative Conyers of Michigan, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR
OF H.R. 137

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 137, a bill originally introduced by Representative Conyers of Michigan, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

PROTECTING ACCESS TO THE
COURTS FOR TAXPAYERS ACT

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3996) to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit other courts to transfer certain cases to United States Tax Court.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Access to the Courts for Taxpayers Act".

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN CASES.

Section 1631 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(or, for cases within the jurisdiction of the United States Tax Court, to that court)" after "any other such court".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3996, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers fighting the Internal Revenue Service deserve their day in court. Not every taxpayer who thinks the IRS is wrong is right, but not every time the IRS brings a case are they right.

The Tax Court is a unique creation of Congress. It is, in fact, an article 1 court specifically created and dedicated to tax issues.

The Tax Court has the expertise necessary to hear complex or, in some cases, simple tax cases. Any situation in which a taxpayer is unable to contest an IRS action, therefore, would be simply unacceptable.

□ 1515

Unfortunately, the problem today is that, due to an oversight in the Federal law, you can find yourself in a situation, by filing in good faith, not to be able to use a Tax Court. Unlike the IRS, not all taxpayers know about the requirement to file tax disputes in the Tax Court. Some taxpayers, in good faith, file in their local district court, which is wrong, and by the time it is discovered, their opportunity to file in Tax Court has expired.

Today, when a Federal Tax Court judge recognizes the improper venue, under current law he is prevented from simply transferring the case to Tax Court, where it rightfully belongs. By the time this happens, the taxpayer usually has lost their day in court since they only have a short time in which to ask for the Tax Court.

Because of this oversight in the Federal law, I, along with the ranking member of the full Judiciary Committee, introduced the Protecting Access to the Courts for Taxpayers Act. The legislation, quite simply, fixes this error that impacts dozens and dozens of Americans repeatedly every year. It is supported by advocates in the Judicial Conference and the Tax Courts.

It just makes sense, Mr. Speaker, that, in fact, getting your day in court should not be nullified by an actual petition to a court erroneously not recognized in time. In any other case in which you file in Federal court, if the court determines it is not an appropriate venue, the case is transferred. This is a lone exception.

I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for his support in this legislation and for his help in making sure it was drafted accurately.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3996, the Protecting Access to the Courts for Taxpayers Act. This bipartisan legislation would ensure that taxpayers who mistakenly file certain

claims in the wrong venue will still have their day in court.

Under current law, when a Federal court does not have jurisdiction over a case, it typically may transfer that case to the appropriate Federal court that does have proper jurisdiction. However, due to a quirk in the law, the United States Tax Court is not authorized to have misfiled cases transferred to it, even when the Tax Court is the proper—and, in many cases, the only—court with jurisdiction to hear the case.

This legislation will remedy that flaw in the law and enable Federal courts to transfer cases directly to the Tax Court when appropriate. The need for this bill is not simply a matter of judicial efficiency; it is fundamentally one of access to justice.

The Tax Court was established to resolve disputes between taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service, and many taxpayers choose to represent themselves in Tax Court proceedings. Unfortunately, these litigants—lacking legal representation—make procedural errors, including filing in the wrong court.

In most instances, by the time a taxpayer's claim is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, the strict guidelines and deadlines for filing in the Tax Court—generally 90 days or fewer—have long passed, and the taxpayer is then barred from filing a claim altogether.

By allowing these cases to be transferred directly to the Tax Court, H.R. 3996 ensures that the case will retain its original filing date and the taxpayer will be able to preserve his or her claim. As a result of this modest but significant amendment to current law, this bill will protect the right of taxpayers to be heard in court.

I appreciate the efforts of the various Tax Court representatives who are bringing this issue to our attention and for their guidance in helping us to develop the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to acknowledge H.R. 3996's author, my friend, Representative DARRELL ISSA, whose leadership on this issue is to be commended. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I am with my friend, and would like to associate all of my further comments with his. So, again, I urge support for this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3996.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTING CRIMES AGAINST VETERANS ACT OF 2017

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 506) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 506

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL TOOL TO PREVENT CERTAIN FRAUDS AGAINST VETERANS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1352. Fraud regarding veterans’ benefits

“(a) Whoever knowingly executes, or attempts to execute, any scheme or artifice to defraud an individual of veterans’ benefits, or in connection with obtaining veteran’s benefits for that individual, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

“(b) In this section—

“(1) the term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38; and

“(2) the term ‘veterans’ benefits’ means any benefit provided by Federal law for a veteran or a dependent or survivor of a veteran.”.

(b) *CLERICAL AMENDMENT.*—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1352. Fraud regarding veterans’ benefits.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 506, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2017 closes a small but significant loophole in Federal law and, in so doing, gives Federal prosecutors an additional mechanism to protect veterans from criminals who seek to defraud them.

In recent years, we have heard distressing and infuriating stories about particularly elderly veterans being swindled out of their veterans’ bene-

fits. Some of these veterans, including those in low-income housing, have been deceived by fraudsters who, in fact, have preyed on their age and infirmity.

Helping veterans in this case certainly should be a priority in this Congress.

This is particularly insidious in that, in some cases, the criminal will claim to get a veteran’s benefits approved in record time, will charge outrageous fees to file, and, ultimately, will provide the veteran with little or no assistance. They will just pocket the money that rightfully belongs to the elderly veteran.

Mr. Speaker, this change in the law is critical. I want to thank Mr. TOM ROONEY, the author of the bill. I want to urge that we consider it quickly, close this loophole, and provide prosecutors with the kind of ability to protect our aging veterans in a way that is currently not available.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2017 would make it a crime to knowingly engage in any scheme to defraud a veteran or his or her dependents of veterans’ benefits. This legislation provides an important, additional tool for Federal prosecutors to use to combat veterans’ benefits fraud.

Because we honor the service of our brave men and women, and because of the sacrifices our veterans have made for us, it is particularly important that we protect them from fraud and ensure the integrity of the benefit system we provide.

According to a 2016 AARP study of investment fraud victims, it shows that while veterans are less than 10 percent of the U.S. population, they were one-third, 33 percent, of the victims of investment fraud because their money is certain. A recent Federal Trade Commission’s Consumer Sentinel program reveals that the number of complaints filed by military veterans each year has increased by 63 percent over the past 5 years.

Recently, my State of Texas highlighted these issues in an article which reported that several disabled veterans were unable to receive their benefits via direct deposit. Investigation revealed a number of veterans did not receive their VA disability compensation checks due to the theft that occurred by way of perpetrators rerouting veterans’ benefits to virtual banks.

Veterans are the targets of many of the same types of fraudulent activities as the rest of society, including mail, telephone, and online fraud. They are more victimized by fraud than non-veterans, and have lost money to scams 16 percent more than non-veterans during the past 5 years.

Nearly 78 percent of veterans report having been a target of veteran-specific scams, such as approving a VA loan, taking advantage of little-known government programs for vets, or paying for a back, knee, or arm brace because of one’s military service. Nearly 22 percent of veterans report receiving 10 or more suspicious phone calls per week. Nearly all veterans, 97 percent, have received at least one scam attempt in the past 5 years.

We hope we can stop this.

Currently, there are about 21 million veterans—and more upcoming—of the United States military. These are men and women who selflessly served our Nation and in the theaters of war, from the Second World War, Korea, and Vietnam, to more recent conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. As I indicated, our veterans will continue to grow and be vulnerable to scams.

Unfortunately, many of our veterans, as a result of their service, have physical and mental scars. There are well over 1 million American veterans with service-connected disabilities. It was my privilege to institute a PTSD center in my own district supported by the late Congressman Murtha.

In addition, veterans are more likely than nonveterans to become homeless. They comprise 17 percent of our homeless population, even though many of them are eligible for veterans’ benefits. On any given night, an estimated 50,000 veterans are sleeping on America’s streets.

In recognition of the extreme sacrifice by our veterans and the hardships many of them continue to face after their military service, it is our duty to provide, to the best of our ability, an appropriate measure of compensation for them, particularly those in need.

For instance, we provide disability payments to those with service-connected disabilities, pensions for veterans with limited incomes, education and training under the GI Bill, and also various life insurance benefits.

This is the least we can do, and it is still not enough. There continues to be issues with the medical care we provide our veterans and problems about some benefits never being processed and paid because of the loss of claims by the Veterans Benefits Administration.

That is why we must prohibit any schemes to defraud a veteran of his or her veteran’s benefits. Anyone convicted of such crime could be fined, imprisoned, or be subject to both penalties. Those who defraud veterans or their surviving spouses or dependents endanger our system of veterans’ benefits not only by harming the victims, but also by diminishing resources required to pay the claims and fund the programs that are needed to help those who have served their country have a decent quality of life.

Accordingly, I support H.R. 506. I commend the bill's sponsors, Representative TOM ROONEY and Representative TED DEUTCH, for their work on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 506, the "Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2017," which would make it a crime to knowingly engage in any scheme to defraud a veteran or his dependents of veteran's benefits. This legislation provides an important, additional tool for federal prosecutors to use to combat veterans' benefits fraud.

Because we honor the service of our brave men and women, and because of the sacrifices our veterans have made for us, it is particularly important that we protect them from fraud and ensure the integrity of the benefit system we provide.

According to a 2016 AARP study of investment fraud victims, it showed that while veterans are less than 10% of the U.S. population, they were one third (33%) of the victims of investment fraud. A recent Federal Trade Commission's Consumer Sentinel program reveals that the number of complaints filed by military veterans each year has increased by 63% over the past five years.

Recently, my state of Texas highlighted these issues in an article, which reported that several disabled veterans were unable to receive their benefits via direct deposit. Investigation revealed that a number of veterans did not receive their VA disability compensation checks, due to the theft that occurred by way of perpetrators re-routing veterans' benefits to virtual banks.

Veterans are the targets of many of the same types of fraudulent activities as the rest of society, including mail, telephone and online fraud. They are more victimized by fraud than nonveterans and have lost money to scams (16%) than nonveterans during the past five years.

Nearly (78%) of veterans report having been a target of veteran-specific scams, such as improving a VA loan, taking advantage of little-known government programs for vets or paying for a back, knee or arm brace because of one's military service. Nearly (22%) of veterans report receiving 10 or more suspicious phone calls per week. Nearly all veterans (97%) have received at least one scam attempt in the past five years.

Currently, there are about 21 million veterans of the United States military—men and women who selflessly served our Nation and in theaters of war, from the Second World War, Korea, and Vietnam to more recent conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Unfortunately, many of our veterans—as a result of their service—have physical and mental scars. There are well over 1 million American veterans with service-connected disabilities.

In addition, veterans are more likely than non-veterans to become homeless. They comprise 17% of our homeless population. On any given night, an estimated 50,000 veterans are sleeping on America's streets.

In recognition of the extreme sacrifice by our veterans and the hardships many of them continue to face after their military service, it is our duty to provide, to the best of our ability, an appropriate measure of compensation for them, particularly for those in need.

For instance, we provide disability payments to those with service-connected disabilities, pensions for veterans with limited incomes, education and training under the GI Bill, and also various life insurance benefits.

This is the least we can do and it is still not enough. There continue to be issues with the medical care we provide our veterans, and problems about some benefits never being processed and paid because of the loss of claims by the Veterans Benefits Administration.

That is why we must prohibit any schemes to defraud a veteran of his or her veteran's benefits. Anyone convicted of such crime could be fined, imprisoned, or be subject to both penalties.

Those who defraud veterans, or their surviving spouses or dependents, endanger our system of veterans' benefits not only by harming the victims, but also by diminishing resources required to pay the claims and fund the programs that are needed to help those who have served their country.

Accordingly, I support H.R. 506 and I commend the bill's sponsors, Representative TOM ROONEY and Representative TED DEUTCH, for their work on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, we must do everything we can to protect our Veterans who have given so much of themselves to keep us all safe. We must ensure that the benefits they have earned are safeguarded against criminal acts.

We ask our veterans to lay their lives on the line so that we can enjoy the freedom, which is at the heart of this great country. We owe them much. Surely we can and should repay our gratitude whenever we can.

Protecting their veterans' benefits is one way of expressing our appreciation, and it is the right and just thing to do.

For reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY), who is the author of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my district is home to over 75,000 veterans, and I am proud to represent an area that has one of the highest concentrations of veterans in the country.

With that distinction comes a duty to fight on their behalf to ensure that the VA is functioning and funded at levels deserving of their sacrifice. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, I am proud that we have secured increases in funding for VA programs that are important to my constituents.

On a daily basis, my staff and Members of Congress' staff across this country try to help veterans navigate the VA bureaucracy. It is no secret that the claims process at the VA is far too slow, so we all try to help veterans with their claims and expedite the process when possible. We have won countless battles against the system,

and we have helped constituents far and wide to get the care and benefits they deserve.

One of our responsibilities as Members of Congress is to listen to these veterans when they tell us there is still more work to be done to help fix the system. In 2016, a group of veterans brought a disturbing problem to my attention concerning individuals who were deliberately stealing money from veterans and the VA without fear of criminal punishment. I started to hear story after story about people advertising their so-called services to veterans, claiming that, for a fee, they can help veterans obtain certain VA benefits or expedite existing claims with the VA.

□ 1530

There are two problems with this. Number one, it is illegal for anyone who isn't approved by the VA to charge fees for helping veterans with their claims or appeals; and two, often times these promises of assistance are empty and never followed through with. Unfortunately, there are no penalties for breaking this law.

One local VSO explained to me at length how these scammers specifically target senior veterans in low-income housing communities, almost as a rule, because they consider those veterans to be the most vulnerable and most likely to fall victim to their schemes. I have heard countless accounts of these con artists going into assisted living facilities, rounding up all the veterans and coercing them all to apply for benefits they don't even qualify for.

When I hear people are taking advantage of these heroes and making a quick buck off of them, it makes me sick, as I am sure it makes all of us sick, because it is wrong and it needs to stop.

The reality is that this isn't just happening in my backyard. It is happening in every one of our districts. These con artists are getting away with it. I refuse to let this fraudulent scheme against some of the most respectable people in our Nation continue.

Without a Federal criminal penalty, we have been unable to prevent these financial predators from preying on our veterans and defrauding the VA.

My friend and fellow Congressman, Democrat TED DEUTCH from south Florida, joined me in introducing this bipartisan bill to penalize these scammers who make their living stealing from our veterans. Our bill would give prosecutors and law enforcement the tools they need to appropriately penalize these predators by imposing a hefty fine, imprisoning them for up to 5 years, or both.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this commonsense, bipartisan bill, and I hope that the Senate will act quickly to send it to the President's desk.

These criminals need to pay the price for these actions. Our veterans have done everything to protect us and our way of life. Now it is our duty in Congress to make sure that they are protected as well.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the coauthor of this legislation.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, many veterans face extraordinary obstacles when they return home, especially in retirement.

Too often, one of the obstacles to a safe and secure retirement for our veterans are so-called pension poachers. These are people who create high-pressure sales pitches that directly target older veterans. They make big promises, knowing they have no intention of ever delivering on them.

These are criminals who not only prey on our veterans, they prey on every American taxpayer who wants to do right by those who have served our country. They prey on the fact that we try to take good care of our veterans. They try to do it for financial gain. It is despicable, and we need to take action to stop it and make them pay for it. It is our job to ensure that they can't get away with it.

That is why I am proud to have partnered with my colleague, fellow Floridian, a veteran and my friend, Mr. ROONEY, to draft the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act. This bill will give Federal prosecutors the tools they need to target criminals who actively work to avoid current mail and wire fraud statutes, all while targeting our veterans. It is time to crack down on pension poachers and fraudsters.

I am thankful for Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member NADLER, and my Judiciary colleagues for their support in helping to get this bill to the floor. I thank every Member of this House who voted unanimously to pass this legislation in the last Congress.

Finally, I would like to thank Veterans Service Officer Greg Dover from Palm Beach County, Florida, who has helped to alert my office of these schemes and has worked tirelessly on behalf of our veterans to stand up for their rights and the benefits they deserve.

I ask all of my colleagues to support our veterans and to vote "yes" on the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 506 creates a new section, 1352, in chapter 63, title 18, to penalize fraudsters that knowingly execute or attempt to execute a scheme or artifice to defraud a veteran of his or her benefits—that is a dastardly act—or in connection with obtaining that veteran's benefits by imposing a fine, imprisonment of up to 5 years, or both.

Under current law, you can be an agent or attorney and meet certain standards and you can help a veteran. But there are many who were not licensed, not connected, or had the approval of various States or local governments, and they were fraudulently taking precious resources from our veterans. There was no criminal or financial penalty for breaking the law.

So, H.R. 506 provides that penalty because, in recent years, financial predators across the country have targeted easy targets, who are veterans. Many, as we have said, have been physically or mentally maimed in their service to this Nation. Many of them are also elderly and live in low-income housing.

This bill is long in coming. I thank Mr. ROONEY and Mr. DEUTCH, working with the members of the Judiciary Committee, for moving this legislation forward.

We ask our veterans to lay their lives on the line so that we can enjoy freedom, which is at the heart of this great country. We owe them much. Surely, we can repay our gratitude whenever we can. Protecting their veterans' benefits is one way of expressing our appreciation, and it is the right and just thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's veterans have sacrificed. They have given us so much. They have protected us.

In his second inaugural address, President Lincoln reminded us of our solemn duty "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

By doing this today, we keep that promise of so long ago: the promise to give back, as appropriate, and to protect that by giving back to the widows, the orphans, and the veterans themselves, because our values don't just say we write a check. We also protect to make sure that check gets to the true beneficiary. This enforcement will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to, on a bipartisan basis, which this bill has been from day one, support it and to move it to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 506, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1207. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, as the "Tilden Veterans Post Office".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2286. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act to provide greater protection and services for Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes.

PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3249) to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3249

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "criminal street gangs" has the meaning given such term in section 521 of title 18, United States Code;

(2) the term "gang crime" means a felony or misdemeanor crime, under State or Federal law, committed by one or more persons who are a member of, or directly affiliated with, a criminal street gang;

(3) the term "transnational organized crime group" has the meaning given such term in section 36(k)(6) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(k)(6));

(4) the term "transnational organized crime" has the meaning given such term in section 36(k)(5) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(k)(5)); and

(5) the term "firearms offenses" means an offense under section 922 or 924 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

The Attorney General of the United States is authorized to establish and carry out a program, to be known as the "Project Safe Neighborhoods Block Grant Program" or, in this Act, as the "Program", within the Office of Justice Programs at the Department of Justice.

SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

The purpose of the Project Safe Neighborhoods Block Grant Program is to foster and improve existing partnerships between Federal, State, and local agencies, including the United States Attorney in each Federal judicial district, to create safer neighborhoods through sustained reductions in violent crimes by—

(1) developing and executing strategic plans to assist law enforcement agencies in combating gang crimes, including the enforcement of gun laws and drug interdiction; and

(2) developing intervention and prevention initiatives, including juvenile justice projects and activities which may include street-level outreach, conflict mediation, and the changing of community norms, in order to reduce violence.

SEC. 5. RULES AND REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, make rules to create, carry out, and administer the Program in accordance with this section.

(b) FUNDS TO BE DIRECTED TO LOCAL CONTROL.—Amounts made available as grants under the Program shall be, to the greatest extent practicable, locally controlled to address problems that are identified locally

(c) REGIONAL GANG TASK FORCES.—30 percent of the amounts made available as grants under the Program each fiscal year shall be granted to established Regional Gang Task Forces in regions experiencing a significant or increased presence of, or high levels of activity from, transnational organized crime groups posing threats to community safety in terms of violent crime, firearms offenses, human trafficking, trafficking and distribution of illegal opioids and heroin, and other crimes.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; CONSOLIDATION OF PROGRAMS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Program under this Act \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2021.

(b) CONSOLIDATION OF PROGRAMS.—For each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, no funds are authorized to be separately appropriated to the Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs for—

(1) competitive and evidence-based programs to reduce gun crime and gang violence;

(2) an Edward Byrne Memorial criminal justice innovation program;

(3) community-based violence prevention initiatives; or

(4) gang and youth violence education, prevention and intervention, and related activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3249, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), the author of the bill.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 3249, the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act of 2017.

I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and the entire Judiciary Committee for their efforts on this legislation and working through the process to bring this to the floor.

I wanted to set out some recent headlines from the in-depth reporting by The Washington Post on the rise of the MS-13 gang problem in the Washington metropolitan area, which includes Maryland, D.C., and Virginia, and why this legislation is needed.

“MS-13 is ‘taking over the school,’ one teen warned before she was killed.”

“She told the girl she’d see her in hell before stabbing her. Now, she’s guilty of an MS-13 murder.”

“‘People here live in fear’: MS-13 menaces a community 7 miles from the White House.”

“Police: MS-13 members in Maryland stab man more than 100 times and decapitate him.”

This is from my local paper, the Loudoun-Times Mirror:

“MS-13 gang members convicted in gruesome murder of a Leesburg teenager.”

In this particular case in Leesburg, Virginia, the teenage boy, Carlos Otero-Henriquez, was stabbed over 50 times and his body was dumped in a quarry miles away in West Virginia.

The Acting U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, Tracy Doherty-McCormick, had this to say after the murderers were convicted: “The hallmark of MS-13 is extreme violence. This brutal kidnapping and murder is a tragic reminder of the impact MS-13 has on communities here in northern Virginia. My hope is that our efforts to investigate and prosecute this case will send a clear message: Violence will be aggressively prosecuted.”

This, and many of these other cases, are why we need the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act, which authorizes \$50 million, but targets 30 percent being directed toward already-established regional gang task forces.

As we know, MS-13 is a transnational gang that has been found not only here in the Washington metropolitan region, but in Los Angeles, Long Island, Houston, and other cities throughout the country.

The Washington Post has highlighted how the 2014 border surge contributed to the MS-13 gang problem writing: “The violent street gang is on the rise in the United States, fueled, in part, by the surge in unaccompanied minors.”

The unaccompanied minors, who often fled their native country to get away from the gangs, arrive here only to find themselves targeted by those very same gang members they were fleeing.

MS-13 preys upon these youngsters in their own community—and let me emphasize, it is their own community that they are victimizing—who may

not have much of a family structure, and, in effect, MS-13 tries to become their family or threaten them with death if they don’t.

Last summer, when I went on a ride-along with our Northern Virginia Regional Task Force, I was able to see their good work right in front of us. There was a young man on the sidewalk of Sterling Boulevard in Sterling, Virginia, just miles from here. The gang task force noticed him and turned around and decided to stop him and see what he was up to. With years of experience, the officers knew the MS-13 indicators.

The boy looked about 16 years old, from what I could tell, but it turned out he was actually a 22-year-old gang member. He was covered in MS-13 gang tattoos. When he lifted up his shirt when they asked him to do so, he showed all of the particular signs of MS-13, from his head to all over his feet.

It turns out he had been jailed in El Salvador for murder when he was 16 and had been deported from the United States twice for engaging in violent crime.

As it turns out now, when they come to the border, we don’t have the law to be able to stop them. Fortunately, this House did pass a law back in the fall, on a bipartisan basis—it is over in the Senate now—to be able to stop these gang members from getting in the country in the first place and being able to deport them quicker. But in the meantime, we need to increase the work and the support for these regional gang task forces.

□ 1545

We also saw the technology they use. They can use something along the lines of an iPad or an iPhone where they put this gang member’s fingerprint on there and immediately it comes to light, as shown in the international records, that he was a murderer and that he had been in jail. But they need more of those resources. They only had two of those that they were able to use, and they said every one of their cars needs that kind of resource.

That same night that we were on the ride-along, three other suspected MS-13 gang members were also picked up. This isn’t an aberration.

At a town festival in Herndon, Virginia, in my district, the Northern Virginia Regional Gang Task Force told us that they had identified an estimated 200 to 300 suspected gang members who were milling about while our children were getting popcorn, getting on the rides, and there were people coming together to have a hotdog or a hamburger in a community festival.

According to the Northern Virginia Regional Gang Task Force, an MS-13 gang member put a hit out on his own brother because he refused to join the organization. Fortunately, because of

the good, intensive work of the Northern Virginia Regional Gang Task Force, they spared this young man from being killed by his own brother.

That is why we need to have these resources that we are voting on today. We need to help on a Federal level.

The community policing involved with the Northern Virginia Regional Gang Task Force includes officers who speak Spanish, understand the gang culture, and help get the kids out of this. They get involved in the education, getting them into the schools. They understand where they are trying to target these young people, and they are familiar with their communities and have developed very good relationships with these communities.

ICE officials complement these efforts by removing the dangerous gang members once identified and allowing the task force to work in our highest risk schools and communities to prevent gang violence.

The Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act would direct this additional Federal funding toward these gang task forces so that our gang task forces—which are comprised in my area of 13 local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies—can really make the best antigang efforts in this three-pronged approach that they engage in: education, intervention and prevention, and enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen firsthand the good work these gang task forces can do to remove these gang threats from our community, so I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak to this.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to the distinguished manager and to the author of this legislation, there is certainly room for legislation that speaks to the needs of our children and speaks to those who obviously have joined vicious and violent gangs even though of young ages.

I will always, however, reemphasize the message that, as we look at these efforts, as I speak about my Juvenile Block Grant Antibullying and Prevention Act, legislation that I would like to see go through the Judiciary Committee, we must be reminded that, in order to continue to be safe, this Congress cannot ignore debate and passage of gun safety legislation.

Guns kill. AR-15s kill. The lack of raising the age from 18 to 21 for guns hurts our children. Not having universal background checks hurts our children. But at the same time, we must find ways to stem the tide of gangs, and there are many gangs throughout the Nation.

Just speaking with my law enforcement, the gang names that came to me were not just MS-13. We will find gangs

in our particular jurisdictions that have many names. But whatever their names, their behavior is dastardly and it is injurious, and if we can find ways to keep our neighborhood safe, as H.R. 3249 intends to do, the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act of 2017, which would provide additional resources to help local jurisdictions prevent and fight crime in their communities, then we should stand together to do so.

The bill would authorize the Attorney General to establish and implement a program to be known as the Project Safe Neighborhoods Block Program within the Office of Justice Programs at the Department of Justice, thereby providing a formal authorization for the Project Safe Neighborhoods program currently implemented by DOJ. A portion of the funding awards under the program would be allocated to fighting gang-related crime.

While I support authorizing this program, I would like to highlight two concerns. The first is the Juvenile Block Grant Antibullying and Prevention Act, which would have reauthorized the juvenile block grants which would go to communities for a variety of reasons. That has been stalled in the Judiciary Committee under the pretense of not having an offset. And I see that this particular legislation does have, seemingly, a \$70 million a year authorization without an offset.

So I think we should work together, and as I support this legislation, I think we should support other legislative initiatives that can really intervene. It is clear that the perpetrator in Florida, there is some evidence, some newspaper reporting, that this individual was bullied and had a very difficult life. We see that that is certainly a reason that young people become gang members.

So as we look to supporting this legislation, I think that we should look to broaden our support and work on the whole idea of steering our children away from the idea of gangs, guns, and violence.

I would hope, first, a substantial portion of the funding of this bill will be dedicated to antigang task forces. I support preventing and fighting crime no matter who the perpetrator may be. But I also want to make sure that we look holistically at dealing with young people and that we have alternatives for them, which block-granting does in giving alternatives to communities to direct young people in other directions other than gangs.

We must be vigilant in conducting oversight, also, of the use of program funds and in protecting those program funds so that they can be utilized for authorization of other efforts to help our young people.

Let me also indicate that this program should be one facet of working with young people. The program will be

one facet of DOJ's efforts to address gun and gang violence at the local, State, and Tribal levels.

The Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, which provide other funds for a myriad of activities in our local communities, we should view it from the holistic perspective and as an effort to supplement but not supplant alternatives that may employ different but yet still effective approaches, which I am speaking of through the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program. None of the funding prohibitions would serve the interest of public safety.

For instance, the bill would eliminate the Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program, which, when implemented, helps local governments develop crime reduction strategies to address crime in hotspots that generate a significant amount of crime within larger communities or jurisdictions.

The Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program is a community-based strategy that aims to prevent and control violent crime, drug abuse, and gang activity in high-crime neighborhoods by providing funding to support partnerships between law enforcement agencies and community-based organizations that balance targeted enforcement with prevention, intervention, and neighborhood restoration services. If you ask your local police, many of them will tout the Byrne program as being very successful.

In the past, OJP has coordinated the efforts of this program with related efforts to promote neighborhood revitalization by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Education. We see no reason to eliminate the possibility of funding for this program which is very helpful.

So along with the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program and many others, I believe this legislation can be enhanced. I hope that as we make our way through the legislative process, we will not only work with H.R. 3249, but we will also work with other legislation that will holistically help the crime situation in our Nation and secure young people as they desire to be secured and, particularly, work on gun violence, which is severe in many of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, again, I want to acknowledge the author of H.R. 3249 for an important statement regarding gangs, and I would hope that we could continue to work on these issues. For instance, the bill would eliminate the Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program, and I hope that we can restore that.

As well, I hope that we can work very closely on other legislative initiatives that are going through the Judiciary Committee. A holistic approach is the best approach. And then I hope that we can restore the funding that is necessary for some of the programs that have been eliminated because of this legislation. Good as it may be, it is important to do a combination of efforts to deal with protecting children and steering children away from these vile actions.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that there are programs dealing with bullying and prevention of bullying that can complement the work that is being done here and the Byrne program that has been utilized by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, cleaning neighborhoods, making neighborhoods safe. I can see it in my congressional district and I can see it in other congressional districts, to come in and combine with those resources. And then, of course, are the resources that uplift our young people, steer them in the right direction and provide alternative support systems for them.

As many people know, in years gone by, something that many people found humorous was midnight basketball. Today I hear law enforcement officers say: You know, that midnight basketball really worked so many years ago.

We need to look at a collective approach to getting kids off the street, making sure our children are safe, and that they don't find, as their only relief, gangs, but they can also find clean, safe neighborhoods and neighborhoods that are free of guns as the only tool to settle their disputes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Texas is quite right. This bill's pay-for comes through consolidation of similar programs, and I think it is important to briefly go over that.

Working with the Attorney General's Office, the author, Mrs. COMSTOCK, went to great lengths to find programs that are essentially doing much the same thing in which, by consolidating, you pick up efficiencies. I particularly note that item two in the bill, the pay-for, the Edward Byrne Memorial criminal justice innovation program, is but a small part of the overall so-called Byrne program.

Many of the things the gentlewoman from Texas cited are good and are not being consolidated but, rather, a small amount. This targeted approach with our limited funds allows those funds to go further; and particularly as we look at community outreach, these funds, by being consolidated, are part of a community outreach and will be used in similar ways to the programs that they are taking from, but taking from it, in this case, in a consolidated way.

So I want to thank a former staff member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the committee that deals with efficiency in government, for looking through the details of these appropriated funds and finding a way to bring them together to give both flexibility and efficiency that I believe this will adhere to. It is the reason that this is a bipartisan bill.

The reason that it is so widely accepted is that it has been narrowly targeted. And although I share with the gentlewoman from Texas, my friend from Houston, that in a perfect world we would be plussing-up funds, if we are not able to do that at this time, I would support and work with the gentlewoman any time to try to do something similar for some of the areas of her concern.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3249, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

TAKING ACCOUNT OF INSTITUTIONS WITH LOW OPERATION RISK ACT OF 2017

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 773, I call up the bill (H.R. 1116) to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 773, the amendment printed in part C of House Report 115-595 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Taking Account of Institutions with Low Operation Risk Act of 2017" or the "TAILOR Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REGULATIONS APPROPRIATE TO BUSINESS MODELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For any regulatory action occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall—

(1) take into consideration the risk profile and business models of each type of institu-

tion or class of institutions subject to the regulatory action;

(2) determine the necessity, appropriateness, and impact of applying such regulatory action to such institutions or classes of institutions; and

(3) tailor such regulatory action in a manner that limits the regulatory compliance impact, cost, liability risk, and other burdens, as appropriate, for the risk profile and business model of the institution or class of institutions involved.

(b) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the requirements of subsection (a), each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall consider—

(1) the impact that such regulatory action, both by itself and in conjunction with the aggregate effect of other regulations, has on the ability of the applicable institution or class of institutions to serve evolving and diverse customer needs;

(2) the potential impact of examination manuals, regulatory actions taken with respect to third-party service providers, or other regulatory directives that may be in conflict or inconsistent with the tailoring of such regulatory action described in subsection (a)(3); and

(3) the underlying policy objectives of the regulatory action and statutory scheme involved.

(c) NOTICE OF PROPOSED AND FINAL RULEMAKING.—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall disclose in every notice of proposed rulemaking and in any final rulemaking for a regulatory action how the agency has applied subsections (a) and (b).

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) INDIVIDUAL AGENCY REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on the specific actions taken to tailor the regulatory actions of the agency pursuant to the requirements of this Act.

(B) APPEARANCE BEFORE THE COMMITTEES.—The head of each Federal financial institution regulatory agency shall appear before the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate after each report is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) to testify on the contents of such report.

(2) FIEC REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after each report is submitted under paragraph (1), the Financial Institutions Examination Council shall report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on—

(i) the extent to which regulatory actions tailored pursuant to this Act result in different treatment of similarly situated institutions of diverse charter types; and

(ii) the reasons for such differential treatment.

(B) APPEARANCE BEFORE THE COMMITTEES.—The Chairman of the Financial Institutions Examination Council shall appear before the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate after each report is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) to testify on the contents of such report.

(e) LIMITED LOOK-BACK APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall conduct a review of all regulations adopted during the period beginning on the date that is seven years before the date of the introduction of this Act in the House of Representatives and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act, and apply the requirements of this Act to such regulations.

(2) REVISION.—If the application of the requirements of this Act to any such regulation requires such regulation to be revised, the applicable Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall revise such regulation within 3 years of the enactment of this Act.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REGULATORY AGENCIES.—The term “Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies” means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

(2) REGULATORY ACTION.—The term “regulatory action” means any proposed, interim, or final rule or regulation, guidance, or published interpretation.

SEC. 3. REDUCTION OF SURPLUS FUNDS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$7,500,000,000” and inserting “\$7,385,714,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on June 1, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we were told many, many years ago that Dodd-Frank was passed to deal with the big Wall Street banks, that somehow our community banks and our credit unions would be held harmless because, Mr. Speaker, they didn't cause the crisis.

Now, we can have the discussion of what did—that is a whole different discussion for a different day—but unfortunately, regardless of whatever good intentions there might have been at the time, and I don't offer an opinion

as to those intentions, the facts are that, since Dodd-Frank was passed, the big banks are bigger and the small banks and credit unions are fewer. We are losing, on average, a community bank or credit union every other day in America.

And as we lose them, Mr. Speaker, so do we lose the hopes and dreams and desires of our constituents, of so many hardworking Americans who deserve to buy that car, who deserve to be able to own their own home, who deserve, after working so many years on the assembly line, to finally capitalize their own small business. But none of this is going to happen unless we actually tailor this regulatory burden to the size and complexity of the financial institution, something that, in many respects, was promised by Dodd-Frank but not delivered by Dodd-Frank.

So I am very, very happy that, today, we have yet another bipartisan bill from the Financial Services Committee that is aimed to promote economic growth, to help hardworking Americans, again, achieve their American Dream, because half of this country is living from paycheck to paycheck, and we need to ease that economic anxiety, and so we have got to make sure that the lifeblood of credit, that capital, is flowing through the system.

It is our community banks in particular that fund our small businesses. Unfortunately, up until the advent of the new administration, Mr. Speaker, small business lending by banks was at a 25-year low, entrepreneurship was at a generational low.

Now, thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we have turned that corner, but we have so much further to go. So a particularly hardworking member of the House Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), has come to us today with H.R. 1116, the Taking Account of Institutions with Low Operation Risk Act, yes, Mr. Speaker, the TAILOR Act.

Simply put, what this bill does is simply directs the Federal financial regulators to, again, simply tailor their regulations to entities based upon their size, their risk profile, their complexity. It also demands that they have some transparency in this process by requiring that the regulators report to Congress, report to the representatives of “we the people” how they have actually tailored the regulations—again, something that was implied, something that was promised in Dodd-Frank but did not actually occur.

Again, Mr. Speaker, every single day we hear from our community financial institutions. I heard from one in New Mexico that said:

You know, we are a \$300 million community bank in an area with high unemployment. Thirty-seven percent of our employees are active in community organizations, Little League, charities, and many serve in

leadership positions in these organizations, and we also make tens of thousands of dollars in charitable contributions every year; but if our bank can't survive, you take away the local leadership, you take away the economic engine of our community.

This banker was clearly talking about the regulatory burden.

I heard from one in Iowa:

I am a mortgage consumer lender and also the compliance officer of a small community bank in rural Iowa. I have been in banking for over 30 years and always enjoyed my job until the last 5 years. The new rules that will be implemented are ridiculous, and at that time, we may discontinue to offer in-house mortgage loans.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, my mailbox runneth over.

As our small banks and credit unions go, so goes the American Dream.

At a bare minimum, let's tailor the rules and regulations to the size and complexity of the institution so our credit unions, so our banks can thrive and, thus, our constituents can thrive and meet their economic goals and responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1116, the so-called Taking Account of Institutions with Low Operation Risk Act of 2017, or the TAILOR Act.

This bill would weaken important safeguards established since the financial crisis by requiring agencies on the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council—composed of the Federal Reserve Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Credit Union Administration, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency—to perform a biased analysis that favors lessening the costs for industry over protecting consumers and the economy.

It was 10 years ago today that Bear Stearns collapsed and the Federal Reserve used taxpayer funding to arrange a shotgun wedding to J.P. Morgan to avoid a catastrophe. We now know that much, much worse was to come, when AIG, Lehman Brothers, the money market fund industry, and hundreds of banks, including all of the largest ones, would need a bailout. And this says nothing of the tremendous damage inflicted on the millions of Americans whose homes were lost to foreclosure, the millions who lost their jobs, and the trillions of dollars of wealth that evaporated.

Congress took decisive action to ensure that we were never caught unaware again when it passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

Although some claim that the measure that is now before us is aimed at helping community banks, that is not

the case. If enacted, this bill would provide all financial institutions, including the largest banks, with opportunities to challenge any and every regulation in court if they felt it was not, so-called, uniquely tailored to their business needs.

This bill would ignore the mandates and requirements of all other laws passed by Congress and override decades of well-established administrative law requirements by subjecting all new financial rules to a vague, if not impossible, standard to meet. This includes an undefined standard of appropriateness and a vague standard of the ability to serve evolving and diverse customer needs; and, importantly, the legislation includes no similar mandate that regulators consider the benefits of Federal regulations, including the promotion of our Nation's financial stability or the protection of our consumers.

Let us not forget that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is the centerpiece of this Dodd-Frank reform. Prior to Dodd-Frank, our consumers had nobody looking out for them. They were left and they were taken advantage of, and so that is why we have Dodd-Frank reform.

But it seems that my friends on the opposite side of the aisle have forgotten about all of this. This set of standards that they are promoting not only applies to all future guidance and rulemaking, but retroactively to all of the rulemakings in the past 7 years, which, conveniently for the industry, covers all rules under the Dodd-Frank Act.

But financial regulators already have to go through extensive look-back reviews that refine and improve rules that make sense. In fact, under the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, or EGRPRA, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were just last week calling the gold standard for how regulators should review regulations, the Federal Reserve, OCC, and FDIC are already required to review their rules once every 10 years.

During this review, the regulators must identify whether regulations are outdated, unnecessary, or unduly burdensome and consider how to reduce regulatory burdens on insured depository institutions while, at the same time, ensuring safety and soundness.

The Consumer Bureau engages in a similar look-back review 5 years after a significant rule takes effect.

Make no mistake: I support tiered and tailored regulations for community banks and credit unions, but week after week, we have been on this House floor debating deregulatory gifts to Wall Street instead of moving legislation that actually benefits community banks and credit unions.

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and I have differences about Dodd-Frank, but something we

worked hard to do in crafting those critical reforms was to make sure that the law did not impose a one-size-fits-all approach on every financial institution. So, as you can see, the toughest rules focus on the largest and most complex financial firms that, as we saw in the crisis, can destabilize the financial system and inflict lasting damage to the economy and constituents we serve.

We have monitored Dodd-Frank's implementation carefully and pushed regulators to tailor rules to reduce unnecessary compliance burdens while maintaining appropriate protections and safeguards for consumers, investors, and taxpayers.

We must continue to take this type of targeted approach instead of advancing measures like H.R. 1116, this bill that we are talking about right now, which would force the regulators to prioritize costs to Wall Street over benefits to consumers and the economy and expose rulemaking to needless litigation because of the nebulous standards in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of the TAILOR Act, who also serves as the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of our Financial Services Committee, a very, very hardworking member of the committee and a real leader to help preserve and maintain our community banks and credit unions.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on this issue, as well, and for considering this bipartisan legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, the ever-growing burden and complexity of financial regulations is creating an environment of difficult choices for community banks and credit unions. Often, they must choose to incur the costs of complying with a regulation or cease to offer the financial product the regulation modifies. Whatever choice these community institutions make, it is the local consumer and the local economy that loses.

Burdensome regulations drive up the costs of financial products and limit choices for consumers, which decreases a community's access to financial products and services that help their families to be able to buy their first home, to help small businesses grow.

In districts like mine in Colorado, that amounts to real economic impact, especially in towns where the community bank or credit union on the corner is the only true access to credit that the community has.

□ 1615

When smaller institutions are unable to absorb the costs of additional com-

pliance, it is the small towns across America that are disproportionately affected.

As one banker from Colorado recently wrote me: We have seen time and again the impact of this regulatory environment consume many hours and resources of our compliance, credit, and audit teams despite the relatively simple business model that we follow.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the bipartisan TAILOR Act's consideration on the floor today is so important. The TAILOR Act directs the Federal financial regulators to take into account the risk profile and business model of institutions as they develop new regulations, making them more targeted, more deliberate. The TAILOR Act also instructs regulators to weigh the impact that new regulatory burdens will have on smaller institutions, meaning real relief from compliance burdens for banks and credit unions.

To put the impact of regulations into perspective, the Dodd-Frank Act alone created 400 new rules and came with 30,000 pages of explanation. In my travels across Colorado, I have heard far too often that community institutions have been forced to stop making home loans or loans to small businesses because they can't afford to hire more employees to manage the added compliance paperwork.

The TAILOR Act would make sure that the compliance burdens are considered when new regulations are made so that community financial institutions won't have to choose between the needs of their communities and complying with regulations out of Washington, D.C. Community banks and credit unions need to be able to prioritize their customers and the needs of their communities instead of prioritizing compliance with heavy-handed regulations.

One community banker from Colorado brought this into focus when he wrote me saying: Providing a real-time view of risk and continual review of such a risk applicable to each financial institution allows regulators to direct their attention to developing issues that could have the most damaging effect. With the number of financial institutions declining to historically low levels, the redeployment of focus based on complexity makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, in Colorado, mortgages haven't been made, loans to expand small businesses have been denied, retirees and recently employed workers have been turned away, and relationships between community bankers and their neighbors have been discarded. The one-size-fits-all approach to regulating the financial services industry has resulted in decreased access to much-needed credit.

America is now in a position to be able to address this. The trickle-down effect of regulation intended to respond to the culpable actions of the big banks

after the 2008 financial crisis is harming Main Street and the ability of everyday Americans to be able to realize their financial goals. Directing the regulators to refocus their regulations will help Americans start achieving their goals once again.

Once more, the regulators themselves have acknowledged the need for tailored regulations. Both Treasury Secretary Mnuchin and Federal Reserve Chairman Powell have acknowledged the significant need for a return to common sense in the financial regulatory landscape. Mr. Speaker, the TAILOR Act, which passed out of the Financial Services Committee with broad bipartisan support, does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I would again like to thank Chairman HENSARLING for considering this measure here today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), a member of the Financial Services Committee, ranking member of the Small Business Committee, and a senior member, of course, of our Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman, MAXINE WATERS, for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act. This bill requires regulators on the FFIEC to reduce the scale and scope of their regulations based on the size and profile of a financial institution or class of institutions.

Let me be clear: Like many of the bill's supporters, I strongly believe that we should not take a one-size-fits-all approach to financial regulation. Financial regulation must be appropriately adjusted according to the size and complexity of an institution or class of institutions. That is why Democrats worked so hard to create these flexibilities in Dodd-Frank and regulators are already required to adjust their rules accordingly. For example, the CFPB has exempted community banks from many of the requirements under the qualified mortgage rule, and the Federal Reserve has developed different capital standards for banks based on size.

Moreover, we already have laws like the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act that instructs Federal financial regulators to go through extensive look-back reviews to update and improve their regulations. So while I agree that it is necessary to review and update our regulatory framework from time to time, particularly for our smaller institutions, I oppose H.R. 1116 because the reviews required under the bill tilt too far in the industry's favor and fail to provide sufficient protection to the public's or the consumer's interest.

If enacted, this bill will provide our Nation's largest financial institutions

with the opportunity to challenge any revised rulemaking in court if they felt a regulation was not uniquely tailored to meet their business needs. The bill also requires regulators to ignore the requirements of Dodd-Frank and other laws and subjects any future financial regulation to vague and impossible standards like appropriateness and necessity. These standards are undefined in the bill, making it very easy for a financial institution to challenge them in court.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Perhaps most importantly, the bill makes no mention of regulators also considering the protection a current or future regulation has for consumers or the benefit it provides to our Nation's financial stability.

Instead of developing sweeping rollbacks of financial regulation, we should instead spend our time working to improve our regulatory framework in order to ensure it maintains appropriate protections and safeguards for consumers, investors, and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this ill-advised bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit and a real leader on our committee for proper regulation.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his hard work and leadership on our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, for being such a champion for this initiative and others to bring about a more responsible, effective regulatory regime. For years, Members on both sides of the aisle have advocated for a more tailored, commonsense approach to Federal banking regulation. We have all said, time and time again, that rules designed for large institutions shouldn't apply to community banks and smaller credit unions.

We pressed the Federal financial regulators to take into consideration the risk profile and business models of institutions. In their appearances before the Financial Services Committee and in response to congressional letters and calls, the regulators tell us they are tailoring regulations and supervisory requirements based on individual institutions. They tell us what we want to hear, that one size fits all; but, Mr. Speaker, these institutions have yet to see this relief that they really need.

We lose a community bank or a credit union every day in this country. Today we have an opportunity to work together in an effort to change that, to

make sure that our constituents continue to have access to the services they need and to achieve financial independence. We are doing a disservice to our communities and the people we represent if we continue to allow rules intended for the largest firms to be forced upon our small financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I have got a couple of 6-year-old grandsons. When they come over to the house and they want to play basketball, they can't hit a 10-foot goal, so we need to lower the goal in order for them to be able to play. Otherwise, they are going to quit; they get tired, frustrated; and they go away.

This is what is happening with our smaller institutions. They are saddled with rules and regulations that are for the larger institutions, yet they have to play that same game and experience the same costs. As a result, they are going out of business at the rate of one a day.

This bipartisan bill is straightforward and one that every Member of this body should be able to support. Mr. TIPTON's legislation simply requires the Federal financial regulators to actually consider the risk profile and business model of a financial institution and to tailor regulatory actions accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for his outstanding work on this legislation and ask my colleagues for the support of the TAILOR Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed at the deregulatory bills that are produced by the opposite side of the aisle, and I keep wondering why there are so many attempts to provide the banks and the financial institutions, the largest banks in this country, opportunities to make even more money.

According to an estimate from Goldman Sachs, the Republicans' tax scam bill represents a giant windfall for Wall Street megabanks. So we are here with another bill to deregulate, basically to talk about tailoring. Let me just redefine this tailoring. It just means changing, modifying, coming up with ways that the banks can basically complain about their costs and their burdens. But my friends continue to basically support them in whatever efforts they want in order to make more money.

This report that I just referred to estimates that all of the largest banks, eight of the largest banks, will receive \$15 billion windfalls on their 2018 tax bill. This includes \$3.7 billion for Wells Fargo, \$3.5 billion for Bank of America, \$3.3 billion for JPMorgan, \$1.4 billion for Citigroup, and \$1 billion for Goldman Sachs.

What more do they want? How much more can you give them? What is the next deregulatory bill that you will come with on this floor?

It is interesting to note that the Financial Services Committee is responsible for over 50 percent, or at least 50 percent, of all of the bills coming through the Rules Committee that come to the floor, which means that my friends on the opposite side of the aisle have spent an inordinate amount of time coming up with legislation dealing with deregulation of these big banks.

Now, we have a lot of things that we could be doing to protect consumers, working people, and families in that committee. I wish we would spend a lot more time on HUD. The homeless population in this country is expanding. It is exploding all over the country. In New York and California, in the Midwest—you name it—people are on the streets.

Do you think we have been able to have a hearing on homelessness in this committee? No, because all of this time is spent on supporting the biggest banks in America and deregulating in ways that will cause them to be able to make more and more money.

How much more do they want? How much more do they need? How much time is this Congress going to spend on trying to undo Dodd-Frank and kill the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau?

I don't know the answers to these questions, Mr. Speaker. And I wish they would answer me, but no, I know they are not going to. They are simply going to come and talk about tailoring. Well, tailoring just means changing, fixing in a way that will benefit the biggest banks.

Mr. Speaker, I will let them continue with their deregulatory efforts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for yielding. My hat is off to the vice chair of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, my good friend, Congressman TIPTON, for this fine piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act, and I urge its immediate passage.

According to the most recent estimates, the 147 new regulations created under the Dodd-Frank Act have resulted in \$40 billion in additional regulatory costs. Unfortunately, this one-size-fits-all approach trickles down to consumers and small businesses in my home State of Missouri, who, for years, have struggled to keep up with these unnecessary burdens.

I would like to take a moment to share how those burdens have had a

real impact on the constituents of Missouri's Second Congressional District.

Due to new regulatory burdens imposed under the Dodd-Frank Act, a local credit union in my district contacted my office to tell us how they were forced to redirect their efforts away from helping their customers and into bureaucratic studies of how the new rules affected the credit union. Third-party costs skyrocketed, as the credit union was forced to spend more money on outside vendors and lawyers for guidance. Instead of providing their customers with new products or decreased costs, employees shifted their focus toward compliance efforts.

Congressman TIPTON's bill, which enjoys bipartisan support, is yet another example of Congress getting it right. This legislation will focus on the institutions model and risk profile, which will, in turn, allow financial institutions like the one I previously mentioned to focus their time and resources on the communities that they serve.

Again, I am proud to support my good friend from Colorado, Congressman TIPTON. I urge all Members to support his bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who is the chairman of our Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1116, the Taking Account of Institutions with Low Operation Risk Act of 2017, which directs the Federal financial regulatory agencies to tailor their rulemakings in consideration of the risk profiles and business models of the financial institutions that are subject to such rules.

It also directs the agencies to annually report to Congress regarding the specific actions that those agencies have taken to tailor their regulatory actions.

I would just like to thank the ranking member of our committee for actually making the argument in favor of this legislation. She is concerned about big banks, or big banks getting benefits, or big banks not getting enough scrutiny. This bill makes sure that regulatory agencies are focused on the systemic institutions and not overwhelmed by responsibilities of regulating nonsystemically important institutions, our community banks, our regulatory-challenged institutions in our communities; not focus so much attention on imposing compliance burdens on small credit unions.

That is why I support my good friend from Colorado, Representative TIPTON's bill, because it gives the regulators more focus on what they should be doing instead of heaping an avalanche of red tape on nonsystemic,

small community banks, which are withering on the vine under Dodd-Frank.

Mr. Speaker, since 2010, the Dodd-Frank financial control law has been a disaster for small institutions, those small community banks and credit unions across our country. That law generally applied one-size-fits-all rules and regulations on financial institutions, regardless of the fact that many businesses in the same industry are substantially different.

This is in recognition of the ranking member's argument that big banks are different than small banks. For the life of me, I don't know why she wouldn't be fully supportive of the bill.

As a direct result of Dodd-Frank, which applies this one-size-fits-all approach, the Commonwealth of Kentucky has lost about 20 percent of its banks and credit unions, with more bank closures anticipated in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. This is particularly concerning because our State-chartered banks provide about 75 percent of the lending in rural America and about half of all the U.S. lending nationwide. As you can see, with fewer community financial institutions due to Dodd-Frank's 28,000 new restrictions, Americans will have less access to the capital they need to buy a home, purchase a car, and start a business.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Mr. TIPTON, for his leadership on the TAILOR Act. I urge my colleagues, especially the ranking member, to vote in favor of the TAILOR Act, to do exactly what she has been urging, which is allow regulators to focus on big banks, not small community banks. I applaud Mr. TIPTON for fulfilling that objective.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am perplexed and somewhat amused by the statement that the community banks are just withering on the vine.

Well, let me just talk about what is happening in the banking community. Dodd-Frank is not hampering the banking sector at all. In 2016, the industry made record profits of \$171 billion, and community banks are outperforming their larger peers. At the end of 2016, lending was up 8.3 percent for community banks and 4.8 percent for larger banks. Credit unions are expanding, and they have increased their membership by more than 16 million since 2010, an increase of 18 percent.

We oftentimes talk about what we are doing to the community banks. But we always—you, rather, always have a way of making sure that big banks are

attached to this deregulation that you say you want to do for community banks. All you have to do is amend this bill and make it apply only to community banks.

Would the gentleman who is talking about what the ranking member should understand and should be thinking about be willing to amend the bill so that it only applies to community banks?

That is rhetorical, and I won't ask for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the vice chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the TAILOR Act. As the vice chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, and a cosponsor of this bipartisan bill, I also want to thank my colleague, Representative TIPTON, for his work on this measure.

I emphasize bipartisan. I listened to the other side of the aisle, and it sounds like there would be no support for this legislation, but there is support for this legislation. I wonder if the ranking member has been having some of the conversations with some of her members, because, over the past few years, we have learned that one-size-fits-all, those rules, are a recipe for a more concentrated and less dynamic financial system.

I spend a lot of time talking with community bankers, credit unions, and their customers. They complain about skyrocketing compliance costs and regulatory burdens that force them to take attention away from their core businesses when they continue to add staff not to serve customers but to work on compliance issues.

Consumers complained about higher prices, fewer choices, and less access to important financial products. Small- and mid-sized institutions play an important role in financing the dreams and aspirations of Main Street businesses and middle class families.

Unfortunately, these institutions are disproportionately affected by the one-size-fits-all rules coming out of Washington, D.C. Banks and credit unions are merging or closing altogether, and new banks are not forming to take their place. Storied institutions with multigenerational relationships in their communities are being forced to close their doors and abandon the cities and towns they once served.

It is very sad, Mr. Speaker, to see a small town with a shuttered bank. We see it across western Pennsylvania and we are seeing it across the country.

This has an unmistakable impact on our economy. I remind the other side about the studies where, because of the

overregulation over the last 10 years, that 650,000 fewer small businesses have been created; 6.5 million fewer jobs, that is 6.5 million fewer people paying Social Security tax, 6.5 million people fewer paying Medicare tax; critical, critical jobs that have not been created.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, small businesses can't get the loans that they need. Families can't get the mortgage or pay for college. All of this means that the American Dream is getting harder and harder for people across the country.

Again, as I often remind my colleagues, the solution isn't deregulation. It is right regulation. The TAILOR Act achieves this. By enacting the TAILOR Act, we can focus regulatory energy and resources where they are most needed and help reinvigorate our community financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was just reviewing this bill somewhat and it has come to my attention that this so-called tailoring, which really means modifying, changing, doing something different, is for each individual bank.

So each individual bank could say: We do things this way, so we want a rule that is tailored especially for us.

Another bank could say: We do things another way, and we want some separate rules just for us.

And on and on for every bank.

Is this what this is all about? Is this what this so-called tailoring is about? This tailoring, which is modifying, changing, basically deregulating in the interest of the big banks to make sure they can reduce their costs and get rid of what they would call their burdens?

Are you really talking about having our regulators look at each bank and say: You do business a little bit different, so we are going to change the rules just to fit your bank?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't seem to me as if this is plausible. This does not make good sense. I don't understand why my friends on the opposite side of the aisle, in their deregulatory efforts, would even try this one. This one doesn't work.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee, and the former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, who knows how important our community banks are to the world of agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to speak on Mr. TIPTON's bill, the TAILOR Act.

But first I would note, as always, in participating in these kind of debates, any time you have a discussion led by Chairman HENSARLING and by Ranking Member WATERS, it is always an exciting, stimulating debate, and the intensity and the focus is always there.

But, today, we are focused on what I think is a very important piece of legislation because too often we think of financial institutions as the big guys, the truly massive entities. The truth is, however, that institutions that accept deposits from Americans come in all shapes and sizes. Thus, it is important that the regulators consider those many shapes and sizes when requiring compliance. The TAILOR Act would require that consideration by regulators.

My colleagues have already discussed that this provision has passed the House and is supported by the administration, as well as several industry groups. But I will note that for anyone in this body who represents a rural area, I guarantee banks and credit unions in your district are devoting a large portion of their budget to compliance. That is money that could easily go toward providing credit to the many Americans who need it.

Shouldn't the regulators consider the small institutions when forming these regulations?

This bill will free up some ability for those institutions to lend money to typical Americans and local businesses. I know my district would see the benefits of this bill, and I would guess that many districts nationwide would also benefit in the same ways.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for working so diligently on this bill and bringing it through the committee process, bringing it to the floor today, and giving us the opportunity to vote for it. I urge that vote. I advocate support.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my colleague on the opposite side of the aisle, Congressman LUCAS, enjoys engaging in these discussions also. I watched very closely his countenance, and I see that he is enjoying it even more than I ever dreamed he would. So let us continue with this very lively debate where we can at least lift the spirits of each other as we go through our daily work.

Having said that, the chairman likes to say that we lose a community bank a day. However, last year, only eight banks failed.

□ 1645

The other 230 banks merged with others, and I would like the chairman to even acknowledge that long before Dodd-Frank, we were losing a bank a

day, and that trend had been going on for 30 years. So I do not wish us to think that something new and extraordinary is happening, that somehow we have come to a point in time in the banking world where banks are being lost on a daily basis in a way that they have not been lost before.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), a very hardworking member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, on countless occasions, my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee have called out the challenges faced by our family-owned community banks and credit unions created by the one-size-fits-all regulatory approach of this Federal Government. We keep repeating this message because this is what all of us, Republicans and Democrats, are hearing from our constituents on Main Street U.S.A.

As a direct result of the overly burdensome and unnecessary Federal regulation, members of the Ideal Credit Union in Minnesota pay an additional \$225, and it now takes over 44 days to close a home mortgage. Ideal told me that, if the credit union could return to a more normal, reasonable processing time, their members would be better served and the process would be more efficient.

My colleague from Colorado has heard similar examples from his constituents, too. That is why he introduced the TAILOR Act, to change the way agencies regulate our small town financial institutions that are telling us time and time again they need relief.

Representative TIPTON's legislation will direct the Federal regulatory agencies responsible for regulating our local Main Street financial institutions to consider a few factors when they are regulating, such as the impact their actions have on the ability of banks and credit unions to serve their customers, the risk profile and business models of the institutions they regulate, and the necessity and appropriateness of the regulations they are imposing.

Tailored regulations are smart regulations and will help to limit the regulatory burden our community banks and credit unions continue to face.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of aisle to listen to the stories of their constituents and support the relief they are asking for. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing my colleagues talk about one size does not fit all and they keep trying to make a case for the community banks, but they always tie the community banks to these deregulatory efforts so that the big banks can benefit from it.

When I take a look at the Dodd-Frank requirements and how they target the largest banks, let's take a look at those banks that are less than \$10 billion in assets. They don't have to comply with all of these regulations.

If they are a little bit bigger, they are between \$10 billion and \$50 billion, they have to comply with just a few more, but not as many as the large banks. If they are \$50 billion to \$250 billion, yes, we have a few more requirements for them. And then the big boys, the big banks, yes, we have more oversight and more requirements.

Do you know why? Because they put this entire economy at risk if they fail.

When we talk about doing all of the stress-testing, we are stress-testing on these banks because we know that, in the event of an economic downfall, if they don't have the capital, if they don't have the kinds of things that would keep them safe, they could trigger another recession.

So stop saying that one size does not fit all and trying to make people believe that somehow we are requiring the same thing of the small community bank as we are requiring of the big bank. It is absolutely not true.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), someone who knows that one size does not fit all.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) for allowing me this time to speak in strong support of the TAILOR Act and for my colleague, Mr. TIPTON, for bringing this legislation forward.

I am an original cosponsor of this bill, Mr. Speaker, not just because it is just one of these bills that you want your name on. It is because I really believe in the concept that right-sizing regulation of our community banks and credit unions is what they need to be able to survive and succeed.

Now, I want to make something clear. The other side has argued that if one bank wants a regulation one way and another one wants a regulation another way, it is almost impossible. It is the regulators that are doing the tailoring. It is the regulators, not the banks, that would tailor the rules. And if the minority side does not trust the regulators enough, they should not have extended all this power to them through Dodd-Frank.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, every time I meet with community banks and credit unions in my district, they tell me about the excessive regulatory compliance burdens that this one-size-fits-all regulatory scheme has on them, and they describe it as a death by 1,000 cuts. In other words, it is not one single regulation that makes it difficult to do business; it is the combination of many under this one-size-fits-all scheme. That is why this TAILOR Act is so important for the small guy.

Since the financial crisis, our Nation has lost one community bank or credit union a day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, in Georgia, we have lost more banks than any other State in the Nation, and, today, 52 of Georgia's 159 counties do not have a community bank headquartered there, and we have three counties that have no bank at all.

The TAILOR Act is simple. It is a commonsense idea, and I stand in full support. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense act to right-size regulations for our small banks and credit unions.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentlewoman from California has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Members, and to my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, I am going to take a couple of minutes to bore you. I am going to bore you with all of the groups who are opposed to your legislation.

I heard one of your Members say that you have tremendous support. I didn't hear where that support is coming from, but I do believe that probably the biggest banks in America are supporting your legislation. So please allow me to share with you who is opposing your legislation.

Allied Progress; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Americans for Financial Reform; the Arkansans Against Abusive Payday Lending; Center for American Progress; Center for Economic Integrity; Center for Justice and Democracy; Center for Responsible Lending; Consumer Action; Consumer Federation of America; Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety; Consumers Union; Demos; the Florida Alliance for Consumer Protection; Indivisible; Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility; Jacksonville Area Legal Aid Incorporated; the Kentucky Equal Justice Center; the NAACP; the National Association of Consumer Advocates;

the National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys; the National Center for Law and Economic Justice; the National Coalition for the Homeless; the National Consumer Law Center, on behalf of its low-income clients; the National Consumers League; the National Fair Housing Alliance; the National Urban League; the People's Action Institute; PolicyLink; Progressive Congress Action Fund; Prosperity Now; Public Citizen; Public Justice Center; Reinvestment Partners; Statewide Poverty Action Network; Tennessee Citizen Action; U.S. PIRG; West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy; the Woodstock Institute; and the World Privacy Forum.

If you have time, I would like you to share with me who is supporting your legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close, so I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority is continuing to move to roll back important financial regulations at a furious pace. Week after week, the majority pushes harmful bills through the House. This bill is just the latest example.

In recent months, this deregulatory frenzy has included House passage of bills that, among other things, allow payday lenders to evade State interest cap rates, decrease operational risk capital requirements and roll back enhanced prudential standards for the Nation's largest banks, weaken consumer protections for mortgages, undermine efforts to combat discriminatory and predatory lending, reduce consumer privacy protections, and threaten the stability of our financial system and economy.

Last week, Republicans pushed through H.R. 4607, another bill that is designed to weaken rules considered inconvenient by the financial services industry, despite the harm that could result for consumers and the economy.

As we have discussed, the bill we are debating today, H.R. 1116, would allow large financial institutions to challenge financial regulations in court if they believe them not to be uniquely tailored to their business needs. It includes a provision that would allow these challenges for all of the financial regulations put in place following the financial crisis, making all of the important Dodd-Frank reforms targets.

Of course, the legislation is totally silent on the need for regulators to consider the interest of consumers and to ensure the stability of our economy as they conduct rulemakings.

Ultimately, this bill would serve to put consumers and the financial system at risk by subjecting important regulations to endless litigation. It is designed to block and bog down important rules that were put in place following the financial crisis to protect consumers, investors, and our economy.

I would simply urge Members to oppose H.R. 1116, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for his leadership. Again, whether it be through failure, whether it be through merger or acquisition, we still, on average, are losing a community bank or credit union a day in America. And when we listen to them, Mr. Speaker, what we know is it is the regulatory burden.

I know that the ranking member speaks frequently of the Wall Street megabanks. They have done quite fine under Dodd-Frank. The ranking member likes to allude to their profitability. Listen, I hope every business in America can find some way to be profitable, but that is not the question.

The real question is the profitability of our constituents, half of whom are living paycheck to paycheck. And it is those constituents who we care about when we lose an opportunity for them to capitalize their American Dream.

When I hear from Colton in Terrell, Texas, in the Fifth District that I proudly represent, who says:

You know what? Me and my wife have been unable to get a mortgage due to credit. We are 25 to 30 years old. We have good credit, but we are getting denied.

That is everything to do with the regulatory burden, Mr. Speaker.

I heard from Sara in Eustace in my district. She writes:

I would like to refinance with a cashout option to fix some storm damage to my property and home, but I found out that it is not an option for me because the government doesn't believe I should be able to do this.

I heard from Alan, in Kaufman, Texas, who said:

However, as a small-business owner, I offer owner financing for real estate to people with little or no credit, but the overregulation of Dodd-Frank has caused my cost of business to rise. I am forced to pass that cost on to the consumer. Regulations cost the consumer, not the business.

So the ranking member wants to know who is for this bill. Well, I can tell you what, Colton is for this bill, Sara is for this bill, Al is for this bill, and, oh, by the way, so is the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), Democratic member of our committee; so is the gentleman from New Jersey

(Mr. GOTTHEIMER), Democratic member of our committee; so is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), Democrat member of our committee; so is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), Democratic member of our committee.

Again, there is lots of great bipartisan work that goes on at the House Financial Services Committee. Regrettably, very little of it takes place with the participation of the ranking member.

□ 1700

Again, this is a very simple bill. It just says tailor the regulation. Tailor the regulation to the size and complexity.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe in too-big-to-fail banks. I don't believe any financial institution is too big to fail in America. I am not going to vote to bail them out with taxpayer funds; maybe the ranking member will.

But if I did, if I believed in too-big-to-fail banks, it would be limited to about eight or nine. Using the ranking member's favorite phrase, the Wall Street megabanks. Then, fine. Then why don't we see an amendment from her that limits the entirety of Dodd-Frank to the so-called Wall Street megabanks? I am still waiting for that amendment. I have yet to see it.

Why don't we release the rest of the banking and credit union world to help finance the American Dream, to help finance the cars, to help finance the small businesses, to help finance the homes?

Again, it is a simple amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment. And, by the way, it happens to be one of the most important amendments supported by the trade associations for the credit unions and for our community banks. So they believe in it, Mr. Speaker.

So I encourage every Member of this body to vote for the TAILOR Act and save our community banks and credit unions to finance the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 773, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Connolly moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1116 to the Committee on Financial

Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 22, insert “, unless such tailoring is done at the request of and for the personal gain of the President, his or her immediate family members, or senior Executive Branch officials who are required to file annual financial disclosure forms, or is otherwise determined inappropriate by the appropriate Federal financial regulator” before the period at the end.

Mr. CONNOLLY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to this bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to the committee.

If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended, and you are going to love it.

My amendment would prohibit Federal agencies that regulate financial institutions from tailoring their regulation of the financial industry at the request of and the personal gain of the President, the President's family members, or senior executive branch officials; something that ought to concern us in light of recent headlines.

This is a simple prohibition that in any other era would pass for common sense. Unfortunately, we have become inured to the daily outrages emanating from this White House, and we are learning how much our democracy depends on the morality and ethical behavior of individuals in the absence of institutional restraints.

When the President calls his friend to tip him off, if that is what happened, to a major announcement about steel tariffs, and that friend dumps affected stocks, there is no mechanism to prevent that from happening.

It just shouldn't happen. Morality and ethics dictate as much.

When a senior White House employee repeatedly violates the Hatch Act, allegedly, we depend on the President to punish and rein in that kind of behavior. If he doesn't, nothing happens, and the message to the rest of the Federal Government is that the politicalization of government institutions is okay as long as it is the President who approves your motives.

Now, of course, this institution, a co-equal branch of government under our Constitution, could create consequences, but, of course, we won't.

Instead, we will continue to turn a blind eye to activities and behavior that are dangerous to our democracy, Mr. Speaker. Behavior that should concern any patriotic American.

In predicting inaction by this body, I am not engaging in idle speculation. This Congress has a proven track record of shirking its institutional responsibilities for basic oversight of the executive branch, irrespective of who is in the White House.

Take the President's tax returns. That which was once a norm, Presidents releasing their tax returns as a credential to be examined for Presidency, was overturned by the simple refusal to do so by this President.

We depended for so long on candidates and Presidents to self-govern, to self-report, that we didn't anticipate the scenario in which a President, so devoid of any sense of transparency and accountability, would simply say: No, I won't do that. And not so much as a whimper from the Congress.

A year ago, one might have said Congress would never pass the President's tax plan without insisting on first seeing the President's tax returns and how he might stand to benefit or not from the actions we took.

Well, we did just that. And in the process, we exploded the deficit by close to \$2 trillion for good measure.

This should go without saying, but the corruption that is emanating in this time, in this administration, is not normal. It is not how the government should be run.

Neither President Trump, Jared Kushner, nor Ivanka Trump has divested entirely from their personal businesses. And our appreciation for divestiture as an anticorruption measure only grows in its absence.

The President's son-in-law and senior White House official, Jared Kushner, has been freelancing meetings with foreign governments while also seeking financing from those countries for his distressed property at 666 Fifth Avenue in Manhattan. He is taking meetings with financial institutions in his official capacity, apparently, and then turning around and securing, apparently, hundreds of millions of dollars in loans for his family business from those same institutions. This is not normal. It is not how government should be run.

We should not be selling our foreign and domestic policies to the highest bidder at a real estate auction. This Congress could hold hearings, could issue subpoenas, could create real consequence for these actions, but we see and hear no evil.

The Oversight and Government Reform Committee, on which I sit, is missing in action. We have requested multiple subpoenas for information from the White House on everything from General Flynn's activity while serving as National Security Advisor to Jared Kushner's conflicts of interest, or apparent conflicts of interest, and inability to obtain a security clearance.

Not a single subpoena request has been granted by the majority. The ma-

jority won't even give us a vote on those requests. It may seem tedious and repetitive, but we need to get back to the basics of government oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this simple, commonsense amendment to return us to regular order and to return to our duty as Members of Congress to provide vigorous oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to my friend from Virginia, and he is my friend, but I also must say that rarely in the history of the House have I ever seen a motion to recommit that has less to do with the underlying bill than this one.

I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle, over a year later, still cannot accept the outcome of the election, which, unfortunately, is a complete slap in the face of democracy.

I know there is an element that works full time on the other side of the aisle to impeach the President. This is their full-time avocation. Meanwhile, on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, we continue to work in order to try to improve the lot in lives of the common working man and woman.

So we were very proud to work with the President on the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that has brought us the lowest unemployment rate in America in 17 years.

Under their economic policies, Mr. Speaker, what we saw were high levels of unemployment. What we saw were stagnant wages. What we saw was 1.6 percent GDP growth when in the post-war era we have averaged 3 percent economic growth. What we saw under their economic policies was that people couldn't make ends meet. Too many were still living paycheck to paycheck.

And now I hear from my constituents. I heard from one the other day who said: Guess what? They just announced at my husband's business everybody is getting a 5 percent pay increase.

I just heard from Michael in Terrell, who is a doctor, and he said: Thanks to President Trump—who they are trying to impeach—thanks to President Trump and the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, now I can afford to buy a new ultrasound machine for my rural practice, and I am going to actually hire an additional ultrasound technician.

All due to the President, again, they are trying to impeach.

I heard from Charles in Winnsboro who said: You know what? The new tax reforms will drop my tax bracket by 17 percent, and this will allow me to rebuild my shop that had been destroyed.

And then I look at the employers in my hometown of Dallas, Texas: American Airlines, Southwest Airlines,

AT&T, Comerica. So many of them, Mr. Speaker, are offering \$1,000 bonuses. Many are offering increases in minimum wages. Many have increased 401(k) plans. All, again, due to the activities of the Republicans, because not one single Democrat supported the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

So I understand how my friends on the other side of the aisle wish to attempt to change the subject because they are probably now embarrassed they didn't support it, because they have seen how much good it has done, how much of a difference it makes.

So if they want to waste the House's time by once again trying to find ways to undermine the President, impeach the President, I know it is a full-time job for many, but on this side of the aisle, we are going to continue to make sure that the lot of the common man and woman is improved. We are going to make sure that our community banks and credit unions can lend to them. We are going to ensure that there is great economic growth so that we can continue to fund the American Dream. That is what we are going to do on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to reject the motion to recommit and to support the underlying TAILOR Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 232, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—182

Adams	Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)
Aguilar	Cartwright	DeFazio
Barragán	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Bass	Castro (TX)	Delaney
Beatty	Chu, Judy	DeLauro
Bera	Cicilline	DeBene
Beyer	Clark (MA)	Demings
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Blumenauer	Clay	Deutch
Blunt Rochester	Cleaver	Dingell
Bonamici	Clyburn	Doggett
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cohen	Doyle, Michael F.
Brady (PA)	Connolly	Ellison
Brown (MD)	Cooper	Engel
Brownley (CA)	Correa	Eshoo
Bustos	Costa	Españolat
Butterfield	Courtney	Esty (CT)
Capuano	Crist	Evans
Carbajal	Crowley	Foster
	Cuellar	

Frankel (FL)	Lewis (GA)
Fudge	Loebach
Gabbard	Lofgren
Gallago	Lowenthal
Garamendi	Lowe
Gomez	Lujan Grisham, M.
Gonzalez (TX)	Luján, Ben Ray
Gottheimer	Lynch
Green, Al	Maloney
Green, Gene	Carolyn B.
Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Gutiérrez	Matsui
Hanabusa	McCollum
Hastings	McEachin
Heck	McGovern
Higgins (NY)	McNerney
Himes	Meeks
Hoyer	Meng
Huffman	Moulton
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)
Jayapal	Nadler
Jeffries	Napolitano
Johnson (GA)	Neal
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan
Jones	Norcross
Kaptur	O'Halleran
Keating	O'Rourke
Kelly (IL)	Kennedy
Kind	Khan
Krishnamoorthi	Khan
Kuster (NH)	Kihuen
Langevin	Kildee
Larsen (WA)	Kilmer
Larson (CT)	Kind
Lawrence	Krishnamoorthi
Lawson (FL)	Kuster (NH)
Lee	Langevin
Levin	Larsen (WA)
	Larson (CT)
	Lawrence
	Lawson (FL)
	Lee
	Levin

NAYS—232

Abraham	Curtis	Hollingsworth
Aderholt	Davidson	Hudson
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Huizenga
Amash	Denham	Hultgren
Amodei	Dent	Hunter
Arrington	DeSantis	Hurd
Babin	DesJarlais	Issa
Bacon	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins (KS)
Banks (IN)	Donovan	Jenkins (WV)
Barletta	Duffy	Johnson (LA)
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Bergman	Dunn	Jordan
Biggs	Emmer	Joyce (OH)
Bilirakis	Estes (KS)	Kelly (MS)
Bishop (MI)	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Faso	King (IA)
Black	Ferguson	King (NY)
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Kinziger
Blum	Fleischmann	Knight
Bost	Flores	Kustoff (TN)
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Labrador
Brat	Fox	LaHood
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Brooks (AL)	Gaetz	Lamborn
Brooks (IN)	Gallagher	Lance
Buchanan	Garrett	Latta
Buck	Gianforte	Lewis (MN)
Bucshon	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Budd	Gohmert	Long
Burgess	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Byrne	Gosar	Love
Calvert	Gowdy	Lucas
Carter (GA)	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	MacArthur
Chabot	Graves (LA)	Marchant
Cheney	Graves (MO)	Marino
Coffman	Griffith	Marshall
Cole	Grothman	Massie
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Mast
Collins (NY)	Handel	McCarthy
Cramer	Harper	McCaul
Comstock	Harris	McClintock
Conaway	Hartzer	McHenry
Cook	Hensarling	McKinley
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	McMorris
Crawford	Hice, Jody B.	Rodgers
Culberson	Higgins (LA)	McSally
Curbelo (FL)	Hill	Meadows
	Holding	Meehan

Messer	Rohrabacher	Tenney
Mitchell	Rokita	Thompson (PA)
Moolenaar	Rooney, Thomas J.	Thornberry
Mooney (WV)	Roskam	Tipton
Mullin	Ross	Trott
Newhouse	Rothfus	Turner
Noem	Rouzer	Upton
Norman	Royce (CA)	Valadao
Nunes	Russell	Wagner
Olson	Rutherford	Walberg
Palazzo	Sanford	Walden
Palmer	Scalise	Walker
Paulsen	Schweikert	Walorski
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Pittenger	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Poliquin	Shuster	Westerman
Posey	Simpson	Williams
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Reichert	Smith (TX)	Womack
Renacci	Smucker	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Stefanik	Yoder
Roby	Stewart	Yoho
Roe (TN)	Stivers	Young (AK)
Rogers (AL)	Taylor	Young (IA)
Rogers (KY)		Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Cárdenas	Moore	Speier
Cumings	Rice (NY)	Tsongas
Davis, Danny	Rooney, Francis	Walz
Katko	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (FL)
Lieu, Ted	Slaughter	
Lipinski	Smith (MO)	

□ 1737

Messrs. ROKITA, MITCHELL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. STEWART, THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, BUCK, and GRAVES of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. RASKIN, NEAL, DOGGETT, LOWENTHAL, and SCHRADER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 107.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 169, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—247

Abraham	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Aderholt	Bishop (MI)	Budd
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Amash	Black	Byrne
Amodei	Blackburn	Calvert
Arrington	Blum	Carter (GA)
Babin	Bost	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Banks (IN)	Brat	Cheney
Barletta	Bridenstine	Coffman
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Bergman	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Biggs	Buck	Cramer

Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren

Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Loebach
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin

Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—169

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer

Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.

Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez

Cummings
Davis, Danny
Katko
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

Olson
Rice (NY)
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Slaughter

Smith (MO)
Tsongas
Walz
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

□ 1745

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the following votes because I chose to remain in my congressional district in Miami because of health reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall Vote No. 104; "no" on rollcall Vote No. 105; "yes" on rollcall Vote No. 106; "yes" on rollcall Vote No. 107; and "no" on rollcall Vote No. 108.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4061, FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4293, STRESS TEST IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-600) on the resolution (H. Res. 780) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4061) to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4293) to reform the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review process, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Test process, and for other purposes, which was referred to

the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, and Mr. Christopher Donesa, Legal Counsel, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 115th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

IN MEMORY OF SERGEANT MARK J. BASERMAN

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in remembrance of a remarkable community servant, a faithful friend and husband, and a brave veteran: Sergeant Mark J. Baserman.

A corrections officer who devoted many years of service at the State Correctional Institute in Somerset, Pennsylvania, Mark tragically lost his life in the line of duty on February 26, 2018. Known throughout Johnstown and by colleagues as a man of integrity, bravery, and strength, thousands attended his remembrance service to pay their respects to Mark and his family.

A 1975 graduate of Greater Johnstown Vo-Tech High School, as a young man, Mark volunteered many years with the Oakland Volunteer Fire Company and he served in the Army. Before becoming a corrections officer, Mark worked more than 20 years as a first responder with East Hills Ambulance Service.

Mark's life history of public service is evident. Putting others first, including his wife, Rebecca, and mother, Lucille—both who have physical disabilities—is a powerful testimony and a shining example.

Mr. Speaker, as we grieve the loss of this honorable man, I offer my deepest condolences to Mark's family, friends, and the Johnstown community.

SCHOOL AND GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that we must refuse to accept gun violence as normal. Today, I stand with students from Oregon to Florida, who are courageously and peacefully demanding that their elected leaders take real action to prevent gun violence in their communities.

This past weekend I met Madeline, a high school student from Beaverton, Oregon. She said that now when she enters a classroom, her first thought is: where can she hide, and how could she escape.

As a mom, that broke my heart. And I heard from students in McMinnville, Oregon. They told me they are terrified when they hear a fire alarm because that is how the Parkland, Florida, massacre started.

How have we become a country where our students are afraid in their classrooms?

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to Madeline and to all of the students around the country to protect them from violence and to keep them safe in school and in their communities.

The STOP School Violence Act is a modest first step, but we must do more. We must listen to the voices of the students and work toward creating a safer future for them and for everyone.

FEDERAL COURT DISRESPECTS WORLD WAR I VETERANS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1925, the American Legion erected a memorial in Bladensburg, Maryland, to honor the 49 men who were killed in World War I. The mothers of those who died decided to erect a large cross to mirror the cross-shaped grave markers in the foreign cemeteries where their sons were buried. The 40-foot-tall memorial became known as the Peace Cross.

Even though the monument is secular, and after almost 100 years, an agnostic Federal court ruled the historic monument must be torn down, all because it is in the shape of a cross.

The wrong-headed decision to tear down the 93-year-old monument is proof that this Federal court has no respect for the sacrifices of Americans killed in World War I. Instead of destroying monuments, we should erect more.

What is next? Are Federal judges going to chisel off the crosses on grave markers at veterans' cemeteries?

We will see.

Keep the Memorial Peace Cross memorial. Heaven forbid, don't remove the cross.

And that is just the way it is.

HAPPY PI DAY

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, every year on March 14, mathematicians and dessert lovers around the world come together to celebrate a shared constant in our lives. It may sound irrational, but it is actually transcendental.

Pi Day is a day dedicated to celebrating everything fascinating in the world of mathematics by recognizing its most famous number: 3.14.

Pi represents the ratio of a circle's circumference to its diameter, and has been calculated to over 1 trillion digits. It was first discovered in Ancient Greece and has captivated mathematicians like myself for over 1,000 years.

While Congress officially recognized Pi Day in 2009, it was in 1988 that the transcendental number got its day of dedication, when physicist Larry Shaw organized the first Pi Day at the San Francisco Exploratorium science museum.

Today, pi is used in all kinds of applications and can be found throughout our lives.

So to my fellow mathematicians, dessert lovers, and all of those celebrating today, I wish you a happy Pi Day.

CONGRATULATING MINNESOTA STATE WRESTLING CHAMPIONS

(Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, although Minnesota is known for hockey, I rise today to recognize the impressive high school wrestling programs in Minnesota's Second District.

This season, Shakopee and Apple Valley continued their strong, outstanding records in wrestling. In fact, Apple Valley held 12 straight State titles until this year, when Shakopee edged them out in the sectionals.

And while Shakopee did not bring home the State title, wrestlers from both Apple Valley and Shakopee put up some extraordinary victories.

Trey Rogers from Hastings finished his season with a perfect record.

Shakopee's Alex Lloyd won his third State championship.

And Apple Valley's Gable Steveson concluded his high school career with a winning percentage of 0.986, the best in State history.

I am proud to have such driven State athletes in my district. Their dedication and hard work will continue to bring them success for years to come, and I look forward to seeing future victories from our Second District wrestlers.

CHILDREN OF OUR NATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the children of our Nation are raising their voices. In the last couple of days in my district, many young people representing the 140,000 DACA-status young people in Texas and 800,000 in the Nation walked and shouted and asked and cajoled and spoke eloquently about the ridiculous malaise of this Congress, where we have not reauthorized DACA when there is a bill ready to move.

Do we care about our children? Do we care about the doctors, lawyers, and astronauts? Do we care about the teachers? Do we care about the parents—mothers and fathers—all DACA-status individuals who love this Nation?

And then today we heard from the voices of those who raised their hands and said: I do not feel safe in school. I do not feel safe.

So they left their schools and honored those who died in Florida just a few weeks ago. They begged for this Nation and this Congress to get out of its stupor and to begin to pass real gun safety legislation.

Raise the age. Ban the bump stocks. Have universal background checks. The children's voices are crying.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, where in the world does General Sessions get in his mind that he can fire FBI Directors, Assistant Directors? And where in the world does the President get in his mind that he can fire the Secretary of State in such a disgraceful manner?

□ 1800

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Public Schools Week.

A quality public education is among the most important gifts we can provide to our children.

As a product of a terrific public school, where my son also attended and graduated from 30 years later, I understand the challenges our local schools, administrators, and teachers are facing in public schools.

Ninety percent of American children attend public school, making the local school district in most communities the largest and most significant employer.

I had and will continue to be a strong advocate for public schools throughout our communities and throughout our Nation.

Throughout my time in office, I have called for responsible increases in education and resources to our public

schools, that are increasingly having to take on unfunded mandates and face many of the societal challenges that are now brought into the school districts.

As a former member of the New York State Assembly Education Committee, I fought against a very unfair school aid formula that indirectly and unfairly impacted our upstate public schools.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the public schools and thanking those teachers, administrators, and custodians who provide guidance and provide leadership and a lifetime of memories to our students.

Communities are stronger and schools are better when we work together to support public education.

NATIONAL SCHOOL WALKOUT

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today, high school students got up from their desks and walked out of their classes to take a stand against gun violence and for school safety. From the east coast of Florida to the central coast of California, students left their classrooms for 17 minutes to remember the 17 lives lost at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School and to demand that Congress take action on gun violence.

Now, today, Mr. Speaker, I commend you. We acted together to pass the STOP School Violence Act for school safety and security, but with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, that is not enough, and it is time we come together to pass commonsense reforms that have broad support across our Nation, from banning bump stocks to repealing the Dickey amendment, to fixing our system of background checks.

We all appreciate the emotion and passion by the high school students all across our country, but we realize, as they do, that thoughts and prayers only go so far. So now it is up to Congress to govern not just by crisis, but actually by leadership to make our schools, our communities, and our country safer.

THE LIBERAL MEDIA

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people hate the # inhuman liberal media more and more every day. The last example? A Washington Post op-ed, titled, "I Would Have Aborted a Fetus With Down Syndrome." My entire hometown of Sugar Land, Texas, was disgusted by those nine words.

I sent the hurtful article to Ammie, Massey, and Kristin, three friends with

gorgeous Down kids. Ammie was stunned, because The Post basically said:

If you knew your child would have cancer, cerebral palsy, diabetes, be deaf, blind, mute, or autistic, they should be aborted.

Ammie's Sadie has Down. Ammie says about her daughter:

Even on my hardest days, her smile can take all the difficulties away from my day. I will forget them. Through my tears, I typed this note.

Mr. Speaker, none of us is perfect and none of us should be aborted because we are not perfect.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHARLESTON HARTFIELD

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Charleston Hartfield.

Charleston was a military veteran who served for 16 years and was deployed to Iraq. He had received a Presidential Citation for extraordinary heroism in Iraq, along with numerous other individual commendations and achievement medals.

After the military, Charleston began his career with the Las Vegas Police Department, where he had worked for 11 years while also being an active member of the National Guard.

Along with protecting our Nation, he also enjoyed coaching youth football. Although he had no experience in football, he bought and studied books about coaching.

Charleston was a husband and a father to a son and a daughter.

He attended the Route 91 music festival on October 1 in Las Vegas with his wife, who was his high school sweetheart.

Charleston died trying to save the lives of concertgoers. As gunfire erupted, he immediately jumped in to usher people to safety.

He was loved by many and touched many lives.

As a published memoir author, Charleston's story will always be remembered. He was a selfless man who dedicated his life to protecting the community and country he loved.

We also grieve the loss of Charleston's mother, who died 2 days after his funeral from what many people said was a broken heart.

I would like to extend my condolences to Charleston Hartfield's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas and the State of Nevada and the entire country grieve with you.

PALMETTO WOMEN'S CENTER

(Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight a pro-life pregnancy center in my own district, the Palmetto Women's Center.

The Palmetto Women's Center is focused on uniting hope, health, and healing to women as they bring a child into their family. The center provides women with pregnancy tests, ultrasounds, Biblical counseling, education from nurses, connections within the community for access to resources, and much, much more. For example, the center partners with the Rock Hill Salvation Army to ensure that soon-to-be mothers can have access to maternity clothing and baby supplies.

The Palmetto Women's Center will be able to reach more women in my district as they begin operating in their new mobile unit. This will allow the staff of the center to travel throughout the district and provide women with the center's free services.

Palmetto Women's Center is working to lower the number of abortions in South Carolina and supporting women as they choose life for their children. I applaud the work that pro-life pregnancy centers are doing, and I will continue to be an advocate for them and for life.

CELEBRATING CONGRESSWOMAN MARCY KAPTUR

(Ms. SÁNCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate my dear friend, MARCY KAPTUR, from the Ninth District of Ohio.

Earlier today, the Speaker and minority leader honored MARCY for hitting a historic milestone. She is the longest serving woman in the history of the House, which is quite an accomplishment.

Ever since joining Congress, MARCY has been blazing trails, and I have been honored to know her for many years and to work with her on important issues impacting working families.

She has been a steadfast advocate for labor unions, fighting to ensure that hardworking men and women get paid a decent wage, and she has been fighting efforts to ship good American jobs overseas. MARCY knows that labor unions are a critical part of our country, creating a middle class and moving us all forward.

She has also been a strong advocate for our military and national security.

Her work is far from done. I know she will continue to be a powerful voice in our Caucus, and I look forward to many more years working with MARCY on issues that are important to the American people.

THE WALK UP MOVEMENT

(Mr. STIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, as co-chairman of the House Civility and Respect Caucus, I want to talk about something that people aren't talking about today.

There is a movement called the walk up movement, where a lot of kids around this country are taking action. They are walking up to the kid who sits alone and asking him to join their group. They are walking up to the kid who never has a voluntary partner and asking them to be the partner. They are walking up to teachers and saying, "thank you." They are walking up to people and just being nice.

Civility and respect is for everyone. It makes a difference in our lives. There are a lot of people recognizing a lot of things today, but I just want to recognize, today, that the walk up movement is constructive, it is helpful, and it is going to change people for the better.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN
MARCY KAPTUR

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, who has become the longest serving woman in the United States House of Representatives. She is from Toledo, Ohio.

I want to rise today to recognize being able to see someone of her caliber for so many years contribute so greatly. The World War II monument on The Mall here in Washington, D.C., was a long-term project that she started and she finished.

Those of us who represent working class people in Ohio know Marcy, respect Marcy. She is tough, she is smart, and she has one of the biggest hearts in this Chamber.

This is what I love about her: she is not afraid to say the word "union" and to recognize the power of working people coming together to bring economic justice to our society.

Mr. Speaker, we salute Ms. KAPTUR's service and look forward to many, many more years ahead working on behalf and for those working class families in Ohio.

HONORING OFFICER RYAN
MORTON

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and to applaud

the heroism of Clinton Police Officer Ryan Morton, who gave his life last week protecting the citizens of Clinton, Missouri.

Ryan was beloved by all. He was a veteran who fought in Afghanistan, an ardent Royals fan, and a dedicated law enforcement officer who stepped up to serve his community as a full-time police officer after the tragic death of another Clinton police officer named Gary Michael. Sadly, Officer Morton lost his life 7 months to the day after Officer Michael was killed.

Officer Morton embodied what we all should emulate: dedication, patriotism, service, and a willingness to lay down one's life for others.

We mourn the loss, but we celebrate Ryan's life.

May the Lord comfort his family and the Clinton Police Department, and may his example inspire us all.

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY MEN'S BASKETBALL
TEAM CHAMPS

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pride to congratulate the North Carolina Central University men's basketball team for winning the 2018 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference Basketball Tournament. NCCU, Mr. Speaker, is located in Durham, North Carolina. For the second successive year, the NCCU Eagles won the MEAC tournament, by defeating the Hampton University Pirates 71 to 63.

As a proud alumnus of NCCU, I was delighted to cheer the entire team, the players, the coaches, and staff during their outstanding performance in one of the Nation's most popular college athletic tournaments.

The basketball program has benefited from the exceptional leadership of Head Coach LeVelle Moton and Athletic Director Dr. Ingrid Wicker-McCree.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, how proud I am of the NCCU men's basketball team and the entire Eagle family on this historic win. The hard work of the team and the unwavering support of Eagle pride and Chancellor Dr. Johnson Akinleye, NCCU students, and the faculty and all of the staff have made this accomplishment possible.

I wish this great team much success as they embark upon the NCAA tournament.

Go Eagles.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the names of the players, the coaches, and the staff.

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY 2017-2018 MEN'S BASKETBALL ROSTER

Larry McKnight, Jr.; C.J. Wiggins; Zacarry Douglas; Brandon Goldsmith; Jordan Perkins; Reggie Gardner, Jr.; Rashann London;

Alston Jones; Alex Mills; Pablo Rivas; Raekwon Harney; Marius McAllister; Dominique Reid; Raasean Davis; John Guerra.

COACHING STAFF

LeVelle Moton, Head Coach, Men's Basketball; Luke D'Alessio, Assistant Coach, Men's Basketball; Reggie Sharp, Assistant Coach, Men's Basketball; Eric Wilson, Assistant Coach, Men's Basketball; LaRon Parks, Director of Basketball Operations.

NIFLA V. BECERRA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, March 20, the Supreme Court will hear oral arguments for the case NIFLA v. Becerra. At issue is a California law that requires medically licensed pro-life pregnancy centers to advertise for and to promote the abortion industry by posting notices alerting clients that the State of California provides free or low-cost abortions.

This law blatantly violates the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment. The government may never compel anyone, including pregnancy centers, to make statements with which they disagree. This is clearly and blatantly unconstitutional, and courts across the Nation agree.

When abortionists sought to compel the speech of pregnancy centers in other jurisdictions, their laws were not allowed to stand. In fact, in 2009, in my home State of Maryland, a Baltimore city ordinance required pregnancy centers to post signs in their waiting rooms stating that they do not refer for abortions. This January, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled unanimously that this law is unconstitutional. Judge Wilkinson said that the ordinance compels "a politically and religiously motivated group to convey a message fundamentally at odds with its core belief and its mission."

Similar laws have been tried in Austin, Texas; Montgomery County, Maryland; and New York City. These laws, too, have been partially or fully invalidated. Even the California law in question has already been found to violate freedom of speech.

While the Federal case was advancing to the Supreme Court, a parallel track

was being pursued at the State level. In October of last year, Judge Gloria Trask found that the law violated article I, section 2 of the California Constitution. In fact, she granted an injunction that prevents California from enforcing the law. She said the “speech required by the FACT Act is unquestionably compelled and content based.” It forces the clinic to point the way to the abortion clinic and can leave patients with the belief that they were referred to an abortion clinic provider by that pro-life pregnancy center.

□ 1815

Now, instead of seeking to silence pro-life pregnancy centers, people in every community should celebrate and support their work. They provide vital free or low-cost care to vulnerable women and children. So today we are here to talk about how pro-life pregnancy centers help mothers in our communities, giving them real choice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), who organized this Special Order with me, for comments he might make.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and pleased to join with Dr. HARRIS in this effort. Now, at this point, 130 of our colleagues have signed on to the petition to the Supreme Court to let them know that we believe this is morally wrong.

What we have: Again, as a California legislator, I have experience with the efforts our State legislators have done in the past and currently with Assembly Bill 775, which is known as the Reproductive FACT Act—fact, indeed—as Dr. HARRIS mentioned, requiring licensed medical centers that offer free pro-life help to pregnant women to then have to post written advertisements promoting the availability of free or low-cost abortions subsidized by the State of California.

It also requires nonmedically licensed centers to note, in multiple languages, that they do not have a medical provider on staff, which is kind of interesting due to the places that provide abortions having lower standards for medical care and standards for the doctors on staff to have to be overseen. It is very interesting, the double standard for that type of healthcare, as you would call it, versus other healthcare centers at abortion clinics. Yet they want to point out that there wouldn't be a medical provider on staff at these pro-life places, which aren't required to have them anyhow.

So the court will consider whether these disclosures required by the Reproductive FACT Act, by the California Legislature, violate the free speech clause of the First Amendment. Indeed, it is a blatant violation. The government has no business forcing private citizens or anyone else to promote an ideology that violates their beliefs.

The whole purpose of these pregnancy centers is to provide free pro-life

help to prospective mothers, not to serve as a billboard for abortions. If anyone needed further proof of the moral degradation in California's State government, this is exhibit A.

The Supreme Court must set a precedent, as lower courts have already done, as Dr. HARRIS mentioned. They must set a precedent that we will not watch, we will not stand by and watch as California's liberal elites bully anyone into giving up their constitutionally protected freedoms under the First Amendment.

Indeed, I want to thank Dr. HARRIS and all of the rest of my colleagues you will hear from here tonight for standing up on this issue, helping to not only bail out California's irresponsibility, but, more importantly, to stand up for the rights of people who are trying to save lives and provide positive counseling to those who find themselves in crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for this Special Order.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, we need to remind people that these pro-life pregnancy centers are private entities. They run on private donations. They provide services at no charge to these mothers. In some pregnancy centers—a lot of them, for instance—they will have a room that is just full of supplies, supplies to help a mother, to help a mother in a crisis pregnancy get through the pregnancy, take care of that child, and to give that child the very precious gift of life.

Mr. Speaker, I would next yield to the gentleman from Michigan for comments he might make on the importance of pregnancy centers. While he is getting to the microphone, let me just tell you a story that one of the pregnancy crisis centers told me. Again, these are centers that frequently now provide ultrasound exams.

And they tell me the story of a woman who called the helpline seeking an abortion, actually. She called the pregnancy center helpline. She knew very little about the emotional, physical, or spiritual repercussions of the choice she was considering. She felt alone, told by her boyfriend to “get rid of it” or he was gone.

But the pregnancy center gave her a choice. They scheduled an appointment. She came for the appointment. And after seeing her 9-week-old baby's heartbeat and it move about playfully in her womb, she decided to give this child the gift of life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for his leadership and my friend from California on this.

Mr. Speaker, I can't think of anything that is more important than

what we are talking about here in Washington. There are three critical foundations which our Nation was built upon: the freedom of speech, the freedom of conscience, and the right to life.

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and our third President, said: “No provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of the civil authority.”

What he means by civil authority is government.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand here today in the well of the House Chamber, Americans' freedom of conscience and our right to life is, once again, under attack, and this time in California. This law at issue in California is a classic example of government using its power to force citizens to promote messages that conflict with their personal beliefs.

Pro-life pregnancy centers are a valuable asset to women, to men, to the families, and certainly to those babies. Not only around the country but certainly in Michigan, these centers provide, at no charge, practical advice and resources, information, emotional support for expecting mothers and those fathers and families in need. As leaders of this Nation, we should be offering support, resources, and praises for their efforts, not forcibly targeting these PRCs with unconstitutional government mandates.

Through the work of my wife, Natalie, who served for a number of years on the board of a local pregnancy resource center in west Michigan, I have seen firsthand the overwhelming positive impact that they have on the community. My sister-in-law still serves on that board. This is real impact in real lives, to women and certainly to their babies.

Now, maybe even more importantly, even after that baby is born, these resource centers will oftentimes provide care and clothing and education and emotional support. I know in my own church in west Michigan we regularly have those dresser drives where we fill a dresser for that pregnancy center, and we are providing those diapers and providing that formula. We are there to help those mothers make it through.

Well, the Federal Government should never force or attempt to coerce medical professionals, employers, or resource centers to perform or promote abortions against their beliefs. Our basic freedoms and founding principles were established to protect us from that exact sort of intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank my friends for leading this effort, but these pregnancy resource centers work. We know that. They offer compassionate care to those who need it the most and should be treasured by the government and not targeted by them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his comments. He brings up a good point. These pregnancy centers don't only help mothers and give them choices; they actually help the fathers as well. A lot of times these fathers just don't know what fatherhood will be like, and they mentor these fathers and, again, begin to give that couple the ability to create a loving household for that child.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) to also speak on this topic.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of pro-life pregnancy centers, not only in the Fourth District of Arkansas but all across our country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS, and my colleague Mr. LAMALFA from California for hosting this important time so that we can come together and talk about the great work that these crisis pregnancy centers do.

In my hometown of Hot Springs, Arkansas, in 1988, a crisis pregnancy center was formed to assist young parents and to protect innocent lives. In the last 30 years, Change Point Pregnancy Center has saved the lives of 2,821 babies by offering and advocating for alternatives to abortion. This center is comprised of compassionate volunteers and staff who invest significant time and energy in our posterity, making a positive difference for our future.

Mr. Speaker, I know firsthand the quality of these volunteers because my own mother was one of them in the early years of the crisis pregnancy center, when it was just getting off the ground.

In addition to free pregnancy testing and ultrasounds, Change Point offers diapers, wipes, and formula through their Earn While You Learn program, which offers supplies to families who attend parenting classes at the center. Families and churches like mine have been vital in supporting Change Point Pregnancy Center, not only by volunteering but also by donating supplies and baby bottles full of change to help fund the center.

Change Point has taught more than 10,000 classes for both mothers and fathers. As Mr. HARRIS mentioned, these centers are not only for mothers, but they also help fathers and they help parents and families. They give families the tools to succeed rather than the stigma that burdens them.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support Change Point in their continued mission to provide care and support to families in the Fourth District of Arkansas, and I applaud these centers not only from my home State but all across the country for the great work that they are doing.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for those

words in support of these pro-life pregnancy centers. Tonight we are going to hear, during this hour, from some of the real leaders of the pro-life movement; but, in this case, we should really call this the pro-choice movement because that is what these pregnancy centers actually do: they give women a real choice.

A lot of women who come to these pregnancy centers, of course, are pressured or expect that they can't bring these pregnancies to fulfillment, to the birth of a new life. And these pregnancy centers give them the choice to do that. They provide the resources, the support, the mentoring, the prayers that these difficult pregnancies need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a pro-life leader, to speak about these crisis pregnancy centers.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for leading on this Special Order here this evening and appreciate the opportunity to be recognized.

There are a number of things that I would point out. For starters, I chair the Constitution Committee for a reason, and the delivery by Mr. LAMALFA on California's horrible Reproductive FACT Act law—it is not facts, by the way, but it forces pro-life pregnancy centers to provide free advertising for the abortion industry.

I don't think there is any question, if you coerce people to advertise for something that, in the first place, is immoral and directly runs against the convictions of the people who are volunteering their time and those who are contributing their resources to bring about a crisis pregnancy center, which is driven by the hearts of the pro-life community in America—I can hardly think of anything more important than having that happen.

Now, freedom of speech is one thing. You can't limit speech. But for a State to impose speech, that is another level. That goes beyond. That is beyond the pale of the constitutional First Amendment rights.

So as I think about crisis pregnancy centers and what it matters and how it matters to me and the district that I represent: Not long after I was elected to Congress, I went to Gabriel's Corner in Council Bluffs, Iowa. I walked in there, a crisis pregnancy center, a building that was built in what was an empty lot across the street from Planned Parenthood's abortion center. As I walked in there, they had a big picture window they had set up and a kneeler there so that you could be there to look out through that window and pray for those mothers who were going into the Planned Parenthood.

And they said to me in that briefing that if a mother was able to have a 4D ultrasound then—this would be about, say, 13, 14 years ago—that 70 percent of

the mothers would decide, once they had seen the ultrasound, to keep the baby.

As we walked through there, we finished the tour, and I said: Where is your ultrasound?

They said: Well, we don't have one.

I said: Why not?

They said: We can't afford it.

They told me the price on it then was \$100,000 for a refurbished ultrasound. I said: Let's raise the money for the ultrasound so that you can save 70 percent of the lives of the babies who come in here because of their mother.

So we set about the fundraising effort. I hardly got started and an anonymous benefactor showed up and said: Why are you waiting? Why don't you have the ultrasound?

□ 1830

I answered: We're raising the money.

He said: Well, go buy the ultrasound, but don't tell anybody who I am.

So he wanted to be an anonymous benefactor. We did that; set up the ultrasound. The annual dinner for Gabriel's Corner, the first little baby that was saved by Gabriel's Corner that we knew was brought along to that dinner. And I looked back in that dinner and there was that man sitting in the table clear back at the end, not talking to anybody, but watching. Wow. I have never forgotten what that meant.

Another occasion, an individual came to me and he said: I'm in between careers. I need something to do.

As we discussed this, it came to the foundational idea to establish Mary's Choice in Sioux City, Iowa. They went ahead with that, a Catholic pregnancy center, a crisis pregnancy center. As they followed through, they built that next to—or they developed it next to Planned Parenthood's abortion clinic.

Planned Parenthood couldn't stand the guilt of people praying for them, so they built a big fence, thinking that was going to block the prayers. Well, I think it attracted them instead. The last time I was there, I had my picture taken in front of the Planned Parenthood center in Sioux City. There is a Century 21 real estate sign in front of there, and you can't read "Planned Parenthood of the Heartland" any longer on there except in the glue, where they pulled the sign off. It is for sale, or may be sold by now.

Progress has been made, lives have been saved. The respect for innocent, unborn human life has grown. And to muzzle them, or force a speech, not just limiting their freedom of speech, but forcing speech—so I just looked at my iPhone here, and there are a number of ultrasounds that have been texted to me. I am kind of like, I guess I would say, the number one proponent of procreation in Congress, as far as I know.

Here is one. It says: "Baby looked good yesterday. Moving like crazy on the ultrasound."

I answer: "This is so beautiful. I'll keep my prayers going. This ultrasound is an answer to them. God's blessings."

Next ultrasound comes along. This is dated just last Friday. I sent back: "What is the heartbeat rate for this perfect little miracle?"

She answers: "161 beats per minute."

And then I say: "Purring along like a finely-tuned racing motor, that little miracle."

"Yes, and she's moving all around" is the answer.

And here is the conclusion of this. I just think this is so important to implant this in our memory.

She answered this way, this mother: "These ultrasounds are amazing. Watching her stretch and cross her legs, curl up her hand, suck her thumb. At 19 weeks, I can't imagine anyone contemplating abortion would proceed with it after seeing that in their own little baby."

That little baby is my little granddaughter, and I am going to stand up for life so long as I live.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for those touching comments. Again, this is about giving mothers choices.

You know, one has to ask the question: Why in the world don't abortion clinics show ultrasounds? What are they afraid of? Are they afraid of giving a woman a real choice, of actually seeing that baby, of denying the fact that it is not a blob of tissue, it is actually a baby with a heartbeat?

It is a baby that moves. It is your child. But they don't get that choice in an abortion clinic. They get it at a crisis pregnancy center.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for his remarks.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS, for his leadership on the most sacred of issues.

Mr. Speaker, in the shadow of over 60 million precious American lives aborted in the United States, there is light. This light shines through the roughly 2,000 pro-life pregnancy centers in communities across our Nation, including mine in west Texas. These pregnancy centers are dedicated to serving 2.3 million women a year. That is 6,500 a day.

Because of their good work, providing ultrasounds, medical services, and parenting classes, and even ministering to their deeper emotional and spiritual needs, these pregnancy centers save lives, hundreds of thousands of lives.

You see, Mr. Speaker, they believe, like a lot of us do, that all life is a gift from God and deserves their constitutional right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But now these pro-life pregnancy centers in California are being forced by law to advertise in

a way that goes directly against their mission and, more importantly, their conscience.

The State of California mandates that these pregnancy centers disclose how patients can obtain a State-sponsored abortion. California, in my opinion, is abusing the power of the State to force people to post messages they do not believe in and which violate their conscience.

Government coercion of speech or conduct that violates the religious conscience of an individual is in direct violation of the First Amendment. The Founders intentionally listed the right to freely express our religious beliefs first because they recognized the vital role faith in God plays in cultivating a moral foundation necessary for this democratic society.

While this inherent right to religious expression is being undermined, the Constitution could not be clearer on this question. I am confident the Supreme Court will uphold this sacred right against the heavy hand of government coercion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for those comments. He is absolutely right. No matter where you stand on the issue of abortion, you should stand with the First Amendment on the right of an individual not to have their speech compelled by the government; and that is what at stake in this court case.

I want to just thank God that we have a President who understands the importance of these constitutional bases, and one who, I believe, will nominate Justices to the Supreme Court who will continue to uphold the First Amendment and the other amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), a pro-life leader in the House of Representatives.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and Representative LAMALFA for hosting tonight's Special Order to draw attention to the wonderful benefits of crisis pregnancy centers.

I would like to share the story of two women. Summer is a smart 17-year-old who is in love with her first love, John. Although their parents are concerned about how serious they have gotten, they spend as much time together as possible. They soon find out that their college plans are in jeopardy when they discover that they are pregnant.

Tanya is a 40-year-old single mom with three kids. She works at a local restaurant as a server, and she gets by with the help of Federal welfare programs. She has been seeing Sam off and on for the past several months, but they recently broke up. Now she finds out that she is pregnant. She can't handle one more mouth to feed. Abortion seems to be the only option.

Summer's and Tanya's situations are different, yet they both can find help

and hope through their local crisis pregnancy centers. Like over 2.3 million women and men across America, they can receive pregnancy tests; ultrasounds; parenting classes; and other basic necessities, such as maternity and baby clothing, through these centers. These vital centers are making a huge difference for so many.

Pregnancy care centers provide a safe haven for women in crisis. In other words, they provide a safe haven for pregnant moms who need love and support as they welcome their babies into the world. There are more than 2,300 pregnancy care centers throughout America. Some of these clinics provide medical care, housing for expectant moms and their children, and adoption referrals.

I am thankful for the Shiloh Center in Harrisonville, Missouri, my hometown. The Shiloh Center welcomes moms in difficult circumstances, offering hope and help, enabling each mother to choose life for her baby. Like many other centers, the Shiloh Center provides free pregnancy testing, ultrasound services, counseling, and educational resources.

The Shiloh Center also provides prenatal care for pregnant moms, and ensures that new moms are equipped with baby clothes, diapers, and formula for their little ones.

There are thousands of these centers across America. I would like to highlight the wonderful pregnancy care centers in my district: Crossroads Pregnancy Resource Center in Warsaw, Missouri; My Life Clinic in Columbia, Missouri; Pregnancy Health Center Lake of the Ozarks in Camdenton, Missouri; Door of Hope Pregnancy Center in Clinton, Missouri; New Beginnings Women's Center in Warrensburg, Missouri; Pregnancy Support Center in Lebanon, Missouri; Birthright of Sedalia in Sedalia, Missouri; Free Women's Center of Pulaski County in Waynesville, Missouri; Birthright of Moberly in Moberly, Missouri; Birthright of Nevada in Nevada, Missouri; and Choices Pregnancy Center in Marshfield, Missouri.

I am grateful to each of these centers for the countless hours of community service and client care lovingly offered to women like Summer and Tanya and thousands in similar circumstances experiencing challenging life circumstances. They are bringing practical help and hope, and that is the best story of all.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for her comments.

Just to remind people, you know, there are things you find in a crisis pregnancy center you just don't find in your local Planned Parenthood. Almost all of them will have a room where donated clothing—clothing that, you know, most of it used. Yeah, that is the way it is. People who have had children, their children are grown. They

will donate their clothing to a pregnancy center to help those mothers who need help, mothers who perhaps feel they can't financially afford to have a child because they have to buy clothing for a child, they have to buy diapers. These pregnancy centers give them a real choice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), another pro-life leader in the House of Representatives.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) for leading this Special Order tonight and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the life-affirming and lifesaving work done across the country by pro-life pregnancy centers.

I have the privilege of representing the New Hope Pregnancy Compassion Care Center in Yadkinville, North Carolina; and I am proud to share the testimony of a young woman who perfectly encapsulates what these care centers do.

She writes: "The day I found out I was pregnant, I was very upset and didn't know what to do. I had so many different emotions and knew that it was going to be very hard, especially with me still being in college. I didn't know how I was going to tell my parents, my family, or my church. After having two positive pregnancy tests, I decided to go to Compassion Care Center. This was one of the best decisions I could have ever made.

"When I got there, I took another pregnancy test and it was positive. After that, I ended up having an ultrasound. After I seen my little baby on the ultrasound, I was lost for words. I had so many emotions and felt like I had no one. After my ultrasound, I ended up talking to a staff person about life and about this new baby. I told her how scared I was to tell my parents and how bad of a person I felt because of this. Even though this baby was not planned by me, God had planned it for me. She explained to me that even though I was still in college and still living at home, that she knew that I could do this and get through this. After we talked for a while about my life, the new baby, and religion, we prayed together.

"I ended up going home after that and telling my parents. It was very hard for them to cope with at first, but eventually they accepted it. I started going back to Compassion Care every week after that to take classes that offered videos about pregnancy and babies. Watching those videos helped me so much because it was a lot of new information that I did not know.

"I earned points every time that I came to watch these videos by watching them and doing homework sheets. The points I earned I could use to buy stuff in the store. The store had many different items that I could get. I got

maternity clothes, baby clothes, diapers, wipes, and toys. These items helped me tremendously.

"Without Compassion Care offering these classes and items, I wouldn't have known what to do. I have learned so much stuff that I didn't know before and they have given me the best support. I absolutely love everyone there and appreciate everything that they have done for me. I just recently had my daughter, and she has become my entire life.

"I know one thing, though, if I would have not been involved with Compassion Care Center, I would not have been able to do this. They were a lifesaver and I cannot express enough how thankful I am that they were there for me every step of the way."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for comments.

Again, just reminding, as the gentlewoman said, these are centers that provide true resources to women at a time when they are very, very vulnerable. I can't imagine why a city council or a State legislature, or any jurisdiction, or any legislature would want to—what amounts to—close these centers down, because these are people who believe abortion is wrong.

□ 1845

They are not going to refer people for abortions. That is the bottom line. They will close their doors before they will send someone to something that they think is morally reprehensible, and the last thing the State should do is compel them to ever do that. Why we would want to close these centers down that are so vital to our communities is a puzzle to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for his comments.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the First Amendment free speech rights of pro-life pregnancy centers across the Nation. I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman ANDY HARRIS as well as Congressman DOUG LAMALFA, for leading this Special Order this evening.

Mr. Speaker, our Declaration of Independence proclaims that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are God-given rights of all people. If we truly believe that, then we must be consistent that the right to life is inherent for every person, born or unborn.

National Institute of Family and Life Advocates v. Becerra is a case before the Supreme Court that centers on the right of free speech of pro-life licensed medical centers. Under California's State law, these centers are forced to violate their conscientious objections and post written advertisements for

free or low-cost abortions subsidized by the State.

I would ask: What could be more deeply offensive to any person who shares the strongly held belief that abortion takes innocent lives?

I believe that this unjust law violates First Amendment protections under our Constitution, and the ramifications of this Court decision will be felt across the Nation.

There are nearly a dozen crisis pregnancy centers in central Washington State, and most are in the Fourth Congressional District, which I represent. Life Choices Pregnancy Medical Center in Yakima, which I recently visited, is a pregnancy medical center that provides pregnancy testing, medical consultation, STD testing, and adoption referrals for expectant mothers.

Crisis pregnancy centers exist to support mothers, fathers, and their children. Many provide free material resources for young families and ongoing parental support. These centers exist to further the progress and protection of innocent life.

I signed onto the amicus brief supporting NIFLA with more than 140 colleagues because States do not have the right to force private individuals or entities to compel speech that violates their conscience.

I am proud of the House of Representatives' work to protect the sanctity of life, such as the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which I supported, to ensure that children who survive an abortion or an attempted abortion are given proper medical treatment. Today I stand with my colleagues to be a voice for the voiceless and to stand for the right of free speech of all who believe in the sanctity of life.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for those comments. He points out that each of our districts have numerous pregnancy centers, usually. In fact, crisis pregnancy centers outnumber abortion clinics three to one. These are valuable resources in anyone's district, in any town, any county.

What is at issue here is, if you had a nonprofit running a recreation center in your neighborhood and it provided resources to troubled teenagers after school, this would be like the State telling that recreation center, "Do you know what? You have got to promote a certain religion in your recreation center," or, "Do you know what? You have got to put out certain political pamphlets of one political party on your desk when people come in the door." We would be incensed with that. This is exactly what California is attempting to do with this law to these pro-life crisis pregnancy centers.

With that, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for his comments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize pro-life pregnancy centers and all the good they do for mothers and their unborn children.

As a God-fearing father and grandfather, I have always believed that life begins at the moment of conception. No one should ever be forced to promote the abortion of an unborn baby against their will.

Rather than protecting free speech, a constitutional right, the Federal Government is extorting speech by forcing these pregnancy centers to contradict their pro-life message.

During my time in Congress, I have visited multiple pro-life pregnancy centers around the 25th District of Texas. In particular, I would like to highlight the Austin Pregnancy Resource Center and the Cleburne Pregnancy Center, both of which I have been to.

These outstanding centers provide resources, information, and emotional support for those soon-to-be moms. They also provide after-care for moms and their baby, such as supplies, clothing, and education, as we previously heard. Women deserve to know there are better options than abortion and that there are facilities out there to help them.

The bottom line, Americans and organizations should not be forced by the government to promote ideas that conflict with their beliefs. As a steadfast pro-life supporter, I will continue advocating for the rights of the unborn and the centers that fight for them.

In God we trust.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and, again, remind everyone that these are such valuable resources in their towns and their neighborhoods.

I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

One thing about Congress is we have people with all different areas of expertise, but on this particular issue, the gentleman from Louisiana brings particular expertise because of his background as a lawyer and one who has defended religious liberty in courtrooms here in the United States, protecting that very important right given to us in the First Amendment that is at issue, at issue in this California case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for this time this evening and all of our strong colleagues who are standing with us today for the Constitution and for the sanctity of human life.

You know, Psalm 127 says:

Children are a heritage from the Lord, a reward from him.

For most women, of course, finding out they are pregnant is certainly a beautiful moment in their life. Often, it is an answer to years of prayer. However, of course, there are times when

the heavy responsibility of carrying a child can bring uncertainty. That is why the work of thousands of pro-life pregnancy centers throughout our Nation is so vital.

Hundreds of thousands of women have sought the guidance and the services of these pregnancy centers nationwide, and they have been embraced and supported with unconditional love and care throughout their entire pregnancies. These centers serve the woman, the child, and their whole family.

There are more than six pregnancy care centers in Louisiana's Fourth Congressional District—that is my district—from the Community Care Center, the Northwest Louisiana Crisis Pregnancy Center, and Mary's House in the northern part of our district to the Community Pregnancy Center, the New Life Crisis Pregnancy Center, and the Cenla Pregnancy Center in the southern part of our district. These centers work day in and day out to serve our communities. I know these folks well. They are selfless servants down in the trenches.

Over the past two decades, I have provided pro bono legal services to almost all of these centers and many more around the country, and I have often defended their causes in court because I believe so very strongly in what they do: they save lives and they provide critical care, like performing ultrasounds and counseling services and parenting classes and so much more, and they do this at zero cost to the persons who are receiving these vital services.

They also do it with zero Federal funding, by the way, and they save their clients and taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars every year.

As fathers and mothers and sisters and brothers and friends, I think Members of Congress have to stand with these pregnancy care centers throughout our districts, and we ought to support these women and their children and their families, especially in times as precious as pregnancy when they need us most.

As Dr. HARRIS mentioned, on March 20, my former colleagues at the Alliance Defending Freedom will stand before the U.S. Supreme Court, and they will argue on behalf of National Institute of Family and Life Advocates and its affiliated pregnancy centers in California.

All of us ask and expect the High Court to protect the freedom of speech not just for pregnancy care centers, but for anyone who would be forced by the government to speak a message that contradicts their sincerely held beliefs. It is absolutely absurd for the State of California to try to force pro-life centers to provide information on abortion services.

The outcome of this case could not only affect the freedom of speech for

every American, it could save countless innocent lives. This is a pivotal moment in our Nation's history, and we pray the Court will uphold our fundamental liberty, the sanctity of every single human life, and the best of our American traditions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana not only for those excellent remarks, but for bringing this kind of expertise to the House of Representatives.

Now I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH is a leader in protecting human rights around the world, from the U.S. House of Representatives, a leader in protecting life and, in this case, giving his remarks about how important pro-life pregnancy centers are to our Nation and our communities and how damaging this law would be.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for his leadership for many, many years. He is an extraordinary physician—Johns Hopkins and so many other places where he has been an anesthesiologist, and we are so grateful for the expertise and precision that he brings. Doctors can focus in a way that makes it so clear and so nonambiguous.

In defense of life, never has that message been more important than now because there is so much fuzziness, so much distortion, and it is about time clarity breaks out when it comes to the abortion issue. We have never had that national debate.

In a way, we have had it in a minor way, in a micro way. Every time a woman goes in and has an ultrasound, she walks away seeing her baby still in utero. The first baby pictures today, as we all know, are not newborns. On the refrigerators all across America, the first baby pictures happen to be unborn babies, and we all are thrilled when we see our children and grandchildren up on the refrigerator as an unborn baby. That is the first thing they see as they begin to comprehend what they are looking at: "That is me while I was still in Mommy."

As Dr. HARRIS pointed out in his opening, the Supreme Court does take up this case next week, *NIFLA v. Becerra*, the California law that requires medically licensed pregnancy centers to advertise for the abortion industry by putting up notices. Telling clients where to get free and low-cost abortions is an egregious—an egregious—violation of the First Amendment Free Speech Clause.

The government should not compel, should not coerce an organization or organizations and the people behind them to facilitate the dismemberment and chemical poisoning of unborn children, which is exactly what abortion is. The sophistry of choice cloaks the deed, and the deed is all about taking that child apart through dismemberment or through a chemical poison.

Dr. HARRIS spoke earlier about ultrasounds. We know that when abortion is done, many types of abortions, they use an ultrasound. Ultrasound-guided abortions make it easier for them to dismember the child. And it was Abby Johnson who ran a clinic, was director of a clinic in Texas for about 8 years, a Planned Parenthood clinic, who quit when she finally saw on that screen an ultrasound-guided abortion and was repelled and repulsed by how that child was being killed by a so-called physician. She was repulsed. She became a very strong pro-lifer since then.

Let me say one thing about pregnancy care centers. There are about 2,752 in the country, according to Heartbeat International, and the numbers are growing. There are many in my district, like Dr. HARRIS said are in his as well.

A few years ago, my wife and I went to a pregnancy care banquet in Middlesex County, New Jersey. Two women got up and spoke so eloquently and with tears in their eyes about how they were scheduled and actually en route to the abortion at the clinic, and there were these compassionate women, selfless women who said: Please reconsider. Please take a look at the alternatives. We will help you.

Both of those women turned around, two different times, and went back and had their babies.

With tears in their eyes, two young girls got up a little later, and at first we thought they were just going to talk about how committed they were to life. They talked about school and sports and boys, but at the end of their talk, they looked at the director of the pregnancy care center and her volunteers and thanked them for being there outside that abortion clinic that day, the day that their moms were scheduled to abort them.

Mr. Speaker, in an amicus brief submitted by a head of the NIFLA v. Becerra oral arguments, 13 women told their stories of the care and the hope that they received from pregnancy care centers, and here, briefly, is Angela's story.

Angela grew up in a very difficult household and turned to drugs when she was 14 years old. Angela continued to wrestle with addiction and, at 31, discovered she was pregnant. Although she made an appointment for an abortion, she decided to keep the baby.

Because of her addiction and the circumstance of her pregnancy, she felt she could not turn to her family for support, so she found a pregnancy care center. This one was in New York.

At her first appointment, staff showed Angela her baby through an ultrasound.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that Dr. Bernard Nathanson, the cofounder

of NARAL, who said, "I have come to the agonizing conclusion that I presided over 60,000 deaths," was one of leaders in the sixties and seventies in promoting abortion throughout this country, and was very effective at it. When he became pro-life, he said:

If wombs had windows, if every woman prior to an abortion would see an ultrasound of her baby, she would run out of that clinic.

Well, the pregnancy care center people in New York showed Angela the ultrasound, and she was enamored, touched deeply by the baby—her baby—that she saw on the screen.

They met with her weekly as the pregnancy progressed, always staying by her side, and a staff member was with her in the hospital when she delivered.

After Angela gave birth to her son, Cameryn, the staff helped her to enroll in WIC and to reach out to New York's Department of Social Services.

She continued to come to the pregnancy center—this is all in the friend-of-the-court brief—for parenting courses and for support in staying clean of those drugs that had so hurt her life.

She writes:

I always thought that people were fake, but they are genuine, particularly at the center. This is who they really are. They will help me. And they are helping to raise my son.

Looking forward to life now, she credits the center with giving her support so that she doesn't turn back to drugs.

Women and children across our Nation share similar stories. I have heard many, many of those stories over my time in the pro-life movement. And every time you meet one of those women—because we argue, Dr. HARRIS and I and all of those in the pro-life movement, that there are two victims in every abortion. The obvious is the dead child, who is dismembered or chemically poisoned; and the mother.

And pregnancy care centers are all about life affirmation, loving them both. And to be told by California, "You must advertise how to kill that baby," when you are about loving them both, like I said at the beginning, is an egregious violation of the First Amendment. And I do believe, and I know Dr. HARRIS and others on our side of this issue believe, that the Supreme Court will see that as such and render that law moot.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much for his comments.

It is a shame that here in the United States, with the freedoms that we have guaranteed in our Constitution, that this even has to come before a court. It is so clear that it is unconstitutional to compel speech against someone's beliefs—political, religious beliefs. These are what our Nation is founded on, and to compel these clinics to do this is

something that shouldn't even enter the thoughts of anyone.

Again, we would never compel any other nonprofit existing on donations and the neighborhood providing things to people in those neighborhoods and communities. We wouldn't think of compelling, again, political speech. We wouldn't think of compelling religious activity.

Yet, here, California attempts to compel these volunteers, these clinics, who work on providing such a valuable choice to the women in their community, to essentially refer for an abortion that is against all the deeply held beliefs of these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read the stories of some of the women who go to these clinics, because this really is about choice. This is about institutions in a community that offer true choice. Now, these are stories from the pregnancy centers in my community.

So let me first tell you about Miranda. Mr. Speaker, 19-year-old Miranda came to this pregnancy center with her boyfriend and learned she was 9 weeks pregnant. Miranda worked 9 hours a day as a cashier at a Home Depot. She, honestly, was not happy with the positive results of her test. She didn't think she could raise a baby, and nobody had any faith in her.

You see, a year earlier, Miranda had had an abortion. She still cries at the recollection and feels the pain of what she had done. She didn't want to make that choice again, but her circumstances hadn't changed, and she felt that that is what she had to do.

Now, the volunteer counselor praised Miranda for working full time and getting her GED. The volunteer counselor explained how Miranda could obtain healthcare, and how that clinic's Earn While You Learn Program would educate her on prenatal care and parenting, as well as provide her with much-needed baby supplies once the baby was born.

Then Miranda saw the fetal models depicting a 9-week-old fetus. She couldn't believe what she was seeing. She asked so many questions, like: When does the heart start beating? Would it be possible for her to hear the beating heart? When does the baby start kicking?

You see, Miranda explained that the abortion clinic she had been to a year before never told her about the development of the baby. She had been 15 weeks pregnant at the time she aborted.

It was so surprising for her to see the truth in those baby models. Nobody ever told her that her baby had been so fully developed. Miranda said that the best part about coming to the pregnancy center was that they "told her she could do it." You see, she had never heard that before. Nobody had ever told her that. She had a real choice now.

Here is a story about Laura. When Laura came to the center 2 years ago, she was feeling nauseated and miserable. The timing of her pregnancy couldn't be worse. She had recently discovered that her mother had been diagnosed with late stage liver disease.

Laura, too, was post-abortive. Her previous abortion was a terrible experience that left her emotionally scarred, of course, as it leaves many women.

She didn't want to have another abortion, but felt she had no choice. She wanted to be there for her mom during her mother's time of need.

Now, the volunteer advocate in the clinic spent lots of time just listening to Laura. It became clear that Laura really wanted to keep her baby but was lost in trying to figure out how.

Mr. Speaker, this is a recurring story in these pregnancy centers. There is a reason why they used to be called crisis pregnancy centers. These are women frequently in crisis who want to have that choice but don't see the way out of their circumstances.

Well, this counselor helped Laura navigate through the muddy waters of her life and envision a future with her child.

Soon, Laura's fear began to subside. A sonogram revealed a 7-week-old baby. In a tearful voice, Laura said: "That is my baby."

Since then, Laura has returned to the center weekly, participating in their prenatal education classes. She actually moved in with her mother so she could help her through her illness. Laura's hope is that her mom will be strong enough to hold the baby and spend her last days on Earth with her grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of hope that pregnancy centers give women and their families. And, often, two lives are saved in these pregnancy centers: the child's and the mother's.

An unplanned pregnancy can provide an opportunity and inspiration for a woman to get her life back on track; in these two cases, to actually start the family. A pregnancy can give a woman a reason to live, to take care of that child; a reason to go back to school to finish her education, as we heard about Miranda; a reason to reconcile with her family.

As a father of five, and everyone who has been a parent knows this: we know how parenthood truly fundamentally transforms a person well before the child is born.

From the time you know that you are going to have a new baby in the family, as well as every moment afterward, life is precious, life is priceless. Pregnancy centers support women during every step of that journey of providing a new life, a gift from God.

Mr. Speaker, next week, the Court will hear a case that perhaps threatens the very existence of crisis pregnancy centers and pro-life pregnancy centers

in the United States. I hope that those nine Justices have the wisdom to see that, in America, that a jurisdiction—whether it is California or Baltimore, Montgomery County, or Austin, Texas, or any jurisdiction—that has tried to compel speech in these pregnancy centers is violating our constitutional rights and, worse than that, is really affecting valuable resources in our community, the most valuable resource a woman with a crisis pregnancy can have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN MARCY KAPTUR, THE LONGEST SERVING WOMAN IN THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, as this month is Women's History Month, it is my honor to rise today to recognize my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), as she becomes the longest serving woman in the history of the United States House of Representatives.

On March 18, 2018, Congresswoman KAPTUR will have served in the House for 35 years, or a total of 12,858 days.

While Congresswoman KAPTUR earns a notable place in American history for her length of service, her true accomplishment is the profound impact that she has had on this Nation through her legislative work, her leadership, her representation of the northern Ohio district, and her steadfast commitment to addressing critically important issues.

I think about Congresswoman KAPTUR every evening that I am in Washington, D.C., because when I leave the Capitol, I drive past the marvelous beautiful World War II national memorial, which would not exist but for the tireless work of Congresswoman KAPTUR.

After being approached by a constituent, Congresswoman KAPTUR first proposed legislation in 1987. She began a yearlong effort to have that legislation enacted into law, and turned the World War II monument into a reality.

Congresswoman KAPTUR's commitment to that project symbolizes what her colleagues know about her. MARCY KAPTUR is one of the hardest working Members of the United States Congress, and she is one of the most dedicated advocates for the people and the values that she represents.

Congresswoman KAPTUR is a community organizer and a serious public policymaker. She serves on the House Ap-

propriations Committee, where she is an incredibly powerful voice for appropriate spending levels for programs and projects important to working families across the country.

She serves as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, where she has been tremendously impactful on promoting U.S. energy independence and the protection of the natural resources.

Congresswoman KAPTUR previously served on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, which is now known as the Committee on Financial Services.

□ 1915

As the current ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, I am grateful that Congresswoman KAPTUR has not lost interest in financial issues. In fact, she has remained extremely engaged on issues pertaining to Wall Street. She has been a leader in responding to issues that arose or were painfully identified during the financial crisis.

Congresswoman KAPTUR and I regularly speak about financial services matters. She shares articles and materials with me about key individuals on Wall Street. She finds and shares information with me on individuals' and firms' involvement in creating financial products or engaging in activities that might be harmful to consumers.

I am thankful to have the benefit of her thoughts on these matters. Congresswoman KAPTUR has the courage of her convictions even in the face of fierce opposition. Since the 1990s, the Congresswoman has been a proponent for the reestablishment of the Glass-Steagall barriers between investment banking and traditional depository banks. Although her legislation on this matter has been considered controversial, Congresswoman KAPTUR has stood by her convictions out of a sincere desire for protecting working families and Main Street over the interests of Wall Street.

Congresswoman KAPTUR supports policies that are good for her district without hesitation. For instance, she fought tirelessly to combat threats to Lake Erie. Congresswoman KAPTUR is a strong advocate in so many areas like national security, energy independence, and support for the Armed Forces. Her attention to important issues, her dedication, her skills as a legislator, and her work ethic should serve as an example for all public servants. I am proud and honored to call MARCY KAPTUR not only my colleague, but my friend.

So I would like to say congratulations to Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR for taking her place in American history as the longest serving woman in the House. I would like to say to the Congresswoman that I am not so sure

that I should have worked with others to sneak up on her tonight and make this a surprise, and I know that, in doing that, she has been sitting there thinking about working on and coming up with things that should be said about Wall Street. But tonight we are talking about MARCY KAPTUR, we are not talking about Wall Street. We will talk about that later on.

But let me just say that the gentlewoman has been a wonderful and extremely acknowledgeable voice and someone who understands the history, not only of Wall Street, but many of the players who have played over the years who were responsible for some of the problems that caused us to have the recession that we got involved in in 2008.

So I thank the gentlewoman for her caring about Main Street, and I thank the gentlewoman for knowing and spending time on these financial issues despite the fact she has so many other things on her plate. Again, I feel very honored to be her friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to fool MARCY KAPTUR, but we pulled it off. She thought we were going to talk about Wall Street? We are going to talk about Main Street. In that regard, I think it was appropriate for me to bring this.

MARCY, do you recognize this?

It was 30 some years ago that MARCY KAPTUR and I went to Japan, and she had a spark plug made in Toledo. This is an old one, so it is safe. She took it to Japan because it was impossible to export from the United States a spark plug to Japan. They excluded our products completely.

So MARCY and I went over; and everywhere she went, she had a spark plug. People thought it was because she is kind of a spark plug. But, instead, again, it was because of the exclusion of any product made in the U.S. going to Japan. They blocked it out while they had a completely open market. That began a struggle that went on and on and on. MARCY never gave up, and we still haven't given up. She was one of those among us, and we joined together to say that trade is vital, but it has to work both ways. I may give this to the gentlewoman afterwards.

I just say this with deep feeling because of her deep feeling. We spent days and days in Japan and came back and spent days and days, and we pleaded with administrations: let there be reciprocity when there wasn't.

So I am afraid MARCY has done so much that it is forgotten what she was doing some years ago. But she was a pioneer in saying that when it comes to trade, expand it, do so in a way that is reciprocal, and do so in a way that is fair that remembers Main Street.

Secondly, I want to talk about another activity I have been privileged to work on with MARCY KAPTUR. There has been reference to her heritage. Marcy never forgot her roots in Ohio, and she never forgot her family's roots overseas—never. Indeed, her deep feelings about democracy—it was in Ukraine that she and I worked on—really reflected the depth of her feeling about democracy and the United States of America. So together we put together the Ukrainian American Caucus, and she has been the spark plug in that caucus.

I think both activities reflect so much about MARCY KAPTUR, her intelligence, combined with her deep feeling. She has never forgotten where she came from, and she has taken that remembrance, that remembering, and essentially took it into action in this place.

So we will talk about Wall Street some other day. But we are here on behalf of so many to tell Congresswoman KAPTUR that her career has been so distinguished.

I have a special duty here. She and I are the two people remaining in the class that came in. I think there were 81 of us, and the gentlewoman has never, never failed with the same enthusiasm with which she came. What a tribute that is to the gentlewoman and her character.

I finish with this. MARCY remembered her roots, and also that meant deep feeling about family. Her love for her mother and her dedication to her well-being was something that I think pervaded her life, and it spilled over into all of ours.

So, I say to MARCY, with this spark plug and everything else, I am honored to come today speaking for myself and so many others: job well done, but you are still doing it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the ranking member of the House Financial Services Committee, Representative MAXINE WATERS, for calling us together to honor someone whom I consider to be a great American.

I rise today to honor this great public servant, a trailblazer in this House, the longest serving female Member in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives, my great friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR.

Congresswoman KAPTUR is more than just a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee. She is a mentor to many of us, including me.

The Congresswoman rose from a humble, hardworking family in Toledo to become a champion for jobs with justice, women in the workplace, children's healthcare, and strengthening Social Security and Medicare.

She also is one of the most respected voices for human rights and freedom around the world, especially for Ukraine as it faces military aggression and constant threats from the Russian Federation.

Congresswoman KAPTUR also shares my absolute commitment to protecting wilderness areas, our national shorelines and forests, and standing strong against those special interests who would sacrifice clean air and safe water for short-term profit.

Finally, Congresswoman KAPTUR shares my lifelong interest in history and helping Americans understand that we all stand on the shoulders of the brave men and women who came before us. That is why she was one of the earliest advocates for the World War II Memorial, a long overdue tribute to the Greatest Generation who defended freedom at its moment of greatest peril and saved the world.

Congresswoman KAPTUR continues to stand tall for seniors, veterans, working families, and the core values of the people of Ohio. Her hard work is greatly respected on both sides of the aisle, and I am truly blessed to call her my good friend.

There is one story I would like to relate on a personal note, and we discussed it today at her reception earlier. During my college days, I was a full-time worker in this body. I was a member of the staff of the Office of the Doorkeeper. My door was the west door on the Republican side because Tip O'Neill did not want me to congregate with my dad who was a Member of this body. Our job was to memorize the picture book of every Member, especially the incoming freshmen. In the winter of 1982, I had to memorize her picture to know who she was to be able to identify her. Back in those days, life was simpler because we were the security for this floor. So that is how I first met MARCY KAPTUR. I will always call her my friend.

Congresswoman, congratulations on reaching this historic milestone in service to your constituents and our country. God bless you.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is the dean of the Ohio delegation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

First of all, I am glad that the gentlewoman isn't talking about Wall Street this evening. The gentlewoman always wants to talk about Wall Street, and I am glad we are talking about MARCY KAPTUR this evening because she is really special.

□ 1930

This, of course, is in recognition of a fellow Ohioan, MARCY KAPTUR, who will become the longest serving woman in the history of the United States

House of Representatives. That is quite an accomplishment. She will be breaking the record currently held by Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers, a Republican from Massachusetts, who served from 1925 to 1960.

I think I speak for most Ohioans, regardless of party, when I say we are proud that MARCY has brought this prestigious milestone back home to Ohio.

MARCY has been a stalwart supporter of her constituents, fighting for jobs and fair trade agreements. That is why her constituents continue to elect her to represent them in this body every 2 years, even though we have been trying every 2 years to knock her off. We just haven't been able to do it, she is that good.

Like me, MARCY grew up in a working class family. She was the first member of her family to attend college, earning degrees from the University of Wisconsin and the University of Michigan. Graduating from these two universities, one of which is not even recognized in some parts of Ohio, had to be a tremendous hurdle to overcome when first running to represent Ohioans. Yet MARCY continues to earn the trust of her constituents, and that says a lot about who MARCY KAPTUR is as a person.

As the son of a World War II veteran myself, I would submit that perhaps MARCY's most enduring accomplishment was her 17-year battle to get a World War II Memorial built on The National Mall.

I just wish that it had been completed in time for my father to have seen that. I know he would have been really excited about it. Unfortunately, he passed away in 1998, before that wonderful memorial was completed, but I know he is looking down and sees it. I really appreciate all the other World War II veterans that do get to see it.

Through a number of setbacks, MARCY KAPTUR never wavered in her support for that memorial. Every time I meet with a group of World War II veterans who have flown in on an honor flight—which was another Ohio creation, I might add—to visit the memorial, I am reminded of MARCY's dedication and determination to make that happen. We truly owe her a great deal of credit for the beautiful tribute to the Greatest Generation that the World War II Memorial has become. As dean of the Ohio Republican delegation, I would like to express how proud the Members in this Chamber are for this historic accomplishment.

Even though we do not agree on everything—or, I guess, even very much sometimes—and have been known to have a few disagreements here and there, I am proud that she is not only breaking the record for the longest serving woman in this body, but she is doing so as a Representative of our great State, the great State of Ohio.

We are really proud of MARCY. We are happy that she has accomplished this. We hope she will be around here for many years to come. I hope I am here, as well, to continue to serve with her. Obviously, all of our constituents get to make that decision every 2 years.

Congratulations, MARCY. I speak on behalf of all my colleagues within the Ohio delegation as well as on behalf of an awful lot of other Republicans in the House who respect you greatly.

Congratulations.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for contriving this colloquy on Financial Services.

It is my distinct honor to join my colleagues in celebrating this milestone in recognizing Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR's remarkable record of service to her constituents, her country, and to every woman in every corner of this country. I would add, every man and every child.

On the long, dark road to equality, role models are the street lamps that light the path forward. For the last 35 years, MARCY KAPTUR has been a role model and a source of light for millions of young women and young men. In other words, even after 35 years in this body, she is still woke, just like the ranking member.

Ms. KAPTUR has championed progress on several important issues: protecting our water and our air from pollution, protecting consumers from predatory financial institutions, honoring the incredible sacrifice of our veterans—we have heard at length her work behind the World War II Memorial—and supporting working families so they have a fair shot in this economy.

But it is very much possible, and I would say very much probable, that her greatest accomplishment has not yet been realized. I am confident this Chamber will someday be filled with women—someday soon—who are inspired to run for Congress by the longest serving woman in history.

MARCY has taught me the value and the way to fight for the little guy. I remember this one moment on a Sunday evening when I was catching a few hours of a television show. I have very little time to watch TV, but I had a moment to watch the John Oliver show. I don't even think MARCY knew that she was the subject of that evening's broadcast. I will just briefly say that it was about John Oliver totally disgusted by the way little poultry farmers had been put at a disadvantage by the way we had rigged the rules here in Washington.

MARCY was the hero of the show when they showed her standing at a podium much like this in the Appropriations Committee room trying to unrig

the law so it was not so unfair to these poultry farmers. I remember her so passionately standing there saying: All these people want to do is earn an honest living.

I felt that deep in my gut. Here was a Congresswoman standing up for the little guy against the big corporations.

John Oliver whipped the national audience into such a fervor, they were so angry when they saw this happen, and here was MARCY standing up for them. He then accused all the people who rigged the rules, who were defending the rigged rules, of having—I can't even speak about what he said on the floor of the House. I urge you to go see it for yourself. I think you will be quite entertained.

I was so excited, the next morning, on Monday, I saw MARCY on the floor and I said: MARCY, you were great on this show.

She said: What happened?

Then I explained to her. I said: You need to put this on your Facebook page. You are going to get hundreds of thousands of new followers. You need to put this on your website.

But her first concern was this. She said: Oh, I heard the John Oliver show uses bad language.

That typifies MARCY KAPTUR: decent, collegial.

MARCY has taught me many important lessons about the value of this institution. I know she loves the Congress. I know she loves this House of Representatives and wants to uphold the mores, uphold the norms, norms that are so important in a democracy: it is important to be civil; it is important to speak in ways that are respectful.

MARCY serves as that example to me. It is not just the surface niceties, but the deep values of standing up for the little guy against the big corporations and defending the American Dream for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I thank MARCY for her service, and I look forward to serving with her many more years.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, Congressman WATERS, for pulling this little surprise together.

I thank MARCY KAPTUR. It is so great to be able to stand on the floor of the House and laud one of our great, great Members on her great achievement of serving here for 36 years in the House of Representatives. She continues every day to bring her intelligence and persistence to issues from labor and working people to Ukraine.

Her accomplishments are enormous. She was the first in her family to graduate from high school. She earned a BA and an MA, served in the White House, and now is the longest serving woman in Congress.

MARCY has never forgotten her blue-collar roots. She knows the importance of unions in providing job security and good wages. She has focused on making sure that workers get their earned pension benefits. This is a big issue right now that she is leading the charge on.

I feel, and have felt from the beginning, a special affinity, being a midwesterner and coming to this Congress with these Midwestern values: nothing fancy; it is just about working people who want a good life and deserve to get it.

MARCY can match anybody with her understanding in the details of pension policy. She always stays focused on the fundamental goal of pensions, which is simply making sure that, after a life of hard work, women and men can retire with dignity and security, something that I am afraid is in too short supply today. MARCY is continuing to lead that battle.

MARCY has been an expert on trade policy. I learned that early on in my tenure here in the House. On the 10th anniversary of NAFTA, MARCY, with the help of the Teamsters union, organized a visit and took a group of us first to the border city of El Paso, Texas, to look at and talk to people who had lost their jobs and had moved across the border.

We then crossed the border to Ciudad Juarez, where we actually saw people living in the packing crates of the products they were working to manufacture at the maquiladoras.

So, on both sides of the border, we saw the pain that was caused.

On that trip, we went to Mexico City, talked to leaders, talked to union leaders and political leaders, government leaders. We also went to the city of Puebla and talked to people there. It was a really comprehensive trip that gave us a sense of what happens to people when they are not being considered when policies are being made.

She continues today, as we renegotiate the NAFTA agreement and the administration works on that, to have input on what a really fair trade deal looks like—not just free trade, but fair trade—where it is not just the big corporations, but it is the workers in all the countries, in the United States of America and the workers in countries that we have trade agreements with, and that all the workers get a fair deal.

MARCY fights for people who played by the rules, faithfully going to work every day and making their pension contributions. They are counting on her and us to fight for them and to fight for a middle class in this country to help people who are poor get to the middle class and stay there. Those people—our people—could not have a better champion in this United States House of Representatives, in this Congress, than MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio.

I love you, MARCY.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a personal thrill for me to participate in this special hour. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for doing a very good job of surprising our guest of honor this evening. She did it very well because she did it on policy.

She got Marcy to come here on a night when she should be celebrating, but she didn't hesitate to come down here to talk about what is wrong with Wall Street, which shows you how committed MARCY KAPTUR is.

□ 1945

When I think of MARCY KAPTUR, I think of a string of pearls. She is always providing pearls of wisdom to all of us. We have heard from many Members who have spoken about the fact that she has mentored them. I know when I was a young Member here—young only in time served—that it was MARCY who came up to me a number of times to show support and to provide me guidance.

She also has a very elegant way, a very simple and elegant way that she comports herself. When she talks about issues, she talks with great passion, but with great dignity—again, a reflection of a string of pearls.

She has never forgotten her roots. She has never forgotten her constituents. Now, her blood may be red, but there is a lot of blue running through them because she has always been there for the blue-collar worker. And she oftentimes in caucus is the conscience for all of us because she reminds us about the working class: What are we doing for the working class, lower middle class Americans?

Her commitment to economic justice cannot be lost on any of us because that has been one of the main principles that has really directed her work here and has been a moral compass for her.

So when the financial meltdown happened, MARCY had such a passion for wanting to right this terrible wrong, and she was no longer serving on the Financial Services Committee, but she had a thirst to learn everything she possibly could about what was necessary to reform the system. And I remember her coming to a briefing that I had with some experts, and then she invited me to a briefing that she had with some experts because all she wanted to do was get to the truth of what we needed to do.

She has conviction that she, I think, reflected in all she did through that financial meltdown because she was going to stop at nothing less than wholesale changes to fix the system, because, as many of us felt: never, ever again.

So as I think about the fact that we are celebrating the longest serving woman in the history of the United States House of Representatives, I feel so privileged to say that I know you;

that I have served with you. There is no one who is more ethical in this building than you; there is no one more compassionate in this building than you; and there is no one more committed to economic justice in this building.

There has never been, nor do I think will there ever be, anyone who cares about Ohio like MARCY KAPTUR.

MARCY, thank you for being a beacon for all of us to follow. I truly love you, respect you, honor you; and I am truly pleased that we are celebrating a wonderful career here tonight that is only going to continue. But I think we all feel pretty special being part of this celebration.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for organizing the "What is Wrong with Wall Street" here tonight so that we could have the opportunity to hail one of our true champions and sheroes this evening.

I just, first of all, want to associate myself with all of the comments that have already been made. When you have served for 36 years, we could wax on forever about your distinguished career of public service, so I won't do that.

I just want to focus on one thing that you have done that has really touched me in a very profound way, and that is, as a valued friend and colleague and mentor, your passion for the Great Lakes. From your seat on the Appropriations Committee, and now the co-chair of the bipartisan Great Lakes Task Force, you have never ever, MARCY, missed a beat when it came to the Great Lakes. And I am sure that there were times when you have felt like you were a lonely voice out there crying in the wilderness.

There is an old African proverb that says: Water has no enemies. So you would think, given that, that there would be just this plethora of funding and strategies, but there has not been. We have seen the crisis in lead in drinking water, bathing; sportsmen depend on water; agriculture depends on water; and truly, we need a water policy and a policy around the Great Lakes that makes sense whenever we do an infrastructure bill.

Now, for every one of those 18,000-plus days of service in the House, you have been a steward and a champion for protecting not only this environmental treasure, but MARCY also recognizes how much this resource provides for our regional and national economy.

If the Great Lakes region, the U.S. and Canadian provinces, were a separate country, it would have a gross domestic product of \$6 trillion, making it the third largest economy in the world. That growth and development would

not be possible without leaders with vision and passion like you, MARCY, and so I want to thank you.

I agree with the gentleman who has said that your greatest accomplishments have not even occurred yet, as it pertains to developing the potential for these water resources in the Great Lakes.

I want to thank you for your legacy of working to stop the invasive Asian carp; fighting for safe and clean drinking water; making sure that the Great Lakes get the needed support from the Army Corps of Engineers for their funding, for dredging, and to maintain the critical infrastructure to support commerce; for fighting against efforts to roll back the Clean Water Act; and, certainly, for your vigorous opposition to efforts to kill the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

Thank you, MARCY, for your leadership, and I love you dearly.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

MARCY, it is an honor to be on the floor this evening. We have joined together many times to share a message for the American public about the fight for what is right. No one leads that fight better than you. We have assembled here to celebrate the extraordinary career of our great colleague and friend from Ohio, my friend from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR.

MARCY is a towering giant in the history of Congress. Her legislative achievements are too numerous to count. Her work led the way in the creation of the moving and so powerful World War II Memorial on the National Mall. What great respect for our veterans. And that is who you are, a respectful individual.

MARCY was one of the first Members of Congress to raise the alarm for America's workers and industries facing unfair competition from trade policies around the world.

She has been a champion of America's farmers, fighting tirelessly to protect the rights of poultry growers and restore some balance to our Nation's increasing consolidated meat industry.

She continues to be a champion and a visionary in the fight to bring down skyrocketing prescription drug costs; to restore stability and good sense to our financial system; and to save the Great Lakes and the millions who rely on their resources from the harmful algal blooms—blooms that threaten to poison their rich waters.

There is no Member in this or any Congress who is more committed to serving the needs of her constituents and her district. While she has proven to be truly formidable to her opponents, MARCY is as kind as she is fierce.

In just a few days, this Sunday, March 18, MARCY will become the long-

est serving woman in the history of the United States House of Representatives. What a proud achievement. What a proud moment. What a great moment in history to witness and share: 35 years, 2 months and 14 days, but who is counting?

Those numbers are the official numbers that surpass the record set by former Massachusetts Representative Edith Nourse Rogers. Her enduring service has met more than three decades whereby girls have grown up in Ohio and all across America seeing that they, too, could serve and lead in the United States Congress, an impressive example that my friend, MARCY KAPTUR, continues to set.

I am more than pleased and more than a little relieved to say that MARCY is as passionate and driven as the day we met nearly a decade ago.

As the longest serving woman remaining in either Chamber, God willing, in a few years, MARCY will become the longest serving woman in the history of the United States Congress. It is my great hope that I will have the privilege to witness that historic moment, just as I am humbled to share in this one.

I want to thank MARCY KAPTUR for years of our friendship, our collaboration, our conversations, our coaching—her coaching, I should say—on the floor between votes and in Special Orders here on the floor after session, and for always upholding the values we share in service of the American people.

Speaking of values, we cherish the bond that we both hold with a common Polish heritage, something that I know causes her heart to pound nobly and boldly and proudly.

MARCY, you are a unique individual, a one-of-a-kind human being. You are a living legend, a leader with a steel backbone, and a treasure of this Congress and our great Nation.

We say thank you for your passion. We say thank you for your intellect. We say thank you for your integrity, and we say thank you for leading in the walk for justice, social and economic justice, so that all people can be touched by your soulfulness and your kind and loving being.

God Bless you. Congratulations.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Representative LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and greatly appreciate a moment to speak.

I guess to borrow a bit from Shakespeare's account of what Marc Antony said: I come not to bury MARCY KAPTUR, but to praise her.

I got to know MARCY back during the economic disaster where investment banks brought us to the brink of ruin. And though we come from different backgrounds and we have different ideas at times about the best way to go

forward, I always know that MARCY KAPTUR will be honest with me, that she cares deeply about the country, and that is her driving concern. It is actually easy to talk to people in this body—even across the aisle—when their driving concern is in the best interest of the country.

We shared a passion back after the problems in late 2008, in that I saw someone who was ethical and actually righteous who wanted to see that those who caused the problem that brought us to the brink of ruin were not rewarded, and that also we didn't end up punishing those who had no fault.

I am still concerned that she and I were not able to see that the problems were not rewarded and the innocent were not punished. I am not real proud of how our parties together responded to that crisis, but through all of that, and in the years intervening since, actually 10 years—it was back in 2008—I have come to build my respect for MARCY KAPTUR and know that this is somebody—agree or disagree, and we often disagree—but she is going to be honest, and that she has that passion in her heart to do what is best for the country.

□ 2000

There are people who have attributed the comment to different people over the years. My late mother said that our pastor back in 1951, before I was ever around, used it about a married couple, and he said: If two people agree on everything, one of them is unnecessary.

So here on the floor, it is important that we hear from each other and we get different viewpoints in arriving at what is best for the country. But one thing I have grown to understand and know is that when I talk to MARCY KAPTUR, it is somebody who I know will be straightforward, agree or disagree, will be honest, and will be honorable; and that is not a bad way to approach things.

If we had more people with whom we could have those kind of discussions, there would probably be a lot fewer ulcers amongst our colleagues on this floor and the country would be far the better off for it.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend, Congresswoman WATERS, for sharing this opportunity. I didn't realize that my friend, MARCY KAPTUR, was going to set a new record. All I knew is I didn't really care about the gender, but I care greatly about the person and how she has enriched this body by being here.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members will have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend

their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, prior to wrapping up this session of friends who care so much about MARCY KAPTUR, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) not to talk about Wall Street.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I must say, I was not expecting what just happened. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California, my beloved friend of almost over three decades—in having the deep respect I have for her in her own life before she came to Congress and now as the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee; a very difficult position to hold—for taking this opportunity so late in the evening to commemorate my tenure here in our magnificent U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I thank every single Member who has come down.

Obviously this is Women's History Month, and we had this announcement today, and I happened to be the victim of it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the people of Ohio's Ninth Congressional District for believing in me throughout my political career, for teaching me, for helping me to learn more and to understand the travails and the possibilities that were in their minds and hearts. I thank them so very much for that.

As with anyone, we all have our faults and human limitations, but, to the best of our ability, we have tried to uphold the Constitution and to help the American people.

I think back to my very first term in Congress, beginning in 1983. There was a great Congressman from Florida, Claude Pepper. I can still see him down in the well. Probably the most important vote I cast in my first few months in Congress was the refinancing of Social Security. What a great leader he was. Probably not originally from the liberal wing of our party, yet liberals and conservatives came together to do what was right in resecur-ing Social Security for the next generation.

Congressman LEVIN came to the floor with a spark plug. Our fight has always been to define where our jobs went, and we began to track places where we saw production move beyond our ability to restrain. Places such as I represent became hollowed out in many corners of our community. Since the early 1980s until today, this country has not been able to balance its trade accounts or to write trade agreements that were truly fair, as Congressman LEVIN has referenced. So we hemorrhage at the rate of over half a trillion dollars a year, almost \$600 billion annually, because we

can't get other markets open, and they take it out of the hides of our people and our communities here in this country.

So if we go back to the 1980s. If you really look at when the numbers began to change, it is not hard to understand why the American people are unsettled and frustrated because of what has happened with the economy.

As I said in remarks earlier today, I was taught by a very great professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin many years ago that economics is not destiny, but it is 85 percent of it. If you really think about that, what we have endured over the last period of my service, three decades—going on four decades almost, we have seen this transformation in production platforms.

Unfortunately, with NAFTA on this continent, as we struggle to find a solution to the immigration issue, the reciprocal of NAFTA in Mexico was the upending of millions of small farmers, millions and millions of people who lived at the poverty level, but they had some way to eke out a living. And when their corn market was destroyed after NAFTA's passage in 1993, it took about a decade; but every year, hundreds of thousands of people lost their livelihood. They were desperate, desperate people.

What are they going to do?

Our grandparents fled to this country from what was greater Poland at the turn of the 20th century because they couldn't feed themselves.

It is the same reason the Irish came, right?

We look at what happened in Mexico as the flip side of NAFTA. We have never been able to fix that as a continent.

Are our leaders that stupid that we really can't face the music and develop adjustment provisions, as Europe did when it brought in Spain and Portugal?

So we look back to the basis, the root of why things have happened and hurt the American people, and we can understand their frustration. So I think I have been a voice for that. It is a problem we haven't fixed yet, but it is one that we need to attend to very carefully, because the American people have paid the price of, really, policies that went awry.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman WATERS for surprising me. She and I have fought so hard on prudent lending, prudent banking, and we have served here long enough to see when it wasn't, and when greed took over a gambling mentality rather than a prudent banking mentality, what it did to this country and how hard it was to pick up the pieces.

African Americans lost half of their accumulated wealth after 2008, half, since the founding of the Republic. The pain in those communities is not over. Maybe somebody from Wall Street

might tune us in and hear that, but I want to tell them that it isn't fixed yet.

What has happened in many places such as I represent, predatory lenders have moved in, auto title loan companies, scam artists, who are making terrible, terrible exploitative deals with these individuals who simply don't know what those agreements they are signing mean. That is wrong.

If we look at the Latino community, they lost one-third of their accumulated wealth in the financial crash of 2008. And then for those who were the remaining Caucasians and other parts of our population, they lost about one-fifth of their wealth. It was extraordinary loss of capital, of money, of property value that belonged to them.

So sometimes, though, we try, but we can't always fix what is wrong. As we look to the future, our primary responsibility here is to defend liberty, as Congressmen TAKANO and LEVIN and Congresswoman SPEIER and so many others who came down here this evening talked about.

I feel very privileged to work with my colleagues in defending liberty and making sure we have the strongest defense in the world, and try to help those countries that are now being invaded by the Russian Federation, whose citizens simply want to be free and to have a decent life.

Mr. Speaker, I note that one of our colleagues has come to the floor, and I don't want to deny him any ability to speak. Congressman SOTO and I have worked so much on issues of concern to Florida and Puerto Rico and, obviously, trying to fix the bad gerrymandering that happened around the country, so I want to acknowledge his presence here this evening.

I thank all of my beloved colleagues for this great honor.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my family; my brother, Steven, who is doing extremely well after a very serious illness and coming back to us. It means so very much to me. I am hoping he is listening tonight. In memory of all of our family members and my godchildren, some of whom were here today, and all of the people who helped me along the way, there is just no way to properly thank them except to keep trying to do a very good job and to meet the unaddressed needs of this great, great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman WATERS so very much for this great surprise and for being my friend.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are some wonderful moments in this institution. There are times when we are not always pleased and we don't feel as if anything is getting done, but then there are times like these when we have the opportunity to pay tribute to and to recognize one of our Members who have made tremendous contributions, someone who loves

this institution and has worked hard to ensure that we get the best out of it.

I am just pleased and proud that I have been a part of not only the recognition that we have done today, both in the reception that was held earlier for Congresswoman KAPTUR, and for being able to be on this floor this evening and spend this opportunity with my other colleagues who helped us to understand the vast knowledge and contributions that this Congresswoman has made to this institution and all of the advice and mentoring that she has done for so many.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on this special occasion to commemorate our beloved colleague and next door neighbor, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR from the 9th District of Ohio.

March has been designated to commemorate Women's History Month and Congresswoman KAPTUR has indeed made history this month.

First elected to the 98th Congress in 1982, and reelected to the succeeding 17 Congresses, MARCY KAPTUR is now the longest serving woman in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives, breaking the record previously set by Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts.

Congresswoman KAPTUR, a native Toledoan, lives in the same modest house where she grew up.

She is a Polish-American with humble, working class roots.

Her family operated a small grocery store and her mother later served on the original organizing committee of a trade union at the Champion Spark Plug factory in Toledo.

After graduating from St. Ursula Academy, she became the first member of her family to attend college, earning a bachelor's degree in history from the University of Wisconsin (1968) and later a master's degree in urban planning from the University of Michigan.

After working for 15 years as a city and regional planner, primarily in Toledo and Chicago, she accepted an appointment as a domestic policy advisor to President Jimmy Carter.

During his Administration, she helped maneuver 17 housing and neighborhood revitalization bills through Congress.

In 1981, while pursuing a doctorate in urban planning and development finance at MIT, she was recruited by the Lucas County Democratic Party to run for Congress against a first-term Republican.

Although she was outspent by a 3-to-1 margin, MARCY KAPTUR parlayed a strong economic message during the 1982 recession to stage a nationally-recognized upset.

In Washington, MARCY KAPTUR fought vigorously to win a seat on the House Appropriations Committee.

Today she is the ranking member on the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, which is fitting given that the Ninth District hugs the Lake Erie coastline from Cleveland to Toledo.

Congresswoman KAPTUR also is the first Democratic woman ever to serve on the powerful Defense Subcommittee.

There, she is a strong advocate for national security, energy independence and adequate support for the armed forces.

She is also a member of the Interior Subcommittee where she fights for clean water programs that protect our Great Lakes.

Earlier in her congressional career, she served on the Appropriations Financial Services Subcommittee as well as the Banking Committee.

She served on the Budget Committee as recently as the 112th Congress.

She has received the Prisoner of War "Barbed Wire" Award for her commitment to veterans' affairs.

She has secured funding for a path-breaking study into the incidence of post-traumatic stress disorders and other mental health issues among our armed forces.

And she helped lead a community effort to save the 180th Fighter Wing in Toledo when it was threatened by the base closure commission.

Congresswoman KAPTUR has always shown strong interest in America's standing in the world and its relations with other countries.

She currently serves on the Congressional-Executive Commission on China and co-chairs the Congressional Hungarian Caucus and also the Ukraine Caucus.

A strong supporter of Middle East peace, she directed the first surplus farm commodities in 1999 to support the peace process in Lebanon, Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

Congresswoman KAPTUR remains dedicated to the development of democratic institutions globally.

She has spearheaded private charitable efforts to alleviate suffering in nations such as Ukraine and Vietnam.

As leader on issues related to international trade and human and labor rights, MARCY KAPTUR has led the fight for fair trade laws, dating back to her opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

In 1993, Congresswoman KAPTUR was awarded an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree by the University of Toledo in recognition of her "effective representation of the community."

St. Ursula Academy named MARCY KAPTUR Alumna of the Year in 1995.

She is recipient of the Taubman College Distinguished Alumna award from the University of Michigan, making her the first woman so recognized and the first graduate of the Urban and Regional Planning Program to be so honored.

MARCY KAPTUR recently received the Director's Award from the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University for her commitment to increased understanding and appreciation of the peoples and cultures of Eurasia, Russia and East Europe.

MARCY KAPTUR was named the National Mental Health Association's "Legislator of the Year" for her championing mental health and received the 2002 Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

MARCY KAPTUR is also the author of a book, *Women in Congress: A Twentieth Century Odyssey* that was published by Congressional Quarterly in 1996.

Dedicated to the principle that fiscal responsibility begins in "one's own backyard," Congresswoman KAPTUR has consistently returned money to the federal Treasury.

MARCY KAPTUR refuses to accept Congressional pay raises and donates them to offset the federal deficit and charitable causes in her home community.

MARCY KAPTUR leads the charge on urban agriculture in Congress, she introduced the Urban Agriculture Production Act of 2017, which will create help create jobs, healthier, local food options and opportunities for cities and towns to become part of the food production process.

With all of that said, Congresswoman KAPTUR's kindness, thoughtfulness, and generosity precede her.

When Hurricane Harvey hit the 18th District, she promptly sent my staff a box of doughnuts, knowing they would need that extra push to get through the busy hours ahead.

Congresswoman KAPTUR goes above and beyond her job description as Ranking Member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies.

MARCY KAPTUR worked closely with me to pass several Jackson Lee amendments to Energy and Water Appropriations spending bills to provide funding for flood mitigation studies in Houston and Harris County and was crucial in securing House passage of the supplemental appropriations providing disaster recovery relief for hurricane Harvey victims.

So on behalf of the residents of the 18th District of Texas, I say thank you Congresswoman KAPTUR for being there and standing strong with us in our time of need.

Her compassion shows through random acts of kindness and thoughtfulness ranging from holding the door open for a young staffer to calling to check on the status of the 18th District as she is concerned about the human consequences of extreme flooding—I imagine her background in urban planning plays a role in her attentiveness.

As the Ranking Member for the subcommittee with Jurisdiction over the Army Corps of Engineer, Congresswoman KAPTUR helped in the effort to secure funding allocated to study floods—a crucial program for Hurricane Harvey recovery and future preparedness.

Thank you for your leadership, Congresswoman KAPTUR.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my friend and colleague Representative MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio on becoming the longest-serving woman in the history of the House. On Sunday, March 18, she will surpass the late Representative Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts, who held the previous record of thirty-five years, two months, and fourteen days. But more than her longevity, Representative KAPTUR has brought to the House her tireless work ethic, her intellect, and her devotion to serving the people of lakeshore Ohio.

A Toledo native and the first in her family to attend college, Representative KAPTUR began her public service career as a member of the Toledo-Lucas County Plan Commission and later as a domestic policy advisor to President Jimmy Carter. When she defeated an incumbent Representative in a stunning upset election in 1982, Representative KAPTUR came to Congress and hit the ground running. She has been a leader in the fight for higher wages, workers' rights, and ensuring access to affordable health care. It was Representative KAPTUR who first proposed the idea in Congress

of creating a National World War II Memorial, and she wrote the legislation that eventually authorized its construction on the National Mall. As a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, Representative KAPTUR has been at the forefront of efforts to invest in both our national security and in domestic priorities that help working families access opportunities to achieve economic security and get ahead in Ohio and across America.

I have very great respect for Representative KAPTUR's intellect and her passion for working people and the pain she feels whenever they feel pain. No Member is more committed to drawing attention to and addressing the difficult challenges so many working people experience—not only in her native Ohio, but throughout the middle of our country.

I've been honored to serve alongside Representative KAPTUR, both on the Appropriations Committee and on the Floor of the House, for the past thirty-five years. I look forward to continue working closely with her as Democrats carry forward the fight for economic opportunity, equal justice, and stronger communities.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand today to congratulate my friend and colleague from the great State of Ohio, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR who on March 18th will become the longest serving woman U.S. Representative in U.S. history.

MARCY, for 35 years, has served this nation and the people of Ohio with distinction.

It is my honor to serve with someone that never backs down from a fight and leads on all the things that are important to Ohio and all Americans.

I applaud her for her commitment and dedication to revitalizing our cities, ensuring fair trade deals and good jobs for American workers, increased funding for defense and energy security, and protecting the Great Lakes.

She has accomplished and contributed so much yet never forgot where she came from or the people that have helped her to become.

On behalf of the people of Ohio's 11th Congressional District, I thank her for her service and congratulations on this historic achievement.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is nice when we can talk across party lines about someone's excellent level of service. It has been an honor and privilege to serve with MARCY KAPTUR my 13 years here in Congress.

Unfortunately, I want to move from talking about someone with ethical, upright, and righteous scruples to talking about a former FBI Director.

□ 2015

I had concerns back when Robert Mueller was FBI Director. And some people have forgotten, but one of the things that he implemented as FBI Director that I have heard from FBI agents around the country caused a great deal of concern was what he called a 5-year up-or-out policy, which, in essence—it is more complicated

than this, but basically anyone who found themselves in a supervisory position within the FBI offices anywhere in the country, in the world, they were in a supervisory position for 5 years. At the end of that 5 years they had to either come to Washington and most likely ride a cubical, sit at a desk, or they could get out of the FBI.

Most of the honorable, wonderful agents we had in the FBI across the country that so many people here in Washington with the FBI like to point to—why? Because they can point around the country to upright, moral, ethical, honest FBI agents so that you don't look at the top of the FBI as it has been here. Since I have been here in Congress both under the Bush administration followed by the Obama administration, there have been problems at the top of the FBI.

The first time I had an opportunity to question Mr. Mueller, FBI Director Mueller, after getting to Congress in 2005, I was not aware of all of the problems that Director Mueller was creating within the FBI, and so I paid deference, in effect, to his service in the military, in Vietnam. I felt like he deserved that. But then, as I have said about other individuals, no matter how grueling someone's service may have been, Vietnam or elsewhere, it still doesn't give them a right to harm my country either through negligence or intentional misconduct.

This 5-year up-or-out policy—people didn't realize what I was understanding and realizing from around the country—was doing massive damage to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And I kept wondering, "Why would he do this?"

Now, I understand here in Washington it wouldn't be a bad policy. If you are in a supervisory position for 5 years in Washington, maybe you ought to be bounced out into the real United States, outside this surreal District of Columbia for government service, the paradise for bureaucrats. That would have been a far better policy for the FBI, for probably any bureaucracy here.

For many of the departments and agencies in Washington, that wouldn't be a bad idea. Okay. If you are in a supervisory position in Washington, D.C., for 5 years, at the end of the 5 years you have to go out to the real world, go out to the United States itself, in one of the offices out there and deal with real people in real situations rather than this bubble in Washington, D.C., inside the beltway.

That might have been a good policy, but that is not the one that Robert Mueller utilized.

As I wrestled with that—why would someone implement a policy that forced some of the best people in law enforcement, happened to be in the FBI, in a supervisory position, force them out, why would an FBI Director do that?—it became clear. And I believe it was NPR that had an article, I believe it was, about this policy of Mueller's and how, I believe it was in part of 2007, Mueller's policy ran off around 140 or so supervisors in our FBI offices.

From the FBI agents I knew who were in supervisory positions around the country, some had 20, 25, 30 years of experience. So when one thinks about 140 FBI agents with absolutely priceless, invaluable experience in law enforcement around the country, and Mueller runs them off not because they are unethical—all the cases of which I am aware, they were very ethical. They were good law enforcement officers.

And for those who have been in law enforcement, whether Federal or State or local, I think most would agree with this comment that it takes probably 5 years before someone in law enforcement can gain the respect of other law enforcement officers, and especially if that officer, that agent is with the FBI; because there are too many local, State law enforcement who have dealt with FBI agents who came in, wanted to make a name for themselves, the local officers would do the research, they would do the real tough police work going out, knocking on doors, talking to witnesses, only to have their work, when they finally find the culprit, have, as I have heard local law enforcement talk about, the FBI swoop in, have a press conference, and take the credit for the local work.

So that is a reputation, fair or unfair, that local law enforcement often are thinking about when they see a new FBI agent come into town. They are watching to see: Is this person going to be a selfless team player, strictly in the pursuit of law and order and the rule of law, or are they going to come in and use my work to make a name for themselves?

Over 5 years or so, the FBI agents would gain respect. I have seen it, read about it, and I know that that has, too often, been the case. It takes a while to build that kind of respect among local law enforcement and also to build that kind of respect in the criminal community so that they know that is a nonsense person, that the FBI agent is not about ego; it is about following the law and making sure everybody else does.

Yet here Robert Mueller comes in as FBI Director, and he is putting in place a policy that is getting rid of the best of the best that we have in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

And some say, well, you may not realize, but he was a Bush appointee. I know he was. And he took office as Director of the FBI shortly before 9/11, so it would be a bit unfair to blame Robert Mueller for failing to see what was coming on 9/11 because he had just simply not been in office that long.

But Director Mueller implemented this policy. And as I struggled with why he would do this—he is running off thousands of years of experience. I mean, just in that, about, three-fourths of 1 year, 2007, where it was maybe, I believe, about 140 supervisory agents who Mueller ran off—not for unethical conduct, not for inefficiency or inability to be a good law enforcement officer, no. He ran them off because they, perhaps, had too much experience.

Anybody who has concern about their own self-image and perhaps—I mean, I was wrestling with why somebody would run off thousands of years of experience within the FBI, and what I

kept coming back to is perhaps there is some kind of insecurity that would cause a Director to be concerned that there would be people within the FBI that might not be complete yes-men, who might have more experience and, because they have been there 20, 30 years, be able to say: Director Mueller, I know this appears to be a good idea. That is what we thought 20 years ago or 15 years ago. We tried that, and it failed. And let me explain to you why, and perhaps I can help suggest a better policy or a better approach to this criminal case or this type of case.

When you start running off thousands of years of experience within the FBI, you are creating a great vacuum for experience within the FBI. So that could create situations, and did, where you could have people who were the special agent in charge in the supervisory position for 5 years, and then, because of Mueller's policy and them not wanting to take their family to Washington, D.C., and sit in some cubical or sit at some desk, be a yes-man—they wanted to be law officers.

And so, in many cases of which I had heard, FBI agents said: I am not going to sit in a cubical for Mueller. I am a law officer. I am about investigating and enforcing the law. So I am getting out. I am going to make more money where I am going. I would rather have stayed in the FBI. That is where my heart is. That is where I wanted to be. But Mueller is forcing me out. Yeah, it will be better for my family. I will have better hours. I will make more money. But I am not going to Washington. I want to be here in real America making a difference here.

Those are the kind of people that Robert Mueller ran off. Maybe it was his insecurity. Maybe, some have said, it was a God complex. I don't know. But I know, in my heart, I believe Robert Mueller did more damage to the FBI than all of the FBI Directors put together since J. Edgar Hoover. And it is dangerous when one person runs off so many people.

So when we came to find out—and again, this was during the Bush administration, the second term. Alberto Gonzalez was the Attorney General. And we had been assured that this very dangerous—dangerous because it was so easily manipulated and abused, but it was called the National Security Letters, NSLs. They were like a subpoena, except without the formalities.

Under this law that created what are called the National Security Letters, someone in the Justice Department could simply write a letter to an individual, to a company, to a bank, and say: I am writing this under Federal law regarding National Security Letters that allows me to just simply send a letter to you, sign the letter, and direct you to deliver to me all of the documents you have regarding this person or this company, whatever the case might be.

They would also put into the letter what the law said, that if the recipient of the letter leaks or tells anybody about that letter, then they have violated the criminal law of the United States and they can be put in prison for leaking, for saying that they had

received a letter from the FBI or Justice Department asking for documents.

That is a powerful weapon for the U.S. Congress to hand over to the Justice Department, and especially if it is utilized by one lone FBI agent.

Well, we have been told in Judiciary Committee repeatedly by FBI Director—we have been told informally, talking about the NSLs, National Security Letters, no, there are no known abuses of the National Security Letters. And then there was an inspector general investigation just to see whether there had been any abuse of these National Security Letters.

The report came back from the inspector general that there were potentially thousands of abuses of the National Security Letters where an FBI agent just sent the letter and, under the Fourth Amendment under our Constitution, there was no probable cause that a crime was committed.

□ 2030

There was no evidence that this individual committed a crime. The FBI agent just wanted to find out more about this person; maybe do a fishing exercise to see if there might be something that the FBI agent might investigate.

Perhaps the FBI agent, maybe he didn't like somebody in the community, so he wanted to see if there was anything out there, maybe in his banking records, or in his dealings with other companies. So he sends a national security letter, says give me all the documents you have on this person.

In my mind, that is a violation of every American's constitutional rights. It was a gross deviation from propriety. It violated what FBI Director Mueller told us about how the NSLs were being used as an investigatory tool, and a lot of us got very upset. And I think, to a large degree, that is why the Attorney General ended up stepping down.

In retrospect, it really should have been Robert Mueller who stepped down. They were his FBI agents. He failed to control; he failed to provide proper supervision. And I can't help but think perhaps a contributing factor, maybe the contributing factor to all of the widespread abuses of this power that Congress gave the Justice Department could well have been, probably was because FBI Director Robert Mueller decided to get rid of thousands of years of experience.

These are the agents, the supervisors, the people with the most experience that could have told a younger, inexperienced FBI agent: You may be tempted to do this, but that would be an abuse. Don't even try it. Don't even go there.

But because Mueller had stripped the FBI of thousands of years of experience, there were not the "gray hairs" or the "no hairs" that were out there to mentor younger FBI agents. Sure, there were some around, but not like there would have been had there been such insecurity or whatever it was that caused FBI Director Robert Mueller to do such terrible damage to the ranks of the FBI.

This is a guy that we were told: He will be an absolutely perfect special

counsel. Well, I knew as soon as I heard that he was being appointed that this was a mistake; that this is a guy that did such horrendous damage to the FBI's ranks, to their experience level.

In fact, as I mentioned to FBI Director Mueller on one of the occasions where I was given the chance to ask questions during our Judiciary Committee hearing, in essence, I said: Director, do you realize that if you really applied your 5-year up-or-out policy to everyone in the FBI in a supervisory position, since you think it is such a good idea, you, Director Mueller, would have had to have left before September of 2006?

But instead of being consistent in the way he treated himself as he treated such invaluable FBI agents when he ran them off for no reason other than possibly insecurity, not only did he serve 10 years as FBI Director, which was an insult to all of those he ran off after 5 years, but then President Obama said: Hey, I am going to extend you 2 years.

An ethical, fair man, I believe, would have said: I am sorry, President Obama, but I was so vicious in the way I implemented this 5-year up-or-out policy and ran so many good agents off, it would be inappropriate, not only for me to have served 10 years, but to add 2 years on top of that, 12 years. But Robert Mueller did not do that. He was not fair across the board. He was not consistent.

That brings me back to—here is a report, March 15 of 2012, by NPR, the headline is: "Report: Prosecutors Hid Evidence in Ted Stevens Case."

Now, Ted Stevens, as I recall, was the longest serving Republican in the Senate back in 2008. Senator Stevens was running for re-election, and he was considered by many to be one of the most ethical, upright Senators out of the 100 who were in the U.S. Senate. Yet Mueller's FBI decided, apparently, to take out this patriotic, honest, honorable U.S. Senator by what I consider to be abuse of the justice system.

This article from NPR says, it starts with this:

"A blistering report released Thursday found that the government team concealed documents that would have helped the late Stevens, a longtime Republican Senator from Alaska, defend himself against false-statements charges in 2008. Stevens lost his Senate seat as the scandal played out, and he died in a plane crash 2 years later.

"The 500-page report by investigator Henry F. Schuelke III shook the legal community, as law professors described it as a milestone in the history of prosecutorial misconduct.

"Investigators weren't talking Thursday. But Brendan Sullivan, who defended the Senator, had plenty to say. 'The extent of the corruption is shocking,' Sullivan says. 'It's the worst misconduct we've seen in a generation by prosecutors at the Department of Justice.'

But it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that this was an FBI case, and it is difficult to believe that the Director of the FBI would have not been personally monitoring, if not personally dictating instructions in such a

politically sensitive case as a long-term, sitting U.S. Senator; that if you are going to use and manipulate the Department of Justice to take out a U.S. Senator, you should be extraordinarily sure that you have a legitimate case.

But I don't have the information that would indicate what briefings FBI Director Mueller had over the investigation, but I would humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, either Director Mueller got regular briefings on the investigation and development of the case against Senator Ted Stevens, or he was incompetent in not even bothering to keep abreast of developments in a case that would be so politically sensitive.

But this article says: "The report"—by the Inspector General—"is based on a review of 128,000 documents and interviews with prosecutors and FBI agents on the hot seat."

But sadly, the FBI, under Mueller, pushed this case, this investigation, to a head so that it was capable of being tried before the 2008 election in November and, in fact, Stevens was convicted just days before the election, and then I believe he only lost the race for Senate by a couple of thousand votes or so.

But the report says that prosecutors should have shared information that might have obliterated the witness' credibility against Stevens, and they had evidence that their key witness had told the same story 55 different times; but that the FBI got evidence that their key witness had had a sexual relationship with a 15-year-old girl and then asked the girl to lie about it under oath. And so it is easy to see how he would have been manipulated.

But after telling the story that would have acquitted Ted Stevens, as he should have been acquitted we now know from all the evidence, actually, they were able to push the witness into changing his story immediately before trial in order to testify against Stevens.

Like I said, we do not know exactly what Mueller knew, didn't know, but he surely had to know when the FBI agent who was assisting his supervisor in the case, when he did an affidavit, signed it under penalty of perjury, indicating the improprieties of the agent in charge of the case, which is named Kepner, Director Mueller had to have known that one of his agents said: I cannot live with this prosecutorial misconduct. This is figuratively what he said.

The agent in charge, the FBI agent in charge, hid evidence that would have proved what I believe, beyond a reasonable doubt, Ted Stevens was not guilty. Not just raised a reasonable doubt; would have proved he was not guilty.

As the Alaska Dispatch News asked in their headline from their article in September 2016—actually, June 6, 2012, then updated September 2016, their headline asked: "Why is lead FBI agent in botched Ted Stevens case still employed?"

So we do know, under Mueller's FBI, that he did such horrific damage, running off thousands of years of experience, years later, after one FBI agent had such pangs of conscience that an innocent man, Ted Stevens, was con-

victed when he was 100 percent not guilty, the agent that was the whistleblower had been run off from the FBI. That had to have been with Mueller's consent. He was removed from every criminal case, which means you need to get out because you are not going to have a job.

Yet the agent, Kepner, who was in charge of the investigation, manufactured evidence, hid evidence, according to these reports, and she was still working in the criminal division of the FBI.

So when anybody talks to me about how fair and ethical and upright Robert Mueller is, I don't buy it. I have seen the damage he did to the FBI. I have seen the damage he created by not allowing his FBI agents to be trained to recognize radical Islamists.

Sure, after the FBI got notice under Mueller that Tsarnaev, the Boston bomber, had been radicalized and he was a threat to lives and U.S. security, oh, yeah; they sent out an FBI agent to talk to him. And apparently he said: Oh, no, I am not a terrorist.

And then they went the extra step to talk to his mother who said: Oh, no, he is a good boy. He is not a terrorist.

But because of Robert Mueller placating the Council on American-Islamic Relations that was a named party co-conspirator supporting terrorism, he placated CAIR, and he had the training materials for our FBI agents purged so they didn't know what to look for. That is the reason the Boston bombers were on the loose. He needs to resign and go home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2045

DANGERS OF BURN PITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the Helping Veterans Exposed to Burn Pits Act, H.R. 1279, and I will talk a minute about one of my own constituents, Brian, who is facing this very dangerous condition.

From the summer of 2004 through 2009, my constituent Brian was deployed a total of six times on combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan as a United States Marine Corps helicopter mechanic.

As a junior marine, he would haul trash daily to the airbases' burn pits. He helped burn all the unit's trash and stood security watch on the burn pits, which are always located near work or housing areas in airbases.

During each deployment, Brian would smell the trash burning in the pits and was always in the path of the smoke. He would often wear rags across his mouth and nose to reduce the foul smell and filter the smoke from the air he was breathing.

After some time, Brian developed breathing troubles, and the base medical center provided inhalers that helped temporarily. When he was home in between the deployments, he had breathing treatments and was diag-

nosed with bronchitis on multiple occasions.

In 2013, Brian developed a serious case of pneumonia. An abscess had formed in the lower lobe of his left lung. It ruptured, filling the lobe with fluid. The doctors removed a portion of Brian's left lung to save his life. The surgery kept him alive but greatly reduced lung capacity and functionality.

In 2016, Brian was offered the option to retire early from the United States Marine Corps. The Veterans Administration reviewed his case and determined a 100 percent disability rating. He is currently going through more testing due to undiagnosed heart issues and elevated blood level count for his blood cells, and he is still being treated for lung problems.

To this day, Brian reports having rib cage pain and nerve damage from the lung surgery on a daily basis.

Brian is, unfortunately, not the only servicemember whose health is deteriorating due to exposure to harmful substances from burning of waste in military bases.

While we are glad to see action taken in the NDAA for fiscal year 2018, we need a more permanent solution. I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 1279, Helping Veterans Exposed to Burn Pits Act, that would create a center of excellence within the Department of Veterans Affairs to better understand the health effects and treatments associated with burn pits.

I also encourage our United States military to provide proper breathing safety apparatuses and reconsider their current policy of having burn pits on or near our bases.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and these reforms because we all have an obligation to care for our veterans.

HONORING DR. CYNDIA MORALES MUNIZ DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Cyndia Morales Muniz.

Dr. Cyndia Morales Muniz serves as an assistant director at Hispanic Initiatives in the president's division at the University of Central Florida, affectionately known as UCF in central Florida. As chair of UCF's Hispanic Serving Institution, HSI, Task Force, she facilitates communication and collaboration within the university community to strengthen UCF's Hispanic-serving efforts.

As founding president of the Latino Faculty & Staff Association, LaFaSA, at UCF, Dr. Muniz has been the catalyst that has elevated Latino programming at UCF. With grant support from the Hispanic Federation, she established the CREAR Futuros Mentoring Program at UCF in 2016. The following year, she planned UCF's inaugural Latino graduation ceremony, Nuestra Graduación.

In the local community, she supports the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando and the Hispanic Heritage Scholarship Fund of Metro Orlando.

Dr. Muniz is highly regarded in the central Florida community. She also advocates for Latino student success at the national level, helping lead two national projects in partnership with

Excelencia in Education and serving as the UCF representative within the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. She also coleads the Puerto Rican Education Relief Team at UCF, helping support displaced students affected by Hurricane Maria in their transition to central Florida.

Having been a first-generation, low-income college student, she takes full advantage of opportunities to discuss and elevate best practices and policy implications for underrepresented communities.

Dr. Muniz earned a bachelor's degree in sociology at Binghamton University, a master's degree in sociology at St. John's University, and a doctoral degree in educational leadership at the University of Central Florida. Most recently, she was selected as a 2018 College Board Professional Fellow.

Dr. Muniz is a proud Puerto Rican and resides in Orlando with her loving husband, Antonio.

For that, Dr. Cyndia Morales Muniz, we honor you.

HONORING VETNAH "YEMEN" MONESSAR DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Vetnah "Yemen" Monessar.

Vetnah "Yemen" Monessar is a community organizer and political activist with over 13 years of experience in mobilizing and elevating the narrative of Muslim Americans in our community.

She has led legislative and electoral campaigns at all levels of government, advocating for equitable healthcare, education reform, fair access economic development, and human rights, in addition to numerous other issue-based campaigns.

Vetnah serves as the executive director of Emgage Florida, a civic engagement nonprofit that aims to educate, engage, and empower Muslim Americans in the civic engagement process.

She made history as the first hired woman State director for a Presidential campaign as the State coalition director for Hillary for America.

Vetnah currently serves as the vice president of the Orlando American Muslim Chamber of Commerce, on the Young Professionals Board of Harbor House, and on the Orlando Chapter 57 Citizen Review Board and has received numerous community service and leadership awards.

She received her degree in Islamic studies and religion from the Islamic University of Dr. Bilal Philips, as well as a degree in paralegal studies with a focus on transactional and litigation law.

As a community leader, she is a constant champion of those who traditionally do not have their voices heard and empowering them to be involved in the democratic process.

For that, Vetnah "Yemen" Monessar, we salute you.

HONORING MARGIE VIERA DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Margie Viera.

Margie Viera is a force of nature and an inspiration to us all.

She works with community leaders, government, and business owners from all industries to bring opportunities and growth to the central Florida region. She has influence in major areas, including public affairs, education, business development, international commercial import and export, and strategic alliances.

She helps businesses, big and small, to achieve growth. Her work has made an impact globally in major world centers, including in Puerto Rico; California, Texas, Florida in the United States; as well as Latin America, Spain, among other countries.

Margie is passionate about volunteering and mentoring. She is the development director at the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando, one of the Nation's leading organizations committed to the economic development of the Hispanic community directly impacting the central Florida region. Throughout her tenure as development director, Margie has engaged widely in policy development and advocacy across education, economic, social, and cultural spheres.

In the educational industry, Margie worked transforming lives through her service as the daytime program director at Ana G. Mendez University System, where she started the first bilingual program that serves Hispanic youth and empowered her students by giving them access to professional opportunities and skills development.

She is the cofounder of the Aspire to Inspire Youth Mentorship Program, which impacts underserved students to inspire them to become the next generation of leaders. Aspire to Inspire is a community organization that inspires Latin youth to stay in school and reach for the stars while creating a culture of #Paying IT Forward in her community.

Born in Puerto Rico and the single mother of two boys, Margie understands firsthand the challenges of living on the mainland away from her family on the island. She is a woman of valor, a loving mother, and a fierce advocate for education.

Margie Viera is a Latina leader using her powerful voice for our most vulnerable in central Florida.

For that, Margie Viera, we honor you.

HONORING KAREN COOPER WELZEL DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Karen Cooper Welzel.

Karen Cooper Welzel was born in Michigan. Both her parents fought for workers' rights and led the formation of the United Auto Workers union. Her family history became the basis for Karen to become politically active and as involved as she is today. Karen and her husband, George, moved to central Florida in 1994 and soon thereafter joined in the Polk Democratic Executive Committee meetings and the local Democratic club meetings.

Karen worked in human resources and later became a corporate HR director for a private hospitality company, overseeing five hotels and other properties.

Karen volunteered for the Howard Dean Presidential campaign in 2003 and continued in local politics by participating in Democratic clubs and the Polk County Democratic Party. She attended training sessions, served as a delegate to the Florida Democratic Party conventions, and encouraged and supported local candidates.

Karen was later elected chairwoman of the Polk County DEC. She chartered five new Democratic clubs in the county and opened two campaign offices. She also serves on the board of directors of Side Street Art Beat, an organization that provides opportunities for creative self-expression and support for individuals with special needs.

In 2014, Karen started a local chapter of the Democratic Women's Club of Florida in East Polk County. She currently serves as the chair of the Candidate Screening Committee.

In 2016, she was elected by the Polk County DEC members to serve as the State Committee Woman and currently is chairing the Polk DEC Campaign Committee. Karen and members of the DWC East Polk Ridge Club organized two women's rallies that resulted in the creation of the DWCF Lakeland Club.

Karen has stood before the Polk County Legislative Delegation several years in a row demanding voting rights for all citizens and gun safety measures.

Karen is the mother of two sons and now proud to be a grandmother.

For that, Karen Cooper Welzel, we honor you.

HONORING YBETH BRUZUAL DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor of Ybeth Bruzual.

Ybeth Bruzual is a beloved Venezuelan-Puerto Rican journalist in our community who has lived in central Florida since 1981 and considers our area her home.

Ybeth is an anchor for Spectrum News 13. She also hosts "Political Connections" on Sundays.

She is a three-time Emmy nominee and won an Emmy in 2016 for the Pulse Vigil live coverage at Lake Eola. Bruzual was honored with the UCF Department of Political Science Outstanding Alumni Award in 2015 for her political coverage.

She is fascinated by politics. She earned a bachelor's degree in international politics from the University of Central Florida. She puts that knowledge to good use in her job at News 13.

Ybeth bleeds black and gold and is a proud member of the UCF Alumni Association. She enjoys cheering on the UCF Knights at sporting event at Spectrum Stadium.

She also earned an AA degree from Valencia College, where she served as a writer and circulation manager in the 1990s on the school's newspaper, Valencia Voice.

She calls herself an endless prisoner of hope, and demonstrates that by her many community activities. She is a past board member for both Shepherd's Hope Clinic and Central Florida Chapter Board for Lighthouse of Central Florida, offering service to the blind, and a former mentor for the Compact Program for Orange County Public Schools.

Ybeth is the past president of the Central Florida Chapter of the National Association of Hispanic Journalists, and is a proud lifetime member of that organization.

Ybeth and her husband, Alfredo, have a young son.

And for that, Ybeth Bruzual, we honor you.

□ 2100

HONORING LISA ANN FRANCHINA DURING
WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Lisa Ann Franchina.

Lisa Ann Franchina is a local attorney. She is also a member of many civic organizations, and has served on many community boards in central Florida.

Born in Queens, New York, Lisa received her bachelor of arts in humanities from Hofstra University, and her juris doctorate from the Shepard Broad Law Center at Nova Southeastern University.

After her graduation from law school, Lisa was an assistant public defender in Orlando, handling trials and appeals in criminal court. For the last 25 years, Lisa has been a small-business owner, operating her own firm.

In 2016, Lisa received a Spotlight Award for her service on the membership committee of the family law section of the Florida bar.

In addition, Lisa is an active member of our community. She is a current member and past secretary for the Orange County League of Women Voters, and a member of the Tiger Bay Club of Central Florida as well. Lisa has served as President of the Central Florida Chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners, as a director and executive committee member of the Back to Nature Wildlife Refuge, and as a board member for the Orlando Marine Institute.

Lisa is currently serving her third term as president of the Board of Trustees for the Orange County Library System, and her second term as chair of the Orange County Animal Services Advisory Board.

Lisa is a shelter volunteer at the Orange County Animal Services, and has donated over 5,000 volunteer hours in the past 2 years.

Lisa was named as 2016 Orange County District Four Citizen of the Year for her service to the central Florida community.

And for that, Lisa Ann Franchina, we honor you.

HONORING DAISY LOPEZ-CID DURING WOMEN'S
HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Daisy Lopez-Cid.

Not many people can say that, in the height of a financial meltdown and national housing crisis back in 2008, they would venture out on their own to open up a real estate brokerage.

While most were downsizing, Daisy Lopez-Cid was planning her empire. In 2007 and 2008, she dove in feet first and opened her office. By 2016, office number two made its debut, and both have been churning out steady numbers since their doors opened.

Daisy was ranked in the top 250 sales agents in the country 4 years in a row; and, in 2015, she was ranked number 3 in the Nation.

She joined NAHREP, the National Association of Hispanic Real Estate Professionals, in 2008, and quickly realized how the association's mission to advance sustainable Hispanic home ownership lined up with her core values as a real estate professional.

To give back to the organization that has empowered her for so long, she now serves as the NAHREP 2018 national president.

Recently, when Hurricane Maria hit our native island of Puerto Rico, she traveled down there for over 2 weeks, bringing down thousands and thousands of pounds of supplies: food, water, medications, clothing, and so many other of the bare essentials that we need for living every day.

She went down door to door, and people in Puerto Rico welcomed her into their homes and welcomed the much-needed help that helped lift up the island, along with so many entrepreneurs in central Florida who helped with our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico.

Although real estate was not her first career, it was clear to see that this former New York paralegal had found her calling in real estate. Daisy is someone you want to have in your corner, as her zest for success is contagious, and her wisdom speaks beyond her years. Her vast real estate knowledge and love for education and for educating her agents has allowed her firm to grow on Broadway in Kissimmee, and to put more families into homes.

Daisy has a passion for customer care that is contagious, and her 50 agents will tell you that she is in it to win it.

Her goal is and has always been quality over quantity, and that makes Daisy a success. It is a priority for her to educate her agents and equip them with the tools they will need for success.

She also serves as a trustee in our local community college, Valencia College, where we worked together to create Poinciana Valencia campus, which now is up and running and serving thousands of folks in south Osceola County.

And for that, Daisy Lopez-Cid, we honor you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2286. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act to provide greater protection and services for Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; in addition, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 15, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4257. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting Selected Acquisition Reports for the Navy/Marine Corps Major Defense Acquisition Programs, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432(b)(1); Public Law 97-252, Sec. 1107(a)(1); (96 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4258. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Twenty-fifth Report to Congress on Progress Made in Licensing and Constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 16523; Public Law 109-58, Sec. 1810; (119 Stat. 1126); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4259. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG Revision — Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About 10 CFR Part 36 Irradiator Licenses Final Report [NUREG 1556, Volume 6, Revision 1] received March 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4260. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the value of sales of defense equipment for the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2018, pursuant to Secs. 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the March 24, 1979, Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 96-70), and the July 31, 1981, Seventh Report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-214); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4261. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-272, "Extension of Time to Dispose of 8th & O Streets, N.W., Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4262. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-271, "Public Employee Relations Board Term Limit Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4263. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-270, "Office of Employee Appeals Hearing Examiner Classification Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law

93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4264. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-257, "Relieve High Unemployment Tax Incentives Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4265. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-258, "City Innovation Fund Re-Establishment Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4266. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's FY 2019 Annual Performance Plan and FY 2017 Annual Performance Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4267. A letter from the Attorney, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Pequonnock River, Bridgeport, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0750] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4268. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Gasparilla Marine Parade; Hillsborough Bay; Tampa, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-1102] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4269. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Pamlico River, Washington, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2017-1100] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4270. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; China Basin, Mission Creek, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-1015] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4271. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation Canaveral Barge Canal, Canaveral, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0161] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3249. A bill to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3996. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit other courts to transfer certain cases to United States Tax Court (Rept. 115-598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 506. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 780. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4061) to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4293) to reform the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review process, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Test process, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-600). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 5268. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security, through the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to make grants to eligible local education agencies to provide improved security measures on school grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 5269. A bill to require State or territorial approval of restriction by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce of recreational or commercial fishing access to certain State or territorial waters, respectively; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARR, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 5270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for coal-powered electric generation units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 5271. A bill to repeal certain impediments to the administration of the firearms laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 5272. A bill to ensure that programs and activities that are funded by a grant, cooperative agreement, loan, or loan guarantee from the Department of Health and Human Services, and whose purpose is to prevent or treat a mental health or substance use disorder, are evidence-based; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 5273. A bill to reduce global fragility and violence by improving the capacity of the United States to reduce and address the causes of violence, violent conflict, and fragility in pilot countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 5274. A bill to promote international exchanges on best election practices, cultivate more secure democratic institutions around the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BOST, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KIND, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BLUM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BARTON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. YODER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. VELA, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 5275. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for air emissions from animal waste at farms; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5276. A bill to modernize the Food for Peace Program in the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 5277. A bill to require the Financial Literacy and Education Commission to establish and publish best practices for teaching financial literacy for institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 5278. A bill to make daylight savings time permanent for the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 5279. A bill to make daylight savings time permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 5280. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse", and to designate the jury room in that Federal building and United States courthouse as the "Marcel C. Notzon II Jury Room"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5281. A bill to provide for congressional review of the imposition of duties and other trade measures by the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GIBBS, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 5282. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage retirement savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 5283. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 7, title 20, and title 43, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 5284. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for Congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAST (for himself and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 5285. A bill to condition eligibility for a Federal license to deal in firearms on the passage of an online behavioral awareness training course, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5286. A bill to impose a 60-day moratorium on the transfer or receipt of an assault rifle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 5287. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to clarify the exclusion for seller-financiers from the definition of mortgage originator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 5288. A bill to delay the effective date of the rule issued by the National Credit Union Administration titled "Risk-Based

Capital"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 5289. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit any individual serving as President or Vice President or as a Member of Congress, or any individual who served as an employee of the office of the President or Vice President or the office of a Member of Congress, from engaging in any lobbying activity after serving in such a position, to amend title 41, United States Code, to prohibit executive agencies from awarding contracts to former elected officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 5290. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the disclosure, public documentation, and reporting of Federal employee bonuses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 5291. A bill to establish an offshore wind career training grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H. Res. 779. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 12 through 16, 2018, as "Public Education Week"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MAST, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POLQUIN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. DUNN):

H. Res. 781. A resolution recognizing Girl Scouts of the United States of America on its 106th birthday and the importance of leadership development for girls; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 782. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 14, 2018, as "National Pi Day"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H. Res. 783. A resolution expressing support for designation of September as "National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. FASO):

H. Res. 784. A resolution honoring Chris Mazdzer of Saranac Lake, New York, for proudly representing the United States in three consecutive Olympic Winter Games; to

the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 5268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 5269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 5270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 5271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 5272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 5274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . ."

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 5275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have

power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. ROYCE of California:
H.R. 5276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. BEATTY:
H.R. 5277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:
H.R. 5278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. BUCHANAN:
H.R. 5279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. CUELLAR:
H.R. 5280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:
H.R. 5281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, subsection 1: "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises" and

Article 1, Section 8, subsection 3: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations"

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 5282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:
H.R. 5283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to titles 7, 20, and 43, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:
H.R. 5284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' powers granted under Article I of the United States Constitution, including the legislative vesting clause of Article I, Section 1; the power granted to each House of Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2; and the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MAST:
H.R. 5285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MAST:
H.R. 5286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:
H.R. 5287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have power. . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. POSEY:
H.R. 5288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROKITA:
H.R. 5289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states.

By Mr. SANFORD:
H.R. 5290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. TSONGAS:
H.R. 5291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 51: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 66: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 173: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 196: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 291: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 389: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 483: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 559: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 592: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 644: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. HANDEL, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 754: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 771: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 846: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 1038: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1171: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1267: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1276: Ms. BASS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1278: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1279: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1291: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1322: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1339: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1409: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1472: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1478: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. NEAL, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1494: Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 1519: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1544: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1553: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 1649: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1661: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1676: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1697: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1734: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1802: Mr. SOTO and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1825: Mr. DENT and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1881: Mr. COLE, Mr. DUNN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1911: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1943: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1953: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 2055: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2077: Mr. FASO and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2152: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 2267: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2358: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2488: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2584: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2663: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2670: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2942: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2987: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2999: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 3067: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 3192: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 3207: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3330: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3378: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 3464: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3503: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3569: Mr. CORREA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3642: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 3666: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 3798: Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 3842: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 4018: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 4052: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4078: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 4106: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4203: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 4223: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 4236: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 4256: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 4267: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 4638: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of

New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4659: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 4681: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4744: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4747: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 4811: Mr. COSTA and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 4837: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 4844: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 4857: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 4904: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 4909: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4915: Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 5001: Mr. COHEN and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 5085: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 5099: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 5107: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 5111: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5112: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 5116: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5126: Mr. PANETTA and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5132: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina,

Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 5138: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 5155: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 5180: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 5187: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 5199: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. LONG, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 5214: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 5216: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 5222: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 5242: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 5243: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 5244: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 5247: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 5262: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5263: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.J. Res. 31: Ms. GABBARD.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. YODER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms.

JAYAPAL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HURD, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 69: Mr. HUNTER.

H. Res. 128: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. RUSSELL.

H. Res. 319: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. BUDD.

H. Res. 632: Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 644: Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H. Res. 652: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Res. 763: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 768: Mr. RUIZ.

H. Res. 772: Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. GAETZ.

H. Res. 774: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FASO, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DENT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TROTT, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REED, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HURD, Mr. PAULSEN, and Ms. STEFANIK.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. AND MRS. CHAZZ
AND SUE HUMPHREY FOR THEIR
60TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. and Mrs. Chazz and Sue Humphrey, who will be celebrating their 60th wedding anniversary on April 11, 2018. Chazz and Sue are a great example of the lifelong bond of marriage and illustrate the strength of love.

Chazz and Sue both grew up in Mission, Kansas and were married on April 11, 1958, just one year after they met. Sue, a lover of flying, earned her FAA student's license in 1985. From that day forward, Sue and Chazz have enjoyed flying ultralight planes. And if that was not enough, they have volunteered for nearly 15 years at the Experimental Aircraft Association (EAA) Airshow in Oshkosh, Wisconsin. Throughout their time with the EAA, Chazz has served on the Experimental Aircraft Association's Ultralight Council and as the Ultralight Chairman. In recent years, Chazz volunteered at the National Museum of Transportation steam train display.

Chazz and Sue have 3 children, Chuck, Dave, and Rachel, 5 grandchildren, and 18 great-grandchildren. When they are not volunteering or flying, both Chazz and Sue enjoy traveling and spending time with family and friends.

Please join me in congratulating Chazz and Sue Humphrey on their 60th Wedding Anniversary and wishing them happiness and health in the years to come.

TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF DR.
PEARSE LYONS

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of my Irish friend and one of Kentucky's best imports, Dr. Pearse Lyons.

Dr. Lyons was born and raised across the pond in Ireland and the United Kingdom and immigrated to Kentucky over 40 years ago to launch his first major business, Alltech. He quickly became a Kentuckian at heart and developed an inspiring passion for rural Eastern Kentucky. In many ways, he would tell me, that Kentucky's Appalachian region reminded him of his homeplace in Ireland, where folks take great pride in their communities and their trades. In fact, he believed in Eastern Kentucky so much that he extended a branch from

Alltech into Pikeville, Kentucky with a new distillery to create jobs and invest in our region. Today, Alltech is now a \$3 million company that employs more than 5,000 people across 128 countries, and soon those numbers will include Eastern Kentucky.

Dr. Lyons was the type of visionary that believed we could accomplish monumental things by telling the story of Eastern Kentucky with our own people leading the charge, with our own talents. His charisma and enthusiasm for life were contagious. He helped remind us of the unique treasures that we have in Eastern Kentucky and inspired us to share them on a broader spectrum.

In addition to his business ingenuity, Dr. Lyons and his lovely wife, Deidre, shared their philanthropic spirit with the entire Commonwealth. In fact, Alltech was birthed as a way to help feed the world with locally farmed products. Thanks to his global leadership in agribusiness, Dr. Lyons played an essential role in attracting the World Equestrian Games to Kentucky in 2010 by building the state-of-the-art Alltech Arena at the Kentucky Horse Park. Aside from the farm, Dr. Pearse and Deidre Lyons have shared immense generosity around the globe through disaster relief, improving access to education, and countless other worthy programs.

I counted Dr. Lyons a dear friend who displayed genuine kindness and love for our state. I'm grateful that he planted seeds of hope in Kentucky, where we will see his dreams continue to flourish for years to come. My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Deidre and the entire Lyons family.

RECOGNIZING THE DEER PARK
ART PARK PLAYERS AND THE
TEXAS NON-PROFIT THEATRE
ANNUAL CONFERENCE

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I seek to recognize the Deer Park Art Park Players on the occasion of the Texas Non-Profit Theatre Annual Conference. The City of Deer Park Parks and Recreation Department, The Art Park Players, and The Friends of the Art Park Players are hosting the conference on Thursday, March 15th. Theatre companies from across the State of Texas will be in attendance.

In early 1979, a small group of Deer Park residents, led by Jeff Smith and Jean Riggs, met at the Deer Park Community Center to form a script-reading club. Later that year, they staged their very first production, *Once Upon a Mattress*, at Deer Park High School's Gaines Mason Auditorium. The City of Deer Park recognized the community's love of the-

atrical arts and hired Sue Fenley Meyers as the full-time Artistic Managing Director of the "Not-Yet-Named-Theatre Company." The theatre officially became The Art Park Players in 1980. In December 1986, the current theater facility was opened by the city. Longtime theatre performer, Junior Art Park Player director, and volunteer, Susan Mele, was named director in April 2004 following Meyer's retirement.

After nearly four decades, The Art Park Players have grown in number and spirit. Their success relies heavily on their staff, families, and more than one hundred volunteers. With four mainstage productions, concerts, and youth productions, The Art Park Players engage over 12,000 patrons each season, enriching the Deer Park community artistically and financially. The Art Park Players hold the distinction of being the only year-round dinner theatre in the Greater Houston area and is truly one-of-a-kind in the State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize the Deer Park Art Park Players.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN
MARCY KAPTUR ON BECOMING
THE LONGEST SERVING WOMAN
IN THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio's Ninth District, for becoming the longest serving woman in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives. She breaks a record that has stood since 1960, when it was set by another great American trailblazer, Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers.

It is only fitting that Congresswoman KAPTUR becomes the longest serving woman in the history of the House during Women's History Month. This dedicated public servant has demonstrated time and time again her commitment to constituent service and her passion for tackling the tough issues. In representing the Great Lakes Region, she has shown her dedication to preserving the waters, lands, and environment our states share. Her leadership in the Polish Caucus is greatly appreciated and I have learned much through exploring our mutual heritage. And as she has stood up for the middle class, I have had the privilege of watching her fight for the Midwest and our manufacturing roots.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Congresswoman KAPTUR on this achievement. During my time in Congress, I have been honored to serve with Congresswoman KAPTUR. Her conviction, work ethic, and strength stand as a model to all Americans. As we celebrate Women's History

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Month, I hope that many more women will be inspired by her example and pursue a career in public service. I extend the most heartfelt congratulations to Congresswoman KAPTUR, both on her phenomenal accomplishment and her proud tenure in Congress.

IN RECOGNITION OF HONORARY
TAYLOR AUXILIARY POLICE OF-
FICER DAVE GORGON'S SERVICE
TO OUR LOCAL COMMUNITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished public service of Dave Gorgon. He has enriched our community through his positive leadership.

Established in 1962 as a volunteer civil defense organization to assist the Taylor Police Department, the Taylor Auxiliary Police play a key role in safeguarding the public. In addition to helping the full-time police department staff community events like high school sports events and assisting with regular police patrols, the auxiliary police also serve as a reserve force to assist the City of Taylor in the event of a disaster or emergency situation. Additionally, the auxiliary has partnered with the city to further crime prevention initiatives, including Taylor on Watch, an education and outreach program that shares best practices for neighborhood and community safety. These initiatives and the service of officers are well documented by Dave Gorgon, a photographer with the City of Taylor.

Mr. Gorgon is a well-loved member of our local community who is known for his passion and leadership. Known around Downriver as "Mr. Taylor," he has served the city in various capacities, including as an interim member of the Taylor City Council and as a reporter and photographer for the Southgate News-Herald. Those who know Mr. Gorgon laud him as a special person who is always willing to go out of the way to make someone feel special, and positively impact their day. He is a strong supporter of both the Taylor Police Department and the Taylor Auxiliary Police Department and often attends events to take photos of the departments in action and share the good work being done by local officers. Taylor Auxiliary officers credit Mr. Gorgon as a positive force for the community and an irreplaceable member of the department. He is truly deserving of being named an Honorary Taylor Auxiliary Police Officer; we are grateful for his lifetime of service and positivity and look forward to his continued contributions to the Downriver in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Dave Gorgon for his years of commitment to the community that he loves. His passion and dedicated service have bettered Taylor for years to come.

HONORING MARTINEZTOWN FOOD
PANTRY

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the founders of an outstanding organization in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Celebrating the 10-year anniversary since its inception, the Martineztown Food Pantry has provided meals for thousands of families in New Mexico since 2008.

The idea for a neighborhood food pantry was sparked when a young neighbor of Brad Brown and Michael Griego knocked on the door of their home asking if they were interested in buying a pair of his shoes so that he would have money to purchase food for his young wife and child. Brown and Griego felt compelled to address the larger issue at hand and do something to help end hunger in Albuquerque.

The pair started by giving up their gym memberships and donating that money to the Roadrunner Food Bank. Eventually they would establish their own mobile food program known as the Martineztown Food Pantry. Since its creation, this program has brought together a dedicated group of volunteers in the community to pursue a noble cause. They've helped feed 32,000 families for over a decade, totaling 1,612,000 pounds of food.

Dedicated to ending hunger and preserving the dignity of citizens of New Mexico, Brown and Griego truly embody the values of humanitarianism. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Brad Brown and Michael Griego and everyone who volunteers at the Martineztown Food Pantry for their selfless dedication to improving the community, and congratulate them on all they have achieved over the last 10 years.

JONATHAN GARCIA, OLYMPIAN
AND HOUSTONIAN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the whirl of skate gliding across the ice transfixes spectators at the 2018 Pyeongchang Winter Olympic Games. Competing on the ice is Olympic speed skater, Texan, and Houston native, Jonathan Garcia.

Jonathan has been speed skating since he was 7 years old. His love for skating began when he witnessed Dan Jansen win the speed skating gold medal at the 1994 Winter Olympic Games in Lillehammer, Norway. Ever since that time, Jonathan has passionately competed in speed skating and has enjoyed years of success.

Jonathan did not immediately begin speed skating at the ripe old age of 7, as one would assume. He first competed in roller speed skating for 14 years, before switching to speed skating in 2007. His goal was to compete in

the Winter Olympic Games, and that wouldn't be possible as a roller speed skater. Jonathan, being the determined and motivated person he is, quickly took up speed skating and began competing in major competitions throughout the country.

Jonathan's first major achievement came during the 2011 to 2012 Short Track U.S. Time Trials where he earned the gold medal in the 1000 meters. After that, Jonathan's career absolutely skyrocketed. He has competed in the World Championships consistently for the past 7 years, even placing in every event he skated in.

Perhaps most impressively, Jonathan has qualified for and competed in the past two Winter Olympics. He placed 28th overall in the 1000 meters at the 2014 Sochi Olympic Winter Games.

In this year's 2018 Pyeongchang Winter Olympics, Jonathan finished 23rd in the 500 meters. He was also second among the three U.S. entries to compete in the speed skating competition.

We are beyond thrilled to have a hometown hero representing Team USA and his town of Katy, Texas. Jonathan's determination to succeed and his passion for speed skating will no doubt inspire a younger generation to compete and achieve their wildest dreams.

And that is just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 102 on H.R. 5247, I mistakenly recorded my vote as nay when I should have voted yea.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the students, teachers, and communities who work together to support our public schools during Public Education Week.

Our public schools are where our students come to be educated in the fullest sense of the word as citizens of this great country. Our educators strive daily to make every public school a place where we prepare the nation's young people to contribute to our society, economy and citizenry.

Ninety percent of American children attend public schools. Lawmakers of every level can agree that we should all support our nation's public schools and empower local education leaders to manage and lead school districts in partnership with educators, parents, and other local education stakeholders and learning communities. This support includes recognizing how educators and our schools provide important services outside the classroom such as counseling, extra/co-curricular activities,

and mental health supports that are critical to help meet students' needs.

As an advocate for public education, I believe we must promote advancing excellence in public education, by implementing continuous improvement and evidence-based practices. Every child has the right to an education and to attend schools that offer a high quality experience and help them reach their full potential.

I support predictable and adequate funding for our public schools so that students have classrooms and up-to-date resources as well as well-prepared educators. Our school buildings should have manageable class sizes to allow teachers to provide students the attention they need to succeed. Furthermore, I believe that public tax dollars should support public schools that are accountable to parents, educators and the communities they serve.

As a product of the public school system in Northwest Missouri, I reiterate my support for public education and pride in our public schools. I will continue to promote the promise and purpose of public education, to elevate the great things happening every day in our public schools, and to engage communities about strategies that help students succeed. I affirm my commitment to fight for resources and support for public schools, and will be steadfast in my efforts to support policies that would protect these values.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 102, and YEA on Roll Call No. 103.

HONORING THOMAS H. MCCARTHY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE 47TH ANNUAL BUFFALO IRISH CENTER CIVIC LUNCHEON

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Thomas H. McCarthy, who has been selected to serve as Honorary Chairman of the 47th Annual Civic Luncheon to benefit the Buffalo Irish Center. A proud Buffalonian, born and raised, Tom is a graduate of St. Thomas Aquinas School, Bishop Timon-St. Jude High School, Canisius College, and Simmons School of Mortuary Science.

One year after graduating from Simmons, he founded the Thomas H. McCarthy Funeral Home. Through his funeral home business, he has provided care and compassion to neighborhood families during difficult times.

Tom is a dedicated community servant. He served in the Buffalo Fire Department for 37 years, retiring as a Lieutenant. Additionally, he

is a member of the Knights of Columbus, an organization of nearly two million Catholic men. Tom embodies their principles of charity, unity, fraternity, and patriotism.

Organizations that benefit from Tom's stewardship include his alma mater, Bishop Timon, where he raises funds for student scholarships with the Hillery Foundation. For almost 60 years, he has been a member of the Blackthorn Club, a group which encourages the camaraderie and connection of its members with Irish ancestry through social events. At one point, he served as President of the Club.

Married for 63 years, Tom and his wife Mary Ellen have raised six children together. They now have twelve grandchildren and two great grandchildren. Alongside his wonderful family, Tom has been an active participant in this Luncheon since the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Mr. Thomas H. McCarthy here today, to recognize his countless contributions to the Irish community in Buffalo, and the Western New York community as a whole. His time and talents have made a difference in the lives of so many, and he is deserving of our most sincere gratitude.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for roll call votes 102 and 103 on Tuesday, March 13, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay on Roll Call 102 and Yea on Roll Call 103.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF CHARLES EDWARD WERN, JR.

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Charles Edward Wern, Jr., 85, who passed away peacefully on Tuesday, Feb. 13, 2018, at home with his family by his side.

Charles was born on November 11, 1932 to Charles E. Wern, Sr. and Mary Lyke Wern. After graduating from Vienna High School in 1950, he completed his undergraduate degree at Duke University where he played both basketball and baseball. Upon graduation, Chuck served in the U.S. Army for two years and played professional basketball and baseball in Europe after his time in the Army. Chuck later returned to the United States and graduated from Ohio Northern law school in 1959. Chuck practiced law in the Warren, Ohio area for over 57 years.

Chuck married the love of his life, Maureen Ann McGlone on November 14, 1990. They shared a long and happy marriage filled with love, respect, and laughter. Together, they

had three children. Nothing brought him more pride and joy than being a part of their lives. All three children followed in his footsteps and began practicing law.

Chuck's passion for sports and competition never faded. He coached JFK baseball and golf, he was an avid golfer winning several area events including the Trumbull Country Club Championship. He was the co-chair for two of the LPGA tournaments when the tour was coming to the Valley. He crossed off a big "Bucket List Item" when he became a minority owner of the Mahoning Valley Scrappers. For the past 18 seasons, Chuck and Maureen enjoyed hosting over 50 Scrapper players.

Chuck always believed you have an obligation to support your community whenever the opportunity presents itself. He lived that philosophy, serving on numerous committees throughout his life in the Mahoning Valley. Specifically, he served over a span of 20 years on the Mahoning Valley Economic Development Corporation, serving as its Chairman for three different terms. He served as both past and present Chairman of the Warren Commerce Industrial Park. He was a Trustee of Warren General Hospital for several years, Chair of the Blessed Sacrament Building Fund Drive, Chairman and Trustee of the Warren Philharmonic Orchestra Association, Trustee of the Community Foundation of the Mahoning Valley and most recently served on the Board of Directors of the American Red Cross. He was also a recipient of the American Heart Association's "Heart of The Community" award honoring heart patients who give of their time and talent to the community.

He will be deeply missed by his wife, Maureen; three children and eight grandchildren, Atty. Happy (Atty. Giovanni) DiCenso and Luca, Rocco and Valentina of Pepper Pike, Atty. Charles E. (Melissa) Wern, III and Chase, Cole and Clay of Denver and Atty. Theodore "Ted" (Georgia) Wern and Evan and Owen of Chicago; his sister, Marjorie Turner of Gillette, Wyo.; brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, James McGlone of Struthers, Kitty (William) Brown of Canfield, John (Sally) McGlone of Jamestown, Pa., Michael (Lori) McGlone of Boardman, Matthew (Judi) McGlone of Canfield and Lorraine McGlone of Hudson; and several nieces, nephews, cousins and dear friends. He was preceded in death by his parents; his mother-in-law and father-in-law, Peg and Joe McGlone; his brother-in-law, Joseph McGlone; his niece, Jaqueline Turner; his nephew, Chet Turner; and several aunts, uncles, cousins and friends.

Chuck was a valued member of the community, and I know he is dearly missed. I extend my sincerest condolences to his family and friends.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, I regret not being present for two vote sessions. Had I been

present, I would have voted in support of the Endangered Fish Recovery Programs Extension Act of 2017, H.R. 4465, Roll Call No. 103, and against the Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2018, H.R. 5247, Roll Call No. 102.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OF JEFF WITMER, TAYLOR AUXILIARY POLICE OFFICER OF THE YEAR

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished public service of Commander Jeff Witmer, the 2017 Taylor Auxiliary Police Officer of the Year. He has protected the City of Taylor and its residents for over 14 years.

Established in 1962 as a volunteer civil defense organization to assist the Taylor Police Department, the Taylor Auxiliary Police play a key role in safeguarding the public. In addition to helping the full-time police department staff community events like high school sports events and assisting with regular police patrols, the auxiliary police also serve as a reserve force to assist the City of Taylor in the event of a disaster or emergency situation. Additionally, the auxiliary has partnered with the city to further crime prevention initiatives, including Taylor on Watch, an education and outreach program that shares best practices for neighborhood and community safety. These initiatives and the service of officers, including 2017 award recipient Commander Jeff Witmer, have helped to make Taylor a safe city to live and work.

Commander Jeff Witmer has served the Taylor Auxiliary Police Department in various capacities for the past 14 years, including range instructor, Platoon Lieutenant, and the department's Operations Commander. As Operations Commander, Mr. Witmer is entrusted with the command of department operations making sure platoons run smoothly, and that all patrol rides go out on schedule. He is a well-respected member of both the department and the City of Taylor for his positivity, dedication, and community-oriented leadership. Due to his years of service and the trust placed in him, Commander Witmer oversees the training department for new recruits and serves as a mentor for junior department members. Our city is better because of Commander Witmer's leadership, and he is truly deserving of being named the 2017 Taylor Auxiliary Police Officer of the Year. We are grateful for Commander Witmer's service and look forward to his continued contributions to protecting our city and growing the auxiliary department in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Commander Jeff Witmer for his years of service to our local community. He has impacted countless lives through his work with Taylor's Auxiliary Police Department.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH COUNTRY PUBLIC RADIO

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize North Country Public Radio on its 50th anniversary.

North Country Public Radio (NCPR) is a public radio network with a mission to inform, enrich, and connect the community. Based out of Canton, New York, the network is the NPR affiliate for the North Country, providing NPR programming as well as music and award-winning regional news coverage. In addition, NCPR serves as the emergency broadcast system for many communities within the North Country. After starting with a single transmitter covering St. Lawrence County, NCPR debuted on the air in 1968 and has since expanded to operate 34 transmitters today, serving not only the entire Adirondack North Country region, but also western Vermont and southeastern Ontario.

NCPR provides a particularly important service to my district, delivering invaluable content to the people of the North Country. The hard work of NCPR employees has greatly expanded the options available to North Country residents, whether they are looking for entertainment programming or for news and information.

On behalf of New York's 21st district, I would like to thank NCPR for prioritizing the enrichment of our community during its 50 years of broadcasting.

SPECIAL OLYMPIAN, CHRISTI ROBERTS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, special Olympian and native of Houston, Christi Roberts, knows a thing or two about competition. In her own words she says, "Don't mess with me, because I'm bringing the Texas heat." And Texas heat is what she brings.

Christi was born with a rare heart condition that required surgery when she was just two years old. She had to get her index fingers corrected and constantly has to check her blood pressure. None of that brought Christi down, but only pushed her to become a better athlete and pursue her passions in life.

Christi loves to run. As a Special Olympics athlete, she has competed in multiple events, but track is by far her favorite. And who would doubt it? Christi smokes the competition. During races she surprised all of her coaches, teammates and onlookers as she blazed down the track at lightning speed. Christi is not to be messed with, because she has one goal: winning. Her motto is, "I win, but I don't like losing."

When you can't find her beating the competition on the track, you can find her at the

Houston Police Barn, sponsoring a horse by the name of Smash. She spends her extra time feeding, brushing and loving on her horse. Spending time with Smash is one of her favorite past times, and the Houston Police Barn is grateful for her time and dedication to sponsoring one of their beloved horses.

Christi's positive attitude and passion for life is infectious and she radiates happiness every single day. Her dedication to competing in the Special Olympics and continuing to crush the competition is one to be admired.

Christi is the definition of what it means to be a Special Olympian and Houstonian, and I'm proud to honor her and spread her inspirational story.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on March 13, 2018 due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 102 and Yea on Roll Call No. 103.

RECOGNITION OF THE LEADERSHIP COBB CLASS OF 2018

HON. BARRY LOUDERMILK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding leaders and members of the Leadership Cobb Class of 2018.

Leadership Cobb was founded in 1983 by a nucleus of leaders, including Harris Hines, Johnny Isakson, Phil Sanders and Jay Whorton, in order to train a new group of leaders to guide Cobb County's future.

From hundreds of qualified applicants, Leadership Cobb selected 50 exceptionally qualified individuals for the Class of 2018, to provide a learning environment that enhances personal and professional growth to benefit the individual, his or her local community, and the entire Atlanta region.

The Leadership Cobb Class of 2018 is led by Leadership Cobb alumni Lee Freeman-Smith, Brett McClung, Chris Martin, Tripp Boyer, and Michelle Howard from the Cobb County Chamber of Commerce, and dozens of alumni who volunteer for committees to plan each program day, including class members Wendy Alpine, Elaine Armster, Lisa Ashby, Neera Bahl, Dale Bercher, Alyssa Blanchard, Obie Brannon, Little Brown, Jarrette Burckhalter, Amy Carrier, Karen Cates, Cedric Clark, Christi Cronin, Lisa Cupid, Frank Durrance, Jesse Evans, Britt Fleck, Jason Gaines, Derek Goshay, Tyler Gwynn, Bonnie Harris, Stacy Haubenschield, Bob Heuel, David Hoeller, Erick Hofstetter, Peter Hortman, Schuyler Hoynes, David Jones, Derek Krebs, Kelly Luscre, Tim Matthews, Anthony Mullins,

Nicole Nurse, Jonathan Page, Amber Patterson, Serena Ploessl, Ron Price, Esther Prieto, Valerie Prince, Matt Reid, Christina Saliba, Jessi Samford, Kelvin Scott, Amanda Seals, Jason Shepherd, Thomas Sherrer, Jr., Angie Smith, Trey Spivey, Meaghan Timko, and Erin Zwigart.

On behalf of Georgia's 11th Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I commend Leadership Cobb and the members of the Leadership Cobb Class of 2018 for their dedication to community service and their commitment to improving opportunities for local citizens.

RECOGNIZING MARCY KAPTUR AS LONGEST SERVING WOMAN IN CONGRESS

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, as people across America celebrate Women's History Month and honor our nation's many sheroes, I rise today to recognize a modern-day shero, my colleague, fellow Ohioan, and good friend Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR.

This Sunday, March 18, 2018, Congresswoman KAPTUR will become the longest-serving woman in the U.S. House of Representatives, serving incredibly for 35 years, 2 months, 15 days and counting.

I have had the privilege of knowing MARCY for more than two decades, as well as the honor of serving in the House alongside her for the last six years, and I cannot think of a more determined, driven, and dedicated public servant than she.

Throughout her entire decades-long service to the people of Ohio's Ninth Congressional District, Congresswoman KAPTUR has been a steadfast champion for our great automotive and manufacturing industries, the American worker and their families, and the brave men and women in the Armed Forces. In addition, she has been a tireless advocate for the middle class, and in ensuring that everyone has a fair shake to succeed and realize the American Dream.

Of course, I would be remiss to also not mention her unyielding commitment to our nation's veterans—highlighted by her tireless work and driving force to establish the National World War II Memorial.

Yes, Congresswoman KAPTUR has left an indelible mark on Ohio and this nation, and I join all those in Congress and across the country in saluting her on this momentous and most historic accomplishment.

Congratulations, MARCY.

SALUTING REPRESENTATIVE MARCY KAPTUR

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Representative MARCY KAPTUR as she

becomes the longest-serving woman in the history of the United States House of Representatives.

For more than 35 years, Representative KAPTUR has served the people of Toledo and northern Ohio with passion and tenacity. Ms. KAPTUR has been a tireless advocate for energy independence, strong international engagement, robust national defense, workers' rights, and America's veterans.

There is no greater physical symbol of Representative KAPTUR's leadership than the National World War II Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. Ms. KAPTUR shepherded legislation creating the memorial through Congress and then worked vigorously to appropriate the funds needed to complete it.

It has been my privilege to serve with MARCY on the Appropriations Committee, where she is Ranking Member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee and sits with me on both the Defense and Interior-Environment Subcommittees.

On every issue we consider, Representative KAPTUR is a thoughtful voice who consistently prioritizes the needs and interests of her constituents. Her support for our Great Lakes has been invaluable to me as we work to sustain important restoration efforts in the area.

Mr. Speaker, the entire House is lucky to have such a distinguished colleague as Ms. KAPTUR. As we celebrate this historic milestone, I salute Representative MARCY KAPTUR on her service.

HONORING THE MEMORY AND SERVICE OF OFFICER GREGGORY JONATHAN CASILLAS

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, on Friday March 9th, the brave men and women of the Pomona Police Department responded to a short pursuit that resulted in a 15-hour long standoff in my hometown. Among those brave first responders was Officer Gregory Jonathan Casillas.

It is with more than a heavy heart that I stand here on the House floor to say that during that altercation, Officer Casillas was killed in the line of duty. I can't say much about the motives of the individual who committed this abhorrent crime, nor do I want to.

What I do want to do is focus on Officer Casillas and the incredible contributions he made to leave Pomona safer than it was before.

He made the ultimate sacrifice doing what he loved, and he will be missed dearly. He is survived not only by his parents, brothers, wife, five-month old and four-year old sons, but also by every single law enforcement officer of the Pomona Police Department and every member of our community.

Casillas knew his calling early on: to one day become a Pomona Police Officer. In March of 2015, he set out on this pursuit and joined the Pomona PD as a records specialist. Casillas would go on to work his way up

through the department, prudently learning every detail at every step. On November 2015, he became a jailer before eventually becoming a Pomona police recruit, putting him one step closer to attending the police academy.

Officer Casillas intentionally took on these varying roles within the department because he was eager to learn and wanted to become the best version of himself to prepare him for the role of officer.

Colleagues recall Casillas diligently studying officer reports so he could learn how to write them—he was known for always carrying flashcards of penal codes and books to prepare for the police officer exam.

He was honest, dedicated, and determined. He never lost hope nor sight of his dreams.

And last September, that relentless determination led him to graduate from the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department Academy Class No. 207. He accomplished his goal of becoming a Pomona Police Officer.

Officer Casillas was in the final stages of finishing his field training, which would have allowed him to ride on his own without a training officer—a self-imposed final hurdle for achieving his ultimate goal of riding solo.

But in my opinion, he achieved his goal nearly four years ago when he decided to join the Pomona Police Department. It takes a special kind of unyielding dedication for someone to be willing to put their lives at risk every single day that they put on a uniform.

Casillas was this type of individual.

Officer Casillas accomplished his goal long ago and surpassed it.

The hundreds of people that gathered for multiple vigils in his memory is evidence.

The young generation of police recruits that he has inspired by leading by example is proof.

He selflessly left his family at home to protect our community. His memory and spirit will live on, and we are eternally grateful for his sacrifice. May he rest in peace.

SWIMMING PRO AND SPECIAL OLYMPIAN, MEG NORMAN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every individual finds their refuge and sanctuary in different places. Meg Norman finds hers in the swimming pool. Rightfully so, as Meg is a fierce swimming competitor and an even fiercer lover of life.

At the age of two, Meg appeared on the autism spectrum. Her mom, Joan, said being doted on by her older siblings helped boost her confidence. And boost her confidence it did. Meg has no hesitation jumping into a pool to compete in races. Her competitors don't even stand a chance when she pushes off that pool wall. Her recipe for success? Practicing hard, having a lot of fun and always smiling. Meg is determined to succeed every time she jumps into the pool and that's aided by focusing on winning and keeping a positive attitude.

Meg is a competitor in the Special Olympics and as you can imagine, has been very successful. The Special Olympics has given her an outlet to compete in a sport she loves and she has thrived during every moment. Meg's competitive spirit has driven her motivation to succeed and also helped her to win several titles and medals throughout her life.

When you can't find Meg at the pool swimming laps, you can find her working in the Special Olympics office. At the office, she devotes her time to helping staff with various projects, which comes as a huge help.

Meg's "can-do" attitude and joyful spirit is one to be admired. Her success in and out of the pool can be attributed to hard work and her own sense of determination. Nothing can get Meg down. That is why the pool is her sanctuary.

I am honored to say Meg is a Special Olympian from Houston, Texas. As Texans and Houstonians, we pride ourselves in our hard work and determination to do something great with our lives. Meg has certainly lived up to both of those qualities, and I'm proud to be able to spread her story today. Just keep swimming, Meg.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, I was absent for recorded votes No. 102 and No. 103. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on Roll Call No. 102 I would have voted NO; and on Roll Call No. 103 I would have voted YES.

HONORING CERRO COSO COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 45 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 45th anniversary of Cerro Coso Community College.

Established in the fall of 1973 as a separate college within the Kern Community College District, Cerro Coso grew quickly from its humble roots in the Indian Wells Valley community of Ridgecrest to representing the largest service area of any community college in the State of California. Today, the college serves an incredible 18,000 square miles of desert, mountain, and valley communities in eastern California at eight sites across Kern, Inyo, and Mono counties.

Cerro Coso has defined itself as the premiere community college in the eastern region of the Congressional District I represent, offering over 180 classes each semester and nineteen two-year degree programs, all of which have been accessible online since 1997. A source of great pride for the Indian Wells Val-

ley, Cerro Coso has dedicated its mission to serving students who deserve an education regardless of financial or personal status. In what has become known as the "Cerro Coso Promise," the college offers financial support to its student body, assisting with tuition and books so that students can achieve their educational goals regardless of financial barriers. The work accomplished at Cerro Coso is invaluable and truly vital to the community it serves.

I am incredibly proud of the faculty, administrators, and educators who have made Cerro Coso Community College into the educational powerhouse it is today in our community. The work these dedicated individuals have done has touched the lives of thousands of students, providing them the skills and knowledge to succeed in any endeavor they pursue. As a former trustee of the Kern Community College District and currently a proud Representative of the college and the Ridgecrest community, I look forward to continuing to watch Cerro Coso's growth and achievements in the years to come. Go Coyotes.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 15, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 20

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Energy.

SD-366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SD-406

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John J. Bartrum, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, both of the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-215

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the need to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. Res. 85, calling on the Government of Iran to fulfill repeated promises of assistance in the case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history, S. Res. 224, recognizing the 5th anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Paya Sardinias, and commemorating his legacy and commitment to democratic values and principles, S. Res. 376, urging the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh to ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military, S. Res. 426, supporting the goals of International Women's Day, S. Res. 429, commemorating the 59th anniversary of Tibet's 1959 uprising as "Tibetan Rights Day", and expressing support for the human rights and religious freedom of the Tibetan people and the Tibetan Buddhist faith community, S. Res. 432, congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence, H.R. 1660, to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency, extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Kosovo (the "Treaty"), signed at Pristina on March 29, 2016 (Treaty Doc. 115-02), the Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Kiribati on the Delimitation of Maritime Boundaries, signed at Majuro on September 6, 2013, and the Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia on the Delimitation of a Maritime Boundary, signed at Koror on August 1, 2014 (Treaty Doc. 114-13), extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Serbia (the "Treaty"), signed at Belgrade on August 15, 2016 (Treaty Doc. 115-01), the United Nations Convention on the Assignment of Receivables in International Trade, done at

New York on December 12, 2001, and signed by the United States on December 30, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 114-07), and the nominations of Erik Bethel, of Florida, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Judy Lynn Shelton, of Virginia, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Kevin Edward Moley, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Organization Affairs), Robert Frank Pence, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland, and Trevor D. Traina, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria, all of the Department of State, and Josephine Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

S-116

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Marine Corps ground modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security

To hold hearings to examine an update on National Highway Traffic Safety

Administration and automaker efforts to repair defective Takata air bag inflators.

SR-253

MARCH 21

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael Y. Scudder, of Illinois, and Amy J. St. Eve, of Illinois, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, and Charles J. Williams, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President.

SD-608

2 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for veterans' programs and fiscal year 2020 advance appropriations requests.

SR-418

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense policies and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for Indian Programs.

SD-628

MARCH 22

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the challenges in the Department of Energy's atomic energy defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SH-216

SENATE—Thursday, March 15, 2018

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, as we join our hearts in prayer, we praise You for protecting and preserving this land we love.

Remind our lawmakers that by themselves, they aren't sufficient for the challenges of our times. Give them the wisdom to solve the problems that require more than human ingenuity. May they never fail to do the very best they can, striving to please You in their every endeavor. Lord, when they are perplexed, provide them with the clarity of Your guidance. May Your will be done and Your purposes carried out above party and personality.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN MCCAIN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week marks an important anniversary for an exceptional American. Forty-five years ago yesterday, our friend and colleague JOHN MCCAIN was released after more than 5½ years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam.

The "Hanoi Hilton" was the site of unspeakable brutality, but it was also a crucible of character, where a brave patriot was tested and grew into a generational leader.

Here in the Senate, we are not only grateful that JOHN MCCAIN was welcomed home, we are especially grateful that he answered yet another call to serve, bringing that leadership to this body for more than 30 years. His leadership and his example are as important today as they have ever been.

APPOINTMENT OF LARRY KUDLOW AND NOMINATION OF KEVIN MCALEENAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, yesterday the President named Larry Kudlow as the next head of the National Economic Council.

Larry is well known as a happy warrior for pro-growth economics and widely respected for his expertise in fiscal policy. The country will be lucky to have Larry serving in this role. I look forward to continued engagement with the White House team that will now benefit from his insight.

Speaking of highly qualified personnel, here in the Senate yesterday afternoon, we voted to advance Kevin McAleenan's nomination to serve as Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. This is an essential post, and Mr. McAleenan is an excellent nominee.

I urge everyone to join me in voting for his confirmation when we return on Monday.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate took a big step forward for community banks, credit unions, and other small lenders on which communities across America rely for access to credit.

On a strong bipartisan vote, we passed Senator CRAPO's legislation to streamline the Dodd-Frank Act so regulations intended for Wall Street place less of a crushing burden on Main Street.

Next up is legislation to combat sex trafficking. Debate on this issue will begin today.

It might be easy to imagine sex trafficking doesn't happen here. It would be easy to pretend it is only a problem in other parts of the world, but that is dead wrong.

Trafficking is a crisis right here in the United States. From 2010 to 2015, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children saw reports of suspected child sex trafficking increase more than eightfold—an eightfold increase. Last year alone, more than 8,500 cases of human trafficking were reported to the National Human Trafficking Hotline.

As Senator PORTMAN has been informing us throughout his tireless work on this issue, sex trafficking has moved from the street corner to the smartphone. That is, in large part, because a 1996 law meant to protect on-

line speech is now misused as a shield to stop sex traffickers and those who profit from their crimes from facing the rightful consequences.

I am as strong a defender of the First Amendment as you will find. I was in the Congress in 1996. I voted for the Telecommunications Act that included this provision, as did the vast majority of my colleagues. Let me assure you, not one of us intended to create a special protection for platforms that knowingly allow sex traffickers to exploit children.

The legislation we will consider would ensure that institutions that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking can be held accountable for their actions.

There is a reason why 67 Senators have joined Senator PORTMAN in support of legislation to accomplish this. There is a reason why the White House is strongly supportive. American children should not be sold—online or anywhere else. America's families should not be victimized by such evil, and America's laws should not be misused to protect those who perpetrate these crimes or those who, according to the stunning subcommittee report, knowingly give them space and tools to operate while profiting in the process.

Several of us have worked hard on this issue for a number of years. It is now past time to take this additional step. When we vote next week, that time will have come.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, few subjects are closer to the heart of parents than their children's education. That is why Republicans made sure the historic tax reform we passed last year included a provision, championed by Senator CRUZ and others, that will help parents choose an education for their children that makes sense for their family.

A recent article in the Courier-Journal in Louisville, KY, shared the story of one family whose second grade son had struggled with an undiagnosed learning disability. He had trouble keeping up with his public school class. So like many parents facing similar challenges, his family decided to send him to a private school with smaller classes and more individual attention, but that was a tough financial decision. Even though both parents worked, affording tuition was a struggle.

Families like this are why Republican tax reform gave parents more flexibility in paying educational expenses. The law builds the foundation

for important expansions of the tax-advantaged college savings accounts known as 529 plans. As a result of tax reform, we are empowering families to use these tax-exempt accounts not only for college expenses but also for tuition at private and religious schools, K-12.

The philosophy here is simple: More choice is better than less. That really is the moral of the story on tax reform—getting government out of the way, letting families keep more of their own income, and empowering Americans to make the economic choices that make sense for them.

Parents know best what works for their children. So if we can get government out of the way so the IRS takes less from families and parents, and parents get more control over their kids' education, we ought to do it.

The young man from Louisville is in the fifth grade now. His new private school was able to properly diagnose and approach his dyslexia. He is thriving. Now, thanks to tax reform, school choice will soon become more affordable for families like his.

Historically, helping families save for schooling costs has been a bipartisan priority. In 1996, I worked with Senator Bob Graham and other friends across the aisle to create section 529 in the first place. Five years later, I sponsored legislation to let families tap into 529 plans tax-free. It ended up in the 2001 tax cuts—again, a bipartisan affair, but this time was different.

No Democrats in the House or the Senate—not a single one—voted for this historic tax reform law. They tried to block this law to help families across America afford schooling of their choice. This time, Republicans had to do it all by themselves. Fortunately, we got it done for American families.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, H.R. 1865, a bill to amend the Communica-

tions Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, since the Republicans jammed through a massive corporate tax cut in December, hardly a day goes by that we don't read about a corporation using the savings to purchase its own stock. The average citizen may ask: What is that all about?

Well, when a company purchases its own stock, it is sort of artificially making less stock, buying it back, and raising the price of the shares. Why do they do that? There are two reasons, both to benefit the corporate CEOs but not the workers. First, corporate CEOs have a lot of the stock themselves, so they make money; second, they look better when the stock price goes up. But the stock price isn't going up because the company has sold more goods, been more productive, bought new machinery, or found a new product. The stock simply goes up because they have decreased the number of shares. It is a scam in a certain sense, helping corporate CEOs, helping shareholders—80 percent of the shares are held by the top 10 percent, so it doesn't really help average Americans, and that is including 401(k)s—but it doesn't help the worker.

We have heard many claims from our Republican friends: Pass this tax bill, and the workers will benefit. Well, unfortunately, now we see who is really benefitting. Just as we predicted, it is the corporate CEOs and the wealthiest of Americans.

Just recently, the total amount of share buybacks surpassed \$220 billion this year. According to the market data firm, TrimTabs, share buybacks in 2018 averaged \$4.8 billion a day—a day—double the pace for the same period last year.

For a few weeks, right after the President passed his tax bill, what happened? They had these companies announce bonuses for average workers. Very few Americans saw those bonuses—a lot of hoopla, but not much else. The bonuses—not wage increases, not new hires, but one-time annual bonuses—anyone who gets them, God bless them; there have just been so few. Those bonuses are being overwhelmed by a deluge of corporate share buybacks, which do not benefit the average worker, but benefit the CEOs and the heads of the companies.

According to an analysis by JUST Capital, only 6 percent of the capital allocated by companies from the tax bill has gone to employees, while near-

ly 60 percent has gone to shareholders—again, to the corporate CEOs who own those shares, the wealthiest of Americans who own the vast majority of shares. Ten times more capital is going to shareholders than to workers.

So this bill, which is poorly structured and aimed at the wealthy, ain't working. The more Americans see it—you know, there was an initial thrust: Oh, we like the tax bill. At first, it was unpopular as we talked about it here on the floor. Then, with these bonuses and the stock market going up, popularity went up a little. Now it is flattening out and even heading down. In the last three polls, fewer people liked this tax plan, and that is going to keep happening, my Republican friends, because they know what it was aimed at and you know what it was aimed at—the corporate CEOs who came to lobby you and the wealthy individuals who came to lobby you. It is no wonder the American people are starting to turn on the Republican tax bill. Polls have shown its popularity is underwater and trending downward, not up.

This idea that tax cuts would be a political panacea for Republicans come November is losing altitude fast. Remember, that is what our Republican friends said: Well, maybe people are upset with the President's tweets, and maybe this and that are not going so well; maybe they are not accomplishing that much, but now, with the tax bill, we will win the election.

Well, look at the Pennsylvania election where a Democrat won the district that Trump carried by 20 points. This is the kind of district that our Republican friends need to carry. These are Republican suburbs in blue-collar Southwest Pennsylvania.

Early in the race, what did Republicans do? They tried running ads about the tax bill to help their candidate, Rick Saccone, during the first few weeks of February. These were the super PACs, the Koch brothers, and all the others who will benefit hugely from the tax bill. Somehow they believe that because they will benefit, everyone is going to think they have benefited.

They ran these ads, often paid for by the Kochs. Two-thirds of the ads mentioned taxes—two-thirds of all Saccone's ads, both by the Koch-like super PACs and by Saccone himself. The next week, 36 percent mentioned taxes. Guess what. After 2 weeks of these tax ads, our Republican friends tested it out, and they got rid of taxes as an issue. It wasn't working. It wasn't working with fairly well-off middle-class Pittsburgh suburbanites or blue-collar workers in Greene County and Westmoreland County and Washington County in Southwest PA, which are areas where people had voted for Trump.

It is eerily similar, folks, to the Governor's race in Virginia—the same thing. That was before the bill passed,

but still, Republican candidate Ed Gillespie started his campaign on a tax plan similar to the Republican tax plan. He had to give it up because it wasn't getting traction.

The American people are smart about this. They know what is going on. They know the vast majority of this goes to the wealthy. They know the amount that is going to them is small. They know their tax break is temporary and the corporate tax break is permanent. Most of all, they know we have created a huge deficit. And how are some of our Republicans friends saying we pay for the deficit? Cut Medicare. Cut Social Security. Cut healthcare. That is not what the American people want.

Poll after poll shows healthcare is far more important to the American people than tax cuts. Do you know why? If you get a break on your taxes of \$20 a week and your premiums go up several thousand dollars in a month or even several hundred dollars in a month, that little increase is wiped away. Our Republican colleagues, even in their tax bill, caused premiums to go up by monkeying around with healthcare.

The Republican Party needs to wake up and realize that by giving massive benefits to corporations and the wealthy, it is never going to be a popular issue for them in the election because it is a terrible policy for the average middle-class and working Americans. It gets to the contradiction at the core of the Presidency. The President talks like a populous but governs like a plutocrat. Let me repeat that. The President talks like a populous but governs like a plutocrat. He just got rid of a Wall Street executive—Gary Cohn—and now he is putting in as his economic adviser Larry Kudlow, who has favored the wealthy. Club for Growth policies—help the wealthy and all of America will benefit—throughout his whole career. That is not how Trump ran. That is not what he tells working people when he goes to a big tent in Pennsylvania. But that is what he is doing. Sooner or later, it catches up with you. The Pennsylvania election showed it is catching up faster than our Republican friends would like. The President talks like a populous but governs like a plutocrat.

President Trump said that his tax bill would be a middle-class miracle, but the actual legislation is a miracle for the wealthy corporations and the richest 1 percent. As I said, part of the problem is that the President surrounds himself with the wealthy elite. Those are his advisers. These wealthy elites push for tax cuts for the rich and rhapsodize failed economic orthodoxies like trickle-down. That applies to Larry Kudlow. Here is a man who is a cheerleader for Bush-era economics. He ignored the housing bubble and actually recommended—Larry Kudlow, the man who is now going to give the President economic advice—that

Americans buy stock in the fall of 2008 when everyone else saw that the economy was about to collapse. Does anyone think Larry Kudlow is going to bring a renewed focus on improving the middle class? Forget it. He believes in the plutocracy. He has his whole career. That is who President Trump picked. He is getting rid of one and putting in another, like going from the frying pan into the fire.

By the way, I think the President loves having the big crowds of working-class people in those tents, but who are his real friends? They are the very wealthy. That is who he hung out with in New York. He cares what they think, and that is why his policies are so aimed at them.

My Republican friends, in a nutshell, this is the problem you face. Your rhetoric is all about helping working people, but your policies and the people developing them are all about helping corporations and the rich.

I am not against the rich or corporations. God bless them. Let's hope they do well. But average Americans need far more help than the top 1 percent and wealthy corporations. Give it to average folks. They need it. They are still struggling with paying for college, affording a vacation, helping their elderly mom and dad through a healthcare problem. They are who need the help, not the top 1 percent. But our Republican colleagues aim everything at that top 1 percent.

If we would only get rid of Citizens United, that awful decision that allows the wealthy to have such huge influence on the Republican Party, the super PACs—individual Members have super PACs funded by the wealthy. I wish we could get rid of it on both sides, Democratic and Republican. Unfortunately, it doesn't look like the Supreme Court is doing it.

The rhetoric of Republicans: Help working people. The policies of Republicans: Help the wealthy corporations and the rich. As we have seen in poll after poll and in recent elections, the American people are waking up to that reality.

It is hard to make a tax cut unpopular, but Republicans have managed to do it by designing a bill that will direct 83 percent of the benefits to the top 1 percent and \$1.5 trillion to the deficit and then threaten to cut Medicare and Social Security to make up the difference. My colleagues, that is a toxic combination, and Republicans will not be able to run on it because only a very few wealthy Americans support that agenda.

RUSSIA

Mr. President, now on a different matter—Russia. A little more than a week ago, our friends in the United Kingdom—England, Great Britain—suffered an attack on two individuals by a nerve agent. In a joint statement today, the leadership of the United

States, the UK, France, and Germany agreed that Putin was behind it. To her great credit, Prime Minister May demanded an immediate response from Putin and promised appropriate countermeasures. She has already expelled 23 Russian diplomats, and I hope she takes additional action. Expelling 23 diplomats is strong action, but we need more.

Mr. Putin—he is a bully. I grew up in Brooklyn. There are a lot of bullies around Brooklyn. You have to stand up to them, or they will keep taking advantage of you. That is how a bully works.

Let's compare Prime Minister May's action to President Trump's. It is a study in contrast when it comes to Russia. Prime Minister May was quick and decisive about countering Russia's aggression. President Trump can hardly seem to utter a peep in criticism of President Putin—a man who is trying to undermine the power of the United States, a man who is trying to undermine the very democracy of the United States, the beauty of America. It was on full display this week when, instead of personally defending our ally Britain, President Trump didn't say a word about the attack, directing everything through aides or statements.

President Trump warns all the time that “we need to get smart” about other countries taking advantage of the United States. I agree. I tend to agree with the President on China. China is taking advantage of us, and President Trump, to his credit, is doing more than the Bush or Obama administrations did. But guess who is taking advantage of us even more than China. Russia. They meddle in our elections, continue to sow division on social media through Russia-linked bots or building an intelligence machine to meddle in our elections again later this year. Putin constantly attacks our allies, our friends.

President Trump, when are you going to get smart about the threat Russia poses to the United States and our allies?

We in Congress, 98 to 2, the Democrats and Republicans together—Leader MCCONNELL and I worked this out. We voted to implement mandatory sanctions against Russia. Guess what, America. President Trump hasn't even implemented them. What is he afraid of? What is he hiding?

Hopefully, we will get an announcement today that maybe he is implementing sanctions after what Russia did, but that is not enough. As my friend from New Jersey has suggested, the President should further sanction Putin and anyone else involved under the Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act for this heinous attack in the UK.

We are still waiting for President Trump to direct our intelligence agencies and the State Department to use

the resources we have provided them to combat Russian cyber attacks. We have heard from officials who are in charge of cyber security. They have gotten no direction from the White House, no orders to do anything. We are still waiting for actions to harden our election security, and we are still waiting for President Trump to utter one word of public criticism for what Putin is doing to the United States and democracies around the world.

I say to President Trump: Your silence speaks on this issue. Your silence speaks volumes to the Russian Government and America's other adversaries, as well as our friends and allies. Finally, it speaks volumes to the American people. More and more Americans are asking: Why is President Trump so afraid to take on probably our No. 1 menace, Russia? What is he hiding? What is going on? Why?

It is ringing in America's ear. The President is not going to escape it. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the issue before the Senate, and I am very pleased the Senate is finally taking up this legislation. It has to do with stopping sex trafficking specifically—a growing scourge in our country and really a stain on our national character—which is girls, women being sold online.

The legislation is called the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act. It includes the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA. That has gone through a process here in the Senate. We had hearings on it. We had a markup. This is an issue many of us have been working on for many months—in fact, for the last couple of years—doing the investigations to come up with how to deal with this problem.

I am very pleased that we now have the opportunity here in the Senate to take up this legislation and begin the process of turning the tide, changing this horrific situation where, in this country, in this century, we actually have an increase in the trafficking of human beings—specifically women and children being trafficked online. I thought the speech earlier by Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL laid this out very well. He talked about the fact that there has been an eightfold increase, in the most recent data from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children; that is, between 2010 and 2015, there was an eightfold increase in the incidence of trafficking. He also talked about the fact that this is growing because of this growth of the internet, that the internet—specifically this one website—has caused this increase that Congress has the ability to address through a change in a Federal law that can be targeted and focused and can make a huge difference

in the lives of those who would be trafficked and undergo the intense trauma that results.

I am very pleased we are taking up this legislation. I thank Majority Leader MCCONNELL for putting the bill on the floor.

I know we have an important omnibus spending bill coming up, and I know the Senate needs to focus on that, but first let's get this common-sense legislation passed. Let's take this opportunity to do something that is actually going to help immediately on this issue of sex trafficking.

I also thank Senator JOHN THUNE. He is the chairman of the Commerce Committee, which had the hearings and marked up this legislation. I also thank his colleague, Ranking Member BILL NELSON, for his work on this. We held a powerful hearing. I had a chance to testify there and testify about the work we had done in another committee investigating this issue. We heard from victims, and we heard from experts. At the end of the day, that vote in the Commerce Committee was unanimous—Republicans and Democrats alike saying: We get it. We need to address this issue.

We have had a lot of collaboration on this over the last couple of years. I would say it has been a truly non-partisan effort, not just a bipartisan effort, which is rare around this place. In particular, I would like to thank the coauthor of the legislation we are dealing with, and that is RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, who, as a former prosecutor, understands these issues because he prosecuted sex trafficking cases.

I also thank Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL because it was Senator MCCASKILL and I who headed up the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which looked into this issue. We spent a year and a half studying it, and we were able to find out shocking information about what is going on online.

I also thank Senator JOHN CORNYN, Senator HEIDI HETKAMP, Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR, and Senator TED CRUZ. They are a group of Senators who were the initial cosponsors of this legislation and have helped us put this legislation together in a way that addresses the issue in a very focused and targeted way, so we are going to actually have the result we are looking for but without affecting what some were concerned about, which was the freedom of the internet. We all believe in the freedom of the internet, but we also know that committing these kinds of horrific crimes on the internet has to be something people are held accountable for.

I want to take a moment to recognize a couple of other leaders in this effort, one of whom is a Senator, and the other is his spouse, and that is Cindy and JOHN MCCAIN. I hope they are watching these proceedings over the next week as we take up this legisla-

tion, debate it, and I hope pass it on the floor of the Senate, because they have been very involved.

JOHN MCCAIN from the start, as one of the leaders on this issue here in the Senate, helped us put together the legislation. He was with me on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations as we looked into this matter. JOHN can't be with us here on the floor, but I know his presence is felt. I will tell my colleagues that it is felt by me, as well as the influence he has had on this legislation and on many of us in bringing up this issue.

One reason he brings up this issue a lot is that he has a spouse who is passionate about it and has spent a lot of time working on it. The McCain Institute has specialized on this issue of human trafficking, and Cindy McCain has been a tireless advocate globally on this issue. So I thank both Cindy and JOHN for their inspiration. Again, I am confident that as we get it across the finish line here, they will be celebrating with us.

We have 68 cosponsors of this legislation now, and, again, for those who follow scorecards around here, that is unusual. We have a majority of Republicans, and we have a majority of Democrats. We have a situation here where everybody is affected by it in their States. They get it, and they understand that this is a Federal responsibility to change this law because it is a Federal law that creates this opening for websites to engage in this kind of behavior without accountability. They are effectively shielded from prosecutions or from lawsuits. This legislation takes away that shield.

We have heard from the FBI, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children; we have heard from Polaris, which runs the national tip line on human trafficking. All kinds of experts have told us that trafficking is not just increasing, but it is increasing because of the ruthless efficiency of the internet.

One website—backpage.com—is involved in the majority of online sex trafficking. One anti-trafficking organization has said that backpage is involved in about 75 percent of the online trafficking reports it receives from the public. Another organization, Shared Hope International, says it is even more than that. So think about that. We have this increase in trafficking. It is primarily being caused by this movement from the street corner to the smartphone, as victims have told me back home, and there is one website that has the majority of this activity. That is what we studied.

As we looked into it further, Senator MCCASKILL and I were shocked to find out that not only is this activity going on on this website, but they were complicit in the sense that they knowingly facilitated criminal sex trafficking, including coaching users—people who were placing ads with them—to

post clean ads so that they wouldn't indicate—which was very obvious in the initial ads that were presented—that these were underage girls. As an example, taking out words like “schoolgirl” or “cheerleader”—they told them to do that so they could still place the ads; in other words, get the money for the ads. As you can imagine, this is a very lucrative business. So they were saying that they needed to clean it up. That practice covered up evidence of these crimes. It actually also made it harder for law enforcement to follow up on these cases. They did it for a very simple reason. They wanted the ads because they increased their profits, but obviously they had an incredibly detrimental impact, and still do, on women and children around our country.

I spoke earlier this week on the floor about Kubiiki Pride because she testified before us and she is also part of a documentary called “I Am Jane Doe.” If you are interested in this issue, check it out. It is on Netflix.

Kubiiki Pride told us this alarming story of a mom whose daughter goes missing. She can't find her. She was told to look on this site called backpage. She does, and she sees her daughter's photographs there—sexually explicit photographs.

She calls backpage and says: That is my daughter; she has been missing. She is 14 years old, and she is on your website. Thank you for taking down the ad.

Their response: Did you pay for the ad?

She said: No, of course I didn't pay for it. I am the mother.

They said: We can't take down the ad because you didn't pay for it.

That story tells us how evil these websites are.

Let me tell you another story about Yvonne Ambrose. Yvonne testified before the Commerce Committee, and you could have heard a pin drop when she was telling her story. Her daughter was 16 years old and she was trafficked on backpage.com. She was sold for sex on backpage.com at 16 years old. Yvonne got a call on Christmas Eve 2016, the call no parent ever wants to get. The call was from law enforcement saying that her daughter, Desiree, who was being trafficked at the time on backpage.com, had been murdered.

Yvonne is honoring Desiree's memory by getting engaged in this issue and helping us to pass this legislation. I appreciate her challenge and her grief. But she is also sure that this legislation is the thing that would have kept girls like her daughter from getting involved in this, because when she went after backpage to try to hold them accountable, she was told: I am sorry; they have immunity under Federal law.

That Federal law, by the way, is called the Communications Decency Act. It was put in place with good in-

tentions to help protect the freedom of the internet. It protects websites from liability when users put something on their site, but it was never meant to protect criminal activity. It has been misinterpreted, in my view, by the courts, but it also needs to be clarified, because it is not as clear as it should be, and that is what our legislation does.

This legislation, by the way, was enacted back in 1996—22 years ago, when the internet was in its infancy. There needed to be something to help provide protection from liability. But, unfortunately, it has been used as a shield by these criminals to be able to sell women and children online without accountability.

The same law that was actually written back then was also focused, in part, on keeping indecent material—pornography—from going to children, ironically, and now it is being used to shield these traffickers. I know Congress did not intend that broad immunity, and I know we need to fix it.

By the way, the district attorneys around the country agree with us on this—prosecutors. They have asked us to change this law. Their associations have even been involved in this issue. Fifty State attorneys general have written to us, asking us to do this, including, by the way, some former State attorneys general who are now Members of this body.

In the most blatant call on Congress yet, we had a court in Sacramento, CA, say: You have to fix this law because, otherwise, we can't do anything to keep people from exploiting women and children online. A number of courts have said this and basically have called on Congress—welcomed us to enter into it. The one in California said: “If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by allowing trafficking.”

In other words, they are asking Congress to step in and do something.

That is what this does. It allows online sex trafficking victims to get the justice they deserve and it allows prosecutors to hold these websites accountable.

We do it with two very narrow changes. First, allowing these victims to get the justice they deserve by removing the broad liability protections for a narrow set of bad actors. In fact, we actually say that for the good actors, there is a Good Samaritan provision: If you want to clean up your website and get the offensive material off, you are protected.

Second, it does allow for the State prosecutors to go after these websites, which they can't do now. So it takes the Federal standard—it is not a new standard; it is Federal law, which is already a criminal act—and says, allow

these State prosecutors, these State attorneys general, to prosecute these websites that violate these Federal laws.

It is incredibly important to pass this. We did it narrowly. We have a knowing standard here; in other words, to be affected by this, you have to knowingly be facilitating, supporting, or assisting sex trafficking. We did that because we wanted to be sure it was focused on this issue and not affecting the broader freedom of the internet.

We have a lot of support now. A couple of weeks ago the White House announced its support for this legislation. I mentioned that 68 Senators are now supporting it. It passed in the House of Representatives about 10 days ago with over 300 votes.

It has support from around the country, most importantly. All of the groups are focused on this issue of how to avoid women and children from getting caught in this web of human trafficking and then how to help them when they get out to provide for the important recovery efforts that are needed from the trauma of this. Those groups, of course, are strongly supportive.

Law enforcement has been terrific. The Fraternal Order of Police stepped up early on in strong support of this legislation. So have all of the other law enforcement groups represented here in Washington through their national offices. We appreciate their help.

We appreciate the fact that parents have been willing to come forward and tell these difficult stories, as was the case of Kubiiki Pride, as was the case of Yvonne Ambrose, whom I talked about earlier, and her daughter, Desiree. They told their stories from their heart in order to get Congress to wake up and do the right thing. We now need to do that.

This legislation is now before this body. We expect to have a vote next week on it. We need to do all we can to address this stain on our national character. We need to do all we can to provide these victims the justice they deserve. We need to do all we can to ensure that we stop the selling of women and children online.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY LOAN FLEXIBILITY BILL

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Michigan's farmers. Agriculture is a vital part of Michigan's economy. Our State is home to more than 51,000 farmers who contribute over \$100 billion to the Nation's economy.

Michigan is also the second most diverse farm State in the Nation, growing more than 300 commodities, including a significant portion of our Nation's milk, corn, cherries, cucumbers, and much more.

Michigan farmers and farmers across our country feed the Nation and the world, and we must do what we can to support them. Our agricultural businesses rely on the ability to access the resources they need to keep growing, creating jobs, and contributing to our national economy.

Access to these resources can be especially challenging for new farm operations that are just getting started, including small farms that make up 82 percent of Michigan's agricultural producers. Small farms that are just starting out and are facing tough economic conditions sometimes struggle to have access to affordable credit. These businesses rely upon important services provided by the Farm Service Agency, which works with lenders to guarantee and deliver small-dollar loans to the small farmers who need it most.

Farm Service Agency loans and guarantees can help farmers cover urgent operating costs like feed, seed, and fertilizer to get them through the season. Without these loans, farmers could lose their ability to purchase equipment and other necessities for the planting season and could be forced to curtail their operations.

Currently, more than 2,300 farms in Michigan have Farm Service Agency loans, totaling more than \$630 million. Across the country last year, the Farm Service Agency made and guaranteed almost 40,000 loans, totaling over \$6 billion.

This program is in such high demand that in 2016, the Farm Service Agency ran out of money to finance operating loans. This included more than 1,000 loans that have already been approved. This led to a backlog, and farmers were forced to wait for months until Congress passed emergency funding to get the loans they needed for their day-to-day operations.

Access to capital is critical across a range of businesses, but it is incredibly important for our small farmers. They can lose out on an entire growing season if they can't buy the equipment and the supplies they need while they wait on Congress to fund the Farm Service Agency.

This year the FSA loan programs are again on track to exceed available funding, and if that happens, farmers will again be stuck waiting on Congress to receive the loan they deserve and need.

That is why I introduced bipartisan legislation this week with my colleague, Senator DAVID PERDUE of Georgia, to provide greater flexibility to the FSA loan program to continue serving farmers during periods of high demand.

My bill—the Farm Service Agency Loan Flexibility Act—would allow the FSA program to increase its loan authority in years when the demand for loans unexpectedly exceeds the supply of funding.

The legislation would enable FSA to increase the available loan funding by up to 25 percent for the fiscal year for self-funding loans and guarantees that do not require appropriation. It would also authorize FSA to increase the loan cap by up to 25 percent for FSA direct loans that require budget authority and would allow FSA to draw stopgap funding for these direct loans from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I am proud to have the support of the Michigan Farm Bureau, the Michigan Agri-business Association, the American Bankers Association, and the National Farmers Union, among many others.

Like our small businesses, students, and families, America's farmers deserve to have affordable loan options. They deserve our attention and they deserve our support.

I urge my colleagues to support the Farm Service Agency Loan Flexibility Act to help meet the financial needs of our farming communities as they support and sustain us each and every day.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, it is not often I get to come to the U.S. Senate with an uplifted heart, but today I do. Yesterday, two-thirds of this body got together on an issue that is so important to Main Street America and agreed.

After weeks of negotiation and going back and forth, we passed a bipartisan banking bill, and I believe historians will look back on this week and this bill as being a watershed event. It was a measured bill. It didn't blow up Dodd-Frank; it didn't do away with it. It didn't go as far as some people wanted; it did more than others wanted, but two-thirds of us put the national interests above our own self-interests and passed a bill that will change the face of lending for small community banks and regional banks across our country.

Last year, when President Trump became President, he said: Job one is growing the economy. After 8 years of the lowest economic performance in our history, he knew that if you are ever going to deal with the long-term debt crisis we have, you have to first grow the economy. He was right. His instincts were exactly right on.

So what did we focus on? The President had us focus on regulations, energy, and taxes. I am happy to tell you,

this body collectively agreed, and we got those things done. We reversed 860-some rules and regulations last year. We unleashed our energy potential, as the Presiding Officer knows very well. Late last year, we passed an earth-shattering, historic tax cut and tax modification bill that will unleash our potential and make us competitive with the rest of the world.

Why was all that necessary? Well, we had gone through an experiment where Big Government—more regulation and more control—was the call of the day, and we saw the result of that. So what we have been doing is, in a measured way, reversing many of those onerous fiscal policies that kept the monetary policy from igniting the economy again. That is all this is.

At the beginning of last year, some \$7 trillion almost was not at work in our \$20 trillion economy. That is historic. That is unbelievable. You can't even describe that to people outside this country. There was some \$2 trillion on the balance sheets of the Russell 1000. That is now being employed. We see announcements every week where companies are announcing capital plans, capital expenditure plans, for the next few years largely as a result of the pull-back on regulations last year.

Second, we see that by eliminating our archaic repatriation tax that was part of the tax bill, there is some \$3 trillion of unrepatriated U.S. profits overseas, and most of that will be coming back. The banking bill we just did that reverses some of the more onerous provisions of Dodd-Frank on small banks and community banks will free up some \$2 trillion potential in lending capacity. I think this is historic.

After Dodd-Frank, we created a two-street economy: We had Wall Street and we had Main Street. I have a chart here that explains. This happens so often in Washington, where well-intended people who have very little experience in the free enterprise system make decisions that have unintended consequences—and this is one. Dodd-Frank was intended to rein in and control the big banks. Yet what it did inadvertently was penalize the small banks and make big banks better business.

This chart calls out—the way I would measure this is the lending activity. The dark blue line here shows, since the 2008 crisis, large business loans coming out of the major money-centered banks have increased dramatically. Even that hasn't driven the recovery we talk about because a lot of the job creation comes in smalltown America and small companies.

This light-blue line is small business loans, less than \$1 million. We are not even back to where we were in 2008. We will be, now that this bill just passed, because it releases or changes the reserve requirements for small and community banks and regional banks. It

also changes the definition of what is a regional bank and increases it to \$250 billion from \$50 billion. That lowers the regulatory burden and the cost of compliance for these small banks. That gets translated into money flow—cashflow—into businesses that create jobs.

This is an innovation economy. We know how to create jobs. We just need to get the Federal Government out of the way. One-size-fits-all regulations do not work. Yesterday, we pulled back on a blunt instrument law—Dodd-Frank—done with a supermajority, by the way. Dodd-Frank was totally ineffective and got the opposite result of what they really wanted.

Those small banks and community banks did nothing to cause the 2008 and 2009 crisis, but since Dodd-Frank was enacted, over 1,700 small banks, primarily, have gone out of business—1,700—many because they were unable to cope or afford to comply with the 2,319 pages and 390 new regulations imposed by Dodd-Frank. Let me say that again: 390 new regulations were imposed by Dodd-Frank. My goodness.

These small banks had nothing to do with the crisis of 2008. Many of these banks were community and regional banks that actually support small businesses on Main Street, give small businesses the needed capital, and sponsor Little League baseball parks. I grew up in a Little League baseball park sponsored by the three banks in my hometown. My father was a board member of one of those small banks. I remember those days. They were involved in the community. When you borrowed money from them, they knew you personally. What we have done is created an environment that just shut down lending activity in these small banks.

Small business lending—which we all know is a driver in every recovery since World War II—took nearly 8 years to barely get back to where we were in 2008, and I am not sure we are totally there, if you go across the board, entirely.

I am so glad to stand here and say that finally the U.S. Senate took action. I am also proud to say, even though it didn't go as far as I would like, that we got to a measured approach here that both sides could agree.

I remind everybody in this body that two-thirds of us agreed to this. I can't think of another issue that has come before this body. I think we had one vote, 98 to 2, to allow the head of the VA to run his human resources practices the way people in the real world do, and we have seen over 1,500 people now replaced at the VA to clean that place up. I can't think of another thing that has brought us together like this because we all know small banks have been inappropriately affected by Dodd-Frank.

Republicans and Democrats proved this week, and over the past several

weeks, that we can put our self-interests aside and get to the better good. I am proud to be a part of this. That is why I ran for the Senate. That is why the Presiding Officer ran. We didn't come up here to not get anything and to just get reelected. The American people are fed up. That is how Donald Trump got elected President. That is how I got elected.

I would dare say, the American people have the right idea about the future of America, if we would just listen to them. Nobody has all the right answers, but freeing up capital right now to put to work in our economy is the only way we are going to grow this economy north of 3 percent, and I believe we can breathe life back into our rural communities.

I had lunch yesterday with the Secretary of Agriculture. They are focused on redeveloping our rural communities that have been ignored for the last decade. These communities share the values that built America. Yet they have been ignored by past administrations that led to big city, big urban focus. I think this bill, more than anything else we have done since I have been in the Senate, will actually breathe life back into those rural communities.

I applaud our Democratic partners across the aisle. Seventeen of them took the heat from their own party and from K Street and from the vested lobbyists who did not want this to happen. I applaud them for their courage and for standing up for the people back home. That is what we are here to do. It doesn't always work out this way, but sometimes 15 or 16 of our Republican Party will work with them and get a bill they want to do. That is what this Senate body is supposed to do.

I know there are some on the other side of the aisle who really want a one-size-fits-all bigger government and more intrusion. We heard the speeches this week: It is going to be so draconian. They just don't understand how this bill will breathe life back into capital formation, which is the cornerstone of a capitalistic society, but I believe most people in America have seen the dark side. They have seen the punitive nature of large regulatory bodies by a Federal Government that wants to dominate every aspect of our life, and Dodd-Frank was one of the ramifications of that—accomplished, as I said, only during a supermajority.

The irony of Dodd-Frank is that it is just another example of Washington overreach that hurts the very people it claims to champion and fails to help the working middle class. We see from this chart, large businesses had no problem getting loans, but the small startup entrepreneur is having trouble today, and that is what this bill goes a long way toward helping to alleviate. Small businesses should look at this and say: We are back in business. We are open for business. I believe this will

breathe life back into many communities around our country.

Community and regional banks and, by extension, communities and small businesses across the country have been unduly punished for something they had nothing to do with. It is time to correct that, and this bill does that.

I am proud to be a Member of the U.S. Senate today. I haven't said that many times here. I am proud because we took action, we put our self-interests aside, and this is exactly the kind of result the American people want us to deliver.

This rollback—which I believe is very measured—combined with last year's regulatory rollback, President Trump's steps to unleash our energy potential and, yes, our historic tax bill, go a long way to be a big win for our economy. It sends a message to the rest of the world.

I am hopeful the House is going to pass this bill as soon as possible and that President Trump is going to be able to sign it into law very soon. President Trump has a vision for America. It is born out of Main Street America. I believe this puts us back on the track to greatness and leadership in the world economically, socially, politically. It is the right thing to do for our country. It is the right thing to do for every person in America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN SAFETY

MR. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about gun ownership and gun safety in Virginia and in the United States. I speak as a gun owner, and I speak as a strong Second Amendment supporter. I want to do a couple of things in this speech, but one thing I want to do is put to rest the idea that gun owners, gun ownership, and the Second Amendment are incompatible with reasonable gun safety rules.

I accept the ruling, the holding, and the principle announced by the Supreme Court in the Heller decision that the Second Amendment conveys an individual right to bear arms and conveys that right to the American public. There was, and there remains, some controversy over the ruling. Some have argued that the text of the amendment discusses only the right to bear arms in the context of participating in a militia, which in 1787 was a necessary strategy for defending the Nation during a time when we had no standing Army. For years, many scholars and courts accepted that notion and argued that the Second Amendment was sort

of different from the others in that way. In *Heller*, the Supreme Court ruled that the Second Amendment, like all the other amendments, conveys an individual right, and I accept and believe that interpretation.

But the *Heller* decision came with an important caveat. The Second Amendment is the only amendment that uses the phrase “well regulated.” The amendment may convey a personal right to gun ownership, and it does, but it explicitly acknowledges that regulations are part of what may be necessary. Courts subsequent to *Heller* have frequently held that the particular regulations are well within the scope of the Second Amendment.

The NRA and other organizations often pretend that the phrase “well regulated” doesn’t even appear in the amendment. Often, they will print a copy of the Second Amendment or the text, and they will have only the second clause, omitting the “well regulated” phrase. While that phrase, like the text of the amendment itself, is set in the context of a militia, it is clear from its usage that the Framers knew firearms were dangerous, though necessary, and there needed to be rules to ensure their safe use. In other words, the phrase “well regulated” in the text is not there to refer to the kind of uniform that a militia member would wear, whether they should have a beard or not. It is there to refer to the need for discipline and training to keep those people who bear arms behaving in a reasonable and safe manner.

Even if the phrase “well regulated” did not appear in the text of the Second Amendment—and that phrase “well regulated” appears in no other amendment, only the second—it would still be pretty clear that the Second Amendment right, just like other constitutional rights, is not absolute and free from any governmental rules. The *Heller* decision, authored by Justice Scalia, stated this very clearly: A ruling of individual ownership and use of firearms does not restrict the government from imposing reasonable rules on their use. Many subsequent cases have affirmed these reasonable rules over time.

The First Amendment, for example, guarantees the right to free speech and makes clear that no law infringing upon such a right is constitutional. But the Supreme Court has long held that government agencies can place reasonable limits on the time, place, and manner of speech, so long as the limits don’t discriminate on the content of the idea that is expressed. An easy example is, a city can ban sound trucks with megaphones from driving through neighborhoods blaring ads in the middle of the night while people are sleeping. The right to free speech is subject to reasonable limitation.

Similarly, the First Amendment guarantees freedom of the press, but

States punish civil libel through their civil litigation and court processes. A newspaper trashing somebody through a knowingly false statement can be subjected to civil liability, and that paper can’t claim the right to free press to shield it from accountability.

The Second Amendment, in this way, is similar to the First Amendment, and I could go through other examples. While the right to ownership, to bear and use arms—not just ownership but using arms—may not be infringed, reasonable rules regarding gun usage are explicitly contemplated by the amendment and constitutionally allowable.

It is important to recognize that we all tolerate reasonable limits on gun use. One common use of firearms in Virginia and Alaska—I know from my one visit to Alaska that this is the case—is hunting. In Virginia, the voters of our State, by referendum, amended our State constitution in 2000 to guarantee to all a right to hunt, fish, and gather game subject to rules prescribed by our general assembly. I was legal counsel for this effort, before I was in State office, arguing the validity of the amendment when a citizens group sued to try to keep it off the ballot. We prevailed in the litigation, and the amendment passed overwhelmingly, with more than 60 percent of the vote. That vote showed our population both embraced the right to hunt but also embraced the acceptance of the notion that this right should be subject to reasonable rules imposed by the legislature.

We have many State-imposed rules on hunting in Virginia, just as I am sure is the case in Alaska. The State determines the seasons in which hunting can occur—those seasons can differ depending on what you are hunting—where it can occur, the license you need, the training you must complete, which days of the week are open for hunting, what kinds of weapons can be used in hunting, and even the size of a magazine in any automatic or repeating weapon that can be used in hunting.

For example, in Virginia, by statute, you can hunt with a repeating shotgun, but the magazine can contain no more than three rounds. If the magazine on a weapon is larger than that—a larger magazine—you are required to have a plug or filler in the magazine that will reduce its capacity to no more than three total rounds, as measured either in the magazine or in the chamber itself.

The bottom line for these regulations, which are well accepted and understood in Virginia, is clear. Even the use of firearms for hunting, protected by the Virginia Constitution as well as by the Second Amendment, is subject to safety rules that society fully accepts. The clear constitutionality of gun safety rules and the public acceptance of these rules pose stark questions to Congress.

Why, in the face of escalating tragedy, are we so unwilling to adopt commonsense gun safety rules designed to reduce gun violence? Why does Congress shield gun manufacturers from liability with a Federal protection that we don’t give to the manufacturers of other products? Why does Congress limit the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention from using its resources to research gun violence? Why does Congress limit the ability of law enforcement to fully trace the use of guns that are used to commit crimes? Why does Congress prohibit weapon use and ownership by certain classes of dangerous individuals but resist a universal background check system that would be necessary to enforce that prohibition? Why won’t Congress enact the same kinds of magazine limitations on weapons used to kill people that we embrace on weapons used to kill deer? Why won’t Congress ban weapons of war—weapons of war that are used by trained officials, as was the case with the Presiding Officer in his military service or my son in military service, but why won’t we ban those weapons of war from the streets of our country?

Self-defense, sport, hunting are all protected and encompassed within the broad protections of the Second Amendment. There is not, there has never been, and there never will be an effort to confiscate all weapons in the country because of their popular acceptance and because of the clear commands of the Constitution. But why can’t we have reasonable safety rules?

America’s children—so many of them appeared here yesterday, children from a middle school in Northern Virginia, some high schoolers from Thomas Jefferson High School; I visited with students from Florida—posed some even starker questions to us.

Does Congress care more about its children or more about contributions from the NRA and gun manufacturers? Can adults act like adults and try to keep children safe? Those were the questions that I heard from the students on the Capitol steps yesterday.

I applaud the children of the country who are asking these questions. They stand together with an overwhelming majority of Americans who believes we can do better and we need to do better. I have seen the tragedy of gun violence, but I have also seen that we can do better and that part of that is having better rules on guns.

When I was elected to the city council in Richmond in 1994, we had the second highest homicide rate in the United States. That was the only top 10 list we were on. That is not the one you want to be on. I went to too many funerals and too many wakes and too many crime scenes, and I was in too many church basements with support groups of homicide victims’ families, and I don’t want to do those kinds of things again.

Yet, through the pain of that—multiple efforts by multiple people—we helped reduce our violent crime rate risk. We dropped the homicide rate by 60 percent. We dropped the aggravated assault/violent crime rate by nearly the same number. We did a number of things, but one of the things we did was to recognize that we had a problem with guns. It was not just about people or just about mental health. Those were issues, sure, but we had a high gun carry rate in Richmond. The gun carry rate means: In 100 stops that the police would make, what percentage of the time were people carrying weapons? In Richmond, we just had an unusually high percentage compared to other cities for a variety of the reasons.

What we decided to do is, if we could bring down the gun carry rate, we may not make bad people good people, but we could avoid an argument's breaking bad and then turning into a homicide or an aggravated assault. We were able to do things that brought the gun carry rate down, that made people leave their guns at home, if they were leaving their homes, instead of putting them in their pockets. By doing that, we helped to bring down gun violence. We found that you could take concrete steps to make people safer.

I was the Governor at the time of what was the worst shooting in the history of the United States. The weird thing to say about my own State is that I wish it had always been the worst shooting—the tragedy at Virginia Tech in April of 2007, when 32 people were killed. It has now been eclipsed by shootings in Orlando and Las Vegas and Newtown. So many other tragedies have happened since then that even some of the particulars of the Virginia Tech shooting start to recede in memory as new tragedies happen.

It was painful. I interacted with the 32 families who had lost their kids and who had lost their parents who were professors, and I have continued to interact with them over the years and to learn what went wrong that day, and a lot of things went wrong. Vowing to the families that we would try to fix them has been a cause of my life for the last 11 years.

We also learned through the pain some things we could do to make our communities safer. In this particular case, there were problems with mental health, and there were problems with privacy rules, and there were problems with campus safety protocols. Yet a significant problem was that we had a flaw in the background record check system. A young individual who had been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous and was prohibited from owning a weapon was able to slip through the cracks in the system to get a weapon that he shouldn't have had. So the lesson we learned is, with a better back-

ground check system, you reduce the risk of tragedy.

Whether it is a common street crime of the kind that occurs every day and may not get the attention on the weekly news, I have had some scar tissue over this, but at least the scar tissue has taught me a few things. One of the things I have learned is you can take meaningful steps, and if you do so, you make communities safer. If you know that you can take steps to make people safer, then you must. You must.

I will conclude and just say this.

We need a debate on the floor of this Chamber about how to reduce gun violence and promote gun safety. We haven't had one since April of 2013. It has been 5 years, and the list of tragedies is getting longer and longer and longer. We shouldn't be afraid to entertain both Republican and Democratic proposals for reducing the scourge of gun violence. There will be different kinds of proposals, and that is as it should be.

It is just like the debate we had about Dreamers a few weeks ago. There were different proposals put on the table that were going in different directions. We know in this body that we need to get 60 votes to get anything passed, which means nothing will pass unless there is some bipartisan support. Yet we shouldn't be afraid of having that debate. We have been afraid to have the debate, but our children are afraid for their lives. If they are showing the courage to speak out for change, the least we can do is show that we are listening.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

THE FIRST SAINT PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before the Senator from Virginia leaves, since he is the cochairman of the United States-Spain Council, I want him to hear my very brief remarks.

As will be officially announced today at 4 o'clock on the new website, La Florida, the following has been discovered by historian Dr. Michael Francis, of the University of South Florida at St. Petersburg, who is one of the eminent Spanish colonial scholars in the world: The first St. Patrick's Day was not in Boston in 1737. Neither was the first St. Patrick's Day parade in New York in 1762. As discovered by Dr. Francis in the Spanish archives in Seville, the first St. Patrick's Day was celebrated by an Irish priest, Richard Arthur, better known as Ricardo Arturo, in St. Augustine in 1600, to be followed by the first St. Patrick's Day parade in the New World, in St. Augustine, in 1601.

Needless to say, it is not going to make our friends in Boston and New York happy to hear that they have been eclipsed by well over a century

and a half. However, it shows the strong roots of the Irish people in America all the way back to Saint Patty's Day in 1600 in St. Augustine, FL.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I enjoyed that little bit of history there. I am sure that the Irish everywhere—and those who are, perhaps, not quite as Irish—will find good reason to celebrate on March 17 whether one is in Florida or in the Northeast or in Alaska, as the Presiding Officer certainly knows.

THE IDITAROD

Mr. President, I am here to share a little bit of Alaska. I know that the Presiding Officer will also appreciate the update on an event that we in Alaska celebrate every year and have for the past 46 years—the annual Iditarod race.

This is a sled dog race of international fame, a race that begins just outside of Anchorage, AK, and ends in Nome. It is about 1,000 miles. I think this year's southern route was 998 miles to be exact. It is one of the longest sled dog races on Earth, and it travels over some pretty interesting terrain. "Interesting" is a choice word to use as you cross mountains and frozen tundra and forests and the frozen ice. The Iditarod is, truly, a race for only the most hardy, only the best.

The Iditarod, itself, commemorates the deadly 1925 diphtheria outbreak that happened in Nome. There was no way to get the diphtheria antitoxin from the coastal area, down in Seward at the time, all the way up to Nome. This was before we had air transport as a viable option. So the real question was, How do you move this? How do you move this quickly? It was the middle of the winter. This was not a race. This was a lifesaving mission to move serum, again, 1,000-plus miles to the north to save a community. They resorted to a relay of dog sleds, of dog teams, to move that serum.

Today, the Iditarod is no longer a relay. It is a race of individual sled dog teams. Again, it is about a 1,000-mile race. It is a test of determination, certainly, of the K-9 mushers, and it is tough. It is always in the first weekend of March. At this time of year in Alaska, sometimes conditions can be pretty good—above zero. Sometimes they can be 30 degrees or 40 degrees below zero. Sometimes you can have a ground blizzard and wind conditions that move close to 80, 90, 100 miles an hour, and when you want to talk about windchill, out there, it is real; it is extreme.

This 46th annual running of the Iditarod hasn't been that challenging in terms of the cold, in terms of what they have seen in the past, but there is always some bump. There is always something that causes the race to be a

little bit different. This year, the mushers had a scheduled checkpoint on Eagle Island. This is a place where they take a mandatory 8-hour break. The game changer in the race this year was in the snow conditions. Because of the ceiling, planes could not drop food for the mushers, so they had to take this very critical checkpoint off of the board. The mushers plan all of this out in advance of the trip. They kind of know where they are going to be along the way. They plan their moves. So this was a pretty unanticipated event at the end and could have impacted it. Yet you had mushers who were pretty versatile, pretty adaptable. They took the news in stride and continued up the Yukon River toward other rest stops there.

Nicolas Petit, who had arrived in Anvik, was the frontrunner at the time. He was, like, "Ah, no big deal. My strategy is an evolving thing." Yet that evolving thing allows for, again, curve balls that get in the way. In the instance of Nicolas Petit, the frontrunner—a Girdwood musher from a place that the Presiding Officer and I frequent often and I call home—everyone was quite excited. Long story short, he lost the trail and lost the lead.

You think to yourself: Wait a minute. How can you lose the trail? This is not a NASCAR race, where you just go around the same track here. This is 1,000 miles. If it is windy, if it is blowing, if there is ground cover that you can't see through, things happen—things truly happen. On top of the harsh climate conditions that the mushers face, there are occasionally chance encounters with some wildlife. You have moose, caribou, bears, and porcupines out there, and they are all potential rendezvous for mushers around the trail.

One of the interesting headlines to come out of the Iditarod this year was a headline that read: "Iditarod Musher Chases off Bison with Ax"—an ax, yes. Marcelle Fressineau and her 14-sled dogs were between Rohn and Nikolai, and they came face-to-face with a mother bison and her calf. What do you do? You don't want your dogs to be in danger, so the tough Alaskan woman takes her ax and charges the bison and says, "Go away. Go away." Long story short, they ran away, and she continued her journey to Nome. You have to admit that people like this are ready for adventure and are full of grit and determination to succeed.

Of course, it is not just the mushers. It is the K-9 athletes. It is these dogs that, truly, are the inspiration to watch along the journey. This year's Iditarod kicked off with 67 talented, resilient competitors from all over Alaska and the world—67 dog teams.

This year, Joar Ulsom was the first musher to arrive in Nome. He came in just after 3 a.m. on Wednesday morn-

ing. He is originally from Norway, and he has been dreaming of being an Iditarod racer since he was a kid. In 2011, he relocated to Willow, AK, which is kind of our dog mushing capital of the world, and he really has made this dream a reality. He is a seasoned racer. He first completed the Yukon Quest in 2012 and has completed other races since then. He completed—he won the race in 9 days 12 hours. Again, this is not a recordbreaking time. Snow slowed things down, but think about standing on the back of a sled for 9 days 12 hours, minimal sleep, constant attention to the dogs in front of you. It is just an extraordinary story.

The newspapers are telling the story of Joar crossing the finish line in Nome. Thousands of people had gathered under the burlled arch to congratulate him. It was about 4 degrees, 3 a.m., with thousands of people out in the street. My brother and sister-in-law came all the way from Brazil to be there on the other end. It was my sister-in-law's dream of a lifetime—bucket list—to be there at the end of the Iditarod.

Joar and his team are happy, and we are very pleased for him. I offer hearty congratulations to our 2018 Iditarod champion and his team of amazing dogs.

I wish all the competitors, many of whom are still out on the trail, success and safety as they compete in this truly "Last Great Race on Earth."

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK KLEESCHULTE

Mr. President, I want to recognize a longtime member of my staff, Chuck Kleeschulte, who recently retired from the Senate. If you are from Alaska and you have ever had any dealings with the Alaska delegation, you have met or have dealt with Chuck Kleeschulte. He is held in great respect in our State as a result of the work he did for so many people back home.

It is an understatement to say we miss him already. He hasn't been gone that long, but we miss him already.

Let me share a little bit of his biography for those who were not fortunate enough to know and work with Chuck. He is an Alaskan not by birth but by choice. He moved from Ohio to Alaska in 1976 to work as a reporter at the Juneau Empire in our capital. A few years later, he became press secretary for then-Governor Jay Hammond. He followed that with a stint at the Department of Environmental Conservation and then he returned to reporting for a few more years.

Chuck first came to the Senate in 1991. He was convinced by my father Frank Murkowski, who was a Senator at the time, to move to Washington, DC, to be his press secretary. So he did. He made the move, and now 27 years later, Chuck is still part of the family here. He served as my father's communications director, a legislative assistant in my personal office, and most re-

cently as a senior adviser for the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Chuck, I think it is fair to say, is an institution within our institution. He has an encyclopedic knowledge of all things Alaska. If someone wanted to know what the vote was on a measure back in 1993 that related to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline or whatever, Chuck would be able to recall that without any notes, without any prodding, without any background. Chuck is extraordinary. He has a work ethic that is second to none.

We have a phrase that has been around for about 30 years now, and it is "Check with Chuck." Just check with Chuck because you don't need to do any fact-checking. He is it.

His legislative achievements are almost too many to name. Let me talk about some of the big-ticket Alaska items that Chuck was involved with. He was involved with responsible energy development in the 1002 area. He led this fight for us for decades as we sought to open up ANWR. He has been the lead on a lifesaving road for the good people of King Cove that we just, again, have been successful with. He has been working to build out a safer route on the Sterling Highway, a much needed timber supply in the Tongass National Forest. He wrote legislation to ensure the transfer of lands owed to Alaska, to promote the construction of an Alaska gasline, and to expand the use of renewable resources, such as hydropower, marine hydrokinetic, and geothermal. Chuck was involved with all of it.

He has been involved in so many significant accomplishments for our State, but what is equally impressive is the work Chuck did very quietly and just every day for Alaskans all over the State. Whether it was a bridge that needed repair, a light pole that had toppled over in bad weather, land use fees that had been miscalculated by a Federal agency, a land exchange for a remote community, Chuck was always there. No matter how small the problem, no matter how complicated it may be, Chuck was there to work on it.

Chuck has only been retired now for a few weeks, and the people I talk to are all asking: How is Chuck doing? Where is Chuck? They all say they are going to miss him, and I say how much I already do.

It is a comfort to know that Chuck is not going too far. He is retiring from Washington, DC, and he is moving to a beautiful little farm in Floyd, VA. Apparently there is only one spotlight in Chuck's new town, but I think Chuck is going to keep busy. His better half Tori says she wants a cow. They want to grow a little bit of hay, and there is grass to mow. There is a half-acre pond that apparently is stocked with fish. There is a barn we all volunteered to help him paint this summer. We will figure out time to do the barn painting.

To the people of Floyd, congratulations on bringing Chuck into the fold. We know the barn, the cow, the hay, the pond, the single spotlight, and the community are all very lucky to have him. I certainly was.

He spent 27 years in Congress and near double that working on behalf of Alaska in some fashion or another. Chuck's guidance and work have not only benefited me but the State and people of Alaska and the rest of our country.

My favorite part, what I loved best about Chuck is, after all he has done and all he has accomplished, he is still one of the most humble guys you will ever meet. I told him that recently, and he said: "Oh, yeah, it's easy to be humble when you have a lot to be humble about."

Chuck was just that way. He is always modest, but the example he set as a true public servant is one to emulate. He worked hard every day—every day. He made our office a better place. He helped people, and in doing so, he left some truly enormous shoes to fill.

Should anybody doubt that Chuck left a lasting impression, all we have to do is look at the single space, 50-page exit memo he wrote to give the rest of my staff, giving them updates on everything he had been working on, the status, whom to contact, what to do next. Chuck left the guidebook. He is incredibly thorough, amazingly impressive, and always appreciated.

So I want to thank Chuck Kleeschulte. Thank you. Thank you for everything you did for me, for Alaska, and for our Nation. You will always be a part of our Senate family and a beloved member of Team Murkowski. After 27 years, and on behalf of those who knew him, I wish Chuck the absolute best as he begins his very well-deserved retirement.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I want to talk for a moment about something that is on the minds of anybody in this country who is making \$60,000, \$70,000, \$80,000, \$90,000 too much to have a subsidy to pay for your healthcare insurance and maybe are paying \$15,000, \$20,000, \$25,000 of that salary for your insurance this year and who has heard from a lot of people that on October 1, the insurance companies are going to announce that your premium is going up. That is whom I would like to talk with today.

Specifically, let me use the example of a woman named Marty in Tennessee.

She came up to me before Christmas at the Chick-fil-A on Charlotte Road in Nashville, and she stopped me while I was getting my mac and cheese at Chick-fil-A, and she said: My name is Marty. I am a self-employed farmer. A few years ago, my health insurance was \$300 a month, today it is \$1,300 a month, and I cannot afford that.

Well, in Tennessee, prices for health insurance for people who work and don't get any subsidy to help them buy their insurance and don't get insurance on the job, they don't get it from Medicare or Medicaid, people who work, the self-employed farmer, the contractor, the plumber, the songwriter, somebody who might be making \$60,000, say—they are like Marty. They are paying \$20,000 for their health insurance, and they cannot afford that.

I told Marty: I think we have a Christmas present for you. I think Congress, when we pass the omnibus spending bill, is going to include in it a set of policies we have that is going to lower your rates when they are announced on October 1 of next year, which is 2018.

Well, unfortunately, we had a continuing resolution at the end of the year, and Marty didn't get her Christmas present. Then I thought she might get a Valentine's present, and we went by Valentine's Day and did another CR, a continuing resolution.

Now we have until the end of next week to fund the government for the year we are halfway through. I am on the floor today, and I can say to Marty and to every plumber, songwriter, self-employed person in this country, someone who might be between jobs, that if the Congress will act, we can lower their rates next year for up to as much as 40 percent—40 percent. That is according to Oliver Wyman, one of the leading healthcare consulting firms in this country, which announced on Monday that a set of policies which we call Alexander-Murray-Collins-Nelson, which President Trump supports, which Congressman WALDEN, who is the chairman of the House committee in this area, supports, which Senator MCCONNELL supports, which I support—we have broad support for this. This policy we have been working on for months, according to Oliver Wyman, over the next 3 years, assuming States take full advantage of all the options we are giving them, could lower rates by 40 percent.

What does that mean? That means that if you are paying \$20,000 for your health insurance—you are that \$60,000-a-year plumber—that is 40 percent of \$20,000, which, by my math, is \$8,000. So that would cut your insurance to \$12,000, and you get down toward something you might be able to afford. Can you imagine anything more frightening than approaching next year knowing that you might not be able to afford health insurance for your family? You

are thinking: Well, look, I am doing everything I am supposed to. The government has not gotten me on any kind of subsidy to buy health insurance. I am out here working. I am paying my taxes. Maybe I got a little tax cut that the Republicans put through last year, but the thing that is really a problem for me is my health insurance. If I am making \$60,000, \$70,000, \$80,000 a year, I cannot afford \$15,000, \$20,000, or \$25,000 a year.

If you are a farmer in Iowa or a miner in Alaska or a songwriter in Nashville, you can't afford that, and you shouldn't have to, and you won't have to if Congress will act next week to accept the set of policies that I am about to briefly describe.

There are three things we propose to do. The most important is 3 years of reinsurance or the invisible risk pool. This is an idea that House Republicans have strongly supported and that Senator COLLINS and Senator NELSON have strongly supported here. It would allow more States to do what the State of Alaska has done. The Presiding Officer is from Alaska. Alaska took the very sickest people in Alaska and put them in one pool and called that the reinsurance pool and paid for their health insurance. When they did that, it so reduced the cost for everybody else that it lowered the rates for everybody else by 20 percent. What we are talking about is lowering the rate for everybody else by 40 percent if States take full advantage of what we are proposing next week. So reinsurance is the first thing—3 years of reinsurance at \$10 billion a year.

The second thing is 3 years of cost-sharing subsidies. You have to stop and think about it a minute, but the cost-sharing subsidies pay for the reinsurance. Cost-sharing subsidies are payments that are made to insurance companies to pay for the copays and the deductibles for low-income people, and that allows the companies to reduce the premiums. When you reduce the premiums, you reduce the ObamaCare subsidies.

According to conversations we have had with the Congressional Budget Office, if we do 3 years of cost-sharing subsidies and 3 years of reinsurance at \$10 billion, the cost-sharing subsidies more than pay for the reinsurance, if you base it on reality, which is, if Congress passes a law that costs \$30 billion over 3 years for reinsurance and 3 years of cost-sharing subsidies, the cost-sharing subsidies pay for the reinsurance and leave \$2 billion over to reduce the Federal debt.

The third part is a set of proposals that would give States more flexibility. This streamlines the section 1332 waiver in the Affordable Care Act. It makes some changes that permit the agency we call CMS to approve waivers from States, like the State of Alaska or Nebraska or Tennessee, which may

say: We would like to spend our ObamaCare subsidy money in a different way, and we would like to add some of this reinsurance money to it. By doing that, that is how you achieve the 40-percent savings for the Nebraska self-employed farmer or the Nashville songwriter in their insurance policies.

So that is the set of proposals, plus within there is a provision for what we call a catastrophic policy, which is a policy that has somewhat higher deductibles but lower premiums, which people may choose to buy.

All of that policy has broad bipartisan support. I think the reinsurance provision—in the Republican discussions we have had in the Senate, almost everybody seems to agree that the only way we can have an individual market, which is the market for people who buy insurance on their own—people who don't get it from Medicare, people who don't get it from Medicaid, people who don't get it on the job—let's say you are between jobs or you are self-employed. You are the songwriter. You are the plumber. Those are the people whom we are focused on here. There are about 11 million in the United States, but there could be a lot more because all of us know what it is like to think, well, I might lose my job, or, I might change jobs, and what do I do for insurance in the interim? I have the so-called COBRA available, but it is very expensive. If I suddenly find I am losing my job or if I am changing jobs and I am worrying about insurance—that is the person we are talking about.

Where did these ideas come from? Did we just write them on the back of an envelope and give them to Congress? No. We went through a very serious process here in the Senate. Senator MURRAY, the ranking Democrat on the Senate HELP Committee—I am the chairman—and I held four hearings last fall after Republicans failed to repeal and replace the ObamaCare law. We invited all Senators to participate. We had more than half the Senate come to our hearings and to our meetings with the witnesses. Out of that came the proposals to streamline the 1332 waiver—that is flexibility for States—and the need to pay for the cost-sharing subsidies temporarily, because people began to understand that they don't cost money, but they save taxpayer money because they reduce the need for Federal taxpayer subsidies. So that is where that came from.

The single most important idea that was not a part of the original Alexander-Murray proposal was reinsurance. In the House, they call it the invisible risk pool. Senators COLLINS and NELSON have championed it here. Representative COSTELLO, Representative MEADOWS, and other people championed it over there. It was part of the Republican repeal-and-replace legislation in the House of Representatives.

So the idea of 3 years of reinsurance really has come from both bodies and from both sides of the aisle. It is the most essential part of any long-term policy to create an individual market where people can buy insurance if they don't get it on the job or from the government.

This would give States half a billion dollars in the current year, 2018, to plan for their reinsurance pools. It would then create \$10 billion over 3 years that States could use to help pay for their reinsurance pools, and they would use their 1332 streamlined waiver in the second and third year. So they could have a combination of State money, reinsurance Federal money, and ObamaCare subsidy money and hopefully, in that process, create their own way of helping to pay for the needs of the very sickest people in the State and, by taking them out of the insurance pool, lower the rates for everybody else over that 4-year period, according to the Oliver Wyman consulting firm, by as much as 40 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office has also reviewed the set of proposals I have just described. My staff has been working closely with them because we want to know what it costs if we are going to put it in the omnibus bill, and the preliminary feedback from the Congressional Budget Office is more conservative than the Oliver Wyman estimate. The Congressional Budget Office says that it would reduce premiums by an average of 10 percent in 2019 and 20 percent in 2020 and 2021 if States take full advantage of the 1332 waiver they have.

As you can imagine, State Governors and State insurance commissioners are delighted with this package. First, they like to see us do something in a bipartisan way to stabilize the health insurance market so people aren't scared to death that they may not be able to buy a policy next year, but second, they think it is sound policy. It is sound policy.

Much of this started when the President called me last August and said: Between now and the time we make a final decision on what to do about the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, I want to make sure that people aren't hurt. So he asked me if I would work with Senator MURRAY and see if we could come up with a bipartisan set of proposals that would stabilize the individual market. He called me several times about that, and we have worked together since then. That is when we came together with the original Alexander-Murray proposal.

Then we had a big disagreement here within the Senate, and we had our tax bill wherein we repealed the individual mandate in the Affordable Care Act. Republicans thought that was a good idea. It made people buy insurance they didn't want, and it was a tax on low-income people, so we got rid of it. Democrats didn't like that at all.

It is true that taking the individual mandate out, even though States could add it back if they want to, does increase the cost of insurance in the individual market. Despite that, this set of policies that I have described—State flexibility, the 3 years of cost-sharing subsidies, and the 3 years of reinsurance/invisible risk pools—those three policies, according to Oliver Wyman consulting, which is one of the leading health consulting firms in America, could lower rates to 40 percent lower than they otherwise would be. According to the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan agency that looks at things for us, it will lower them 10 percent in 2019 and as much as 20 percent in the next 2 years after that. Even if it is only 20 and not 40, 20 percent of \$20,000 is \$4,000 for Marty, the self-employed farmer in Nashville who stopped me at Chick-fil-A and said her insurance had gone from \$300 to \$1,300, \$1,400 a month.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Oliver Wyman consulting company that says that the combination of policies I just described—reinsurance, cost-sharing subsidies, and the section 1332 waiver, which is the State flexibility—that those three policies will reduce rates by up to 40 percent.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLIVER WYMAN REPORT: A PROPOSAL TO LOWER ACA PREMIUMS BY MORE THAN 40% AND COVER 3.2 MILLION MORE

(By Tammy Tomczyk, FSA, FCA, MAAA, Partner, Oliver Wyman Actuarial Consulting, and Kurt Gesa, FSA, MAAA, Practice Leader, Oliver Wyman Actuarial Consulting)

In our December 9, 2017 article, we analyzed the effects of a proposal the US Senate was considering to fund cost-sharing reduction (CSR) payments and appropriate \$5 billion in 2019 and 2020 for states to establish reinsurance programs to stabilize their individual insurance markets. We discussed how pass-through savings could provide reinsurance coverage equal to roughly \$15 billion in protection for high-cost claimants, and how this protection, combined with CSR funding, would bring more people into the individual market and lower premiums by over 20 percent.

More recent congressional attention is focusing on a proposal that includes an extension of CSRs and a reinsurance program in 2019, 2020, and 2021, funded with a \$10 billion appropriation in each year, with federal fallback option available to states in 2019. The federal fallback option would likely be based on—and use the federal infrastructure built to administer—the Transitional Reinsurance Program in place from 2014 through 2016.

Our healthcare microsimulation model, used to understand this package's likely effects on the market, assumed states would use federal pass-through savings under Section 1332 of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to supplement and leverage the \$10 billion the considered legislation would authorize and appropriate each year. Pass-through savings result from the fact that the premium subsidies available under the ACA cover the difference between the second lowest cost silver

plan available in a rating area and a fixed percentage of a household's income, varying only by federal poverty level (FPL). Lower premiums result directly in lower premium subsidies, and under a Section 1332 waiver, these savings from lower premiums may be used to provide additional reinsurance.

In our modeling, we are presuming that states will take advantage of these pass-through savings in 2019. In reality, states that have not already begun working on a waiver will be challenged to get a 1332 waiver filed and approved under the current regulatory regime in time to impact 2019 premiums. The current regulatory regime includes a requirement that a state enact enabling legislation, develop an application, hold public hearings during a 30-day public comment period, and submit the application to the US Health and Human Services (HHS). HHS then undertakes a two-step review process that can span up to 225 days—up to 45 days for a completeness determination followed by up to 180 days for review. But even those states unable to get a waiver in place for 2019 would still benefit from that year's federal fallback program.

Therefore, we estimate, under the assumptions described above, that an additional 3.2 million people will be covered in the non-group market, and the proposal would result in premiums that are at least 40 percent lower than they would have been without the proposal in place, across all metal levels. In those states that are not able to obtain a 1332 waiver and take advantage of pass-through savings for 2019, we estimate that premium would decline by more than 20 percent across all metal levels. Those estimates include an average 10 percent reduction due to the funding of CSRs, with the remaining reduction coming from the reinsurance program.

As a note, our modeling reflects elimination of the mandate penalty, but does not consider the proposed regulation's likely effects on association health plans or on short-term, limited duration coverage.

REPORT: INDIVIDUAL INSURANCE PREMIUMS NEXT YEAR 40% LOWER UNDER ALEXANDER-MURRAY, COLLINS-NELSON THAN IF CONGRESS DOESN'T ACT

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Health care experts at Oliver Wyman released an analysis today showing that the passage of a proposal based on the Alexander-Murray Bipartisan Health Care Stabilization Act and the Collins-Nelson Lower Premiums Through Reinsurance Act will lower premiums, compared to what people in the individual market will pay if Congress doesn't act, by more than 40 percent in the individual market and provide insurance coverage to an additional 3.2 million individuals.

Oliver Wyman based its analysis on a proposal that would fund CSRs—temporary payments to reduce out-of-pocket costs for low-income Americans in the individual market—and provide \$10 billion annually for invisible risk pool/reinsurance funding in 2019, 2020, and 2021. It also factored in increased flexibility for states that seek to use waivers under Section 1332 of the Affordable Care Act. The analysis applies to ACA-compliant plans in the individual market, both on and off the exchange.

"This analysis from the experts at Oliver Wyman further demonstrates that our bipartisan proposals will help drive down premiums in the individual market and make health insurance more affordable for millions of Americans," said Senators Lamar Alexander, the Chairman of the HELP Committee, and Susan Collins.

From the experts at Oliver Wyman:

"Therefore, we estimate . . . that an additional 3.2 million people will be covered in the non-group market, and the proposal would result in premiums that are at least 40 percent lower than they would have been without the proposal in place . . ."

The analysis found that the lower rates would benefit all plan levels on the exchanges.

The analysis was performed by consulting firm Oliver Wyman. On its website, Oliver Wyman describes itself as "a global leader in management consulting. With offices in 50+ cities across nearly 30 countries, Oliver Wyman combines deep industry knowledge with specialized expertise in strategy, operations, risk management, and organization transformation. The firm has more than 4,700 professionals around the world who help clients optimize their business, improve their operations and risk profile, and accelerate their organizational performance to seize the most attractive opportunities."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Finally, I would ask the question, What if we don't do this? I am generally a very optimistic person. I am results-oriented, and you don't get results if you don't work across party lines and if you don't think you are going to succeed. So I always think we will succeed. This has been more difficult to do than it should have been.

I would like to suggest to my colleagues and to the American people that we should focus on October 1 of this year because that is the date when insurance rates for next year, 2019, will be announced all across the country. Insurance companies are working with insurance commissioners in every State to try to figure out what is going to happen, what the rates will be. They will be announcing rates on October 1, which is about a month before the next election.

There a lot of people who are going to be looking at that because, in my State of Tennessee, rates were up 58 percent this year, and that is for the plumber who makes \$60,000 a year; the songwriter; Marty, the farmer; and the people I have been describing. There was a 58-percent increase. So they are going to be looking on October 1 to see whether they can even afford any insurance in 2019.

If we do what we are proposing here in the Alexander-Murray-Collins-Nelson set of policies, which has broad bipartisan support in the House and the Senate and the support of the President, if we do that next week, Marty, the self-employed farmer in Tennessee, will be able to see on October 1 that her rates will go down and that, if Oliver Wyman is correct, instead of her rates going up 58 percent the way they did this year, they will go down 40 percent over the next 2 or 3 years. That means she could afford insurance.

If we don't do it, rates will go up, and the individual market will probably collapse. It was near collapse a year ago. By collapsing, I mean there will be counties where people can't buy insurance at all. There will be 11 million

people who are between jobs, who are self-employed, or who are working who literally cannot afford insurance, and they are not going to be very happy campers. They are going to blame every one of us, and they should. They are going to blame the President, they are going to blame Republicans, they are going to blame Democrats, and they are going to blame insurance companies because we have an opportunity next week to solve that problem in a bipartisan way, developed through a bipartisan process, incorporating ideas that virtually everyone who looks at them says make very good policy sense.

We have a couple of things to work through on ancillary issues, but those shouldn't cloud the fact that we can reduce rates by up to 40 percent for the working Americans who can't afford insurance—the insurance companies will announce that on October 1—or we can do nothing, and we can let the markets falter.

There will be some counties where you can't buy insurance at all, some counties where you can't afford insurance at all, and we will have people look at us and say: My goodness, why did we send them up there to do nothing about that?

I am optimistic. I think we can do it. I appreciate the hard work on both sides of the aisle. In many respects, it has been a very difficult negotiation. I appreciate the President's consistency over the past couple of months in supporting this and the Vice President's work. Senator MCCONNELL has been very supportive of this, which makes it very helpful in terms of getting it into the bipartisan agreement next week.

I look forward to being able to say to my songwriters, self-employed business men and women, plumbers, and Marty, the farmer, that if they are making \$60,000 or \$70,000 in Tennessee, we put in place something that will lower their rates by 40 percent over the next 3 years.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFERRED ENFORCED DEPARTURE FOR LIBERIAN REFUGEES

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise, as I have many times for nearly two decades, to shed light on the long struggle of Liberian refugees in the United States, and to make the case for this administration to extend Deferred Enforced Departure, or DED, for this population before they face potential separation from their jobs and families when their current DED designation expires on March 31.

I also call on my colleagues to take up and pass the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act, which I offered in some form for as long as I have served in this body, to end nearly 30 years of uncertainty by finally giving these Liberians the opportunity to apply for permanent residency and a pathway to citizenship.

I also would like to take a moment to express my gratitude to those advocates who have stood with me as I have worked for a solution for Liberians in America, including my Rhode Island colleague, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, as well as our colleagues from Minnesota, Senators KLOBUCHAR and SMITH.

The case of these Liberians is a tragic and historically unique situation. In 1989, a seven-year civil war broke out in Liberia that would claim the lives of over 200,000 people and displace more than half of the Liberian population. This conflict devastated Liberia—halting food production, collapsing the nation's economy, and destroying its infrastructure. By 1991, an estimated 14,000 Liberians fled to the United States seeking refuge from the conflict. In March of that year, the Attorney General granted them the opportunity to register for temporary protected status, or TPS.

Every subsequent administration has renewed TPS for Liberians each year until the end of the first civil war, but the prospects for a safe return ended when Liberia plunged into a second civil war from 1999 to 2003. This horrific conflict ended with the departure from power of former President Charles Taylor, who is currently serving a fifty-year prison sentence, issued by the Special Court for Sierra Leone, for war crimes.

In 2014, Liberia's still poverty-stricken and recovering infrastructure faced the challenge of responding to the Ebola virus outbreak in West Africa. Liberia had fewer than 200 licensed doctors to contend with the outbreak among the country's population of over 4 million people.

Throughout this succession of conflict and tragedy, Liberians who sought refuge in the United States have had the option to remain here lawfully under TPS or DED while conditions remained unstable in Liberia.

This is not amnesty. In order to participate, these Liberians are required to pass periodic background investigations, pay hundreds of dollars in fees, and stay out of trouble with the law. Many of these Liberians who have been through this process for decades are perhaps among the most vetted and rigorously examined individuals in the United States today.

They have also received work authorizations, enabling them to work and start businesses, pay taxes, and raise families. Many have full-grown American citizen children who attend Amer-

ican schools and serve in our military. At the same time, they have not been afforded earned benefits available to American citizens, so they are responsible for paying their taxes, they are responsible to conduct themselves as law-abiding citizens, but they are not building up any type of Social Security benefits or any other benefits like other American workers are. In the years since 1989, they have become our neighbors, our friends, and an important community that contributes a great deal to the diversity and prosperity of States like Rhode Island.

Today, Liberia has only just completed its first democratic transfer of power in decades, and there are still serious concerns about the Nation's ability to maintain peace and deliver essential services to its population.

If the Trump administration fails to extend the DED deadline for Liberians, hundreds of Liberian American families could be separated and uprooted from their jobs and homes, and forced to return to a country that is unrecognizable to them. Moreover, at best, it is unclear how Liberia's recovery could be affected by a sudden and unexpected influx of newcomers from the United States.

This is why, each time Congress has taken up comprehensive immigration reform—and more recently discussed these issues in the context of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, Program—I have worked to ensure that any adjustment of status provision includes relief for Liberians who have become Americans in every way except on paper. Congress continues to debate the best path forward for Dreamers, TPS recipients, and comprehensive immigration reform, but Liberians cannot wait another month or another year. They have just over 2 weeks before their time is up.

At the very least, the Trump administration should extend DED for this population for 3 additional years while Congress debates a path forward on comprehensive immigration reform.

In my view, with each year that has passed since the first of these Liberians arrived, the case has grown stronger that they should have the option to adjust their status and remain in the communities where they have made their homes and raised their families. We have long since reached the point where simple justice requires that Congress extend this option to these Liberians.

On several occasions, Congress has granted temporary residents the opportunity to apply for permanent residency when their stays in the United States were prolonged by dangerous conditions in their home countries. In 1988, Congress passed a law offering permanent residency to temporary residents from Poland, Uganda, Afghanistan, and Ethiopia. Following the events in Tiananmen Square in China,

Congress permitted over 52,000 Chinese nationals to apply for permanent residency. The Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act, or NACARA, permitted the same for 259,000 nationals of Nicaragua, Cuba, El Salvador, and Guatemala. The Syrian Adjustment Act permitted 2,000 Syrian Jews to obtain permanent residency. The list goes on. The fact is that there is ample precedent for providing relief for this relatively small Liberian population. Like past Congresses, this Congress must acknowledge the simple fact that the United States is now home to these law-abiding and tax-paying Liberians. To ignore them or to say otherwise not only threatens to break up American families, but also to turn away a group whose story is quintessentially American. They fled violence and disease to come here. They worked hard and raised families here. They followed our laws and subjected themselves to rigorous screening and vetting. They deserve the opportunity to make their own decision on whether to stay here or return to Liberia.

I can say with confidence that Rhode Island will feel their absence if this Liberian community were forced to leave after contributing to our communities for so long, and our country would be poorer for their loss.

There are many examples I could discuss of how the Liberian community has enriched our State, but I will name two: Lance Corporal Abraham Tarwoe of the U.S. Marines and Providence Police Sergeant Maxwell Dorley. Both came to Rhode Island from Liberia to start their own chapters of the American dream. They both led exemplary lives and endeavored to give back to their newfound homes through public service in the form of military service and as a member of our local police force in Providence. Both of them served with distinction, and our State tragically lost both of them in the line of duty in 2012. They are emblematic of the extraordinary contributions that Liberians have made to my State, and no fulsome discussion of what Liberians have meant to us is complete without mentioning both of these gentlemen by name.

I strongly urge President Trump to do the right thing and extend DED to Liberians living legally in the United States. I also urge my colleagues to take up and pass the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act and put an end to uncertainty for this population after decades of displacement.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I come to the floor today for a number of reasons, but first and most pressing is to call on and ask the administration to extend deferred enforced departure status for a group of Liberians. This is a unique situation. Senator JACK REED was on the floor in the last hour talking about it as well.

Both the State of Rhode Island and the State of Minnesota have a number of Liberians who didn't just come to this country—they didn't come to this country illegally—they came to this country decades ago. They came because of a civil war in their country of Liberia, and then after that war was basically resolved, they were allowed to stay. So they are all registered in this country, they are working legally in this country, and they are in a special status called deferred enforced departure.

Ever since George H.W. Bush, Presidents—Democrats and Republicans; George Bush, of course, President Clinton, and President Obama—every one has allowed them to stay.

As my colleagues can imagine, since this happened back in 1991, these are people who have been working in our country for decades now. I met one who is 65 years old. Some of them are now 70 years old. They have obeyed the law. They have paid their taxes. They tend to be working in a lot of—of course, consistently—working in our assisted living facilities in Minnesota. They are working in our hospitals. Some of them had healthcare experience in Liberia before they came to Minnesota. They are a thriving community that has integrated well into our State and into Rhode Island. We are a State where the unemployment rate is somewhere around 3 percent and even lower in some of the areas where this community is working. It would literally be a big jolt to our economy—and not to mention immoral—if they were suddenly deported and lost the legal status they have had for literally decades.

Unlike some of the other things we talk about with people who maybe just came here—and I worked so hard on the Dreamers, to get them a path to citizenship—this is a pretty unique situation. We hope the administration will be practical about this. That is why Senator REED and I are working on this issue. We hope to get it resolved quickly since their status is ending on March 31, which is just a few weeks from now.

Liberians are the only group of people and it is the only country with deferred enforced departure—or DED, as it is known—which is a temporary legal status that requires the President to reauthorize it every 18 months.

One idea is that the President could reauthorize it, and then they could look into it more. As we know, there is

a lot going on in our country. There are a lot of changes right now within the Office of the Secretary of State and other things. So one idea would be that they could simply allow the program to continue for 18 months and then come to a conclusion on what they think they should do about it.

As I mentioned, in 1991, President George H.W. Bush first issued temporary protected status to Liberians in response to the nation's civil war. Since 1991, Presidents on both sides of the aisle have extended legal protection to Liberians in the United States under either TPS or DED—deferred enforced departure—because of civil wars, the Ebola outbreak, and other instabilities in their country. All Liberians covered by DED have been living in the United States since 2002. This isn't, as I said, new people coming in under that status; these are people who have been living here with that status for decades. As I mentioned, some are now in their seventies, and all of them have lived here legally. They have paid their taxes and contributed to our communities and worked at our employers. If DED is not extended by March 31, they will lose their legal status and work authorization and face deportation.

Minnesota, as I mentioned, has one of the largest Liberian populations in the country. Many of these people are business owners. They are teachers. They are healthcare workers. According to one organization, nearly 40 percent of Liberians in Minnesota work in our nursing homes as nursing assistants and other support staff. Imagine if we took thousands of people away just like that on March 31, because they wouldn't have legal status to work at the nursing homes where they have worked for decades.

I have also called for action on the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act—a bill that Senator REED has introduced every Congress since 1999—and I have cosponsored this bill. The bill would actually provide permanent protected status, including a path to citizenship, for those Liberians who have obeyed the law and have been here in this temporary status for decades.

That is not what we are asking for today. We understand and we hope that negotiations are ongoing so that we can have a more comprehensive immigration bill. We are simply asking the administration to continue with the 18-month status that was started back in 1991 by a Republican President.

I met with a number of members of our Liberian community yesterday. They are experiencing extreme fear right now that their livelihoods will be lost and their families will be ripped apart. I am hopeful that we will be able to resolve this, at least for that temporary 18-month period.

SUPPORT OUR MILITARY SPOUSES ACT

Secondly, Madam President, on a different topic, I want to take a moment

to discuss a bipartisan bill that I introduced this week that would help reduce the burden of relocation for military families.

When servicemembers relocate to comply with military orders, they and their families make sacrifices to help protect our Nation. Right now, there is a problem with the way the law treats some military spouses who make frequent moves, and the law, ironically, makes it even harder on them rather than easier on them.

Current law allows Active-Duty servicemembers to maintain one State of legal residence for tax and voting purposes even when military orders require them to relocate. That makes moving a lot easier. Unfortunately, this convenience does not apply to a servicemember's spouse unless they were living together at the same residence before they got married. In other words, if you were not living with your servicemember before you got married, you have to establish residency every single time your family gets moving orders from the military. From filing taxes to registering to vote, a military family then has double the paperwork and stress each time they move.

This is a loophole that must be fixed. Why would we make it harder for the spouses of those who are making a sacrifice by having their loved one serve overseas and not make it easier for them to vote and to pay their taxes and to basically be the citizen they deserve to be? That is why, on Tuesday, Senators CORNYN, KAINE, KENNEDY, MANCHIN, and I introduced the Support Our Military Spouses Act—legislation that would ensure that spouses have the same residency protections regardless of their living arrangements before marriage. From titling a car, to filing taxes, to registering to vote, everything is a little easier when the law ensures that you can stay a resident of one State and that it is the same State as your spouse's. That is just common sense, and it cuts out a lot of redtape for military families.

The bill has the support of the Military Spouses Network, the Military Officers Association of America, and the Council of State Governments. This bill passed the House in July of 2017 with bipartisan support, and I am going to work with my cosponsors to get it done in the Senate.

We ask a lot of our military members and their families. When we can make life easier for them, we should. This is one simple thing we can do.

HONEST ADS ACT

Finally, Madam President, I would like to mention the sanctions that were just announced against Russia for interfering in the 2016 election. It took 14 months, multiple indictments, and a poisoning in Britain, but the administration is finally imposing sanctions—the same sanctions that were passed by the Senate 98 to 2 and 419 to 3 in the House last year.

Sanctioning Russia for undermining our democracy is what we should do, but we must remember that it is not enough to protect ourselves from future attacks. There is no longer any doubt that our elections will continue to be a target for foreign adversaries. Intelligence reports make it clear that Russia used covert cyber attacks, espionage, and harmful propaganda to attack our political system.

Trump administration officials—not Obama officials, Trump intelligence officials—continue to sound the alarm that Russia is continuing its efforts to attack our democracy. The CIA Director said that he has seen no signs that Russia has decreased its activity and that Russia is currently working to disrupt the upcoming 2018 elections. National Intelligence Director Coats, who was once a Senator here, said that Russia is bolder.

It would be a mistake to think the sanctions passed today are all we need to do to address these warnings. They will no doubt help because if you do nothing, then you just embolden them to do more. It is the policy of the United States to defend against and respond to cyber threats to our democratic system, and we need to start acting like it. We need to be as sophisticated as those who are trying to do us harm.

We know that Russia attempted to hack into 21 States' election systems. In Illinois, they actually got into the voter data system. That is why Senator LANKFORD and I have led a bill to take an amount of money which is just 3 percent of one aircraft carrier and invest it in our States, to let them, on a decentralized basis, make their own decisions about the kind of equipment they want and to be able to upgrade it. Forty of our States have not upgraded their equipment in 10 years. Ten of our States do not even have backup paper ballots. What would happen if they were hacked, as they got so close the last time? There would be no way to prove what actually happened. You would have to vote again.

That is why we have Democrats and Republicans supporting this effort. Representative MARK MEADOWS, the head of the Freedom Caucus, is leading the bill that Senator GRAHAM and I have—which is similar to the one I have with Senator LANKFORD—over in the House. Senator COONS from the Appropriations Committee has been a strong supporter of this effort, as have Senator KAMALA HARRIS, Senator GRAHAM, and a number of other people. This is a truly bipartisan effort because people understand that it is no longer going to be only traditional ways of warfare when we are attacked; it is going to be cyber. It is not going to be just election infrastructure. It is not going to be just government infrastructure. It is going to be our businesses, power companies—you name it.

That is why we need to upgrade our cyber protection.

The last thing I would mention on this front, as we look to the next election and how we are going to protect our democracy, is the Honest Ads Act. This is a bill I have with Senator MCCAIN, also cosponsored by Senator WARNER, the ranking member of the Senate Intelligence Committee. This is based on the fact that we know Russia spent millions of dollars buying ads. That was reflected in the indictment of 13 Russians and what they did and how they plotted to disrupt elections and to spend money on political ads. A number of these ads were even purchased in rubles.

What Senator MCCAIN and Senator WARNER and I are trying to do is simply apply the same rules already in place to protect Americans in our elections by making sure that we know who is paying for the ads and what those ads are. Who is paying for the ads—those are the simple disclaimers you see on the ads where they say, whoever the candidate is, I paid for this ad. Who discloses the ads—that is simply when any radio station or TV station—you can go into the station or see it online and see what the ads are. That is not true right now of some of the most sophisticated companies, if not the most sophisticated companies, in America, companies like Facebook and Twitter, which have made millions and billions of dollars, companies that are profiting off of political ads.

It is no different from when a newspaper or a TV station allows someone to buy an ad. They make money off it, so it is their duty to protect the citizens, to make sure that the ads don't contain falsehoods, that the ads are not criminal, that the ads are known to everyone. That is all we are trying to do, is to apply the same rules of the game to what you see when you see political ads on issues or candidate ads.

The FEC did something just yesterday—but it was very narrow—about candidate ads. So what you see on candidate ads and issue ads—that you also see those same disclaimers and, most importantly, the disclosure on ads that are on social media companies. And I use those words carefully—"media companies." Newspaper print and radio—we love them—are media companies. Facebook and Twitter—we love them—are media companies. We are not talking about recipes and cat videos. We are not talking about free stuff that people put up. We are talking about paid political ads that need to be treated the same.

While we are pleased that these sanctions have been put in place, while it is good that the FEC is narrowly trying to do something within their jurisdiction about disclaimers on candidate ads, we must pass the Honest Ads Act, because if we think it was bad last election when \$1.4 billion was spent on

election ads, try this next one out: Forecasts are that \$3 billion to \$4 billion is going to be spent on social media ads against candidates on issues, and there is no way to track it. It is just going to go out to your Facebook page. You are not going to know if it is true, you are not going to know who paid for it, and the ads will just vanish.

I think Americans deserve something better, and I ask my colleagues to support the Honest Ads Act.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I particularly appreciate, in light of my comments in a moment, Senator KLOBUCHAR's service. She has been a pioneer as the first woman Senator from Minnesota. And I believe the Presiding Officer, Senator FISCHER, is the first female Senator from Nebraska.

TRIBUTE TO MARCY KAPTUR

Madam President, I rise today to honor my colleague and my longtime close friend, MARCY KAPTUR. MARCY KAPTUR serves down the hall on the other side of the building. She has dedicated her life to serving the people of Toledo and northern Ohio.

This Sunday, she will make history. She will officially become the longest serving woman in the history of the U.S. Congress in either House. On Sunday, she will have served in the House of Representatives for 35 years, 2 months, and 18 days, breaking a record that was set in 1960 by I believe a Massachusetts Congresswoman. For 3½ decades, she has been principled and she has been passionate about her family, her community, and our country, and she has advocated for Ohioans. She serves like nobody else.

She is the granddaughter of Polish immigrants. That is important to her. She comes from a working-class family. That is important to her. She is a practicing Roman Catholic. That is important to her. That describes much of who MARCY is—Polish immigrant, working-class family, Catholic faith.

Her father was a trucker and auto-worker who became a small businessman. Her mother worked at the Champion spark plug factory, where, of course, she helped to organize a union. I say "of course" because of MARCY's not just understanding of the importance of the labor movement but her feeling it in her bones, that a unionized workforce is good for those workers, good for the company, and good for the community, and we need more of that.

MARCY's story echoes that of so many of our generation. Her parents worked hard. With the help of a union card, they earned their way to a better life for MARCY and her brother. She became the first in her family to graduate from high school and then college, and then she ended up in the U.S. Congress. What a great country we live in.

MARCY has never forgotten those roots. If you want to know one thing

about MARCY KAPTUR—who, as I said, works down the hall at the other end of the building—know that she has never forgotten her roots. That is what drives her. That is who she is. That is why she is such a terrific public servant. That is why she is going to break the record of 35 years, 2 months, and 15 days. She remembers her roots in Ohio's Polish and Ukrainian communities and how much they matter.

Unemployment reached 19 percent in Toledo in the early Reagan years when MARCY first ran for office. She said it was “the condition of working people that drove me to change my life and run for office.” She has lived up to that ideal, fighting for working families in Ohio for every one of the nearly 13,000 days she has served in Congress.

In my first year in the House, MARCY was a mentor to me. I worked with her to fight against the North American Free Trade Agreement. She showed me the way in understanding these trade agreements because she knew they would mean job losses in Ohio. She knew these trade agreements would push down wages. That is sort of the untold story—something I don't think the President quite understands when he talks about NAFTA even though he is right that NAFTA was bad for our country. What NAFTA has done, which MARCY explained to me and understood for 25 years, is NAFTA also pushed down wages and is one of the reasons working-class Americans, whether they are in Omaha or Cleveland, so often don't get a raise. Unfortunately, MARCY was right.

Since then, as we have fought bad trade deal after bad trade deal, MARCY has been a reliable ally and leader in our fight for a trade policy that puts workers in Toledo and everywhere else in this country first.

We have also worked together to protect another very important love of MARCY KAPTUR's, and that is our greatest natural resource, Lake Erie. We fought for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. We joined with Senator PORTMAN on a bipartisan basis to stop the President's all but elimination of the—why would the President of the United States want to stop our cleanup of Lake Erie? That is why MARCY steps up. She works to protect the lake from invasive Asian carp; she works with farmers to prevent runoff into Lake Erie—all to protect the lake. It is what the lake means to us in terms of drinking water, jobs, commercialism, commercial development, and people just enjoying the beauty of the lake.

She has gone to bat time and again for the auto industry. When some called the auto industry dead, she fought back. Never bet against American workers. Never bet against the American auto industry. Never bet against MARCY KAPTUR. That scrappy, fighting spirit is one of the qualities I love most about Ohio, and you find it in abundance in MARCY KAPTUR.

No one fights harder for people in her district. Because of absurd redistricting, her district now goes from Toledo all across northern Ohio, only a few miles wide along the lake, all the way to the city of Cleveland. In only 5 years, the people of Cleveland have gained the same affection for MARCY as the people from Toledo have. You can see the love and respect they have.

I remember once going to a rally in Toledo for President Obama. People were excited to see him, of course. I guess a few people may have noticed I was there too. But when MARCY walked in, someone screamed “MARCY,” and there was pandemonium. Everyone got to their feet as if a rock star had just taken the stage, because in Toledo, a rock star had taken the stage.

She fights for the people of Ohio. She fights for her district. She fights. She is known, more than anything, as a fighter for working families. It is so fitting that she reaches this milestone during Women's History Month. When she first joined the House, there were fewer than two dozen women serving. She helped blaze a trail for others. She even told the stories of the women who paved the way for her in her book “Women of Congress: A Twentieth Century Odyssey.”

Having MARCY in Congress matters for so many reasons. It matters for the hundreds of thousands of Ohioans she serves. It matters for the perspective she brings as the daughter of working-class parents. As I said, she was first in her family not just to go to college; she was first in her family to graduate from high school, right in the industrialized heartland.

As in Nebraska, Madam President, it matters to the little girls in Toledo, who for 35 years—do you know how, when you are in school, there is often a map or a chart of the Presidents? There was a calendar in Brinkerhoff Grade School when I was a little kid in Mansfield, OH. Every year, there was a calendar with all the Presidents' pictures on it. When I was in school, all the Presidents looked alike. Some had whiskers; some didn't. But they all looked alike because they were all White guys. Right? That changed in 2008. I was hoping it would change in 2016. It didn't. That is beside the point.

MARCY KAPTUR—because she is the Congresswoman for Toledo, little girls growing up in Toledo since 1982 have realized there is someone to look up to. In Scottsbluff and in Lincoln and in Kearny, NE, they will now look up to having a woman Senator from Nebraska. Ohio has never had a woman Senator or woman Governor, but they have had MARCY KAPTUR. That has mattered to little girls for 35 years, as they see a picture of their Representative in the local paper, the Toledo Blade. It is not just another man in a suit but someone who looks more like them, someone they can grow up to be.

I want to thank MARCY. She is not in the building now, but I want to thank MARCY for her service to Ohio. I hope we get to keep working with MARCY KAPTUR for another couple of decades. The voters would have to approve that, but I am hopeful that we will.

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL PETRI

Madam President, I also want to talk about somebody else who is sitting in this Chamber who will continue, as her career advances, to be a role model for the people of this country and the people of her community. A daughter of Eastern Ohio, Rachel Petri has done communications work for me for a number of years.

She is leaving our office to, of course, return to her home State of Ohio. She has been a joy to work with. She has been a pleasure to work with. She is so smart and so committed, with an incredible work ethic. I am honored that she has spent part of her life working with me in our office in Washington, DC, and I thank her for her service.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING NEBRASKA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST
THEIR LIVES IN COMBAT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to continue my tribute to Nebraska's heroes: the current generation of men and women who lost their lives defending our freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan. Each of these Nebraskans has a special story to tell.

SERGEANT LONNIE “CALVIN” ALLEN, JR.

Today, Mr. President, I will recall the life and service of Sergeant Lonnie “Calvin” Allen, Jr., a native of Bellevue, NE.

Calvin grew up in a military family. His father, Lonnie Allen, Sr., was a senior master sergeant in the Air Force. When Lonnie Sr. was assigned to Offutt Air Force Base in Bellevue, both he and his wife Sallie thought they would be there only for a short time. However, they enjoyed “the good life,” and soon after the birth of their two sons, Nuru and Calvin, they decided to stay.

As a young child, Calvin spent much of his time in the kitchen. His mother still talks about how Calvin learned to cook at the age of 5. Sallie has vivid memories of Calvin in the kitchen in the early mornings or on the weekends, experimenting with new recipes or dishes. There were times when she would still be in bed and Calvin would bring her food or a new dish to try. She said that he was always open to trying new things, whether it was in the kitchen or elsewhere. This also pertained to sports, where Calvin played

basketball and football, ran track, and wrestled.

Calvin also had a caring attitude, which extended to church on Sundays. Calvin was widely known amongst the congregation at Mount Carmel Baptist Church in Bellevue. He often volunteered to be an usher and displayed his musical talent in the choir. Calvin had a personal and very open relationship with God, and he happily shared it with everyone he met.

Throughout his high school years at Bellevue East, Calvin spent much of his time with friends and family. Sallie recalled many video game parties and sleepovers at their house, which would end with many of Calvin's friends sprawled out on the Allen living room floor.

Calvin was a member of a close-knit family who spent time playing games together. Whether it was card games or board games, the competitive spirit would always come out in the Allen boys. They loved to compete.

After graduating from Bellevue East in 1998, Calvin enrolled at Northeastern Junior College in Sterling, CO, to study criminal justice. He long envisioned a career in law enforcement and thought this would be a good starting point for him to launch his career.

After completing 2 years at Northeastern, Calvin enrolled at Colorado State to finish his criminal justice degree. Soon after enrolling at Colorado State, however, he returned home to Bellevue. Calvin's vehicle had been involved in a wreck, which left him without any means of transportation. Due to this, he enlisted in the Army as a way to pay for a new vehicle, while also pursuing his law enforcement career while serving his country. Sallie still laughs about the fact that Calvin returned to Nebraska due to a wrecked car. Although many expected he would follow in his dad's footsteps by enlisting in the Air Force, Sallie knew better. Calvin wanted to pave his own road in the Army.

Following his enlistment, Calvin soon shipped off to Fort Benning to complete his One Station Unit Training for the infantry. Shortly after graduation, he was assigned to a station in Germany. It was in Germany where Calvin met his wife, Brigit, a German native. After dating for some time, Calvin was assigned to Fort Drum in New York as part of the 2nd Battalion, 22nd Infantry, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division. Brigit came with him to New York, where they wed in 2004.

Shortly after their marriage, Calvin served in Iraq for the first time, and Brigit moved to Bellevue to be closer to Calvin's family while he was deployed. After a brief stint at home, he deployed to Iraq for a second time. In August of 2005, Calvin was stationed near Baghdad.

During Sergeant Allen's second deployment, patrols became increasingly

dangerous. At the time, the Baghdad area experienced a large increase in suicide bombings and sectarian fighting. On May 18, 2006, while on patrol in Baghdad, Sergeant Allen's Humvee was struck by an improvised explosive device, killing him and three other servicemembers.

Sergeant Allen's memorial service was held at the Capehart Chapel in Bellevue. Over 500 people attended the standing-room-only ceremony to pay their respects, including over 200 Patriot Riders, who lined up with American flags. Calvin was laid to rest on May 30, 2006, in Arlington National Cemetery—the day after Memorial Day.

Fellow friend and Air Force Capt. Bill Eckley talked about how Calvin was a man of honor. Bellevue also honored him by naming a street after him, and his high school established the Sgt. Lonnie Calvin Allen, Jr. Scholarship.

Sgt. Lonnie "Calvin" Allen, Jr., received the Bronze Star and Purple Heart posthumously.

I join Nebraskans and Americans across our country in saluting his willingness and his family's sacrifice to keep us free. I am honored to tell his story.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO REX TILLERSON

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, 2 days ago, the President of the United States announced his decision to replace Secretary of State Rex Tillerson with CIA Director Mike Pompeo. I respect and admire both of these men immensely.

I just want to take a moment to talk about Secretary Tillerson's public service. I know his entering government after his long and illustrious career in the private sector was quite a transition, but he provided able leadership to the Department of State during a period of transition from one Presidency to the next and a period of diplomatic turbulence. He worked hard to strengthen and, in some cases, repair our global alliances.

I have known Secretary Tillerson for a long time. He is a man of character who has led the Boy Scouts, which continues to be one of his abiding passions—developing young men as persons of character, and I respect that. At the same time, he advanced his own career as the head of one of the largest businesses in the world at the pinnacle of success, as we count success. I wish him the best, and I hope his statesmanship, professionalism, and deep and

abiding friendships spanning the globe are remembered and maintained after he is gone from public life.

NOMINATION OF MIKE POMPEO

Mr. President, I also want to say a few good words about my friend Mike Pompeo. After graduating first in his class at West Point and then graduating from Harvard Law School, he had a successful career in law and business before transitioning into public service. As a Member of the House of Representatives, he represented Kansas's Fourth Congressional District and served on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Then he was named by President Trump, as we know, to lead the Central Intelligence Agency.

Director Pompeo is a terrific guy, smart and well respected by all. He has a keen sense of the delicate nature of global diplomacy and the crucial role America and American intelligence agencies have to play. I know he has a great rapport with the President, and I think he will make an excellent Secretary of State.

NOMINATION OF GINA HASPEL

Mr. President, finally, I want to state my utmost confidence in Gina Haspel, Director Pompeo's Deputy, who has been nominated to take over after he leaves as Director of the CIA. As a career intelligence professional, she is tough, she is direct, but she is collegial, too, and much beloved by the people who work out at the Central Intelligence Agency.

As my colleague, the senior Senator from California, has previously stated, Ms. Haspel has great experience acting as Deputy Director, and she has the confidence of the Central Intelligence Agency, which is no small feat.

I support Ms. Haspel's nomination and look forward to working hard to ensure her confirmation.

Of course, there will be groups who will waste no time trying to tarnish her reputation over efforts she made doing her part to keep our Nation safe after the terrible tragedy of 9/11, but I think it is more telling that those who know her best commend her in the strongest of terms. Take, for example, President Obama's former Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, who has called her tremendous, and President Obama's CIA Director Leon Panetta has expressed his support and said he is glad the nominee is Ms. Haspel because she knows the CIA inside out.

So in the days ahead, we will be discussing Ms. Haspel, but let's not just buy into the phony narratives that other people will give about her public service. The views of those who doubt her qualifications and who question her experience will continue to attack and denigrate Ms. Haspel, no doubt, in the open debate. Ultimately, their arguments, if believed and accepted, would make the country less safe and less secure.

We have to remember that right after the terrible events of 9/11, we didn't have the luxury of hindsight. Our leaders were worried about follow-on attacks following the terrible tragedy in New York and the plane crashing into the Pentagon. Public fears regarding another attack were at an alltime high, and tough calls had to be made. That is what leadership is all about.

So I look forward to continuing to make the case for why Ms. Haspel is the person the country needs to lead the Central Intelligence Agency.

FIX NICS BILL

Mr. President, I admit to sounding like a broken record. I am here again to talk about the Fix NICS bill, a bill I introduced with the junior Senator from Connecticut. Just as a refresher, Fix NICS is about fixing the broken background check system that is used when somebody purchases a firearm, but in the case of my constituents in Sutherland Springs, TX, because of the failures of the Federal Government—notably, in this case, the U.S. Air Force—to upload felony convictions and convictions for domestic violence into the background check system, no derogatory information was reported, and ultimately the gunman in Sutherland Springs took the life of 26 innocent people and shot 20 more.

The reason I keep talking about this legislation is, it is just too important to let up on. We cannot, and we never should, just move on after another tragedy like that which occurred in Parkland, FL, and Sutherland Springs, TX, or what happened in Las Vegas, NV, where 58 people were killed and 851 others injured by a gunman using a bump stock, which essentially turned a semiautomatic weapon into an automatic weapon. We can't just move on when lives hang in the balance. We have to do our duty and do our part to save lives. We have to fix our criminal background check system so dangerous felons do not lie their way into obtaining firearms to use to slaughter innocent people.

To do that, we have to get this bill to the President as soon as possible. The President will sign this legislation once it passes the House and the Senate. I am grateful that today 72 Members of the U.S. Senate have signed on as cosponsors to the bill.

It is not just the lawmakers here in Washington who support it; the country is asking for it too. I have a Thursday morning coffee for my constituents from Texas and a number of them—students—came to talk to me about their concerns about gun violence and particularly the feeling that not only parents have, and worry about for their children, but that students have themselves about whether they are going to continue to be safe in their schools.

Yesterday, a broad coalition of victims' rights advocates, law enforcement officers, and gun violence preven-

tion groups and prosecutors sent me a letter, along with to the majority and minority leaders, asking them for a clean vote on the Fix NICS legislation before the upcoming Easter recess. They said it would improve key elements of the background check system, particularly domestic violence, criminal history, and protective order records.

Let me just pause there. One of the most frequent victims of shootings are domestic violence victims—family disputes, custody disputes, divorces, and the like. One of the purposes of the background check system is to make sure nobody who has been convicted of a domestic violence assault can legally purchase or possess a firearm.

These same groups call this bill bipartisan, bicameral, commonsense, and noncontroversial. Again, they made a point to note in their letter that the vote should be clean—in other words, not conditioned on other controversial measures. Well, they are absolutely right, and I would ask the minority leader to listen to the 80 percent of his conference that backed this bill and believe in its promise to help stem the tide of violence and help save lives.

I would ask those who are objecting to us considering this legislation on a clean up-or-down vote to reconsider. Many of them say: Well, there are other things we want to vote on. Well, I would be happy to have that happen, but none of these ideas, at this point, have achieved the sort of consensus the Fix NICS bill has. They are waiting for impossible outcomes, insisting on votes on other measures, when we know those votes will fail, but worst of all, conditioning their willingness to vote on Fix NICS for those other votes, which we know will not succeed and will fail.

So I implore those standing in the way of a rollcall vote on this consensus piece of legislation to lift their objections and join us. Their current strategy will guarantee failure, and failure on this issue, more than others, we absolutely cannot afford.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S CAMPAIGN FOR PRESIDENT

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am here to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Robert F. Kennedy's monumental campaign for President. Kennedy's brief, tragic run at the Presidency has had an enduring impact on so many generations of Americans. The reason, I think, is because Robert Kennedy had the courage to challenge a divided nation to face up to its failings, to challenge a divided people to acknowledge their own contributions to our Nation's ills, to challenge us to step back from the stale, cheap politics of the moment, to challenge us to do better by each other.

History may not repeat, but it often rhymes. Conditions are different now, but a lot of the anxiety that swept through the country in 1968 echoes the anxiety of today, especially the economic anxiety felt by millions of Americans who are working harder than ever but feel opportunity slipping away from themselves and from their children.

Too often, our political and business leaders refuse to see this. Instead they hide behind macroeconomic statistics, using them as a shield to dismiss the concerns of the American people as faulty, wrongheaded, or even as nonexistent.

Robert Kennedy understood that America's national economy is not the same as the economic well-being of its people. In 1968, in a speech at the University of Kansas, he spoke eloquently about the differences between them, and here is what he said:

[Our] Gross National Product counts air pollution and cigarette advertising, and ambulances to clear our highways of carnage. It counts special locks for our doors and the jails for the people who break them. It counts the destruction of the redwood and the loss of our natural wonder in chaotic sprawl. It counts napalm and counts nuclear warheads and armored cars for the police to fight the riots in our cities. It counts Whitman's rifle and Speck's knife, and the television programs which glorify violence in order to sell toys to our children.

Yet the gross national product does not allow for the health of our children, the quality of their education or the joy of their play. It does not include the beauty of our poetry or the strength of our marriages, the intelligence of our public debate or the integrity of our public officials. It measures neither our wit nor our courage, neither our wisdom nor our learning, neither our compassion nor our devotion to our country.

It measures everything, in short, except that which makes life worthwhile. And it can tell us everything about America except why we are proud that we are Americans.

Consider three stats: corporate profits, the stock market, and unemployment.

Today, corporate profits are up—corporate profits that count gun sales for manufacturers whose weapons are used to massacre children in our schools and our streets. Corporate profits that count revenues from drug companies when they quadruple prices for the sick and the desperate. Corporate profits that count revenues of banks like Wells Fargo as they rip off millions of American consumers.

The stock market is up as giant companies pocket trillions in taxpayer money stolen from middle-class families. The market is up as CEOs shut down plants and factories in the United States and move them overseas. The market is up as business leaders, flush with cash, turn their backs on workers while they plow millions and even billions into stock buybacks to goose investors' returns and CEOs' bonuses.

Unemployment is down, but wages have barely budged in a generation.

Unemployment is down, but for millions of people, the exploding costs for housing, healthcare, and childcare mean it now takes two jobs to do what one job covered a generation ago. Unemployment is down, but the numbers fail to represent the millions living in rural and urban American communities alike that have given up on the search for a job.

These statistics on corporate profits, the stock market, and unemployment tell us everything about the American economy, but they tell us very little about the lived experience of today's Americans. They do not speak to the citizen who fears police violence or the police officer who fears gang violence or the immigrant who cannot speak out about sexual assault at the hands of her boss or the toxic rhetoric flowing through our politics seeking to turn neighbor against neighbor. They do not account for our devotion to our communities, to our churches, and to our children. They tell us virtually nothing about our trials, our challenges, our hopes, or our principles.

Robert Kennedy understood this. He knew we cannot simply run an economy for those at the top and assume it will solve America's problems. In the intervening 50 years since his speech, America ran that experiment anyway and watched it fail miserably.

It is time to try something different. It is time to challenge each of us to do better by each other, to see the dignity in one another, and to put our values first. I believe we can make Robert Kennedy's legacy a reality, and I am proud to fight for it.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, in the next few days, we will begin to debate this important bill on sex trafficking. This is something that, for whatever reason, the country turned its back on for too long. As the ways to communicate and the ways to offer so-called adult services grew, the government and law enforcement didn't have the new tools they needed to fight back.

This is a bill that Senator PORTMAN and others have worked so hard on, on this side of the building. We are actually taking up the House bill. The principal sponsor of the House bill is Missouri Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, with whom I have worked closely and who has been a good friend of mine—she and her family—for a long time.

When the House passed this bill overwhelmingly, ANN WAGNER said that

they “sent a clear message to trafficking victims: you are not alone, and justice is no longer out of reach.” It is hard to imagine a more lonely place, I would think, than someone who is being trafficked, some young woman, young child, boy or girl, who has fallen into the hands of traffickers and who, for drugs or whatever reason, has been sold into this or become dependent in a way that put them into this.

Congresswoman WAGNER went on to say about this bill that “FOSTA will produce more prosecutions of bad actor websites and more convictions and put more predators behind bars.” She said: “It will give victims a pathway to justice and provide a meaningful criminal deterrent, so that fewer businesses will ever enter the sex trade and fewer victims will ever be sold.”

The whole idea that people are being sold to be used in whatever terrible way someone else wants to use them is so offensive. The idea that we have websites that people can go to that have some description of some person who is helplessly in this system and how they would be used—that is something Congress should stand up on. By voting for Congresswoman WAGNER's bill, the House has already done that.

On our side of the building, Senator PORTMAN and others have worked so hard to draw attention to the fact that we need to find time to get this bill on the floor. Now we have a bill that has already passed the House, and all we have to do is pass that bill and send it right to the President, or we can make some changes that Senator PORTMAN and others may want to suggest, and then we can send the bill back to the House, where hopefully it can be dealt with in the same overwhelming way they passed it the first time. Then we can get this bill on the President's desk and do exactly what Congresswoman WAGNER said this bill will do. It is time for us to do everything we can to end this.

We would be foolish to think that one piece of legislation will end this problem. By working with law enforcement, looking at trafficking, looking at locations like the intersections of major interstate highways, where it is easy to bring people, to pass people along to somebody else, to get them to where not only are they disoriented, but your actual contact with that person doesn't last very long before you give them to somebody else or sell them to somebody else who could use them in a terrible way—this needs to stop. I am confident the Senate will pass this next week, and I will just say that it is about time.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, also next week we are going to move forward on an appropriating process that has gotten way out of control. I am glad the leaders have decided to appoint a special committee to look at this. The Presiding

Officer and I are on that committee. We will be looking at the budgeting process and looking at what has happened. Instead of bringing these bills to the floor one at a time and letting every Member of the Senate have an opportunity to amend any bill in any way they want to as long as it deals with spending and as long as you don't add new money—every amendment you want to come up with where you want to take some money here and spend it here instead and have a debate about why that should happen—that is what the Congress did for a couple of hundred years, and it is time we did it again. This idea that all the bills come together in one big, what we call an omnibus—“ominous” might be a better word—an omnibus spending bill that includes everything, plus all the legislation that it can possibly carry, is not the way this process should work. It is the way this process is going to have to work this year because we missed all of those opportunities that are now behind us.

As soon as we get this done, we need to start on this year's process. We know what the top-line spending number is going to be. There is every reason to believe that this year's process could be a big step in the right direction, but some guidelines from that special House and Senate committee will do even more.

I would like to say, as the chairman of one of those appropriating committees—the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee—that one bill of the 11 left after the Defense bill is decided on—that one bill has about a third of all of the money to be appropriated of the discretionary money. Senator MURRAY, my counterpart on the other side, and I have worked hard on this committee for 3 years now. In the House, Chairman COLE and Congresswoman DELAURO, the chair and the ranking member on that side, have worked hard as well.

These are big decisions to be made. These programs matter, but some of them matter more than others, and part of our job should be and needs to be setting priorities, doing things that increase the commitment to the programs that are working and eliminate the programs or change the programs that don't work. Hopefully, we will continue to do more of that this year and even more of that next year.

Some of the programs touch the lives of so many Americans, such as apprenticeship programs. Medical research clearly touches the life of virtually every American and every American family. What we could do to develop a flu vaccine that actually hits the mark every year instead of misses the mark often, things we can do in special education—these are all parts of this one part of the bill that Senator MURRAY

and I and Congressman COLE and Congresswoman DELAURO have been working on.

Frankly, everybody should have had a chance to work on this. I think we know a lot about these topics. I think that our debate is a good debate, but it is not nearly as good of a debate as if every single Senator got to be a part of working on this, not just the three dozen or fewer Senators who are on the Appropriations Committee.

There are a wide variety of programs here that need to be funded. I want to spend just a few minutes talking about some of the priorities that we are looking at that need to be part of this bill and create a sense that this is really a process that matters.

First, we are on track to increase the third straight year of significant increases for the National Institutes of Health and health research. What do they do? In the last decade, we failed most of the time to make any increase at all. In fact, 2 years ago, when I started chairing this committee and Congressman COLE started chairing the committee on the other side of the building, it had been 12 years since there had been a one-penny increase in health research. During that 12 years, we figured out so much more about the human genome. We figured out so many more ways to figure out how I am different from you and how you are different from me and how that makes a difference and how whatever is attacking my system we can fight back.

There was not one penny of an increase in 12 years. In fact, the research people said that we were 22 percent below, in research buying power 3 years ago, where we had been 12 years earlier. Young researchers who had never gotten a research grant before weren't likely to get one when they had less effective money to spend than they have had for over a decade. So hopefully that 22 percent—our goal would be to get most of that 22 percent back in 3 years. We have also already restored 13 percent of it. I hope we have a big number next week that gets us back to where we are—at least back to where we were in 2005 or so.

We made a commitment at the end of the last century to double, in a short period of time, the National Institutes of Health funding, and then somehow we thought we were done. We would be done anytime there is no more research to be done. We will be done as soon as we have developed a cure for cancer and found out what to do about Alzheimer's and determined what we can do to lessen heart attack risks and found the answer to every orphan disease, diseases that only a few people have. Let me tell my colleagues, we are a long way from doing that. In the last 3 years, we have tripled the amount of dollars going to Alzheimer's research. Without a cure for Alzheimer's or a way to slow down the onset of Alz-

heimer's, the projection is that by 2050, we will be spending twice as many tax dollars on Alzheimer's-related care and dementia-related care as we are spending now to defend the country. If I had said we would spend \$1.1 trillion, I don't know about everybody who is listening, but in my case, it is pretty hard to get a handle on that. What does that really mean? How much bigger is that than \$1.1 billion? Well, \$1.1 trillion is twice what we spend to defend the country. Every military base everywhere in the world, every ship, every plane, every paycheck for every soldier, sailor, airman, marine; the National Guard, the Coast Guard; training dollars—that is about \$500-and-some billion, approaching \$600 billion. We would be spending twice that in today's dollars, in tax dollars—not what families would spend to try to deal with the tragedy of Alzheimer's but twice that in just tax dollars if we don't find something to do. A cure would be great. Just figuring out how we could determine early, in an effective way, that you were likely to get Alzheimer's and try to begin to delay the onset of Alzheimer's so it either doesn't affect you at all because some other health concern does or you get it a few years later. If we could delay the onset of Alzheimer's by 5 years on the average, that \$1.1 trillion in today's dollars—in 2015—would be reduced by almost half, by 46 percent. So knowing how to detect this—there have been some great studies going on that have been funded in better ways over recent years. This has continued.

I think what we are looking at in the Brain Initiative—the Cancer Moonshot, as Vice President Biden referred to it—diabetes—again, these diseases that maybe not very many people get are particularly the diseases that the National Institutes of Health needs to be doing research on because there is not much of an economic driver for private sector research on a disease that almost nobody has. So a lot of the money that we put into NIH research we specifically try to put in there without any specific category, where we are saying: You take this money, and you do what you think needs to be done, and we are going to have oversight to talk about what you did. A bunch of Members of the Senate and the House aren't going to try to become the research deciders for the United States of America—and, by the way, for the world—when you do that.

In this bill, we are also looking at the crucial fight on the opioid epidemic. The President says it is a crisis, and he is right. It is the No. 1 cause of accidental death in the country today. It has exceeded car accidents as a cause of death in the country and in Missouri and in many other States.

The last two funding bills have put almost an additional \$1 billion into opioids from where we were just 3 years

ago, but the Presiding Officer will remember that in the last continuing resolution, some specific money—about \$3 billion more—was given to this cause, and it is the job of our committee and then the Congress to decide how to spend that \$3 billion.

We need more resources. There is no reason to think that the opioid addiction epidemic, leading to heroin and other drugs, is slowing down, so we need to do things that improve treatment and prevention efforts. Prevention, obviously, is better than treatment, but if prevention fails, we need better treatment systems than we have now.

We need to look for alternative pain medications that aren't addictive. I will say that in the 1970s and 1980s, I am told, in medical schools, they thought opioids weren't addictive. So we need to be sure that when we have an alternative that seems to be non-addictive, that it really isn't addictive.

We need to think of the workforce needs and what happens when people become addicted to pain medicine and their pain doesn't go away, probably because their addiction doesn't go away. Then there is behavioral health that impacts so many families and so many communities.

If you are going to recover from opioid addiction, you have to have a place to go. Too many programs and policies say: We will work with you for 14 days. A lot of them say: We will work with you for 28 days—4 weeks. Not many people get this behind them in 28 days. So we are doing that.

In this bill, we are also looking at ways to support students and parents and teachers. Obviously, a safe environment—what can we do to provide more flexibility to schools to spend the money they currently have from the Federal Government to create a safer environment, and what can we do to increase the money available for that?

We need to be doing things that prepare people not just for college but for careers. If you can get a certificate that puts you to work in a job you love quicker than you can get a college degree that maybe doesn't do those two things—we ought to be thinking about whether our post-high school dollars are equally available to both college and other kinds of training.

We need to see that people have access to higher education. We are doing that by increasing funding for the Pell grant—this is not a loan; it doesn't have to be paid back—given specifically based on economic need and performance in school. You have to stay in school; you have to get passing grades. But in many colleges in my State of Missouri—in community college and in several of our 4-year schools—if you qualify for the full Pell grant, that is more than enough to pay tuition, books, and fees.

If you are putting yourself through school or if you are returning to school

as an adult, if you are the first person in your family to graduate from college, year-round Pell means that if you have something working, you need to stick with it as long as you can, as quickly as you can.

Summer break is always well-intended. For 10 years Pell didn't pay for school in the summer; it does now, starting last year. This will be the first year that students and colleges and universities can really prepare for summer Pell. But if you don't break the rhythm you are in where things are working for you, you are much more likely to graduate from college than you would otherwise.

We need to be sure we prioritize funding for elementary and secondary education grant programs so that they are fair across the country, so that we are not only supporting STEM education, but we are also supporting IDEA for students with learning disabilities, an obligation the Federal Government has taken on itself.

We are going to have a chance next week to deal with this important, long-awaited bill on trafficking. I think there will probably be one vote that covers more things than it should on funding the government for the year we are already in. But, as I have talked about today, there are many reasons for Americans and American families to be focused on the job we do. Frankly, we need to spend our time figuring out how, in the future, the American people can watch the Congress more closely and watch the Congress openly debate the priorities of the government, which the government sets nowhere else quite the way it does when it decides how to spend the money we have been entrusted with.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND
CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, which passed the Senate yesterday. This bipartisan bill protects and boosts the U.S. economy. I commend Chairman CRAPO, members of the Banking Committee, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the hard work in getting this particular bill proposal across the finish line.

Making the rules simpler and fairer for small and midsize financial institutions is a commonsense idea that has garnered broad bipartisan support. That is because, done right, it helps

hardworking Americans who aspire to invent things, start businesses, and manufacture goods and services—exactly the kind of entrepreneurship and growth America needs more of.

There are plenty of people with different viewpoints on how to improve the financial system. Some, however, say that almost any modification to the 849-page Dodd-Frank Act equates to a bonfire financial regulation, a gift to Wall Street, and so on. I think we need to cut through such patronizing, derisive mudslinging, and instead focus on commonsense solutions for the American people.

Let me tell you a plain truth: The bill the Senate passed yesterday is the result of sensible debate, reasonable compromise, and hard policy choices. Without compromising the safety and soundness of our financial system, it provides regulatory relief to small and midsize banks, credit unions, and financial institutions—the kind most familiar on Main Street in my home State of Utah.

Our constituents deserve regulatory relief. Between 2010 and 2016, compliance with Dodd-Frank cost \$36 billion and required 73 million paperwork hours. Dodd-Frank alone enacted more than five times as many restrictions as any other law passed by the Obama administration and more than 22,000 pages of regulations.

With their vast resources, large banks could stomach these regulations mainly through automation, but smaller banks could not. Saddled with extra compliance requirements and no material benefit to resilience, many buckled under the weight of these burdensome regulations.

Consider that there are 1,736 fewer community banks today than when Dodd-Frank was signed into law. Since 2010, the number of FDIC-insured commercial banks in Utah dropped from 53 to 42. In a similar timespan, the number of NCUA-insured credit unions in my home State fell from 94 to 66. Over the past decade, the percentage of small business and commercial loans dropped more than 15 percent.

Indeed, 8 years since the passage of Dodd-Frank, it is high time for Congress to reflect and make adjustments, as necessary, to improve our financial regulatory system. Let's focus on resilience and efficiency. This bill does just that.

I would like to briefly highlight three reforms in the bill that benefit our national and local economies. First, the bill provides relief and flexibility to small financial institutions. More small bank holding companies will be able to raise capital, which will help bank lending opportunities for families, businesses, and startups. This policy was based on a bipartisan bill, the Community Bank Relief Act, that I introduced along with Senators King, Nelson, and Perdue. It is common sense

to know that Utah's community banks are different from Wall Street banks, but too often regulations treat them the same.

Second, the bill increases the bank asset threshold for enhanced standards from \$50 billion to \$250 billion. I have long supported raising or recalibrating the asset threshold. It makes little sense that regional banks undergo stress tests and capital reviews similar to some of the largest, most complex global financial institutions. Similar to the unrealistic expectations put on community banks, this one-size-fits-all approach negatively affected regional banks.

Third, the bill eases the regulatory burden on 5,000 community banks that make up about 98 percent of financial institutions. For small banks and credit unions, this legislation provides relief from some of the requirements from the qualified mortgage rule, allowing them to devote more resources to serving their members rather than spending hours complying with regulatory overreach.

In today's era of extreme partisanship, this bill is a breath of fresh air. What the Senate has been able to accomplish this week is based on practical, consensus-led policy choices. While there remain other reforms that could relieve stress of burdensome regulations, this bill is a much needed start, which is why I wholeheartedly support this legislation.

Members on both sides of the aisle agree that the broad scope of Dodd-Frank created some harmful, unintended consequences. Let's make the rules simpler and fairer, as appropriate but not at the expense of safety. This bipartisan bill does just that, and the American people would be better off because of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, a committee I feel very privileged to serve on with our distinguished chairman. He has a message that I think should be required reading for everybody on this side, and more especially on the other side, and I really appreciate his remarks and his leadership.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague.

CONFIRMATION OF GREGG DOUD

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I want to speak today on the confirmation of Mr. Gregg Doud, the President's nominee for the Chief Agricultural Negotiator at the Office of the United States Trade Representative. In the Senate, we often say, or I hope we often say, that we are only as good as our staff. I have been blessed with the very best. Gregg is one example of why that is true.

Gregg served as senior professional staff on the Senate Agriculture Committee for me during my time as ranking member, 2011 through 2013. We like to say in Kansas that congressional staff are bucket toters. During those few years, we toted a lot of buckets together.

From the early days of the supercommittee and sequestration, multiple iterations of farm bills, animal disease scares, and the oversight of the MF Global mess, or situation, Gregg handled everything that was thrown at him—and all while wearing his cowboy boots with the pointed toes. Capitol Hill certainly isn't where Gregg started cutting his teeth in agriculture.

He hails from Mankato, KS, where he was raised on a dryland wheat, grain sorghum, soybean, swine, and cow-calf operation. Talk about diversified agriculture. He attended my alma mater, Kansas State University, home of the ever-fighting and always optimistic Wildcats. Good luck to them tonight.

Just last September, Gregg was back in Manhattan, KS, where he was honored as the 2017 Kansas State University Department of Agriculture Economics Distinguished Alumni Award.

From K-State, Gregg went on to work for the U.S. Wheat Associates, which is tasked with developing markets for U.S. wheat all around the world. Eventually, he became the chief economist for the National Cattlemen's Beef Association.

One of the very first trials that Gregg faced at NCBA was "the cow that stole Christmas," when just before Christmas, in 2003, a case of mad cow disease was confirmed in the United States, resulting in a devastating blow to U.S. beef exports.

Gregg worked on behalf of the beef industry with the U.S. Trade Representative, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the State Department to rebuild the reputation and reliability of U.S. beef exports. Kansas currently ranks as the third highest U.S. State exporter of beef to the global market.

U.S. trade policy has been a very hot topic in the last year, and it is one that Gregg certainly experienced and is well-versed. He served as a "cleared advisor" and later chairman of the USDA/USTR Animal and Animal Products Agriculture Trade Advisory Committee. It is a lot of words but a very important committee. It was during the negotiations of a variety of trade agreements, including Australia, Bahrain, Colombia, CAFTA, South Korea, Morocco, Panama, and Peru. Obviously, he has been everywhere.

Gregg's background and experience give him a leg up in the challenge of serving as the Chief Agriculture Negotiator at USTR. He understands what trade means to the agriculture industry, and he has the experience to help maintain U.S. agriculture's role as a

reliable supplier around the world. It is certainly a big challenge today.

At a time when the agriculture economy is in a rough patch—fourth year of prices below the cost of production pretty much across the board, all across the country—and commodity prices still falling, farmers and ranchers now depend on trade more than ever. We need continued focus on exporting not just what we make but also what we grow. Let me repeat that. We need to export not just what we make—there is a lot of focus on that with regard to trade policy now coming out of the White House and this administration—but also what we grow.

Kansas farmers and ranchers work hard. On a regular basis, they have to make sacrifices to overcome the weather, overcome obstacles, and make commonsense decisions that have significant consequences. That is why I know Gregg will be successful in the job of Chief Agricultural Negotiator. He is a Kansas cowboy who knows how to roll up his sleeves and certainly get things done.

Gregg understands why strong trading relationships are absolutely critical to agriculture. I am glad he is at the USTR, where he can get to work with Ambassador Bob Lighthizer and lead the charge in advancing the U.S. trade agenda. Along with partners at the Department of Agriculture—like our champion there, Secretary Sonny Perdue—and the Undersecretary for Trade and Foreign Agriculture Affairs, Ted McKinney, Gregg will ensure that agriculture has a seat at the table and that our farmers and ranchers are being heard.

The U.S. agriculture industry has worked long and hard to increase our competitiveness and markets around the world, but their work is never finished, and they cannot do it alone. I know that with Gregg riding point, the voices of the hard-working farmer and rancher will be well represented all around the world.

Congratulations to you, Gregg, on your confirmation as the Chief Agricultural Negotiator at the USTR. I look forward to continuing to work with you on behalf of U.S. ag.

One more admonition, one more piece of advice. When you are riding point, just make sure you look over your shoulder once in a while to see if the herd is still there, and if it isn't, don't worry about it, we have your back.

I yield my time.

After careful inspection, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MARK PETERSON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to join with Members of Congress and congressional staff in celebrating Mark Peterson's 30 years of service and retirement from the town of Normal. Mark has honorably served the people of Normal, IL, since 1988 and as its city manager since 1998.

He has served on the governing boards for a variety of public and community organizations, including the MetCom Emergency Communications Center, the Bloomington-Normal Economic Development Council, the Central Illinois Regional Broadband Network, the McLean County Regional Planning Commission Executive Committee, the Community Development Corporation, the BN Advantage Leadership Council, and Connect Transit.

Mark was instrumental in the planning and successful redevelopment of Uptown Normal, including the Children's Discovery Museum, as well as Uptown Station and its new rail platform, waiting area, bus bays, and related development at the Marriott Hotel and Conference Center and the Hyatt Place Bloomington-Normal Hotel.

Under the administration of Mark Peterson, the Shoppes at College Hills grew into a thriving modern retail center. The Constitution Trail also grew to nearly 50 miles of recreational trail through the cities of Normal and Bloomington, providing the community with an outstanding linear park.

Mark oversaw a period of tremendous growth in the town of Normal, while maintaining an AAA bond rating and serving as independent confirmation of the town's fiscal health and stability. He also cultivated fruitful partnerships with members of the Illinois congressional delegation, but most importantly, Mark has been a loyal leader and community servant for the residents of Normal and will continue to be an admired citizen of the community.

Mark's commitment to the town of Normal can be seen in every corner of the city, and that work will not be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO MARK BOOTH

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, today I wish to honor and recognize the outstanding service of Mark Booth on his retirement after 31 years of public service at the Congressional Budget Office. Mark's expertise as a forecaster and

modeler has made him an invaluable contributor to CBO's analysis of the budget outlook. Since 2003, Mark has been chief of the revenue estimating unit of CBO's tax analysis division, overseeing its forecasts of tax revenues and cost estimates of legislative proposals.

Mark came to CBO in 1986 from the private sector, where he began his career as a forecaster and analyst. He took over responsibility for CBO's corporate income tax projections and quickly demonstrated his analytic skills. As a result, Mark's portfolio continuously expanded, as he soon also became the lead analyst for CBO's projections of individual income taxes and Federal Reserve System's earnings. In addition, Mark joined the tax analysis division's cost-estimating team, overseeing assistant analysts to produce timely estimates of legislative proposals. Over those years, Mark won the CBO Director's Award for Exceptional Service, the agency's highest recognition for work by a CBO staffer, twice.

In recognition of Mark's abilities and breadth of experience, he was promoted to the position of unit chief for revenue estimating in 2003, and he has overseen the division's projections and cost estimates ever since. As head of the revenue estimating unit, Mark has led his staff in providing high-quality and timely projections of revenues and analysis of budget issues. Mark has made valuable contributions to numerous reports, testimonies, and cost estimates in just about every subject area covered by CBO, including the economy, energy, transportation, and healthcare. He also has served a crucial role in trying to make CBO's analysis more transparent, preparing several background papers that describe CBO's methods of forecasting revenues and evaluate the agency's projections record.

I know my colleagues join me in extending our thanks and appreciation to Mark for his service to our Nation. We wish him well in his retirement from CBO and hope he will continue in future years to lend his expertise to the analysis of important tax policy issues.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO KELLI LOHR

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Kelli Lohr, the new owner of the Prairie Peddler in Shelby. The Prairie Peddler has been a community business for over two decades. Families throughout the years have come to indulge in scones, cookies and coffee, and shop for household decor and gifts.

When Kelli saw that the notable community establishment may close without a new owner, she stepped up without any prior experience as a

businessowner and took a chance. Working together with the former owner to make a smooth transition, Kelli was able to ensure that the community's favorite staples would still be available as she stocked the shelves with new and exciting items as well. Her work has paid off. The family business is growing as folks have more money in their paychecks following the recent tax cuts and the community is eager to support the new management.

Thank you, Kelli, and the rest of the Lohr family. Your dedication to maintaining a community business is appreciated by the people of Toole County and the surrounding area. It is businesses like yours that make Montana the "Last Best Place." •

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:58 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 506. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1116. An act to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3249. An act to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3996. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit other courts to transfer certain cases to United States Tax Court.

H.R. 4909. An act to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:34 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1177. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States the condition that certain lands conveyed to the City of Old Town, Maine, be used for a municipal airport, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 506. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1116. An act to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3249. An act to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3996. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit other courts to transfer certain cases to United States Tax Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4909. An act to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4579. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the report on activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4580. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9973-20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4581. A joint communication from the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the certification of the sum of moneys deposited in the Treasury in relation to environmental cleanup and infrastructure costs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4582. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Vermont; Non-attainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Program Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9975-16-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4583. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; City of Philadelphia; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units" (FRL No. 9975-33-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4584. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; City of Philadelphia; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Units" (FRL No. 9975-38-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4585. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS); Final Rule" (FRL No. 9975-69-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4586. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS); Final Rule" (FRL No. 9975-68-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4587. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Method 301: Field Validation of Pollutant Measurement Methods from Various Waste Media" (FRL No. 9975-62-DAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4588. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Millennium Challenge Corporation's Annual Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4589. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-270, "Office of Employee Appeals Hearing Examiner Classification Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4590. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-271, "Public Employee Relations Board Term Limit Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4591. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-272, "Extension of Time to Dispose of 8th & O Streets, N.W., Temporary Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4592. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-257, "Relieve High Unemployment Tax Incentives Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4593. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-258, "City Innovation Fund Re-Establishment Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4594. A communication from the Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled "Electronic Submission of Certain Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance, Family Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance, and Veterans' Group Life Insurance Forms" (RIN2900-AP98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4595. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund Phase II Auction Scheduled for July 24, 2018; Notice and Filing Requirements and Other Procedures for Auction 903" ((AU Docket No. 17-182 and WC Docket No. 10-90) (FCC 18-06)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4596. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "All-Terrain Vehicles" ((16 CFR Part 1420) (Docket No. CPSC-2017-0032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4597. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ex Parte Communications in Informal Rulemaking Proceedings" ((RIN2140-AB39) (Docket No. EP 739) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4598. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Testing and Training Activities Conducted in the Eglin Gulf Test and Training Range in the Gulf of Mexico" (RIN0648-BH21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Joel M. Carson III, of New Mexico, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Colm F. Connolly, of Delaware, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

William F. Jung, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Maryellen Noreika, of Delaware, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

Ryan T. Holte, of Ohio, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Jonathan F. Mitchell, of Washington, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States for the term of five years.

William M. McSwain, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.

Matthew D. Harris, of Utah, to be United States Marshal for the District of Utah for the term of four years.

Johnny Lee Kuhlman, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

Joseph D. McClain, of Indiana, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of four years.

David A. Weaver, of Colorado, to be United States Marshal for the District of Colorado for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2556. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to promulgate regulations to prohibit the storage of live animals in overhead compartments of airplanes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2557. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to improve conservation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2558. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to Scenic Rivers Development Alliance certain National Forest System land in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HATCH, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2559. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to implement the Marrakesh Treaty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 2560. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2561. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to suspend a controlled substances registration if there is a likelihood of a threat of diversion of a controlled substance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2562. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Alice Paul in recognition of her role in the women's suffrage movement and in advancing equal rights for women; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BARASSO):

S. 2563. A bill to improve the water supply and drought resilience of the United States,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2564. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to promote the investigation of fraudulent claims against certain trusts, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties against fraudulent claims against certain trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2565. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide child care assistance to veterans receiving certain training or vocational rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2566. A bill to require that any trade agreement eligible for expedited consideration by Congress include enforceable standards requiring paying adequate wages and maintaining sustainable production methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 177

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to provide for congressional review of the imposition of duties and other trade measures by the executive branch, and for other purposes.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 422

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 422, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII

of the Social Security Act to waive co-insurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 636

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 636, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 936

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 936, a bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 943

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 943, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an accurate comprehensive student count for the purposes of calculating formula allocations for programs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health.

S. 1113

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2269

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 2269, a bill to reauthorize the Global Food Security Act of 2016 for 5 additional years.

S. 2398

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2398, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide that activities relating to the training and readiness of the reserve components of the Armed Forces during a lapse in appropriations shall constitute voluntary services that may be accepted by the United States.

S. 2500

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2500, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the vehicles, weaponry, and ammunition to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 2507

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2507, a bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such coverage at the option of the enrollees.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 434

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 434, a resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORKER,

Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HATCH, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2559. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to implement the Marrakesh Treaty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would implement the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who are Blind, Visually Impaired, or Otherwise Print Disabled ("Marrakesh Treaty"). I'm pleased that Senators FEINSTEIN, CORKER, MENENDEZ, HATCH, HARRIS and LEAHY are joining me as original cosponsors.

The Marrakesh Treaty was signed by the United States in October 2013. It seeks to help address the global "book famine" and facilitate access to printed works for visually impaired individuals by providing, with appropriate safeguards, that copyright protection should not impede the creation and distribution of accessible format copies, including the exchange of such copies internationally.

The Marrakesh Treaty Implementation Act represents a consensus approach developed by the Senate Judiciary and Foreign Relations Committees with stakeholders within the publishers, libraries and print disabilities communities, in consultation with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and the U.S. Copyright Office as well as other interested industry and public interest stakeholders. I particularly want to commend the National Federation of the Blind, the Association of American Publishers and the Library Copyright Alliance for working with us in reaching an agreement on legislative text and proposed legislative history. We would not be here today without their efforts.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member MENENDEZ, on ratification of the Marrakesh Treaty in the Senate, and with Judiciary Committee Ranking Member FEINSTEIN on passing the Marrakesh Treaty Implementation Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2561. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to suspend a controlled substances registration if there is a likelihood of a threat of diversion of a controlled substance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague, Senator CAPITO, to introduce the Stopping Suspicious Orders of Opioids Act.

In 2016, the opioid epidemic caused more than 42,000 deaths in the United States.

In 2017, this epidemic was declared a public health emergency.

Now, more than 400 State, local, and Tribal governments have filed suits (some consolidated, some individual) against opioid manufacturers and distributors for their alleged roles in fueling and perpetuating this devastating crisis. The U.S. Justice Department, or DOJ, has filed a statement of interest in these lawsuits, which are currently pending.

As our Nation struggles to effectively address the opioid epidemic, one thing is clear: there is no silver bullet.

Yet, it is also clear that law enforcement can play a critical role in preventing and reducing overdose deaths.

That is why we must ensure that law enforcement has and uses the necessary tools to hold opioid manufacturers, distributors and others accountable when they fail to properly disclose to the Drug Enforcement Administration, or the DEA, opioid orders that are suspicious because of their size, frequency, or patterns. This simple disclosure could prevent millions of prescription opioid pills from ending up on the black market.

Unfortunately, current law has inadvertently created a standard that is too high for DOJ to meet in order to take immediate action against those who fail to make these disclosures to the DEA or who fail to adequately protect against diversion.

For instance, the DEA has told my staff that under current law, in order to immediately stop a drug manufacturer or distributor from distributing opioids, a pharmacy from dispensing opioids, or a practitioner from prescribing opioids, it must prove that the distribution, dispensation, or prescription of the drugs directly resulted in an immediate and substantial likelihood that death, serious bodily harm, or abuse of a controlled substance occurred.

For this reason, the bill Senator CAPITO and I are introducing today would change the standard in current law to make it easier to immediately stop potentially dangerous shipments of prescription opioids. It would allow DOJ to take action when it can demonstrate that an opioid manufacturer or distributor's lack of control over a prescription opioid would likely result in the drugs winding up in the hands of someone other than the intended recipient or on the black market.

This change will compel opioid manufacturers and distributors to be more vigilant in their efforts to report and stop the delivery of suspicious orders of opioids as well as to protect against diversion. In the absence of such vigilance, our bill would allow DOJ to immediately stop the delivery of opioids.

Our bill further ensures that bad actors are held accountable by establishing backstops and consequences for when opioid manufacturers, distributors, dispensers, and prescribers fail to take corrective action.

Under current law, if there is no immediate threat to the public health or safety, opioid manufacturers, distributors, dispensers and prescribers can submit a corrective action plan to DOJ before their registrations can be revoked or suspended. DOJ does not have to accept this plan, but if it does, current law does not outline a timeframe by which the plan must be fully implemented or consequences for failure to do so.

Given the magnitude of the opioid epidemic, this is unacceptable.

That is why our bill would require those who manufacture, distribute, dispense or prescribe opioids to fully implement any plan that is accepted by DOJ within 30 days. Failure to do so will result in the immediate suspension of a registration until the reinstated proceedings to deny, revoke, or suspend the registration permanently have concluded.

Mr. President, I have been struck by the seemingly countless examples of opioid manufacturers and distributors that have done little to safeguard against diversion that have been raised in hearings, roundtables, and in the news over the last several years.

The example most often cited is that of Kermit, West Virginia, where, over a two year period nine million opioids were delivered to a single pharmacy. Between 2007 and 2012, 780 million oxycodone and hydrocodone pills were delivered to pharmacies throughout that state. This resulted in 1,728 fatal overdoses that were largely preventable.

We cannot allow this to happen again.

The bill Senator CAPITO and I are introducing today will strengthen current law by providing law enforcement with the additional tools it needs to better and more proactively combat the opioid epidemic and hold bad actors accountable.

I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this important legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2210. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3210, to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, and for other purposes.

SA 2211. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1869, to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2210. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL)) proposed an amendment to the

bill H.R. 3210, to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Securely Expediting Clearances Through Reporting Transparency Act of 2018” or the “SECRET Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Bureau” means the National Background Investigations Bureau of the Office;

(2) the term “Director” means the Director of National Intelligence acting as the Security Executive Agent; and

(3) the term “Office” means the Office of Personnel Management acting as the Suitability and Credentialing Executive Agent.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PERSONNEL SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter for 5 years, the Director of the Bureau, in coordination with the Director, shall submit to Congress a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations at the Bureau for the most recent full calendar quarter, which shall include—

(1) the size of the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations of the Bureau, including, for each sensitivity level—

(A) the number of interim clearances granted;

(B) the number of initial investigations for Federal employees;

(C) the number of periodic reinvestigations for Federal employees;

(D) the number of initial investigations for employees of Federal contractors;

(E) the number of periodic reinvestigations for employees of Federal contractors;

(F) the number of initial investigations for employees of, and employees of contractors of, the Department of Defense;

(G) the number of periodic reinvestigations for employees of and employees of contractors of the Department of Defense;

(H) the number of employees of the Bureau conducting background investigations for the Bureau; and

(I) the number of employees of contractors of the Bureau conducting background investigations for the Bureau;

(2) the average length of time, for each sensitivity level, for the Bureau to carry out an initial investigation and a periodic reinvestigation;

(3) a discussion of the factors contributing to the average length of time to carry out an initial investigation and a periodic reinvestigation;

(4) a backlog mitigation plan, which shall include—

(A) the identification of the cause of, and recommendations to remedy, the backlog at the Bureau;

(B) the steps the Director of the Bureau shall take to reduce the backlog;

(C) process reforms to improve efficiencies in, and the quality of, background investigations by the Bureau; and

(D) a projection of when the backlog at the Bureau will be sufficiently reduced to meet required timeliness standards; and

(5) a description of improvements in the information and data security of the Bureau.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONNEL OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Administration of the Executive Office of the President, in coordination with the Director and the Director of the Office, shall submit to Congress a report that explains the process for conducting and adjudicating security clearance investigations for personnel of the Executive Office of the President, including personnel of the White House Office.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH BIFURCATED BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION SYSTEMS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office, in consultation with the other members of the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, shall submit to Congress a report on the cost of maintaining comprehensive background investigations capability within the Office under the control or direction of the Bureau and a background investigations capability for Department of Defense personnel under the control or direction of the Department of Defense for implementation of the plan referenced in section 925 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91), as compared to the cost of sustaining a single Government-wide background investigations enterprise.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON CONTINUOUS EVALUATION, RECIPROCITY, AND TIMELINESS MEASURES.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress reports that provide—

(1) the status of implementing continuous evaluation Government-wide, including—

(A) the number of agencies with continuous evaluation programs and how many of those programs are currently conducting automated records checks of the required data sources as identified by the Director; and

(B) a discussion of the barriers for agencies to implement continuous evaluation programs, including any requirement under a statute, regulation, Executive Order, or other administrative requirement;

(2) a detailed explanation of efforts by agencies to meet requirements for reciprocal recognition to access classified information, including—

(A) the range of the length of time for agencies to grant reciprocal recognition to access classified information;

(B) additional requirements for reinvestigations or readjudications, by agency; and

(C) any other barriers to the timely granting of reciprocity, by agency, including any requirement under a statute, regulation, Executive Order, or other administrative requirement; and

(3) a review of whether the schedule for processing security clearances under section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341) should be modified.

SEC. 7. REVIEW AND UPDATE OF POSITION DESIGNATION GUIDANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term in Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto;

(2) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(3) the term “background investigation” means any investigation required for the purpose of determining the—

(A) eligibility of a covered individual for logical and physical access to Federally controlled facilities or information systems;

(B) suitability or fitness of a covered individual for Federal employment;

(C) eligibility of a covered individual for access to classified information or to hold a national security sensitive position; or

(D) fitness of a covered individual to perform work for or on behalf of the United States Government as a contractor employee; and

(4) the term “covered individual”—

(A) means a person who performs work for or on behalf of the executive branch or seeks to perform work for or on behalf of the executive branch;

(B) is not limited to Federal employees;

(C) includes all persons, not excluded under subparagraph (D), who require eligibility for access to classified information or eligibility to hold a sensitive position, including, but not limited to, contractors, subcontractors, licensees, certificate holders, grantees, experts, consultants, and government employees; and

(D) does not include—

(i) the President;

(ii) employees of the President under section 105 or 107 of title 3, United States Code (except to the extent otherwise directed by the President);

(iii) the Vice President; or

(iv) employees of the Vice President under section 106 of title 3, United States Code, or an annual legislative branch appropriations Act (except to the extent otherwise directed by the Vice President).

(b) REVIEW AND UPDATING.—

(1) INITIAL REVIEW AND UPDATE OF GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director and the Director of the Office shall review and make recommendations to Congress and the President as appropriate to issue guidance to assist agencies in determining—

(A) position sensitivity designation; and

(B) the appropriate background investigation to initiate for each position designation.

(2) REVIEWS AND REVISIONS OF POSITION DESIGNATIONS.—Not less frequently than every 4 years, the President, acting through relevant agencies (as determined by the President) and in accordance with the guidance described in paragraph (1), shall review and, if necessary, revise the position designation of positions within agencies.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after completing a review under subsection (b)(2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(1) any issues identified in the review; and

(2) the number of position designations revised as a result of the review.

(d) NO CHANGE IN AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section limits or expands the authority of any agency to designate a position as sensitive or as requiring its occupant to have access to classified information.

SA 2211. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to

the bill S. 1869, to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator; as follows:

On page 6, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

(d) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 117 of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-199; 126 Stat. 1475) is repealed.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on November 26, 2017.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 15, 2018, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 15, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Review of the FY 2019 State Department Budget."

THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 15, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Perspective on the 340B Drug Pricing Program."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 15, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a joint hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on nomination of Lieutenant General Paul M. Nakasone, to

be Director of the National Security Agency, Department of Defense.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kennis Brady, a member of my staff, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECURELY EXPEDITING CLEARANCES THROUGH REPORTING TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 264, H.R. 3210.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3210) to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Securely Expediting Clearances Through Reporting Transparency Act of 2017" or the "SECRET Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PERSONNEL SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter for 5 years, the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to Congress a report on the backlog of security clearance investigations that includes, for the most recent full calendar quarter—

(1) the size of the personnel security clearance investigation process backlog, including, for each sensitivity level—

(A) the number of interim clearances granted;

(B) the number of initial investigations for Federal employees;

(C) the number of periodic reinvestigations for Federal employees;

(D) the number of initial investigations for employees of Federal contractors;

(E) the number of periodic reinvestigations for employees of Federal contractors;

(F) the number of initial investigations for employees of, and employees of contractors of, the Department of Defense;

(G) the number of periodic reinvestigations for employees of and employees of contractors of the Department of Defense;

(H) the number of Federal employees conducting background investigations; and

(I) the number of employees of Federal contractors conducting background investigations;

(2) the average length of time, for each sensitivity level, to carry out an initial investigation and a periodic reinvestigation;

(3) a discussion of the factors contributing to the average length of time to carry out an initial investigation and a periodic reinvestigation;

(4) a backlog mitigation plan, which shall include—

(A) the identification of the cause of, and recommendations to remedy, the backlog;

(B) the steps the Director shall take to reduce the backlog;

(C) process reforms to improve efficiencies in, and the quality of, background investigations; and

(D) a projection of when the backlog will be sufficiently reduced to meet required timeliness standards; and

(5) a description of improvements in information and data security.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONNEL OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Administration of the Executive Office of the President shall submit to Congress a report that explains the process for conducting and adjudicating security clearance investigations for personnel of the Executive Office of the President, including White House personnel.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON DUPLICATIVE COSTS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the other members of the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), shall submit to Congress a report on the cost of duplicating resources under the control or direction of the National Background Investigations Bureau for implementation of the plan referenced in section 951(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (10 U.S.C. 1564 note).

SEC. 5. REPORT ON CONTINUOUS EVALUATION AND RECIPROCITY.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to Congress a report that provides—

(1) the status of implementing continuous evaluation Governmentwide, including—

(A) the number of agencies with continuous evaluation programs and how many of those programs are currently meeting the investigative standards;

(B) a risk assessment of replacing current reinvestigation requirements with continuous evaluation programs by 2020;

(C) a discussion of the barriers for agencies to implement continuous evaluation programs, including any requirement under a statute, regulation, Executive Order, or other administrative requirement; and

(D) plans, including timelines, for implementing continuous evaluation Governmentwide and phasing out periodic reinvestigations;

(2) a detailed explanation of efforts by agencies to meet requirements for reciprocal recognition to access classified information, including—

(A) the range of the length of time for agencies to grant reciprocal recognition to access classified information;

(B) additional requirements for reinvestigations or readjudications, by agency; and

(C) any other barriers to the timely granting of reciprocity, by agency, including any requirement under a statute, regulation, Executive Order, or other administrative requirement;

(3) recommendations, including timelines, to improve the background investigation process to—

(A) simplify the Questionnaire for National Security Positions (Standard Form 86) and increase customer support for applicants completing such questionnaire;

(B) use remote and virtual techniques and centralized locations during field investigation work;

(C) use secure and reliable digitization of information obtained during the clearance process; and

(D) build the capacity of the background investigation labor sector; and

(4) a review of whether the schedule for processing security clearances under section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341) should be modified.

SEC. 6. REVIEW AND UPDATE OF POSITION DESIGNATION GUIDANCE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term in Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto;

(2) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(3) the term “background investigation” means any investigation required for the purpose of determining the—

(A) eligibility of a covered individual for logical and physical access to Federally controlled facilities or information systems;

(B) suitability or fitness of a covered individual for Federal employment;

(C) eligibility of a covered individual for access to classified information or to hold a national security sensitive position; or

(D) fitness of a covered individual to perform work for or on behalf of the United States Government as a contractor employee; and

(4) the term “covered individual” means an individual who—

(A) performs work for or on behalf of an agency; or

(B) seeks to perform work for or on behalf of an agency.

(b) **REVIEW AND UPDATING.**—

(1) **INITIAL REVIEW AND UPDATE OF GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall review and, if appropriate, update the guidance the President issues to assist agencies in determining—

(A) position sensitivity designation; and

(B) the appropriate background investigation to initiate for each position designation.

(2) **REVIEWS AND REVISIONS OF POSITION DESIGNATIONS.**—Not less frequently than every 4 years, the President, acting through relevant agencies (as determined by the President) and in accordance with the guidance described in paragraph (1), shall review and, if necessary, revise the position designation of positions within agencies.

(c) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after completing a review under subsection (b)(2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(1) any issues identified in the review; and

(2) the number of position designations revised as a result of the review.

(d) **NO CHANGE IN AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this section limits or expands the authority of any agency to designate a position as sensitive or as requiring its occupant to have access to classified information.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be withdrawn; that the Johnson-McCaskill substitute amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 2210) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Securely Expediting Clearances Through Reporting Transparency Act of 2018” or the “SECRET Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Bureau” means the National Background Investigations Bureau of the Office;

(2) the term “Director” means the Director of National Intelligence acting as the Security Executive Agent; and

(3) the term “Office” means the Office of Personnel Management acting as the Suitability and Credentialing Executive Agent.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PERSONNEL SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter for 5 years, the Director of the Bureau, in coordination with the Director, shall submit to Congress a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations at the Bureau for the most recent full calendar quarter, which shall include—

(1) the size of the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations of the Bureau, including, for each sensitivity level—

(A) the number of interim clearances granted;

(B) the number of initial investigations for Federal employees;

(C) the number of periodic reinvestigations for Federal employees;

(D) the number of initial investigations for employees of Federal contractors;

(E) the number of periodic reinvestigations for employees of Federal contractors;

(F) the number of initial investigations for employees of, and employees of contractors of, the Department of Defense;

(G) the number of periodic reinvestigations for employees of and employees of contractors of the Department of Defense;

(H) the number of employees of the Bureau conducting background investigations for the Bureau; and

(I) the number of employees of contractors of the Bureau conducting background investigations for the Bureau;

(2) the average length of time, for each sensitivity level, for the Bureau to carry out an initial investigation and a periodic reinvestigation;

(3) a discussion of the factors contributing to the average length of time to carry out an initial investigation and a periodic reinvestigation;

(4) a backlog mitigation plan, which shall include—

(A) the identification of the cause of, and recommendations to remedy, the backlog at the Bureau;

(B) the steps the Director of the Bureau shall take to reduce the backlog;

(C) process reforms to improve efficiencies in, and the quality of, background investigations by the Bureau; and

(D) a projection of when the backlog at the Bureau will be sufficiently reduced to meet required timeliness standards; and

(5) a description of improvements in the information and data security of the Bureau.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONNEL OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Administration of the Executive Office of the President, in coordination with the Director and the Director of the Office, shall submit to Congress a report that explains the process for conducting and adjudicating security clearance investigations for personnel of the Executive Office of the President, including personnel of the White House Office.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH BIFURCATED BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION SYSTEMS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office, in consultation with the other members of the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, shall submit to Congress a report on the cost of maintaining comprehensive background investigations capability within the Office under the control or direction of the Bureau and a background investigations capability for Department of Defense personnel under the control or direction of the Department of Defense for implementation of the plan referenced in section 925 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91), as compared to the cost of sustaining a single Government-wide background investigations enterprise.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON CONTINUOUS EVALUATION, RECIPROCITY, AND TIMELINESS MEASURES.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress reports that provide—

(1) the status of implementing continuous evaluation Government-wide, including—

(A) the number of agencies with continuous evaluation programs and how many of those programs are currently conducting automated records checks of the required data sources as identified by the Director; and

(B) a discussion of the barriers for agencies to implement continuous evaluation programs, including any requirement under a statute, regulation, Executive Order, or other administrative requirement;

(2) a detailed explanation of efforts by agencies to meet requirements for reciprocal recognition to access classified information, including—

(A) the range of the length of time for agencies to grant reciprocal recognition to access classified information;

(B) additional requirements for reinvestigations or readjudications, by agency; and

(C) any other barriers to the timely granting of reciprocity, by agency, including any requirement under a statute, regulation, Executive Order, or other administrative requirement; and

(3) a review of whether the schedule for processing security clearances under section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341) should be modified.

SEC. 7. REVIEW AND UPDATE OF POSITION DESIGNATION GUIDANCE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term in Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto;

(2) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(3) the term “background investigation” means any investigation required for the purpose of determining the—

(A) eligibility of a covered individual for logical and physical access to Federally controlled facilities or information systems;

(B) suitability or fitness of a covered individual for Federal employment;

(C) eligibility of a covered individual for access to classified information or to hold a national security sensitive position; or

(D) fitness of a covered individual to perform work for or on behalf of the United States Government as a contractor employee; and

(4) the term “covered individual”—

(A) means a person who performs work for or on behalf of the executive branch or seeks to perform work for or on behalf of the executive branch;

(B) is not limited to Federal employees;

(C) includes all persons, not excluded under subparagraph (D), who require eligibility for access to classified information or eligibility to hold a sensitive position, including, but not limited to, contractors, subcontractors, licensees, certificate holders, grantees, experts, consultants, and government employees; and

(D) does not include—

(i) the President;

(ii) employees of the President under section 105 or 107 of title 3, United States Code (except to the extent otherwise directed by the President);

(iii) the Vice President; or

(iv) employees of the Vice President under section 106 of title 3, United States Code, or an annual legislative branch appropriations Act (except to the extent otherwise directed by the Vice President).

(b) REVIEW AND UPDATING.—

(1) INITIAL REVIEW AND UPDATE OF GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director and the Director of the Office shall review and make recommendations to Congress and the President as appropriate to issue guidance to assist agencies in determining—

(A) position sensitivity designation; and

(B) the appropriate background investigation to initiate for each position designation.

(2) REVIEWS AND REVISIONS OF POSITION DESIGNATIONS.—Not less frequently than every 4 years, the President, acting through relevant agencies (as determined by the President) and in accordance with the guidance described in paragraph (1), shall review and, if necessary, revise the position designation of positions within agencies.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after completing a review under subsection (b)(2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(1) any issues identified in the review; and

(2) the number of position designations revised as a result of the review.

(d) NO CHANGE IN AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section limits or expands the authority of any agency to designate a position as sensitive or as requiring its occupant to have access to classified information.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 3210), as amended, was passed.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION COORDINATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 286, S. 1869.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1869) to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets and the part of the bill intended to be inserted is shown in italics.)

S. 1869

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by striking “Ombudsman who shall educate agency employees—” and inserting the following: “Coordinator who shall—

“(i) educate agency employees—”;

(C) in subclause (I), as so redesignated, by striking “on retaliation” and inserting “against retaliation”;

(D) in subclause (II), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, including—

“(aa) the means by which employees may seek review of any allegation of reprisal, including the roles of the Office of the Inspector General, the Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and any other relevant entities; and

“(bb) general information about the timeliness of such cases, the availability of any alternative dispute mechanisms, and avenues for potential relief.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) assist the Inspector General in promoting the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures and allegations of reprisal, to the extent practicable, by the Inspector General; and

“(iii) assist the Inspector General in facilitating communication and coordination with the Special Counsel, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the [agency] establishment, Congress, and any other relevant entity regarding the timely and appropriate handling and consid-

eration of protected disclosures, allegations of reprisal, and general matters regarding the implementation and administration of whistleblower protection laws, rules, and regulations.”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “Ombudsman” and inserting “Coordinator”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) The Whistleblower Protection Coordinator shall have direct access to the Inspector General as needed to accomplish the requirements of this subsection.”.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CIGIE.—Section 11(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.—The Council shall—

“(A) facilitate the work of the Whistleblower Protection Coordinators designated under section 3(d)(C); and

“(B) in consultation with the Office of Special Counsel and Whistleblower Protection Coordinators from the member offices of the Inspector General, develop best practices for coordination and communication in promoting the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures, allegations of reprisal, and general matters regarding the implementation and administration of whistleblower protection laws, in accordance with Federal law.”.

(c) REPORTING.—Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (20) to read as follows:

“(20)(A) a detailed description of any instance of whistleblower retaliation, including information about the official found to have engaged in retaliation; and

“(B) what, if any, consequences the establishment actually imposed to hold the official described in subparagraph (A) accountable.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(D), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) whether the establishment entered into a settlement agreement with the official described in subsection (a)(20)(A), which shall be reported regardless of any confidentiality agreement relating to the settlement agreement; and”.

(d) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—Subsection (c) of section 117 of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–199; 126 Stat. 1475) is repealed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; that the Grassley amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2211) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the repeal of sunset provision)

On page 6, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

(d) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 117 of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–199; 126 Stat. 1475) is repealed.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on November 26, 2017.

The bill (S. 1869), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1869

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by striking “Ombudsman who shall educate agency employees—” and inserting the following: “Coordinator who shall—

“(i) educate agency employees—”;

(C) in subclause (I), as so redesignated, by striking “on retaliation” and inserting “against retaliation”;

(D) in subclause (II), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, including—

“(aa) the means by which employees may seek review of any allegation of reprisal, including the roles of the Office of the Inspector General, the Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and any other relevant entities; and

“(bb) general information about the timeliness of such cases, the availability of any alternative dispute mechanisms, and avenues for potential relief.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) assist the Inspector General in promoting the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures and allegations of reprisal, to the extent practicable, by the Inspector General; and

“(iii) assist the Inspector General in facilitating communication and coordination with the Special Counsel, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the establishment, Congress, and any other relevant entity regarding the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures, allegations of reprisal, and general matters regarding the implementation and administration of whistleblower protection laws, rules, and regulations.”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “Ombudsman” and inserting “Coordinator”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) The Whistleblower Protection Coordinator shall have direct access to the Inspector General as needed to accomplish the requirements of this subsection.”.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CIGIE.—Section 11(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.—The Council shall—

“(A) facilitate the work of the Whistleblower Protection Coordinators designated under section 3(d)(C); and

“(B) in consultation with the Office of Special Counsel and Whistleblower Protection Coordinators from the member offices of the Inspector General, develop best practices for coordination and communication in promoting the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures, allegations of reprisal, and general matters regarding the implementation and administration of whistleblower protection laws, in accordance with Federal law.”.

(c) REPORTING.—Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (20) to read as follows:

“(20)(A) a detailed description of any instance of whistleblower retaliation, including information about the official found to have engaged in retaliation; and

“(B) what, if any, consequences the establishment actually imposed to hold the official described in subparagraph (A) accountable.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(D), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) whether the establishment entered into a settlement agreement with the official described in subsection (a)(20)(A), which shall be reported regardless of any confidentiality agreement relating to the settlement agreement; and”.

(d) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 117 of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–199; 126 Stat. 1475) is repealed.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on November 26, 2017.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 19, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, March 19; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865 and that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on that motion occur following disposition of the McAleenan nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 19, 2018, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:29 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 19, 2018, at 3 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 15, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION SHOULD INVESTIGATE ILLEGAL INSIDER TRADING BY CARL ICAHN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I wrote a letter to Jay Clayton, the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, asking him about this guy.

This is Carl Icahn, the billionaire, financier, and buddy of our President Donald Trump.

It seems that he had a massive amount of stock in a company that sells cranes and equipment, which, in case you didn't know, are made of a lot of steel. Then all of a sudden, Mr. Icahn sold his position in the crane and equipment maker; and 1 week later, his friend, buddy, pal, and fellow billionaire, Donald Trump, announced he was proposing import tariffs on steel and aluminum.

Now, we all know what happens to the stock of companies heavily dependent on steel and aluminum when the President announces he will impose new tariffs. Their stock prices go down a lot.

So I guess you could say that Carl Icahn was lucky to unload his shares, valued at, at least, \$31 million, just before the President made his announcement, but I suspect that luck had nothing to do with it.

Here is a Trump insider making a gigantic decision on tens of millions of dollars, and we are just supposed to believe it is a coincidence.

Sorry, but I am not buying it.

So I wrote the chairman of the SEC to request that he investigate. I have

not heard back from him, but I hope after he hears this speech, he might have a change of mind.

In the letter, I said: "The announcement of tariffs on the heels of Mr. Icahn's stock sale is highly suspicious. The close relationship between the President and Mr. Icahn adds to the appearance of wrongdoing."

So I think the SEC has an obligation to investigate, because it looks bad. We are talking about the President of the United States, and the people have a right to know that things are on the up and up.

Let's remember that Mr. Icahn left as an adviser to Trump at the White House because, we are told, it would raise difficult conflicts of interest, and presumably, just like the President, Mr. Icahn was not interested in selling off part of his empire just so he could appear impartial and demonstrate core integrity to the American people.

The President, who many of us think is profiting illegally from the office—and we have filed Articles of Impeachment because of it—seems to attract a lot of people with deep pockets and shallow reserves of judgment to his side.

Mr. Icahn, who was a notorious corporate raider and vulture capitalist during the Clinton boom years of the 1990s, appears to me and a lot of others to fit this mold.

If there is nothing to hide in this deal, then the investigation will be quick and that will be that, but simply saying this multimillion-dollar stroke of luck was just a coincidence is not flying; not with me, anyway.

Do you know the rigorous reporting of assets that we as House Members have to do to fully disclose our debts and investments?

And all those disclosures are available to the public, and the press goes over them with a fine-tooth comb. Every time a Member of Congress buys or sells a security over \$1,000, we have to file a form, and then that gets shared with the public. And if we are late with the filing of the paperwork, we have to pay a fine.

This may seem burdensome, but the important goal here is transparency and to ensure that Members are not using insider information they have access to to personally enrich themselves.

If I was as lucky as Carl Icahn to make a stock trade that my friend had the power to tell me the inside information on and it resulted in me making millions of dollars or avoiding losing millions of dollars, well, let's see,

there would be investigative reporters, hearings, an Ethics Committee report, maybe even criminal charges. But for Mr. Icahn and his buddy, the President, nothing; at least not yet.

Let's demand that the friends who circle the White House and the Trump businesses provide the American people with answers and transparency. That is all we ask so that we can have greater confidence in our President and his family that they are not running a kleptocracy like we see in Russia, where those who govern are simply governing to make money.

Mr. Speaker, no tax returns; very little in the way of disclosure; recusals that don't seem to actually be recusals; hotel and business conflicts of interest; and the strong odor of something fishy; those close to the President who are making millions, apparently because of the proximity to the President; those people demand scrutiny from watchdog agencies; and, in this case, it requires an investigation of Carl Icahn by the SEC.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my letter to the Honorable Jay Clayton, the chairman of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, of last week.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2018.

Hon. JAY CLAYTON,
Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: I write to request that you and your agency immediately investigate possible illegal insider trading by Mr. Carl Icahn, a longtime friend of President Donald Trump, who according to his SEC filings sold \$31.3 million worth of stock in a company heavily dependent on steel just days before the President announced plans to impose import tariffs on steel and aluminum.

According to Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) filings submitted in February, Mr. Icahn disclosed that he sold nearly 1 million shares of Manitowoc Company, Inc., which is heavily dependent on steel to manufacture cranes and lifts. Approximately seven days later, his good friend President Trump announced plans to impose steep tariffs on steel imports. On that news, Manitowoc stock plunged and lost 6% of its value, but Mr. Icahn had already cashed out.

The announcement of tariffs on the heels of Mr. Icahn's stock sale is highly suspicious. The close relationship between the President and Mr. Icahn adds to the appearance of wrongdoing. This is also not the first time Mr. Icahn has been suspected of using his relationship with the President for his personal benefit. It was widely reported that Mr. Icahn stepped down from his role as "special adviser" to the President because of potential conflicts of interest.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

As a member of the House of Representatives I am required to report my assets and liabilities yearly and to report within 30 days of a transaction any securities I buy or sell. The purpose of these rules is to ensure transparency and to help prevent personal profiteering from insider information that Members of Congress may have access to while serving. In other words, if I were to dump a stock a week before Congress took action that would impact that stock's price, I would most certainly be investigated resulting in possible sanctions, removal from office or jail time.

It is hard to believe Mr. Icahn's actions with regard to unloading voluminous shares of Manitowoc stock right before the President's is just a coincidence. It undoubtedly warrants a federal investigation. Thank you for your attention in this matter and I look forward to your agency taking swift action and your response to this request. To contact me about this request, please call me at my Washington DC office.

Sincerely,

LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

WE SHOULD DEBATE A NEW AUMF REGARDING AMERICAN TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago, BARBARA LEE and TOM COLE sent a letter to the Speaker of the House that was signed by 100 Members of Congress, including myself, asking the Speaker to authorize the committees of jurisdiction to bring an AUMF—that is an Authorization for Use of Military Force—so that we can have a debate.

The last time we had a policy debate on Afghanistan was 2001, 17 years ago.

I have been on the floor for the last 5 years because I am frustrated that we can't get a debate. It is our constitutional duty. And our young men and women are around the world in different locations, half we don't even know about, yet we can't debate an issue of war when young men and women go and die for this country.

That 5 years included calling on John Boehner to authorize an AUMF. Now we are calling on PAUL RYAN. I think my name has been on 15 letters going back to the days of John Boehner.

In the 17 years, we have spent over \$1 trillion, over 2,300 Americans have died, and over 20,000 wounded; yet we in Congress are not meeting our constitutional responsibility.

I have Camp Lejeune in my district. I have talked to many Active Duty marines who have been there five, six, seven times. It is so chaotic now, that the Russians are working with Karzai and trying to get back in with the Taliban.

It is a no-win situation. It is time to have a debate and let Members vote

whether they want to stay or come home.

Mr. Speaker, to make things worse than ever, on February 15, Pamela Constable wrote an article in The Washington Post titled, "Taliban appeals to American people to 'rationally' rethink war effort."

They are our enemy, but it is not bad advice, to be honest with you.

Pamela Constable mentions many portions of a longer letter written by the Taliban to the United States. I have a copy of this article and I read it yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the article written by Pamela Constable.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 2018]
TALIBAN APPEALS TO AMERICAN PEOPLE TO
'RATIONALLY' RETHINK WAR EFFORT
(By Pamela Constable)

KABUL.—Taliban insurgents on Wednesday issued an extraordinary, 17,000-word appeal to the "American people," asking them to pressure U.S. officials to end the 16-year-old conflict in Afghanistan and asserting that the protracted American "occupation" had brought only death, corruption and drugs to the impoverished country.

The letter, whose authenticity was confirmed by a brief telephone conversation with insurgent spokesman Zabiullah Mujahid, was primarily aimed at a U.S. audience. Unlike previous statements issued by the Taliban, it used statistics and logical arguments—not just ideological harangues—to convince Americans that their government's investment in the war has been a dire mistake.

"Prolonging the war in Afghanistan and maintaining American troop presence is neither beneficial for America nor for anyone else," the document said, calling on U.S. citizens, legislators and others to "read this letter prudently" and evaluate the costs and benefits of continuing to fight. "Stubbornly seeking the protraction of this war," it added, "will have 'dreadful consequences' for the region and the 'stability of America herself.'"

The letter, sent under the banner of "The Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan," was issued just weeks after a blitz of deadly insurgent attacks in the Afghan capital have left the government struggling to cope with increased public anxiety and anger. It also came as the Trump administration is ramping up a new military strategy, involving thousands of additional troops, to expand the Afghan security forces and train them to defend their country independently.

While insisting that "our preference is to solve the Afghan issue through peaceful dialogues," the letter also warned that Taliban forces "cannot be subdued by sheer force" and that seeking a peaceful solution does not mean "that we are exhausted or our will has been sapped."

This combination of outreach and threat has been a hallmark of Taliban statements, including a shorter one issued shortly after the spate of attacks last month that killed more than 150 people in urban population centers. The insurgent group has said it would not revive peace talks unless foreign troops leave the country, and it has rejected feelers from the administration of President Ashraf Ghani.

A spokesman for Ghani, Shah Hussain Murtazawi, responded sharply to the letter,

saying, "We never negotiate with groups who resort to crime and the brutal killing of people and then claim responsibility for it. The door of peace is shut to them, but the door of peace is open to those groups who have expressed their hatred for such crimes."

The letter's talking points included a list of goals that the U.S. government had set out to achieve in entering the war, including eliminating terrorism, establishing the rule of law and eradicating drugs. It then systematically presented arguments, backed up with international statistics but also exaggerated for effect, to show that these efforts had failed or had extremely negative consequences.

"As confirmed by your own military authorities, 3546 American and foreign soldiers have been killed, more than 20,000 American forces injured and tens of thousands more are suffering mentally," the letter said, asserting that the actual casualty figures were much higher but were being "concealed" by U.S. leaders. The casualty figures track with those provided by the U.S. military.

A second argument said reports by the U.S. Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction estimated that "sixty percent of Afghan territory is now under the control of Taliban." The figure is actually much lower, but the inspector general and other agencies have said that insurgents control or influence more territory than at any previous time in the war and that the area continues to widen.

The letter also said that there had been 751 U.S. airstrikes in September, which appears to be an accurate figure. "You should ask your generals that despite using such force, have you retaken even a single inch of land from the Taliban," the letter suggested.

A third assertion was that previous U.S. administrations had cited the "prevention and eradication of narcotics" as a justification to "invade" Afghanistan, an inaccurate claim. But the letter correctly cited figures from the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime showing that opium poppy cultivation has "skyrocketed" in the 16 years since the military intervention and that the number of Afghan drug addicts has reached more than 3 million.

The overall message of these arguments was that the American people should make a "rational" assessment of the war effort, realize that it is backfiring and prevail upon their leaders to withdraw.

"You proclaim to be a developed and civilized nation," the letter said. "We leave it to your judgment to decide" whether the prevailing conditions of "insecurity, chaos" and soaring drug problems in Afghanistan constitute "reforms or crimes against humanity."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic because many of us in the House of Representatives do think and would agree with the Taliban: It is time to rethink the policy in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I must have at least 35 or 40 posters that I have been using on the floor of the House for the last number of years. This one is of a woman who lost her husband, in tears, and the little baby girl sitting in her lap. She doesn't know why there is a man in a uniform kneeling before her mother with a folded flag.

There is just so much that we are missing as Members of Congress because we won't debate the war in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan is a graveyard of empires. I think one day that Afghan graveyard is going to have a headstone that says, "USA," because we are going broke trying to fix a country that couldn't care less about our values and our system. But that is the way it works around here. You can't even get a debate on sending young men and women to die for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Mr. RYAN to please let us have this debate. Members of Congress in both parties want to debate. You can vote for staying in Afghanistan, or you can vote for getting out of Afghanistan, but let us meet our constitutional responsibility.

I ask God to bless our men and women in uniform, and God to bless America.

YABUCOA AND VIEQUES, PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, as we speak today, the people of Puerto Rico continue to suffer. Currently, 200,000 families and businesses, 16 percent of the island, remain without power. That is not 6 days after the hurricane or 6 weeks. We are talking about 6 months.

For those still without power in Puerto Rico, they are now living through the longest blackout in modern history.

While parts of the island are recovering, it is the rural, far-flung portions of the island that continue to suffer the most and where aid has been slowest to reach. For example, if you go to my hometown of Yabucoa, where Hurricane Maria made landfall, it looks like the hurricane struck yesterday. Two-thirds of the residents living there are without electricity.

For decades, Yabucoa's baseball stadium stood as an important symbol of that town's community. The people there love baseball, and the stadium was a community anchor, a symbol of the town and its people. Those who live in Yabucoa are proud of their baseball diamond, as this town fielded Puerto Rico's team in the 2017 Junior League World Series.

Today, the baseball stadium sits empty, now a symbol of how the people of Yabucoa struggle daily to survive. Meanwhile, basic services are hard to come by, with hospitals relying on generators to provide lifesaving treatment. Older, rural parts of Puerto Rico continue to suffer immensely.

Thirty miles east of Yabucoa's coast sits the island of Vieques. As an island off an island, Vieques also has been neglected, waiting for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to restore power.

Just a few weeks ago, I was there and I saw this on the road: power poles dangling from electric wires, just waiting to snap.

Can you imagine seeing that in the mainland United States?

Again, this is not 1 week or 2 weeks after the hurricane. It is close to 6 months later. Meanwhile, the island's connection to the main power grid has been cut off, and some workers think it will take years to fully restore the undersea cables.

Those are just two towns in a commonwealth of 3.3 million American citizens, but all across Puerto Rico there are rural areas that have been hit hard and are still suffering today.

We cannot afford to forget what has happened there. These are fellow American citizens. For 120 years they have fought, shed blood, and died in our wars, defending our freedoms. Now they need our help to recover from a humanitarian crisis.

I implore my colleagues, we must not forget Puerto Rico. We must allocate additional aid and help. We must rebuild Puerto Rico stronger and better than ever before. Until we do, we will be failing the people of Puerto Rico, we will be failing our fellow Americans.

SEE SOMETHING, SAY SOMETHING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last night, 406 of my colleagues and I voted to pass the STOP School Violence Act and the Securing Our Schools Act.

As a father of four, when I dropped each of my kids off at Jefferson Elementary School in Great Bend, Kansas, I felt confident that they were going to have a safe place where they could learn and grow; but, today, we have seen time and time again that we need to revisit how we are protecting our children.

The STOP School Violence Act will train students, teachers, faculty, and local law enforcement on ways to identify threats and report them. It goes back to the message we have been relaying for ages: see something, say something.

□ 1015

This bill recognizes that sometimes our children and educators often do not have the training to spot some of the warning signs, and that is why it is critical that we provide training so students and personnel can recognize and report threats before they occur.

We also looked at ways to better our reporting process so that, when a threat is made, we have an effective way to log and intervene. To do so, this bill provides funding for States to upgrade their technology and develop an anonymous reporting system through a mobile app, hotline, and website. Not only does it allocate funds for violence, prevention training, and modernize our reporting protocols, it also allocates

funds to improve school security equipment.

The STOP School Violence Act, coupled last night with the Securing Our Schools Act, grants funds for schools to install panic buttons and further hardening and protection of our schools. These are steps forward that approach the issue of school safety from several angles, and I am proud to have cosponsored both pieces of legislation.

I want to make sure that my message to everyone back home today is clear. The House of Representatives is listening, and our school grounds should no longer be soft targets. After last night's vote, the STOP School Violence Act and the Securing Our Schools Act joins the Fix NICS Act that has been waiting on a vote from the Senate since last December. Fix NICS would strengthen background checks and close critical loopholes.

Today I urge my friends in the Senate to pass these bills so that our Nation's schools and children can be safer.

RECOGNIZING RESILIENCY OF KANSANS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as droughts continue to worsen across Kansas, now impacting all 105 counties, we are again at the point of seeing wildfires whip across the State of Kansas. While so far none of them have come close to the size of last year's Starbuck fire, there is reason to be concerned.

Today I want to recognize the resiliency of Kansans who have been coming together to help neighbors and strangers alike, as well as soldiers from the Kansas National Guard. These guardsmen work in cooperation with local firefighters and emergency personnel to combat fires and save people, property, and animals.

I stand today to commend their hard work and thank them for their service. These fires are a stark reminder of the devastation created by wildfires last year and provide a reminder of the importance in standing together in the face of difficulties.

RECOGNIZING PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN WASHINGTON'S SEVENTH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our wonderful public schools across the country.

Every child, Mr. Speaker, has the right to pursue opportunity, and through our public schools our country makes that opportunity a reality every day. Education imparts practical and invaluable skills that kids carry with them for the rest of their lives, teaches our children to become engaged members of our society and our democracy,

and public education is a great equalizer, having remained a means of mobility for generations of families. I know this firsthand, Mr. Speaker. I came to the United States when I was 16 years old by myself to go to college and take advantage of all the opportunities that an American education had to offer.

For much of our Nation's history, our public schools have served this essential purpose of helping students and their families to thrive. And public schools, which serve all students, regardless of who they are, are the only institutions where the vast majority of our kids can access these benefits.

It is those schools and the teachers, professionals, and staff who serve in them—and I use “serve” very deliberately, because it is a service to be in our public schools, where teachers could earn so much more elsewhere but choose to be in the public schools because that is the place where they can help the most kids. It is those schools and those amazing successes in my own district that I want to celebrate today.

Monserrat is a teacher at Concord International Elementary School where almost 80 percent of the students are from low-income families and more than half are English language learners. Last year, Monserrat created a writing lesson using both Spanish and English. Before this lesson, most of the kids wrote at a kindergarten or a first grade level, but by the end of that lesson, every single one of her students was able to write a complex complete sentence. And over the next year Monserrat's second graders became ambassadors for Concord International, giving tours of their school in both Spanish and English. It is clear that her investment in her students opened doors to achievement for these Seattle public school students.

Another story comes from Shorewood High School in Shoreline, Washington. Emily, a leader on her school's robotics team, wasn't interested in STEM until she got to high school because no one encouraged her to pursue it when she was younger. It wasn't until she learned about the lack of representation of women and girls in STEM that she realized that something needed to change. And last summer, Emily launched the Full STEAM Ahead Club, an all girls' mentoring group that encourages middle school girls to pursue science, technology, engineering, arts, and math. The youth mentors showed girls how important it is to engage in STEM fields early, and they work every day to expand girls' perceptions of what they can achieve, which is to say, anything.

And at Evergreen High School, a youth-led group called FEEST is working to combat food injustice in public schools. One of their campaigns recently made waves when youth leaders created the first student advisory com-

mittee with the district's nutrition services director. They provided the director with feedback on how to increase fresh and culturally relevant food items on school menus. And last month, they successfully got one of the recipes they created onto the district menu.

Through their work, these young people have developed relationships with their classmates, with decision-makers at the school district level, and they are building power and using their own innate intelligence about the issues that matter to create change in their schools and communities.

Mr. Speaker, I share these stories today to highlight how critical public schools are to my constituents and all Members. And as Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to ensure that we continue supporting our public schools. For example, public money should go to public schools. It should not be used to bankroll private entities and corporations that don't deliver excellent, inclusive, equitable instruction.

Our public schools are under attack right now from the Secretary of Education and the Trump administration. Our public schools and public money should not be used to generate a profit. And teachers, Mr. Speaker, should be teaching and not carrying guns to try to protect their students.

As tens of thousands of students across our country and here in the capital have rallied and called for attention to safety in our public schools by passing sensible gun reform legislation, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this body has yet to address the issue of guns and safety in our schools and in our classrooms.

And if we want to support education for our kids, we should make sure that they have the right to live. That is what we are talking about: kids who go to sleep at night wondering if they are going to cower in the corners of their classrooms the next day because somebody has a gun because Congress has not done our job.

The Trump administration and Secretary DeVos have demonstrated that they want to make sure that the money is what prevails. And, Mr. Speaker, today as we honor our public schools, we also need to honor the responsibility of Congress to protect our students and protect our public education.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANDREW KISTLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today in Franklin, Pennsylvania, an American hero will be laid to rest. Mr. Andrew A. Kistler, past

commander of the Disabled American Veterans, died on March 9 in Erie, Pennsylvania. He was 88 years old.

Andy Kistler was a tireless advocate for disabled veterans not only in Pennsylvania, but nationally. A Korean war veteran who was almost mortally wounded Christmas week in 1952, he lost both of his legs, a finger, and a concussion put him into a deep coma.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you the words of the late Korean war medic and journalist Chris Farlekas. He helped save Andy Kistler, a 21-year-old baseball player from Franklin who arrived at the 11th Evacuation Hospital for care. I quote from this letter:

“The ward was crammed with casualties, and every helicopter that landed outside the tent brought even more. The doctor said Andy was too far gone, that he would die.

“But something inside me said no.

“I still don't completely understand my ferocity in needing Andy to live. Maybe it was because I'd seen so much death already in the 4 months that I'd been in the war, holding frightened, dying young men as they talked about home. Andy was my test case with God. If he lived, I'd believe. If not, tough.

“So for 3 days I sat with Andy, willing him to live.

“On Christmas Eve, several of the nurses, doctors, and corpsmen went through the 11th Evac, singing Christmas carols. At exactly midnight, they came to the shock ward and sang ‘Silent Night.’ It may have sounded a little ragged, off-pitch, but to me it was absolutely beautiful, angelic.

“As I listened, Andy came out of the coma, opened his eyes, grabbed my hand, and softly sang, ‘All is calm, all is bright.’ The doctors said it was a miracle.”

Andy and Chris spoke about that glorious moment in the PBS documentary, “Korean War Stories,” produced in 2002.

Andy, a double amputee, went on to be a major force for the American veterans as head of the Disabled American Veterans, a nonprofit that provides a lifetime of support for veterans and their families. With almost 1,300 chapters and more than a million members across the country, DAV empowers our Nation's heroes and their families by helping to provide the resources they need and ensuring our Nation keeps the promises that were made to them.

Mr. Speaker, Andy said he sometimes found himself humming or singing “Silent Night” in odd moments, “like when I'm shaving,” he told Chris. I know that as friends and family say good-bye to a true American hero today in Franklin, all is calm, all is bright.

May God bless Andy Kistler, whose service to this Nation will be long remembered, and may he rest in peace.

HONORING THE NATION'S TEACHERS DURING PUBLIC SCHOOL WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANCE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our Nation's dedicated teachers during this year's Public School Week.

When I think back to my teachers in public school, one in particular stands out: Ms. Eleanor Ball, my eighth grade English teacher. In addition to instilling in me a love and respect for the English language, she was a teacher who went above and beyond the call of duty and gave each of us youngsters a sense of confidence to face the challenges that would lie ahead in our society.

But who are the Ms. Balls of today? Perhaps they are like Cristina Stout, a 4th grade teacher at Leading Creek Elementary School in Gilmer County, West Virginia. Ms. Stout is known for her compassion for her students. She often buys school supplies and winter coats for kids whose families can't afford them. One year she gave up every lunch break, every day, so that just one of her students who suffers with a sensory issue could eat in her classroom with her and avoid the overstimulating cafeteria. Most days, she stays late to tutor students who need the extra care, help, and assistance to ensure that they don't fall behind.

These are just two of countless examples of our Nation's teachers going above and beyond the call of duty every day across America.

To Ms. Ball, Ms. Stout, and teachers everywhere, we thank you, from the bottom of our hearts.

HONORING JOE ORGILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember Joel Orgill, a friend of mine and a great west Tennessean who passed away this week at the age of 80.

Joe was a lifelong Memphian who inspired so many with his business prowess, his strong faith, and, most importantly, his kindness and commitment to giving back to his community. Through the years, Joe was always very nice to me and offered great advice and counsel.

Like most Memphians, I knew Joe as an astute businessman who started in the family business as a salesman and worked his way up to president and chairman of the board. Joe played a major role in growing Orgill, Inc., the company as it is known today, into one of the largest hardware distributors of its kind in the entire world and the longest running business in Memphis history.

Joe Orgill was a real titan in the hardware industry. Besides leading one of the major privately held companies in the Memphis area, Joe was a real people person. He had the rare ability to connect and to interact with people of all types and, more importantly, treated everyone the same way.

But much more importantly, Joe was a philanthropist who always gave back to his community. Joe Orgill dedicated an incredible amount of his time and resources to charitable organizations throughout the MidSouth: the United Way, Meals on Wheels, Church Health Center, Rhodes College, the Dixon Gallery and Gardens, and many more.

I mentioned Meals on Wheels. Joe took great pleasure in stopping whatever he was doing, whatever meetings, to personally deliver these meals to those most needy. To me, that really personifies Joe Orgill.

But most importantly, Joe enjoyed spending time with his family.

Roberta and I send our condolences to Joe's wife, Irene, as well as his four daughters—Adele, Irene, Anne, and Kate—and to the entire family.

While we mourn the loss of Joe, I know that his spirit lives on in his wonderful family and in the Memphis community, and I have no doubt that Joe Orgill's legacy will inspire generations to come.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JENKINS of Kansas) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dom Elias M. Carr, All Saints Regional Catholic School, Glen Cove, New York, offered the following prayer:

O God, beyond all praising, source of light, sustainer of life, significance of liberty, we come before You.

With hearts filled with wonder, we thank You for every gift You send, for blessings without number, and mercies without end.

Turn to us as we lift our hearts before You, and wait upon Your word, honoring and adoring You, our good and gracious Lord.

Then hear us, O God, accepting the love we bring, that we, who know Your favor, may serve You, our unimagined king.

Look kindly upon these Representatives and their staffs, showering upon them the spirit of wisdom, charity, and justice.

And whether our tomorrows be filled with good or ill, let us triumph through our sorrows and rise to bless You still: to marvel at Your beauty and glory in Your ways and make a joyful duty our sacrifice of praise.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SUOZZI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DOM ELIAS M. CARR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I am here to welcome Father Elias to the Chamber. He is from my hometown of the city of Glen Cove.

Father Elias, as was mentioned, is a canon regular of St. Augustine from Klosterneuburg, Austria, and he and three of his colleagues from Klosterneuburg have been assigned to my parish, St. Rocco's, and our neighboring parish of St. Patrick's since 2011.

He is joined here today by his parents as well as his brother, who is also a priest, Father Richard from Annandale, Virginia.

I just wanted to say that we are so honored to have him here today. He has made such a dramatic difference in our community, along with his colleagues, Father Daniel, Father Ambrose, and Father Gabriel; and a great difference in my family's life as well.

We are so grateful to you for your service to our community and to your faith, and to our faith, and for making such a difference in our lives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WORKERS AND FAMILIES ARE OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE NEW TAX CUT LAW

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, as I travel to each corner of my district, I hear from workers and families who are optimistic about the new tax cut law and what it means for their pocketbooks.

There is a momentum in our economy, and the latest jobs report from February is another piece of positive news. Last month, the economy added 313,000 jobs, far exceeding expectations; the unemployment rate remained at a 17-year low for the fifth consecutive month; and labor force participation increased by more than 800,000 workers, the biggest surge in 15 years.

Earlier this week, the National Federation of Independent Business released a survey that found small-business owners' confidence in the economy is soaring, and they are prepared to hire and raise wages without a government mandate. Imagine that.

Madam Speaker, these are encouraging signs that our policies of reducing excessive red tape and cutting taxes are working.

Let's build on these results and continue to advance solutions that improve the lives of the people we represent.

CELEBRATING 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF GOOD FRIDAY AGREEMENT

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, this weekend, Irish Americans will celebrate St. Patrick's Day with parades and parties of every level of exuberance, including in my hometown of Buffalo, New York.

Buffalo's St. Patrick's Day celebration is one of the most spirited in America.

This year is a special celebration as it marks the 20-year anniversary of peace in Northern Ireland. The 1998 Good Friday Agreement brought peace to Catholics and Protestants after 700 years of armed conflict.

This peace belongs to the people of Northern Ireland and to the world.

Sinn Féin leaders Gerry Adams and the late Martin McGuinness, along with the Democratic Unionist Party's Reverend Ian Paisley took a courageous step no one believed was possible 20 years ago. They denounced violence and committed themselves to a peaceful power-sharing and reconciliation to live in peace together.

Madam Speaker, let this St. Patrick's Day and the 20th anniversary of the Good Friday Agreement stand as a shining light of hope for a gentler America and a more peaceful world.

CIVIL WAR IN SYRIA

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to shine light on the ongoing tragedy in Syria.

Today marks 7 years of civil war in Syria, 7 years of indiscriminate killing of women and children, 7 years of intermittent chemical attacks on civilians by the Assad regime, 7 years of bombings, of people thrown out of their homes, of children whose youth has been stolen from them.

The ongoing tragedy in eastern Ghouta is just the most recent of horrific events perpetrated by the Assad regime and their Iranian-backed militia.

The White Helmets group reports that 800 civilians have been killed in the past 2 weeks as the Assad regime continues to pound the rebel-held area, despite the ongoing humanitarian cease-fire.

The blatant disregard regime forces have for civilian life is nothing short of despicable.

We must continue to be engaged in efforts to support the Syrian Democratic Forces and other allies that believe in a free, democratic, and independent Syria.

Without U.S. leadership, the carnage will continue and we will be left with meaningless U.N. resolutions. We must stand with our allies to stop this devastating carnage that is tearing apart families and ruining countless lives.

HONORING DEPUTY DAVID LEE'SEAN MANNING

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise today to honor the life and work of a young 24-year-old deputy sheriff from Edgecombe County, North Carolina, who was tragically killed during a traffic stop in his community on Sunday, March 11, 2018.

Deputy David Lee'Sean Manning lost his life when his patrol vehicle crashed while engaged in the traffic stop.

The elected sheriff of Edgecombe County, my friend, Sheriff Clee Atkinson, informed me that this loss has resulted in tremendous sadness for the Manning family and the entire law enforcement community, an emotion that we all certainly understand.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the 750,000 citizens of North Carolina's First Congressional District, we honor the life and service of Deputy David Lee'Sean Manning.

May God continue to embrace David's biological family, embrace his law enforcement family in the weeks and months to come, and give them the sol-

ace that they need to continue with their lives.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of Public Schools Week to recognize the incredible work in public education done every day in every State in our Union.

I have the honor of representing some of the finest public schools in the Nation. This did not happen by accident. Our public schools lead the country because of the tremendous work of our public educators.

I attended public schools, I respect our teachers, and I proudly support our public schools here in Congress.

I know the work of educators can be difficult, but the life of a teacher is a vocation, not an occupation. Educators give their lives in service to future generations of leaders, thinkers, writers, doctors, scientists, and visionaries.

We need teachers, and we need the public education system to remain strong in the United States. Public schools are where our students realize their talents and their potential.

We need good educators to continue offering encouragement and advice and to be champions and mentors.

Let us celebrate this Public Schools Week by thanking the teachers and educators in our lives.

PUTTING PENSIONS BACK ON SOLID GROUND

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, many pension plans across America are on the brink of failure and threatened by massive cuts. If nothing is done, 200 multiemployer plans are projected to fail, many within the next 10 years, and the impacts will be felt by Americans in every State in our country.

Cuts to these pensions would be economically devastating for 1.5 million people who have earned their livings as carpenters, truck drivers, iron and steel workers, bricklayers, and painters.

They paid into these plans. After a lifetime of hard work, they deserve to retire with dignity and peace of mind.

If these plans fail, taxpayers could have to pay billions of dollars if the Federal Government's Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation fails.

That is why Democrats have proposed A Better Deal to save our pensions that provides financing to put failing pension plans back on solid ground to ensure that they can meet their commitments to retirees today and workers for decades to come, prevents a single dollar of cuts to benefits

retirees have earned, and it puts safeguards in place so that pension plans remain strong in order to be there for today's workers when they retire.

We need to bring these proposals to the floor so we can work together to protect the pensions that American workers have earned.

CELEBRATING FIVE GENERATIONS AND 125 YEARS OF VARNS AND HOOVER HARDWARE

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Varns and Hoover Hardware, which has been a fixture in the Middlebury community for more than 125 years.

The success and longevity of this family-owned business lies in the family's dedication to serving their neighbors and providing high-quality products with a friendly smile.

Small businesses like this are the backbone of the American economy, and it is a privilege to represent a family so devoted to the prosperity of their community for so many years.

To honor Varns and Hoover Hardware is to honor what it means to achieve the American Dream.

With ownership now being passed down to the fifth generation family member, Nathan Miller, I am grateful to be able to recognize such a pivotal moment in the history of this Hoosier family, their small business, and the community that they serve.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Varns and Hoover Hardware and in wishing them the best in all the years to come.

REMEMBERING BOB BANUELOS

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of a remarkable member of my staff and a remarkable member of my community, Bob Banuelos, who passed away suddenly last week.

Bob spent over 30 years working for the people of Orange County. Before joining my team, he also worked for my predecessor, Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez.

Bob had deep roots in our community. He grew up on a small family farm in Fountain Valley and was a long-time member of the Orange County political environment.

Bob worked for the less fortunate throughout his community, and he was a friend to everybody he met.

Bob was also the first Native American candidate to run for Congress in Orange County in 1992, and he came close to winning. He changed Orange County politics forever.

I am saddened by his passing. He devoted his life to making Orange County a better place for everybody to live. We will all miss him, and we will never forget him.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. GIANFORTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Montana men's basketball team for an outstanding season and to wish them success in the 2018 NCAA Tournament.

The Grizzlies were regular season champions of the Big Sky Conference, going 16 to 2 in conference play.

Last weekend, the squad won the Big Sky Tournament.

They begin their journey in the NCAA Tournament tonight with a first-round game in Wichita, Kansas.

The Grizzlies will be strong contenders. Their defense is relentless, leading the Big Sky Conference this year. Every player on the floor contributes to their offense. They represent the spirit of Montana.

Congratulations also to Montana head coach Travis DeCuipe, who was named Coach of the Year in the Big Sky Conference. In his fourth season at the helm, he guided the Grizzlies to a 26-7 record and their first NCAA Tournament appearance since 2013.

I know the folks in the Treasure State will join me in saying: "Up With Montana."

□ 1215

GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, yesterday marked 1 month since the gunman at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School cut short the lives of 17 students and teachers. These tragedies have become so common that the response of this Congress is practically routine: thoughts and prayers are offered, moments of silence held, and then we move on with no specific action on gun violence.

Madam Speaker, this is not enough. We need to heed the call of thousands of students across the country who organized walkouts and events with a simple message for us: It is time to act.

We need to be able to look these students in the eye and say: "We are doing everything we can to protect you." But for too long, this institution has refused to do just that. We are not considering legislation to pass universal

background checks. We have not debated restricting the sale of military assault weapons, bump stocks, and high-capacity magazines, or even lifting the ban on preventing our government from researching gun safety solutions.

Yesterday we did pass a bill with important resources for school safety, including a bipartisan provision I introduced with Representative MIKE BOST to help schools install panic buttons. That is an important first step, but really protecting our children is not possible without concrete measures to reduce gun violence.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the wisdom of the young people in our districts, and let's all find the courage to pass sensible gun safety laws and, finally, to save lives.

HONORING VETERAN HOMER VAUGHN WAGNON, JR.

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of Homer Vaughn Wagnon, Jr., a veteran of World War II who left this world on November 29, having "just satisfied his life's ambitions," per the obituary provided for him.

Mr. Wagnon served our country in the infantry, fighting his way across France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany as he and his fellow members of the Greatest Generation pushed back against tyranny.

He continued his service to our country in private business, helping to build a post-World War II incredible economy as a mechanical engineer. His range of new products included mechanical rubber goods, radio and TV equipment, and items for naval ships and aircraft applications.

Mr. Wagnon leaves behind the love of his life, Darlene Raitt Wright, and Wagnon's 6 children, 11 grandchildren, and 5 great-grandchildren. His grandson Tariq Bokhari followed his grandfather's example: In distinction, he now serves as an outstanding member of the Charlotte City Council.

Madam Speaker, please join me in expressing condolences to the Wagnon family.

TRUMP IN SAN DIEGO

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, President Trump was in my hometown of San Diego this week. He went to inspect prototypes for his proposed border wall, a wall California doesn't want, doesn't need, and is an overly simplistic approach to a complex issue.

The President was in San Diego for just a few hours and missed a real opportunity to hear from locals about what Americans in California actually need. Had he taken the time to actually listen, he might have learned how connected Mexico and the United States are and how important the cross-border economy is to our region. He might have learned about our infrastructure needs, about the contributions of our immigrant communities, or the environmental issues facing our region.

Instead, he flew 3,000 miles on the taxpayers' dime for a photo-op for his political base, that achieved very little. Something is wrong when a President doesn't listen to the American people.

CHEERING ON SETON HALL PIRATES

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, today begins the best time of the year. March Madness is in full effect as of noon today, and I am here to support a team that I have followed for 50 years in college basketball, the Seton Hall Pirates from South Orange, New Jersey.

Thirty years ago, Madam Speaker, they played for the championship in the Final Four against a Michigan team and lost by 1 point. Today we have another team that has the potential of going all the way.

I would just like to acknowledge the Seton Hall Pirates as they start their journey for a national championship against the North Carolina State Wolfpack and ask that we honor seniors Ismael Sanogo, Khadeen Carrington, Angel Delgado, and Desi Rodriguez as they start their trek.

Go, Pirates.

CALLING FOR FEMA REFORM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is 8 months since Hurricane Harvey devastated parts of the State of Texas and the United States.

We are engaged in an assessment, and I will tell you, after 88 people died, people are still in hotels, houses are still in disrepair, and we are still in need. We are a strong State and a resilient city with great leaders who work very hard.

But I think it is important that, as we try to recover, we work to restructure FEMA, as we are assessing right now in a hearing, so that we can address the questions that 300-plus of my constituents on March 5 in Kashmere Gardens—heavily hit, along with northeast Houston—asked the ques-

tions: Why were there so many FEMA denials? Why did the inspectors see 4 inches of rain in your house and it was 4 feet? What is the structure that we can utilize to allow people to come out of hotels and get into housing when they don't have a down payment or they don't have the first month's rent?

This is a holistic approach. We need to reform FEMA from the perspective of housing and the Stafford Act. We need to structure FEMA in the rescue part and the recovery part. We need answers, and my constituents need answers now regarding the many, many denials that have stopped them from proceeding with their lives.

ORONO HOCKEY CHAMPS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Orono High School boys hockey team on winning the Minnesota State championship, their very first State championship in school history. Their win came against Alexandria under the lights in the Xcel Energy Center.

Orono took the lead early in the first, but their advantage was very short lived. Alexandria's Cardinals came back to tie it up in very little time. Despite outshooting the Cardinals 11 to 1 in the second period, Orono just couldn't connect, which made the winning shot, taken midway through the third period, all the more exciting.

Madam Speaker, the student athletes brought home more than just a statewide trophy. They set the example for their classmates because of their work in the classroom and managing other activities.

Congratulations again to the coaches, the players, the parents, and all of the fans of the Orono High School boys hockey team.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4061, FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4293, STRESS TEST IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 780 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 780

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4061) to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes. All

points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-64, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4293) to reform the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review process, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Test process, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-63, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. The rule makes in order two bills reported favorably by the Committee on Financial Services. Both bills were the subject of multiple hearings before the Committee on Financial Services. Each bill was reported favorably by a bipartisan majority without amendment. The rule adopts the only two amendments that were offered to these bills.

Madam Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of being here on the floor debating three financial services bills, and I am back with two more today. Last night, the Senate took a significant step toward joining the House in producing a banking reform bill. The negative impacts of Dodd-Frank are enough to finally overcome even the Senate's inertia.

Last year, the House Republicans passed our own plan to reform our banking system and regulate financial institutions in a smarter way. Ever since Dodd-Frank became law, our small town and community lenders have been hamstrung by regulations intended for large Wall Street banks.

As is usually the case, Washington did not regulate in a manner that focused on bad actors or that differentiated between diverse financing institutions. Instead, Federal regulators stamped out one-size-fits-all regulations that have had negative impacts on our local community banks and credit unions.

Under the House Republican plan, we correct this wrongheaded approach by forcing regulators to take into account the size and risk profiles of smaller institutions. The Financial CHOICE Act ensures the security of our financial institutions without creating a too-big-to-fail government support system and encouraging local banks and credit unions to invest in our communities.

Over the past few months, we have put various components of the Financial CHOICE Act on the floor in order to demonstrate to the Senate that there is a bipartisan pathway forward on many of our proposals. We continue that effort today.

The first bill that is made in order by this rule is H.R. 4061, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act. This bill enhances transparency and procedural equity of the nonbank systemically important financial institution designation process.

Under Dodd-Frank, systemically important financial institutions were intended to be large banks whose collapse would bring about enormous financial upheaval; however, in the hands of regulators, certain insurance companies and asset managers were designated as systemically important. This was not Congress' intent when allowing regulators to designate nonbanks as systemically important.

The bill before us today will not roll back the ability of regulators to determine that a large nonbank financial institution is systemically important, but it will ensure the process for designating the nonbank as transparent. It also forces regulators to consider other possible regulatory fixes before designating a nonbank as systemically important.

□ 1230

Well, this is all well and good. But what does this mean for Coloradans and other Americans?

In 2014, the life insurer MetLife was designated as a systemically important financial institution by regulators. By 2016, MetLife had prevailed in court and had their designation overturned.

What was revealed was how arbitrary and capricious the designation process seemed to be. Regulators never clarified what level of risk would be acceptable, nor did they clearly identify particular types of financial products or business activities that would result in too much risk.

So life insurers and others were left wondering how to avoid the important designation. Being designated would not only increase compliance costs and consume resources that could not be invested into the business, it also would have forced the financial company to limit the options they made available to their customers.

So we see the vicious cycle of over-regulation play out again: less growth and fewer choices.

Fortunately, in the case referenced above, the courts stepped in early and halted the process. However, we have the opportunity now to bring about reforms to the designation process that protect Americans from losing access to financial products that serve them well.

When we talk about Washington picking winners and losers, look no further than Dodd-Frank and the systemically important financial institution designation. Let's put an end to these opaque regulatory decisions and allow light to shine on financial regulators.

Madam Speaker, the second bill that this bill makes in order is H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act.

The Federal Reserve determines the ability of bank holding companies to withstand certain types of economic turmoil. These determinations have become known as stress tests.

These stress tests have become notorious for their vague rules and the secrecy by which the regulators conduct the tests. Bank compliance officers are often stuck trying to figure on what exactly their bank is going to be examined. Banks not only do not know what they are going to be tested on, they often never know what they were tested on after the stress test is conducted.

Frankly, technocrat regulators playing "hide the ball" from Americans that they are regulating seems like a system of government wholly unlike our own.

A professor from Columbia University testified before the House Committee on Financial Service that: "It is hard to believe that the stress tests' current structure could occur in a country like the United States, which prizes the rule of law and adherence to due process."

Former Senator Phil Gramm testified before a Senate panel and said the following: "What does the stress test test? Not only does no one know, but

the regulators see that as a virtue. The Fed's vice chairman has stated that giving banks a clear road map for compliance might make it 'easier to game the test.' But isn't the fact that compliance is easier when you know what the law says the whole point of the rule of law?"

The Stress Test Improvement Act inserts much-needed transparency into the testing process. It alters current regulations to make the internal, company-run test an annual exercise. It also streamlines the number of scenarios on which a bank may be tested, while ensuring that banks are still tested on whether they are able to withstand a seriously adverse scenario.

Dodd-Frank was born out of an effort to prevent another collapse of our financial institutions like we experienced in 2008. Unfortunately, the broad brush stroke regulatory regime that it produced has had many unintended consequences.

Hardest hit were our small community banks and credit unions. However, there were also unforeseen negative impacts on larger financial institutions as well.

The bills made in order by this rule restructure portions of Dodd-Frank that have resulted in unreasonable regulation of our financial institutions. They preserve consumer protections while providing the certainty needed to reduce compliance costs and expand the ability of these organizations to provide the best and safest financial services to Americans.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Madam Speaker, today's bills would roll back important consumer and financial protections by undermining the effectiveness of financial regulators' ability to conduct important stress tests, create unnecessary hurdles for regulators to contend with in the future, and limit the Federal Reserve Board's flexibility in determining the health and stability of our financial institutions.

Madam Speaker, including these two measures, the Rules Committee will have considered 30 Financial Services bills this Congress, 15 of which were considered under closed rules. Those 15 are part of a much larger closed process that Republican leadership has wielded with brute force to push through the legislative priorities of powerful special interests. Indeed, this week, we witnessed the 73rd closed rule for this Congress, a style of legislating that is as brazen as it is broken.

This critique of the majority's reliance on a closed process is not just

some technical point, but, rather, an important one; because when you close out those on your side of the aisle who are not in leadership and those on our side of the aisle from offering amendments, you do not simply silence us, you silence the American people.

And what has this process wrought for the American people?

Well, let's take a look. Bear with me because it is a doozy.

First, we witnessed the majority—in what I believe was the most chaotic and convoluted process during my 25 years in the House of Representatives—try to take away healthcare from 23 million Americans.

When they couldn't get that done, the majority then honed in on a tax giveaway to corporate America and the ultrawealthy not only at the expense of the middle class, but also to the detriment of future generations, as that bill will explode our national debt by an estimated \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

Just last week, we watched as our Republican friends attacked Clean Air Act protections to give a handout to specified industries to emit more pollution into the air.

Is this what my Republican friends were sent here to do: To take away healthcare from millions of people? To remove important environmental protections that keep America's air and water safe? To limit the amount of stress tests the Federal Reserve Board should run on our biggest financial institutions so that we can avoid another financial meltdown?

Footnote right there. If these stress tests are so bothersome to these big old banks, how is it that they are making all of this big old money?

They don't seem to have any hindrance when it comes to sopping up the resources of this country.

Madam Speaker, my constituents haven't been calling me or writing or emailing my office asking that we consider or pass any of the measures the House will consider this week. On the other hand, they have written to my office asking what Republican leadership is going to do about addressing the gun violence epidemic ravaging our country. I was meeting in my office just an hour ago with officials from Tamarac, Florida, and we received an alert that two schools near the Parkland school were on lockdown.

My constituents have asked about what Republican leadership will do to ensure that the DACA recipients have a pathway to citizenship. They have asked what Republican leadership will do to address our Nation's needs for serious and sustained investments in our infrastructure. Unfortunately, the answer is little to nothing.

Footnote right there. When I came to this Congress 25 years ago, there were 14,000 bridges in the United States of America in need of a repair. Today,

there are 56,000 bridges in this country in need of repair.

Madam Speaker, since 2014, there have been over 1,360 mass shootings in America. Let me let that soak in. Since 2014, there have been over 1,360 mass shootings in America.

In 2018 alone, nearly 500 teens and over 100 children have been killed or injured by guns. Last month, 14 students and 3 teachers were gunned down at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School by a former student using an AR-15 that he bought legally.

And just 2 days ago, American citizens took to the grounds of this Capitol and placed 7,000 pairs of shoes on the front lawn here at the Capitol. Citizens placed a pair of shoes for every child killed by gun violence since the Sandy Hook massacre. Regardless of your views on this subject, please let that number sink in: 7,000 pairs of shoes.

Madam Speaker, we should not be considering a bill to reform the Financial Stability Oversight Council. We should not be considering a measure that limits the frequency of stress tests on our financial institutions.

What we should be doing is considering a ban on bump stocks. We should be considering a ban on weapons of war. We should be considering protective orders allowing people to petition a court to temporarily remove firearms from an individual in crisis.

We should be considering a measure to provide for comprehensive background checks, and maybe this time try not to sabotage it by attaching a controversial concealed carry provision to the measure.

Madam Speaker, the Republican majority is also ignoring the plight of 22,000 Dreamers who have lost their protected status since President Trump ended DACA, and the other hundreds of thousands of Dreamers who remain in legal limbo. Every day, 120 of them lose their status.

Madam Speaker, 25 times—25 times—House Republicans blocked a vote on the bipartisan Dream Act, which protects innocent Dreamers from this cruel Republican inaction. Every day of inaction on the part of my friends across the aisle means another day that families are needlessly made to live under the threat of being torn apart.

Madam Speaker, all across America, our infrastructure is in need of repair and greater investment. Every Member in the House of Representatives likely received a visit from members of the National League of Cities around the United States of America, and every one of them is talking about infrastructure needs. Every one of them. Yet the Republican majority has stalled on presenting a single infrastructure bill.

Even President Donald John Trump's infrastructure plan faces an obstacle: his own budget cuts.

President Trump claimed the Federal Government was investing \$1.5 trillion to our infrastructure, but, in reality, the White House's plan actually only proposed \$200 billion in Federal funding. At the same time, he proposed slashing critical infrastructure funding to the Department of Transportation by nearly 20 percent, and the Army Corps of Engineers' budget by 22 percent.

How does that work, Madam Speaker?

The truth is, it doesn't.

Madam Speaker, we stand here today with a to-do list a mile long and an ocean wide. I suggest the following: that we stop being forced to spend our time checking off items on the wish lists of powerful corporate special interests, and we turn to the business of the American people—Republican and Democrat, independent, conservative, and liberal American people.

For starters, we could work together to end our country's gun violence epidemic, bring relief to DACA recipients, and bring thought-out and serious legislation to the floor that will invest in our infrastructure.

□ 1245

Now, I am sure that my friend is either thinking or likely to say that we are here about financial services measures, and he is correct. That is what these rules call for. But what these rules are about, in the final analysis, is a diversion from things that we know are more critical.

Why, then, are we not dealing with prioritized matters that we know that the American people want, rather than those that the corporate greedy, needy, big old businesses want?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), the sponsor of H.R. 4293.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important rule and in support of the two underlying bipartisan bills that will improve our banking system and help grow our Nation's economy: H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act of 2017; and H.R. 4061, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017.

These are two essential pieces of legislation that cleared the Committee on Financial Services with bipartisan support.

I am the sponsor of the Stress Test Improvement Act, alongside the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), my Democratic colleague.

Stress tests are one of the aspects of current law that are contributing to the climate of legal and regulatory uncertainty because the Federal Reserve

has failed to provide the necessary transparency around this process.

This bipartisan bill will inject transparency, consistency, and fairness into the stress testing process. Without needed reform, rather than ensuring financial stability, the Federal Reserve's stress tests are likely missing real risks while constraining the competitive flow of financial services that is critical to increasing economic opportunity.

While a valuable resource, stress test results may be creating a false sense of security, while at the same time sowing the seeds of financial instability. In order to succeed, a stress test must build from an accurate forecast of the next macroeconomic storm; and even the best forecasts tend to be wrong.

This is a bipartisan bill that was amended in the committee markup with unanimous support of every committee member, including the ranking member. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) that we accepted focused the bill on core reforms to the stress testing process that will make the rules more transparent, effective, and fair.

We are not gutting standards, but making them work for the real world. This bill is a bipartisan team effort to accomplish those goals. So is the other bill covered by this rule, the FSOC Improvement Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule, and I urge the passage of both of these important bills.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it has been one month since the tragic events at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. The district that I am privileged to serve is adjacent to that school, and I have two of my remaining cousins in life that live in Parkland, and I live within 30 minutes of where that school is situated.

A gunman killed 17 innocent students and teachers. Since that heartbreaking day, Americans from coast to coast have raised their voices and said: Enough is enough.

Yesterday, thousands of students from across our country walked out of their classrooms to protest this body's inaction. Two days ago, as I said earlier, 7,000 empty pairs of children's shoes were laid on the Capitol lawn to commemorate all the children who have been tragically killed by gun violence since the 2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting. I might add, not only at schools, but in Nevada, in California, in Texas, in South Carolina, in churches, in Orlando bars, these mass shootings are occurring. People don't think it is an epidemic.

My friends on the other side of the aisle did bring a bill to the floor yesterday that I voted for that was also co-

joined by my friend, TED DEUTCH, whose district is where the Parkland school is. He, too, was involved with that legislation, but it was done to improve school security. Much more needs to be done, and it needs to be done now.

So, today, I offer my colleagues yet another opportunity to show the American people that they value their safety and the safety of their children over the lobbying of the National Rifle Association and the gun manufacturers.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up four commonsense gun safety bills: H.R. 4240, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act; H.R. 3464, the Background Check Completion Act; H.R. 2598, the Gun Violence Restraining Order Act; and H.R. 1478, the Gun Violence Research Act.

These bills would close the dangerous gun show and internet sale background check loopholes, prevent the sale of guns without a completed background check, ensure that people who are a danger to themselves or to others can be prevented from possessing a gun, and lift the prohibition on government-sponsored scientific research on causes of gun violence.

Let me send a message to gun owners in this country. I own a gun. I believe in the Second Amendment. I don't want anybody to take anybody's gun; but nobody can persuade me that anybody, other than military and police officers, are deserving of having in their possession automatic weapons. I believe every American feels the same way.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), my very good friend that I knew before we came to Congress together, and the distinguished assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, this rule fails to make in order four significant measures to address the gun violence epidemic that is plaguing our Nation.

In addition to closing the gun show and internet sale loopholes in the background check system, lifting the prohibition on Federal research into gun violence, and creating a process to prevent dangerous individuals from having firearms, the amendment includes my legislation to close the Charleston loophole, which allows gun sales to be completed even if FBI investigations

are still going on to determine the outcome of a background check.

The tragic consequences of this loophole were demonstrated on June 17, 2015, when a hate-filled gunman opened fire at the historic Emanuel A.M.E. Church in Charleston, South Carolina, killing nine and injuring three others. In that fateful instance, the shooter attempted to buy a firearm on April 11 and was initially delayed due to possible red flags in his criminal record.

Despite the investigation not being completed in 3 days, he was allowed to purchase the weapon. The FBI later discovered the shooter would not have been allowed to purchase the firearm due to his documented history of drug abuse had they been able to complete the background check.

Madam Speaker, the consequences are too great to allow loopholes like these to persist. We have laws on the books to prohibit dangerous individuals like the shooter in Charleston from buying weapons, but these loopholes prevent them from being enforced. Thousands of weapons are sold each year through the Charleston loophole alone. In fact, I read that over 6,000 such weapons have been sold through this loophole.

I appreciate that many of my colleagues have signaled they are supportive of improving the background check system, but no amount of improvement will protect the American people if all the loopholes are allowed to exist.

For almost 3 years, the people of Charleston, South Carolina, and across the country have been demanding a vote from this House on closing the Charleston loophole. They have yet to get one.

I urge my colleagues to allow this body to take a vote on closing this loophole and giving the American people the protections they need and deserve. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), the sponsor of H.R. 4061.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and my underlying legislation, H.R. 4061, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017.

Madam Speaker, when folks back home save for retirement, college, or a down payment on a house, they expect that the system is both safe and geared towards maximizing their benefit.

A beautiful thing about America's free enterprise system is how anyone can participate in the marketplace, strengthen the economy, and earn a dividend of the American Dream. That opportunity, however, is not guaranteed, and, as lawmakers, we have a duty to protect it.

My bill will help us do just that by improving the Financial Stability

Oversight Council's process for reviewing nonbank financial institutions for potential systemic threats. We must be clear that simply designating more companies as systemically important financial institutions doesn't make our system safer.

The FSOC can better serve the American people by working with prudential regulators and the private sector to address threats to our economy before they transform into calamities.

Would you say it is sufficient for firefighters just to identify a house that is on fire?

Of course not. The key is preventing the fire in the first place.

This is the problem that we face with the FSOC's oversight of nonbank financial institutions. The FSOC may be able to identify tinderboxes, but fails to explain how they might be made less flammable, and, instead, the Council defaults to what should be the heavy-handed regulations of last resort.

To be sure, the FSOC has begun to recognize the benefits of leveraging the expertise of prudential regulators, as well as providing increased transparency. In recent years, they have taken steps to improve the designation process, including the February 2015 guidance providing increased transparency in the nonbank SIFI designation process.

These 2015 reforms were welcome, and this legislation will codify many of them into law, as well as provide a path for a nonbank financial company to eliminate risk rather than be designated.

Importantly, our legislation will ensure a company's primary regulator has a meaningful role in the SIFI designation process. After 8 years, if we don't take steps to address the obvious shortcomings of the FSOC, like the nonbank designation process, the regulator intended to protect financial stability could very well become a liability.

The American Action Forum has found that additional capital requirements resulting from a SIFI designation of asset management firms could affect American retirees in the amount of at least \$100,000 in potential savings over the lifetime of their investments.

That is why these reforms included in H.R. 4061 are critical to the more than 90 million investors who rely on the services of asset management firms to achieve their most important financial goals.

Companies must have a chance to de-risk before the FSOC can saddle their customers with such extraordinary losses. This bill will give them that opportunity. I am proud to have worked with my colleague and friend across the aisle, Representative JOHN DELANEY, on this strongly bipartisan piece of legislation. I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for his support and leadership in moving this bill

through our committee and onto the House floor.

This bill has 58 original cosponsors: 29 Democrats, 29 Republicans. Our bill demonstrates that there can be broad bipartisan support for increased transparency of the FSOC designation process.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

□ 1300

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), a member of the Armed Services and Budget Committees of this House of Representatives.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan Gun Violence Restraining Order Act.

After the Parkland, Florida shooting tragically took the lives of 17 students and educators, students across the country have stood up and said: Enough is enough. They have demanded that Congress act to prevent these horrific acts of violence.

Since Parkland, NRA officials, Republican lawmakers, and even the President have repeatedly said that we need to disarm individuals who pose a threat to themselves or their community—those posting on social media or telling friends and family that they plan to take lives with a gun.

GVRO laws do just that. That is why California passed these protections after the shooting at UCSB's Isla Vista. And now Florida is considering similar legislation in the wake of the Parkland shooting.

Only a handful of States currently have legal processes to temporarily remove those firearms. The GVRO Act encourages other States to follow their lead to empower family members or law enforcement officials to petition a judge to temporarily remove firearms from an individual in crisis. No one law will be a panacea, but that is not an excuse for inaction.

Since its introduction, the GVRO Act has gained significant support from my colleagues in the majority. Madam Speaker, we are calling on Speaker RYAN to bring the bipartisan GVRO Act to the floor for a vote. Our children's lives depend on it.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY), my colleague who represents my home area that I was born in, a member of the Armed Services and Small Business Committees.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, America has always been a nation of problem-solvers. When

our country is confronted with a seemingly impossible challenge, we tackle it head-on. We conduct research, we examine evidence, and we perform studies, and we don't quit until we have made meaningful progress.

From reducing automobile and aviation deaths to eradicating deadly diseases, we always rise to the challenge. In each case, a serious problem was claiming too many lives; and American determination, based on rigorous research, helped solve or mitigate that problem.

However, there is one place where we have deviated from this proud American tradition and abandoned an evidence-based approach to addressing our Nation's most pressing challenges, and that is when it comes to the problem of gun violence.

Homicides in this country occur as a part of the daily drumbeat of violence in our communities. They also take place in the context of mass shootings, like the recent tragedies at Pulse and Parkland, where a single individual transformed a place of life into a war zone.

Let me be clear. Gun violence is a plague upon this Nation and must be treated like the public health crisis it is.

Instead of confronting this problem with courage and candor, Congress has cowered in fear. For over 20 years, a single sentence, known as the Dickey amendment, has been added to the annual bill that funds the CDC and other Federal agencies.

We can debate the exact meaning of the Dickey amendment, what it does and does not allow, but the reality is that federally sponsored research on ways to reduce gun violence has come to a grinding halt.

I introduced a bipartisan bill to repeal the Dickey amendment, and it currently has 170 cosponsors. There are many steps that we can take right now to protect our communities and our children, while respecting the Second Amendment.

One of these steps should be to empower our Nation to fund independent, unbiased gun violence research that will lead to policies that save lives. It is the right and patriotic thing to do.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I would advise the previous speaker that I knew Jay Dickey, I served with him here, as did many other Members; and my understanding is that, before his death, he indicated that he thought that his measure that has carried forth was a mistake.

Madam Speaker, my friends across the aisle have clearly demonstrated where their priorities lie. And for the benefit of the American public, if it looks like we are ships passing in the

night, then doubtless we are when it comes to priorities.

I would ask anyone in this country and anyone in this House: Which do you think should be a priority? Addressing the gun epidemic in this country or bailing out big old banks with more opportunities to potentially carry us to yet another financial disaster by simply disallowing them having to undergo the stress test that they need?

I listened to my friend when he talked about stress tests, that they don't know how they are going to be tested or what part they are going to—well, my goodness gracious. Kids in school don't know what is going to be on the test; so why should the bank know what is going to be on the test?

But in the deal, when it goes down, whether they know or not, they still are making a ton of money; and, therefore, the regulations aren't affecting them in the way that we make it sound here. And there again, I ask the question: Which is your priority, America? Whether we address gun violence in this country and the epidemic that it is or whether we address these financial services regulatory measures that are more for corporate America than they are for you?

Americans working hard to make ends meet need answers—working hard to get their kids off to school, working hard to make sure they can put food on the table at the end of the day, working hard to ensure that they can put a little money aside for their child's education, working hard to ensure that they can put some retirement money aside.

Footnote there. What are we doing to protect the pensions of people in this country? We are not addressing that. We are addressing big banks.

That they don't have to keep working two or three jobs for the rest of their lives, that is what Americans are looking for.

Well, if they are working hard, then we need to be working hard, and we need to be working hard for them. It is with their interests in mind that we are sent here, and we do a disservice to them and to our country when we abandon that responsibility and consider bills like those put before us today rather than addressing the many, many needs that this country has.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend for his support of the STOP School Violence Act yesterday, along with 406 of our colleagues; that passed overwhelmingly.

Madam Speaker, Dodd-Frank unleashed a torrent of regulation on our financial institutions. While it is un-

derstandable that people reacted strongly after the 2008 crisis, most of the Federal response heaped needless red tape onto our banks and credit unions.

Much of this red tape has, at best, done nothing to improve the security of financial customers and, at worst, deprived Americans of crucial capital and financial products.

It is important that we rein in the Federal Government and allow our financial institutions to invest their resources in our communities.

These two bills today continue the regulatory reforms that the House has advanced since last year.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman SESSIONS for bringing these bills to the floor today. I urge support of the rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 780 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4240) to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 4240 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3464) to prohibit firearms dealers from selling a firearm prior to the completion of a background check. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After

general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 3464 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2598) to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Immediately after the disposition of H.R. 2598, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1478) To repeal the provision that in practice prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from sponsoring research on gun violence in fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on

the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4240, H.R. 3464, H.R. 2598, or H.R. 1478.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2154. An act to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2155. An act to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 188) "An Act to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO H.R. 4545, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION FAIRNESS AND REFORM ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-595 to H.R. 4545 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION FAIRNESS AND REFORM ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 773, I

call up the bill (H.R. 4545) to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 773, an amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-595 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4545

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.

Section 1003(3) of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3302(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the term 'financial institution'—

"(A) means a commercial bank, a savings bank, a trust company, a savings association, a building and loan association, a homestead association, a cooperative bank, or a credit union; and

"(B) for purposes of sections 1012, 1013, and 1014, includes a nondepository covered person subject to supervision by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection under section 1024 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5514)."

SEC. 3. TIMELINESS OF EXAMINATION REPORTS.

The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 1012. TIMELINESS OF EXAMINATION REPORTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) FINAL EXAMINATION REPORT.—A Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall provide a final examination report to a financial institution not later than 60 days after the later of—

"(A) the exit interview for an examination of the institution; or

"(B) the provision of additional information by the institution relating to the examination.

"(2) EXIT INTERVIEW.—If a financial institution is not subject to a resident examiner program, the exit interview shall occur not later than the end of the 9-month period beginning on the commencement of the examination, except that such period may be extended by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency by providing written notice to the institution and the Independent Examination Review Director describing with particularity the reasons that a longer period is needed to complete the examination.

"(b) EXAMINATION MATERIALS.—Upon the request of a financial institution, the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall include with the final report an appendix listing all examination or other factual information relied upon by the agency in support of a material supervisory determination."

SEC. 4. INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW DIRECTOR.

The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1013. OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Council an Office of Independent Examination Review (the ‘Office’).

“(b) HEAD OF OFFICE.—There is established the position of the Independent Examination Review Director (the ‘Director’), as the head of the Office. The Director shall be appointed by the Council and shall be independent from any member agency of the Council.

“(c) TERM.—The Director shall serve for a term of 5 years, and may be appointed to serve a subsequent 5-year term.

“(d) STAFFING.—The Director is authorized to hire staff to support the activities of the Office.

“(e) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

“(1) receive and, at the Director’s discretion, investigate complaints from financial institutions, their representatives, or another entity acting on behalf of such institutions, concerning examinations, examination practices, or examination reports;

“(2) hold meetings, at least once every three months and in locations designed to encourage participation from all sections of the United States, with financial institutions, their representatives, or another entity acting on behalf of such institutions, to discuss examination procedures, examination practices, or examination policies;

“(3) in accordance with subsection (f), review examination procedures of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to ensure that the written examination policies of those agencies are being followed in practice and adhere to the standards for consistency established by the Council;

“(4) conduct a continuing and regular review of examination quality assurance for all examination types conducted by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies;

“(5) adjudicate any supervisory appeal initiated under section 1014; and

“(6) report annually to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Council, on the reviews carried out pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4), including compliance with the requirements set forth in section 1012 regarding timeliness of examination reports, and the Council’s recommendations for improvements in examination procedures, practices, and policies.

“(f) STANDARD FOR REVIEWING EXAMINATION PROCEDURES.—In conducting reviews pursuant to subsection (e)(4), the Director shall prioritize factors relating to the safety and soundness of the financial system of the United States.

“(g) REMOVAL.—If the Director is removed from office, the Council shall communicate in writing the reasons for any such removal to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate not later than 30 days before the removal.

“(h) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Director shall keep confidential all meetings with, discussions with, and information provided by financial institutions.”.

SEC. 5. RIGHT TO INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MATERIAL SUPERVISORY DETERMINATIONS.

The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et

seq.), as amended by section 4, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1014. RIGHT TO INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MATERIAL SUPERVISORY DETERMINATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution shall have the right to obtain an independent review of a material supervisory determination contained in a final report of examination.

“(b) NOTICE.—

“(1) TIMING.—A financial institution seeking review of a material supervisory determination under this section shall file a written notice with the Independent Examination Review Director (the ‘Director’) within 60 days after receiving the final report of examination that is the subject of such review.

“(2) IDENTIFICATION OF DETERMINATION.—The written notice shall identify the material supervisory determination that is the subject of the independent examination review, and a statement of the reasons why the institution believes that the determination is incorrect or should otherwise be modified.

“(3) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO INSTITUTION.—Any information relied upon by the agency in the final report that is not in the possession of the financial institution may be requested by the financial institution and shall be delivered promptly by the agency to the financial institution.

“(c) RIGHT TO HEARING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall determine the merits of the appeal on the record or, at the financial institution’s election, shall refer the appeal to an Administrative Law Judge to conduct a confidential hearing pursuant to the procedures set forth under sections 556 and 557 of title 5, United States Code, which hearing shall take place not later than 60 days after the petition for review was received by the Director, and to issue a proposed decision to the Director based upon the record established at such hearing.

“(2) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In rendering a determination or recommendation under this subsection, neither the Administrative Law Judge nor the Director shall defer to the opinions of the examiner or agency, but shall conduct a de novo review to independently determine the appropriateness of the agency’s decision based upon the relevant statutes, regulations, and other appropriate guidance, as well as evidence adduced at any hearing.

“(d) FINAL DECISION.—A decision by the Director on an independent review under this section shall—

“(1) be made not later than 60 days after the record has been closed; and

“(2) subject to subsection (e), be deemed a final agency action and shall bind the agency whose supervisory determination was the subject of the review and the financial institution requesting the review.

“(e) LIMITED REVIEW BY FFIEC.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the agency whose supervisory determination was the subject of the review believes that the Director’s decision under subsection (d) would pose an imminent threat to the safety and soundness of the financial institution, such agency may file a written notice seeking review of the Director’s decision with the Council within 10 days of receiving the Director’s decision.

“(2) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In making a determination under this subsection, the Council shall conduct a review to determine whether there is substantial evidence that the Director’s decision would pose an imminent threat to the safety and soundness of the financial institution.

“(3) FINAL DETERMINATION.—A determination by the Council shall—

“(A) be made not later than 30 days after the filing of the notice pursuant to paragraph (1); and

“(B) be deemed a final agency action and shall bind the agency whose supervisory determination was the subject of the review and the financial institution requesting the review.

“(f) RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A financial institution shall have the right to petition for review of final agency action under this section by filing a Petition for Review within 60 days of the Director’s decision or the Council’s decision in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or the Circuit in which the financial institution is located.

“(g) REPORT.—The Director shall report annually to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on actions taken under this section, including the types of issues that the Director has reviewed and the results of those reviews. In no case shall such a report contain information about individual financial institutions or any confidential or privileged information shared by financial institutions.

“(h) RETALIATION PROHIBITED.—A Federal financial institutions regulatory agency may not—

“(1) retaliate against a financial institution, including service providers, or any institution-affiliated party (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act), for exercising appellate rights under this section; or

“(2) delay or deny any agency action that would benefit a financial institution or any institution-affiliated party on the basis that an appeal under this section is pending under this section.

“(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

“(1) to affect the right of a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency to take enforcement or other supervisory actions related to a material supervisory determination under review under this section; or

“(2) to prohibit the review under this section of a material supervisory determination with respect to which there is an ongoing enforcement or other supervisory action.”.

SEC. 6. ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) RIEGLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Section 309 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4806) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting after “appropriate Federal banking agency” the following: “, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “the appellant from retaliation by agency examiners” and inserting “the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by the agencies referred to in subsection (a)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following flush-left text:

“For purposes of this subsection and subsection (e), retaliation includes delaying consideration of, or withholding approval of, any request, notice, or application that otherwise would have been approved, but for the exercise of the institution’s or credit union’s rights under this section.”;

(3) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ensure that appropriate safeguards exist for protecting the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by any agency referred to in subsection (a) for exercising its rights under this subsection.”; and

(4) in subsection (f)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) any issue specifically listed in an exam report as a matter requiring attention by the institution’s management or board of directors; and

“(v) any suspension or removal of an institution’s status as eligible for expedited processing of applications, requests, notices, or filings on the grounds of a supervisory or compliance concern, regardless of whether that concern has been cited as a basis for another material supervisory determination or matter requiring attention in an examination report, provided that the conduct at issue did not involve violation of any criminal law; and”.

(b) **FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT.**—Section 205(j) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1785(j)) is amended by inserting “the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,” before “the Administration” each place such term appears.

(c) **FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL ACT OF 1978.**—The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1003, by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) the term ‘Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies’—

“(A) means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the National Credit Union Administration; and

“(B) for purposes of sections 1012, 1013, and 1014, includes the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.”; and

(2) in section 1005, by striking “One-fifth” and inserting “One-fourth”.

SEC. 7. REDUCTION OF SURPLUS FUNDS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$7,500,000,000” and inserting “\$7,324,285,000”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall take effect on June 1, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 115-595, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentleman from Mis-

souri (Mr. CLEAVER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act.

It is a strongly bipartisan bill, having come out of our committee by a vote of 50-10. It is authored by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), who serves as the vice chairman of our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and is, indeed, one of the leaders in the House in bringing regulatory relief to our community financial institutions. I want to thank him for his leadership on this very, very important issue.

H.R. 4545 creates transparency and accountability among regulators by improving the timeliness of examinations, while also creating a new more independent examination appeals process.

□ 1315

Madam Speaker, this is about, again, transparency. It is about due process. The Office of Independent Examination Review created under this bill will ensure accountability and fairness for financial institutions during their supervisory examinations. It does so by providing the right for these institutions to obtain an independent review of a material supervisory determination contained in a final examination report.

The creation of this independent review process is particularly important for our Nation’s community banks and credit unions that will now be able to appeal their examination decisions without fear of reprisal from their regulator.

By reforming the process for examining financial institutions to ensure it is fair and consistent, Congress will indeed enhance the safety and soundness of the financial system overall while ensuring Main Street businesses can access the liquidity and capital resources they need to grow and create jobs. Again, Madam Speaker, this is why this is so important. Ultimately, this is about ensuring a free flow of credit to Main Street businesses and families.

Many of our community financial institutions have felt a very, very heavy

hand of burdensome Federal regulations that were intended—or so we were told—for the largest and most complex institutions; and regulators, unfortunately, seem to ignore congressional directive and apply each one of these standards to our smallest institutions. Thus, yesterday, Madam Speaker, we voted on the TAILOR Act, also authored by the gentleman from Colorado, that would also help ensure these regulations are tailored to the size and complexity of the institution.

Without having due process and fairness in this exam review, the result has been catastrophic. This regulatory burden, of which this is a part, has been resulting in the closing or merger of one community bank or credit union per day, on average. And again, they are not being lost to natural causes.

Our community financial institutions serve as the backbone of our American economy, and we simply cannot afford to lose them. As chairman of the Financial Services Committee, in my sixth year, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are all too familiar with this problem. I hear from credit unions and community banks every day.

I heard from West Community Credit Union in Missouri, who wrote: “This one-size-fits-all approach is simple-minded and has real consequences. We are beginning to make changes that will negatively impact our ability to continue to serve members in meeting their home equity lending needs.”

In fact, Madam Speaker, we know that a number of banks and credit unions have had to leave mortgage lending because of the regulatory burden.

Then there is County-City Credit Union in Wisconsin, who said: “Small credit unions are dropping every day. Unless we get immediate relief, there won’t be any left. That would be tragic for our members and the very fabric of our country. Please help us, and help us right now.”

I have good news. Help is on the way if we can get a good, solid vote this afternoon.

The CEO of Commonwealth National Bank in Tennessee wrote: “The fact remains that there are fewer community banks today than there were several years ago, a trend that will continue until rational changes”—for example, like the ones we are speaking of today, Madam Speaker—“are made that will provide some relief to America’s hometown banks.”

Again, we are hearing this plea every single day. So there is good reason why H.R. 4545 was reported by this committee with a strong bipartisan vote, 50-10, including a majority support of the Democrats on the committee.

Again, the bill is strongly bipartisan, it is practical, and it is necessary. H.R. 4545 will allow financial institutions, again, to have supervisory determinations reviewed by a newly established

independent examination review board. This will allow for uniformity among regulatory agencies, again, while making the overall exam process more fair and more efficient.

The bill does not prevent a regulatory agency from conducting examinations or imposing restrictions on financial exams, but, again, it will restore fairness, due process, and accountability for the sake of our community banks and credit unions; and, more importantly, for the sake of those who still have the American Dream of either buying their own home, starting their own business, or sending that first kid to college, it is imperative that we enact H.R. 4545.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4545.

Today we are considering yet another measure that would weaken our system of financial regulation and bog down regulators in their important work. It would ultimately take us right back to some of the problems that led to the largest financial crisis since the Great Depression. The bill puts financial institutions' profits before the protection of consumers and the best interests of the American public.

I rise, Madam Speaker, to say to Members of both sides of the aisle that we must remember the past as we create policies. I was here during that entire period, and it created a very, very heavy darkness over this entire country.

In the years preceding the financial crisis, the Federal Reserve failed to write rules stopping predatory, risky mortgage loans. The OCC and OTS preempted State regulators from reining in mortgage abuses. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York and other regulators failed to stem excesses at large companies and did not downgrade troubled companies until it was too late. Legislation such as H.R. 4545 sets the stage to return us to an ineffective regulatory system.

Republicans have made it a habit to falsely claim that their legislation is designed to benefit small community banks and credit unions. There are some things that could be changed to improve Dodd-Frank and to provide responsible relief for small community institutions, which I believe we all recognize did not cause the financial crisis.

I have said in our committee and I will say openly in any other place, including on the floor here, that there are some things we can repair in Dodd-Frank. But what this bill would do is give all regulated financial institutions an additional way to appeal and, thereby, postpone material supervisory determinations of their prudential regu-

lator and of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

In other words, messy megabanks and other big financial firms could appeal and delay adverse determinations such as a downgrade of a bank's credit rating for capital asset quality management, earnings, liquidity, and sensitivity to the market risk. It would also enable them to appeal significant deficiencies of their anti-money laundering programs, findings related to the violations of various rules, or a downgrade of their Community Reinvestment Act ratings.

Let's think about this for just a minute. Some banks would be allowed, under this bill, to appeal the OCC's historic and well-deserved double downgrade of its CR rating. Under this bill, Wells Fargo, for example, would be allowed to unleash its army of lawyers to not only fight against the rating, but to tie the OCC up in proceedings. We all know that when the banks who spend millions on legal teams each year deploy those resources, they deploy them to win; and if they win, then American consumers lose.

But let's focus on CRA. CRA was intended to ensure that institutions were making loans and providing services in the lower-income and moderate-income neighborhoods in which they were located to address the problems of redlining.

As highlighted in the recent report by the Center for Investigative Reporting, redlining is not just some relic of the past. Sadly, painfully, and embarrassingly, redlining appears to be still very much an ongoing, troubling problem that continues to harm many minority mortgage loan borrowers in cities all across the United States of America.

This bill will make redlining worse, and that will happen because, instead of improving their ratings and trying to end discriminatory lending practices, bank executives will simply challenge these rates and bully their own regulators into submission.

Now, this may be unintentional, as I would presume to believe, but this bill ignores the fact that prudential regulators and the Consumer Bureau each already have an agency ombudsman and an intra-agency formal review and appeals process. What's more, messy megabanks already have existing avenues to bring a court challenge to any form of regulatory enforcement act.

Thus, what this bill would actually do is create unprecedented barriers to the effective, prudential, and consumer protection supervision of the messy megabanks. It will give messy megabanks and predatory lenders, including payday lenders, an additional way to resist corrective actions to avoid violations of law or safety and soundness risk. As a result, the bill would allow these financial institutions to bog down agencies with frivolous appeals.

In a letter opposing H.R. 4545, the National Consumer Law Center wrote that the effective bill "would be most pronounced at the largest banks who could appeal dozens or hundreds of material findings from every examination creating enormous roadblocks to supervision. The bank supervision process has been the first line of regulatory defense against threats to bank safety and soundness for a century or more. H.R. 4545 creates unprecedented roadblocks to the effectiveness of bank supervisory determinations and could be devastating to effective regulatory oversight in areas ranging from basic prudential oversight to key consumer protections that make our financial markets fairer."

In addition, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found that H.R. 4545 would increase the deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars—by hundreds of millions of dollars. It would increase by hundreds of millions of dollars. Hundreds of millions of dollars it would increase. Millions of dollars would be increased because banks would be more likely to fail and need government assistance.

In sum, H.R. 4545 would weaken our Nation's system of financial regulation, and, in so doing, it would recklessly set the stage for a return to the captive, hamstrung regulatory system that existed in the years before the 2008 financial crisis that enabled the risky profit-fueled activities of large, complex, messy megabanks and other titans on Wall Street to go unchecked. I therefore urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4545.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to my friend from Missouri, as he recounts his parade of horrors, that this bill was supported by a majority of Democrats on the committee, including Mr. CRIST of Florida, Democrat; Mr. DELANEY of Maryland, Democrat; Mr. FOSTER of Illinois, Democrat; Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Democrat; Mr. GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey, Democrat; Mr. HECK of Washington, Democrat; and Mr. HIMES of Connecticut, Democrat.

I think my 30 seconds is winding down, but perhaps I can share the rest of the Democratic Members who supported this excellent piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), who is back with us again today. He is the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and is the author of H.R. 4545.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity today to be able to advance an important piece of bipartisan legislation. The Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act seeks to bring fairness to the

Federal financial regulators' examination appeals process by instituting a uniform framework free from examination retaliation.

Our community banks and credit unions currently have no independent recourse in the appeals process of examination decisions. These institutions often lack the experience, capacity, and resources needed to effectively resolve challenges to Federal financial regulators' examination determinations as each regulator has its own different rules and standards for the appeals process.

Under the current examination appeals framework, appeals of material supervisory determinations, which are decisions of significant consequence that can have serious impact on the financial institution's future, run through the agency that handed down the decision in the first place.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, that is like asking an arresting police officer to also be the judge and the jury when a case goes to trial.

Put simply, this legislation will move away from that framework and establish an independent office of review to address appeals of serious consequence, and harmonize and consolidate the appeals process across the various Federal regulators so that the review process is fair and predictable.

One banker in Colorado put it to me this way: "The Dodd-Frank Act has added complexity and uncertainty to the entire exam process and to the bank's ability to serve its customers confidently and in full compliance of regulations."

He continues: "For instance, overlap between the OCC and CFPB is an ongoing issue. The OCC lost regulatory oversight with the Dodd-Frank Act and the foundation of the CFPB, especially in the fair lending world. When the CFPB made it clear they were not going to examine the banks over \$10 billion on fair lending the way that the OCC had historically done it, the OCC started expanding the way that they assessed a bank's Compliance Management Program to add questions about fair lending, including transaction sampling and testing. It creates a very burdensome environment as well as duplication and the risk of double jeopardy."

Mr. Speaker, an examination environment that runs the risk of duplication and double jeopardy between agencies isn't tenable and puts our community institutions at risk of being examined into extinction.

This environment is further complicated by the reality that, currently, institutions that want to appeal double jeopardy examination results would have to appeal through two regulators who likely aren't communicating with one another about the other's exam determinations.

The Examination Fairness bill before the House today would solve this problem by establishing an Office of Independent Examination Review, which would function as a consolidated, sober judge of the examination appeals process. This newly created office under the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council would provide a community bank or credit union an avenue for independent recourse to appeal a material supervisory determination where fairness, transparency, and timeliness are paramount. Because this new review process only applies to material supervisory determinations, the new process is limited in scope and reserved only for the most serious appeals.

This legislation is also careful not to constrain the power of the regulators to pursue enforcement actions or to prevent them from issuing a further material supervisory determination. In fact, enforcement actions resulting from a determination would continue to be enforced under this new appeals process until the independent office either agrees with the finding of the regulator or overturns a determination of the regulator.

Mr. Speaker, by creating consistency; instituting timeline expectations of examinations and appeals; increasing transparency; and adding independent, sober review of appeals to the rights of the financial institutions, H.R. 4545 will go a long way to usher in a new environment of fairness in the examination appeals process for small banks and credit unions. Giving these institutions independent recourse in the appeals process will create greater certainty that they won't have to reduce their financial service product offerings because of an unfair or untimely review.

Mr. Speaker, that translates to greater assurances for communities across the country that their small banks and credit unions will be able to provide a mortgage for their home, a loan for their car, and capital for their small businesses to be able to grow.

This measure passed out of the Financial Services Committee with strong bipartisan support, with a majority of our Democrat colleagues joining with us to be able to support exam fairness. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), for her support of this measure's consideration here today.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the inimitable chair of our committee is absolutely right: there are Democrats. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation. But it proves what I was trying to say earlier, and that is that I and many other people believe that we need to make some changes to Dodd-Frank. This is just not one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his tireless work in bringing this and so many other commonsense bills to the floor. I also want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for his commitment to this issue.

The lack of consistency and quality in the bank examination process has created serious problems for financial institutions and their customers. Mr. TIPTON's legislation aims to remedy many of the issues we have heard about from the banks and credit unions in our congressional districts.

H.R. 4545 will allow financial institutions to have supervisory determinations reviewed by a newly established independent examination review board. This will create uniformity among regulatory agencies, while making the overall exam process fair and efficient.

The legislation includes several other key reforms, such as imposition of a reasonable time limit on examiners to provide exam results to institutions. It may seem like a simple request in the bill, a simple provision, but, today, institutions may wait as much as a year or more—in some cases, several years—to get the results of a single exam.

How can you be expected to comply with regulations if the regulators don't get back to you in a timely fashion with their feedback?

I myself spent several years as a bank examiner. The relationship between banker and examiner was a collegial one. Examiners would work with bankers to make sure they understood their rules and address the issues that manifested themselves during the course of the examination. If an institution failed to fix those issues, it then faced appropriate repercussions.

Today's exam environment is completely different. Financial regulators seem to play a constant game of "gotcha." The only recourse for a financial institution is to turn to an appeals process that, quite frankly, has a predetermined outcome.

Mr. Speaker, something has to change.

To be clear, this bill does not prevent regulatory agencies from conducting exams or imposing restrictions on financial institutions. What it does is restore order to the exam process, which, for far too long, has been politicized and abused.

This is an incredibly important measure and one that I hope will receive support from all my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his work.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), who is the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my deep appreciation to my colleague on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. TIPTON, for his efforts to improve and reform the examination process for our Nation's financial institutions.

H.R. 4545 is designed to address enduring concerns about the lack of consistency and quality in the bank examination process. The current exam process can be both opaque and secretive. Coupling this with overburdensome regulations and increased compliance costs have forced many community banks and credit unions to close up shop or reduce their ability to provide for consumers.

Look no further than my State, North Carolina, which has lost about 50 percent of its banks since the financial crisis. In my own city of Charlotte, a decade ago, we had six community banks. Today, we only have one because of the burdensome and costly compliance requirements.

Mr. TIPTON's legislation creates a fair and impartial process for financial institutions to appeal their examinations, which gives the necessary clarity for banks and credit unions to provide services to their customers, leading to a job creation and economic prosperity environment.

That is why I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for working on this bipartisan piece of legislation. It is long past time that we provide commonsense reforms in a transparent approach regarding regulators' decision-making during the examination process.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the vice chairman of the Financial Service Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act.

As the vice chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, and as a longtime advocate for examination and review reforms, I commend my colleague, Representative TIPTON, for his hard work on this issue.

As we all know, our financial regulatory agencies are not without their flaws. From time to time, examiners offer decisions that are misguided, and these decisions deserve to be challenged. Managers of financial institutions that believe that the decisions passed down by their examiners are wrong deserve a chance to challenge

those decisions at an independent forum and, if necessary, in the courts. We are all better served by a financial supervisory structure that subjects decisions to the scrutiny of further review.

I know community bankers in western Pennsylvania who have struggled with their examiners for years to get flawed determinations changed. In many cases, these individuals were doing the right thing for their companies and their communities. Without the benefit of a clear timeline, this process has been allowed to drag on.

Without a truly independent review process and protection against retaliation, these men and women working in our community financial institutions understand that they are facing an uphill battle. The current system is not independent and it is not sufficiently transparent. This is unfair. It is bad for our community financial institutions and it is detrimental to the integrity of our regulatory system.

I again urge my colleagues to support Representative TIPTON's work.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), and I ask unanimous consent that she may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), a hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act. I also want to thank Representative TIPTON for bringing this fine legislation.

In the Financial Services Committee, we often focus on relieving the regulatory burdens our smaller financial institutions face. While larger banks have the bandwidth, if you will, to comply with various regulations, our smaller financial institutions have their hands tied with onerous regulations and high compliance costs. Too often, this strains the ability for our smaller banks and credit unions to loan money to people who rely on them for capital.

The legislation that we are discussing today creates more transparency and certainty for community banks and credit unions undergoing each regulators' examination process. Currently, each of the four regulators has its own appeals process. As we know, each regulator has their own rules about what decisions can or cannot be repealed.

In many instances, this exam process can take months and is conducted secretly, often leaving the institution in the dark about the possible violations. If an unfavorable determination results from the exam, the financial institution is then forced to limit its ability to open new branches or from offering certain financial products.

Folks in every community across the country rely on these financial institutions to access credit, grow a business, purchase a new car, or pay for an unexpected expense. This important legislation restores some of the transparency to the examination process and prevents regulators from being the cop, the judge, and the jury.

In addition, this legislation will restore accountability on the part of the regulators to review their own decisions, and to do so in a timely fashion to limit the impact to our community financial institutions.

As we all can agree, our community banks and credit unions are best equipped to work with communities in which they serve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. This legislation provides a system of checks and balances by establishing clear standards to ensure the consistency and transparency of all examinations.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and the Financial Services Committee for their hard work. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1345

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very important bill that I am asking the Members of Congress to vote "no" on because we don't want to empower the megabanks and huge conglomerates to be able to skirt adverse supervisory decisions about regulators.

The bill would give all financial institutions, regardless of their size, an additional method to appeal, thereby significantly delaying adverse determinations by creating a new independent review office to conduct de novo reviews without concern for the institution's safety and soundness or the protection of consumers.

This bill goes far beyond relief for community banks and credit unions by enabling megabanks and nonbanks, like payday lenders and Equifax, to pursue limitless challenges to the agency's actions in court.

If you take a look at the examples that we have prepared for you, take a look at Wells Fargo. Wells Fargo has been at the center of attention in this country for the fraudulent accounts that it established using their customers' accounts and information to

create more accounts without informing their customers; and then they had the illegal student loan servicing practices that we have all been so concerned about; and even after the fraudulent accounts were exposed and a fine was made because of the harm that they had caused to their customers, we then found that they had inappropriate force-placed insurance, which means that people who were already paying for their insurance were forced to pay again because the bank basically forced them to have additional insurance.

And then there is J.P. Morgan with illegal credit card practices and discriminatory lending, sale of bad credit card debt, and illegal robo-signing.

And Citi with deficient mortgage servicing and foreclosure processing practices; inappropriate fees, marketing, billing, administration of add-on products; and foreclosure abuses.

Bank of America, also mortgage abuses, deficient mortgage servicing and foreclosure processing practices, credit monitoring abuses, deceptive marketing for add-on products, violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Now, we find that these banks have determined—they act in ways that we know that fighting is just the cost of doing business. It is a slap on the wrist. And they are going to continue to be able to get away with this. And if they are saying that the bank examiners who come in and find these adverse conditions somehow will be ignored and they can literally get around them, then we are going to add to the problems of our consumers in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly asking for a “no” vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to say that I just find some of the comments of the ranking member curious.

I know if she continues this attack on the so-called Wall Street megabanks, I just continue to be so curious why she supports bailing them out? She voted against the Financial CHOICE Act that would have ended bailouts to these megabanks. And so she supports a bailout fund in Dodd-Frank to continue to bail out these banks.

Second of all, if she continues to attack them, I guess I am curious also why she supports the Federal Reserve's program to pay interest on excess reserves. She supports taking taxpayer money to pay the so-called Wall Street megabanks not to loan money to Main Street, something that I have opposed as have many other Republicans on this side of the aisle.

And then to make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, on this interest on excess reserves, these banks are getting almost 10 to 15 times what our constituents are getting on their savings accounts.

In many cases, it is the difference between 0.07 percent, versus 1.5 percent. And so I understand, again, she attacks them, but then I am just curious, why does she find so many ways to support them?

So personally, I think in this economy, there is a need for community banks and credit unions. There is a need for regional banks, and there is a need for global banks as well. What we want is accountability. We want less Federal control, and what we want is more private capital. We want to ensure that there are never more taxpayer bailouts.

And again, as I said earlier, as this so-called parade of horrors was brought to the attention of the House, why is it that a majority of Democrats on her committee support this legislation? Sixteen of them support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I always have these lively debates with my chairman, and he never fails to point out that I voted for the bailout. And, of course, oftentimes when he comes with one of these deregulation bills, he talks about bipartisan and how he had Democrats. Well, I want you to know the bailout was a bipartisan thing. It was appointed by both Democrats and Republicans at a time when we were in great difficulty in this country.

It was the Bush bailout, and it was Mr. Paulson, appointed by Mr. Bush, who was the Secretary who led it and gave us the advice and had us participate in saving our economy based on the information that he had uncovered about the risk that was now proposed for our country.

So I am not for bailing out big banks at all. We had an emergency situation in this country where, again, it was the Bush bailout that we had to deal with the fact that we were in great danger. But let me just also say this: we have something now that we put into Dodd-Frank reform called the Orderly Liquidation Authority scenario that we are able to look at banks, and, because of the stress testing that they have gone through, if there is a need for an orderly resolution because there are problems with the bank, we cannot only recommend breaking off parts of the bank, but reordering parts of the bank and doing what is necessary to ensure that the bank does not get into a situation where it fails and triggers the failures of others in our economy.

So it is the Orderly Liquidation Authority that I am referring to, and I do not support bailing out big banks. This is one thing that I join with my chairman on. We both agree that we should not be bailing out these big banks. And, of course, that is what Dodd-Frank is helping us to avoid.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just note that the Orderly Liquidation Authority is an authority to bail out big banks, consistent with the bailout that the ranking member voted for in, I believe, 2008, that the chairman, I believe, voted against.

When we talk about those who use rhetoric to say they don't support big banks, but then actually vote for them, I think that is a hard note to take.

But I rise today to support H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act, a bipartisan measure introduced by Mr. TIP-TON.

This bill would amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978, a long time ago, by updating the definition of financial institutions, establishing new requirements for the final examination report process, and creating an office of independent examination review, giving some independence here, some common sense.

These updates are critical because, in 1994, Congress directed Federal regulators to establish an independent intra-agency appellate process for institutions to seek the review of examination ratings, adequacy of loan loss reserve, and clarifications on loans.

I agree that these entities should be reviewed to ensure that they are financially sound. We want to make sure that we prevent failure so we don't have folks across the aisle voting for bailouts. However, we are hearing from our community financial institutions, the ones that serve most of my district in Wisconsin, that the avenues needed to appeal these determinations are limited. The process is secretive, and the regulators are overempowered.

The intra-agency review process has also been criticized as not being independent because the regulatory determinations are reviewed, not by a third party, but by the employees of the same regulator handing down the verdict. So this is the judge, the jury, and the executioner.

I was a prosecutor, and when I presented a case to a jury and they found someone guilty, I didn't make the defendant appeal the verdict to the same jury that found him guilty. They have got to go to a third-party appellate process, independent reviewers. That is the way the American system works and should work in this scenario as well.

Our community bankers explained that they feel victimized. They feel

retribution for challenging the outcomes of these exams, and that is a bad thing. Add to the fear the fact that these examinations lack transparency, and now we have real problems to contend with which is why the solution is so bipartisan. The chairman mentioned 16 Democrats on the committee voted for this commonsense piece of legislation.

That is why the bill is so important. It will embolden our community banks by creating an independent auditor to ensure fairness and transparency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, this bill ensures that there is an open forum for these institutions to discuss the examination procedures, practices, and policies without fear of reprisals. It gives them a little bit of freedom.

Importantly, the office would also review regulators' procedures to make sure that their written examination policies are being followed and adhered to.

Lastly, the bill would provide a right to a hearing upon appeal. The decision as to whether the appeal is heard on the record will be left to the petitioner. Again, you are getting due process. We want due process. That is something we all fight for. No one disagrees on that. Why can't we offer that to our small community banks and credit unions that oftentimes feel victimized? This is a bipartisan bill.

This is common sense, and I would encourage my good friend, the ranking member—who I like so much—to join us and let's get something done for small community banks.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the offer from my good friend to join him, but I don't think I will be doing that today.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD organizations that have sent us information in opposition to this bill. It includes the National Consumer Law Center, AFSCME, the Center for American Progress, and Americans for Financial Reform.

NATIONAL CONSUMER LAW CENTER,

Washington, DC, March 8, 2017.

Re Oppose S. Amdt. 2140 (Moran), HR 4545, The Financial Institutions Examination Fairness Act; creates roadblocks to bank supervision for safety and soundness, consumer protection.

SENATOR,

U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

On behalf of our low income clients, I urge you to oppose Senate Amendment 2140 to S. 2155, which incorporates HR 4545 (Tipton), The Financial Institutions Examination Fairness Act. The bill would create unprecedented barriers to effective prudential and consumer protection supervision of banks, allowing banks to resist corrective actions to address law violations or safety and

soundness risks, bogging down agencies with frivolous appeals.

HR 4545 would grant regulated banks the right to appeal any supervisory determination made by any prudential banking agency or by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) to a new "Office of Independent Examination Review" established in the Federal Financial Institutions Examinations Council (FFIEC). Upon appeal by a supervised bank, this new office would be required to undertake a repetitive de novo review of the agency's supervisory decision. No deference to the initial examination findings or the agency's judgment would be required in this review.

This new process is duplicative to appeals processes and ombudsmen already present. The CFPB, FDIC, OCC, Federal Reserve, and National Credit Union Administration each already have an agency ombudsman and an intra-agency formal review and appeals process. In addition, banks may bring a court challenge to any formal regulatory enforcement action.

HR 4545 would enormously increase the ability of banks to resist supervisory decisions. This effect would be most pronounced at the largest banks, who could appeal dozens or hundreds of material findings from every examination, creating enormous roadblocks to supervision. The bank supervision process has been the first line of regulatory defense against threats to bank safety and soundness for a century or more. HR 4545 creates unprecedented roadblocks to the effectiveness of bank supervisory determinations and could be devastating to effective regulatory oversight in areas ranging from basic prudential oversight to key consumer protections that make our financial markets fairer.

I urge you to oppose HR 4545 and any amendment that incorporates the bill.

Yours very truly,

LAUREN K. SAUNDERS,
Associate Director.

AFSCME,

Washington, DC, March 13, 2018.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to oppose the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act (H.R. 4545), which would undermine the federal government's enforcement of bank regulations and related systemic risk protections by granting every bank—of any size—a new right to appeal and postpone existing banking regulators' adverse supervisory determinations. Now is not the time to undermine these protections.

AFSCME strongly opposes H.R. 4545 because it would undermine bank regulators' existing authority and related systemic safeguards that protect our economy from risky practices of banks. This would impose added costs and risks on working families and consumers. Specifically, H.R. 4545 would grant regulated banks the right to appeal a prudential banking agency's material supervisory determination. H.R. 4545 installs the new appeals process in a not yet created Office of Independent Examination Review (OIER) located within the Federal Financial Institutions Examinations Council (FFIEC) and would require OIER to initiate a de novo review of the appealed supervisory decision with zero deference to the regulators' prior pre-appeal review, findings, or determinations. By creating a de novo appeals process,

H.R. 4545 further incentivizes banks to challenge every supervisory decision and allows banks to more easily circumvent and delay penalties. Furthermore, H.R. 4545 also would grant these appeal rights to any nonbank under supervisory authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) and require OIER de novo review.

Unlike the current process with existing prudential regulators, OIER would not be responsible for our banking system's safety and soundness, and thus OIER's decision-making would be narrower in purpose and thereby increase risk to America's economy. We do not need H.R. 4545's appeals process because a formal review and appeals process along with ombudsmen already exist at affected banking agencies, such as CFPB, FDIC, the Federal Reserve, National Credit Union Administration, and OCC. Furthermore, banks already can bring a court challenge to any formal regulatory enforcement action.

H.R. 4545's scope is huge and not merely limited to small, community depository banks. At committee mark-up, an amendment to narrow H.R. 4545's scope to community financial institutions below \$10 billion in assets was rejected clarifying the intent that H.R. 4545 would benefit enormous banks, including Wells Fargo. The tax bill enacted just months ago in December 2017 grants many of these same large banks tens of billions of dollars in new tax breaks. Moreover, many are already earning record profits.

We are nearing the 10th anniversary of the 2008 financial crisis, which triggered U.S. and global recessions, America's multiyear underwater mortgage crises, and bankruptcies for many companies that nearly sank the U.S. economy. The subsequent Dodd-Frank financial reform protections added essential safeguards that stabilized our economy. We should not weaken these protections. Rather than rolling back Dodd-Frank protections, we should improve protections for working families from the abuses of large banks like Wells Fargo, and take steps to penalize large data companies like Equifax for breaches of its consumer data.

AFSCME opposes this harmful risky bill because it increases the likelihood that banks, both large and small, will continue harming working families and consumers and trigger new systemic economic problems. AFSCME urges you to vote against H.R. 4545.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government Affairs.

CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The Center for American Progress ("CAP") is writing today to express opposition to the following bills impacting the regulation of financial institutions: H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act of 2017; H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act; H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act; H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act of 2017; and H.R. 4061, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017. These bills may be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives in the near-term, so we welcome the chance to share our concerns regarding this series of bills with you and your Members.

H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act of 2017, would require the Federal Reserve Board to open up its Dodd-Frank Act Stress Testing (DFAST) and Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review (CCAR) scenarios, methodologies, loss models, and other information to public notice and comment prior to conducting the stress tests. This is a similar policy proposal to what was included in Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin's banking report released in June 2017. H.R. 4293 would also limit the frequency of the CCAR process to no more than once every two years and would prohibit the Fed from objecting to a firm's capital plan when a firm fails the qualitative portion of CCAR.

These proposed changes to the Fed's stress testing framework would severely undermine the effectiveness of the stress tests. Stress testing is arguably the most important new prudential tool implemented by the Fed following the 2007–2008 financial crisis. The annual stress tests help ensure that banks fund themselves with enough capital to withstand losses from a severe negative shock and economic downturn, while continuing to provide the credit and financial services the real economy needs to grow sustainably. H.R. 4293's requirement that the Fed open DFAST and CCAR to public notice and comment would essentially give the tests to the banks in advance.

If a bank knows what the stress testing scenarios are and has the Fed's loss models, it can tailor its balance sheet to limit its projected losses—and in turn limit its required capital buffer. Opening up the stress tests to this type of gaming and window dressing would be a dangerous deviation from post-crisis best practices. It runs counter to the purpose of stress testing, which is to mimic a financial shock—inherently a surprise that the bank doesn't get a chance to comment on or influence in advance. Moreover, this change could lead to an increase in the correlation of bank balance sheets across the banking sector, making the financial system in general more vulnerable to certain shocks.

H.R. 4293's requirements that CCAR be conducted no more often than once every two years and that the Fed cannot object to a bank's capital plan if the bank fails the qualitative portion of CCAR are also deeply misguided. A lot can change in two years. Risks can build up and capital positions can deteriorate quickly. CCAR must remain a rigorous, forward looking, and annual exercise. The qualitative element of CCAR, which applies to banks with over \$250 billion in assets or \$10 billion in foreign exposure, is also crucial for improving and maintaining robust capital planning processes and procedures at the largest banks in the country. Taking the teeth out of the qualitative portion of CCAR would take a tool away from the Fed and have a negative impact on the risk management capacity at these massive, complex institutions.

H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act, would give financial institutions the authority to appeal any material examination decision rendered by the federal banking regulators or Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) to the Office of Independent Examination Review—a new office created by the bill. Financial regulators already have internal appeals processes in place through their respective Ombudsman offices and financial institutions can pursue legal remedy for flawed examination decisions through the judicial system. This new office and review process is simply an additional hurdle for

regulators to contend with when supervising financial institutions and an additional point at which institutions can slow down or avoid punishments. H.R. 4545 would undermine the examinations process at a time when supervisory authority and penalties for financial sector malfeasance should be strengthened.

H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, would repeal the Federal Reserve Board's discretionary authority to subject nonbank financial companies, that have not been designated by the Financial Stability Oversight Council as systemically important, to annual stress testing. The bill would also repeal the Dodd-Frank Act requirement that a federal primary regulator subject nonbank financial companies with more than \$10 billion in assets to company-run stress testing. The 2007–2008 financial crisis made it clear that substantial risk can build up outside of the traditional banking sector. The failure or near-failure at nonbank financial companies like AIG, Bear Stearns, Merrill Lynch, and Lehman Brothers helped bring the global economy to the brink of collapse. Workers, homeowners, and savers all felt the immense economic pain from that unchecked risk in the financial sector.

Eliminating the Federal Reserve Board's authority to require stress testing at certain nonbank financial companies would needlessly prevent the Fed from acting when necessary. The ability to test a nonbank financial firm's balance sheet to ensure it has enough capital to withstand a financial shock and economic downturn, while continuing to provide the financial services the real economy depends on, is a necessary authority. The same can be said about the company-run stress testing that a primary federal regulator will no longer be required to implement if H.R. 4566 is enacted.

H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act of 2017, places new requirements on federal financial regulators to further "tailor" their respective rules to the riskiness and business models of financial institutions. While a laudable goal, this bill ignores the existing tailoring of regulation by institution type and size. The intent of this bill is to force regulators to minimize regulatory costs without due concern for the significant societal benefits of strong financial regulations. The bill would also give big banks, and small banks alike, ample footing to constantly object to regulations in court—delaying the implementation of important rules on the back-end, or putting pressure on regulators to not even undertake rulemakings on the front-end. Moreover, by mandating a seven-year lookback period under which regulators would be required to reconsider existing rules, the bill completely undermines the regulations enacted under the Dodd-Frank Act, the Credit CARD Act, and other laws.

Separately, CAP sent a detailed letter on H.R. 4061 to you and your Members outlining our strong opposition to the bill—which would render the Financial Stability Oversight Council's authority to designate nonbank financial companies as systemically important, nearly useless.

For these reasons, CAP recommends that Members vote "NO" when these bills are considered on the floor.

Sincerely,

GREGG GELZINIS,
Research Associate, Economic Policy,
Center for American Progress.

—
AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Americans for Financial Reform, we are writing to

urge you to vote in opposition to H.R. 4545, the "Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act," which is being considered on the House floor this week. "Examination fairness" may sound innocuous, but make no mistake—this legislation would put unprecedented new limits on the powers of bank examiners. The impact of this legislation in weakening bank supervision would be especially great at the nation's largest banks. Its effect would be to substantially increase the risk of systemic problems, and of unfair and predatory treatment of consumers.

H.R. 4545 would grant banks the right to appeal any supervisory determination made by any bank regulatory agency, including the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), to a new "Office of Independent Examination Review" that is outside of any regulatory agency. Upon appeal by a supervised bank, this new office would be required to undertake a de novo review of the agency's supervisory decision. No deference to the initial examination findings or the supervisory agency's judgment would be required in this review.

This new appeals process is an addition to formal appeals processes and ombudsmen already present at the banking agencies. The agencies affected by this legislation—including the CFPB, FDIC, OCC, Federal Reserve, and National Credit Union Administration—each already have an agency ombudsman and an intra-agency formal review and appeals process. In addition, banks are already free to bring a court challenge to any formal regulatory enforcement action.

By layering an entirely new appeals process on top of existing processes, this bill would greatly increase the ability of banks to resist supervisory oversight and ignore or delay changes called for by supervisors. The impact would be most pronounced at the largest banks, which can receive dozens or hundreds of material findings from every examination. The ability to appeal every one of those material supervisory findings, or just to threaten to appeal them, would create an enormous new barrier to effective supervision of big banks.

The bank examination process has been the first line of regulatory defense against threats to bank safety and soundness since at least the 1930s. The "Examination Fairness Act" would create unprecedented new barriers to the effectiveness of bank examiners by empowering banks to delay, resist, or overturn their decisions. In a practical sense, this would make bank regulation even weaker than it was before the 2008 crisis. It would be harmful to effective regulatory oversight in areas ranging from basic safety and soundness supervision to enforcement of key consumer protections that make our financial markets fairer.

The "Examination Fairness Act" thus goes beyond overturning post-financial crisis regulations to make bank oversight even weaker than it was prior to 2008. As we reach the 10th anniversary of the greatest economic and financial crisis since 1929, it should be obvious that this is completely the wrong direction for Congress to take. Since the crisis, fresh scandals like those at Wells Fargo have continued to remind us that we need effective supervision to prevent pervasive and harmful abuse of consumers.

We urge you to vote against H.R. 4545.
Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
Mr. Speaker, let me just read one of

the paragraphs from the Center for American Progress that I think is so profound.

“The Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act, would give financial institutions the authority to appeal any material examination decision rendered by the Federal banking regulators or Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, to the Office of Independent Examination Review—a new office created by the bill. Financial regulators already have internal appeals processes in place through their respective ombudsman offices and financial institutions can pursue legal remedy for flawed examination decisions through the judicial system.

“This new office and review process is simply an additional hurdle for regulators to contend with when supervising financial institutions and an additional point at which institutions can slow down or avoid punishments. H.R. 4545 would undermine the examinations process at a time when supervisory authority and penalties for financial sector malfeasance should be strengthened.”

In addition to that, there is another paragraph in the letter from Americans for Financial Reform that I think is extremely important in explaining why this bill should be opposed.

It says: “By layering an entirely new appeals process on top of existing processes, this bill would greatly increase the ability of banks to resist supervisory oversight and ignore or delay changes called for by supervisors. The impact would be most pronounced at the largest banks, which can receive dozens or hundreds of material findings from every examination. The ability to appeal every one of those material supervisory findings, or just to threaten to appeal them, would create an enormous new barrier to effective supervision of big banks.”

In essence, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is, we have our bank examiners who are going in and looking for ways to strengthen the banks and hoping that they will not find these adverse conditions, but, if they do, they have a responsibility to the consumers to try and get them corrected or to try and get changes made.

□ 1400

This bill says, despite adverse conditions that are discovered, we don't want to have to comply; we don't want to have to change; we don't want to have to correct. We want to fight you. We want to use our vast resources to say your examiners didn't know what they were doing.

They are not so much concerned about the consumers; rather, they are more concerned about just being a part of the bureaucracy.

It doesn't make good sense what they are saying about the examiners and why they are not important.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and the former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here for the second time in as many days to discuss a bill from Mr. TIPTON, my friend and our colleague from Colorado. I commend his dedication to find ways to bring more credit options to more Americans. This bill is no exception to that, and I thank him for sponsoring it.

This Nation is founded on the idea that those who enforce the law are not those who ultimately judge those laws.

This idea of due process is something all Americans respect and we enjoy, but in the case of financial institutions, there has been a noted lack of such process during appeals. If a bank or credit union today is assessed a postinspection penalty that they feel is based on inaccurate or incomplete information, the only recourse is back to the regulator that performed the inspection in the first place. Such an argument turns the concept of proper process upside down.

At the very least, I think we would all agree with a number of my colleagues who have noted that the judge, the jury, and the executioner should be separate. There has to be a better way.

This bill provides that better way by giving these institutions a new recourse so they can be assured of fair treatment. We all know this could be an expensive and time-consuming process for a bank or credit union, which is all the more reason to provide fair treatment. Smaller banks and credit unions that go through this appeal process are possibly running the risk of losing an appeal that will severely limit their ability to offer credit.

For that reason, a newer, fairer process will help all Americans by increasing access to credit. I am not pulling that idea out of thin air. The National Bankers Association, which represents minority bankers, supports the legislation. That should tell us how this bill will benefit every American who relies on the financial services and on credit.

Finally, Mr. TIPTON's bill does not change the fact that some banks and credit unions will lose their appeals. No one is saying that bad actors should go unpunished. The point of the bill, however, is to make that process as fair as possible. By consolidating the appeals process into one office that is separate from the four main banking regulators, that fairness can be achieved.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this bill not only supports the concept of due process, but it will also expand credit opportunities for all Americans.

I again commend the bill and the author, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4545 is yet another harmful bill that would help out Wall Street and predatory lenders. It has become a theme for the majority to claim that their legislation is meant to provide relief for small community banks, when, in fact, the legislation plainly benefits the Nation's largest banks, including abusive megabanks like Wells Fargo and even payday lenders. This bill is yet another example.

The bill would allow any bank as well as any nonbank supervised by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to appeal negative supervisory determinations made by regulators in the examination process.

H.R. 4545 makes it more likely that bad actors, including predatory megabanks like Wells Fargo, would avoid or delay accountability when they break Federal law. It takes our system of financial regulation in exactly the wrong direction.

Megabanks like Wells Fargo already treat the fines they are required to pay for violations of the law as simply the cost of doing business. They don't need more escape routes to avoid accountability for their wrongdoing.

I have made it clear many times that abusive megabanks with egregious patterns of harming consumers should face steep penalties from regulators. Last year I introduced H.R. 3937, the Megabank Accountability and Consequences Act, which would require the Federal prudential banking regulators to fully utilize existing authorities, such as the ability to shut down a megabank and ban culpable executives and directors from working in the banking industry.

To get tough on megabanks that repeatedly engage in practices that harm consumers, Congress should be focused on measures that strengthen consumer protections, provide tailored, responsible relief for community banks, and ensure that abusive megabanks are held accountable. This bill, which would help megabanks and predatory lenders get off the hook when they break the law, should be rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is a very commonsense bill, which is one of the reasons it is strongly bipartisan. I am sorry that the ranking member has not chosen to be part of that bipartisanship, but over half of the committee Democrats on our committee support it. Why? Because they understand that it is part of our American DNA to have due process.

When we continue to lose a credit union or a community bank every day in America, on average, with their loss, we are losing home ownership opportunities, opportunities to grow businesses.

Because of that regulatory burden, these exams can mean the difference between a credit union being open and not being open. They can mean the difference between a community bank being open or not open. Thus, it means the difference in our constituents getting homes and small business loans and auto loans.

This is common sense. It simply says you ought to be able to appeal an exam, have a third party take a look at it.

Everybody deserves due process in America, including our community banks and credit unions, so that is why it is so important that we enact H.R. 4545. It came out of our committee with a huge bipartisan vote. Let's make sure credit continues to flow throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4545, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-595.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amend section 2 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITIONS.

Section 1003 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3302) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following

“(2) the term ‘community financial institution’ means a financial institution with total consolidated assets of \$10,000,000,000 or less;”.

Strike “financial institution” each place such term appears and insert “community financial institution”.

Page 6, line 5, strike “financial institutions” and insert “community financial institutions”.

Page 6, line 12, strike “financial institutions” and insert “community financial institutions”.

Page 8, line 3, strike “financial institutions” and insert “community financial institutions”.

Page 9, line 14, strike “financial institutions” and insert “community financial institutions”.

Page 12, beginning on line 4, strike “financial institutions” and insert “community financial institutions”.

Page 12, line 6, strike “financial institutions” and insert “community financial institutions”.

Page 15, beginning on line 21, strike “— (A)”.

Page 16, line 2, insert a period and a quotation mark before the semicolon.

Page 16, strike lines 3 through 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 773, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, my amendment is fairly straightforward. It would limit the applicability of the exam reforms under H.R. 4545 to only depository institutions with assets less than \$10 billion.

I have only heard about community banks and credit unions with respect to concerns regarding their exam process and the ability to enhance the opportunity to appeal exam findings. As Ms. Maloney made clear, when the committee marked up this bill, the sole purpose of the bill was to help community banks and credit unions, so my amendment seeks to narrow the scope of the bill's relief to these small firms.

Congress used a similar \$10 billion asset threshold in Dodd-Frank to exempt small banks and credit unions from the Consumer Bureau's supervision, so applying a similar threshold for the purpose of appealing bank supervisory findings makes sense.

Today, 98 percent of all banks and 99.8 percent of all credit unions have less than \$10 billion in assets. While I am in favor of sensible relief for smaller financial institutions, I believe that the 2007–2009 financial crisis showed the dangers of weak oversight of these big banks, including a \$30 billion bank like IndyMac. The bank's costly failure was the fourth largest in the history of the United States and contributed to the most damaging financial crisis in generations.

As the largest firms pose the greatest risk to the country's economy and the safety and soundness of our financial system, it is only prudent to apply a stringent supervisory approach for the largest institutions. In fact, the GAO issued a report last year criticizing the Federal Reserve's large bank supervision program, underscoring there is more work that must be done.

I have been pushing bank regulators to deploy the full suite of their enforcement tools against megabanks like Wells Fargo that repeatedly and carelessly break the law and harm millions of consumers. That is why I introduced, again, H.R. 3937, the Megabank Accountability and Consequences Act.

So, no, I do not think it is appropriate to let megabanks like Wells Fargo hijack what should be regulatory relief for community banks so that they can challenge their exams. Nonbanks regulated by the Consumer Bureau, like Equifax or payday lenders, do not need this kind of regulatory relief either.

My amendment narrows the scope of the bill on what should garner broad bipartisan support: sensible relief for the community banks and credit unions that need it.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues who truly want to help community banks and credit unions rather than Wall Street megabanks to support my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again, what we are talking about here is fundamental due process: due process for every American, due process for every institution regardless of its size, regardless of its geography. This is about due process.

As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote: “Whatever disagreement there may be as to the scope of the phrase ‘due process of law,’ there can be no doubt that it embraces the fundamental conception of a fair trial, with opportunity to be heard.” He is one of the most famous jurists in all of American history.

We are trying to ensure, again, that a bank examiner or a credit union examiner is not tantamount to judge, jury, prosecutor, cop on the beat, and executioner all rolled into one. There is no due process if your only practical appeal is to the person who rendered the judgment in the first place.

So, number one, it is important that all Americans, all institutions receive due process, which is perhaps why even over half of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee chose to support H.R. 4545.

The ranking member's amendment would set a threshold here, but her threshold, as she talks about these so-called megabanks, at \$10 billion, that is one-half of 1 percent of the size of J.P. Morgan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe in too-big-to-fail banks. I know my friends on the other side of the aisle do. That is why they voted for the bailout fund to support these too-big-to-fail financial institutions with taxpayer funds.

I don't believe in too-big-to-fail institutions, but if I did, Mr. Speaker, if I did, it would be limited to maybe eight or nine banks in America. It certainly wouldn't be applicable to any community bank, credit union, or regional bank.

We have to remember, regardless of the size of the bank, it is their capital that is helping to capitalize our businesses.

□ 1415

I am from Dallas, Texas. One of our major employers is American Airlines.

I wish they could do business with First State Bank of Athens, but I suspect they do not. And so sometimes, yes, global banks are necessary to our economy, regional banks are necessary to our economy, community banks and credit unions are necessary to our economy. They are suffering under the sheer weight, load, volume, complexity, and expense of the regulatory burden, which the examination process is part of it.

Let's give them due process. Let's give them fairness and ensure that credit can flow to every small business, every household that is worthy in America. Let's reject the ranking member's amendment, and let's support the underlying bill, H.R. 4545.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REGULATION A+ IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 773, I call up the bill (H.R. 4263) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 773, the amendment printed in part D of House Report 115-595 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4263

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regulation A+ Improvement Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. JOBS ACT-RELATED EXEMPTION.

Section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking "\$50,000,000" and inserting "\$75,000,000, adjusted for inflation by the Commission every

2 years to the nearest \$10,000 to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics"; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking "such amount as" and inserting: "such amount, in addition to the adjustment for inflation provided for under such paragraph (2)(A), as"; and

(B) by striking "such amount, it" and inserting "such amount, in addition to the adjustment for inflation provided for under such paragraph (2)(A), it".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act.

I want to thank the sponsor of this bipartisan legislation, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR). He has been a huge leader on all capital formation issues within our committee and in this Congress. He is a real asset. His business acumen is well positioned to help serve us, and his leadership on this bill should be commended.

Mr. Speaker, although small companies are at the forefront of technological innovation and job creation, they often face significant obstacles in obtaining funding in our capital markets. These obstacles generally stem from the disproportionately larger burden that securities regulations, written principally for large public companies, instead place on small companies when they seek to go public.

In 2012, the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, known as JOBS Act, sought to modernize and better tailor some of these regulations, including Reg. A, under our securities law. Reg. A is a longstanding exemption from SEC registration that permits public offerings without formal registration as long as certain conditions are met.

Prior to the JOBS Act, a small company seeking to use Reg. A was limited to raising \$5 million of securities in a 12-month period. As you can imagine, over time, Mr. Speaker, Reg. A offer-

ings became increasingly rare due to the relatively small offering size that was available and a requirement that Reg. A securities still comply with 50 different State securities law registration and qualification requirements.

Title IV of the JOBS Act attempted to address the antiquated Regulation A by directing the SEC to update it, which the SEC did in 2015, under the moniker Reg. A+, by creating two tiers of Regulation A offerings and allowing certain securities to qualify for preemption from State securities law.

Under the second tier, the SEC increased the amount companies can offer from \$5 million to \$50 million. Mr. MACARTHUR's legislation only pertains to the Tier 2 limit.

Since Reg. A+ was implemented in 2015, small businesses have increasingly been able to use this tool to raise much-needed capital to expand their businesses and create new jobs in our economy. According to the SEC Office of Small Business Policy, as of November 2017, 69 completed Reg. A+ offerings had raised a total of \$611 million.

Unfortunately, the \$50 million cap leaves significant opportunity on the table for our startups, opportunity that could be better realized if the limit were increased to \$75 million, which the Treasury Department has recommended as a potentially less costly alternative for startups to raise capital. Moreover, increasing the Reg. A+ limit will better position companies that want to use the exemption as an on-ramp to list publicly to bear the corresponding compliance burdens and still invest in jobs and growth.

Mr. Speaker, more and more, we have seen IPOs of companies with products that we use every day—Uber, Facebook, Spotify, Snapchat—come after the company is already valued over \$1 billion. For everyday investors, this often means missing out on some of the most dynamic growth stages of the company that would provide the highest rate of returns for them and their family, all while the wealthy, accredited investors and venture capital firms can invest early, and they get to rake in the better rates of return.

With regulations disproportionately stacked against them, it isn't surprising that small companies so often are choosing to stay private. Many have no other choice. Again, after all, the SEC has estimated that the costs of going public, on average, are \$2.5 million in regulatory costs for undergoing an IPO and annual compliance costs averaging \$1.5 million thereafter.

Those costs stand in stark contrast to the \$111,000 the SEC says is the average legal and auditing cost for Reg. A+ offerings. In other words, by utilizing Reg. A+, small businesses can raise significant capital while saving more than \$2 million—\$2 million that can be invested in jobs and research and other growth opportunities. This is why Reg.

A+ is so important: it provides a more cost-effective way to raise equity capital early on in the growth stages of these companies.

Additionally, Reg. A offerings enjoy preemption from State securities laws. Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member pays close attention to this. They may not know it.

In 1980, when a startup computer company, by the way, called Apple decided to go public, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts decided the stock was too risky and barred its sale to individual investors in the State. Today, Apple's market valuation is almost \$1 trillion. It is an American iconic brand and one of the largest companies in the world. And it is, again, potentially going to be the first public company with a trillion-dollar market cap. If you had bought 45 shares of Apple when it was offered at its IPO, by the end of last year you would have over \$394,000. That is hardly crumbs, Mr. Speaker.

In short, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a very smart but modest improvement in a popular JOBS Act provision.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4263, the so-called Regulation A+ Improvement Act, is a solution in search of a problem that threatens to undermine protections for mom-and-pop investors and the integrity of our capital markets. The bill would arbitrarily and prematurely increase the maximum amount of securities that private companies can sell each year to the public from \$50 million to \$75 million under the Securities and Exchange Commission's Regulation A+ exemption from registration.

Mr. Speaker, such a change makes no sense. First, the SEC only recently implemented Regulation A+ pursuant to the Jumpstart Our Business Startups, the JOBS Act. Effective June 19, 2015, that rule now allows private companies to raise either \$20 million under Tier 1 or \$50 million under Tier 2 from the public with less investor protections and oversight than a public securities offering registered with the SEC.

What little data we have since it became effective suggests that there is no need to raise that \$50 million limit. As of December 31, 2017, only 39 percent of the 172 companies using Tier 2 of Regulation A+ sought the maximum amount of \$50 million; and only three issuers, or 5 percent, of the 61 issuers that have reported proceeds in Tier 2 offerings actually raised the maximum amount.

Second, in the JOBS Act, Congress specifically directed the SEC to review the Regulation A+ limit every 2 years and report its reasons for not raising it to Congress. On April 5, 2016, the SEC sent Congress its report, stating:

"Given the short period of time that the final rules have been in effect and in light of the limited number of Regulation A+ offerings qualified and completed to date, the Commission does not believe that the information currently reported by companies on the amount of capital raised pursuant to Regulation A+ is sufficient to determine whether it would be appropriate to propose an increase in the Tier 2 \$50 million offering limit."

If my Republican colleagues think that the SEC should be doing more, they only have to wait a few more weeks for the SEC's next review and report on the Regulation A+ offering limit. There is no reason why Congress shouldn't acknowledge the SEC's existing efforts to study the empirical evidence instead of making arbitrary decisions devoid of any real analysis.

Finally, and most importantly, the bill may harm retail investors and our markets. What my Republican colleagues fail to acknowledge is that the purpose of Regulation A+ is to provide small private businesses with access to financing from mom-and-pop investors, many of whom are in their community, so that they can grow and eventually enter the public markets as full SEC reporting companies traded on a national securities exchange.

As public companies, they are subject to the full set of investor protections under the securities laws, but also gain access to much deeper sources of capital. Indeed, under the current system, eight Regulation A+ issuers have already listed their shares on an exchange, becoming true public companies. This positive development suggests that Regulation A+ is working as Congress intended, and expanding it could discourage companies from becoming truly public.

However, it is also clear that additional study of the existing Regulation A+ exemption is warranted. A series of recent press articles highlight the high risk of loss that investors face in investing in companies that have used Regulation A+ even when those companies later list their securities for trading on an exchange.

According to a February 2018 article in *The Wall Street Journal*, seven out of the eight companies that listed their securities for trading on an exchange in 2017 following a Regulation A+ offering are trading an average of 42 percent below their offering prices. By comparison, companies that engaged in a traditional initial public offering, or an IPO, in 2017 are trading an average of 22 percent above their offering prices. Moreover, those Regulation A+ companies were trading lower, even as the S&P 500, which tracks 500 large publicly traded companies, has risen 18 percent since the start of 2017.

Congress should better understand why Regulation A+ companies that have gone public fared so poorly com-

pared to the rest of the market before we go ahead and expand Regulation A+ through legislation like H.R. 4263.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I joined with my friends on the opposite side of the aisle, and Mr. McHENRY in particular, and supported the JOBS Act, and of course I had some questions about the risk that would be involved with our mom-and-pop investors. I wasn't sure, but I decided to support the JOBS Act and Mr. McHENRY even with my concerns because I certainly wanted the opportunity for these small businesses to have access to capital that perhaps they would not be able to get otherwise.

□ 1430

Along with that bill, we talked about the review that would be done to determine whether or not we should be increasing, particularly, Tier 2, that would expand the ability for the small businesses to have access to more than \$50 million. So I don't know why we just don't stick with what we did.

I think that, despite whatever we are learning about the A+ regulation, we need to understand thoroughly what the advantages are, what the disadvantages are, and what the risks are to investors, et cetera.

So I am going to ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), the sponsor of this legislation and a hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to advance this bill—this bipartisan bill. I am grateful for my Democratic cosponsor, Congresswoman SINEMA; Democratic Congressman GOTTHEIMER; and Republican Congressman HOLLINGSWORTH, for joining me in this effort.

The purpose of this bill is pretty simple and pretty narrow. Seven out of ten new jobs in this country come from our Nation's 28 million small businesses. When we help those businesses grow, we help them create new jobs.

I think of the biopharmaceutical companies in my home State of New Jersey as an example of companies that desperately need capital to continue to grow, and that growth creates new jobs. The Federal Government cannot do everything, but we can surely help these companies grow in our country.

The 1933 Securities Act laid the groundwork that all interstate security offerings have to be registered with the SEC. It was cumbersome, it was expensive, so that Congress made some exceptions. Regulation A allowed a limited amount of offerings for Main Street investors, and Regulation D allowed unlimited offerings for accredited investors. This bill is working at Regulation A.

Over time, those limits have gone up periodically. The last time it was lifted was effective 2015. It was raised to \$50 million, and it has been helpful. It has created growth. It has created new jobs.

This bill is a modest improvement, raising that \$50 million to \$75 million. This was contemplated in the original JOBS Act, where we raised it to \$50 million. In that law, the SEC was required to either increase the \$50 million or to explain to us why they weren't doing it. Their deadline for doing that expired at the end of 2017. So this is an overdue increase, and I think it is high time that we do it.

I could offer a lot of anecdotes of how this benefits companies. I thought I would offer the one that is closest to home, my own story.

I was fortunate enough to buy a fairly small business in 2002. I did three capital raises in the years that followed. The first was for \$12 million, the second was for \$75 million, the third was for \$500 million. And those capital raises continued during my period of ownership of the company.

I can tell you, without any question, the smallest capital raises were the hardest for me. It is much harder to raise this much money than it is to raise this much. When I was raising a lot of money, I had a lot of interested parties. When I was raising the smaller amount, it was difficult.

What this bill does is allow growing companies to have another point in the market where they can raise money. It is not just banks or private equity funds; it is regular, Main Street investors.

I heard the remarks that this creates risk. I can tell you that there are dozens of people in my old company who became shareholders, who are living a better life today, them and their families, because they had an opportunity to buy stock in a growing company.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is good for businesses. It is good for employees. It is good for Main Street investors. It is a win, win, win. And, ultimately, it is good for the American economy. I urge my colleagues to support it. Let's not be afraid of making a commonsense change. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chairman of the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from New Jersey and the work that he has put into this.

I rise today in support of this much-needed legislation that would increase the limit that small companies looking for additional investments and inves-

tors can solicit under Reg. A+. These deals would increase from \$50 million to \$75 million. This will enhance capital formation for growing small companies that are exploring crowdfunding as a method to raise capital.

The JOBS Act has proven to be wildly successful, and this program has proven itself successful as well. Yet it can be even more so with this modest increase.

So, specifically, the legislation further strengthens the ability for small-to mid-sized companies to attract more traditional underwriters and more sophisticated investors into the Reg. A+ process.

Reg. A+ has been termed a "Mini IPO" or an "IPO to go," and for good reason. While the cost of doing a full-blown IPO has skyrocketed, and the crowdfunding industry has been adopting Reg. A+ and leveraging it to raise growth capital for a fraction of what a traditional full-blown IPO would be, would cost, while still having access to the capital markets.

Like the chairman, I and many others on the committee have been concerned about the decrease in these initial public offerings, or IPOs, over the last number of years. Reg. A+ has been able to step in and help fill that gap. It provides much greater flexibility and marketing to potential investors, both accredited and non-accredited, while maintaining important consumer protections that everybody agrees needs to be there.

Despite Reg. A+ being cheaper and faster, however, major underwriters and broker dealers have been slow to fully adopt Reg. A+ because the size of the increase up to that \$50 million has really been minimal compared to a traditional IPO.

Raising the Reg. A+ limit to \$75 million is certainly a step in the right direction to alleviate this problem, as it opens Reg. A+ to larger companies that may be considering doing a full-blown traditional IPO.

Additionally, this increased limit will have a positive impact for smaller companies because it can attract some of the more traditional underwriters to the process.

So, again, I want to congratulate my friend from New Jersey on his work on this, and the chairman for really trying to push this issue forward. It is an important piece that we have been dealing with on the capital markets as we are trying to maintain and make sure that our markets are the most liquid and deep in the world, and that maintains that.

So I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the vice chair-

man of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, this is an exciting, important debate. I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act.

Congressman MACARTHUR's bipartisan legislation would increase the offering amount that companies can offer under Tier 2 of Reg. A from \$50 million to \$75 million, adjusted for inflation by the SEC every 2 years.

This type of legislation, modeled after the bipartisan JOBS Act, typically enjoys strong bipartisan support in Congress. I hope that will be the case again today.

Title IV of the JOBS Act directed the SEC to issue rules to update Reg. A, which exempts small offerings of up to \$5 million within a 12-month period from Federal registration. The updated exemption, now known as Reg. A+, increased the amount companies could offer from \$5 million to \$50 million within a 12-month period of time, and preempts State registration and qualification requirements to make it easier for small- and medium-sized businesses to undertake Reg. A+ offerings by avoiding the oftentimes prohibitively expensive complexities of complying with up to 50 State regulators, all providing different regulations.

Some opponents of this legislation have argued that it is unnecessary because the SEC is required to review this threshold and has the authority to increase it.

On April 5, 2016, SEC staff informed the Financial Services Committee that the \$50 million threshold would remain in place throughout 2018 because of a lack of information available on Reg. A+ offerings since the rule was finalized in 2015.

However, during the comment period for implementing Reg. A+, the SEC received a significant number of comments that Reg. A+ should be expanded beyond the \$50 million threshold. Furthermore, since the amendment to Reg. A became effective, the rate of Reg. A+ securities offerings has increased.

Last year, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce testified before the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee, noting this legislation "is a way to help make it easier for a small business to access capital to get deals done. To do that, even with the bump up to \$50 million, people are still finding their sea legs. But in terms of driving liquidity, we thought the \$75 million number was important."

Former SEC Commissioner Dan Gallagher has stated: "The SEC should have exercised our clear authority under the JOBS Act to raise the offering limit to \$75 million."

Hester Peirce, now an SEC Commissioner, testified during a hearing of the Financial Services Committee that, "Prior to the JOBS Act's changes to

Regulation A, that provision languished unused by companies, so it is important to revisit different avenues for raising capital frequently to ensure their continued usefulness."

Congressman MACARTHUR's legislation will help ensure that the SEC focuses on its mission of capital formation, especially for small businesses. This is vital if we are going to continue on the course of economic growth.

And at the end of the day, after all of our debate on the merits of this legislation, let's make sure we remember it is simply an inflation adjustment for the amount of shares that can be issued under this exemption. Congressman MACARTHUR is simply proposing to make this financing tool available to more startup companies and their investors. This should not be controversial.

I urge support for Congressman MACARTHUR's bipartisan legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the majority whip of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my congratulations to Mr. MACARTHUR for continuing to find ways to improve Mr. Obama's and this committee's excellent work on the JOBS Act from some 8 years ago. We have learned a lot. We have seen the benefits of the JOBS Act, and today we have a chance to make it even better by improving Reg. A+.

I appreciate Mr. MACARTHUR's personal story about his entrepreneurship and how this is an opportunity for more investors in our country and more capital for our entrepreneurs.

Mr. Speaker, this week I attended a meeting where people asked: Why do we need more public companies?

Gosh, that is an easy rhetorical question.

Because we have half the number of public companies we had during the Reagan administration, and we need them for our young people to invest in. We need them for our union workers to have an earning asset in their pension fund.

So we need more public companies in this Nation to share the growth and prosperity of this Nation. That is what this legislation is all about.

I thank Mr. MACARTHUR for his very straightforward, bipartisan, commonsense increase in the authority from \$50 million to \$75 million for young, growing companies to raise money under Reg. A+.

Former SEC Commissioner Dan Gallagher advocated the increase in the offering threshold to even \$100 million before the SEC adopted their final rule.

□ 1445

Mr. GALLAGHER expressed his disappointment that this offering thresh-

old was not raised in the final rule from that original statutory cap of \$50 million.

We have support through the commission and through the staff for raising this amount, Mr. Speaker, to help our entrepreneurs. Expanding Reg. A+ to include offerings up to \$75 million will allow private companies to consider a mini-IPO under Reg. A+. This will give us more competition for capital, driving down cost of capital, driving up the number of opportunities for people to take advantage of going public, growing a prosperous company, and sharing that equity with investors through their exchange-traded fund, through their pension plan, through their 401(k) plan. We want more opportunities to share our Nation's prosperity.

I thank my friend, Mr. MACARTHUR, for his thoughtful work, and I thank our chairman for his leadership on the committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), from the land of moose and maple syrup, a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity very much. You notice, Mr. Speaker, those who do not live in the great State of Maine are very envious of those who do; so I take full advantage of the moose, bear, and other critters that we have in the State of Maine.

Right now, today, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR) for the great work he has done on this bill, and I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for bringing this bill to the floor. It is very important for all of us to consider this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know what we want in this country, which are more opportunities and more jobs for our kids—better opportunities for our kids so they will have better lives and more freedom. This cannot happen, Mr. Speaker, unless our businesses are able to grow and hire more individuals and pay them more.

Now, that mostly can only happen, Mr. Speaker, if businesses are able to more easily borrow money. The chairman and I both know that the government's job is to help our economy grow, not get in the way.

That is why Reg. A+ cuts through the red tape such that more small- and medium-sized businesses are able to access capital, grow their operations, and hire more people. In a sense, Reg. A+ has implemented, Mr. Speaker, billions of dollars of new financing and has led economic growth in small to medium

businesses to grow and present more opportunities for their workers. So Reg. A+ works. We know that because the evidence is there.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying, Mr. MACARTHUR's bill is a commonsense technical adjustment to a bill—a rule, rather, that works. It simply increases the amount that companies are able to borrow under this rule that works.

Please, everybody, Republicans and Democrats, support Mr. MACARTHUR's bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act. I greatly appreciate my colleague, Representative MACARTHUR, for this bill and for our chairman for moving it through our committee, and, frankly, my colleagues from across the aisle who came together to recognize the need for this bill.

As has already been stated, this has broad implications for small capital companies. I spent the past 15 years, prior to coming to Congress, growing small manufacturing companies, and I can greatly appreciate the challenge of raising capital. This is another means of doing that, but I want to highlight another area that it might be suitable.

With approximately \$4 billion of capital raised worldwide in 2017, it is fair to say that initial coin offerings are just another great way for startups to raise capital and grow their businesses. ICOs in Regulation A+ could work great together, and with Mr. MACARTHUR's bill, they can work even better.

An example of this harmonization is the investor-based Reg. A+ allows investors of any wealth to participate. This Democratic process is a pillar for ICOs in terms of the premise behind distributed ledger technology.

Another provision is anti-money laundering. Reg. A+ requires the validation of investors, as well as background checks on the principles of offering companies. This goes hand in hand with improving the credibility of ICO business practices and reducing the risk of loss.

Compliance with Reg. A+ would mean a disclosure memorandum, not just a white paper. Reg. A+ provides ICO entrepreneurs and their startups with a viable path to compliance with SEC security regulation. So it is important that we have guardrails established in this explosive new industry, while not hampering the ability to grow the business. I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have extensive information here about what is happening with Regulation A+. At first, I decided that some of this information I wouldn't share because I am so anxious for these small businesses to be able to access capital, but I think that, you know, some of my earlier concerns, perhaps, may have been justified.

H.R. 4263, the so-called Regulation A+ Improvement Act, is opposed by consumer and investor advocates. I would like to take a moment to read some of their statements in opposition to this bill.

Consumer Federation of America:

"This bill would increase the offering limit, despite the fact that the SEC already has unlimited authority to raise the cap as it deems appropriate. Moreover, the SEC is required to review the offering limit every 2 years, with its next analysis expected to be released next month. . . . A vote for this bill, before the SEC has had a chance to complete its analysis, is a vote against evidence-based policymaking.

"If Congress were to take the time to consider the research that the SEC has conducted on the Regulation A markets since the Regulation A+ rules were adopted, it would find that there currently is no need to raise the limit . . . data suggest that issuers generally are not clamoring for more capital than is currently allowed to them under the rules. . . .

"The market's tepid reaction to Regulation A offerings is surely also related to the largely abysmal performance of Regulation A offerings to date. . . . A recent Barron's article provided an in-depth review of the Regulation A market, describing the 'woeful performance' of the few dozen companies that are currently exchange-listed and the difficulty trading or getting a price quote for the vast majority of companies that aren't exchange listed. The Barron's article further described how 'most Reg. A+ businesses haven't gotten beyond the startup phase known as the pipedream.' Some examples that the article cites include businesses seeking capital for cannabis paraphernalia, flying cars, studying UFOs, telepathy, and light-speed travel. We wonder why the backers of this legislation would spend so much time and effort seeking to artificially prop up businesses of this sort.

"And while Regulation A's supporters have touted Regulation A's job creating potential, the Barron's article states that the only people Regulation A clearly has created jobs for are Regulation A underwriters and promoters on Wall Street, many of whom have 'checked stock market histories.'"

Are these really the sort of jobs Congress is intending to promote?

"In conclusion, because this bill arbitrarily increases the offering limit

without evidence that doing so is either necessary or beneficial, and in the face of evidence that Regulation A offerings to date largely have been market failures, we urge you to vote 'no.'"

Let me just continue to quote. Americans for Financial Reform: "This is an unwarranted increase in the threshold. Most fundamentally, Congress should not be undermining public securities markets by expanding the ability of larger companies to make offerings while being exempt from core disclosure and investor protection requirements. Private offerings were designed to permit early stage capital raising from sophisticated investors by small companies, but the current cap of \$50 million per year in private capital raising already permits fairly large companies to take advantage of this route. Additionally, the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, already has regulatory authority to increase the current threshold, which they examine on a biannual basis. . . .

"Seven of the eight companies with Regulation A+ offerings in 2017 are down 42 percent from their offer prices, as compared to conventional offerings made during the same period, which are up 22 percent from offer prices. This is to be expected, given that Regulation A+ permits companies to avoid requirements such as disclosures that were designed to protect investors. If it expanded such exemptions, Congress would facilitate increased harm to investors.

"Members should also take notice that with the blockchain and cryptocurrency fever, SEC filing and disclosure exemptions like Regulation A+ are becoming a popular avenue for initial coin offerings, ICOs. . . .

"In the middle of this SEC crackdown on fraudulent ICOs, H.R. 4263 would potentially expose a larger number of investors—including nonaccredited, unsophisticated investors—to shady companies, Ponzi schemes, and exit scams.

"The widespread use of private offerings reduces transparency and investor protections in capital markets. Raising capital under Regulation A+ should be used as an on-ramp to a true public offering and not as an end in itself for larger issuers. Increasing the annual threshold for exempted Regulation A+ offerings goes in the opposite direction."

Public Citizen had this to say:

"Evidence shows little demand for this measure. A study by the SEC of Regulation A+ offerings found that the average issuer sought only \$18 million. Moreover, these firms pose risk for investors, as the issuers had only an average of \$50,000 in cash; no property, plants, and equipment; no revenues; and no net income. Increasing access to capital with no additional investor protections exacerbates the problem."

And so, yes, I do oppose the bill. Let me just say this. I would like small

businesses to do well. I would like our small businesses to have access to the capital that they need to support, you know, good ideas that have been given the kind of research that is necessary to determine the potential for some of these businesses.

You just heard this information from the Barron report. This is serious. What we have seen, despite the fact what we want to happen, is that it is not happening. The fact that we would like very much—and we have done everything that we could do with the JOBS Act to give support to our small businesses because we want them to thrive. We believe that they are job intensive, if they can get up and get going. It is not happening.

What we are doing is we are exposing these little mom-and-pop investors to situations where they are going to lose what small amounts of money they are investing. So let's just be cool, let's be calm, and let's give the SEC the opportunity to do its analysis. There is no reason to push this now.

I would ask my Members on the opposite side of the aisle to rethink and to join with me, oppose the bill so that we can give the SEC the opportunity, again, to do the kind of analysis it needs to do, and let's think about what else can we do to help small businesses, rather than continue down the road of failure, because this is exactly what is being exposed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), a hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bipartisan legislation, H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act, introduced by my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

Congratulations to Mr. MACARTHUR and the chairman for bringing this great legislation to the floor.

This legislation would increase, from \$50 million to \$75 million, the offering exemption amount that companies can offer under the Securities and Exchange Commission's, the SEC, Tier 2 of Regulation A, an amendment to the 2012 JOBS Act.

As the owner of a small business, I understand firsthand the vital importance of making our Nation's business climate competitive at all levels. Small businesses create nearly 70 percent of the new jobs in our country. Yet small businesses are only starting to see a resurgence from the struggling ecosystem created in the last Presidential era. Thanks to the recent tax cuts and regulatory changes, we have seen continued growth.

H.R. 4263 would be the next step toward helping small companies raise necessary equity capital to enable them to grow and compete in a changing and dynamic marketplace. This will result in more jobs and more opportunities for our communities.

This bill would expand the SEC's Regulation A+ from \$50 million to \$75 million, and it would allow companies to consider mini IPOs or mini initial public offerings at a less costly alternative to raising capital.

In my district, it is difficult to raise capital and secure a steady line of credit for developing and sustaining small businesses. I have experienced this very difficulty and struggle with clients I have represented in my own legal practice.

This bill would help tremendously in improving access to capital for small companies that ultimately are the drivers of job growth in New York and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank Mr. MACARTHUR and the bipartisan group of cosponsors for their hard work, and I urge my colleagues to support this great legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4263 is just another reckless partisan bill that could harm mom-and-pop investors and weaken the integrity of the U.S. capital markets. It continues the efforts to repeal or weaken important regulatory protections under the guise of supporting jobs.

Not only have my Republican colleagues failed to come up with any real data or analysis to support this claim, but they also completely substitute their own judgment for that of the SEC, the agency with the expertise over these issues.

As I have already said, we only have to wait a few more weeks to see if the SEC decides to expand the Regulation A+ exemption and to understand its rationale for the decision. But I suppose a few weeks is a few weeks too long for my friends on the opposite side of the aisle who are currently pushing for as many of these kinds of bills as possible to be included in the Senate's Dodd-Frank rollback.

Those bad bills would cause further harm to investors by allowing newly public companies to avoid audits of their controls over financial reporting for a decade; by hampering investors' ability to get independent, reliable information ahead of a shareholder meeting; and by making it easier for fraudsters to swindle unsophisticated investors into buying stock in a fake or failing company.

It should come as no surprise that these same harmful provisions show up in the CHOICE Act, which is 10 times worse than the Senate's deregulatory bill.

Mr. Speaker, both Democrats and Republicans want to help small businesses grow and create jobs, but as Members of Congress, we also have the responsibility to protect investors, particularly retail investors, who are looking to save for retirement, to buy a house, or to support our children's education.

As I have repeatedly said, any regulation must strike the right balance between capital formation in our securities markets and investor protection. This bill fails to do that, and that is why it is opposed by consumer and investor advocates like Americans for Financial Reform, Consumer Federation of America, and Public Citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members to join me in standing up for investors and vote "no" on H.R. 4263, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). The gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), an entrepreneur, someone who brings years and years of experience in capital formation of building a business to help grow jobs and our economy.

H.R. 4263, again, is, in part, an expansion of the JOBS Act, something that was signed into law by President Barack Obama. I didn't agree with that particular President on many occasions, but he got this right, and this has been something good for the American economy.

But what I fear is that, if we don't go forward, we end up going backwards. And what we hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle is: Let's keep the status quo.

But, Mr. Speaker, the status quo is what brought us a 1.6 percent economy. The status quo is what brought paychecks to become stagnant. The status quo ensured that Americans did not recover their savings from the great financial crisis.

Now we have the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and now we have 3 percent economic growth; now we have the lowest unemployment rate in 17 years; now we have seen the greatest growth in paychecks in almost a decade; now we are seeing 90 percent—90 percent—of wage earners seeing a bigger paycheck, better take-home pay, because of the economic policies of this Republican Congress and of the Trump administration.

So the gentleman from New Jersey has brought us, really, in some respects, an important but modest proposition: that we ought to increase the threshold for Reg A+ to \$75 million.

Again, we don't know where the next Uber is coming from. We don't know

where the next Spotify is coming from. We don't know where the next Apple is coming from. But do you know what, Mr. Speaker? We all know they need capital. And this is a valuable alley, chain, path in order to bring capital into our startup businesses.

Now, a constant theme we hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle is consumer protection. Do you know what? Back in the 1980s, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts decided to protect their people from this fly-by-night company called Apple, which now is looking at an almost \$1 trillion market cap valuation, and had you invested at the IPO, you would have a 45,000 percent rate of return. You could buy a home; your children could buy a home; your great-grandchildren could buy a home. You could achieve your American Dream. But a government decided: No, you are too stupid to make this investment decision on your own. We must protect you.

Nothing—nothing—in the bill from the gentleman from New Jersey alters the vast, vast array of consumer protection laws that are already on the books. Nothing in H.R. 4263 prevents the Department of Justice from pursuing criminal prosecutions of fraud. Nothing in the bill impacts the SEC's ability to pursue civil actions for those who engage in fraud, negligent misrepresentations, negligent transactions.

Nothing in this bill prevents the SEC from entering into cease and desist orders and imposing civil liabilities for those who violate SEC rules. Investors get to pursue Federal civil actions against those who defraud them, those who make untrue statements. So there are plenty of very important laws that are on our books.

What we shouldn't do, though, is protect our hardworking constituents from the ability to make decisions for themselves and participate in these early growth companies that now are only restricted to accredited investors. It is only the wealthiest who get to make these decisions. Well, in the land of the free, maybe a few more should, and maybe we ought to have a few more Apples, a few more Ubers, a few more Spotifys.

I want to thank, again, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), who has been a great leader in capital formation and job creation on our committee and in this Congress, and I want to urge all Members to adopt H.R. 4263.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 773, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to it in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Beatty moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4263 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 10, strike “\$75,000,000” and insert “\$50,000,000”.

Page 3, line 23, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. EFFECT OF INCREASE IN OFFERING LIMIT.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that the Securities and Exchange Commission revises regulations promulgated pursuant to subparagraphs (B) through (G) of paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c) as necessary to protect investors before increasing the aggregate offering amount described in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph to an amount that is greater than \$50,000,000.

Mrs. BEATTY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is simple and should be able to garner the support of every Member of this body who seeks to enhance our robust public and private markets while, at the same time, ensuring there are adequate safeguards in place for the benefit of Main Street investors.

Specifically, this motion will accomplish two simple things: one, it will strike the increase in the offering limit to \$75 million; and, two, it will require the SEC to review and revise their bad actor disqualification regulations prior to future increases in the offering threshold.

Unfortunately, as currently written, with all due respect to my Republican colleagues, raising the offering threshold is a solution in search of a problem. Congress designated the SEC with regulating the offering. Congress decided the SEC would administer the offering. The SEC is the expert on Regulation A+, and it should be the one to raise the offering threshold, assuming the data supports such an increase.

Under the law, the SEC will be reporting to Congress whether or not they will raise the threshold just next month. This bill is premature, and for the lawyers in the room, it is not ripe for review. So why wouldn't we wait?

Right now there is zero data to suggest Congress needs to raise the threshold, and it seems prudent to wait until next month to see what the SEC has to say before rushing to increase it.

The majority argues this bill will allow companies to raise more money. I say this bill is a solution in search of a problem because only less than a handful of companies have ever actually raised the current maximum amount of \$50 million.

With regard to updating the bad actor disqualification regulation, Bloomberg recently published an article on Regulation A+ and the companies using the offering and found one executive of a company was convicted for filing false tax returns, another for obstructing justice, and another was accused of selling unregistered stock. For the sake of time, these are just a few examples. Are these really the types of individuals we want selling securities to Main Street mom-and-pop investors?

Another article, appearing in *Baron's*, studied the hundreds of companies that have used Regulation A+ to raise funds, and I quote them: “We were supposed to get new jobs and new industries. Instead, we've gotten GoFundMe-style websites hawking penny stocks and professional wrestlers shilling shares on TV.”

They went on to highlight some of the companies and the products availing themselves of the lightly regulated Regulation A+ offering, which included companies trying to make cannabis paraphernalia, flying cars, guns, and my personal favorite, the founder of a rock band seeking to raise money to study UFOs and light-speed travel.

Now, I am not trying to persuade Members that all companies seeking to raise money through Regulation A+ are Wolf of Wall Street or UFO chasers, because back in my home district, a Scottish-based company successfully used Regulation A+ to open their first brewery and restaurant in the United States. That example is exactly what Congress had in mind when it called for the creation of Regulation A+, and it is precisely the type of opportunity for investors that the law was intended to create.

□ 1515

This is why we need to ensure that we maintain the integrity of the Regulation A+ offering and that we prevent bad actors from using it in a way to rip off and scam all of our constituents.

That is why I urge Congress to adopt this motion, to stand up for strong public and private markets, to wait the 30 days when the SEC can come back to

us, and to stand up for strong protections for Main Street investors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, when I have said something incorrect, I wish to correct myself in front of my colleagues in the public. I earlier said that my colleagues were trying to give us status quo. I wish to correct myself. This motion to recommit is worse than status quo. It would take us back even further.

The gentlewoman from Ohio should admit when she is wrong. She is wrong when she says this will not kill the bill. This will kill it. It will gut it. It will bury it 6 feet under. I think she knows that. So she is entitled to her opinion about what Reg. A+ should be, but she absolutely eviscerates the bipartisan bill that is before the House.

Because many who are watching this may somehow think, “Oh, my Lord, there are no consumer protections for Reg. A+ offerings,” the basic requirements that are applicable to both Tier 1 and tier offerings include company eligibility requirements, bad actor disqualification requirements, issuer disclosure requirements, ongoing reporting requirements.

And then for Tier 2 offerings, additional requirements: providing audited financial statements; requirement to file annual, semiannual, and current event reports; and limitation on the amount of security nonaccredited and accredited investors can purchase.

Then those that are offered on an exchange have to adhere to the exchange's listing standards, including corporate governance requirement, background checks on the management and board, shareholder approval of certain corporate actions, and the list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a good case here. Anybody who picked up a newspaper recently would find out that, yesterday, the SEC charged Theranos with raising more than \$700 million from investors through exaggerated and false statements about the company's technology.

Guess what. In announcing the enforcement decision, here is what the SEC noted:

The charges make clear that there is no exemption—no exemption—from the anti-fraud provisions of the Federal securities laws simply because a company is nonpublic, development-stage, or the subject of exuberant media attention.

In other words, the SEC was thoroughly able to do their job, and they were ready and willing to investigate and bring enforcement actions, as they well should. This is part of their job,

investor protection. But guess what. So is capital formation. Capital formation is part of the mission of the SEC. That is why it is so important that we not protect our constituents against great investment opportunities, like Apple, like Uber, and like Spotify.

So when we have so many Americans who are still living paycheck to paycheck, when they finally get a little savings together, shouldn't they be able to invest in great opportunities of early growth companies? Shouldn't these early growth companies have access to capital?

I think so.

You can't have capitalism without capital. Let's get more capital circulating in the system. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has done so much good, but we need so much more. We need capital circulating the system, particularly for our startups and our early growth stage companies.

We need to reject the MTR, and we need to vote in support of H.R. 4263.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 4263, if ordered;

Adoption of the amendment to H.R. 4545;

A motion to recommit on H.R. 4545, if ordered;

Passage of H.R. 4545, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 780; and

Adoption of House Resolution 780, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 235, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—182

Adams	Bustos	Cohen
Aguilar	Butterfield	Connolly
Barragán	Capuano	Cooper
Bass	Carbajal	Correa
Beatty	Cárdenas	Courtney
Bera	Carson (IN)	Crist
Beyer	Cartwright	Crowley
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Bonamici	Cicilline	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan	Clark (MA)	Delaney
F.	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Clay	DelBene
Brown (MD)	Cleaver	Demings
Brownley (CA)	Clyburn	DeSaulnier

Deutch	Langevin	Price (NC)	McCarthy	Renacci	Smucker
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Quigley	McCaul	Rice (SC)	Stefanik
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Raskin	McClintock	Roby	Stewart
Doyle, Michael	Lawrence	Richmond	McHenry	Roe (TN)	Stivers
F.	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard	McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Duncan (TN)	Lee	Ruiz	McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Tenney
Engel	Levin	Ruppersberger	Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Rush	McSally	Rokita	Thornberry
Españolat	Lieu, Ted	Ryan (OH)	Meadows	Rooney, Francis	Tipton
Esty (CT)	Loeb	Sánchez	Meehan	Rooney, Thomas	Trott
Evans	Lofgren	Sarbanes	Messer	J.	Turner
Foster	Lowenthal	Schakowsky	Mitchell	Rosen	Upton
Frankel (FL)	Lowey	Schiff	Moolenaar	Roskam	Valadao
Fudge	Lujan Grisham,	Schneider	Mooney (WV)	Ross	Wagner
Gabbard	M.	Schrader	Mullin	Rothfus	Walberg
Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott (VA)	Newhouse	Rouzer	Walden
Garamendi	Lynch	Scott, David	Noem	Royce (CA)	Walker
Gomez	Maloney,	Serrano	Norman	Russell	Walorski
Gottheimer	Carolyn B.	Sewell (AL)	Nunes	Rutherford	Walters, Mimi
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Shea-Porter	Olson	Sanford	Weber (TX)
Green, Gene	Matsui	Sherman	Palazzo	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Grijalva	McCollum	Sires	Palmer	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Gutiérrez	McEachin	Smith (WA)	Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Hanabusa	McGovern	Soto	Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Williams
Hastings	McNerney	Speier	Perry	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Heck	Meeks	Suozi	Peterson	Shimkus	Wittman
Higgins (NY)	Meng	Swalwell (CA)	Pittenger	Shuster	Womack
Himes	Moore	Takano	Poe (TX)	Simpson	Woodall
Hoyer	Moulton	Thompson (CA)	Poliquin	Sinema	Yoder
Huffman	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)	Posey	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Titus	Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Jayapal	Napolitano	Tonko	Reed	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)
Jeffries	Neal	Torres	Reichert	Smith (TX)	Zeldin
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Tsongas			
Johnson, E. B.	Norcross	Vargas			
Jones	O'Halloran	Veasey			
Kaptur	O'Rourke	Vela			
Keating	Pallone	Velázquez			
Kelly (IL)	Panetta	Visclosky			
Kennedy	Pascrell	Wasserman			
Khanna	Payne	Schultz			
Kihuen	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine			
Kildee	Perlmutter	Peters			
Kilmer	Pingree	Watson Coleman			
Kind	Pocan	Welch			
Krishnamoorthi	Polis	Yarmuth			
Kuster (NH)					

NAYS—235

Abraham	Crawford	Hartzler
Aderholt	Culberson	Hensarling
Allen	Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler
Amash	Curtis	Hice, Jody B.
Amodei	Davidson	Higgins (LA)
Arrington	Davis, Rodney	Hill
Babin	Denham	Holding
Bacon	Dent	Hollingsworth
Banks (IN)	DeSantis	Hudson
Barletta	DesJarlais	Huizenga
Barr	Díaz-Balart	Hultgren
Barton	Donovan	Hunter
Bergman	Duffy	Hurd
Biggs	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Bilirakis	Dunn	Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (MI)	Emmer	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Estes (KS)	Johnson (LA)
Black	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Blackburn	Faso	Johnson, Sam
Blum	Ferguson	Jordan
Bost	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Kelly (MS)
Brat	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Brooks (AL)	Fox	King (NY)
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger
Buchanan	Gaetz	Knight
Buck	Gallagher	Kustoff (TN)
Bucshon	Garrett	Labrador
Budd	Gianforte	LaHood
Burgess	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Byrne	Gohmert	Lamborn
Calvert	Gonzalez (TX)	Lance
Carter (GA)	Goodlatte	Latta
Chabot	Gosar	Lewis (MN)
Cheney	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Coffman	Granger	Long
Cole	Graves (GA)	Love
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Lucas
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer
Comer	Griffith	MacArthur
Comstock	Grothman	Marchant
Conaway	Guthrie	Marino
Cook	Handel	Marshall
Costello (PA)	Harper	Massie
Cramer	Harris	Mast

McClintock	McHenry	McKinley	McMorris	Rodgers	McSally	Meadows	Meehan	Messer	Mitchell	Moolenaar	Mooney (WV)	Mullin	Newhouse	Noem	Norman	Nunes	Olson	Palazzo	Palmer	Paulsen	Pearce	Perry	Peterson	Pittenger	Poe (TX)	Poliquin	Posey	Ratcliffe	Reed	Reichert		
Renacci	Rice (SC)	Roby	Roe (TN)	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Rohrabacher	Rokita	Rooney, Francis	Rooney, Thomas	J.	Rosen	Roskam	Ross	Rothfus	Rouzer	Royce (CA)	Russell	Rutherford	Sanford	Scalise	Schweikert	Scott, Austin	Sensenbrenner	Sessions	Shimkus	Shuster	Simpson	Sinema	Smith (MO)	Smith (NE)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)

NOT VOTING—13

Carter (TX)	Katko	Slaughter
Costa	Lipinski	Walz
Cummings	Loudermilk	Wilson (FL)
Davis, Danny	Rice (NY)	
Ellison	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1548

Messrs. OLSON, RUTHERFORD, ABRAHAM and STEWART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SHEA-PORTER and BLUNT ROCHESTER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 170, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—246

Abraham	Blum	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Bost	Collins (NY)
Allen	Brady (TX)	Comer
Amash	Brat	Comstock
Amodei	Bridenstine	Conaway
Arrington	Brooks (AL)	Cook
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Correa
Bacon	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Banks (IN)	Buck	Cramer
Barletta	Bucshon	Crawford
Barr	Budd	Cuellar
Barton	Burgess	Culberson
Bergman	Byrne	Curbelo (FL)
Biggs	Calvert	Curtis
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Cheney	Denham
Black	Coffman	Dent
Blackburn	Cole	DeSantis

DesJarlais	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)	Kind	Moulton	Scott (VA)	Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Panetta
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger	Rogers (KY)	Krishnamoorthi	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David	Heck	Heck	Pascarell
Donovan	Knight	Rohrabacher	Kuster (NH)	Nadler	Serrano	Higgins (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Payne
Duffy	Kustoff (TN)	Rokita	Langevin	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)	Himes	Himes	Pelosi
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Rooney, Francis	Larsen (WA)	Neal	Shea-Porter	Hoyer	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	Rooney, Thomas J.	Larson (CT)	Nolan	Sherman	Huffman	Huffman	Peters
Dunn	LaMalfa	Rosen	Lawrence	Norcross	Sires	Jackson Lee	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Emmer	Lamborn	Roskam	Lawson (FL)	O'Halloran	Smith (WA)	Jayapal	Jayapal	Pingree
Eshoo	Lance	Ross	Lee	O'Rourke	Soto	Jeffries	Jeffries	Pocan
Estes (KS)	Latta	Rothfus	Levin	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Farenthold	Lewis (MN)	Rouzer	Lewis (GA)	Panetta	Takano	Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Faso	LoBiondo	Royce (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Pascarell	Thompson (CA)	Kaptur	Kaptur	Quigley
Ferguson	Long	Russell	Loeb sack	Payne	Thompson (MS)	Keating	Keating	Raskin
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Rutherford	Lofgren	Pelosi	Titus	Kelly (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Fleischmann	Love	Sanford	Lowenthal	Pingree	Tonko	Chu, Judy	Chu, Judy	Rooney, Thomas J.
Flores	Lucas	Schneider	Lowe y	Pocan	Torres	Ciicilline	Khanna	Rosen
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert	Lujan Grisham, M.	Price (NC)	Tsongas	Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
Fox	MacArthur	Scott, Austin	Lujan, Ben Ray	Quigley	Vargas	Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Ruiz
Frelinghuysen	Maloney, Sean	Sensenbrenner	Lynch	Raskin	Veasey	Clay	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Gaetz	Marchant	Sessions	Maloney,	Richmond	Vela	Cleaver	Kind	Rush
Gallagher	Marino	Shimkus	Carolyn B.	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez	Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Garamendi	Marshall	Shuster	Matsui	Ruiz	Visclosky	Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Garrett	Massie	Simpson	McCollum	Ruppersberger	Wasserman	Connolly	Langevin	Schakowsky
Gianforte	Mast	Sinema	McEachin	Rush	Schultz	Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Gibbs	McCarthy	Smith (MO)	McGovern	Ryan (OH)	Waters, Maxine	Correa	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Gohmert	McCaul	Smith (NE)	McNerney	Sánchez	Watson Coleman	Courtney	Lawrence	Schrader
Goodlatte	McClintock	Smith (NJ)	Meeks	Sarbanes	Welch	Crist	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Gosar	McHenry	Smith (TX)	Meng	Schakowsky	Yarmuth	Crowley	Lee	Scott, David
Gottheimer	McKinley	Stefanik	Moore	Schiff		Davis (CA)	Levin	Serrano
Gowdy	McMorris	Stewart		Schrader		DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)
Granger	Rodgers	Stivers				DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
Graves (GA)	McSally	Suzuki				Delaney	Loeb sack	Sherman
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Taylor				DeLauro	Lofgren	Sinema
Graves (MO)	Meehan	Tenney				DelBene	Lowenthal	Sires
Griffith	Messer	Thompson (PA)				Demings	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
Grothman	Mitchell	Thornberry				DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham, M.	Soto
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Tipton				Deutch	Lujan, Ben Ray	Speier
Handel	Mooney (WV)	Trott				Dingell	Lynch	Suzuki
Harper	Mullin	Turner				Doggett	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Harris	Newhouse	Upton				Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Hartzler	Noem	Valadao				Engel	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Hensarling	Norman	Wagner				Eshoo	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Walberg				Espallat	McEachin	Titus
Hice, Jody B.	Olson	Walden				Esty (CT)	McGovern	Tonko
Higgins (LA)	Palazzo	Walker				Evans	McNerney	Torres
Hill	Palmer	Walorski				Foster	Meeks	Tsongas
Holding	Paulsen	Walters, Mimi				Frankel (FL)	Meng	Vargas
Hollingsworth	Pearce	Weber (TX)				Fudge	Moore	Veasey
Hudson	Perlmutter	Webster (FL)				Gabbard	Moulton	Vela
Huizenga	Perry	Wenstrup				Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Hultgren	Peters	Westerman				Garamendi	Nadler	Visclosky
Hunter	Peterson	Williams				Gomez	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hurd	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)				Gonzalez (TX)	Neal	Watson Coleman
Issa	Poe (TX)	Wittman				Gottheimer	Nolan	Welch
Jenkins (KS)	Poliquin	Womack				Green, Al	Norcross	Yarmuth
Jenkins (WV)	Polis	Woodall				Green, Gene	O'Halloran	
Johnson (LA)	Posey	Yoder				Grijalva	O'Rourke	
Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Yoho				Gutiérrez	Pallone	
Johnson, Sam	Reed	Young (AK)				Hanabusa		
Jordan	Reichert	Young (IA)						
Joyce (OH)	Renacci	Zeldin						
Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)							
Kelly (PA)	Roby							
King (IA)	Roe (TN)							

NAYS—170

Adams	Clay	Gabbard
Aguilar	Cleaver	Gallego
Barragán	Clyburn	Gomez
Bass	Cohen	Gonzalez (TX)
Beatty	Connolly	Green, Al
Bera	Cooper	Green, Gene
Beyer	Courtney	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Crist	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Crowley	Hanabusa
Blunt Rochester	Davis (CA)	Hastings
Bonamici	DeFazio	Heck
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Himes
Brown (MD)	DeLauro	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Huffman
Bustos	Demings	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Capuano	Deutch	Jeffries
Carbajal	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Jones
Cartwright	Engel	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Espallat	Keating
Castro (TX)	Esty (CT)	Kelly (IL)
Chu, Judy	Evans	Kennedy
Ciicilline	Foster	Khanna
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Kihuen
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Kildee
		Kilmer

NOT VOTING—14

Carter (TX)	Katko	Slaughter
Costa	Lipinski	Speier
Cummings	Rice (NY)	Walz
Davis, Danny	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (FL)
Ellison	Scalise	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1555

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION FAIRNESS AND REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-595, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), to the bill (H.R. 4545) to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—184

Adams	Beatty	Blumenauer
Aguilar	Berra	Blunt Rochester
Barragán	Beyer	Bonamici
Bass	Bishop (GA)	

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Faso
Aderholt	Chabot	Ferguson
Allen	Cheney	Fitzpatrick
Amash	Coffman	Fleischmann
Amodei	Cole	Flores
Arrington	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Babin	Collins (NY)	Fox
Bacon	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Banks (IN)	Comstock	Gaetz
Barletta	Conaway	Gallagher
Barr	Cook	Garrett
Barton	Costello (PA)	Gianforte
Bergman	Cramer	Gibbs
Biggs	Crawford	Gohmert
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Goodlatte
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Gosar
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Gowdy
Black	Curtis	Granger
Blackburn	Davidson	Graves (GA)
Blum	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Bost	Denham	Graves (MO)
Brady (TX)	Dent	Griffith
Brat	DeSantis	Grothman
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Handel
Brooks (IN)	Donovan	Harper
Buchanan	Duffy	Harris
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Bucshon	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Budd	Dunn	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Emmer	Hice, Jody B.
Byrne	Estes (KS)	Higgins (LA)
Calvert	Farenthold	Hill

to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4293) to reform the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review process, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Test process, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 182, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Fortenberry	McCarthy
Aderholt	Fox	McCaul
Allen	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Amash	Gaetz	McHenry
Amodei	Gallagher	McKinley
Arrington	Garrett	McMorris
Babin	Gianforte	Rodgers
Bacon	Gibbs	McSally
Banks (IN)	Gohmert	Meadows
Barletta	Goodlatte	Meehan
Barr	Gosar	Messer
Barton	Gowdy	Mitchell
Bergman	Granger	Moolenaar
Biggs	Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Mullin
Bishop (MI)	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Noem
Black	Grothman	Norman
Blackburn	Guthrie	Nunes
Blum	Handel	Olson
Bost	Harper	Palazzo
Brady (TX)	Harris	Palmer
Brat	Hartzler	Paulsen
Bridenstine	Hensarling	Pearce
Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Brooks (IN)	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Poe (TX)
Buck	Hill	Poliquin
Bucshon	Holding	Posey
Budd	Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe
Burgess	Hudson	Reed
Byrne	Huizenga	Renacci
Calvert	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Roby
Chabot	Hurd	Roe (TN)
Cheney	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Coffman	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Rokita
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Comer	Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Thomas
Comstock	Jones	J.
Conaway	Jordan	Roskam
Cook	Joyce (OH)	Ross
Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Rothfus
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Crawford	King (IA)	Royce (CA)
Culberson	King (NY)	Russell
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzing	Rutherford
Curtis	Knight	Sanford
Davidson	Kustoff (TN)	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Denham	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Dent	LaMalfa	Sessions
DeSantis	Lamborn	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Lance	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Simpson
Donovan	Lewis (MN)	Smith (MO)
Duffy	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Long	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Dunn	Love	Smucker
Emmer	Lucas	Stefanik
Estes (KS)	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Farenthold	MacArthur	Stivers
Faso	Marchant	Taylor
Ferguson	Marino	Tenney
Fitzpatrick	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	Massie	Thornberry
Flores	Mast	Tipton

Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—182

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.

Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Carter (TX)
Costa
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Ellison
Katko

Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe

Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

NOT VOTING—16

Neal
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Yarmuth

Slaughter
Walz
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 113.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 177, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

AYES—235

Abraham	Fortenberry	McCarthy
Aderholt	Fox	McCaul
Allen	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Amash	Gaetz	McHenry
Amodei	Gallagher	McKinley
Arrington	Garrett	McMorris
Babin	Gianforte	Rodgers
Bacon	Gibbs	McSally
Banks (IN)	Gohmert	Meadows
Barletta	Goodlatte	Meehan
Barr	Gosar	Messer
Barton	Gottheimer	Mitchell
Bergman	Gowdy	Moolenaar
Biggs	Granger	Mooney (WV)
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Noem
Black	Griffith	Norman
Blackburn	Grothman	Nunes
Blum	Guthrie	Olson
Bost	Handel	Palazzo
Brady (TX)	Harper	Palmer
Brat	Harris	Paulsen
Bridenstine	Hartzler	Pearce
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Perry
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Buchanan	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Poliquin
Bucshon	Hill	Posey
Budd	Holding	Ratcliffe
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Reed
Byrne	Hudson	Renacci
Calvert	Huizenga	Rice (SC)
Carter (GA)	Hultgren	Roby
Chabot	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Cheney	Hurd	Rogers (AL)
Coffman	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Collins (NY)	Johnson (LA)	Rooney, Francis
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Thomas
Comstock	Johnson, Sam	J.
Conaway	Jones	Roskam
Cook	Jordan	Ross
Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Rothfus
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Crawford	King (IA)	Royce (CA)
Culberson	King (NY)	Russell
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzing	Rutherford
Curtis	Knight	Sanford
Davidson	Kustoff (TN)	Schneider
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Schweikert
Denham	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Dent	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
DeSantis	Lamborn	Sessions
DesJarlais	Lance	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Shuster
Donovan	Lewis (MN)	Simpson
Duffy	LoBiondo	Sinema
Duncan (SC)	Long	Smith (MO)
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Dunn	Love	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Estes (KS)	Luetkemeyer	Smucker
Farenthold	MacArthur	Stefanik
Faso	Marchant	Stewart
Ferguson	Marino	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	Marshall	Suozi
Fleischmann	Massie	Taylor
Flores	Mast	Tenney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1617

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 110, "nay" on rollcall No. 111, "yea" on rollcall No. 112, "yea" on rollcall No. 113, and "yea" on rollcall No. 114.

NOES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Costa
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Danny

Ellison
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Lipinski
Nolan
Reichert

Rice (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Scalise
Slaughter
Walz
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1623

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY,
MARCH 15, 2018, TO MONDAY,
MARCH 19, 2018

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, March 19, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 774

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 774.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPON-
SOR OF H.R. 138

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of H.R. 138, a bill originally introduced by Representative Conyers of Michigan, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FRANKLIN-SIMPSON SPORTS
ANNOUNCERS

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. James Mooneyhan and Mr. Steve Thurmond for their contributions to Simpson County in the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

These two community leaders have not only served as ambassadors for Franklin-Simpson High School throughout their careers and collectively witnessed over 33 years of sports history, but have contributed to the economic development and well-being of their fellow citizens during their careers in public service.

Off air, Steve Thurmond is the executive director of the Franklin-Simpson Chamber of Commerce, and James Mooneyhan has served as Simpson County's jailer. From state championship titles to their children's successes, their commentary continually showcased the fervent pride Simpson Countians hold for their community.

The excitement and spirit resulting from the unique blend of their personalities will be extremely difficult to replace, and their retirement marks the end of an era for this storied program.

Although the voices of Franklin-Simpson athletics will soon be broadcast throughout the region for the last time, I join with the entire community to thank them for the laughs and unforgettable memories they have provided over the last 25 years. I look forward to seeing these Wildcat fans on the sidelines for years to come.

RUSSIAN CHEMICAL ATTACK IN
THE UNITED KINGDOM

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly condemn the March 4 chemical attacks conducted by the Kremlin in Salisbury, England, against former Russian intelligence officer Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia. Detective Sergeant Nick Bailey, the first on the scene, has also been hospitalized.

Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin continues to display a pattern of interfering with and undermining the democratic processes and institutions in contravention of the rules-based international order. We have seen that in Russia's frequent disruptive cyber operations and now chemical warfare.

How far will they push things?

Mr. Speaker, that is why I, along with Representatives MEEKS, WILSON, COLE, HOLDING, and SIRES, introduced a resolution this afternoon condemning this attack, calling for accountability for this and all chemical and biological attacks and standing in firm partnership with our friends and allies in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this important statement of solidarity in condemnation and also in praying for the health of Sergei, Yulia, and Nick.

□ 1630

THANKING PENN STATE STUDENTS
FOR THEIR FIGHT
AGAINST PEDIATRIC CANCER

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank

Penn State students for their fight against pediatric cancer.

THON, a 46-hour dance marathon, took place February 16 through 18, and students raised \$10,151,663 for the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Children's Hospital. Four Diamonds ensures that families that are battling pediatric cancer are not faced with any costs, allowing them to fully focus on the needs of their child.

THON is the largest student-run student philanthropy in the world, but it all began in 1973 by a group of students looking to add excitement to a dreary February in central Pennsylvania and for a way to give back to the community. Today, THON engages more than 15,000 students each year and has inspired other university, high school, middle school, and elementary school students across the Nation to start dance marathons of their own, all in hopes of conquering pediatric cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I am in awe of the power of our Penn State students and their care and concern for others, and I thank them for this outstanding contribution to the community.

OUR FAILURE TO STOP THE SLAUGHTER IN SYRIA IS SHAMEFUL

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today, the brutal conflict in Syria enters its eighth year. As we meet, safe and secure in this Chamber, the Syrian regime, with the support of its principal ally, Russia, is pulverizing Eastern Ghouta.

On February 24, the U.N. Security Council unanimously passed a resolution demanding a 30-day cease-fire across Syria. This was supposed to permit a "durable humanitarian pause" so that aid could be delivered and people who are critically sick and wounded could be evacuated.

It hasn't worked. Instead, a brutal campaign of airstrikes, shelling, and ground offensives has intensified. Populated areas remain under siege. The targeting of civilians continues, and hundreds more men, women, and children have been killed.

In the words of the U.N. Secretary General: "Syria is bleeding inside and out."

Mr. Speaker, our failure to stop this terrible slaughter is shameful. It is unacceptable. We must urgently work with our allies, put an end to this nightmare, and find a path forward.

CONGRATULATING JOHNSTOWN'S ENVIRONMENTAL TANK AND CONTAINER COMPANY

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Johnstown's Environmental Tank and Container Company, a division of JWF Industries, for being named Manufacturer of the Year at the Sixth Annual 2018 Oil & Gas Awards.

The Manufacturer of the Year Award recognizes the outstanding contributions that a manufacturer has made to the industry in the region, such as advances made in environmental stewardship, efficiency, innovation, community leadership, and health and safety, and I am proud of ETC's achievement.

Manufacturing is a key to a nation's prosperity and drives the American economy. As America competes on a global scale, it is critical that this industry continues to grow, creating a wealth of job opportunities for all Americans. Over 500,000 people in Pennsylvania rely on the strength of the manufacturing sector.

Before the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the United States had the highest business tax rates in the industrialized world. Now this law is removing this economic choke hold, putting American businesses at a more favorable corporate tax rate than their foreign competitors, and also allowing companies to write off the full cost of new equipment when it is purchased.

America is gaining its competitive edge, and the manufacturing industry is at the forefront of this success story.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHRIS HAZENCOMB

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Chris Hazencomb. Chris attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Chris was a sports junkie who loved the Angels, Raiders, and Lakers. He worked at the local Walmart and is remembered by all of his customers as being very friendly.

Chris was close to his mother, Maryanne, and even had a gift for her with him while at the festival. Chris died shielding his friend, Nikki, from gunfire with his own body. He is remembered for his love of helping people and his constant need to put others before himself.

I would like to extend my condolences to Chris' family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STEPHEN HAWKING

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our world lost the beloved Stephen Hawking, a man who spent his life defying all obstacles and pursuing the depths of human knowledge. He is the epitome of proving your circumstances don't define you.

Hawking faced being told in his early twenties that he only had a few years to live. Fearlessly, he went on to not only beat those odds, but, along the way, demonstrated the beginning and the end of our universe as we know it today.

Hawking taught us that, if you dare to dream and work hard, you can succeed; and I know he is responsible for inspiring many of our scientific minds, both young and old alike.

As we celebrate his life, let us remember not only his accomplishments, academic and otherwise, but his fighting spirit. We are grateful for all he taught us and the legacy he left our world. Let us all remember him by embracing his steadfast determination and lead lives of action, as he did.

MAPLE WEEKEND

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exciting spring tradition in upstate New York and, particularly, the 22nd Congressional District.

Vernon-Verona-Sherrill School District, or VVS, is holding its Maple Weekend this coming weekend. Maple Weekend is run for two weekends each year by the Future Farmers of America, also known as FFA. This FFA organization has approximately 125 members, and its success has been recognized both on the State and national levels.

Despite the two nor'easters that New York has received in March alone, VVS' FFA organization has worked tirelessly to prepare for the upcoming maple season. This weekend, VVS will join 170 other local organizations across New York to prepare demonstrations on how to harvest and produce maple syrup products, host pancake breakfasts which feature our award-winning syrup, and provide tours of the mouthwatering "sugar shack," where maple products are created.

Last year, VVS' Maple Weekend extravaganza drew more than 2,000 visitors. I am thrilled to attend each year and to take part in this educational and delicious local event that is expertly organized each year by high school students from FFA.

These same FFA members from VVS travel throughout New York State, from Buffalo to New York City, using their Maple Syrup Trailer to educate other high school students across our State, teaching them how to produce

maple syrup and to produce maple candies and other delicious maple products.

New York State still produces the very best maple syrup in the world and is continually winning the award for the best maple syrup.

I would like to congratulate these outstanding VVS and FFA students on their hard work, and I wish them and the hundreds of other maple producers across the State the best of luck during this very difficult season for maple production.

CELEBRATING THE 106TH BIRTHDAY OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Girl Scouts of the USA on their 106th birthday and to commend the organization for helping girls become leaders in their communities and in our Nation. It is fitting that the Girl Scouts' birthday falls during Women's History Month.

In 1912, Juliette Gordon Low founded the first Girl Scout troop, with 18 girls, in Savannah, Georgia. 106 years later, more than 50 million women are Girl Scout alums, and the program reaches nearly 2 million girls. Today, Girl Scout alums launch rockets into space, serve as CEOs of international companies, sit on academic boards, and more.

As we celebrate the Girl Scouts' 106th birthday this week and Women's History Month, I applaud the Girl Scout councils that serve girls in my State for building girls of courage, confidence, and character, who make the world a better place.

I am proud that this program was founded in the First Congressional District of Georgia and in my hometown of Savannah, Georgia.

TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS DESERVE THE RIGHT TO TRY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my displeasure that the House was unable to pass the Right to Try Act this week. This bill would have allowed very sick or terminally ill patients to request access to drugs and treatments that have yet to be approved by the FDA.

For any patient dealing with a serious, life-threatening illness, a sliver of hope can go a long way. Yet, for some reason, even after the Senate, of all places, passed this proposal nearly unanimously, some of my colleagues on

the other side of the aisle blocked this measure from passing.

Sick patients deserve the right to utilize every possible tool at their disposal, even if it is still experimental. The government really has no business telling a terminally ill patient they cannot pursue a certain avenue of treatment, and, as its name suggests, this legislation gives them the right to try.

I thank Mr. RUTHERFORD for his work on this legislation. I urge the House to bring this back to the floor and pass it as quickly as possible.

THE PARALYSIS THAT BESETS THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to share some thoughts with you during this Special Order hour at the request of the minority leader.

I am a professor of constitutional law, as those of you who watch our proceedings here may know by now, and I would like to talk about the Constitution, and I will get there before this is over.

But I want to start, Mr. Speaker, with a basic question of political science, which is: Why does it seem as if it is so hard for us to get the people's business done in Congress these days?

Why does it seem so difficult that, even when we have a vast consensus on what to do about a particular issue, we still can't get it done?

Why is it that the approval rating of our institution, according to the most recent Rasmussen poll, is at 15 percent, which I think most people would agree is a pretty dismal showing for the people's Congress and here in the people's House.

Well, I want to talk about this problem in some historical and constitutional perspective, and I hope that it opens up some roots of thinking and feeling that might enable us to transcend some of the paralysis that now besets the United States Congress.

Of course, the simple explanation that is often given colloquially is that everybody in Washington is just fighting, and you have got the two parties at each others' throats, and everybody is so divided that nothing happens.

This explanation, although it turns out to be wrong, of course, has a long lineage to it. In fact, the Founders wrote very widely at the time our Constitution was adopted about the problem of faction, and they said, if you look at James Madison in *Federalist* No. 10, for example, he identifies faction as the central problem in the political life of a democracy. But he says

that the latent causes of faction are sewn in the nature of man, and we see them everywhere.

Madison cites a zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well as speculation as a practice. He cites, also, an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for preeminence and power; and he invokes the human passions that have divided mankind into parties, inflaming them with mutual animosity.

So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities, Madison writes, "that where no substantial occasion presents itself, the most frivolous and fanciful distinctions have been sufficient to kindle their unfriendly passions and incite their most violent conflicts."

□ 1645

In other words, even when there is not something real and big to be fighting about, people will find something small, trivial, and petulant to fight about. And those of you with little brothers and sisters might agree that is just the way it is. Sometimes it is in human nature for people to fight.

But the Founders understood that faction was something that would arise in a democratic society where people have the liberty of thought and expression. In fact, Madison said one of the ways that you could deal with the problem of faction is to destroy the liberty that gives rise to faction, but that, of course, plunges us into authoritarianism, monarchy dictatorship. One way you get rid of all the different views is you go to one party. You create a one-party state like they have got in North Korea, and then there is no conflicts because everybody does what the one party says.

So Madison dismisses that and says that is not going to work. We are not going to be able to remove the sources of faction, but why don't we try to control the effects of faction. And the way you do that, he said, is that if—in order to control the effects of a majority tyranny is you have a bill of rights that defends the rights of the minority so that people in the majority can implement their policy preferences, but they can't extinguish the rights of the minority, the right to speak, the right of press, the right to dissent, the right to vote, and so on.

But also, Madison said, if you extend the size of the republic, if you create a big country, then even if you get a majority on one particular issue, the majorities are shifting because then you will have a different majority on another issue and a different majority on another issue and so on.

But what happens, he says, if you have a faction that is tyrannizing the society, but it is not a majority faction, it is a minority faction? What if

you have a small group that is able to hijack the process and prevent the majority from having its way? Well, he thought, there, democratic processes and Republican government would take care of it.

He says this: "If a faction consists of less than a majority"—a minority of people—"relief is supplied by the republican principle, which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views by regular vote."

The minority "may clog the administration, it may convulse the society, but it will be unable to execute and mask its violence under the forms of the Constitution."

In other words, Madison is assuming that, when it comes to public policy, the majority will eventually get its way if the governmental process is working correctly.

Now, let's fast-forward to 2018. I am taking three issues where the vast majority of the American people agree as to what should be done to deal with this serious, serious public policy problem.

Let's start with the problem of high prescription drug prices. Now, Congress passed a law saying that the government could not negotiate for lower prescription drug prices in the Medicare program with the big pharmaceutical companies, and it will not surprise you to learn that the big pharmaceutical companies who invest a lot of money and campaign contributions also paid for a lot of lobbyists to go and lobby for that provision to be put into the law.

So the Federal Government can negotiate for lower prescription drug prices in the Medicaid program, it can negotiate for lower prescription drug prices in the VA program, but for Medicare, because this provision got slipped into the law, we can't negotiate; and it is costing the taxpayers \$25 billion to \$30 billion a year, and, of course, driving up everybody's prescription drug prices. The majority of Americans have at least one prescription drug, and one-fifth of Americans have four or more prescription drugs.

Well, 92 percent of Americans support allowing the Federal Government to negotiate free-market style with the prescription drug companies for lower prices in Medicare—92 percent of Americans support that. All right. So that is case number one. Hold that in mind.

Case number two. This is something that should be familiar to you, in the wake of the discussion about the Parkland massacre that took place. I tried not to lapse into calling it a tragedy. Romeo and Juliet, that is a tragedy. Hamlet, that is a tragedy. Macbeth, that is a tragedy. What happened in Parkland, Florida, was a massacre. It was terrorism that took place in a public school. It was a preventable public policy debacle that that young man could walk into a gun store and pur-

chase an AR-15 and that AR-15s are so available that people can get them even when they are not qualified to possess even a handgun.

In any event, after Parkland and after the Pulse massacre, and after the Las Vegas massacre, and after the San Bernardino County massacre, and after the Sandy Hook massacre, and after the Virginia Tech massacre, guess what, 95 percent of American voters—95 percent support a universal criminal and mental background check on all firearm purchases in the United States. That is more than 9 out of 10 Americans—19 out of 20 Americans.

If you include the margin of error, it might be 98 percent. It might be almost everybody except for the leadership of the NRA and the CEOs of gun manufacturers who support a universal background check.

If you go to a licensed gun dealer and you can't purchase a gun because you failed the background check, why should you be able to go to a gun show and buy one? Why should you be able to go to the internet or the parking lot of a 7-Eleven and buy one? It doesn't make any sense.

So the common sense of the American people, 95 percent of American voters favor universal background checks, yet nothing is happening. Just like with giving the government the power to lower prescription drug prices, despite the fact that more than, you know, 9 out of 10 Americans support it. The President of the United States, President Trump, called for it in both of his two State of the Union Addresses. I think the vast majority of the Members of Congress would vote for it if it were brought up for vote, yet nothing happening. So that is case number two.

Let's look at case number three. Another thing that has been very much on the mind of the public and in the public policy debate, 83 percent of Americans favor continuing the DACA program and passing the Dream Act and allowing the Dreamers a path to citizenship in the United States. These, of course, are 800,000 young people who were brought to America with their families when they were kids, grew up here, know this as their country, are in the armed services, are working here, are in school. And we have 83 percent of the American people who say, quite logically, exercising their common sense, let's create a pathway for those people if they are in school, if they are working, if they are in the armed services, to stay here and to become American citizens, yet, again, nothing happening in Congress. Okay.

Now, why not? What is it that is going on? So we go back to the problem of faction. Obviously, people are going to have different views. That is the oxygen of democracy. There is nothing wrong with that. We are not ashamed of that. We have different political par-

ties here. It is much better to have two parties or more than that, than to have one party, a one-party system.

You know, Thomas Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, said: "We are all republicans, we are all federalists." Lincoln tried to strike the same note when he first took office, and Lincoln said: "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection."

So our greatest Presidents and our greatest leaders have understood we fight like cats and dogs in elections. That is how it works in a democratic society. There is a political contest. But once we are in, we try to stand for the whole public, the whole common good. We try to remember that we are not just here to represent one party.

Washington reminded people that the word "party" comes from the French word "fete", a part, one part of the whole. You represent a party. You are just representing a part of the whole. We have got to try to aspire to represent everybody. Yet, given the human condition, given the nature of political passions and moral passions that Madison discusses in Federalist 10, we know that parties are inevitable.

Okay. We accept that in a democratic society. We cherish the fact that people can form political parties that articulate different agendas and different values. So that is not the problem. So what is the problem? Why is it the case that the United States Congress cannot even bring to a vote three measures that have overwhelming public support: to allow the government to negotiate for lower prescription drug prices; to pass a universal criminal and mental background check; and to pass the Dream Act to help deal with the crisis of these young people who have been thrown into a limbo because of President Trump's action last year? Why can't we do it?

Well, there are a couple of reasons I want to identify, and then I want to call on all of us in Congress to try to take us to a higher ground. The young people who are protesting about the nightmare of gun violence, which makes America an absolute outlier state—in terms of industrialized countries, our rate of homicide and suicide by gun violence is simply off the charts when you compare it to other industrialized countries like the United Kingdom or Canada or France or Japan. It is not even close. We are losing tens of thousands of people a year.

The point I was making here is that we have this puzzlement about why we can have massive popular agreement and consensus, political consensus as to what to do, yet a bottleneck in Congress where we get this paralysis and this inaction.

The young people who have ignited a revolution across the country against political complacency with respect to

gun massacres in public places like schools and movie theaters and concerts and churches and so on, they are focused very heavily on the problem of money and politics, and I think that the vast majority of the American people exercising their common sense would agree that money and politics distorts the public agenda.

We know that the NRA has put tens of millions of dollars into our politics, just as we know the prescription drug manufacturers have put tens of millions of dollars into our politics, so I think the right to identify that is one strand of the problem.

But even with that, I think here, in Congress, there is a major failure of political leadership, Mr. Speaker, and I think it goes to something that, at least, used to be called the Hastert Rule. Well, the former speaker has been discredited, but the rule, unfortunately, is still operational. And the Hastert Rule is a rule that has been adopted by the majority caucus, which says that no legislation will be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives unless it passes the Republican caucus first.

Now, think about what that means. If you have got legislation like the Dream Act or like a universal criminal/mental background check act, which has unanimous support by the Democrats and substantial support by the Republicans, such that it would pass overwhelmingly in this body, it never sees the light of day on the floor of the House of Representatives because their rule is they won't bring it out of the GOP caucus to the floor for a vote unless it can get a majority within the caucus.

This means that the majority will, not just of the country, but the majority will of this body is thwarted and frustrated by the Hastert Rule, which I wish Speaker Hastert had taken with him when he left the House of Representatives, because it is fundamentally undemocratic, and we are seeing right now the cost of this rule, which enshrines minority preferences and minority control against majority public opinion.

Now, I hasten to say, of course, we have got a bill of rights, so what we are talking about is not allowing the majority to trample the constitutional rights of the minority. What is happening here is that a political minority is trampling the policy rights of the majority so that the majority policy preferences of the American people and of Congress are being stymied by virtue of minority control in this body.

□ 1700

Now, this is something that our distinguished and thoughtful colleagues on the other side of the aisle can fix. They can say they are no longer going to abide by that rule. They will allow us to have a hearing on a universal

criminal background check. They will allow us to have a hearing on whether the government can negotiate for lower prescription drug prices. They will allow us to have a hearing on the Dream Act, and they will allow us to have a vote on it.

We are not saying everybody has got to agree. They have got the right to vote against it. But doesn't the minority at least have a right to a vote on those issues which reflect the massive policy preferences of the American people?

Don't we think that has got something to do with the very low esteem within which we are held by the American people today? That, when it is very clear what almost all Americans want, we cannot legislate their preferences into law?

Mr. Speaker, in Federalist Paper No. 10, Madison told us that the problem of democracy is the problem of faction. And right now we have got a tiny minority faction driving the entire train of government, and there is not enough space, there is not enough room, for the will of the people to govern.

That is why America is disenchanted with the leadership of Congress and what is happening here. We are seeing it in election results around the country. We are seeing it in public opinion polls. We are seeing it in marches and rallies and walkouts all over the country, and that is good.

Because in their wisdom, the Founders also gave us the First Amendment, which gave the people a right to petition for redress of grievances, a right to assemble, as the young people assembled yesterday on the lawn of the Capitol building and in front of the White House.

It gives us the right of free press so we can write about what is actually taking place here in Congress. It gives us a right against establishment of religion and for free exercise of religion. It gives everybody the right of free speech so we can talk about what is going on.

The Founders never guaranteed us perfection. Madison said, if people were perfect, we wouldn't need government in the first place. But they gave us a structure within which we could improve things, reform things, and make things better.

Yet, the Members of Congress who are now in charge, in the driver's seat, are blocking off the hall. They are thwarting progress across the board on everything from prescription drug prices to the ban on assault weapons and a universal criminal/mental background check, and to the Dreamers. The American people are increasingly unsatisfied and frustrated with this situation.

So I come back, finally, to the responsibility of each one of us who has been entrusted with the high honor and responsibility of coming to Congress.

Madam Speaker, the original democratic philosophers distinguished between sovereignty and government. Government is just the people who go to do the job. Sovereignty belongs always with the people. We the people.

That is why the right of free speech and protest and assembly are so critical. That is where the people come together and tell us what they want; the right to come to the town meetings, to call us up, to email us, and so on.

But we have got a high responsibility. Those of us who aspire and attain to public office are nothing but the servants of the people. There are no kings here. There are no queens here. There are no titles of nobility in the United States of America. It is in the Constitution. We have no slaves here. We have no serfs here. Just equal citizens, all of us. Those of us who get into public office are acting as the servants of those people we are sent here to represent.

Madam Speaker, our people want us to get past all of the procedural obstacles and choke holds that have been put up here at the behest of big money and big special interests, and they want us to get a job done.

Let us start with these three things, which the vast overwhelming majority of the American people—Democrats, Republicans, Independents alike, everybody—agree we need:

A universal criminal/mental background check on firearm purchases in America. We need to give the government the power to negotiate in Medicare for lower drug prices for our people so our mothers and fathers and grandparents can get the prescription drugs they need at affordable prices. We need to pass a Dream Act so we can deal with the crisis situation of hundreds of thousands of young people whose lives have been thrown into limbo over the last year.

We can do those things. We can make that happen.

Madam Speaker, I would invite you or any other Member of Congress to respond. I reach out in a spirit of openness, affection, and, as much as possible, transpartisanship to say: We have got to get America moving in the right direction again.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3210. An act to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, and for other purposes.

A message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1869. An act to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1177. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States the condition that certain lands conveyed to the City of Old Town, Maine, be used for a municipal airport, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 188. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 324. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 13, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3893. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the "Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 4042. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building".

H.R. 4285. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, as the "James C. 'Billy' Johnson Post Office Building".

H.R. 3821. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the "Zack T. Addington Post Office".

H.R. 3638. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the "Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building".

H.R. 3655. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the "Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building".

H.R. 3369. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the "Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 3109. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the "Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building".

H.R. 2815. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the "Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office".

H.R. 2873. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building".

H.R. 2464. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

H.R. 2672. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office".

H.R. 2254. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building".

H.R. 2302. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 1858. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office".

H.R. 1988. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the "Merle Haggard Post Office Building".

H.R. 1208. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the "Converse Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 294. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the "Endy Nddibong Ekpanya Post Office Building".

H.R. 452. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 19, 2018, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4272. A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Organic Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program (NOP); Organic Livestock and Poultry Practices [Document Number: AMS-NOP-15-0012; NOP-15-06] (RIN: 0581-AD75) received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4273. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Depart-

ment's direct final rule — Truth in Lending — Real Estate Settlement Procedures (RIN: 0575-AD11) received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4274. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priorities and definitions — Secretary's Final Supplemental Priorities and Definitions for Discretionary Grant Programs [Docket ID: ED-2017-OS-0078] (RIN: 1894-AA09) received February 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4275. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Silicon Dioxide as a Carrier for Flavors [Docket No.: FDA-2017-F-5528] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4276. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Wireless Emergency Alerts [PS Docket No.: 15-91]; Amendments to Part 11 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Emergency Alert System [PS Docket No.: 15-94] received February 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4277. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Legal Policy, Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund Phase II Auction Scheduled for July 24, 2018; Notice and Filing Requirements and Other Procedures for Auction 903 [AU Docket No.: 17-182] [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4278. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting two (2) notifications of a nomination, and an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4279. A letter from the Deputy White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting eighteen (18) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, change in previously submitted reported information, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4280. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2017 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4281. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Government Publishing Office, transmitting the Office's Annual Report for fiscal year ending September 30, 2017; to the Committee on House Administration.

4282. A letter from the Deputy AA for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Testing and Training Activities Conducted in the Eglin Gulf Test and Training Range in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 170831846-8105-02] (RIN: 0648-BH21) received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4283. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report titled, "Department of Justice Activities Under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act Fiscal Year 2017", pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 522(a); Public Law 89-554, Sec. 4(c) (as amended by Public Law 94-273, Sec. 19); (80 Stat. 615); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4284. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustments [Docket No.: OSM-2017-0012; S1D1S SS08011000 SX064A000 189S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A00 18XS501520] (RIN: 1029-AC75) received March 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4285. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustments (RIN: 3245-AG96) received March 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4286. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report to Congress titled, "Assistance Provided to Foreign Aviation Authorities for FY 2017", pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 40113(e)(4); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 1(e) (as amended by Public Law 112-95, Sec. 207); (126 Stat. 39); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4287. A letter from the Reg. Policy Dev. Coord., Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revise and Streamline VA Acquisition Regulation to Adhere to Federal Acquisition Regulation Principles (VAAR Case 2014-V002) (RIN: 2900-AP82) received February 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4566. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 115-601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. VELA, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COSTA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5292. A bill to establish a task force to review new decennial census questions and their impact on response rates for minorities, the accuracy of the census, redistricting, costs and funding distribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 5293. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions that were formerly classified to title 50, Appendix, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H.R. 5294. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to address the impact of drug abuse on economic development in Appalachia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 5295. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions classified to chapters 44, 45, 46, and 47 of title 50, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 5296. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 5297. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 52, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 5298. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to deem drugs or other substances that act as opioid mu receptor agonists to be in schedule I, subject to exceptions for substances intended for legitimate medical or research use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 5299. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to Scenic Rivers Development Alliance certain National Forest System land in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 5300. A bill to provide agencies with discretion in securing information technology and information systems; to the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COLE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. ROBY):

H.R. 5301. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from requiring a surviving spouse of a veteran to return certain payments for a month in which the veteran dies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 5302. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to any benefit thereunder shall continue through the month of his or her death (without affecting any other person's entitlement to benefits for that month) and that such individual's benefit shall be payable for such month only to the extent proportionate to the number of days in such month preceding the date of such individual's death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 5303. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for the more accurate and complete enumeration of certain overseas Americans in the decennial census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5304. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from using Government funds to pay for the lodging of agency employees at establishments that are owned by or employ certain public officials or their relatives; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 5305. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to ensure the availability of no-fee public access to government information, to reform the Federal Depository Library Program, to authorize the activities of the Superintendent of Documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 5306. A bill to reauthorize the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5307. A bill to require that certain Federal education funds be used for the improvement of security at elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 5308. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue quarter dollars in commemoration of the Nineteenth Amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 5309. A bill to amend the Second Morrill Act to authorize the transmission to Congress of annual reports prepared by colleges endowed under such Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. YODER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 5310. A bill to waive certain procurement provisions for a project that receives funds from certain Federal agencies; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Agriculture, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. MACARTHUR):

H.R. 5311. A bill to reauthorize and expand the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 5312. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reauthorize the Federal work-study program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 5313. A bill to provide for automatic continuing appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KILMER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. HECK, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 5314. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for unlimited eligibility for health care for mental illnesses for veterans of combat service during certain periods of hostilities and war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5315. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to promulgate regulations to prohibit the storage of live animals in overhead compartments of airplanes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 5316. A bill to authorize appropriations for the seniors farmers' market nutrition program for fiscal years 2019 through 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HECK, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 5317. A bill to repeal section 2141 of the Revised Statutes to remove the prohibition on certain alcohol manufacturing on Indian lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5318. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 5319. A bill to transfer Coast Guard property in the Town of Jupiter Island, Florida, for inclusion in Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 5320. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of a military department from entering into a lease of real property for the use of the department unless the Secretary first certifies that facilities of real property owned by the United States may not be reconfigured to support the purpose of the proposed lease in an appropriate and cost-effective manner; to require the Secretary of the Defense to provide more accurate information on the costs incurred in leasing real property for the use of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 5321. A bill to improve communication from Federal agencies to individuals by requiring clear instructions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5322. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national program to conduct and support activities toward the goal of significantly reducing the number of cases of overweight and obesity among individuals in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H. Res. 785. A resolution expressing support for continued cooperation between Israel and the United States to ensure adequate capabilities to counter Iran's destabilizing activities and support shared interests, including stability and safety in the Middle East, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. HOLDING):

H. Res. 786. A resolution condemning the chemical weapons attack on Sergei Skripal, a former Russian intelligence officer, and his daughter on March 4, 2018, and extending its sympathies to those affected by the attack, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

166. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 176, urging Congress and the President of the United States to enact a long-term reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

167. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Resolution 73, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to permanently safeguard and protect the Pacific Coast's Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas leasing, and declaring the Senate's unequivocal support for the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore of the Pacific coast, its opposition to the proposed 5-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program on the Outer Continental Shelf or any attempts to modify that prohibition, and its determination to consider any appropriate actions to maintain the current prohibition; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

168. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 111, memorializing the United States Congress to enact legislation to reduce the risk of harm from firearm sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 5292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 5293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 5294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out

the powers vested in Congress) and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to interstate compacts).

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises," and to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 5299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 (Property Clause)

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 5300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 5301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 5302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 5304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 5305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 5306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 5308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 5309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 5310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 5313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 5315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and/or Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 5316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
[Page H132]

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 5317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 5319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 states "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces . . ."

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 5321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 113: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 291: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 303: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 539: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 750: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 785: Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 795: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 823: Mr. FOSTER and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 881: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 930: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1071: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1120: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1239: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1318: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. DENT, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1507: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1563: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 1818: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 1828: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
 H.R. 1876: Mr. MESSER and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1928: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 1957: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BERA.
 H.R. 2024: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 2212: Mr. BRAT and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 2598: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 2841: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 2902: Mr. KILMER and Mrs. TORRES.
 H.R. 2913: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 2938: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 3032: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3111: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 3170: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 3378: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 3528: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 3566: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 3605: Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 3617: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 3733: Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 3845: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 3941: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 3988: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 4044: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
 H.R. 4099: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 4106: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 4257: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. CURTIS.
 H.R. 4265: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 4311: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 4342: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 4343: Mr. SOTO and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 4344: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 4392: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 4548: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 4575: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 4584: Mr. GAETZ.
 H.R. 4605: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4606: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4647: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. O'ROURKE,

Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LONG, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HILL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MARINO, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 4681: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 4706: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4710: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 4732: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 4747: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 4770: Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 4775: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 4886: Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 4940: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 4963: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 5011: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SIREN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. McEACHIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 5031: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5034: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 5047: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 5105: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 5108: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 5121: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 5138: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 5141: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HENSARLING, and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 5142: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. DAVIDSON.
 H.R. 5143: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. DAVIDSON.
 H.R. 5153: Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 5173: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 5180: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. ROSEN.
 H.R. 5202: Ms. STEFANIK and Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 5243: Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 5272: Mr. LATTI.
 H.R. 5275: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 H.R. 5278: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 5281: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 5282: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. KHANNA.
 H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H. Res. 58: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. KHANNA.
 H. Res. 201: Mr. KHANNA.
 H. Res. 220: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H. Res. 274: Mr. WALDEN, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. DENT.
 H. Res. 466: Ms. SPEIER.
 H. Res. 578: Mr. LYNCH.
 H. Res. 621: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H. Res. 644: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H. Res. 673: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H. Res. 733: Mr. SOTO.
 H. Res. 756: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. PETERS.
 H. Res. 760: Ms. MOORE.
 H. Res. 774: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Res. 774: Mr. CULBERSON.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 6 by Mr. THOMPSON of California on the bill (H.R. 4240): Mr. Vela and Mr. O'Rourke.

Petition 7 by Mr. CLYBURN on the bill (H.R. 3464): Mr. Vela, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. O'Rourke, Mr. Yarmuth, and Mr. Ted Lieu of California.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN NANCY
GOMEZ-FERNANDEZ IN HONOR
OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor Captain Nancy Gomez-Fernandez, who has been serving the Miami-Dade community as a law enforcement officer for a number of years.

Captain Gomez-Fernandez began her career in law enforcement in 2001 with the City of Pinecrest Police Department, where she was a member of the School Resource Unit, Field Training Officer, and Honor Guard. In 2007, she became a Sergeant with the newly formed Doral Police Department and helped recruit and process background checks for officers. Captain Gomez-Fernandez quickly rose through the ranks and achieved the promotion of Captain in 2015, which she currently holds.

Captain Gomez-Fernandez's service extends beyond her obligations as a police officer. In 2017, she was awarded the Life Saver Medal for saving the life of an individual who suffered a cardiac attack. This award speaks volumes to the level of dedication she has to serve and protect the people of Doral.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to know Captain Gomez-Fernandez and I greatly admire her service to the community. Her willingness to risk her life on a daily basis to protect and serve the constituents of Doral has made and will continue to make a difference in the lives of many. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANDIDACY FOR PRESIDENT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this Friday, March 16, 1968, Senator Robert Francis Kennedy announced his candidacy for President of the United States and launched the legendary, whirlwind, wondrous 82-day campaign that captured the imagination of millions and inspired a generation.

Much has been said about Robert F. Kennedy, affectionately known to family and millions of loved ones as "Bobby."

We know of Bobby the brother; we know of Robert the passionate Senator and crusading Attorney General; we know him the tireless and determined champion of civil rights; and,

sadly, we know of Robert Francis Kennedy the martyr.

These different sides of Robert Kennedy came into sharp focus during the last 11 and a half weeks of his time on this Earth.

It has been said that a man is a product of his time.

I remember the 1960s; it was a time when America was divided and driven by social unrest and civil upheaval and facing global dangers threatening the post-World War II international order.

But as I reflect back on that time, it is clear that Bobby Kennedy was not just merely a man of his time, but he was a man whose spirit, ideals, beliefs, and moral clarity transcend time and place.

Robert Kennedy stood for equality, dignity, fairness, humanity, empathy, and moral clarity.

Robert Kennedy lived these ideals during a time when they were in short supply in our society.

Robert Kennedy loved America which he knew to be good but could and must be made better.

"What is right, keep it right; what is wrong, make it right."

That pretty much sums up the belief system of Bobby Kennedy.

I think of Robert Kennedy marching with Cesar Chavez, with whom he met almost 50 years ago on this day, as Cesar Chavez was ending his consequential hunger strike in support of migrant farm workers.

When Robert Kennedy announced his candidacy for president—from the same spot in the Senate Caucus Room as had his brother 8 years before—he remarked that he was running "not to oppose any man, but to propose new policies."

Robert Kennedy also provided a roadmap for those of us in public service when he said: "I don't think we have to shoot each other, to beat each other; I think that we can do better in this country."

But, for me, Robert Kennedy's lasting legacy are his contributions advancing equality of opportunity, civil rights, and human dignity for all Americans.

Robert Kennedy's presidential platform emphasized racial equality, economic and social justice, and civic engagement and tolerance.

Robert Kennedy's appeal was universal, and knew no racial bounds because his vision for America included everyone; whites and blacks and browns, rural and urban dwellers, the poor and working and middle-class.

Robert Kennedy's message—of decency, respect, compassion, and humility—appealed to the good in Americans and was in turn embraced by people of goodwill in every region of the country.

Next month, when we mark the 50th anniversary of a terrible day in Memphis when the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was slain, let us remember the words of Robert Kennedy as he broke the news of Dr. King's

death to an assembled crowd in an African American neighborhood in Indianapolis:

"What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but is love, and wisdom, and compassion toward one another; and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black."

Two months later, on June 4, 1968, Robert Kennedy would himself be felled by an assassin's bullet at the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles, after winning the California Democratic Primary.

In the days immediately following his assassination, the full measure of the country's loss became apparent.

Over two million people assembled along the train tracks as his funeral cortege made its way from the funeral mass at New York City's St. Patrick's Cathedral to Union Station in Washington, D.C. for his interment at Arlington National Cemetery.

When the cortege reached Philadelphia, "estimates of 20,000 people, mostly African-American . . . began to sing 'The Battle Hymn of the Republic' with such force that inside, passengers began to weep."

When America lost Bobby Kennedy, it lost a big heart and a guiding hand and a generation of Americans lost its innocence.

The words used to eulogize Robert Kennedy by his brother, the late Senator Edward Kennedy, are as applicable today as they were in the hectic days of his legendary campaign for President:

"My brother need not be idealized, or enlarged in death beyond what he was in life; to be remembered simply as a good and decent man, who saw wrong and tried to right it, saw suffering and tried to heal it, saw war and tried to stop it."

The life of Robert Francis "Bobby" Kennedy teaches us at least three important lessons when it comes to the question of justice: Words have power, actions matter, moral courage is indispensable.

Many persons have one of these qualities but much rarer are those who possess two, let alone all three in the abundance and to the degree possessed by Robert Kennedy.

Is it any wonder then that we still revere Bobby Kennedy after all these years and still miss him so much?

The 1968 folk classic, "Abraham, Martin, and John," by Dion and the Belmonts still sums up the feelings of countless millions, here in America and around the world:

Has anybody here seen my old friend Bobby?
Can you tell me where he's gone?
I thought I saw him walkin' up over the hill
With Abraham, Martin and John.

Has anybody here seen my old friends?
Can you tell me where they've gone?
They freed a lot of people,
But, it seems the good they die young.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

You know, I just looked around and they were gone.

The mortal presence of Robert Kennedy may be gone but his immortal spirit lives on and we will always remember those joyous, vibrant, and wondrous 82 days that were his legendary 1968 presidential campaign.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of the late Robert Francis Kennedy, the former U.S. Senator from New York and Attorney General of the United States.

RECOGNIZING THE RICHWOODS
GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM ON
WINNING THE ILLINOIS 3A
STATE TITLE

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize Peoria, Illinois' Richwoods High School girls basketball team on winning the 2018 Class 3A state title.

Returning to the state title game for the second straight year, the Lady Knights capped off the 35-1 season with a 55-46 win over La-Grange Park Nazareth. In a back and forth game, the fourth quarter proved pivotal with Richwoods going on a 17-0 run to start the quarter. Over the course of the game, the Richwoods' Knights had an amazing team effort on both offense and defense, with Senior Courtney Crane led the Knights with 19 points.

Richwoods' win is the 1,001st in school history and they will add a fourth Class 3A state title to their trophy case, becoming only the third high school in Illinois history to achieve this milestone. Richwoods' continued success on the hardwood is a testament to the leadership of Coach Todd Hursey and the determination of the young women he coaches.

The Richwoods girls basketball team serves as a reminder to the people of our community that when we believe in ourselves and dedicate our time and effort to the goals that we set, we can achieve even the most daring outcomes. These young women exemplify the strong work ethic rooted in Central Illinois and we could not be prouder. Again, congratulations to Coach Todd Hursey and the Richwoods girls basketball team their remarkable state championship win.

IN RECOGNITION OF AMBASSADOR
FREDERIC C. HOF

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ambassador Frederic C. Hof on his retirement from the Atlantic Council. Ambassador Hof has had an impressive career as a diplomat at the United States Department of State, a private sector CEO, and an officer of the United States Army. He is a Vietnam veteran and Purple Heart recipient. As a mili-

tary officer, he served on the commission that investigated the 1983 bombing of the U.S. Marine Corps headquarters at the Beirut International Airport. In 2001, he served as chief of staff on the Sharm al-Sheikh Fact-Finding Commission, headed by former Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell, and was the principal drafter of the Commission's report. During his time at the State Department, Ambassador Hof took the lead in an effort to mediate Syrian-Israeli peace and was given the rank of Ambassador in his capacity as special adviser to the Secretary of State for transition in Syria.

After joining the Atlantic Council, as the leading Syria fellow in the Rafik Hariri Center for the Middle East, Ambassador Hof devoted his time to furthering the Syrian cause through the protection of civilians. As a prolific writer and leader, Ambassador Hof has hosted Syrian experts, activists, political leaders, and humanitarians in high level discussions pertaining to the U.S.-Syria policy and geopolitical implications of the Syrian conflict. Through his efforts, he has led the discussions on securing a stable and legitimate government in Syria and what role the United States should have. After taking on the role of director at the Rafik Hariri Center for the Middle East, Ambassador Hof continued his efforts to bring attention to the Syrian conflict and its ongoing destabilization to the region at large.

Mr. Speaker, as the seventh anniversary of the Syrian uprising approaches, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Ambassador Hof for his tireless efforts to bring attention to the Syrian conflict and its ongoing destabilization to the region at large. His service to this great nation is deeply appreciated and is a testament to the greatness and opportunity that these United States of America holds for freedom-loving people.

RECOGNIZING DOTTIE JOINER IN
HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY
MONTH

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor Dorothy "Dottie" Joiner, the City Clerk for Everglades City.

Ms. Joiner has been serving Everglades City for twenty-three years and has proved to be loyal, passionate, and driven. She began her career as a purchasing agent, then transitioned into a water billing clerk. In 2002 she was promoted to City Clerk. In her capacity as City Clerk, Dottie oversees the official City records, ranging from the financial statements to the meeting minutes. As such, she is known as the go-to person if an issue needs to be resolved.

Dottie has been crucial in supporting the City in times of crisis. She played a key role in 2005 when Hurricane Wilma destroyed City Hall, resulting in the call for the building to be condemned. She worked tirelessly with the City leadership and myself to showcase the importance of saving the historic building; and was a big part of making sure it happened.

More recently, in the aftermath of Hurricane Irma, she selflessly looked after the wellbeing of the residents of Everglades City, ensuring that necessary resources were there quickly, despite having lost her own home. Dottie's selflessness during this difficult time and the support she has given our community transcends her official responsibilities.

Her dedication to Everglades City extends beyond her responsibilities as the City Clerk. She also serves on the board of the 4th of July Committee, the Betterment Association of the Everglades Area, as well as the Reach Out and Cops Program. Dottie has always placed her community first, even before herself. We are fortunate to have leaders such as Dottie in Everglades City and Florida's 25th Congressional District, and I and my wife Tia are lucky to be able to call her a friend.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to know Ms. Joiner and to have the opportunity to acknowledge her remarkable work for Everglades City. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

IN MEMORIAM: TEXAS STATE
SENATOR JACK OGG

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the life and memory of longtime Texas lawmaker and my friend, Jack Ogg of Houston, Texas who recently passed away at the age of 84.

Jack Ogg was a political icon who had a 52-year career in Texas politics and law. He represented the Houston area for 16 years, first as a State Representative and then as a State Senator. His love for the State of Texas and the law prompted him to further serve with a run for Texas Attorney General. After an unsuccessful race, Jack returned to his renowned law practice in Houston.

When I was a criminal court judge in Houston, Senator Ogg practiced in my court.

Jack was also the father of Harris County District Attorney Kim Ogg. Kim worked alongside her father at the Ogg Law Firm and remembers her father not only as a great statesman, but a wonderful father who kept his family as his top priority. Kim said her father, "was my closest confidante." Mr. Speaker, when I saw Jack recently at the funeral of our friend, the late Texas Governor Mark White, you could tell he was beaming with pride for Kim and how she was carrying on the Ogg tradition of public service.

Those who served in the legislature alongside Jack said he did what he thought was best for his district and worked inside the rules of the legislature instead of concerning himself with partisan fights. He did what was right and stuck to his principles.

Jack told friends he was proud of authoring the bilingual education act in Texas; the bill to create Metro in Harris County; and a measure re-instating the death penalty in the state. Jack's friend Houston attorney Robert Pelton described Ogg as, "one of the finest human beings I've ever met in my life" who did many good things for the state of Texas.

I admired Jack's adventurous spirit and determination. He suffered from congestive heart failure for many years, but that didn't stop him from being active not only in Houston, but across the globe. Just a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, he took a cruise to Spain and Italy. His family said he was born with an explorer's heart and he traveled to more than 225 countries and islands, and visited all seven continents.

Senator Ogg was born in 1933 during the Depression. His family moved to Houston in the 1950s. He graduated from Robert E. Lee High School in Baytown, Texas then worked his way through the University of Houston, where he was twice elected class president. He went to law school at night at South Texas College of Law and was admitted to the State Bar of Texas in 1962. He lost his beloved wife of more than 50 years, philanthropist Connie Harner Ogg, to cancer in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, those who worked with Jack in the State Legislature and at his law practice agree he was larger than life with a sharp mind and keen craft. Today, I salute Senator Ogg's many contributions to our state and the city of Houston. My prayers are with District Attorney Ogg, her brother Jon Ogg, their spouses, Jack's three grandchildren, as well as his brothers Larry and Jim Ogg.

We will dearly miss Senator Jack Ogg. They don't make 'em like Jack Ogg anymore.

And that's just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO ANN AND REX WALTERS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ann and Rex Walters of Beaconsfield, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They were married on January 26, 1958 in Mount Ayr, Iowa.

Ann and Rex's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN
GILLIGAN, GREATER PITSTON
FRIENDLY SONS' MAN OF THE
YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Gilligan, who will re-

ceive the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons' "Man of the Year" Award. Mr. Gilligan will be honored on March 17, 2018, during the Friendly Sons' annual St. Patrick's Day Celebration.

John was born in Wyoming, Pennsylvania to Bernard J. and Rosari Gilligan. He is a graduate of Wyoming High School. He enlisted in the Air Force after graduation, serving one year in Da Nang, Vietnam. After four years in the Air Force, John joined the Wyoming Borough Police Department. He served on the force for thirty-two years and retired in 2004 as Chief of Police. He worked in the private sector until his appointment by Governor Edward Rendell to the post of Luzerne County Sheriff. His appointment was unanimously approved by the Pennsylvania Senate.

Gilligan is a Fourth Degree Knight of the John F. Kennedy Council No. 372 Knights of Columbus and a past Grand Knight of the Wyoming Area Council No. 8598. He is a past president of the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

John has been married to Karen Zofcin Gilligan for thirty-two years, and they are the proud parents of seven children. They also have eighteen grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. Gilligan's three sons, grandsons, and great-grandson are members of the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, a long-standing family tradition.

It is an honor to recognize John Gilligan as he accepts the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons' "Man of the Year" Award. I am grateful to him for his service to our country and for protecting the people of Wyoming Borough and Luzerne County. I wish him all the best this St. Patrick's Day.

RECOGNIZING GLORIA PADILLA IN
HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY
MONTH

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I rise today to recognize Gloria Padilla, whose dedication to the people of Immokalee and the Redlands Christian Migrant Association (RCMA) has had a major impact in our community.

RCMA was established in 1965 and provides childcare and education services for low income and rural families. It has grown from two centers to seventy-one and is active in twenty-one counties in Florida. A lifelong resident of Immokalee, Mrs. Padilla has been a proven leader in our community. She joined the RCMA after graduating high school, becoming the youngest area coordinator in agency history. Gloria is currently tasked with overseeing seven childcare centers and twenty-four childcare homes, collectively serving 483 children.

When Hurricane Irma struck in September, she offered the RCMA Immokalee Community School as a shelter for thousands of families displaced by the storm. Additionally, she helped organize with my office the opening of Horizon Village as temporary living spaces for constituents who lost their homes as a result

of Irma. I find myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to collaborate with such a dedicated individual who cares so deeply about her community.

In addition to her impressive work at the RCMA, Gloria serves on the board of the One by One Leadership Foundation and assists the community through outreach programs with her church. Through her professional and social capacity, Gloria's dedication to the people of Immokalee has improved the lives of many.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to know Mrs. Padilla and I greatly admire her service to Immokalee. Gloria is an exemplary citizen who has chosen to use her many talents in service of those around her. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

IN RECOGNITION OF FONA'S WORKPLACE EXCELLENCE

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it's not every day that long-term sustained excellence can be duly recognized.

FONA International of Geneva, Illinois, provides just such an opportunity, however. I am privileged to extend my enthusiastic congratulations to Joe Slawek and the employees of FONA International for being named a National Best & Brightest Company to Work For by the National Association of Business Resources for the seventh year in a row.

FONA International creates and produces flavors for many of the largest food, beverage, and nutritional companies in the world. It has been doing this for 30 years—a testament to its sustained excellence and commitment to serving customers through cutting-edge technology and personal attention.

CEO and Founder Joe Slawek calls this the "high-tech, high touch" approach. He founded FONA International in 1987 on these principles. He built a business that could compete with the largest flavor companies but stay connected with customers and his family of employees in a way that only a small business can. The honor of this award speaks to that success.

FONA International has been cited by Fortune magazine as one of the top fifty best places to work for medium-sized businesses nationwide. Fortune also named FONA International as the Number 1 workplace in Chicagoland.

To be selected just once as a National Best & Brightest Company would be a distinguished honor. To receive this award seven years in a row is nothing less than a spectacular achievement.

I congratulate Joe Slawek and the employees of FONA International for this remarkable recognition. I thank FONA International for its years of service to the local community and for its leadership in the flavor production industry. I wish them continued success in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly voted no, when I meant to vote yes on Roll Call No. 108, H.R. 1116—the TAILOR Act of 2017.

RECOGNIZING MS. JANET TAYLOR
IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY
MONTH

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor former Hendry County Commissioner Janet Taylor. Her service in this capacity, as well as many others, has had a major impact on our community.

Born in Louisiana, Ms. Taylor moved to Florida at a young age and very quickly became involved in her community. She received her Bachelor's degree in political science from Palm Beach State College. In 1978, she joined the Clewiston Police Department and became the department's first female African American officer. She quickly rose through the ranks and reached Sergeant and Field Training Officer. She dedicated twelve years to serving and protecting those in Hendry County before retiring from the force.

Ms. Taylor was appointed Hendry County Commissioner in 1994 and served in this position for twenty-two years. As Commissioner, she represented the citizens of Hendry County and the State of Florida with passion and dedication. Her impressive resume includes serving as Chairperson of the Florida Association of Counties for twelve years as well as being a member of the National Association of Black County Commissioners. Ms. Taylor's public service extends beyond her work as Commissioner for Hendry County, as she previously served as a Government Liaison for Congressman Alcee Hastings.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to recognize Ms. Taylor for her remarkable service to Hendry County. Her dedication to the betterment of our community is admirable and has touched the lives of many. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM "BILL"
BALLENGER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bill Ballenger of Council Bluffs, Iowa for his leadership and vision in helping organize 13 honor

flights that have taken nearly 3,500 Iowa veterans to Washington, D.C. to visit memorials that were built in their honor.

Bill and his son Jeff saw a need to honor our country's aging veterans from World War II, the Korean War, and Vietnam War. The Ballengers have partnered with HyVee, Inc., Casey's General Stores, and others to raise more than \$3 million to fund this special endeavor. Carol Hagberg's father, the late James Snook, who was a World War II veteran said, "Dad felt so honored and privileged. We heard about the wonderful time he had over and over on the flight. He was very proud to have served his country."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Bill on his incredible efforts to organize and fund the 13 honor flights for our veterans. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Bill and in wishing him nothing but the very best.

RECOGNIZING BRAIN AWARENESS
WEEK

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brain Awareness Week, a critical moment to discuss the impact of brain disorders on our nation and the urgent need for brain research and discovery.

Neurodegenerative disorders like Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease have tremendous, devastating impact on individuals and families. My dad had Parkinson's, so I know firsthand the physical and financial toll it takes on patients and caregivers.

These diseases also pose a serious financial burden for the nation. Today, neurological diseases cost the United States an estimated \$800 billion a year. And that figure is projected to increase dramatically over the coming years.

An estimated 5.5 million Americans are currently living with Alzheimer's disease. In my home state of Michigan, 180,000 people age 65 and older have Alzheimer's. That is projected to increase more than 20 percent—220,000 Michiganders—by 2025. And barring medical breakthroughs, the number of Americans age 65 and older with Alzheimer's is estimated to reach 16 million by 2050. Between now and 2050, the cumulative cost of caring for people with Alzheimer's is projected to exceed \$20 trillion.

Parkinson's disease is the second-most common interdependent disorder in the United States. Each year, 60,000 Americans are diagnosed with Parkinson's. The current total economic burden of the disorder is estimated to be about \$14.4 billion a year in the United States. And by 2040, the prevalence of Parkinson's is expected to more than double.

Thanks to advances in brain research, we have a deeper understanding of Alzheimer's and Parkinson's, and researchers recently identified possible environmental and genetic risk factors for Parkinson's.

However, further research is required to unravel the complexities of these neurological disorders. Without breakthroughs, we will not be able to develop new, more effective treatments. Currently available treatments provide relief from some Parkinson's symptoms, but do not halt the progression of Parkinson's. Alzheimer's is the only disease in the top 10 causes of death in the U.S. that cannot be prevented, slowed or cured.

This Brain Awareness Week, I extend my gratitude to the great scientific minds who are advancing our understanding of brain disorders. And let's redouble our efforts to find new breakthroughs in brain research and bring a healthier future in reach for our nation.

DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY
FOUNDERS DAY CELEBRATION

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Statewide Founders Day Celebration in Green Bay, Wisconsin. With over 700 members committed to public service, the Wisconsin chapters of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority are a significant part of our community and I am proud to honor them.

For over 100 years, the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority has created programs and initiatives that focus on academic excellence, community service, economic development, and health and fitness, with a focus on the African-American community. "The Healthy Lifestyle Initiative—The Total Woman: Mind, Body, and Spirit" is one of the national programs led by Delta Sigma Theta that focuses on improving physical and mental health for its members and their communities. This program is just one example of how the women in the Sorority work to empower and support their communities.

From Friday, March 23, 2018 to Sunday, March 25, 2018, Green Bay, Wisconsin is proud to host the statewide Delta Sigma Theta Founders Day Celebration. This event will bring hundreds of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority members together to celebrate the organization's history and its numerous contributions since its founding on January 13, 1913.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of this body to join me in applauding the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority and the organization's commitment to support communities across the country and the world.

RECOGNIZING WEBSTER, FLORIDA
AS A PURPLE HEART CITY

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Webster, Florida as a Purple Heart City and honor the men and women who have selflessly served our country

in the United States Armed Forces. It is with deep respect that I pause today to honor the brave men and women who were wounded in combat or gave their last full measure and made the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf.

Created by General George Washington on August 7, 1782 to recognize a soldier's meritorious action, the Purple Heart is our nation's oldest decoration. Every person that serves in the United States Armed Forces makes great sacrifices for our country and our freedoms. Many have endured combat wounds as they fought for the freedoms of complete strangers, for individuals they had never met.

We owe our veterans a debt that we can never repay. For more than two centuries the United States military has protected Americans against our enemies and the enemies of our friends. Throughout this time, the valor, dignity, and courage of our men and women in uniform has remained strong. It is due to countless lives selflessly lived and lost in defense of our country that we can stand today, free and grateful.

I congratulate Mayor Carrie Davis, Mayor Pro-Tem Michael T. Foote, Commissioners Bobby Yost, Ana Vigoa, and Mike Harris, and most of all, the men and women of Webster who have served our great nation. It is truly an honor to serve the residents of Webster.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF KAHU MELVIN KAUILA CLARK

HON. COLLEEN HANABUSA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary man, Melvin Kauila Clark, who passed away on Sunday, December 24, 2017. A talented artist, Native Hawaiian traditional healer, celebrated leader of the community health center movement, and a personal friend of mine, Kauila will be deeply missed by the many people whose lives he has touched.

Kauila grew up in Wahiawa on the island of Oahu and graduated from Leilehua High School in 1963. Kauila went on to earn a bachelor's degree in drawing and painting from Graceland University and a master's degree in clay and sculpture from the University of Puget Sound. He became an internationally acclaimed artist and potter, with his works exhibited in 53 countries and museums, including in the Smithsonian here in Washington. I always admired Kauila's pottery because they reflected who he was so well. His pieces were big but also delicate, reflecting both the strength of his character and the gentle kindness of his heart. Kauila's willingness to share and donate his pieces to raise money for the communities around him demonstrated his wonderful generosity of spirit.

In Hawaii, Kauila will be fondly remembered as a Native Hawaiian traditional healer who shared his wisdom with all who sought it. He rightfully believed that the diverse communities of the United States could learn much from traditional indigenous knowledge of balance and harmony. Unsurprisingly, even though Kauila was a Kahn, a "keeper of secrets," one

of the select few certified to hold that title, he preferred to be called Kath, or "priest."

A passionate advocate of the community health center movement, Kauila has dedicated much of his life towards ensuring that Americans of all backgrounds across the country receive culturally competent, patient-centered health care. Kauila and I got to know each other over the course of his work on healthcare with the Waianae community, since Kauila and I were both part of the hānai family of Auntie Agnes "Aggie" Kalaniho'okaha Cope, who first founded the Waianae Coast Comprehensive Health Care Center. Kauila continued Auntie Aggie's work by serving as board director of the Waianae Coast Comprehensive Health Center for twenty-seven years.

Kauila dedicated much of the past nineteen years to the National Association of Community Health Centers (NACHC). Over the course of his distinguished service, he served on the Consumer/Board Member, Finance, Farmworker Health, Membership, Health Center Governance, Nominating, and Screening Committees at various points in time. Between 2005 and 2008, Kauila was treasurer for NACHC. Kauila became chair-elect of NACHC in 2009, board chair in 2011, and immediate past chair in 2015, the first Native Hawaiian to hold those positions in NACHC.

In everything he did, Kauila thought about his sons, whom he loved deeply. We used to talk about his sons and how they were growing up. I especially remember one conversation in which we chatted about how Tiger Woods's success was influencing Kauila's sons towards golf and away from football. Kauila was the grounding for his family, and it was always apparent to me that his kids came first in his heart and in everything he did.

Much can be said of the art, wisdom, and leadership that Kauila shared with the world. He will be fondly remembered and deeply missed by the people whom he encouraged, counseled, inspired, and healed. With cherished memories of Kauila in our hearts, we will continue his life's work for a better, kinder world.

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 90th anniversary of the founding of the American Gold Star Mothers. American Gold Star Mothers dates to 1928 and was founded under the Wilson Administration by Grace Darling Seibold. In 1917, during WWI, families hung banners displaying a blue star for each loved one serving overseas and a gold star for each of those loved ones that made the ultimate sacrifice. Today, the American Gold Star Mothers organization continues to aid and comfort the families of men and women who died while serving their country.

On March 24th the Southwest Florida Gold Star Mothers Chapter will hold an event com-

memorating the 90th anniversary of the American Gold Star Mothers and the 2nd observance of the National Vietnam War Veterans Day. We honor those mothers and families who have lost sons and daughters in recent conflicts around the world, and thank the Southwest Florida chapter for all they do for our fallen heroes and our community.

RECOGNIZING DIABETES ALERT DAY

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the American Diabetes Association Alert Day. Observed annually on the fourth Tuesday in March, this is a day to inform the American public about the seriousness of Type 2 diabetes, particularly when left undiagnosed or untreated.

I would like to thank the American Diabetes Association, as well as numerous other organizations and researchers, who work to raise awareness of this far-reaching disease and seek an eventual cure.

Diabetes affects over 30 million Americans—almost 10 percent of the U.S. population—and nearly 1 in 4 adults are unaware that they have this disease. What's more, another 84 million Americans have pre diabetes, a condition in which blood glucose levels are higher than normal, but not high enough to be diagnosed as diabetes. 9 out of 10 adults with pre diabetes are unaware of their condition and susceptibility to developing diabetes.

Whether it is a parent, child, sibling, grandparent, or neighbor, we all know someone who struggles daily with the medical upkeep of living with diabetes. That is why I join the American Diabetes Association in strongly encouraging all Americans to take the time today to learn more about Type 2 diabetes, its wide-ranging impact upon our nation and its citizens, and the susceptibility to this disease. Testing can take only 60 seconds and results can make a lifetime of difference.

I applaud the American Diabetes Association, for raising awareness about the potentially life-threatening complications associated with diabetes, and their advocacy to promote a healthy lifestyle.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF COLONEL JAMES D. DIGNAN

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and honor the recent retirement of Colonel James Dignan from the United States Air Force and to congratulate him on his new role as President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Youngstown/Warren Regional Chamber in Ohio. Colonel Dignan concluded his service in the Air Force working in the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for force readiness.

Colonel Dignan received his commission through the Naval Aviation Cadet (NAVCAD) program at the Aviation Officer Candidate School at NAS Pensacola, Florida, and he received his "Wings of Gold" at NAS Corpus Christi, Texas. He has served as an officer and pilot in the United States Navy, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve. Colonel Dignan was a command pilot with more than 6,500 hours in trainer, patrol, reconnaissance, and airlift aircraft. He has flown more than 100 hurricane penetration missions in the WC-130 and has flown combat-support missions throughout the Balkans, the Horn of Africa, and Southwest Asia. Colonel Dignan was also the commander of the 910th Airlift Wing at the Youngstown Air Reserve Station in Youngstown, Ohio. Under his leadership, he oversaw more than 1,300 personnel and was in charge of operations which provided support for nearly 2,000 Air Force, Navy, and Marine Reservists.

Now, Dignan will begin his new role as President and CEO of the Youngstown/Warren Regional Chamber. He wanted to remain in Youngstown, Ohio with his wife and three daughters who also desired to stay in the Youngstown area. His new role will allow him to continue serving the Mahoning Valley region alongside the people he loves. Dignan's managerial skills along with his past association as a Chamber board member demonstrated his ability to hit the ground running. He will be an influential voice and leader within the community, and I am enthused to work with him in his new role.

REMEMBERING MILLIE DUNN
VEASEY

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Millie Dunn Veasey, a World War II veteran, civil rights pioneer, and community leader, who passed away this past Friday at the age of 100. My wife Lisa and I extend condolences to her family and her extensive network of friends and admirers as we celebrate her remarkable life.

Born and raised in Raleigh as one of six children, Millie graduated from Washington High School in 1942 and enlisted in the "six-triple-eight" battalion, the only all-female and all-black battalion to serve overseas during World War II. She was stationed in England for four months before transferring to France where she served as a supply officer, rising to the rank of Staff Sergeant. At the end of the war in 1945, she was selected for Officer Candidate School, but decided instead to continue her education.

Millie returned to Raleigh to attend Saint Augustine's College on the G.I. Bill. She graduated in 1953 with a degree in business administration and later obtained a master's degree at N.C. Central University. She taught business education and eighth grade English for four years in Matthews, Virginia, before returning to Raleigh to serve as secretary to

then-President of Saint Augustine's College, James Boyer.

In addition to her secretarial duties, Millie joined the NAACP and eventually became the first African American female president of the Wake County chapter. In that role, she came to know and work with local and national civil rights leaders such as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Thurgood Marshall and hosted Dr. King for his 1966 visit to Raleigh. In addition to her work in the NAACP, she served in leadership roles in her sorority, Zeta Phi Beta, and was active in the National Federation of Democratic Women and the American Legion. She and her husband, Warren Veasey, had two children, Juanita and Warren, Jr.

Mrs. Veasey retired from St. Augustine's in 1986 as director of career planning and placement. She continued to serve her community by teaching Sunday school at St. Ambrose Episcopal Church and was a mainstay of the Raleigh veterans' community. I have fond memories of visiting with her at community events around Veterans' Day. "It's something about the group," she said of her fellow veterans. "Regardless of where you are, there is a bond there that one can never break."

In an interview in the Raleigh News & Observer, Mrs. Veasey offered sage advice for living a meaningful life: "Keep busy and do something for somebody." She exemplified this maxim through her decades of dedicated service and effective leadership, inspiring many to follow in her path. We join with Mrs. Veasey's family, her many friends and admirers, and members of the communities she served, in mourning her passing and honoring her extraordinary life of leadership and service.

GO BUCS

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to not only congratulate the Florida Southwestern State College men's basketball team as they head to the NJCAA tournament for the first time in only their second season of competition, but also to wish them continued success throughout the tournament.

The Bucs clinched the Suncoast Conference Title and head to Kansas with a 29-2 overall record on the season. They are seeded sixth in the tournament. I congratulate Coach Marty Richter and all of the players for their hard work this season—best of luck and continue to make us proud.

HONORING THE CAREER OF
STEPHEN A. ROGERS

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the distinguished career of Stephen A.

Rogers, longtime chairman of Advance Media New York, publisher of The Post-Standard, Syracuse.com, and NYup.com, who recently retired after 58 years in the news business.

A graduate of Syracuse University, Steve Rogers began working part time at The Post-Standard and The Herald-Journal in 1960 as a beat reporter covering crime. Seeking independence from his father, Stephen Rogers, then-editor and publisher of The Post-Standard, Rogers went to work for The Miami Herald as a general assignment reporter. Determined, Rogers worked hard to become The Miami Herald's managing editor for news. In 1977, he returned to Syracuse to become editorial director of The Post-Standard and The Herald-Journal. Four years later, in 1981, Steve succeeded his father as editor and publisher of both newspapers.

During his time leading the company, the newspapers won recognition for reporting on state government failures, Syracuse University basketball NCAA violations, and the Pan Am Flight 103 bombing over Lockerbie, Scotland. Under Rogers' leadership, The Post-Standard has consistently ranked as one of the best-read newspapers in the country.

For the first time in 63 years, the name of Rogers or his late father, Stephen Rogers, who preceded him as publisher, will no longer appear on The Post-Standard's masthead. As a lifelong Central New Yorker, I join many in our community in thanking Steve for his leadership and passion for journalism. I am proud to congratulate him on his much deserved retirement.

THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE SYRIAN CRISIS

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the start of the eighth year for the Syrian crisis. We are no closer to a peaceful resolution to the conflict. Arguably, the situation has only gotten worse, particularly in Eastern Ghouta where the Assad regime is doubling down on its bombings and chemical attacks on civilians. The International Committee of the Red Cross proclaims that suffering in Eastern Ghouta has reached a "critical point," stating that "ordinary people are once again trapped in a situation where life slowly becomes impossible and where goods and aid are severely limited."

Before the war, the country was, by Arab standards, solidly middle income with vibrant communities. Today, Syria's development has regressed by nearly four decades, and the Syrian economy has contracted by an estimated 40 percent. The majority of Syrians have lost their livelihoods. School attendance has dropped over 50 percent with more than two million children now out of school. An estimated 13.5 million people, including six million children, are in need of serious humanitarian assistance. 4.5 million of these people are in hard-to-reach areas, including 540,000 people in eleven besieged areas. The numbers are staggering. And we all know the images are beyond words.

Meanwhile, Assad and Putin continue to indiscriminately target civilians in all locations, as well as civilian hospitals, despite a late February UN resolution calling for a cessation of hostilities to enable humanitarian access to those in need of aid.

These atrocities led me to introduce H. Res. 632, which condemns Assad and Putin for their attacks on hospitals and medical personnel in Syria, and calls on our Secretary of State to work with the international community to conduct investigations into these serious violations of international humanitarian law.

The United States must send a clear message to Assad and Putin that the international community is watching and we will hold them accountable. As the fighting enters its eighth year, I urge this administration to complete a comprehensive U.S. strategy for Syria that specifically addresses civilian protection and these attacks on humanitarian service providers.

HAPPY 90TH BIRTHDAY BEVERLY
GOLDFINE

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to a distinguished member of the Duluth community, Beverly Goldfine, who will soon be celebrating her 90th birthday. Beverly is an activist, volunteer, and mother who made it her mission early on in life to support and improve the Duluth community she loves so much.

Beverly has been active in many Duluth area organizations which help those in need such as the Townview Improvement Corporation and the Duluth-Superior Community Foundation. She made it her goal to help Duluthians find a place to call home regardless of their income. Additionally, her husband and she established the Beverly and Erwin Goldfine Scholarship for Academic Excellence to help students at the University of Minnesota Duluth reach their full potential.

It is an honor to recognize Beverly's many accomplishments and contributions to the community she loves so much. There is no doubt her activism and selfless efforts to help those in need have improved the lives of countless people. I ask my colleagues in Congress to join me in wishing Beverly a very happy 90th birthday. What an incredible milestone.

RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING
ACHIEVEMENT OF ROBERT G.
STANKIEWICZ

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to officially recognize the outstanding public achievement of Robert G. Stankiewicz. Mr. Stankiewicz has been in public service for close to twenty five years, the past ten with

the United States Capitol Police (USCP). As the Telecommunications Manager, Mr. Stankiewicz was instrumental in the implementation of the new USCP Radio System, built the USCP Radio Team now better known as CapCom and developed the first USCP mobile radio system that provides much needed communications for DPD motorcades.

He laid the foundation and brought in a very highly skilled and diversified group of technicians that will serve the United States Capitol Police well for many years to come. Mr. Stankiewicz's retirement marks the end of an era at USCP. He is the last of the originals. His dedication and commitment to the department cannot be measured. Even more important though are the friendships he developed that will last a life time. While his time at the United States Capitol Police has ended with his retirement, I know he will be just as successful in his future endeavors. I thank him for his dedicated service.

IN HONOR OF MARCY KAPTUR
MAKING HISTORY AS THE LONG-
EST SERVING CONGRESSWOMAN

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize my colleague, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, who is making history as the longest serving female member of the House of Representatives.

This is especially momentous for my district, as she now surpasses Edith Nourse Rogers, who served in Congress for 35 years and previously held the record of the longest serving female member. Representative Rogers was the first woman to represent Massachusetts in Congress, hailing from my hometown of Lowell, Massachusetts and serving the district I now represent.

Edith Nourse Rogers became the sixth woman to serve in the House of Representatives when she was elected in 1935. She was one of only 17 upon her death in 1960. Today, MARCY KAPTUR is one of 84 women in the House, and odds are that number is sure to grow in November.

This historic moment is significant because of the remarkable commitment to public service that MARCY KAPTUR has demonstrated over the past 35 years, but also because of the model of service she represents to the thousands of women who have been motivated to run for office in recent years.

I am grateful that MARCY has brought a woman's voice to so many critical debates over the course of her tenure, and I think it is worth pointing out that she has never run unopposed. She's earned every vote she's received in 18 consecutive elections.

I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio on this remarkable achievement. May it inspire continued courage and confidence in women who seek to follow in her "persistent" footsteps.

IN RECGNITION OF THE HONOR-
ABLE MICHAEL T. VOUGH, RE-
CIPIENT OF THE GREATER
PITTSSTON FRIENDLY SONS'
ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Michael T. Vough, who will receive the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick's Achievement Award. He will be honored by the Friendly Sons during their annual Saint Patrick's Day celebration on March 17, 2018.

Judge Vough is the only son of the late Henry and Mary Noci-Vough. He is a graduate of Pittston Area High School and the University of Scranton. In May 1989, he received his Juris Doctorate from the University of Dayton School of Law.

In 1991, Judge Vough founded the Law Office of Vough & Associates, which served over three thousand clients throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and employed a staff of ten.

From 1992 to 2012, Judge Vough worked as an Assistant District Attorney for Luzerne County. As Assistant DA, he prepared, evaluated, and prosecuted all criminal cases from commission of the crime through sentencing. He prosecuted over 1,500 cases resulting in plea or trial; represented the Commonwealth in over 150 jury trials; and had a 100 percent conviction rate in seventy homicide cases. Of these seventy homicide cases, nine resulted in first degree murder convictions. He participated in three death penalty jury selection cases and had an overall 99.8 percent conviction rate in his twenty years of service with the Luzerne County District Attorney's Office.

On January 3, 2012, Judge Vough was sworn in as judge of the Luzerne County Court of Common Pleas. Since 2012, he has presided over thousands of criminal and civil cases. He currently serves as the Criminal Court Division Administrator and has previously served as the Co-Civil Court Division Administrator.

He is married to Cindy Forlenza Vough, and they have four children, Michael, Matthew, Nicholas and Jessica.

It is an honor to recognize Judge Michael T. Vough as he accepts the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons' Achievement Award. I am grateful to him for his service to the people of Pennsylvania. I wish him all the best this Saint Patrick's Day.

HONORING SOMERSET HIGH
SCHOOL SENIOR JUSTIN RIVARD

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable young man from Somerset, Wisconsin named Justin Rivard. Justin is a senior at Somerset High School and is finishing up his final semester. But rather than

just spending that time preparing for his own graduation, Justin has gone out of his way to help others. He recently invented a device, aptly titled the "JustinKase," that protects students and teachers inside their classrooms. The steel device slips underneath a classroom door and latches to the door's jam, locking the door in place. This prevents anyone with intent to commit violence against students or teachers from accessing the room.

A teacher at Somerset High recently described Justin as having "the special combination of motivation and brains and has a motor that just keeps going." Indeed, these skills will serve Justin well as he continues to use his gifts in the service of others as a soldier in the United States Army. Everyone in Wisconsin is proud of Justin's ingenuity. And we are grateful for his decision to enter the military and defend our nation.

TRIBUTE TO BILL PAVKOV

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bill Pavkov of Hastings, Iowa for his dedicated service to our country in World War II and the Korean War. Bill turned 90 in 2017 and has the rare distinction of serving his country in two wars.

Bill was born and raised in Doylestown, Ohio. He left school in the 10th grade to join the U.S. Army Transport Service in 1944. He was only 17 years old and his father had to give his permission in order for Bill to serve. Bill was aboard Army Transport ships that delivered both troops and supplies around the world. After his service to our country, Bill returned to Ohio, married and began his career as an over-the-road semi-truck driver. In 1960, Bill and his family moved to Iowa where he started farming and continued driving trucks. He served his community as a volunteer firefighter and as Mayor of Hastings. When Bill retired in the 1990s he had logged 52 years as a truck driver and 30 years as a farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Bill for his many years of dedicated and devoted service to the United States of America, his family, and his community. It is with great honor that I recognize him today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in applauding his service as a veteran and in wishing him and his family nothing but the best.

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CENTER FOR ASIAN AMERICANS UNITED FOR SELF EMPOWERMENT (CAUSE)

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague, Congresswoman JUDY

CHU, to recognize the Center for Asian Americans United for Self Empowerment (CAUSE), a nonprofit organization based in the Greater Los Angeles area. CAUSE has played a pivotal role in the promotion of civic engagement and leadership development within the local Asian Pacific American (APA) community for the last 25 years.

CAUSE began in 1993 as the Chinese Americans United for Self Empowerment. The organization has been chaired since its inception by Charlie Woo. In 2003, due to the APA community's diversifying population, CAUSE expanded its mission to serve the larger APA community, and changed its name accordingly to the Center for Asian Americans United for Self Empowerment.

CAUSE was created with the mission to advance the political and civic empowerment of the APA community through nonpartisan voter outreach, training, education, and leadership development. By providing a greater understanding of APA issues, access to resources, and a large and thriving network, CAUSE has played a pivotal role in empowering the next generation to vote, participate, and lead.

CAUSE has created a pipeline of leadership development programs that cultivates leaders for the APA community. The oldest of these programs is the Leadership Academy, an undergraduate internship program, which has graduated 26 classes and has exposed students to decision makers, policy makers, and issues of the day. The program's young leaders have developed a deeper awareness of the political issues the APA community faces in California and in Washington, D.C.

CAUSE's Leadership Institute, a six-month fellowship, trains mid-career professionals to become greater advocates for the APA community. The fellowship is comprised of intimate policy roundtable discussions, civic leadership skill development, and access to political leaders who speak at leadership luncheons.

The CAUSE Leadership Council & Network is comprised of preeminent next-generation leaders, who are selected to participate by invitation only. Members move the APA community forward through education, networks, and advancement into leadership positions. They also look to ensure equal opportunities for leadership representation by building key connections and skills necessary to advance and empower emerging leaders.

Through these programs, CAUSE has developed a network of over 200 alumni. CAUSE is also especially dedicated to advocating for more women to rise to positions of power. The CAUSE Women in Power program serves over 400 women annually through leadership conferences to discuss issues women leaders face while exploring strategies to overcome them. This program inspires women to reach their full potential.

CAUSE has been a primary source of information for foreign and native-born APAs. CAUSE's Voter Outreach, Training & Education (VOTE) Initiatives provide voters with valuable access to voter education and registration workshops, candidate debates and forums, and community issue town halls. With over 200 volunteers, the VOTE Initiatives work to increase APA turnout and voter registration, the understanding of candidates and propositions, and discussion of politics and community issues.

Today, the APA community is the fastest growing community in the U.S. and is projected to be the largest immigrant group in the country by 2055. APA voters increased from more than 2 million voters across the country in 2000 to 3.9 million voters in 2012. In addition, there has been a growth of over 600,000 new APA voters nationwide within the last three election cycles. However, only about half of eligible voters were registered in 2016, and there is still a lack of representation in political leadership roles. The APA community is sure to see increased voter activity and voter engagement under CAUSE's stewardship.

Under the leadership of CAUSE's Executive Director, Kim Yamasaki, the organization's budget for programs and staff has increased by more than 50 percent. CAUSE is better positioned than ever to fully activate and engage the APA community in politics and the world around them.

On April 5, 2018, CAUSE celebrates its silver anniversary at an event in Downtown Los Angeles with several hundred supporters in attendance. Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues to please join us in celebrating CAUSE's first 25 years of success. We look forward to its next 25 years with great anticipation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on roll call vote 104, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the mullahs in Tehran are among the world's worst human rights abusers. This year we have witnessed their brutality again on display as they mercilessly crushed political dissent from their own people. International attention has faded but the Iranian people are still in the streets demanding their rights, whether they be economic opportunity, access to water, religious freedom, or gender equality. The United States must support these dissidents fighting for freedom and basic human rights.

In response, the regime has murdered dozens and locked-up thousands as it has done so many times before without punishment from the outside world. In perhaps one of the most egregious cases, in 1988 the Iranian regime initiated a systematic massacre of thousands of political dissidents. The barbaric mass executions by hanging and firing squad included teenagers and pregnant women who refused to renounce their political affiliations, including many from the MEK—today's leading Iranian dissident group.

It's important to remember and emphasize who exactly were the victims of this bloody

massacre. Iranian security officials would ask detainees "What is your political affiliation?" Those who said "MEK" would be immediately placed on execution lists. So horrific was the act that the deputy to Ayatollah Khomeini at the time called it "the greatest crime committed during the Islamic Republic, for which history will condemn us."

Their day of reckoning is fast approaching. It has taken 30 years to condemn and investigate this horrific massacre. The United States must act swiftly to ensure that the Mullahs in Tehran are finally held accountable. Our government must work with international partners to also investigate other major human rights abuses such as the dozens more killed during protests in 1999, 2009, and 2017. In all cases, the families of those murdered by the regime were never told what happened to their loved ones' remains. The United States government and our allies must make it a priority to pressure the Iranian regime to disclose where the final resting place of the missing is so that their families may have a small bit of peace.

Another horrific violation of human rights and decency is taking place today on the shores of Libya. In 2011, our government self-righteously intervened in Libya to topple the regime of Muammar al-Gadhafi and then turned its back on that country. It is now a full-blown failed state where human trafficking is taking place.

Human trafficking is modern day slavery. We are seeing thousands of desperate refugees attempting to cross the war-torn country to the freedom and opportunity of Europe only to end up being exploited by slave traders. Estimates indicate there are about 500,000 to a million migrants bottled up in Libya that could be fodder for this despicable slave trade. Evil men, whether they be criminal opportunists or terrorists, are subjugating those in the most need for their own profit. You cannot put a price on human life.

The fact remains that we simply do not know enough about what exactly is going on in Libya today. The U.S. government and Congress should further investigate this tragic development of human slavery in Libya so we can get to the bottom of what is actually going on.

We must know who is exploiting migrants for profit, where the money is going, and compel Libyan authorities and the international community to respond decisively. It is our moral duty to fight for the voiceless who are being sold as chattel on the shores of Libya. And that's just the way it is.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN
MARCY KAPTUR

HON. JIM JORDAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues from Ohio and across the nation in paying tribute to the dean of the Ohio delegation, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, as she becomes the longest-serving woman in the history of the House of Representatives.

Congresswoman KAPTUR has been tireless in her promotion of Toledo and the people of Ohio's Ninth Congressional District. I am grateful to my colleagues who have already spoken about her many accomplishments on behalf of her constituents throughout her congressional career.

I want to especially highlight her advocacy work on behalf of Lima's Joint Systems Manufacturing Center in my district, which is the only facility in the nation capable of producing large combat vehicles for the Department of Defense. MARCY has used her seniority on the House Appropriations Committee to stave off cuts to JSMC programs that would have devastated military readiness and destroyed the plant's supplier base. I thank her for her long-standing bipartisan work to save money for the taxpayer while keeping the skilled workers of JSMC on the job building modern, safer vehicles on which our servicemembers rely.

On behalf of the people of Ohio's Fourth Congressional District, I congratulate Congresswoman KAPTUR on achieving this milestone. Her decency and civility are a model for all who commit their lives to public service.

TRIBUTE TO BONNIE AND DARYL
HAYNES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bonnie and Daryl Haynes of Prescott, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 70th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on January 18, 2018.

Bonnie and Daryl's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 70th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 70th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

REMEMBERING MR. WARREN
'RHUBARB' JONES

HON. BARRY LOUDERMILK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Warren 'Rhubarb' Jones of Tallapoosa, Georgia, who passed away on April 2, 2017.

Rhubarb's love of music and strong work ethic led him to become one of the most talented and decorated radio personalities in the State of Georgia. In his 48 years as a disc jockey—23 of them in the Atlanta market—he earned many well-deserved accolades, includ-

ing 1983 CMA and ACM DJ of the Year, 1987 Large Market CMA DJ of the Year, 1991 Atlanta Country Music Hall of Fame, and 2001 Country Music Disc Jockey Hall of Fame.

He was one of the founding members of the Georgia Radio Hall of Fame, contributing greatly to their organization. He was inducted into their inaugural class in 2007. At the time of his death, he was the longest-running morning radio personality in the Atlanta radio market. For the last couple years, he hosted mid days on Great Classics 98.9 in West Georgia.

In 2008, Rhubarb joined the Kennesaw State University family as Senior Director of Special Projects in the Office of Development and Distinguished Lecturer in the Department of Communication. He was one of the most popular professors among their communications students and a passionate supporter of the school, even helping launch their football program.

Rhubarb was passionate about the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, and helped start the March Across Georgia in 1990. During the month of June every year, he would make stops all over the state of Georgia, collecting pennies everywhere he went. Over 18 years ago, he began running a celebrity golf tournament to advocate and raise money for their research. Through his efforts, he helped to raise over \$3.5 trillion.

On behalf of Georgia's 11th Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I offer my heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Donna Jones and their daughters, Presley and Callie. Mr. Jones will be fondly remembered by all of Georgia for his strong dedication to his community and his kind spirit. He is greatly missed.

HONORING JOHN CLAY SMITH, JR.

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing John Clay Smith, Jr. for his years of service as interim chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and as Dean of Howard University School of Law. John passed away on February 15, 2018, due to complications from Alzheimer's disease. My thoughts are with John's family during this difficult time.

John Clay Smith, Jr. was born in 1942 just outside of Omaha, Nebraska. He knew he had a passion for law at a very early age. He moved to Washington, D.C., to work as a judge with the Army Judge Advocate General's Corps and as an associate at the law firm Arent Fox. In 1974, he joined the Federal Communications Commission as chief of the cable television bureau, but later became an associate general counsel there. John Clay Smith, Jr. was named interim chair of the EEOC in 1978. It was also during this time that he was elected as the first African American national president of the Federal Bar Association.

As the first female to chair the EEOC, I served alongside John to reform it and to develop and implement guidelines related to

workplace sexual harassment. Once John stepped down from his post at the EEOC, he went on to serve as Dean of Howard University School of Law from 1986 to 1988, obtaining updated equipment and increased funding for faculty members not only to raise the school's profile, but also to assist in it maintaining its accreditation. In addition, John helped raise scholarship funds for the law school. During his time at the law school, he also served as president of the National Bar Association and the Washington Bar Association. In 2004, John retired from Howard.

John graduated in 1964 from Creighton University, where he paid his tuition through scholarships and part-time jobs, and graduated from Howard University School of Law in 1967, where he was class president. He later went on to receive master's and doctoral degrees in law from George Washington University.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in remembering the life and legacy of John Clay Smith, Jr. as interim chairman of the EEOC and as Dean of Howard University School of Law.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 2018, I was not present for votes due to flight delays. If I had been present, I would have voted:

On Roll Call vote 102, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 5247, I would have voted No.

On Roll Call vote 103, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 4465, I would have voted Aye.

TRIBUTE TO DAN FLORES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dan Flores of Council Bluffs, Iowa, on his recent retirement as a Lieutenant with the Council Bluffs Police Department after 36 years of service. Dan began his career with the Council Bluffs Police Department in 1981.

Dan said he could sum up his career by using one word, "service", and said it has been an honor and privilege to be part of the Council Bluffs Police Department. Dan grew up in northern Iowa and attended Minnesota State University where he received his Bachelor's Degree. Council Bluffs Police Chief Tim Carmody said, "the scope of Dan's career is a testament of how officers have a true investment in their communities. It's been a heartwarming experience and an adventure."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Dan on his retirement and career. Dan has made a difference by helping and serving oth-

ers. It is with great honor that I recognize him today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in honoring his accomplishments and in wishing him nothing but the best in his retirement.

CENTENNIAL OF THE YEE SHAN BENEVOLENT SOCIETY, INC.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Yee Shan Benevolent Society, Inc. on its centennial celebration on March 18, 2018.

Since 1918, the Yee Shan Benevolent Society has been sharing fellowship, support, friendship, benevolence and hope with immigrants from the Pan Yu County of the Canton Province in China. Over the course of a century, it has expanded its services to include fundraising for local hospitals, health centers, non-profits and other initiatives. Today, the Society is a beloved cornerstone organization that continues to provide social and community enrichment to Chinese Americans in New York City and the greater NY region.

I am proud that the constituents of my district continue to support the traditions and values of this esteemed fraternity along with its partners, the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association and Lin Sing Association. My district is enriched and indebted to them for their service to advance the betterment of the Chinatown and Lower East Side community.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Yee Shan Benevolent Society in New York for its commendable and exemplary work and wish it many years of continued success.

CELEBRATING FIVE GENERATIONS AND 125 YEARS OF VARNS AND HOOVER HARDWARE

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Varns and Hoover Hardware, a family-owned business that has been a fixture in the Middlebury community for more than 125 years and that will soon be passed down to the fifth generation.

In the late 1800s, Ellsworth Varns moved his hardware store to the heart of Middlebury, Indiana, from Michigan. The store started out serving farmers and families in this small town, but over time it grew and adapted to the changing economic times. The success and longevity of Varns and Hoover Hardware lies in the family's dedication to serving their neighbors and providing high-quality products at a friendly and convenient location.

The store always addressed the specific needs of the town with products that served family farmers, small businesses, the large Amish community, and the growing manufacturing industry. Now more than a century later,

it remains a central stop for the small town's residents to get the products they need as well as catch up with their neighbors. Its charm and character come from its welcoming and personal feel and the friendly smiles that greet you when you walk in.

Small businesses are the backbone of the American economy, and it is a privilege to represent a family so devoted to the prosperity of their community for so many years. To honor Varns and Hoover Hardware is to honor what it means to achieve the American Dream. With ownership now being passed down to fifth-generation family member Nathan Miller, I am grateful to be able to recognize such a pivotal moment in the history of this Hoosier family, their small business, and the community they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Varns and Hoover Hardware and in wishing them the best in all the years to come.

HONORING THE AIROLINA YOUNG AVIATORS PROGRAM

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend the accomplishments of the Airlina Young Aviators (AYA) Program of Durham, North Carolina.

Established in 2016, AYA provides opportunities for high school students—often from disadvantaged communities—to receive professional introductory flight training and mentorship, engaging them in STEM education projects and offers classes and preparing them for flight examinations and pilot licenses. These credentials, enriched by the guidance of AYA mentors, equip students with valuable experience, achievements, skills, and references as they begin to apply to jobs, colleges, and aviation university programs.

The AYA program was founded by Captain Warren Wheeler, a Durham native who established the first African American-owned and -operated air service in the United States. An entrepreneur, aviator, and businessman, Warren paved the way for African Americans and others who wished to pursue careers in the field of aviation. In 1979, he became the first airline owner to use government employment training programs such as the federal Comprehensive Employment Training Act to train unemployed and low-income people of color who sought careers in the airline industry. In addition to providing his students with practical instruction, Wheeler served as their employment negotiator with regional and national carriers to help advance their careers.

Captain Warren continued his mission to expand and support the number of certified minority pilots by establishing AYA as part of Airlina Flight & Music Support, a non-profit organization based in Durham, just two years ago. Through Warren's visionary leadership and the work of dedicated board members and volunteers, AYA currently supports twenty-two students attending flight simulation training, five students presently flying, and two

who will take their flight tests to qualify for their pilot's licenses within the next few months.

On behalf of the people of the Fourth Congressional District of North Carolina, I applaud the work of the Airlina Young Aviators Program for empowering young members of our community and helping move the Research Triangle toward a future in which all our students can pursue and achieve their dreams. For these students, the sky truly is the limit.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE INSTALLATION OF DR. DENNIS FRISCH AS PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN PODIATRIC MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

HON. BRIAN J. MAST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Dennis Frisch, a podiatric physician who practices in his hometown of Boca Raton, Fla., for his installation on March 18, 2018, as President of the American Podiatric Medical Association.

Dr. Frisch has dedicated his life to service in his profession and his community. After graduating from Dr. William M. Scholl College of Podiatric Medicine and completing his residency at the Franklin Boulevard Community Hospital in Chicago, Ill., Dr. Frisch went into private practice in Boca Raton. 30 years later, he continues to provide podiatric care in that community.

He has been board certified in podiatric surgery by the American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons for nearly 25 years and is a founding member of the American Society of Podiatric Surgeon. Dr. Frisch has also served as president of the Florida Podiatric Medical Association, winning the FPMA Podiatrist of the Year Award and its President's Award. In addition, he has twice been named one of the top 150 Most Influential Podiatrists in America and was appointed by Governor Charlie Crist to the Florida Board of Podiatric Medicine, serving for 6 years.

Dr. Frisch has also been an active member of the American Podiatric Medical Association. He was elected to its Board of Trustees in 2007 before becoming Treasurer. He is also a member of APMA's Annual Meeting Committee and Scholarship Committee, as well as serving as the APMA Barry University liaison.

Dr. Frisch is also active in the Boca Raton community. He has served two terms as president of the Boca Raton Rotary Club and served for eight years as a Commissioner for the Greater Boca Raton Beach and Parks District. Currently, he is an appointed Board member to the City of Boca Raton Parks and Recreation Department Advisory Board. And last, but most importantly, Dr. Frisch is a proud husband to his wife Jennifer, father to his two children, Ashley and Daniel, and Pa Pa of two grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Dr. Frisch great success as he takes the helm of the American Podiatric Medical Association.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT FRYZEK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dr. Robert Fryzek of Glenwood, Iowa on his retirement as a practicing physician. Dr. Fryzek has served the Glenwood area for the past 54 years, practicing general family medicine and received the respect, trust, and loyalty of his patients who called him "a working man's doctor."

Dr. Fryzek graduated from Central High School in Omaha, Nebraska in 1952. He received his bachelor's degree from Creighton University in Omaha and earned his medical degree from the University of Nebraska in 1960. Dr. Fryzek served his internship at Wesley Hospital in Wichita, Kansas and spent two years at the Western Shoshone Duck Valley Indian Reservation in Owee, Nevada before moving to Glenwood, Iowa in 1963 to start his local practice. Dr. Fryzek offered weekend hours, treated patients at the local nursing home on his days off, served as the County Medical Examiner, and volunteered as the team doctor for Glenwood High School. He is a one-of-a-kind doctor who went above and beyond for his patients and community.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Dr. Fryzek on his retirement and thank him for his many years of dedicated and devoted service to the citizens of Glenwood. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress and I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him for his many accomplishments and in wishing him and his family nothing but the best.

FIRST DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF MOLY99 BY NORTH STAR NUCLEAR MEDICINE

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 2018, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the first domestic production of Moly99 by North Star Nuclear Medicine, which is located in Beloit, Wisconsin. Moly99 is the key substance used in 50,000 daily procedures using nuclear medicine to diagnose a variety of illness.

For many years, the United States has been dependent on foreign sources using nuclear fission offshore. These reactors, located in Canada, the Netherlands, South Africa, and Australia, are old and have been the subject of many disruptions of supply causing shortages.

Working with help from the U.S. Department of Energy and the cooperation of the FDA, North Star has developed a system to produce Moly99 without any use of uranium, resulting in little waste and no nuclear waste.

I want to congratulate George Messina, North Star's CEO, and his 130 employees, lo-

cated in the cities of Beloit and Madison, on their achievement. Nuclear medicine is vital to the diagnosis and cure of many diseases. Thanks to the dedication and perseverance of this Wisconsin company, consumers will have access to the first domestic supply of this much needed medicine.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JOSEPH KELLY MCCUTCHEM III

HON. BARRY LOUDERMILK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, Mr. Joseph Kelly McCutchen III, a man who has dedicated his life to serving the people of the state of Georgia.

Kelly was born in Ellijay, Georgia, to Joe and Betty McCutchen. He graduated from Gilmer High School and became the third generation in his family to attend the Georgia Institute of Technology, where he graduated with the highest honors. He began his career in the Trust Department of Trust Company Bank in Atlanta, where he was a vice president before he joined the Georgia Public Policy Foundation in 1993. For many years, he offered the state guidance and counsel on issues including education, tax, health care and economic policy.

Kelly became president and CEO of the Georgia Public Policy Foundation in 2010. He resigned from GPPF recently, after nearly 25 years providing Georgia's policymakers and lawmakers with the intellectual ammunition to embrace policy over politics. He remains active in Foundation policy as part of the think tank's network of Senior Fellows.

At the Georgia Public Policy Foundation, his service to the state and its people has been exemplary. Kelly helped create the Civic Renewal Project that highlights the work of outstanding community-based organizations, the "No Excuses" program to recognize and study high achieving and high poverty public schools, and award-winning statewide report cards on education, crime and taxes. During his tenure, the Foundation was named First place for highest integrity and Third place for most knowledgeable among business organizations or state associations in Georgia, by James magazine (2004) and, in January 2018, one of the Best Independent Think Tanks in the 2017 Global Go-To Think Tank Index Report.

A tireless fundraiser for GPPF and numerous nonprofit organizations, Kelly was also a member of the Leadership Georgia Class of 2001. He served on the boards of Leadership Georgia, the Georgia Tech Alumni Association, and the Conservative Policy Leadership Institute. He was a founder and Governing Board Chair of Tech High, a math, science and technology-focused public charter school in Atlanta.

He co-founded the Georgia Warrior Alliance, a nonprofit with the mission to make Georgia the national Leader in programs supporting military veterans and their families. He served on the board of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce and chaired the board of the

Healthcare Institute for Neuro-Recovery and Innovation Foundation. He served on the Education Policy Committee and the Health Care Policy Committee for the Georgia Chamber of Commerce; the Georgia Science and Technology Executive Committee; the Public Policy Committee for the Metro Atlanta United Way, and is a policy adviser for the Technology Association of Georgia.

Through his work and civic engagement, his lovely wife, Mary Kay Davis McCutchen, has been a dedicated companion. Kelly and Mary Kay live in Atlanta, as Kelly tells the rest of Georgia, "So you don't have to!" Married since 1994, the McCutchens have a son, Kelly, and a daughter, Caroline, both in college; Caroline is the family's fourth-generation attendee of Georgia Tech.

On behalf of Georgia's 11th Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I commend Kelly McCutchen for his many years of outstanding, dedicated and effective service.

**CALLING FOR THE END OF THE
SYRIAN CIVIL WAR AND FOR
PRESIDENT BASHAR AL-ASSAD
TO STEP ASIDE**

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the seventh anniversary of the Syrian people's demand for democracy, which began on March 15, 2011.

As a senior Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have watched President Bashar al-Assad commit a catalogue of the most barbaric crimes during seven years of civil war. These include his use of chemical weapons against civilians, his mass imprisonment and murder of his own citizens, and his deliberate shelling of noncombatants. His violence has created a catastrophic refugee crisis, and the death toll from his brutal war is in the hundreds of thousands.

Worse, Russia and Iran have been keen to expand their influence in Syria—no matter the human cost. Not only has Vladimir Putin propped up Assad militarily, but he has provided diplomatic cover for Assad's crimes. Further, Tehran has entrenched itself in Syria by mobilizing and training numerous proxy fighters. This expanded influence undermines American interests, threatens Israel, and further destabilizes the Middle East.

I encourage the Administration to work with Congress and our allies to bring this war to a needed conclusion; one that transitions Syria into a post-Assad future.

TRIBUTE TO GORDON KOKENGE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Gordon

Kokenge of Clarinda, Iowa who recently retired after twenty-eight years of service to the City of Clarinda as a member of the City Council and as Mayor. Gordon was elected in 1988 to the City Council and as Mayor in 2005.

Gordon has served Clarinda with honor, dedication, and with determination to improve the lives of every citizen. During his tenure he has been a leading force in economic development in Clarinda to help develop new industries and help save local companies that have now prospered and expanded. Many citizens in Clarinda supported Gordon because of his insight, knowledge, commitment to the city, and his concern for the city's budget. He has a reputation of working for the good of the city. Clarinda City Manager Gary McClarnon said, "Gordon has been a very good leader for the city and will be remembered as a great leader for the city during his time as a City Councilman and Mayor."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Gordon for taking an active role in his community. Gordon's commitment is not only for Clarinda but for all of Southwest Iowa. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress and I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating him for his service and wishing him nothing but continued success.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARGARET PERKINS, CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL RECIPIENT

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Margaret Perkins, a Civil Air Patrol volunteer from New York's 21st District who is being honored with the Congressional Gold Medal.

Margaret was born on November 17, 1917, and attended Rochester Institute of Technology, Skidmore College, and Columbia University. After training to fly aircraft at the Lewis Lavery Air School in Round Lake, New York, Margaret received her pilot's license from the Civil Aeronautics Authority in 1943 at only twenty-four years old, and became the first female licensed pilot in Saratoga County. As a member of the Civil Air Patrol during World War II, Margaret flew anti-sabotage missions to ensure the security of dams and other structures. She also shuttled single-engine military observation aircraft between airports at the request of the U.S. Government.

In gratitude and recognition of her service in the Civil Air Patrol during World War II, Margaret is being honored with the Congressional Gold Medal. The Medal is the highest civilian award presented by the U.S. Congress as its highest expression of national appreciation for outstanding contributions.

It is no doubt that Margaret contributed significantly to U.S. success in World War II, and I am extremely proud to rise today in honor of her achievements. New York's 21st District is forever grateful for Margaret's courageous service to her country.

**THE SYRIAN SLAUGHTER MUST
END**

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the past few weeks has brought an unfortunate intensification of the Syrian Civil War as the Syrian government, aided by Russia, continues to bomb rebel-held towns and cities in Syria—including targeting hospitals. This worsening crisis puts even more innocent civilians at risk as the fighting moves closer to heavily populated areas.

We should not make the same mistakes as the Obama administration, whose "strategic patience" allowed Russia to get a foothold in the Middle East by propping up the brutal dictatorship of Syrian President Bashar al Assad and obstructing peace efforts by the UN Security Council. Putin is knowingly allied with murderers.

That is why I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 1677, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017, which would sanction anyone responsible for hindering access to humanitarian relief in Syria as well as any person who knowingly provides support to the Syrian Government in their attempt to acquire ballistic missiles. The House passed H.R. 1677 last year, and I urge the Senate to pass this bill as well.

In conclusion, God Bless our Troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

HONORING CARLOS CHAIREZ

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Carlos Chairez for his exceptional service to his community and his country.

Mr. Chairez valiantly served his country during World War II as a Private First Class in the United States Army. Mr. Chairez served in the European Theater of war as a member of General Patton's Third Army, Fourth Armored Division. As the war came to a close, his division was converted into the peacekeeping constabulary force. With great confidence and great strength, Mr. Chairez helped create victory and a better world.

Mr. Chairez embraced his country in a time of great need. He went into a perilous domain and fought to preserve democracy and install freedom. He helped to bring peace to a region torn apart by the ravages of war.

Mr. Chairez has been happily married for almost 70 years to his wife Margarita, has 4 children, and 7 grandchildren. His love for his family and country is unparalleled and I deeply admire his dedication, charisma, and willpower. He is an outstanding role model for us all. I am honored and privileged to thank such an extraordinary man. I hope he continues to be a reminder to us all to never forget no sacrifice is too great or small.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LIFELONG IMPROVEMENTS IN FOOD AND EXERCISE ACT OF 2018

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to reintroduce the Lifelong Improvements in Food and Exercise Act, authorizing a national initiative to attack a major health problem in the United States that cannot be remedied through the health care system alone. Increasing rates of overweight and obesity are now found in Americans of every age, race and other major demographic groups, and threaten the health of Americans like no other disease or condition. In fact, the key to eliminating many of the most serious health conditions is not only to reduce overweight and obesity, but also to encourage exercise of all kinds.

The LIFE Act would provide \$25 million to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for a coordinated national effort to reverse increasingly sedentary lifestyles and diets that are high in fat and sugar. Specifically, my bill seeks to provide the first national strategy to combat the overweight and obesity epidemic by directing the CDC to do three things: train health professionals to recognize the signs of obesity early and to educate people concerning healthy lifestyles, such as proper nutrition and regular exercise; conduct public education campaigns about how to recognize and address overweight and obesity; and develop intervention strategies to be used by the states in everyday life, such as in the workplace and in community settings. This legislation, however, meets the bare minimum for what is needed to address our most important health crisis.

In 2010, estimates from the CDC National Center for Health Statistics showed that since 1980, the percentage of children who are overweight has more than doubled, and the percentage of adolescents who are overweight has tripled. The CDC also reports that Type 2 Diabetes, once considered an adult disease, is now widespread among children. The rising cost of the health care system, including insurance premiums, reflects this epidemic. Today, chronic diseases, many of which are caused or exacerbated by overweight and obesity, account for 70 percent of all deaths in the U.S., and 86 percent of U.S. medical care costs.

A focused national health initiative would provide guidance to the states to engage in similar programs, as mayors of some cities have done. A national focus could lead to changes, such as full participation in high school physical education classes, which dropped from 42 percent in 1991 to 33 percent in 2005. Changes in nutrition are equally critical because more than half of all young people consume too much fat, a factor in the doubling of the percentage of overweight youth. Data also show an increase in unhealthy eating habits for adults and no change in physical activity.

According to a 2017 study conducted by the American College of Sports Medicine, the District of Columbia is one of the fittest cities in the United States and, yet, even here, obesity

continues to be a severe problem. Most of the obesity epidemic is exercise-and-food-related. Approximately one-fifth of District residents are considered obese.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation to mobilize the country now before entirely preventable health conditions, which often begin in childhood, overwhelm the nation's health care system.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ROBERT C. SWEENEY

HON. JOSH GOTTHEIMER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Robert C. Sweeney—a bold and courageous community leader, a pioneer for New Jersey workers, and a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. He will be deeply missed by the entire State of New Jersey, particularly our brothers and sisters in labor for whom he tirelessly advocated throughout his entire life.

Bob was committed to fighting for the working men and women of New Jersey. For twenty-five years, Bob served as President and Business Manager of Local 399 of the International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Ironworkers in South Jersey. As the longest-serving business manager in the history of the ironworkers, Bob fought vigorously to defend the labor movement and New Jersey's dedicated workforce. Bob's unflinching values and passionate leadership continue to live on through the steadfast work of his sons—Robert Sweeney, New Jersey Senate President Stephen Sweeney, and New Jersey AFL-CIO Vice President Richard Sweeney.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for Bob Sweeney's invaluable contributions to our community and our state, and I am confident that his memory will serve as an inspiration for our future generations.

IN RECOGNITION OF GREG COLLINS, GREATER WILKES-BARRE FRIENDLY SONS' MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Greg Collins, who will receive the "Man of the Year" Award from the Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons. He will be honored during the Friendly Sons annual Saint Patrick's Day celebration on Friday, March 16, 2018. Greg has forty years of finance experience and is the former senior vice president and area president of Wells Fargo Bank.

Greg is a native of Kingston, Pennsylvania. After graduating from West Side Central Catholic, he began his career as a teller at Wyoming National Bank. While working as a teller, Greg attended night classes at Misericordia University, majoring in business

administration. While working for Wyoming National Bank and its successors, Greg took on more responsibility, taking management positions and eventually advancing to senior leadership roles. From 2009 until his retirement in September 2017, Greg served as Wells Fargo's community bank area president for Northeastern Pennsylvania. He led more than three hundred team members and oversaw the operations of thirty-seven Wells Fargo branch banking offices across nine counties.

Greg remains an active member of the community in his retirement. He is a member of the board of trustees at Misericordia University, a board member of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Business and Industry, Leadership Wilkes-Barre, the Wilkes-Barre YMCA, the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, and the United Way of Wyoming Valley. In 2015, he chaired the American Heart Association Gala for Northeastern Pennsylvania. He was the recipient of the 2015 North Star Award from the Northeastern Pennsylvania Council Boy Scouts of America, the 2015 Distinguished Leadership Award from Leadership Wilkes-Barre, and the 2015 Community Service Award from the Salvation Army. Greg is a 2010 graduate of Leadership Wilkes-Barre's Executive Leadership Program and a 4th-degree member of the Knights of Columbus.

It is an honor to recognize Greg Collins as he accepts the "Man of the Year" Award from the Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons. I am grateful to him for his forty years of service to the people of Northeastern Pennsylvania, and I thank him for his continued leadership in his community. I wish him all the best on this Saint Patrick's Day.

TRIBUTE TO JEFF BALLENGER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jeff Ballenger of Council Bluffs, Iowa for his leadership and vision in helping organize 13 honor flights that have taken nearly 3,500 Iowa veterans to Washington, D.C. to visit memorials built in their honor.

Jeff and his father, Bill Ballenger, saw a need to honor our country's aging veterans from World War II, the Korean War, and Vietnam War. The Ballengers have partnered with HyVee, Inc., Casey's General Stores, and others to raise more than \$3 million to fund this special endeavor. Jeff said, "It takes nearly 200 volunteers to help make each honor flight a success. Dad and I might be the front, but we could not do it without the volunteers who are so important in turning the plans into a reality."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Jeff on his dedication and diligence to promote, organize, and fund the 13 honor flights for our Veterans. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Jeff and in wishing him nothing but continued success in all his endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 7TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE START OF THE SYRIAN WAR

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 7th anniversary of the beginning of the Syrian War.

Since the conflict began in 2011, over 500,000 Syrians have been killed, including 50,000 children by the murderous dictator Bashar al-Assad and his Russian and Iranian backers. These brutal regimes not only target civilians with their artillery strikes, but the Assad regime continues to use chemical weapons, including chlorine gas, to kill his own citizens with impunity.

Over the last 7 years, over 30 chemical weapons attacks have taken place in Syria. Bashar al-Assad has used these chemical weapons in clear violation of international law, and against countless resolutions by the United Nations Security Council. The world has seen the heartbreaking images of children gasping for their lives, body bags lining the streets, and horrific videos of these chemical weapon attacks. We cannot turn a blind eye to the genocide before us.

The situation in Syria today is devastating with no signs of immediate improvement. As I have said before, in order to prevent the rise of the next generation of terrorists and killers, we must ensure that Bashar al-Assad is removed from power. I believe the United States of America was put on this Earth to be an example of self-governance and order in a world drowning in strongmen, oppression, and poverty.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the United States to exert leadership in Syria. If we fail to act and if we fail to lead, we are failing humanity. Failing to act in Syria is a failure on us all. We must learn from history, learn from past mistakes, and take action as a global leader for freedom and hope. Stopping Assad's genocide in Syria is part of our mission statement, and I will continue to do what I can in support of that mission. I urge my colleagues to join me in doing the same.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. LILLIE RUTH GANTT-EVANS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and service of a dedicated community activist, engaged citizen, and dear friend of longstanding Mrs. Lillie Ruth Gantt-Evans. She will be honored by South Macon Arts Revitalization Technology (SMART), Inc. at the International Cherry Blossom Gospel Extravaganza in Macon, Georgia on Friday, March 23, 2018.

Lillie is a native of Macon, Georgia and a product of the Bibb County School System. After graduating from high school, she went

on to attend Crandall Business College, complete nursing training at Hemlock School of Nursing and Spirometry training through Marshfield Clinic at St. Joseph's Hospital. She also studied Early Childhood Education at Fort Valley State University.

Once she received her nursing degree, she began working as a nurse at Macon Hospital (now The Medical Center). Lillie was one of the first African-American nurses to work in the intensive care unit. After five years at Macon Hospital, she transferred to Robins Air Force Base Hospital where she worked as a nurse for twenty-five years. Beyond her duties and responsibilities as a nurse, she has also dedicated her personal life to helping people from all walks of life in her community. In 1968, during her tenure at Robins Air Force Base Hospital, Lillie opened Gantt's Preschool and G and J Adult Day Care. Once she retired from Robins Air Force Base Hospital in 1986, she opened M.A. Evans School to help students whose birthday delayed their enrollment in school. She kept the school running for 52 years without requiring government funding. She renamed G and J Adult Day Care to L and J Adult Day Care to pay tribute to her late mother, who helped to run her businesses while she worked as a nurse.

Throughout her career, Lillie has been recognized for her commitment and leadership in the community. These acknowledgements include the J. C. Penny Golden Rule Award; the Department of the Air Force Service Award; the Legendary Educator Award; the Humanitarian of the Year Award; an Honorary Doctorate from the City of Macon in 2002; and appointments as Lieutenant Colonel, Aide-De-Camp, and to the Governor's Staff by then Governor Jimmy Carter in 1991.

In conjunction with her professional accomplishments, Lillie became the first African-American to be appointed as President of the Democratic Women's Party and the first African-American woman to serve as Chair of the Democratic Party of Macon-Bibb County.

Lillie's distinguished achievements have been mirrored by her extensive involvement in civil rights. After witnessing several racial injustices against African-Americans, Lillie decided to get involved in the Civil Rights Movement. She marched locally and throughout Georgia alongside Hosea Williams, William P. Randall, and Tyrone Brooks to advocate for civil rights and equal treatment of African Americans.

Lillie's faith has always instilled within her a desire to positively shape the community in which she lives. As a member of New Pleasant Grove Missionary Baptist Church, she regularly incorporates her faith into her commitment to public service by serving as an active participant in the Gospel Choir, the Nurse's Guild, and the Trustee's Ministry.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get, you make your life by what you give." We are so grateful that Lillie has dedicated her time and talents to improve the quality of life for others. A woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise are unparalleled. Middle Georgia shines a little brighter because of Lillie Gantt-Evans.

Lillie has accomplished much throughout her life, but none of this would have been pos-

sible without the love and support of her husband, Benjamin; her children, Merita, Chandra, Gregory, and Jimmy (deceased); her grandchildren; and the countless others positively who impacted her life over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my wife Vivian and me, along with the more than 730,000 constituents of the Second Congressional District, in extending our sincerest congratulations and appreciation to Mrs. Lillie Ruth Gantt-Evans for her dedicated service to the people of Middle Georgia.

HONORING CORA COLE-MCFADDEN

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of a devoted public servant, community leader, and friend, Cora Cole-McFadden, who has recently concluded her service on The Durham City Council and as the city's Mayor Pro Tempore.

A native of Durham, North Carolina, Cora developed her organizational skills and showed a keen sense of justice as early as her teenage years. She and three other classmates desegregated Hillside High School, a defining event that began her lifelong commitment to fighting for equal rights for all members of the Durham community.

Cora's career is marked by many "firsts." She served as the first African American woman to lead a department in the City of Durham and the first African American woman to be named the city's Mayor Pro Tempore. She was also the first recipient of the City of Durham's Diversity Change Agent Award, which is now named in her honor.

In her seventeen years in the Durham City Council and as Mayor Pro Tempore, Cora was a tenacious advocate for safe and affordable housing, accessible healthcare, and empowering youth in the Durham community. She championed the City of Durham Youth Commission's representation at the first-ever Youth Summit sponsored by the North Carolina League of Cities. She helped spur the creation of a local teen center, and constantly sought ways to serve disadvantaged youth.

Cora has served in various leadership positions in the Durham community, including the NAACP, the Housing Appeals Board, the Homeless Services Advisory Committee, the Joint City-County Planning Committee, and the Mayor's Committee for Persons with Disabilities. She has also served on the board of the National League of Cities and has been active in the North Carolina League of Municipalities. Although she is retiring from public office, no one doubts that Cora will find ways to express her love of the people of the Bull City and continue to serve.

I am personally indebted to Cora Cole-McFadden for years of good advice and loyal support—from the time I first learned my district was being redrawn to include Durham right up to the present. She is quick with a smile and a word of encouragement, even in difficult times. Her energy and optimism are infectious—you know you can do the job and you certainly don't want to let her down.

Lisa and I, along with constituents in the Fourth District and colleagues in the North Carolina congressional delegation, want to thank Cora Cole-McFadden for her generous and inclusive spirit and her dedicated service. We wish her and her family the very best as she begins the next chapter of her life.

TRIBUTE TO JESS AND CHASE
WELLER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jess and Chase Weller, of Weller Farms. They were recently awarded the Iowa Farm Environmental Leader Award by the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship, Iowa Department of Natural Resources, and the Iowa Governor's office.

They were nominated for this award because of their implementation of soil health and conservation practices on their farming operation. They have recognized improved water quality and soil sustainability is important for not only their business but also for the farmers working and living near them and the citizens of Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Jess and Chase Weller for this award, and for working hard to make sure Iowa is a quality place to farm and live for many years to come. I am proud to represent them in the United States Congress and ask that my colleagues

in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating the Wellers and wishing them nothing but continued success.

HONORING THOMAS (TOM)
PETERS, PH.D.

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 2018

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Thomas (Tom) Peters, Ph.D., for his twenty years of stellar leadership and exemplary public service as President and CEO of the Marin Community Foundation.

A native of San Francisco, Dr. Peters finished his undergraduate degree at San Francisco State University, before going to the University of Minnesota, where he completed a Doctorate in Psychology and Health Science. He began his public health career in 1974 at the San Francisco Department of Public Health, and would go on to achieve repeated success and advancement over the course of 24 years, finishing that chapter of his professional life as the Director of Marin County's Department of Health and Human Services.

In 1998, Dr. Peters became the President and CEO of the Marin Community Foundation (MCF). Combining his clinical and philanthropic careers to head one of the largest community foundations in the country, Dr. Peters has become a leading national voice for community philanthropy, advocating for and facilitating the dedication of private resources for the public good. MCF has distrib-

uted more than \$1.3 billion in grants to non-profits working in critical community issues, ranging from education, healthcare, and the environment, to economic opportunity and access to the arts.

Under his leadership, Marin Community Foundation became the first community foundation to approve a non-discrimination policy for its donor advised funds. He set the example for others to say NO to organizations, projects, and programs that discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, medical condition, veteran status, marital status, disability, ancestry, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic protected by law.

A respected community leader and champion for equity, he frequently offers the community a moral compass for taking action on important matters, like breaking down barriers to academic achievement and raising the bar for underserved communities, working to protect public lands and the environment, securing affordable housing where supply has been historically elusive, and fighting for comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Peters has been a champion of champions on a wide array of critical issues, and has led the Marin Community Foundation to take actions that have produced positive impacts throughout the region. Therefore, please join me in expressing my deep appreciation and praise for his indomitable leadership on the occasion of his 20th anniversary as President and CEO of the Marin Community Foundation.

SENATE—Monday, March 19, 2018

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Most high God, You are the great King of the Earth. Nations must submit to Your sovereignty, for You hold the hearts of national and global leaders in Your hands.

May our lawmakers remember that You can show them a way out of any difficulty, empowering them to not give up. Remind them that the tests they face are similar to what other generations have experienced and that You will enable them to prevail as You have done in the past.

Lord, thank You for Your faithfulness, mercy, and love.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, H.R. 1865, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

SENATE AGENDA

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this is the start of another busy week in the Senate. We have a lot to accomplish for the American people.

This week, we will take up an omnibus that builds on the bipartisan funding agreement we reached back in February. It will provide our Armed Forces with the stable funding they need to meet emerging challenges.

Among other important matters, it will also strengthen our fight against the scourge of opioid addiction—an issue the President has already declared a public health emergency and is continuing to address today up in New Hampshire.

We have several concrete opportunities to make America safer and more secure. First, we will vote on the confirmation of Kevin McAleenan, the President's nominee for Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Mr. McAleenan is a 16-year veteran of the CBP. He served under administrations of both parties. His nomination carries the unflinching support of a bipartisan group of leaders and was thoroughly vetted in committee. Ensuring our national security means steady control over what and who comes across our borders. I would urge everyone to join me in voting to confirm him later today.

Later this week, the Senate will turn to another important matter relating to America's safety and security. We will take up legislation to combat the evil of sex trafficking. Keeping children safe from exploitation has been a key focus for several of us going back some years. In 1984, I advocated the passage of the Missing Children's Assistance Act. In the 1990s, I was proud to introduce measures that mandated centralized reporting for missing children's cases and created a national database and screening system to identify abusers. In 2003, I joined a number of colleagues as founding members of the Senate Caucus on Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children. As recently as 2015, the Senate passed the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This week, it is time to build on those achievements and take another step.

It is time to confront the reality that trafficking has largely moved from the street corner to the smartphone. From 2010 to 2015, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children saw reports of suspected child sex trafficking increase more than eightfold. Last year alone, more than 8,500 cases were reported to the National Human Trafficking Hotline. Part of the problem is a 1996 communications law that is

being misused to protect websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking. The legislation before the Senate will reform that law and ensure these institutions can be held accountable for facilitating these heinous crimes. Senator PORTMAN has worked long and hard on this subject. He has helped assemble a broad, bipartisan coalition.

I would urge everyone to join me in voting to advance this legislation later this afternoon.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, now, on one final matter, the good news about tax reform keeps piling up. Here is one important headline from just a few days ago. "U.S. consumer confidence hits 14-year high." That is right; tax reform is contributing to a dynamic, growing economy, and Americans are taking notice. In fact, according to the Wall Street Journal, "Optimism improved markedly for households in the bottom third of income distribution." Remember that the next time my friends across the aisle claim tax reform is only helping the big guys. It is just a political talking point.

In the real world, businesses large and small are thriving. In my home State of Kentucky, Goodwood Brewing Company has crunched the numbers and expects a tax reform savings of \$30,000. They are planning to use it to purchase new equipment and hire new employees. According to the CEO, Ted Mitzlaff, tax reform is offering "a significant benefit—hardly crumbs."

Last Wednesday, President Trump visited a Boeing manufacturing facility in St. Louis to hear how tax reform is helping those Americans. For Boeing's workers, tax reform means a new \$300 million investment in workforce development, training, philanthropy, and workplace improvements, but the President didn't just hear from the hometown crowd.

Bonnie Brazzeal works in the cafeteria at the College of the Ozarks—that is in Southwest Missouri, more than 250 miles away from St. Louis. Bonnie made the trip to tell President Trump: "I work in the cafeteria at [the] College of the Ozarks alongside the hard-working students and I am grateful for the bonus. . . . I put mine in savings for my retirement." Renee Crooker, also at the College of the Ozarks, said: "This bonus could not have come at a better time." Her daughter was gravely ill but out of the country. Renee's tax reform bonus enabled her to fly to her daughter's bedside. Brandon Pister is a supervisor at Mid-Am Metal Forming. He received a tax bonus too. It helped him afford the deductible when his 2-year-old son needed surgery.

These Americans' tax reform stories are amazing and so is the fact that only one Senator from Missouri voted to help all this good news happen. Their senior Senator joined Democrats in a party-line vote to block tax reform and keep Washington's foot on the brake of our economy. When Democratic leaders called these historic middle-class tax cuts crumbs, the senior Senator from Missouri followed suit and called them scraps.

I am proud that Republicans, including Missouri's junior Senator, looked past this partisan rhetoric and stood up for the middle-class families who deserve to keep more of their own money. Because we did, Bonnie, Renee, Brandon, and millions more hard-working Americans are already reaping the benefits.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIX NICS BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that Senator CORY BOOKER, our colleague from New Jersey, is the 73rd cosponsor of the Fix NICS bill, which I have introduced and which I hope will be passed out of the Senate soon. This bill is designed to fix the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, which, if it had been working the way it was designed to, would have caught the shooter at Sutherland Springs, perhaps saving the lives of 26 people who lost their lives in that little Baptist church outside of San Antonio; 20 more were shot and will suffer those wounds the rest of their lives.

Today the news brought us the fact that apparently there had been a recommendation by mental health professionals that Nikolas Cruz, the shooter in Parkland, FL, be committed for involuntary treatment, but apparently that never materialized. That was the recommendation, but it never actually happened. If that had happened, under the current law, his name would have been included in the Florida upload of background check information, and that would have prevented him from legally buying a firearm.

So we are starting to see the different data points that begin to paint a picture of the sorts of things that we could do here in Washington, DC, to save lives in these future mass shooting events. We know the President has said to the Department of Justice that he wants bump stocks banned. Of course, that was the instrument used to kill dozens of people in Las Vegas and injure 851 more.

So by addressing things like the background check system, improving

the mental health response, eliminating the bump stock—which takes a semiautomatic weapon and makes it operate essentially like an automatic weapon—and by providing assistance to our schools so that they can harden themselves against potential attacks, we can begin to see a picture of the sorts of things we ought to be doing to prevent future mass shootings like the one we saw most recently in Parkland, FL. It is simply our responsibility to make sure we do everything we humanly can.

I know that after these horrific events, people throw up their hands and say: We need to do something. Well, we need to do something that matters and that will save lives in the future. I think we now begin to have a picture of the sorts of things we can do, starting with the passage of the Fix NICS background check system. It is the only piece of legislation I know of that now has 73 cosponsors, with Senator BOOKER of New Jersey being added as the 73rd today. It is the only bill I know of that has that kind of broad, widespread support and that will actually, if implemented, save lives.

Mr. President, this week we will be discussing another important subject—one that perhaps people do not want to hear about; rather, they would prefer that it not exist at all because it is a manifestation of evil. The subject is online sex trafficking. Unfortunately, it happens in the shadows of our society. Today, the internet and other forms of technology have made certain forms of predatory, perverted behavior easier to engage in without getting caught.

The legislation we are voting on this week aims to protect our children, provide justice to victims of human trafficking, and to make sure Federal laws do not protect profiteering web domains where sex trafficking occurs.

The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA, would allow sex trafficking victims to have their day in court by eliminating Federal liability protections for technology providers that knowingly—knowingly—facilitate online sex trafficking. It would allow State and local law enforcement to investigate and prosecute providers that violate Federal sex trafficking laws.

I am proud to be one of the original cosponsors of this legislation and to have been working on it with my colleagues to get it to this point today. The bill was introduced last summer after a 2-year inquiry by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which culminated in a report. The report found not only that sex trafficking has run rampant in certain online spaces but also that websites have tried to cover it up. Well, no longer. Last fall, the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously approved SESTA, and the House passed it last month. This week, it is our turn.

Senator PORTMAN, the junior Senator from Ohio, has been this bill's greatest champion since its inception. He has been informing us time and again of the ways in which sex trafficking has moved—as he likes to say it—from the street corner to the smartphone. He spoke on the floor earlier this year and reminded us that even as technology develops and gives us new opportunities to learn, to innovate, and to connect with one another, it is not an unalloyed good. In the wrong hands, by the wrong people, it can be misused. As Senator PORTMAN urged us, we need to shine a light onto the “dark side of the internet,” an area he called a “stain on our national character.” He is absolutely right, of course. The buying and selling of young people for sex is a moral scourge, and how we respond is a measure of our national conscience.

In the committee's investigation, one website in particular came up over and over and over again; that is, backpage.com, which is responsible for perhaps three-quarters of all child trafficking reports—three-quarters. It eventually became clear that even though that site was actively helping to sell young women for sex and even though the victims and their families were suing backpage.com in response, none of the lawsuits were successful because of what some people are coming to believe is an outdated immunity for technology providers under a Federal law known as the Communications Decency Act. Courts have repeatedly emphasized that the broad reach of one section of that statute protects websites that help to buy and sell underage girls for sex. Judges across the country have said it is up to Congress to change the law, and now it is our time to do just that.

The original law was intended to protect free speech, which, of course, is important. I, of course, like all of our colleagues, am a firm believer in the First Amendment, but free speech is no license to engage in illegal activity. Free speech can't be used as an excuse to offer young people into sexual servitude. And the internet cannot be a safe place for terrorists and child sex traffickers.

At last count, 67 Senators have joined this effort as cosponsors. We are joined by anti-human trafficking advocates, law enforcement organizations, State attorneys general, the civil rights community, faith-based groups, and tech companies like Facebook and Oracle. We have all made clear that we stand behind SESTA.

I hope our colleagues will join me in voting for this important legislation this week and ensure that websites and online platforms can be held accountable for facilitating sex trafficking.

YEMEN RESOLUTION

On another matter, Mr. President, this week, the Senate may vote on a privileged resolution offered by three

of our colleagues—the junior Senators from Utah, Vermont, and Connecticut—which would direct the President to cut off financial support and other support for the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen. This, of course, is a proxy war, in many ways, between Iran, which has intervened in the civil war in Yemen, and—not only to allow the Saudis the means to defend themselves against incursions and attacks by the Houthis, Iranian-backed rebels, but also to facilitate our relationship with the Saudis and the Emirates, which is very important in terms of our anti-ISIS and anti-al-Qaida effort, with cells of these organizations located in Yemen too.

Our support, of course, is already narrowly circumscribed—our support for the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen. General Mattis, our Secretary of Defense, has described this as our alternative to putting American boots on the ground. We operate by, with, and through our allies by providing logistical support, intelligence, and some technical advice. Currently, in Yemen it takes the forms intelligence-sharing, military advice, and logistical support, such as air-to-air refueling. This is very clearly noncombatant support, at least as traditionally defined and historically known, and it is meant to improve processes and procedures and increase compliance with the international law of armed conflict.

The very support we are providing aids in mitigating civilian casualties and the deteriorating humanitarian crisis brought on by the Iranian-backed Houthis. I know the Presiding Officer has been leading the charge on addressing the humanitarian crisis there, which is mind-boggling, to be sure.

Contrary to the resolution's sponsors' claims, though, the U.S. military is not engaged in hostilities in Yemen, as that term has historically been understood and applied, since it is not in direct conflict or exchanging fire with Houthi forces. Of course, we all share a concern with what is at stake in Yemen and in Saudi Arabia and in the gulf region but also civilian casualties, which this resolution creates problems with. Almost everyone is aware that Yemen has been suffering from a severe humanitarian crisis for years. Were we to remove U.S. targeting and logistical support from the Saudi coalition, then the humanitarian situation could get even worse than it has been.

Both political parties recognize the important role the United States plays in support of our partners' efforts to push back against the malign forces that have been coalescing in Yemen. In fact, President Obama was the one who first implemented the refueling and logistical support policy that remains in effect today.

In 2016, Senator MENENDEZ—now the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—criticized the

international community's failure to address the Iranian-fueled conflicts that included support to a Houthi insurgency that helped topple the internationally recognized Government of Yemen. Senator MENENDEZ went on to say: "I have a sense we are creating a permissive environment."

I agree with Senator MENENDEZ that we should not abandon our partners and leave a "permissive environment"—a vacuum, a void—for bad actors to fill.

If there is one lesson that I thought we learned after 9/11, when 3,000 Americans were killed when two planes were hijacked—actually, four were hijacked; two went into the World Trade Center, one into the Pentagon, and one landed in Pennsylvania because passengers on the plane overwhelmed the hijackers—what we learned is that what happens in the Middle East does not stay in the Middle East. What happened in Afghanistan is that the Taliban provided a safe haven for Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida, and they used that safe haven to train and export their terrorist attacks against countries around the world but primarily against the United States. That is what happened on 9/11/2001.

That is why we can't allow a safe haven, a void, in Yemen, not to mention the fact that Iran continues to use proxies in places like Lebanon, Syria, and Yemen, among others, to try to fight the United States in a low-grade war that has been going on literally since 1979. I should mention Iraq as one of those countries as well.

It is precisely because of the delicate and desperate situation in Yemen that I am making the argument that any consideration to withdraw U.S. troops from fulfilling their limited auxiliary role in this conflict would have broad impacts on our global partnerships and counterterrorism efforts. It is not a decision to be made in haste or a decision to be made lightly; therefore, I believe the idea deserves the careful consideration of the committee of jurisdiction, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. If the Senate takes this vote without adequate preparation and deliberation and passes this resolution, we lose that chance for careful consideration. We lose the chance to have the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issue a thoroughly researched and deliberated recommendation to the entire Senate.

Even more troubling is the prospect that this resolution could set a precedent—one in which a few Members' preferred policies are prioritized over the normal Senate procedures and more thoughtful committee deliberation, with unintended global impacts. Yemen is not the only place where we are addressing challenges to peace and to our country by, with, and through allies, without Americans engaging in direct hostilities. So this would have unintended global impact.

Secretary of Defense James Mattis has voiced his concerns over this resolution. In a letter to congressional leadership, he said that new restrictions on the U.S. military could increase civilian casualties and jeopardize our partners' cooperation on counterterrorism efforts. On top of that list would be the Saudis and the Emirates, among others, and other people are watching as well. And it will reduce our influence in the key region.

He warned that a withdrawal of our noncombat support in Yemen could embolden rebels in the area, enable further missile strikes on Saudi Arabia, and threaten shipping lanes in the Red Sea—one of the key chokepoints for international commerce—right there on the western border of Yemen. All this combined could stoke the embers of an even greater regional conflict in the Middle East with unknown consequences. More importantly, it would damage U.S. credibility and strengthen Iran's position in Yemen and throughout the Middle East more broadly.

I hope our colleagues will think soberly and thoughtfully about this resolution and insist that a fulsome debate take place where it belongs, initially, and that is within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I have talked to Senator CORKER, the chairman of that committee. He will speak for himself, but I think he certainly believes that the committee can help the Senate make a good decision after giving the committee an opportunity to have hearings and to consider all the intended and unintended consequences of this resolution.

I know our colleagues who have offered the resolution mean well and their intentions are good, but sometimes—particularly in the area of international conflict and global interactions with different countries—our actions beget an unintended consequence. I think it is good to be safe in the first place and to take this matter through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where I have every confidence that Senator CORKER, as the chairman, and Ranking Member MENENDEZ can guide the members of that committee through a process that will help us in the end to make a better decision.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, it has been 32 days since the tragedy in Parkland. I think Senator NELSON may

be coming to the floor very soon. Frankly, every day since then, there has been a series of tragedies all across this country. On average, 90 people lose their lives every single day to gun violence. There has been, over the course of the last year, a mass shooting, on average, every single day. Most of them aren't covered in the newspaper, but there is an incident in which four or more people are shot, on average, more than once per day in this country.

Of course, it has now been more than 5 years since the devastating tragedy in my State, where 20 first graders lost their lives. This is deeply personal to all of us here in this Chamber.

It became very personal to me last week when my 6-year old came home from school to tell me about his active shooter drill. He is 6, and he is in kindergarten. In his kindergarten class, they have a small bathroom that all of the kids in the class use. He explained to me that for their active shooter drill, all 25 kids in his classroom—a whole bunch of 5- and 6-year-olds—were shoved inside this tiny, little bathroom together, crunched together, shoulder to shoulder, with the door locked. Imagine how frightening that would be to a 6-year-old child, even if they didn't completely understand why they were there.

He said to me when he got home that night: Daddy, I didn't like it. In the most powerful, most affluent country in the world, our children should not have to go through that; never mind those who have actually had to face down someone with a gun inside their classroom or inside their school.

What is devastating to the parents in Parkland and Sandy Hook, what is devastating to the parents in Baltimore, in New Haven, and in Chicago is that we refuse to have a debate on the Senate floor about how we can help address this epic mass slaughter, this gun violence epidemic in this country.

I have been taking pains over the course of the last 6 months to try to reach out across the aisle and find common ground with my colleagues on some commonsense legislation about changes to our gun laws. I am proud to have worked with Senator CORNYN on a small bill that would encourage States to comply with existing law—the Fix NICS Act. It now has over 60 Republican and Democratic cosponsors, enough that it could overcome a cloture motion.

I have come to the floor today to ask that we come to an agreement—Republicans and Democrats—by which we can have an open debate on the issue of gun violence for the American public before we break for a 2-week Easter recess. We are going to go back to our States and have a wonderful time with our friends and families, while many others continue to grieve all across this country and many others will

enter the ranks of those who grieve because, during the 14 days that we will be away, thousands of people will die from gunshot wounds. I just can't imagine that we would make a decision to go home at the end of this week without having had a debate on the Senate floor for the American people to see how we can try to respond to this cry, this call from the American public to do something.

These kids have been amazing. Literally hundreds of thousands of children walked out of school last week, and hundreds of thousands more students and their parents will be here in Washington for marches and at 600 other marches all around the country this weekend.

The polls tell us over and over again that 9 out of 10 Americans want us to take bold steps forward. Record numbers of American citizens believe the laws that exist today are not sufficient. This isn't a controversial issue outside of Washington. It is controversial only here, inside this Chamber. If we remain silent, if we refuse to have a debate on the Senate floor, we are failing the people who sent us here.

I have come to the floor today to propose a very reasonable path forward so that we can have a debate and some up-or-down votes on proposals this week. From what I understand, there is still a lot of discussion happening with respect to the budget. Obviously, we have to get that done by the end of the week, but it is not ready yet, so we have time this week to have a short but meaningful debate on the issue of guns.

Here is what I am proposing. I am proposing that we have a unanimous consent agreement whereby we can have a time-limited debate—I would suggest perhaps not more than 6 hours—and at the end of that period of time, we have six votes, three votes propounded by the Democratic side and three votes on measures propounded by the Republican side.

I think it is no secret the amendments that Senate Democrats would offer. We would want to see a vote on universal commercial background checks to make sure that commercial sales of guns are subject to background checks. That is something President Trump said he was for at the White House, and he has encouraged the Congress to work on it. Let's have an up-or-down vote on background checks.

I think Democrats would clearly want to see the bipartisan compromise, which has been worked out by Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator GRAHAM with respect to protective orders, red flag orders, come before the Chamber. It simply makes sense that we do what Florida is doing: Pass a law that allows for law enforcement, after a viable court process, to take away weapons temporarily from someone who poses a threat. The problem in Florida was,

even if they had done something about this young man, they didn't have the legal ability to take his weapons away, even if he had made those kinds of threats in public. Florida is correcting that with their new law. We should do the same at the Federal level.

On our side, there is also interest in talking about the kinds of weapons that are legal and the kinds of weapons that are not. I am a believer, of course, that there is a class of military-style tactical semiautomatic weapons that are best if they are not in the hands of civilians. Obviously, that issue divides our side too. So if that were to come up for a vote, there will be Democrats for it and Democrats against it.

On the other two measures, there will be Republicans for them and Republicans against them. Some Republicans are for universal background checks; some aren't. There are many Republicans on record as being for protective orders, and there are others who will not vote for them.

We will have no idea, the American public will have no idea, and our constituents will have no idea what we are really willing to do and what we are not willing to do unless we have a debate. This is our last chance before we go home.

What I am proposing, I think, is reasonable, practical, and viable. We can get it done—six total amendments to the Fix NICS Act, time limited, perhaps only 6 hours. We could be in and out of that debate in a day. I have talked with my leadership about it. I am confident that Democratic leadership would support that path forward, and I propose it to Republican leadership tonight, as we enter this week, as a means of having this debate that the American public so badly needs. The alternative is unthinkable—going home, letting over a month pass since Parkland, since this outcry for action from kids across America, and not even attempting to get something done here.

I understand this issue is still difficult. I don't understand why my Republican colleagues will not support something like background checks, an issue supported by 97 percent of Americans. It is pretty hard to find anything in America that is supported by 97 percent of Americans. Apple pie and Grandma probably don't get 97 percent approval ratings in this country, but universal background checks do. So, yes, I am frustrated that my Republican colleagues don't just come to the floor and agree to pass something that has mind-blowing universal support in the public, but what is more offensive is that we don't even try.

What is more offensive to me is that we don't even make an attempt to put these measures on the floor of the Senate and let them be voted up or down. I don't want the gun lobby to have veto power over the legislation that gets

passed here, but even worse than that is for the gun lobby to have veto power over what we even debate.

I propose a total of six amendments and a total of 6 hours of debate. I would argue that is insufficient to meet the moment, but I get it that time is running out, that there is not a lot of interest from some Members on the Republican side to enter into this debate. So we are very willing to have a short, time-limited debate to see what we can get consensus on and what we can't get consensus on, and whatever moves out of this building, whatever amendments get passed, then we live with it and live to fight another day.

It has been 5 years since the tragedy in my State and now 32 days since Parkland. I don't think we should wait one day longer before we have an open debate on the Senate floor about how we, as those entrusted with the safety of our children, do something about the epidemic of gun violence in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND
CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I rise today to reflect on the landmark legislation that this body passed with overwhelming bipartisan support last week. It isn't every day that folks in Congress can work together in a bipartisan way to get something done that will benefit Main Streets across rural America, but that is exactly what we did last week. I am very proud of that effort.

I say a big thank-you to the chairman of the Banking Committee, Chairman CRAPO, for the work he has done, his ability to listen, his commonsense perspective, and his patience. It would not have happened without those qualities that Chairman CRAPO exhibited.

I also want to single out three Senators who worked very hard on this bill. There are a number of others who did, too, but I am just going to mention Senators HEITKAMP, DONNELLY, and WARNER. Those folks did yeoman's work in bringing into view the challenges that our banking industry has out there, coming up with solutions for those challenges, and coming up with consumer protections to put into this bill to move it forward. There were many others. I think there were 17 or 18 cosponsors on the Democratic side of the aisle, but I say a special thank you to Senators HEITKAMP, DONNELLY, and WARNER for their advocacy, input, knowledge, expertise, and their ability to work to get things done.

People ask me: Senator TESTER, why did you write this bill? Well, I was a part of the folks who wrote this bill for good reason. I remember very well that during the financial crisis, then-Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson came in—it was in 2008, I believe—and

said that we were on the cusp of a financial meltdown in this country. I remember some of the free and irresponsible activities that were done in the financial system. I remember bringing regulators in front of the Banking Committee and ripping them up one side and down the other as to why we had gotten into this situation. In the end, we came up with a bill called Dodd-Frank.

Dodd-Frank was put together after a lot of public input and a lot of hearings, and it was put into effect really to regulate the folks who got us into the situation we were in. At that moment in time, we had banks that were too big to fail, folks who were doing no-doc or low-doc loans, and foreclosures happening everywhere. We put in the regulation.

One of the things we heard when we put in the Dodd-Frank regulation was that it was a big bill and that it was going to need to be changed, adapted—however you want to put it—moving forward. I believe that bill was passed in 2009. Here we are 8 or 9 years later, and we look at Dodd-Frank and see that in some cases, it has done exactly as was intended, especially for the larger banks. Some could argue that there is more work to be done there.

One of the negative things that resulted from the Dodd-Frank regulation was that some of that regulation bled down onto our local community banks and credit unions. This is particularly concerning to me because I come from a very rural part of this country. It is a small town where, when my grandfather homesteaded, they had all sorts of options when they marketed their grain. In the 1940s and 1950s, when my folks took over in my small town, I believe there were five grain elevators there. When Sharla and I took over in the late 1970s, there were three. Today, there is one.

You ask, why does that have anything to do with the banking industry, Jon? Well, it is consolidation. And the consolidation didn't happen overnight; it took decades. You end up with less competition in the marketplace when it comes to selling your grains.

That same thing could be adapted to what has gone on in our community banks over the last 8 or 9 years, where they have been bought up by bigger banks. The bigger banks will tell you that they have to get bigger to be able to compete with the regulations put on them. So they were bought up, and the same thing will extrapolate out over time.

Those folks who say: Well, this isn't necessary because banks are making a lot of money—look, banks may be operating today, but they are looking into the future, as any good business does, and they are saying to themselves: Do I really have what it takes to stick around? They can see the writing on the wall, and they are selling out be-

cause of it. There are no ifs, ands, or buts about this—this will result in less consumer choice and more consolidation, making the bigger banks even bigger and really helping the folks who caused the crisis back in 2008—ultimately, the biggest of the big banks.

We have seen the consolidation at grocery stores, grain elevators, and even bars. The truth is that it isn't all due to one single thing. The consolidation in the financial industry and on the ground isn't due to just regulations. Technology has its impact, and a moving population also has its impact.

As I looked at this 5 years ago, I said: If we don't do something to tweak Dodd-Frank, we are going to end up in a situation where we don't have consumer choice to buy that house or expand that business or start that new business—what entrepreneurs do. So as a policymaker, I thought it was my job to look ahead to the next generation of people who are going to be out there in rural America, whether it is a Main Street small business or a farm or a family who is working for a business. That is why I helped write this bill, because from a rural America perspective, it was the right thing to do, and it was time to do something for the next generation, for our kids and our grandkids, so that they could have the kind of opportunity that, quite frankly, my folks and my grandparents had given to my generation.

I am not the kind of person who will sit back on the sidelines and complain about stuff over a cup of coffee. When we see a problem, my folks taught me to work and try to fix it. I see a problem, and there is little doubt in my mind that if we had not done what we did last week to give some regulatory relief to community banks and credit unions, things would have continued to get worse in rural America. They still may get worse in rural America, but at least we have done what we needed to do in this body to try to change that.

There are some out there who, for whatever reason—and I haven't quite been able to figure it out yet—are spreading misinformation about this bill. Maybe it is just the day we live in. So let me set the record straight about this bill.

This bill does not help the Wall Street banks. It does not. Those who say it does are not correct. This bill does not set us up for another financial crisis. In fact, the authors of the original Dodd-Frank bill, Chris Dodd and Barney Frank—both smart guys whom I admire—wrote:

As the authors of the original Dodd-Frank reform law, we want all Montanans to know that the banking bill Senator Tester helped write does not dismantle Dodd-Frank as some people claim. Jon knows Montana and challenges facing rural America. While we did not agree with every part of this bill, it helps local credit unions and community banks across Montana while keeping protections in place that are designed to prevent another financial crisis.

Those are the original authors. That is why it is called Dodd-Frank—because it is from Chris Dodd and Representative Barney Frank.

The other thing the bill does not do is it does not leave banks unregulated. There is implication by some out there that this bill deregulates 25 of the 40 largest banks. To me, that implication is that now they are no longer regulated. The fact is, all the banks are highly regulated for safety and soundness. Quite frankly, this does not leave banks unregulated. They still have plenty of regulation to go through.

In conclusion, the bill we passed last week does several things. I believe it is going to increase access to capital, particularly in rural America. I think it makes the regulation fit the risk, while still continuing to crack down on risky behavior. It has great consumer protection components to it. Last and certainly not least, from my perspective, it is good for rural America.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

EB-5 REGIONAL CENTER PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I rise today to bring to my colleagues' attention an issue that is important to millions of individuals who understand that American citizenship is something that ought to be treasured.

The American people understand that our citizenship is a blessing and shouldn't be given away cheaply. Unfortunately, for too many years, this body has witnessed the perversion and degradation of a program that sells—yes, we sell citizenship to some people.

This program originally had a good purpose. In return for investing money in underserved areas and creating good-paying American jobs, immigrant entrepreneurs could eventually become U.S. citizens. Sadly, in the last decade, this program has been hijacked by big-moneyed New York City real estate interests—to be specific, the Real Estate Roundtable. These developers now take almost all the foreign investment from this program, and for the last few years, they have actively prevented this body from enacting any reforms and needed reforms.

For those who are not aware, I am talking about the EB-5 Regional Center Program. I have been fighting in a bipartisan way for years to reform this corrupt and scandal-clad program. I have been fighting to protect our national security, to ensure foreign investment is going to the most deserving areas, and to make sure that American citizenship isn't sold at rock-bottom prices in order to feed the addiction of New York interests to cheap money. But no matter how hard I fought, each and every time we tried to reform this program, these same moneyed interests have used their political influence and political connections to block any meaningful reforms.

This is sickening and is exactly why most American people sometimes question what we do here in Washington, DC.

After more than 3 years of trying to fix this broken and scandal-plagued program, I have finally come to the conclusion that it can't be fixed, and since it can't be fixed, the EB-5 Regional Center Program needs to be terminated. Let me explain to my colleagues and directly to the American people exactly how I have reached that conclusion.

Several years ago, I started working with then-Ranking Member LEAHY of the Judiciary Committee on reforms to the EB-5 Regional Center Program. Through the hard work and dedication of our staffers, we discovered the program is riddled with fraud and corruption and poses a real and serious threat to our national security. I will explain some of those things we discovered.

First, investments can be spent before business plans are approved.

Next, regional center operators can charge excessive fees of foreign nationals in addition to their required investments.

Next, none of the jobs created have to be direct or verifiable jobs but rather are indirect and based on estimates of economic modeling; again, not knowing for sure if jobs are created.

Next, investment funds from foreign sources are not adequately vetted. Gifts and loans from anyone are acceptable sources of funds from foreign nationals.

Next, there is no prohibition against foreign governments owning or operating these regional centers or projects. So let me emphasize—that is right—foreign governments can own businesses that sell our citizenship. Now, think about that.

Another problem is regional centers don't have to certify that they comply with security laws.

Next, there are no required background checks on anyone associated with the regional centers.

Just take this example: One need look no further than the indictment last September of two Chinese fraudsters who stole more than \$50 million in foreign investment and managed to sell U.S. citizenship to individuals on the Chinese Government's most wanted list.

Next, gerrymandering continues in rural and urban distressed areas and, as a result, lose out.

There is no transparency on how funds are spent and who is paid and what investors are told about the projects they invest in.

The list can still go on and on and on, but I have given my colleagues just some examples. I could literally speak for hours about the corruption of the program.

Faced with this appalling list of fraud, corruption, and national secu-

rity loopholes, for 3 years, I have been working with Senator LEAHY and our counterparts in the House of Representatives to produce real EB-5 reform. Our staffers have spent countless hours, nights, and weekends meeting with congressional colleagues and industry stakeholders to hammer out a compromise that is fair to all sides, but our offers have constantly been rejected by the Big Money industries, and related real estate roundtables, every single time—not just this time. We reached a compromise with the vast differences of views to start out but still ended up with a compromise. Somehow, these powerful interests are able step in and stop it. This time has been no different than at least three previous times we have gotten this far.

Let me explain how we have been doing this. For the last year, my staff, along with Chairman GOODLATTE of the House Judiciary Committee, Senator CORNYN, and Senator FLAKE—these teams have worked around the clock to produce an EB-5 reform package. Everyone made numerous concessions in order to reach a compromise. After more than 20 meetings, and of course countless hours of drafting, we produced a reform package that was fair to all sides. Our reforms would reauthorize the Regional Center Program for 6 years, providing the certainty that industry has long said it craves.

Our compromise would have permanently set aside 3,000 visas for rural and underserved urban areas and would have increased the minimum investment amount to \$925,000. In recognition of longstanding industry concerns, we agreed to reduce the investment differential between nonpriority areas and priority areas to a mere \$100,000.

Finally, we would have implemented a host of badly needed integrity measures that would have cracked down on investment fraud, cracked down on foreign corruption, and cracked down on bad business practices.

Our reforms had the unanimous support of Invest in the USA, the largest EB-5 trade association. Our reforms had the support of the EB-5 Rural Alliance, a group working to ensure that rural America has a fair shake at attracting EB-5 money.

Why are rural areas such a high concern? Because, quite frankly, way back in the 1990s, that was one of the goals of the EB-5 program—to help economic development in rural America, but these reforms weren't acceptable to the Big Money New York industry stakeholders that currently dominate the program. Because Big Money interests aren't happy with these reforms, we have been told they will not become law.

I have laid out a lot here, letting it sink in for a minute. In spite of the fact that reforms were agreed to by congressional offices and had the support of the largest EB-5 trade association, they will not become law because

a few EB-5 businesses, with lots and lots of money and lots and lots of political power, have used their political connections and influence, once again—for the third time; maybe even the fourth time over a period of that many years—to reach some sort of reform on a program we have demonstrated—I shouldn't say we have demonstrated—we have repeated what the FBI and national security people and people in the Justice Department have said about the shortcomings of this program.

I said, at the beginning of my remarks, I finally realize this program cannot be reformed. I would have to say this for my present ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, she has been telling me that for three or four years: Forget about reforming it; we ought to do away with it. The Regional Center Program is simply too corrupted to be saved, and it needs to be ended.

The American people deserve better than what we are seeing as a result of hard-working Members of the House and Senate trying to reform this program and getting nothing done.

So what happens here at the last minute? It will get stuck in an omnibus appropriations bill to extend it again for a period of time with the same bad practices that are going on. Why does that have to happen when it is so obvious what is wrong?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WYDEN and I be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this Saturday, students from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL, are going to lead hundreds of thousands of Americans all around the country in calling for commonsense gun control measures at the March For Our Lives.

Since this terrible shooting in Parkland, FL, on Valentine's Day, we have seen students all across the country say: Enough. This is a movement that cannot be stopped, and, frankly, we owe it to the students—the next generation—to get this right in the policies and the laws we adopt.

Just a few weeks ago, I went to one of the student's homes in Parkland—a group of them. We talked. Indeed, just last week, a number of the students came to my office here in Washington. It is amazing that at 15, 16, and 17 years old, these students are looking to us in this Congress to, at a minimum, consider legislation that could have prevented the slaughter that happened in Parkland just a month ago.

In Florida, we have witnessed these students march on the State capitol

and demand action. The legislature listened, in part. They made some changes in the law, like changing the age to 21 to buy an assault rifle. That is the same age in Florida law that says you can't buy a handgun until age 21. It was a small step, but it was a step in the right direction to address the problem we are confronting, but we need to do more.

I am so grateful for the resilience of these students, the power of their voices, and the strength of their activism, moving the lawmakers in Washington and in State capitals all across this country to act.

The students, the parents, the teachers, all of them we have asked: What do you want? And they say, obviously, we want commonsense things. We can start with universal background checks in the purchase of a weapon. That would then allow, universally, if you have a background check, you couldn't go to a gun show where there is not a federally licensed dealer and acquire a weapon without having a background check. Why is having a background check a commonsense thing to do? Because you not only pick up someone with a criminal record, you would pick up someone who had a restraining order for whatever reason—it could be mental, it could be domestic abuse. You would pick up somebody being on the terrorist watch list or you could pick up someone who had been on the terrorist watch list. That was the case with the killer in the Orlando Pulse Night Club shooting.

Clearly, that is a commonsense thing to approach this problem.

There is another commonsense thing; that is, these military assault rifles with the long—what I call the banana clips. These are clips that are shaped like a banana or even straight ones that hold 30 rounds. You know, there are State laws in the country that if you are going to hunt wild game, there are certain restrictions on the number of shells or bullets you can put in your gun. My goodness, why wouldn't we want to say there is a limitation on the number of bullets in a clip instead of these long clips that have 30 rounds?

It was used even in the shooting out in Arizona that our colleague Congresswoman Gabby Giffords was one of the victims of, and it was when the gunman was reloading with another clip that he was tackled to the ground; otherwise, there would have been more people who would have been harmed that day.

So it is another commonsense thing that people are asking for and that these students are bringing to light as they argue this case; that they don't want to be in a school where they have this kind of violence that is threatened. The students, the teachers, the parents just want our schools and our communities to be safe. As we have seen across the country, we have had

too much violence with these military-style weapons. Nightclubs, churches, movie theaters, outdoor concerts—it goes on and on. Students want to feel safe, and what some students have witnessed is unimaginable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. The velocity of a bullet fired from an assault weapon compared to the velocity of a handgun is three times the velocity or speed of the handgun bullet. As a result, when that bullet hits its target, the energy is nine times that hitting the target than what a handgun bullet does.

They built a movement now that inspires student walks across the country. In just 5 days, they are inspiring marches across the country, and the future is bright because of these students. But it is up to us to make sure that what happened in Parkland never happens again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF KEVIN MCALEENAN

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in a few minutes the Senate will vote on the nomination of Mr. Kevin McAleenan to serve as Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

As the ranking Democrat on the committee with jurisdiction over trade policy, I am particularly interested in working with Mr. McAleenan on an issue that is of longstanding, bipartisan concern; and that is tougher, smarter enforcement of America's trade laws.

Mr. McAleenan is a longtime public servant, and he has been aware that the Finance Committee has put in many hours over the last few years to guarantee that this agency has tough new tools to fight trade cheats and protect our workers. It is vital that those tools be put to good use because their trade-related mission—defending American jobs from trade rip-offs—has too often gotten short shrift. It doesn't matter what kind of trade deals you sign or what laws you put on the books if you aren't serious about enforcing them. That is where their trade mission comes in.

In my discussions with this nominee, it is clear that he understands that when it comes to trade, this country has to do trade done right, and tougher trade enforcement is especially important.

I will close with the mention of another issue that this agency has seen over the last few months, and that is the onslaught of Americans being stopped at the border and forced to unlock their personal electronic devices for inspection. It clearly invades their personal privacy.

Senator PAUL and I have introduced bipartisan legislation on this—there is

bipartisan legislation in the other body—that recognizes that law enforcement should have to get a warrant before searching a device at the border, and it comes with strong protections to let Americans know when and how they consent to having their devices searched.

In my judgment, this is just common sense, particularly because the U.S. Supreme Court has already ruled that digital is fundamentally different. They did that when they ruled that law enforcement needs a warrant to search a phone after an arrest.

We are going to keep pushing for our bipartisan legislation. In the meantime, we need to work with this agency on this critical issue that ensures, once again, that this country recognizes that security and liberty are not mutually exclusive and that you can have policies that do both.

I want to continue to engage with him, if confirmed, to make sure that the constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans do not disappear at the border.

As I indicated, he is a public servant with many, many years of experience. I support his nomination.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McAleenan nomination?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Ex.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Gardner	Nelson
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Bennet	Grassley	Perdue
Blunt	Hassan	Peters
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Brown	Heitkamp	Reed
Cantwell	Heller	Risch
Capito	Hirono	Rounds
Carper	Hoeven	Rubio
Casey	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Jones	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Smith
Corker	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Leahy	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Warner
Daines	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Wyden
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—19

Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Udall
Duckworth	Markey	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—4

Burr	Roberts
McCain	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, H.R. 1865, an act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Kennedy, John Cornyn, Dan Sullivan, Joni Ernst, James Lankford, Richard Burr, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, Patrick J. Toomey, Mike Rounds, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865, an act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to

clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Baldwin	Gardner	Murray
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Harris	Portman
Booker	Hassan	Reed
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Brown	Heinrich	Rounds
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sanders
Cardin	Hirono	Sasse
Carper	Hoeven	Schatz
Casey	Inhofe	Schumer
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Jones	Shelby
Coons	Kaine	Smith
Corker	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Tester
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Leahy	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Udall
Daines	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Ernst	Merkley	Young
Feinstein	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—2

Paul	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Burr	Roberts
McCain	Toomey

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865, the Senate will resume legislative session and consideration of the motion to proceed.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we just had a vote in this Chamber on a very significant piece of legislation. It was the motion to proceed to it. It was agreed to with good Republican and Democratic majorities, with both sides of the aisle supporting moving to this debate.

Because we have cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, I feel confident that we will get to an end point, and we must. This issue of trafficking human beings is something the Senate must stand up against, particularly because there is a Federal law that now permits trafficking online that otherwise would be considered a criminal act. I want to talk a little about that legislation tonight.

We probably will not have the final vote until Wednesday, and some of the information I will provide tonight will be setting the reasons, the basis for doing this legislation. Then, between now and Wednesday, we will have to learn more about the specifics of it, what is happening online, and how the U.S. Senate can step in and provide the legislation to remediate what is an obvious problem to anyone who looks at this issue.

Human trafficking is such an egregious crime. We all, I hope, agree with that. It is also a very lucrative crime—\$150 billion a year is the estimate, and that is probably second only to the drug trade in terms of the amount of money involved. Think about this. This is selling human beings.

The Senate has taken steps in this body in a bipartisan way over the past 6 or 7 years to focus on this issue, and I certainly commend my colleagues for that. Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Democrat, and I, as a Republican, started a bipartisan caucus to stop human trafficking about 6 years ago. We started with the two of us, and now there are a couple of dozen. There are many Members who are engaged and involved in this.

Over those past 6 years, the Senate has passed legislation to increase the penalties on those who buy children for sex. For the first time in a decade and a half, we increased the Federal penalties.

We have helped to stop international trafficking by U.S. Government contractors overseas with legislation that was signed into law.

We have helped with regard to finding missing children by requiring for the first time that those missing children have a photograph attached to them. Unbelievably, until that legislation, most kids in my home State of Ohio and other States who went missing did not have the information provided to law enforcement and others—people who work in shelters, people who are in the juvenile justice system—to be able to find those children. Why is that so important? Because, as

you can imagine, kids who go missing are sometimes the most vulnerable to being trafficked.

We also passed legislation to improve the data on trafficking. There is legislation called the Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act, which we passed in this body to provide better information about this problem so we could come up with better solutions by understanding what is going on. Trafficking is in the shadows. It is very profitable, but it is an illicit activity. So that legislation was critical.

By the way, the primary author of that legislation was Senator RON WYDEN of Oregon. Senator WYDEN will probably be on this floor over the next couple of days talking about some of the concerns he has about the online legislation we have, but I want you to know that Senator WYDEN has been out front on opposing trafficking through this Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act. I was the lead Republican on that legislation, so I worked with him, and I commend him for that.

We also passed legislation to change the paradigm in Federal law and treat these children who are trafficked as victims rather than as criminals. The key is to get these young people into treatment, longer term recovery, and deal with what is, as you can imagine, a very traumatic situation—often related to drugs as well, so drug treatment. Something that I think is perhaps the most important thing we can do is to understand that these are victims who, in order to get back on their feet, need to be taken from the criminal justice system and put into the kind of treatment they need.

Despite efforts here in the Senate—and by others around the country, by the way—to deal with this trafficking issue and raise an awareness of it, unbelievably today, as we stand here in this country, we are seeing an increase in one type of trafficking, and that is sex trafficking. You might ask, how could that be possible? We passed all this legislation to help. We have gotten increased consciousness about the issue. People are more aware of the problem, and certainly there is a consensus that this is something we ought to crack down on. Yet it is happening. I will tell you what the experts say. They say it is happening for one simple reason, and that is that more and more women and children are being sold online—the ruthless efficiency of the internet. So that is where this legislation focuses, and it focuses there because that is where we see the problem.

Traffickers are using the internet to sell women and children, and we have a responsibility to act. If we don't act, we will allow a Federal law that was passed by this body 21 years ago, which I think inadvertently has created part of the problem by shielding these websites, to remain.

I will talk more about this later in the week as we get into the specifics of

our legislation and why it would address the problem, but the bottom line is that we have a real problem.

The anti-trafficking group Polaris—we recently received its 2017 report. The report illustrates the true nature of the crisis. This is the heat chart put up by Polaris. It shows the locations of cases reported to the National Human Trafficking Hotline last year alone, in 2017. As we can see—and this explains why we see such strong, bipartisan support for our legislation—this is happening everywhere, in every State in the Union. Unfortunately, it is increasing, not decreasing, despite all the efforts locally and even here at the Federal level.

The national hotline that Polaris runs—and I hope to be at that hotline, by the way, later this week, as they are opening a new facility and expanding what they are doing—experienced a 13-percent increase in reported cases nationwide just last year. So despite all the efforts, they are actually seeing an increase. In my home State of Ohio alone, 371 cases of human trafficking were reported to the hotlines. Across the country, their hotlines handled a record 8,759 cases in 2017, up from 7,737 reported cases in 2016. Again, these are only the cases that are reported. That doesn't mean there aren't many, many more cases out there that are not reported to the hotlines.

In the 10 years they have operated these hotlines, by the way, human trafficking reports have increased 842 percent. Again, it is unbelievable that this is happening in this country in this century and increasing.

I chair the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. A couple of years ago, being interested in this issue, we started to talk to some of the experts around the country. I met with people back home—particularly the victims of trafficking and some of the survivors—and I kept hearing the same thing from everybody, whether it was the advocacy groups for those being trafficked, law enforcement, or the social service agencies that are helping to treat these women and girls who are dealing with the trauma we talked about earlier. The one thing I kept hearing was the word “backpage.” That is just one website, but it seemed as though there were a lot of people being trafficked on that one website. I certainly heard it back home, where these women and girls said to me: Rob, this has moved from the street corner to the smartphone, and backpage is where I was trafficked.

Nearly 75 percent of all child trafficking reports that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children receives from the public involved backpage—75 percent of the reports.

Another anti-trafficking organization called Shared Hope International says that service providers working with child sex-trafficking victims have

reported that more than 80 percent of their clients were bought and sold on backpage.

We talked earlier about how lucrative this business is, but one website seems to have practically monopolized it.

With that knowledge, in 2015 the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, led by Ranking Member CLAIRE McCASKILL from Missouri and me, conducted an investigation. We spent 18 months researching this. We looked at every angle of this issue, and specifically we looked into how backpage operates. It wasn't easy because backpage was not willing to cooperate, as you can imagine. What we did find was that the company was far more complicit in these crimes than we had previously thought.

We subpoenaed backpage for their company documents, and they refused to comply. When you refuse to comply with a subpoena around here, normally we can kind of tell people: Well, if you don't comply, we will bring the full weight of the criminal law on you. They still wouldn't comply. So we had to come to the floor of the U.S. Senate to enforce the subpoenas, which hadn't been done in 21 years around here. Fortunately, when we made our case to our colleagues here in the Senate, everyone in the Senate said: Yes, let's be sure they do comply by taking this to the criminal justice system and allowing our lawyers here to take this case. So we did.

We thought, well, we will win a case at the district court level, which we did, and that will be it. No, they appealed that. We won a case at the circuit court level, and we thought that was it. No, they appealed that. Are you getting the drift here that they did not want to supply these documents and did not want to testify? Finally, we took it all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court agreed with us and told them that they had to comply, with the threat of criminal sanctions if they did not.

Having won that, we then found ourselves in possession of over 1 million pages of documents. In other words, they flooded us with documents, and our lawyers did a good job going through them. Through this investigation, we found what some of us had kind of thought might be the case, which was that this company was actually complicit. In other words, they knew what they were doing, and they were knowingly facilitating criminal sex trafficking of vulnerable women and children. They actually coached traffickers on how to edit the adult classified ads to post so-called clean ads for these illegal transactions. Then, of course, they would cover up evidence of those crimes in order to increase their own profits.

In 2006, as an example, backpage executives instructed staff to edit the

text of adult ads—not to take them down, mind you, but to edit them—which is exactly how they facilitated this type of trafficking. By October 2010, backpage executives had a formal process in place, we learned through all these documents, of both manual and automated deletion of incriminating words and phrases in ads.

This is an email from one of backpage's executives in 2010. It says:

I'm attaching a spreadsheet with the most current list of coded items to be stripped out. Email your lists to me by the end of the day. . . . Thanks.

In other words, they were telling these people who were posting ads: Oh, you can't say this word or that word because then law enforcement will know that we are engaged in selling underaged girls online. So they told them to take out those words. It is unbelievable.

What kinds of words were stripped out of the ads, allowing sex trafficking posts to stay up without violating the posting words? These are the kinds of words they took out: "teenage," "little girl," "school girl," "Cheerleader" was one of them. For those of you who are literary types, one was "Lolita," which is a novel about an underaged girl and an older man, and also "fresh" and "AMBER Alert."

These are the kinds of people we are dealing with here. Once these incriminating words were removed, the posts could then go on the website. That is how backpage coached the traffickers on how to get away with their crimes. Again, this filter didn't stop the ads, even though they knew it was illegal activity; they only edited them to try to hide that. So it didn't change what was advertised—the fact that these were underaged girls; they only edited the way it was advertised. Of course, this did nothing to stop the criminal activity, but it facilitated it knowingly.

The incentive? Why would backpage go through all of this? Quite simply, profits. This is a very profitable enterprise.

What is the cost of these crimes? It is very profitable, but the cost is human dignity, trauma. The cost is far more than money; it is suffering and sometimes human life. I have heard stories about this. I know my colleagues in the Senate have heard stories about it, and that is why there is so much support for this legislation across the country. These individual stories are compelling, they are powerful, and they are heartbreaking.

Imagine for a moment that your daughter is missing. She has been gone for several weeks. She is 14 years old. Someone says: You ought to look on this website called backpage. So you do. You look on backpage—you are a mom—and you find your daughter.

This is the story of Kubiiki Pride and M.A. She told her story bravely before

our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. She told us the details, and we were able to use that as part of our investigation and to come up with a legislative response. She said she actually told backpage—she called them and said: I found my daughter. She has been missing for weeks. She is on your website. Thank you for taking down the ad and helping me to connect with my daughter.

As you can imagine, these were sexually explicit photographs of a 14-year-old girl. She didn't know whether she was alive or dead, so she was excited to find her but appalled by what she saw, as any of us would be.

What did backpage say? We can't take down the ad because you didn't pay for it, did you?

She said: Of course, I didn't pay for it; she is my daughter.

That is the level of evil we are talking about.

This is another story of another brave individual who has come forward. This is Nacole, the mom, and J.S. Nacole also bravely testified in front of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. J.S. was a 15-year-old when she ran away. She loved her family, and she wrote them a 5-page letter saying how much she loved them, but she chose to leave the safety of her family and home, and she ended up in a homeless shelter for teens. A 22-year-old woman who was posing as a teen there approached her and said, "I can help you make some money" and then introduced her to a pimp, who then sold her on backpage. For more than 3 months, she was sold online multiple times a day.

Finally, an undercover police officer posing as a customer rescued her. Thankfully, he did, because for some many of the girls, the story goes on and sometimes ends in a very tragic way.

This is Yvonne Ambrose. Yvonne actually testified before the Commerce Committee. She and her mom did a beautiful job talking about her heartbreak and her tragic encounter with backpage. Yvonne got a call on Christmas Eve in 2016 that every parent dreads. It was about her daughter Desiree. They said in the call that her 16-year-old daughter had been murdered after being exploited and sold for sex on backpage.com. One of the backpage customers apparently was the one who murdered her beautiful daughter.

Yvonne is honoring Desiree's memory by working with us to try to hold these websites accountable, and Kubiiki and Nacole are fighting for justice.

These are only three examples tonight, but there are so many others and so many I have experienced back home. Again, these are heartbreaking stories. One girl told me she started to be trafficked at age 9 by her father.

Some others have told me of not having parents at home, being in foster homes and leaving the foster homes either when they were emancipated at age 18 or earlier and the horrible situation they found themselves in.

I have had the opportunity to meet with survivors in cities around Ohio—in Dayton at Oasis House, in Columbus at Alvis, in Akron, Toledo, Cincinnati, and Cleveland. The majority of these young women tell me the same thing about backpage. Usually there are drugs involved as well that create a dependency.

Unbelievably, for years, these websites have gotten away with this because when parents like Yvonne, Kubiiki, or Nacole file a lawsuit for damages to try to stop what is going on, they are told: We are immune. When the prosecutors in these local communities step up and ask: "How could this illegal activity be going on? This is illegal to do on the street corners, certainly it is illegal to do online," the judges say: We are immune.

We will get into this later as to why that happens, how it happens, and what we are doing about it in this legislation. I look forward to that discussion. I look forward to the debate on the Senate floor as to how we came up with a very targeted and very specific approach to this that doesn't interfere with the freedom of the internet at all, but it does stop activity that never was imagined. When Congress passed a law 21 years ago, it never imagined it would permit this kind of criminal activity online.

Tonight I thank those families who had the courage to step forward, tell their stories publicly, and channel their grief into something constructive, which is to come up with a legislative solution that helps address this problem so the next 14-year-old daughter or 16-year-old daughter does not find herself in these same horrible situations, with all the trauma and all the heartbreak that occurs.

Justice cannot be seen, but its absence can be felt, and that is what is happening now, an absence of justice. Those who have been trafficked online only see the websites that knowingly facilitated it to prosper and escape legal consequences. That has to stop. That is an injustice to me.

I look forward to further debate again this week. I look forward to the vote on Wednesday. If we can pass the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, we will make a difference. We will save lives. We will save women, girls, and boys from going through this traumatic experience and instead enable them to achieve their God-given potential in life.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

YEMEN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight to discuss America's role in the crisis in Yemen.

I have here a picture of the fractured remains of buildings, people fleeing from those buildings, and a small child, probably in her father's arms. This represents the challenge of the bombing that is going on in that nation. I am here tonight to discuss America's role in that bombing and the fact that here in the Chamber we need to debate how it is we have come to the point of supporting this bombing when the War Powers Act clearly says we should not be.

When our Founding Fathers wrote our Constitution, they designated the President as the Commander in Chief, but they gave Congress, the House, and the Senate the sole power to declare war. Article I, section 8 states unequivocally: "The Congress shall have the power . . . to declare war."

It is only Congress that can take our Nation from peace to war. If one has any doubt about that, consider the words of James Madison himself, the father of our Constitution. He said: "In no part of the constitution is more wisdom to be found, than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department."

Now, the clearly stated responsibility in our Constitution was reinforced by the 1973 War Powers Resolution, often referred to as the War Powers Act. That particular piece of legislation stated as its purpose the following: "It is the purpose of this joint resolution to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States and insure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities." It goes on to say: "The constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, are exercised only"—and that is a critical word—"pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States."

The picture I showed you showing the fractured remains of buildings and people fleeing that bombing in Yemen, that activity is not taking place subject to a declaration of war by this body—we have done no such thing—nor is there any specific statutory authorization for our assistance in that, nor is there a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States where that is justified.

Tomorrow this Chamber will take up this issue. We will be voting on a resolution put forward by our colleagues

Senator SANDERS, Senator LEE, and Senator MURPHY calling for the removal of our Armed Forces in this role of supporting Saudi Arabia in this war against the Houthis.

There are two basic components of our presence in Yemen, and those are very distinct and not to be confused. The first is counterterrorism efforts in which we are directly engaged against associated forces of al-Qaida. This is a role that stems from the authorization for the use of military force that we passed in this Chamber in 2001. Members may come to the floor and argue about whether that initial authorization for use of military force involving al-Qaida in Afghanistan has been stretched beyond recognition. I would argue it has been stretched substantially and perhaps beyond recognition, but that is not the issue we are debating this week.

This week we are addressing the central issue of whether our involvement in supporting Saudi Arabia in its role in war against the Houthis in Yemen has violated our Constitution and the War Powers Act, and we have to confront and face how our assistance is contributing to a vast humanitarian crisis in that country. We may not have boots on the ground in support of the Saudi war against the Houthis, but we are very involved.

As we judge whether this involvement is violating the Constitution and the War Powers Act, we should turn to section 8, the interpretation of the joint resolution. It says:

Authority to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances shall not be inferred—

(1) from any provision of law . . . including any provision contained in any appropriation Act, unless—

This is the key—

such provision specifically authorizes the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

It is very clear. The interpretation of this joint resolution says there is no room here to be participating in hostilities—that is a war—even in a supporting role, unless it has been specifically authorized by Congress. This interpretation of the joint resolution section of the War Powers Act goes on to say:

(c) For purposes of this joint resolution, the term "introduction of United States Armed Forces" includes—

You see the language here—

the assignment of member of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged.

There is the key fact that was laid out when we passed the War Powers Act. This War Powers Act doesn't just address us directly engaging in hostilities or directly confronting an

enemy on the battlefield, it includes these provisions of commanding, coordinating, participating in the movement of, or accompanying military forces of a foreign country.

There is no question that we are coordinating and participating in the movement of the Saudi forces, so let's take a look at exactly how we are involved. The administration comes back and says: Yes, but we are not directly bombing the Houthis. We are not directly putting boots on the ground and shooting them.

It is clear the War Powers Act includes coordinating with, participating with, supporting, and partnering, if you will, with a foreign country involved in such a war. We are very involved.

First, we are involved by refueling Saudi planes en route to bombing the forces of the Houthis in Yemen. That is pretty direct involvement, and it goes to that language which says "participate in the movement of" those foreign forces. If we are refueling their planes en route to bombing the Houthis, we are participating in the movement of their military forces. A plane, a bomber, is a part of a military force.

Second, we are providing intelligence and thus very directly supporting this war of the Saudis.

Third, we are selling the weapons to them that they are using in this war on the Houthis.

Fourth, we are providing targeting assistance. We have even established a joint combined planning cell, an operation center, to conduct military intelligence activities in partnership with Saudi Arabia.

Here is why this matters so much: It has a huge impact on the lives of the people in Yemen. It is very possible the planes we refueled are responsible for conducting a series of three airstrikes in Saada last month, killing 5 civilians and wounding 14 more, including 4 children, as well as paramedics trying to pull survivors out of the rubble after that first strike, or that the planes we refueled played a role in striking a hotel last August that turned the building's ceiling black with the charred blood of 50 farmers who were staying in that building. We know that the bombs we have sold to the Saudis are killing many civilians. It is time for us here to reckon with that fact.

A lot of Americans may not even know we are involved in this war. It has not been widely discussed. There are so many things going on across the planet at this time—so much going on in Syria, for example, that perhaps Americans in general are not paying attention. But we should be paying attention because of the carnage that is occurring: 10,000 civilians have been killed since this conflict began. The great, vast bulk of those civilians are dying from air strikes conducted by Saudi Arabia that we are supporting

through intelligence and target assistance and refueling. Then there are the consequences of that bombardment. The result is just a tremendous humanitarian crisis.

The Saudis have been involved in blockading the ability to get humanitarian supplies into Yemen—food and medicine and fuel. This has resulted in what the United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, Mark Lowcock, has warned could become "the largest famine the world has seen for many decades." Seven million Yemenis are on the verge of starvation because of this war that we are involved in and the related Saudi blockade of food and medicine.

About every day, 130 Yemeni children die from extreme hunger and disease—130 a day. One of the factors that is killing people is cholera. Since October of 2016—so roughly a little less than a year and a half ago—1 million Yemenis have contracted cholera. More than 2,000 have died from it. It is the largest cholera outbreak in recorded history. Let me say that again: 1 million Yemenis have contracted cholera, and it is the largest cholera outbreak in recorded history. So 7 million Yemenis are on the verge of starvation, 1 million have contracted cholera, and so many are dying because of this war we are involved in.

The death and destruction in Yemen is unimaginable, and the United States needs to take a hard look at the role we are playing—a role we are playing in violation of our Constitution and in violation of the War Powers Act of 1973. That is the issue we are going to be discussing here on the floor.

I know there is some popularity in saying: Let's not look at that humanitarian crisis and our role in it; let's just look at the relationship we have with Saudi Arabia and know that they have helped us in other cases—for example, the war on ISIS. Let's know that they are a good customer for many of our products and for many of our military products. But I say to my colleagues: This issue is bigger than simply a good marketplace or a good relationship with Saudi Arabia. This goes to our involvement, our culpability in the deaths of thousands of Yemenis and 130 children a day through bombs falling on them, through hunger, starvation, through cholera.

It is hard for me to think about this young child in this picture, this young Yemeni, who clearly is the victim either of cholera or starvation or some other consequence of this conflict. But imagine 130 of these children dying every day.

It is our responsibility to honor the Constitution, and it is our responsibility as humans on this planet to wrestle with the fact that our involvement is contributing to this vast hu-

manitarian disaster. Let us not abdicate our responsibility on the basis of friendship with another nation based on the fact that they are a good market for our products or that we think they may be future partners in some other agenda. We have a direct responsibility in war and peace that we have not fulfilled, and this week, with this coming resolution tomorrow, is a point that we must wrestle with this. Let us wrestle with it and honor the Constitution and give some integrity to the 1973 War Powers Resolution.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865 be vitiated, and that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, on Wednesday, March 21, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1865; further, that the only amendments in order be Wyden amendments Nos. 2212 and 2213; finally, that there be up to 4 hours of debate concurrently on the amendments, and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with a 60-vote affirmative threshold required for adoption of each amendment, the bill be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, with no further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 54

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the resumption of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865, on Tuesday, March 20, Senator SANDERS, or his designee, be recognized to offer a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 54; further, that there be up to 4 hours of debate, equally divided between the opponents and the proponents of the resolution, and that following the use or yielding back of that time the Senate vote in relation to the motion to discharge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 471.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nazakhtar Nikakhtar, of

Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nikakhtar nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VERMONT STATE HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for 50 years, the Vermont State Housing Authority, VSHA, has helped make available secure, safe, and affordable housing in my home State of Vermont. Founded in 1968, the Vermont State Housing Authority provides thousands of Vermonters with the resources they need to find housing that works for them. As the first statewide housing authority in the Nation, VSHA was a pioneer in the field, as they built a successful program from the ground up without existing State models or best practices to replicate.

Not only does VSHA help Vermonters of all ages and backgrounds find a home through Federal or State programs, they also provide critical support to those who need it most. The VSHA offers a variety of assistance and resources to the refugee population that has settled in Vermont, including free interpreter services and the promise of a friendly face ready to help navigate a new beginning in an unfamiliar culture. Further, VSHA staff make what can be a frightening transition more tailored, personal, and comfortable—helping new citizens acclimate and assimilate into their new communities.

From connecting families in need with resources from the Department of

Housing and Urban Development to developing innovative programs that inspire self-sufficiency and long-term independence, to promoting affordable housing for veterans, VSHA is involved in every community in Vermont. VSHA, though the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, helps families achieve economic stability and independence. As of the fall of last year, the program has graduated 194 people and has assisted a total of 153 Vermonters in becoming first-time homeowners through the homeownership program. While homeownership is a critical piece of building wealth and a hallmark of the American dream, it is often a far off dream for many families who struggle just to find a stable and affordable place to call home.

As more and more families struggle to make ends meet, especially when affordable units are few and far in between and housing prices continue to rise, the team at VSHA, led by their executive director of more than 30 years, Richard Williams, has worked hard to ensure that we work to meet the needs of our community. Though support for our most vulnerable populations is first and foremost in the minds of the VSHA team, it is clear that civic engagement and involvement plays a large role as well. The VSHA is involved in partnerships with dozens of Vermont nonprofit organizations, State and Federal agencies, and private sector businesses. Through their work rehabilitating and managing buildings, VSHA has revitalized our communities and downtowns one by one.

The Vermont State Housing Authority has made a lasting difference in the lives of Vermonters across our great State. For that, I thank them. On behalf of all Vermonters, congratulations on 50 years of hard work, dedication, and outstanding commitment to those you serve.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAYSIDE RESTAURANT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my wife, Marcelle, and I thoroughly enjoyed reading about the Wayside's 100th anniversary.

I remember when my sister, Mary, brother, John, and I would go with my parents, Howard and Alba Leahy, for a special treat: Sunday after church, we would go to the Wayside for lunch.

I remember my mother speaking Italian with some of the people there, but it was particularly special because of the fact that we would see everybody we knew from Montpelier and Barre, where my father was born.

Even today, I hold those memories from when I was a child, and I have thought of them every time Marcelle and I have brought our children, and now our grandchildren, for lunch at the Wayside. This is one of the institutions

that makes Vermont the most special place in our country.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Wayside Restaurant be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Feb. 16, 2018]

2018 MARKS VERMONT'S WAYSIDE RESTAURANT'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

MONTPELIER.—In 1918, the Allies declared victory in World War 1, Babe Ruth pitched 29½ scoreless innings for the Red Sox in the World Series, Woodrow Wilson was President, color movies were invented, and Effie Ballou opened the Wayside on the Barre-Montpelier Road.

Originally just a roadside eatery, the Wayside Restaurant has withstood the test of time and is ready to celebrate its 100th Anniversary this year! In an industry where 70 percent of all restaurants fail after 10 years, the Wayside has defied the odds.

Throughout the year, there will be meal and dessert specials. In July, the actual month the Wayside opened; there will be a Customer Appreciation Party on July 29th from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. The Wayside Creamery will host a free Ice Cream Social and at sundown all guests will be treated to a special fireworks display! Be sure to save the date.

For those who want to learn more about the Wayside and its long history go to www.WaysideRestaurant.com. There is also a new book on sale at the restaurant commemorating their 100th Anniversary titled, *It's Worth The Ride To The Wayside: Celebrating 100 Years with Anniversary Ale, Yankee Cooking and Ice Cream*. And yes, the book includes several of the Wayside's delicious comfort food recipes!

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent due to a death in my family for rollcall votes Nos. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55. Had I been present I would have voted nay on all the rollcall votes in relation to S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. I would have also voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Kevin McAleenan to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, rollcall vote No. 55; PN1373.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITY MORTGAGE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Banking Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development, today I wish to engage in a colloquy to discuss legislation that I introduced, the Housing Opportunity Mortgage Expansion, HOME, Act, with several of my colleagues to address an issue involving the Federal Home Loan Bank, FHLB, system. The FHLB system is a cooperative organization of 11 banks that support a mission of "helping American families realize the dream of

home ownership, stimulate the creation of affordable housing, and improve the local business environment.” FHLBs are privately capitalized by their 7,300 members and are subject to strict oversight by the Federal Housing Finance Agency, FHFA. The HOME Act is designed to correct the FHFA’s perceived statutory limitation in the FHL Bank Act that does not permit captive insurers to be considered a class of the eligible insurance companies for membership in FHLBs.

In 2016, the FHFA determined that captive insurance firms were not insurance firms for purposes of the FHLB Act. In making this determination, the FHFA abruptly terminated the membership of approximately four dozen captive insurance entities, including mortgage real estate investment trusts, REITs, that were active and responsible members of the FHLB system. These insurance captives greatly contributed to the affordable housing mission of FHLBs through the use of private capital versus taxpayer dollars, something that we should always encourage. I thank Senators DUCKWORTH, JOHNSON, and BALDWIN for their support of this legislation, which I am hopeful will receive favorable consideration by this body in the future.

I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, thank you. I thank the chairman and my colleagues from Wisconsin for their support of this bipartisan legislation, which I introduced in January and filed as an amendment to S. 2155. As the chairman stated, as a result of the 2016 regulation, many of the FHLB system’s captive insurance members have had or will soon have their membership terminated. Our legislation seeks to ensure that captive insurer affiliates of institutions that are active providers of private capital in the mortgage market are eligible to restore or continue their membership.

Their membership is crucial to reliable access to low-cost funding for home mortgages and affordable housing initiatives in Illinois. For the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, these members serve as an important source of private capital in the mortgage market. Their membership broadens access to credit to financial institutions that would otherwise not be able to access credit through their local markets and creates a reliable source of liquidity for affordable housing initiatives.

Our bipartisan bill only seeks to address those captives that were previously granted FHLB membership prior to February 19, 2016. By allowing captive insurers to continue to invest in mortgages and mortgage-related securities through the FHLB system, they can continue to provide both credit and liquidity to the market. Such sources of private capital are critical to the long-term financing of the FHLB system, and therefore, eligibility in the

system should be preserved. Our legislation will achieve this purpose. I wish to turn to my friend from Wisconsin, Senator JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I agree with the comments of my colleagues on the need to pass S. 2361 during the 115th Congress. The legislation is narrowly tailored such that it would provide the opportunity for reapplication or continuation of FHLB membership only for those captive entities that meet a series of criteria pertaining to the mission of their parent companies to serve the residential mortgage market. These captive members have proven track records of responsible membership, have contributed to the system, and have invested their capital in the respective FHLBs. Moreover, each and every captive that would be affected by our bill are subsidiaries of financial institutions that are aligned with the overall mission of the FHLBs.

I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator BALDWIN.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, unfortunately, including this legislation in the recently passed S. 2155 was not possible due to a number of procedural objections that could not be overcome. However, it is our understanding that the substance of our bill has the support of several FHLBs, and we intend to work with our colleagues, the administration, and FHFA to find sustainable ways for housing-focused entities such as relevant captive insurance companies to participate in the FHLB system.

WOMEN’S HEALTH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I wish to speak on the important topic of women’s health, which has been under attack by the Trump administration.

Through its policies and the actions of its officials, the Trump administration has undermined women’s health at every opportunity.

In the first year of the Trump administration, we have seen attempts to block access to Planned Parenthood, restrict women’s access to birth control, legislation to ban certain medical procedures, the creation of new government offices to undermine women’s healthcare, and judges nominated who openly oppose women’s privacy rights.

Scott Lloyd, the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, ORR, is the perfect illustration of this deeply disturbing trend.

Federal court documents and extensive media reports show that Mr. Lloyd has used his official office to prevent unaccompanied minors at ORR shelters from accessing legally available reproductive healthcare.

In one case, a 17-year-old young woman, referred to as Jane Doe, was transferred to an ORR shelter after crossing the U.S.-Mexico border. While

in government custody, Jane Doe discovered she was pregnant and sought access to an abortion. She satisfied all requirements under Texas law and secured her own funds to pay for the procedure. In spite of this, ORR officials repeatedly blocked her from accessing care. Jane Doe went to court and was granted approval to obtain the procedure. Nevertheless, the Trump administration’s Department of Justice cruelly appealed the decision, alleging that the government has an interest in blocking her personal decision.

Since Jane Doe’s case, it has been uncovered that Trump administration officials have directly intervened in other similar cases. There are reports that Mr. Lloyd has denied young women access to their lawyers. Additionally, he has implemented policies that violate young women’s medical privacy rights. It is also concerning that, as someone with no medical expertise or training, Mr. Lloyd has personally pressured young women about their medical options. In court documents, Mr. Lloyd acknowledged that he has never approved a request for the procedure and even admitted that he has denied such requests in the cases of rape victims. This is shocking, particularly considering that many of the young women who come into ORR custody have fled sexual and gender-based violence in their home countries.

On top of that, some of these young women go through harrowing experiences along their journey to the United States, during which they are at risk of being trafficked, kidnapped, and raped. Blocking them from making their own determinations about their health and bodies only adds to the trauma they have already experienced.

In light of Mr. Lloyd’s shocking actions, I have called on him to resign.

I find it appalling that the Trump administration believes women—undocumented or otherwise—do not have the right to control their own bodies and make their own healthcare decisions. Young women do not lose their right to make their own healthcare decisions just because they are in government custody.

ORR is responsible for protecting the well-being of the most vulnerable people: those who have been tortured, children who arrive in the country alone and without a parent, and individuals fleeing persecution.

It is imperative that the leader of this office uphold this mission, rather than advancing his own personal, political agenda. We have an obligation to treat young women in government custody with the dignity and respect they deserve.

The Trump administration needs to stop attacking women and start recognizing their right to control their own bodies, medical decisions, and destiny.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO VICTORIA
HOENINGHAUSEN

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Tori for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Tori is a native of Yellowstone National Park. She is a graduate of the University of Wyoming, where she studied international studies and criminal justice. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Tori for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING VALLEY VIEW
CHAROLAIS RANCH

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President. I would like to offer my congratulations to Valley View Charolais Ranch on their 50th Annual Bull Sale and cowherd. Valley View Charolais have some of the most proven and popular bloodlines available. They have been bred for ease of calving, fertility, milk, and mothering ability, as well as performance. Valley View Charolais Ranch's efforts to produce animals that will make money for all that are involved, including the producer, the cowman, and the packer, have been proven. Their commitment to producing quality 2-year-old bulls despite trends, drought, blizzards, fighting grasshoppers, irrigation water, and cattle price cycles, is remarkable and demonstrates their true dedication.

I commend the Westphal Family for all the dedication and passion they have poured into the industry to be one of the Nation's leading breeders of purebred Charolais cattle and for selling 2-year-old Charolais bulls for 50 years.●

TRIBUTE TO MS. CAROL RIVARD

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and extend my sincerest congratulations and happy birthday wishes to Ms. Carol Rivard who celebrated her 100th birthday on March 17, 2018.

Carol has lived in New Hampshire since she moved to Salem with her family in 1959. She worked in a textile mill and later as an office clerk for Kmart. After her retirement, Carol

dedicated her time to helping a local food pantry where she volunteered every week for nearly 10 years.

To this day, Carol lives independently in her New Hampshire home. Her most cherished moments are spent with loved ones at family gatherings, where they enjoy listening to Frank Sinatra and cheering on the Boston Celtics. Carol has three sons and a daughter, as well as three grandchildren and five great-grandchildren.

I join with Carol's friends and family, as well as many people in the town of Salem and across the Granite State, in wishing her a very happy 100th birthday.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE
ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE
ORDER WITH RESPECT TO VEN-
EZUELA THAT TAKES ADDI-
TIONAL STEPS WITH RESPECT
TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY
DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE
ORDER 13692 ON MARCH 8, 2015—
PM 30

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), I hereby report that I have signed an Executive Order with respect to Venezuela that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13808 of August 24, 2017. The Executive Order prohibits, as of its effective date, all transactions related to, provision of financing for, and other dealings in, by a United States person or within the United States, any digital currency, digital coin, or digital

token, that was issued by, for, or on behalf of the Government of Venezuela on or after January 9, 2018.

I have authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including promulgating rules and regulations and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the Executive Order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 2018.

SOCIAL SECURITY TOTALIZATION
AGREEMENT WITH URUGUAY, TI-
TLED "AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL
SECURITY BETWEEN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AND THE ORIENTAL REPUBLIC
OF URUGUAY," AND AN ACCOM-
PANYING LEGALLY BINDING AD-
MINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT
TITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE AR-
RANGEMENT BETWEEN THE
COMPETENT AUTHORITIES OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMER-
ICA AND THE ORIENTAL REPUB-
LIC OF URUGUAY FOR THE IM-
PLEMENTATION OF THE AGREE-
MENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY"—
PM 31

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Uruguay, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay," and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed at Montevideo, Uruguay, on January 10, 2017.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security totalization agreements already in force with most European Union countries, Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation,

and to help prevent the lost benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Agreements to me.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay and the Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 2018.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 16, 2018, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 188. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 324. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4263. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4545. An act to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today,

March 19, 2018, he has signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 188. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 324. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4263. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4545. An act to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 19, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 188. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 324. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4599. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of *Campanula* spp. Plants for Planting in Approved Growing Media From Denmark into the United States" (RIN0579-AE31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4600. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Expiration Date Required for Serial and Sub-serials and Determination of Expiration Date of Product" (RIN0579-AD06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4601. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Aluminum tris (O-ethylphosphonate); Pesticide Tolerances" (40 CFR Part 180) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4602. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flutianil; Pesticide Tolerances" (40 CFR Part 180) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4603. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "S-Metolachlor; Pesticide Tolerances" (40 CFR Part 180) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4604. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4605. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of additional time required to complete a report relative to core depot-level maintenance and repair capability and sustaining workloads; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4606. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS); Final Rule" (FRL No. 9975-78-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4607. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Elements of the Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide, 2010 Sulfur Dioxide, and 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)" (FRL No. 9975-71-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4608. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loss Safe Harbor/RP-119318-17" (Rev. Proc. 2018-08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4609. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch,

Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hurricanes Harvey & Irma Cost Index Sec. 165/RP-128547-17" (Rev. Proc. 2018-09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4610. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modified 2018 Cost-of-Living Adjustments to the Internal Revenue Code Tax Tables and Other Items" (Rev. Proc. 2018-18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4611. A communication from the Chair of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4612. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clarification of When Products Made or Derived From Tobacco Are Regulated as Drugs, Devices, or Combination Products; Amendments to Regulations Regarding 'Intended Uses'; Partial Delay of Effective Date" ((RIN0910-AH94) (Docket No. FDA-2015-N-2002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4613. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Activities Related to Stillbirth, Sudden Unexpected Infant Death, and Sudden Unexplained Death in Childhood"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4614. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2017 Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts A and B Supplemental Awards Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4615. A communication from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual management report relative to its operations and financial condition for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4616. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs of the Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal relative to the President of the United States' Fiscal Year 2019 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4617. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consolidated Cruise Ship Security Regulations" ((RIN1625-AB30) (Docket No. USCG-2006-23846)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4618. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marine Casualty Reporting Property damage Thresholds" ((RIN1625-AC33) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0748)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 16, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-184. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico requesting the United States Congress to extend the unemployment and the Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) benefits for an additional twenty-six (26) weeks, due to the catastrophic impact of Hurricanes Maria and Irma on Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 50

STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

Only two weeks after Hurricane Irma hit the Island, on September 20th, 2017, Hurricane Maria struck Puerto Rico. The eye of this Category 4 hurricane made landfall in the municipality of Yabucoa.

Puerto Rico suffered damages estimated in at least ninety billion dollars (\$90,000,000,000), and a never-before-seen devastation. The power grid as well as the telecommunications and drinking water systems were down. One month after landfall, a mere eighteen percent (18%) of the population had power service, fifty-nine percent (59%) had telecommunications service, and seventy-three percent (73%) had drinking water service.

Many businesses have been unable to operate due to the lack of these services. Consequently, a significant number of employees have lost their jobs or their work hours have been reduced considerably.

Through a contribution based on a percentage of payroll expenses, employers participate in a program where job-seeking unemployed persons are able to receive financial assistance and labor advisory from the Government.

Workers who have been wrongfully discharged may receive the following benefits:

Unemployment compensation equivalent to a percentage of the salary earned up to one hundred thirty-three dollars (\$133.00) a week. Such compensation may be extended for an additional twenty-six (26) weeks, if eligible.

Job search assistance through their job center locations.

Furthermore, the Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) is available for employed and self-employed persons who have been determined not otherwise eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. This program provides unemployment benefits to individuals who have become unemployed as a direct result of a major disaster. Just as the unemployment benefit, this assistance is available for twenty-six (26) weeks.

Hurricanes Irma and Maria have had a major impact on the economy. Countless Puerto Ricans have lost their jobs, either temporarily or permanently. The lines at the regional offices of the Department of Labor are endless.

Moreover, it has been estimated that more than sixty thousand (60,000) Puerto Ricans have left the Island over the thirty (30) days following Hurricane Maria, forty thousand (40,000) of which have relocated to Florida.

If the U.S. Congress approves the unemployment benefit extension it will greatly contribute to the recovery of the People of Puerto Rico and prevent many others from making the difficult decision of moving from Puerto Rico.

This is not the first time that such a request is made. The U.S. Congress approved a similar extension in 2006 after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita struck Louisiana and Texas, respectively.

For all of the foregoing, this Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico deems it meritorious to request the Congress of the United States of America to extend the unemployment and the Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) benefits for an additional twenty-six (26) weeks, due to the catastrophic impact of Hurricanes Maria and Irma on Puerto Rico.

Be it Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—To request the Congress of the United States of America to extend the unemployment and the Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) benefits for an additional twenty-six (26) weeks, due to the catastrophic impact of Hurricanes Maria and Irma on Puerto Rico.

Section 2.—It is hereby directed that a copy of this Concurrent Resolution, translated into English, be delivered to the leadership of the Congress of the United States of America, including the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, D.C., the President of the United States of America, and the U.S. Secretary of Labor.

Section 3.—This Concurrent Resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

POM-185. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico urging the United States Government to prioritize, increase, and accelerate the recovery, restoration, and reconstruction efforts of Puerto Rico in the wake of Hurricane Maria; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 53

STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

On September 20, 2017, the people of Puerto Rico experienced one of the most catastrophic events in its history. The onslaught of Hurricane Maria and the devastation it caused not only resulted in the loss of dozens of lives, but also had a disastrous effect on the basic infrastructure, thus disrupting the economic stability and fraying the social fabric of the Island.

Thousands of families deprived of their homes, the loss of industries and jobs, the lack of access to essential medical services, and the lack of reliable means of communication, the difficult access to roadways and communities, and the alarming rate of migration to the mainland are just some of the adverse consequences with which the Island is dealing, while experiencing a serious economic recession that has lasted for over a decade. Almost one and a half months later, thousands of students have been unable to return to their classrooms, hundreds of communities continue without water service, and more than half of the Island still has no power. In short, the Island has essentially fallen into a humanitarian crisis.

Furthermore, the issue caused by the large accumulation of debris that has yet to be removed from the streets and the communities

is specifically worth noting. Such debris adversely affects the quality of life of the residents of Puerto Rico. This situation not only constitutes a public safety hazard, but also affects the health of Puerto Ricans, because it promotes the proliferation of pests and mosquito breeding sites due to standing water. According to several experts, as well as the State epidemiologist, we have experienced an increase in the number of Leptospirosis cases and other diseases in many municipalities. In addition, debris affects vehicle traffic, limits accesses, and interferes with recovery efforts.

At this critical time, we are compelled to find effective solutions to protect life and property.

Even though the Government of Puerto Rico, its agencies, instrumentalities, and municipalities have made a massive effort in an attempt to solve these issues at the state and local level, it is clear that the restoration and reconstruction of Puerto Rico is a Herculean task that we could not undertake without the intervention of the Federal Government. Now more than ever, the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico require Federal assistance to set in motion their recovery.

We recognize that the concerned agencies and the different federal officials have expressed their unwavering commitment to the recovery and reconstruction of Puerto Rico. The truth is, however, that the pace at which works are being carried out is at odds with the needs of the People of Puerto Rico.

Indeed, on many occasions, local authorities have been compelled to raise a red flag about the adverse effects that the slow pace at which the works contracted with federal entities are being carried out could have. Several mayors of both political parties have resorted to the Executive Branch to increase the resources allocated to debris recovery and the overall reconstruction and recovery efforts being carried out in Puerto Rico. In some instances, the municipal executives have taken on the task to petition the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers directly and have been successful in arriving at agreements for the recovery of demolition and vegetative debris. However, some of these municipal executives have expressed that despite entering into these agreements, the demolition and vegetative debris recovery efforts have yet to begin. Likewise, it was reported that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has been slow to contract the resources necessary to restore the power grid of the Island as well as to install reinforced blue plastic sheeting to protect the property of those residents who have lost their roofs.

Once again, we stress that allocating resources, establishing long-term plans, and claiming that essential services shall be restored eventually is not enough. The U.S. citizens residing in Puerto Rico deserve and warrant that their needs be addressed with the same promptness and urgency with which the needs of our fellow citizens have been addressed under similar circumstances. It is not out of sheer convenience that we make this claim, but rather it is based on the most basic rights that the residents of Puerto Rico are entitled to enjoy.

In light of the foregoing, and with the utmost sense of urgency given the critical time that the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico are living in, we deemed it necessary to emphatically demand from the Government of the United States of America that the pace with which the recovery and reconstruction works are being carried out in Puerto Rico is increased and accelerated. Time is of the essence.

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—To demand from the Government of the United States of America that they prioritize, increase, and accelerate the recovery, restoration, and reconstruction efforts of Puerto Rico in the wake of Hurricane Maria.

Section 2.—As part of the efforts, the President shall direct the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expedite the debris removal efforts in the municipalities of Puerto Rico and reestablish the power grid of the Island, among other matters, including specific instructions on the recovery works that Puerto Rico needs and a work schedule.

Section 3.—A copy of this Concurrent Resolution, translated into English, shall be delivered to the President of the United States, Donald Trump; the Vice President of the United States and President of the United States Senate, Michael Pence; the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Paul Ryan; and the Senate Majority Leader, Mitch McConnell.

Section 4.—This Concurrent Resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 526. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 791. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1538. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish awareness of, and technical assistance for, the creation of employee stock ownership plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1961. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to temporarily reauthorize certain pilot programs under the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment:

S. 1995. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2283. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2419. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the technical and business assistance services under the SBIR and STTR programs.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 2527. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the

amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2567. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the national strategy for combating and eliminating tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2568. A bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2569. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to benefit the Appalachia region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2570. A bill to repeal the funding authorization sunset and the total funding cap for the Essex National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 2571. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 437. A resolution supporting the goals of World Tuberculosis Day to raise awareness about tuberculosis; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 438. A resolution commemorating the 150th anniversary of the University of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MORAN):

S. Res. 439. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title

XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 281

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 281, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

S. 487

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 487, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 526

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

S. 528

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 528, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 781

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the

liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1016, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 1022

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1022, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to support such centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1152

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1152, a bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

S. 1161

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1161, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medicines relating to preventative health services, and for other purposes.

S. 1276

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1276, a bill to require the Attorney General to make a determination as to whether cannabidiol should be a controlled substance and listed in a schedule under the Controlled Substances Act and to expand research on the potential medical benefits of cannabidiol and other marijuana components.

S. 1520

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and for other purposes.

S. 1613

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1613, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to modernize the funding of wildlife conservation, and for other purposes.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 2006

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2006, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2155

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2245

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2245, a bill to include New Zealand in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E-1 and E-2 non-immigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of New Zealand.

S. 2271

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2271, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

S. 2283

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2283, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2334

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2334, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide clarity with respect to, and to modernize, the licensing system for musical works under section 115 of that title, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of that title, and for other purposes.

S. 2383

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2383, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve law enforcement access to data stored across borders, and for other purposes.

S. 2416

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2416, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 37, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services for certain benefits.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana

(Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2495

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2495, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

S. 2524

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2524, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a loan repayment program for substance use disorder treatment employees, and for other purposes.

S. 2529

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2529, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the applicable percentage under the premium assistance tax credit for households with young adults.

S. 2553

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2553, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit health plans and pharmacy benefit managers from restricting pharmacies from informing individuals regarding the prices for certain drugs and biologicals.

S. 2556

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2556, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to promulgate regulations to prohibit the storage of live animals in overhead compartments of airplanes.

S. 2564

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2564, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to promote the investigation of fraudulent claims against certain trusts, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties against fraudulent claims against certain trusts, and for other purposes.

S. 2565

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a

cosponsor of S. 2565, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide child care assistance to veterans receiving certain training or vocational rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 424

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 424, a resolution honoring the 25th anniversary of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 432, a resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 2571. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I am proud to once again join with Senator COLLINS to introduce the bipartisan Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. Senator COLLINS and I have championed this effort together for years now, and I thank her for her thoughtful and steadfast advocacy and constructive contribution throughout our efforts. Our bill will extend for five years key programs authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and expand and improve the programs and services that are vital—and sometimes lifesaving—resources and safe havens for at risk youth in our home states and across the country.

Runaway and homeless youth are significantly more likely to become victims of sexual abuse and trafficking. Our bill ensures that service providers,

who are the bedrock of the support system for runaway and homeless youth, have the information, training, and resources they need to identify and serve youth that have been victims of trauma. This includes connecting the youth with appropriate additional services to ensure their physical and mental health and safety.

The bill reauthorizes and expands programs and guidance that help providers reunify youth with their families and loved ones, or, if not possible, provide a tailored and comprehensive support system to help them get back on their feet or on a path to self-sufficiency. The spectrum of support services include emergency and transitional housing—because the first step is having a safe place to stay. They also include training and counseling relating to physical and mental health care, financial literacy, and workforce training. Runaway and Homeless Youth providers are there for the youth every step of the way, supporting them and connecting them to their community and to available resources. Our reauthorization adds completion of the Free Application for Financial Student Aid (FAFSA) form to the available assistance to help youth who wish to pursue advanced educational opportunities realize their goals.

Finally, our bill ensures that no child can be discriminated against in trying to gain access to access services or housing through Runaway and Homeless Youth programs. It is unconscionable to turn away any child in need—gay, straight, black or white. These are our Nation's most vulnerable youth and they must all feel welcome. In many cases, Runaway and Homeless Youth programs can be a last resort. We cannot let one child fall through the cracks in our support system.

In Vermont alone, the Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs served 500 young people in need of housing supports in Fiscal Year 2017. Vermont is the seventh most expensive State to live in for rural areas, and ranks within the top five States for the largest shortfall between housing wage and renter wage. As youth and families struggle to make ends meet in Vermont and across the Nation, these programs and support systems are more important than ever. We must invest the resources to ensure our youth have a safe place to go and the resources they need to become self-sufficient.

Senator COLLINS and I know just how dangerous and unpredictable the weather can be in the Northeast. In fact, we are getting hit with yet another nor'easter complete with fresh snow this week. No child in either of our states, or anywhere in the United States, should have to call the street home. The bill we are introducing today will help ensure our nation's

children have a safe place to stay and have the support they need to grow, learn, and thrive.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 437—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF WORLD TUBERCULOSIS DAY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 437

Whereas $\frac{1}{4}$ of the population of the world is infected with the tuberculosis bacterium (commonly referred to as "TB");

Whereas the World Health Organization (commonly referred to as the "WHO") estimates that 10,400,000 people were newly infected with TB in 2016, 10 percent of whom were also infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (commonly referred to as "HIV");

Whereas, in 2016, TB killed an estimated 1,700,000 people, causing more deaths worldwide than any other single infectious agent;

Whereas more than 80 percent of TB deaths among HIV-negative people in 2016 occurred in Africa and Southeast Asia, and India accounted for 33 percent of global HIV-negative TB deaths;

Whereas TB is a leading killer of people infected with HIV, and 400,000 people with HIV died of TB in 2016;

Whereas additional vulnerable populations at high risk for developing TB include pregnant women and newborns;

Whereas TB is 1 of the 5 leading causes of death among adult women between the ages of 20 and 59 in low-income countries, and women with TB can face stigma, discrimination, and in some settings ostracization by their families and communities;

Whereas the global TB epidemic and the spread of drug-resistant TB present a persistent public health threat to the United States because the disease does not recognize borders;

Whereas antibiotic-resistant pathogens are a growing problem worldwide, and drug-resistant TB can occur when the drugs used to treat TB are misused or mismanaged;

Whereas studies have demonstrated direct person-to-person transmission of drug-resistant TB;

Whereas multi-drug resistant TB (commonly referred to as "MDR-TB") is caused by bacteria with resistance to rifampin and isoniazid, the 2 most potent treatments for TB infection;

Whereas, according to the 2017 WHO Global Tuberculosis Report, in 2016 an estimated 4.1 percent of all new TB cases and 19 percent of previously treated cases were MDR-TB or rifampin-resistant TB;

Whereas, in 2016, an estimated 600,000 people around the world developed MDR-TB or rifampin-resistant TB and those drug-resistant strains caused approximately 240,000 deaths worldwide;

Whereas extensively drug-resistant TB (commonly referred to as "XDR-TB") is a rare type of TB that is resistant to nearly all medicines, and therefore can be very difficult and expensive to treat, especially among patients with HIV and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (commonly referred to as "AIDS");

Whereas, according to the 2017 WHO Global Tuberculosis Report, in 2015, 123 countries reported at least 1 case of XDR-TB;

Whereas, in 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that the cost of treating a single patient with MDR-TB in the United States averaged \$160,000, and the average cost of treating a patient with XDR-TB was even higher at \$513,000, compared with \$18,000 to treat a patient with drug-susceptible TB;

Whereas MDR-TB and XDR-TB cases in the United States between 2005 and 2007 collectively cost the health care system an estimated \$53,000,000, according to an analysis by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

Whereas, in a 2000 report, the Institute of Medicine found that a decrease in TB control funding and the spread of HIV and AIDS caused a resurgence of TB in the late 1980s and early 1990s;

Whereas a total of 9,272 TB cases were reported in the United States in 2016, representing all 50 States and the District of Columbia, and up to 13,000,000 people in the United States may be living with latent TB infection;

Whereas 75 percent of States have reported an increase in the proportion of complex cases of TB in recent years due to factors such as homelessness, HIV infection, drug resistance, substance abuse, refugee status, and other factors;

Whereas the rate of TB disease in African Americans is 8 times higher than the rate in white non-Hispanic Americans, and significant disparities exist among other minorities in the United States, including Native Americans and Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans, with 86 percent of all reported TB cases in the United States in 2016 occurring in racial or ethnic minorities;

Whereas, globally in 2016, an estimated 1,000,000 children developed TB and 250,000 children died of TB;

Whereas smoking greatly increases the risk of death from TB, and more than 20 percent of TB cases worldwide may be attributable to smoking;

Whereas diabetes is a major risk factor for TB, and people with diabetes are more likely to develop TB and have a higher risk of death due to TB;

Whereas bedaquiline is an antibiotic that boosts an MDR-TB patient's chance of survival from approximately 50 percent to as much as 80 percent, and through a public-private partnership, the United States Agency for International Development (commonly referred to as "USAID") assists more than 8,000 patients in almost 40 countries in accessing this new medication;

Whereas Bacillus Calmette-Guerin, a TB vaccine that is known as "BCG", provides some protection to children but has had little epidemiologic impact on TB worldwide;

Whereas there is a critical need for new drugs, diagnostics, and vaccines for controlling the global TB epidemic;

Whereas the WHO has called for "global solidarity and action" to support a 20-year strategy to end the global TB epidemic;

Whereas the enactment of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-293; 122 Stat. 2918), and the Comprehensive Tuberculosis Elimination Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-392; 122 Stat. 4195) provided a historic United States commitment to the global eradication of TB, including a commitment to treat 4,500,000 TB patients and 90,000 MDR-TB patients between

2009 and 2013 and to provide additional treatment through coordinated multilateral efforts;

Whereas USAID provides financial and technical assistance to 23 countries highly burdened by TB, helps to support the development of new diagnostic and treatment tools, and is authorized to support research to develop new vaccines to combat TB;

Whereas TB incidence in the countries that receive bilateral TB funding from the United States through USAID has decreased by nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ since 2000;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, partnering with other entities of the United States and individual States and territories, directs the national TB elimination program, coordinates TB surveillance, technical assistance, and prevention activities, and helps to support the development of new diagnostic, treatment, and prevention tools to combat TB;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health, through its many institutes and centers, plays the leading role in basic and clinical research on the identification, treatment, and prevention of TB;

Whereas the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (commonly referred to as the "Global Fund"), to which the United States is a top financial donor, provides more than 65 percent of all international financing for TB programs;

Whereas, to date, Global Fund-supported programs have detected and treated 17,400,000 cases of TB; and

Whereas March 24, 2018, is World Tuberculosis Day, a day that commemorates the date in 1882 on which Dr. Robert Koch announced his discovery of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, the bacteria that causes TB: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of World Tuberculosis Day to raise awareness about tuberculosis;

(2) commends the progress of tuberculosis bacteria elimination efforts by entities that include the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training, the United States Agency for International Development, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, the World Health Organization, and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment to strengthen the United States leadership and effectiveness of the global response to tuberculosis.

SENATE RESOLUTION 438—COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 438

Whereas Congress enacted the Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the "First Morrill Act") (12 Stat. 503, chapter 130; 7 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), to allow for the establishment of land-grant colleges offering programs teaching agriculture and the mechanic arts;

Whereas on March 23, 1868, the State of California enacted the Organic Act, which—

(1) established the University of California (referred to in this preamble as the "University"); and

(2) entrusted the organization and government of the University to a corporate body entitled the Regents of the University;

Whereas in 1869 the University opened in Oakland, California, and had an inaugural class of 40 students and 10 faculty members;

Whereas, since 1869, the University has grown to include a total of 10 campuses in the following cities: San Francisco; Berkeley; Davis; Los Angeles; Santa Barbara; Riverside; San Diego; Santa Cruz; Irvine; and Merced;

Whereas, as of 2018, the University has more than 273,000 enrolled students and employs more than 223,300 faculty, staff, and other academics;

Whereas the University has graduated more than 2,000,000 living alumni;

Whereas in 1870 the University decreed that the University would admit women and men equally;

Whereas the University has 5 academic medical centers, which include 6 medical schools, 12 public hospitals, and 18 health professional schools;

Whereas the University is affiliated with—

(1) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, since 1931;

(2) Los Alamos National Laboratory, since 1943; and

(3) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, since 1952;

Whereas these 3 national laboratories are—

(1) working to create advanced new tools for scientific discovery;

(2) enabling transformational solutions for health and the environment;

(3) enhancing the defense of the United States while reducing the global threat from terrorism; and

(4) addressing other emerging national security and energy challenges;

Whereas, due to the commitment of the University to diversity and to providing access to higher education to all qualified students in the State of California, the University currently enrolls the highest number of resident undergraduates in the history of the University;

Whereas the faculty of the University is internationally renowned for scholarly and scientific achievements, and has helped maintain the prestige and quality of education of the University during decades of social and technological change;

Whereas in 1939 University professor E.O. Lawrence received the first Nobel Prize of the University for inventing the cyclotron;

Whereas 61 faculty members associated with the University have won Nobel Prizes;

Whereas the faculty and alumni of the University include hundreds of MacArthur "Genius" grant winners, Pulitzer Prize winners, Fulbright Award recipients, National Medal of Science winners, prominent policy makers, athletes, and thespians;

Whereas the University established the fields of nuclear physics and biotechnology, revolutionized agriculture, and helped the movie industry mature;

Whereas the University, through faculty and alumni, continues to drive technological innovation and actively partners with private industry; and

Whereas the University continues to address the most pressing issues in the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of California (referred to in this resolving clause as the "University") on the 150th anniversary of the founding of the University;

(2) recognizes and celebrates the 150 years of history, legacy, and achievements of the University;

(3) recognizes the achievements of all of the administrators, professors, students, and staff members who have contributed to the success of the University;

(4) reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to ensuring access to a quality and affordable higher education across the United States; and

(5) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the President of the University; and
(B) the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution that honors one of the most venerable institutions in our State: the University of California.

The resolution before us commemorates the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the University of California, a noteworthy milestone that must be celebrated by recognizing all of the achievements. I would like to thank my dear friend, Senator HARRIS, for joining me and supporting this endeavor.

Throughout its history, the University of California has become a foundation, and a beacon of hope, for the State of California and the Nation as a whole. It embraces the same spirit and tenacity that defines our great State.

The University of California has grown from one campus in Berkeley to a system of 10 top-ranked universities, five notable and top-notch academic medical centers, and three affiliated National Laboratories, all impacting far reaches of the State.

We should recognize the University of California for what it is: the finest and most accessible public university system in this country. It was established on the premise that college is for everyone and designed with every Californian in mind. That is why the University of California's Board of Regents in 1870 decreed that women be admitted equally with men, 50 years before the adoption of the Nineteenth Amendment, which granted women the right to vote.

Diversity has always been a cornerstone of the University of California. Because of its progressive and forward-thinking ways, notable alumni include Jackie Robinson, who shattered the Major League Baseball's color barrier; Sally Ride, the first American woman in space; and the countless number of students and faculty members who are the first generation in their families to attend college.

Today, the University of California has more than 273,000 enrolled students and employs more than 223,300 faculty, staff, and other academics. It has graduated more than two million living alumni.

The University of California is also a national leader in scientific discovery and medical advancement, enabling transformational solutions for

healthcare and the environment, enhancing our Nation's defense while reducing the global threat from terrorism, and addressing other emerging national security and energy challenges. It established itself in the fields of nuclear physics and biotechnology, revolutionized agriculture, and helped the movie industry mature, all of which are now multi-billion-dollar industries. Through its faculty and alumni, the University continues to drive technological innovation and actively partner with the private sector.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I would like to end with a small anecdote. Every year in our household, we always look forward to the "Big Game." For the uninitiated, this is the biggest college football game of the year: the Stanford Cardinal versus the California Golden Bears. This is the oldest college football rivalry in the West, which began in 1892, and still continues to this day. I do not hold it against those who attended Berkeley, but I will be happy to gloat when my Cardinal beat the Bears. I am not one to boast, but it must be noted that Stanford has won more "Big Games" than Berkeley.

All quips aside, as we commemorate this momentous occasion in the storied history that is the University of California, we must remember the past and present, with an eye towards the future. The challenges before it are great, but the potential that lies within itself is even greater. I know and believe that the University of California will continue to push boundaries, explore the great unknown, stand up for American values, and continue to solve the world's most complex problems. Here is to another exceptional 150 years.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SENATE RESOLUTION 439—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MORAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 439

Whereas multiple sclerosis (referred to in this preamble as "MS") can impact individuals of all ages, races, and ethnicities, but MS is at least 2 to 3 times more common in women than in men;

Whereas there are approximately 2,300,000 individuals worldwide who have been diagnosed with MS;

Whereas MS is typically diagnosed in individuals between the ages of 20 and 50, but it is estimated that between 8,000 and 10,000 children and adolescents are living with MS in the United States;

Whereas MS is an unpredictable, often disabling disease of the central nervous system

that disrupts the flow of information within the brain and between the brain and the body;

Whereas symptoms of MS range from numbness and tingling to vision problems and paralysis, and the progress, severity, and specific symptoms of MS in any 1 person cannot yet be predicted;

Whereas, while there is no evidence that MS is directly inherited, studies show that there are genetic and environmental factors that give certain individuals a higher risk of developing MS;

Whereas the exact cause of MS is unknown, and there is no cure for MS;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition, a national network of independent MS organizations dedicated to the enhancement of the quality of life of individuals affected by MS, recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

Whereas the mission of the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition is to increase opportunities for cooperation and to provide greater opportunity to leverage the effective use of resources for the benefit of the MS community;

Whereas the United States plays a critical role in coordinating MS research globally and amplifies the impact of research in the United States through which results are delivered to MS patients;

Whereas, in 2012, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society was a founding member of the International Progressive MS Alliance, which coordinates research to accelerate the development of treatments for progressive MS by removing international scientific and technological barriers and, as of 2018, includes 17 MS organizations from 17 countries, 9 foundation and trust members, and 7 pharmaceutical partners;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week during March each year;

Whereas the goals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week are—

(1) to invite people to join the movement to end MS;

(2) to encourage everyone to do something to demonstrate a commitment to moving toward a world free of MS; and

(3) to acknowledge those who have dedicated time and talent to help promote MS research and programs; and

Whereas, in 2018, Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week is recognized during the week of March 11 through March 17: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(2) encourages States, localities, and the territories and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week by issuing proclamations designating Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(3) encourages media organizations—

(A) to participate in Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; and

(B) to help provide education to the public about multiple sclerosis;

(4) commends the efforts of States, localities, and the territories and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(5) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to ending multiple sclerosis by—

(A) promoting awareness about individuals that are affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) supporting multiple sclerosis research and education programs;

(6) recognizes all individuals in the United States living with multiple sclerosis;

(7) expresses gratitude to the family members and friends of individuals living with multiple sclerosis, who are a source of love and encouragement for those individuals; and

(8) salutes the health care professionals and medical researchers who—

(A) provide assistance to individuals affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) continue to work to find ways—

(i) to stop multiple sclerosis;

(ii) to restore what has been lost due to multiple sclerosis; and

(iii) to end multiple sclerosis forever.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2212. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1865, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2213. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1865, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2214. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3731, to provide overtime pay for employees of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2212. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1865, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EFFECT ON LIABILITY OF EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY, RESTRICT ACCESS TO, OR REMOVE OBJECTIONABLE MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) EFFECT OF EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY, RESTRICT ACCESS TO, OR REMOVE OBJECTIONABLE MATERIAL.—

“(A) EFFECT ON CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LIABILITY GENERALLY.—The fact that a provider or user of an interactive computer service has undertaken any efforts (including monitoring and filtering) to identify, restrict access to, or remove material the provider or user considers objectionable shall not be considered in determining the criminal or civil liability of the provider or user for any material that the provider or user has not removed or restricted access to.

“(B) EFFECT ON PROTECTIONS.—The protections under paragraphs (1) and (2) are not

limited by or contingent upon an interactive computer service provider's—

“(i) moderation of content; or
“(ii) use of particular content moderation practices.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred, or is alleged to have occurred, before, on, or after such date of enactment.

SA 2213. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1865, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTING SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS FROM CRIMINAL WEBSITES.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Protecting Sex Trafficking Victims from Criminal Websites Act”.

(b) **APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS.**—Out of funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Attorney General, for use in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to investigate and prosecute website operators that criminally facilitate sex trafficking or the sexual exploitation of children.

(c) **AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED.**—Amounts appropriated under subsection (b) shall remain available until expended.

(d) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—

(1) **PAYGO SCORECARD.**—The budgetary effects of this section shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(2) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.**—The budgetary effects of this section shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

SA 2214. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3731, to provide overtime pay for employees of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Secret Service Recruitment and Retention Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF OVERTIME PAY EXCEPTION THROUGH 2018 FOR PROTECTIVE SERVICES.

(a) **AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2 of the Overtime Pay for Protective Services Act of 2016 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note) is amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “IN 2016” and inserting “DURING 2016 THROUGH 2018”;

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “2016” and inserting “2016, 2017, or 2018”; and

(C) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 5547(a) of title 5, United States Code, and only to the extent that an appropriation is provided specifically in an appropriations Act for premium pay in excess of the annual equivalent of the limitation on the rate of pay contained in section 5547(a), any covered employee may receive premium pay during 2016, 2017, and 2018, to the extent provided under section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note).”.

(2) **CLARIFYING PROVISION.**—Section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note) is amended, in the first sentence, by inserting “or 3056A” after “section 3056(a)”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on December 31, 2016.

(c) **REPORT ON EXTENSIONS.**—Not later than January 30, 2018, and January 30, 2019, the Director of the Secret Service shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the effects of the amendment made by subsection (a)(2). The report shall include, with respect to the previous calendar year—

(1) the total number of United States Secret Service personnel receiving premium pay above the premium pay limitation in subsection (a) of section 5547 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the total amount of premium pay for that calendar year paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection;

(3) the mean and median amount of premium pay paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection;

(4) the greatest amount paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection and the number of employees who received that amount;

(5) notwithstanding the amendments made by subsection (a), the total number of United States Secret Service personnel who were not fully compensated for service because of the premium pay earnings limitation in section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note);

(6) the total amount of premium pay United States Secret Service personnel would have been paid but for the premium pay earnings limitation in such section; and

(7) a list of United States Secret Service personnel who, within the calendar year, received premium pay above the premium pay limitation in subsection (a) of section 5547 of title 5, United States Code, and separated from the agency, including the type of separation in each case.

SEC. 3. REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 1 year after the effective date of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representa-

tives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the extent of the progress made by the United States Secret Service in implementing the recommendations of the United States Secret Service Protective Mission Panel, including in particular those items pertaining to training and personnel enumerated in the Executive Summary to Report from the United States Secret Service Protective Mission Panel to the Secretary of Homeland Security dated December 15, 2014.

APPOINTMENTS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, and Public Law 106-292, appoints the following Senator to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN of Maryland.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: the Honorable JOE MANCHIN III of West Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations.

SECRET SERVICE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3731 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3731) to provide overtime pay for employees of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2214) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Secret Service Recruitment and Retention Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF OVERTIME PAY EXCEPTION THROUGH 2018 FOR PROTECTIVE SERVICES.

(a) **AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2 of the Overtime Pay for Protective Services Act of 2016 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note) is amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “IN 2016” and inserting “DURING 2016 THROUGH 2018”;

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “2016” and inserting “2016, 2017, or 2018”; and

(C) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 5547(a) of title 5, United States Code, and only to the extent that an appropriation is provided specifically in an appropriations Act for premium pay in excess of the annual equivalent of the limitation on the rate of pay contained in section 5547(a), any covered employee may receive premium pay during 2016, 2017, and 2018, to the extent provided under section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note).”

(2) CLARIFYING PROVISION.—Section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note) is amended, in the first sentence, by inserting “or 3056A” after “section 3056(a)”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on December 31, 2016.

(c) REPORT ON EXTENSIONS.—Not later than January 30, 2018, and January 30, 2019, the Director of the Secret Service shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the effects of the amendment made by subsection (a)(2). The report shall include, with respect to the previous calendar year—

(1) the total number of United States Secret Service personnel receiving premium pay above the premium pay limitation in subsection (a) of section 5547 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the total amount of premium pay for that calendar year paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection;

(3) the mean and median amount of premium pay paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection;

(4) the greatest amount paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection and the number of employees who received that amount;

(5) notwithstanding the amendments made by subsection (a), the total number of United States Secret Service personnel who were not fully compensated for service because of the premium pay earnings limitation in section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note);

(6) the total amount of premium pay United States Secret Service personnel would have been paid but for the premium pay earnings limitation in such section; and

(7) a list of United States Secret Service personnel who, within the calendar year, received premium pay above the premium pay limitation in subsection (a) of section 5547 of title 5, United States Code, and separated

from the agency, including the type of separation in each case.

SEC. 3. REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 1 year after the effective date of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the extent of the progress made by the United States Secret Service in implementing the recommendations of the United States Secret Service Protective Mission Panel, including in particular those items pertaining to training and personnel enumerated in the Executive Summary to Report from the United States Secret Service Protective Mission Panel to the Secretary of Homeland Security dated December 15, 2014.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H. R. 3731), as amended, was passed.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 20; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865. Finally, I ask that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:18 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

AIMEE KATHRYN JORJANI, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2021, VICE MILFORD WAYNE DONALDSON, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ELIZABETH DARLING, OF TEXAS, TO BE COMMISSIONER ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE RAFAEL J. LOPEZ.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOSEPH N. MONDELLO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MARK SCHULTZ, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE JANET LORRAINE LABRECK.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

EDWARD W. FELTEN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2019, VICE PATRICIA M. WALD, RETIRED.

JANE NITZE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2023, VICE RACHEL L. BRAND, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

TIA W. CAPHART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

NAPOLÉON A. CAMPOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KEVIN R. EMBRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ANDREW J. FURJANIC

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DANIEL L. LEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JOHN M. WILLIAMS

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 19, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NAZAKHAT NIKAKHTAR, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

KEVIN K. MCALEENAN, OF HAWAII, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 19, 2018

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK MEADOWS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

NATIONAL PHYSICIANS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, March 25 through March 31 is National Physicians Week. As a practicing physician for nearly 30 years, I would like to use my time today to acknowledge the dedicated doctors nationwide who devote their lives to providing quality care for our patients.

I am so thankful for the doctors who have led the charge to observe a week dedicated to our Nation's physicians, and especially thanks to Dr. Kimberly Jackson. Dr. Jackson is a true pioneer for the medical profession. In June of 2015, she founded the Physicians Working Together organization. This group was created to bring physicians together from a broad spectrum of specialties. Dr. Jackson then, just 1 year later, established the last week in March as National Physicians Week.

This year's celebration will include a physician-led virtual conference hosted by the Physicians Working Together group. The conference is available for free and will provide physicians with

valuable ways to improve their everyday practice. The virtual sessions will also highlight ways that physicians can take action in policy through advocacy groups and navigate the world of politics. I encourage my friends in the medical industry to tune in.

As an obstetrician/gynecologist, I have had the privilege of building relationships with patients that I will always hold dear to my heart. There is nothing quite like watching a family grow before your eyes and having a hand in their healthy growing.

Although government regulations piled on over the years have continued to make it difficult to build and nurture these relationships, my patients have become no less important nor less of a priority to me. I know this to be the case for many other doctors throughout the Nation.

During my time practicing medicine in Great Bend, Kansas, I had the opportunity to work alongside many fellow physicians who practice with a level of care that I want for my own family, physicians who are more than deserving of a week of appreciation. So please take a few moments to show your support for your local physicians.

For more information regarding the conference, I would ask you to check out the National Physicians Week Facebook page, or look at my own social media pages for more ways to spread the word.

IT IS TIME TO STAND UP FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to talk about the events of Friday night and concern for the continued special counsel position of Robert Mueller.

On Friday night, late, the Deputy Director of the FBI, Mr. Andrew McCabe, was fired. I haven't seen the IG report. Nobody has seen it. It won't be available until April. But it is concerning that, that late at night, people were working at Justice to fire a career employee and possibly deprive him of his pension.

Mr. McCabe believes the reason he was fired was because of his knowledge of Mr. Comey's conversations with the President, and his own conversations with the President, and his being a corroborating witness. I don't know what the cause was, but the process was awful. It was rushed, and it seemed to

violate the due process rights of this career Federal employee.

And then to watch the President of the United States, a multibillionaire, spike the ball on being able to deprive a 20-year Federal employee of a pension was cruel, un-American, and mean-spirited. It was a shot across the bow at other government officials who are doing their jobs—Justice Department officials, FBI officials, law enforcement officials who love this country and put their lives on the line—and that if they don't agree with the Mueller investigation continuing; or if they see concerns about the United States President and his campaign and some involvement with Russia or with obstruction of justice, or violations of emoluments clauses; that they too risk their jobs and risk their pensions, and risk their financial security.

It is a scary time in America, and we are looking at the abyss.

In December, I was concerned about this as well. And Representative WALTER JONES from North Carolina, a Republican, and I, have a bipartisan bill, H.R. 4669, which has a Senate companion filed, and is bipartisan as well, by Senator TILLIS and Senator COONS, which is S. 1741; and it gives the special counsel due process if he is fired for causes that are not objective—related to his job and the performance of his duties.

But it means he couldn't be fired for politics and he couldn't be fired to squelch an investigation concerning the very fundamentals of this country and allegiance and adherence to the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America for which we have all taken an oath to uphold. Nothing is more sacred.

If the President has done nothing wrong, as he has said on many occasions, and he has tweeted recently about Mr. Mueller and said it is a "witch hunt" and said there is no collusion. If there is no collusion, if there is no obstruction of justice, if there are no violations, the President should, as Representative TREY GOWDY has said, welcome the continuation of the investigation to clear him.

As Representative TREY GOWDY said: He is not acting like a man who is innocent. And Representative CHARLIE DENT has said similar things.

If you have nothing to hide, why stop an investigation if there is nothing to find? And if there is something to find and something for the American people to know about, and for Congress to

know about and act on, then it is incumbent on us to protect Mr. Mueller and protect that investigation.

That is why we have these bipartisan bills. I know there is Democratic support for these bills, but there hasn't been Republican support that I know of, beyond Senator TILLIS and Representative WALTER JONES.

I call on Speaker RYAN to schedule this bill, have it scheduled in Representative GOODLATTE's committee, my committee, the Judiciary Committee, for a hearing, or bring it directly to the floor for a vote.

I call on Representative GOODLATTE to schedule the bill for a markup and have it voted on.

But, more importantly, I call on my Republican colleagues to stand up for America and stand up for their oath of office.

We get along, Republicans and Democrats. Republicans are good people, too. They have different thoughts on certain issues and different perspectives than most Democrats and I do. But we all believe in an America that should not be capitulating to Russia, and an America that shouldn't be seeing the Constitution shredded and laws violated.

So I call on my Republican colleagues to look into their soul, look into their heart, remember their oath. Sign on to H.R. 4669, as Representative WALTER JONES has, and stand up for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

NEVER AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, over 4 weeks have passed since our Nation suffered an unspeakable tragedy in Parkland, Florida, where we lost 17 souls that we cannot get back.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the names of these young, brave souls who will move this country to act to protect other young students across this Nation.

Alyssa Alhadeff, Scott Beigel, Martin Duque Anguiano, Nicholas Dworet, Aaron Feis, Jaime Guttenberg, Chris Hixon, Luke Hoyer, Cara Loughran, Gina Montalto, Joaquin Oliver, Alaina Petty, Meadow Pollack, Helena Ramsay, Alex Schachter, Carmen Schentrup, Peter Wang.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have met with the brave students of Parkland. I have also met with the parent of one of those lost souls.

I have met with students and parents and teachers alike in my own district in Pennsylvania. I have seen the fear and the anxiety in their demeanor. I have seen the tears in their eyes. They

are asking for this Congress to do what past Congresses have failed to do.

Mr. Speaker, there were countless missed signals and missed opportunities that could have prevented this tragedy from happening. However, this is not the time for finger-pointing; this is a time for healing, and, more importantly, this is a time for action.

We were elected to Congress not to hide from tough decisions, not to be afraid to tackle tough problems. Mr. Speaker, we were elected to lead, and lead we must.

As a 14-year FBI agent, I carried a weapon on my ankle every day in order to save lives and keep people safe. And as a Federal gun crimes prosecutor, I prosecuted and imprisoned those who committed violent gun crimes in order to protect people, in my role as a prosecutor, and keep our communities safe.

Keeping our communities safe and protecting the Second Amendment are not mutually exclusive concepts. We can advance both and preserve both simultaneously. All we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is be willing to do what every American wants us to do, which is put away ideology and come together in a bipartisan fashion.

Of all the responsibilities we have, of all of the responsibilities we have, we have no higher responsibility as elected officials, and as citizens, than to protect our kids.

After the terror attacks of September 11, we said: Never again. Never again will we allow terrorists to seize control of a cockpit and turn a commercial airliner into a guided missile.

What did we do? We created the Department of Homeland Security; we deployed a Federal Air Marshal Service, the likes of which this country has never seen; we fortified our cockpits; we deployed state-of-the-art screening equipment across our Nation's 450-plus airports across the country. We said: Never again.

I am calling on my colleagues to have the same response to school shootings: Never again.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, of which I am a proud member, has developed a well-thought-out list of 10 legislative proposals that help us achieve this goal, to protect our kids, to say never again to this needless violence.

I urge my colleagues in this House, Democrat and Republican alike, to show leadership in tackling these tough issues. Call for a floor vote and support these bipartisan proposals. Let's do it for our kids. They need us now more than ever.

GUN SAFETY PROVISIONS MAKE A DIFFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the presentation from my friend from Pennsylvania. I could not agree more that it is time for us to come forward with action.

It was my honor this morning to address the Council of the Great City Schools, who are gathered in our Nation's Capitol—board members, superintendents, dealing with the challenges of education. And they are standing in solidarity with the young people who have raised their voices calling upon Congress to finally act.

One of the things that is deeply troubling is that the Republican leadership refuses to allow a robust debate and action on the floor of the House. There are dozens of provisions that we can come together, produce majorities, enact legislation that will protect children's lives.

Mr. Speaker, the Council of the Great City Schools had a resolution calling upon us to take action that I include in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION

COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS, RELATING TO SCHOOL SHOOTINGS IN THE UNITED STATES

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the Council of the Great City Schools assign the Board of Directors all powers and duties necessary to define the policies and positions of the organization and state that the Board may conduct acts in furtherance of those policies, except where the organization is prohibited from doing so by law or other governing documents;

WHEREAS, there is a need for the nation's major city school systems to express their positions on school safety matters that affect its students and the children residing in its cities;

WHEREAS, thousands of our students have publicly expressed concern for their safety and well-being and have indicated that policymakers should act immediately to protect them in school and beyond;

WHEREAS, the leaders of the nation's major city public school systems respect the concerns of their students, and support the growing civic and social participation of high school students that was inspired by recent events;

WHEREAS, since the school shooting in Columbine in 1999, there have been numerous other school shootings, including those in Red Lake (MN), Lancaster (PA), Blacksburg (VA), Chardon (OH), Cleveland (OH), Sandy Hook (CT), Broward County (FL), and many others that have taken scores of young lives;

WHEREAS, too many of our young people are shot and killed on the streets of our major cities almost every day;

WHEREAS, Americans are 25 times more likely to be killed with a gun than people in other developed countries;

WHEREAS, Americans make up about 4.4 percent of the world's population but own some 42 percent of the world's guns;

WHEREAS, assault weapons have no place in society and other types of guns are too easily obtained;

WHEREAS, teachers are not trained law enforcement officers, and should not be asked or incentivized to keep weapons accessible in their classrooms;

WHEREAS, there is no reason based on any viable research to suggest that adding guns

into a school setting or arming teachers would prevent these acts of violence;

WHEREAS, schools across the country need considerable additional resources to plan for the possibility of such acts of violence, coordinate with law enforcement, and secure their buildings from intruders;

WHEREAS, many schools lack the mental health counselors, psychologists, and social workers they need to identify and work with students showing warning signs for depression and violence;

WHEREAS, the nation's data collection on gun violence and gun ownership is inadequate to monitor, understand, or prevent these events from happening; and

WHEREAS, the multiple school shootings that the nation has witnessed over the years have complex causes requiring multiple solutions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools, its member districts, and staff stand with the students of Broward County Public Schools and the nation in demanding effective and comprehensive action from the federal government to protect schoolchildren;

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools calls on the Congress of the United States to ban the sale, purchase, possession, and use of assault weapons and large-capacity ammunition cartridges, except those needed by the military and law enforcement;

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools calls on the Congress of the United States to require and strengthen universal background checks to possess any type of firearm;

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools calls on the President of the United States to charge all agencies of the federal government with the task of reducing the number of gun-related injuries and deaths in America.

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools is opposed to the arming of teachers to protect schools and children;

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools calls on the Congress of the United States to extend the perimeter of Gun-Free School Zones;

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools calls on the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate new funds to allow school districts across the nation to plan and coordinate school security efforts with law enforcement officials and make other building alterations that may be necessary to protect students, teachers, and staff;

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools calls on the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate new funds to increase the numbers of counselors, mental health staff, psychologists, and social workers in our schools;

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools calls on the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate new funds for programs to educate students and their families on the dangers of firearms; and

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Great City Schools calls on the Congress of the United States to require that states and the federal government collect whatever data necessary to track, monitor, understand, and prevent the extent of gun violence in America.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we find that areas that have acted, in the aftermath of gun violence, to increase protections for gun safety actually makes a difference. It is a lie that gun safety provisions make no difference; that, somehow, people who are intent on slaughter will not behave according to the law, they won't obey it; it will have no impact.

The evidence is that where actions are taken to reduce gun violence, to increase protections, to take guns away from people who shouldn't have them, gun violence is reduced.

In the aftermath of Sandy Hook, when this Congress was paralyzed, refused to allow a bipartisan legislation that would have increased universal background checks, for instance, the State of Connecticut acted. And over the years, they have enacted a series of provisions on gun safety that have resulted in reduced gun violence.

Indeed, the States with the fewest gun safety protections, some no protections at all, have the highest rates of gun violence.

□ 1215

We don't have to fall victim to that type of thinking.

The Council of the Great City Schools pointed out in their resolution that Americans are 25 times more likely to be killed with a gun than people in other developed countries. They reject the proposition that we have to be the only developed country that cannot protect our families from gun violence.

They recognize that there is no place to arm teachers in response. There is no evidence that having teachers packing heat would make any difference at all. What it would do is add another layer of uncertainty, and more guns in schools increases the likelihood that they will be used.

They categorically reject the arming of teachers, but say move forward, remove the ability of people to purchase high-capacity automatic weapons, tighten background checks, and make it easier to do research on gun violence—which this Congress has tried to make illegal.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we will not have the Republican leadership continue to deny us an opportunity to fully debate the proposals that are circulating on a bipartisan basis that would make a difference dealing with background checks, dealing with taking guns away from people who shouldn't have them; making sure that we are reducing the access to some of the most destructive military weapons that have no place circulating in society, that children not old enough, young men not old enough to buy a beer can buy an AK-47. That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that people's hearts and minds will be touched by the eloquence that we have heard from these young people in Florida who have

endured it, who have put pressure on the Florida Legislature to act. I hope we can do the same.

RETURNING LAND TO THE GOVERNMENT OF GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Guam Land Return Act of 2018. For decades, the people of Guam have worked to see their ancestral lands returned.

In Congress, I have made returning land from the Federal Government to our territorial government of Guam and Guam families a top priority. Since 2003, I have secured return of more than 1,000 acres from the Federal Government to the people of Guam.

My Guam Land Return Act of 2018 would reduce Federal landownership on Guam and return those lands to GovGuam and, ultimately, our people. This important legislation builds upon the work of my predecessors, former Congressman Robert A. Underwood, in particular.

The Guam Land Return Act would authorize the General Services Administration to transfer Federal land, buildings, vehicles, and other heavy equipment designated as surplus to GovGuam at no cost to the taxpayers. This would provide another avenue for the Federal Government to compensate GovGuam for expenses that our territorial government is required to bear in serving migrants under the Compact of Free Association, known as Compact Impact. It would also ask Federal agencies to return more Federal land to GovGuam more quickly.

The Federal Government must finally live up to its commitment to Guam and other affected U.S. jurisdictions with Compact migrant residents. I continue working to secure full Federal reimbursements for GovGuam's costs in providing local services to Compact migrants.

Indeed, I have sponsored the Compact Impact Relief Act, H.R. 4761, this year. I have also championed legislation to reimburse GovGuam for Compact Impact at the mandatory \$180 million annual level recommended by the Government Accountability Office.

Transfers of valuable surplus Federal property under my Guam Land Return Act provide yet another way to increase Federal reimbursement to GovGuam for Compact Impact expenses, and these transfers of surplus property would occur at no cost to the Federal Government or the taxpayers.

Our island of Guam hosts a substantial U.S. military presence and is a strategic forward-facing domestic military base in the important Asia-Pacific region. In January of 2011, the U.S. military made a commitment to the people of Guam to reduce Federal landownership and the military's footprint

on Guam. Importantly, the commitment coincides with the buildup of American military personnel and base resources on Guam, part of the relocation of U.S. Marines from Okinawa, Japan.

U.S. military and Defense Department leadership under the Trump administration have reaffirmed this net-negative commitment to our people and to me, personally. Since January of 2011, the Defense Department has returned approximately 686 acres to GovGuam.

My Guam Land Return Act holds the Defense Department accountable for meeting the net-negative commitment in full. This legislation would require the Secretary of Defense to maintain a public inventory of all land parcels the Defense Department expects to ultimately transfer to GovGuam under the net-negative commitment.

My legislation outlines 17 specific Federal land parcels, totalling 476 acres that should be transferred to GovGuam. The Guam Land Reform Act would also provide a public mechanism for the Governor of Guam to petition the Defense Department to consider transferring additional land parcels to GovGuam under the net-negative commitment.

Lastly, my legislation includes several provisions relating to current and former Federal land on Guam. Two provisions ensure that no-cost transfers of surplus Federal land and other valuable property do not create additional liabilities or public safety concerns for the Federal Government relating to environmental cleanup or flight paths for air traffic control. One section removes an antiquated Federal restriction on 927 acres on Guam's Cabras Island, which GovGuam has owned since 1981.

The people of Guam are patriotic Americans and support our military servicemembers and their families and the Nation's veterans, and at the same time, the people of Guam want to see their ancestral lands returned, and rightfully so.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You are the source of all life and unconditional love. The House of Representatives is a noble institution which embraces the highest aspirations of the Nation's people and embodies their lasting values.

Help the Members of this House to look at themselves, their politics, priorities, and the Nation's interests with new vision in the light of Your Spirit. Help them to be wise and patient legislators, seeking not immediate political wins, but a productive future which will nourish the stability of our homeland and reap a harvest of peace in the world.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DUNN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STAFF SERGEANT CARL ENIS

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a life that was lost too soon. Staff Sergeant Carl Enis from Tallahassee was tragically killed in the Black Hawk helicopter crash that claimed the lives of seven members of the United States Air Force in western Iraq last week.

Sergeant Enis graduated from Florida State University, and went on to get his MBA in 2017. He chose to selflessly serve our country and he joined the Air Force after college, serving as a paramedic, where he performed combat rescue missions as a member of the elite 308th Rescue Squadron.

Sergeant Enis loved the outdoors, and he even had a blog about hunting, fishing, and hiking. He was loved and respected by all who met him.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Staff Sergeant Carl Enis and all of our fallen heroes who gave their last full measure of devotion to this country to make Americans safe at home and abroad.

CELEBRATING MS. BETTYE JEAN WILSON FRANKLIN'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Ms. Bettye Jean Wilson Franklin's 90th birthday.

Ms. Franklin was born March 18, 1928. She is a native of Fort Worth. Ms. Franklin attended and graduated from the historical I.M. Terrell High School. Her passion for education inspired her to work for the Fort Worth Independent School District for 27 years until she retired in 1990.

But it is her everlasting commitment to her faith that is well-known among her friends and family. Ms. Franklin has been a faithful member of the Saint James Baptist Church for the last 77 years, where she contributed in various capacities, including her participation in the senior choir for 52 years.

In addition, she serves her community as a member of the Greater Fort Worth Area Negro Business and Professional Women's Club, and the Fort Worth Zeta Amicae Auxiliary of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority.

Ms. Franklin is also a member of the Eastern Star Southern Beauty Chapter 446, and served as Grand Secretary of the Masonic Grand Chapter Order of Eastern Star of Texas for 13 years.

She is the proud mother of two daughters, a grandmother of four grandchildren, and the great-grandmother to her seven great-grandchildren.

Happy 90th birthday, Ms. Franklin. I wish you continued health and happiness on this milestone occasion.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE FOREST HILLS HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the state champion Forest Hills High School basketball team that won the North Carolina High School Athletic Association 2-A Championship on March 10.

Forest Hills High School is located in Marshville, North Carolina. This is their first basketball championship in school history.

Yellow Jackets junior guard Jai Rorie made four free throws in the final 14 seconds to lead his team to a 63 to 59 victory.

Congratulations to the team: Brandon Barrier, Dillon Wright, Cam Richardson, Jaquan Williams, Asiah Byrd, Trey Belin, Jaleel McLaughlin, Tanner Lowery, Tyquan Rushing, Janylan Blakeney, Garrett Horne, Jalen Huntley, Keeshawn Tyson, Nasione Tyson, Jai Rorie, and Josh Owens;

Congratulations to head coach Matt Sides; and assistant coaches Danny Bailey, Garrett Malone, and Keith Sides.

Go, Yellow Jackets.

WORLD CIVILITY DAY

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the initiative of Mr. Chuck Hughes and Dr. Gordon E. Bradshaw from the city of Gary Chamber of Commerce. Their dedicated efforts have created the Community Civility Counts initiative and a World Civility Day, which will celebrate its third annual occurrence on April 12.

World Civility Day was established as a day to become more aware of our behavior toward others and to think about how we can bring more understanding into our lives and the lives of others.

We live in a time when we can all benefit from being a little bit more civil. We live in a time when a kind gesture can have a great consequence for creating a just and tolerant society.

I congratulate the initiative and dedicated work of Mr. Hughes and Dr. Bradshaw. I ask my colleagues to join me this World Civility Day and every day to do our part to bring a little more empathy into our world.

FOREST FIRE RELIEF

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge House leadership to include some very important forestry priorities in the upcoming omnibus funding bill.

We all agree that fire borrowing must be fixed. Raiding funds is no way to run a business. But we need much more than that. We need active forest management reforms in order to prevent another devastating wildfire year like we just witnessed in California, as we seem to do every year in the West.

There are over 100 million dead trees right now in just California alone, and they will only turn into tinderboxes if we cannot remove them as we should.

For example, my bill, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, would allow utility companies to clear a tree in danger of falling on a power line in these rights-of-way without months of paperwork and the liability relief they need in case the government doesn't give them the permission to do it timely.

But congressional leadership on the other side of the aisle refuses to budge when it comes to meaningful forestry management reforms to remove these

hazardous dead trees, which is even worse for forest health when we continue to have these fires for no good reason.

I urge them to come to California, come to the north State, come breathe the dirty air each summer when we see firsthand the damage these wildfires cause. Listen to the people who are impacted, who are endangered, and who have to breathe that bad air each year because of these forest fires that are allowed to happen because the government will not manage its land.

Why do we continue to allow this to happen?

I don't know.

RECOGNIZING THE BUCKS COUNTY CHILDREN'S MUSEUM

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Bucks County Children's Museum and the impactful programs that they bring to our community.

Located in New Hope, the museum focuses on creating fun for children up to 7 years old who enjoy using their imagination. At 9,000 square feet, the Children's Museum provides something for every kid. From "The Hospital" exhibit, where kids can put on a lab coat, drive an ambulance, and perform an operation, to the "Town Square," where kids can go back in time to a "turn of the century" general store, or ride the Express train. Our kids can take a virtual hot air balloon or grab a shovel and dig to find artifacts buried in a "Digging" exhibit.

It is incredibly important that we continue to inspire and educate our next generation. I thank the Bucks County Children's Museum for what they do to bring wonder and wonderful experiences to the youngest citizens of Bucks County.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the whole number of the House is 430.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3:45 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1545

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

CEILING FAN ENERGY CONSERVATION HARMONIZATION ACT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2030) to deem the compliance date for amended energy conservation standards for ceiling fan light kits to be January 21, 2020, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2030

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ceiling Fan Energy Conservation Harmonization Act".

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE DATE FOR AMENDED ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR CEILING FAN LIGHT KITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The compliance date for the amended energy conservation standards established for ceiling fan light kits in the final rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fan Light Kits" (81 Fed. Reg. 580 (January 6, 2016)) is deemed to be January 21, 2020.

(b) CONFORMING CHANGES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall make such technical and conforming changes to any regulation, guidance document, or procedure as may be necessary to implement subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert

extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, energy efficiency can provide benefits for consumers, for job-creating businesses, for energy security, and for the environment, but we have got to make sure that it is done right; and that is why I support S. 2030, Ceiling Fan Energy Conservation Harmonization Act, which was sponsored by my good friend from North Carolina, RICHARD HUDSON, and certainly has strong bipartisan cosponsorship, including Mr. CARTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

As most of you know, ceiling fans often come with lights attached, thus, they serve two purposes for consumers. The Department of Energy regulates the energy efficiency of both the ceiling fans and the ceiling fan lights, and stringent new standards are scheduled to take effect in the next 2 years; but for some reason, DOE set the deadline for the ceiling fan light kits in 2019, while the ceiling fan standard deadline is in 2020.

This bill, S. 2030, would take the logical step of aligning the compliance deadlines for ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits so that they both occur in 2020. This should ease the compliance burden for some manufacturers, make things easier for retailers, and may help lower the costs, in fact, for all consumers.

Although ceiling fan regulations may not be a front-burner issue, we ought to make sure that we take every opportunity to streamline Federal regs and help keep compliance costs down. That is why I would urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this, what I would consider, noncontroversial bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2030, the Ceiling Fan Energy Conservation Harmonization Act.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the chairman on this issue. It is bipartisan, and we are going to go ahead and do this law right.

Now, S. 2030 is essentially identical to H.R. 3477, legislation introduced by my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. HUDSON and Mr. BUTTERFIELD. The purpose of the legislation is to align the current 2019 compliance deadline for ceiling fan light kit standards with a separate standard for ceiling fans set for 2020.

S. 2030 essentially extends the compliance deadline for the rule amending

the standards for ceiling fan light kits by just over 1 year to January 21, 2020, so they can both occur at the same time.

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by the Energy Policy Act of 2005, required the Department of Energy to put in place efficiency standards for ceiling light kits. The DOE has determined that increasing efficiency standards for ceiling fan light kits would conserve energy more, while being economically feasible. The DOE finally put forth the standard that, as stated previously, would take effect in January of next year. However, because the DOE did not meet the statutory deadline for promulgating a ceiling fan lighting kit standard, certain backstop requirements have been triggered that would be vitiated by the new regulations.

Some have raised questions as to whether the enactment of this legislation would result in an extension of portions of these backstop requirements. I think it is important for manufacturers that we respond to this question, and it is my intent, later on in this debate, to enter into a colloquy with the chairman in order to provide direction to the DOE and make clear Congress' intent with regard to this matter.

New standards for these kits will save money and reduce carbon emissions, and I believe the sooner they are in place, the better for consumers and for our environment.

Having said that, the bill is not opposed by any environmental, community, or consumer groups. Perhaps this is because it is sensible legislation that will greatly help retailers by eliminating unnecessary burdens for sellers of the products, while only minimally delaying new standards.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a brief colloquy with Mr. UPTON, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy.

As I understand the purpose of S. 2030, it is to delay the January 7, 2019, compliance deadline for the latest ceiling fan light kit efficiency standard so as to align it with the January 21, 2020, compliance deadline for ceiling fans overall. Thus the efficiency standards for ceiling fans and for ceiling fan lights will go into force at the same time on January 21, 2020. Is that correct?

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCNERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. That is correct. That is the purpose.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I further understand that, pursuant to current law, because the DOE has not yet promulgated a ceiling fan light kit standard, there are backstop standards that have taken ef-

fect. As a part of this backstop, no ceiling fan light kit can be offered for sale in interstate commerce whose lamps use more than 180 watts of electricity.

To ensure this result, ceiling fan light kits are required to include a device that limits lamp efficiency consumption to 190 watts or less. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCNERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. I would note that in the gentleman's earlier statement, he said: "whose lamps use more than 180 watts of electricity," but, in fact, it is 190 watts or less, but the gentleman, again, is correct.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time. I thank the chairman and acknowledge that correction.

I understand that, in preparation for ceiling fan light kit standards going into effect in January 2019, many manufacturers have already switched production and produced kits without the device that limits total lamp consumption to 190 watts or less.

Lighting manufacturers have informed me that the limiting device has been a major source of product failure and that, due to the vast gains in lightbulb technology and a huge drop in the price of highly efficient bulbs, it is no longer necessary to have such a device to keep consumption low.

Unfortunately, because the limiter requirement is tied by statute to the date of enactment of the new standard, technically this bill that is designed to ease regulatory burdens may inadvertently extend for an additional year the 190-watt limiter requirement. I do not believe this is the intent of this body or our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, in other words, the Senate.

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCNERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

I, too, have heard from lighting manufacturers, and I sympathize with the concerns asserted by them regarding potential unintended consequences.

The intent of this bill, and, for that matter, my intent, is to keep the compliance deadline for changes to the 190-watt limiter requirement at January 7, 2019.

We now know that the limiter requirement adds to the cost to consumers, it can compromise ceiling fan reliability, and is no longer needed to meet efficiency standards. The final rule that included the ceiling fan light kit standards also provided that the 190-watt limiter requirement is deemed to be met by any product that complies with the new efficiency standards.

The bottom line is that the 190-watt limiter should no longer be required

beginning on January 7, 2019. This bill, S. 2030, seeks to delay the ceiling fan light kit compliance deadline only, but not to delay the change to the 190-watt limiter requirement.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for confirming that the provisions of S. 2030 are not intended to delay the change to the 190-watt limiter requirement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe ceiling fan lighting kit manufacturers have acted in good faith in the run-up to the change in the standard and that they should not be penalized for producing light kits without the 190-watt limiting device.

In my view, DOE should take whatever steps are necessary to revise its rules to allow these otherwise compliant kits to be sold and should take no enforcement actions against manufacturers solely because a kit fails to include the 190-watt limiting device.

That doesn't mean the Department should stop all enforcement to ensure compliance with standards for these kits, but it should specifically forgo action against companies for failing to include a limiting device.

Mr. Speaker, I ask if the chairman shares my view.

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McNERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, I do share that view. This bill directs the Secretary of Energy to make technical and conforming changes to any implementing regulation so as to carry out the provisions in this bill.

In carrying out this requirement, DOE should make clear to the regulated community that the specific inclusion of a watt-limiting device is no longer needed for a kit to be deemed to meet the 190-watt-or-less consumption requirement.

I further want to associate myself with the gentleman's comments regarding enforcement. The Secretary should take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that no enforcement action is taken against any manufacturer solely because a kit fails to include the 190-watt limiting device.

To the extent he can, the Secretary should make clear in a public manner that DOE will not enforce against these manufacturers with regard to this particular matter so that no producer holds back their product for the market out of fear of violation.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the chairman for his indulgence in this important clarification of legislative intent.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the chairman and commend my colleagues in both Chambers, specifically Mr. HUDSON and Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for working on this bill. The legislation enjoys support from both sides of the aisle on this committee; and, in fact, the House version of the bill, H.R. 3477, passed both the Energy Subcommittee and the full Energy and Commerce Committee by a voice vote with almost no debate. Similarly, the Senate companion, which is before us now, passed that body by unanimous consent. I hope that we can do the same today and swiftly send this to the President's desk for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of S. 2030.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2030.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

DHS CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE TEAMS ACT OF 2018

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5074) to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5074

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS Cyber Incident Response Teams Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE TEAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B)(iv), by inserting “, including cybersecurity specialists” after “entities”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) through (m) as subsections (g) through (n), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

“(f) CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE TEAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall maintain cyber hunt and incident response teams for the purpose of providing, as appropriate and upon request, assistance, including the following:

“(A) Assistance to asset owners and operators in restoring services following a cyber incident.

“(B) The identification of cybersecurity risk and unauthorized cyber activity.

“(C) Mitigation strategies to prevent, deter, and protect against cybersecurity risks.

“(D) Recommendations to asset owners and operators for improving overall network and control systems security to lower cybersecurity risks, and other recommendations, as appropriate.

“(E) Such other capabilities as the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H) determines appropriate.

“(2) CYBERSECURITY SPECIALISTS.—The Secretary may include cybersecurity specialists from the private sector on cyber hunt and incident response teams.

“(3) ASSOCIATED METRICS.—The Center shall continually assess and evaluate the cyber incident response teams and their operations using robust metrics.

“(4) SUBMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.—Upon the conclusion of each of the first four fiscal years ending after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Center shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee of the Senate, information on the metrics used for evaluation and assessment of the cyber incident response teams and operations pursuant to paragraph (3), including the resources and staffing of such cyber incident response teams. Such information shall include each of the following for the period covered by the report:

“(A) The total number of incident response requests received.

“(B) The number of incident response tickets opened.

“(C) All interagency staffing of incident response teams.

“(D) The interagency collaborations established to support incident response teams.”; and

(4) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, or any team or activity of the Center,” after “Center”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or any team or activity of the Center,” after “Center”.

(b) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the DHS Cyber Incident Response Teams Act.

Before I discuss the bill, however, I would like to say a few words about the recent bombings in my hometown of Austin. In the past month, there have been a total of four bombings that have killed two people and injured four others. These are heinous, hateful acts on innocent Americans, and they will not be tolerated.

I know the people of Austin very well, and they will not be intimidated. I urge everyone back home to take caution and heed the warnings of local law enforcement. We will find whoever is responsible for these bombings and bring them to justice.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now address the bill I have introduced and the threats confronting our cybersecurity.

As technology advances, more and more people are relying on their computers, iPads, and smartphones for both personal and professional use. In short, Mr. Speaker, everyone is a target.

But our enemies do not just attack individuals and their devices. They also put America's critical infrastructure sectors in their crosshairs, endangering all aspects of civilian life. These sectors include our financial services, healthcare systems, dams, and our energy production, among others. All of them play a vital role in making America work, and each one is vulnerable to an attack.

Last week, the FBI and DHS reported that Russian hackers had engineered a series of cyber attacks against American and European nuclear power plants and electric systems. Crippling or shutting down our power plants would have catastrophic effects.

We also know that Russia tried to undermine the credibility of our democratic system in the 2016 elections and are likely to try again in 2018. Strengthening our cyber election security needs to be a bipartisan priority.

Russia is not the only perpetrator of these kinds of attacks. Between 2011 and 2013, Iranian hackers attacked dozens of U.S. banks and even tried to shut down a dam in New York.

In 2015, we learned that Chinese hackers gained access to the private information of 80 million members and employees of Anthem healthcare. The Chinese also stole 22 million security clearances, including my own, from OPM. This attack allowed them to obtain highly sensitive personal data, including fingerprints and Social Security numbers. These continual onslaughts are part of a greater cyber war being carried out against the United States, even as I stand here and speak.

Unfortunately, it doesn't stop there. Our adversaries have weaponized technology and are using it to engage in espionage and to steal our intellectual

property. This costs our economy hundreds of billions of dollars each year. In fact, former NSA Director, General Keith Alexander, described this theft as the "greatest transfer of wealth in history."

We must do more to stop these attacks. That is why I have prioritized the cybersecurity mission of DHS as chairman of the Homeland Security Committee. Through CISA, the previous bill which passed the House in December, we are elevating and making operational the Department's cybersecurity and infrastructure protection missions.

As part of the landmark DHS reauthorization, which passed the House in July, the Department will be required to provide volunteer assistance to State and local election officials upon request. These were important bipartisan steps, but we need to do more.

The legislation before us today codifies and enhances the cyber incident response times at DHS. These teams shall provide, upon request, assistance to asset owners and operators following cyber incidents, including with election infrastructure.

These teams may also include cybersecurity specialists from the private sector to provide outside expertise, which is a new, innovative breakthrough. By fostering this new collaboration between government and private sector, we can harness our talent and maximize our efforts to stay one step ahead of our enemies.

This innovative approach serves as a force multiplier to enhance our cybersecurity workforce. Being able to utilize a great number of experts will strengthen our efforts to protect our cyber networks. My bill provides DHS with that necessary capability.

The American people deserve to know that we are making every effort to strengthen our cybersecurity. This bill helps us achieve that goal, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5074, the DHS Cyber Incident Response Teams Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me again support the chairman's comments about Austin, Texas. We talked a little bit about it last week in a hearing and, since that hearing, another incident has occurred. Terrorism, whether it is domestic or whatever, has no place in this country. I look forward to the capture of the person or persons who are committing these heinous acts in Austin, as well as providing whatever resources might go toward any future apprehensions.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the Department of Homeland Security issued a technical alert with the FBI on the

Russian Government's efforts to use cyber tools to target our critical infrastructure—including our energy, water, aviation, and commercial facilities, critical infrastructure sectors.

DHS and the FBI released the alert amidst ongoing discussions about the urgent need to better secure our election infrastructure against Russian targeting and as the sophisticated cyber capabilities of Iran, North Korea, China, and nonstate actors continue to evolve. H.R. 5074, the DHS Cyber Incident Response Teams Act of 2018, would codify DHS' Hunt and Incident Response Teams into law.

The Department deploys Hunt and Incident Response Teams to owners and operators of critical infrastructure, upon request and free of charge after a cybersecurity incident. These DHS teams provide intrusion analysis, identify malicious actors, analyze malicious tools, and provide mitigation assistance strategies. They are DHS' "boots on the ground" in cyber incident response and, as such, play an integral role in improving the cybersecurity posture of critical infrastructure owners and operators.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the President's decision last week to finally issue sanctions in response to meddling in the 2016 election was long overdue. Though it was a positive move, I believe it will do little to deter the Russian Government from using cyber tools to target our critical infrastructure.

The Trump administration has yet to put any meaningful strategy in place to address ongoing efforts by the Russian Government—or any other bad actor, for that matter—to undermine the stability of the U.S. economy and government infrastructure in cyberspace. We must ensure that organizations have access to high-quality cyber incident response capabilities. H.R. 5074 would do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a hugely important issue. I think cyber often gets overlooked when we look at kinetic threats of nuclear missiles coming out of North Korea, which is obviously a huge threat to the United States and its allies. But in cyberspace, we are at war, as well, with countries like Russia and China and Iran and North Korea, the Russian meddling in the elections. We can't sit idly by and let that happen again in 2018.

I think this is, as Mr. THOMPSON stated, a very bipartisan issue that we need to work together on against our foreign adversaries that every day are trying to undermine us, stealing intellectual property, espionage, or bringing down things in a cyber warfare attack.

It is not the future of warfare; it is warfare here and now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5074, the DHS Cyber Incident Response Teams Act of 2018.

The “DHS Cyber Incident Response Teams Act of 2018,” codifies DHS’ National Cybersecurity and Communications Coordination Center (NCCIC) hunt and incident response teams which the Department currently deploys to provide intrusion analysis, identify malicious actors, analyze malicious tools, and provide mitigation assistance to entities requesting assistance after a cybersecurity incident.

The DHS’ Hunt and Incident Response Teams play an integral role in improving the cybersecurity posture of critical infrastructure owners and operators, from energy and nuclear power firms to state and local governments administering elections.

The bill requires the NCCIC to submit information to Congress regarding metrics for the teams, at the conclusion of the first four years after enactment.

In 2016, Russian actors targeted U.S. election infrastructure, hackers escalated efforts to breach the domestic energy sector, and WannaCry and NotPetya ransomware wreaked havoc on public and private infrastructure around the world.

According to Symantec, a leading provider of cybersecurity solutions, said that “The world of cyber espionage experienced a notable shift towards more overt activity, designed to destabilize and disrupt targeted organizations and countries.”

These threats to cyber security are not new.

In June 2015, it was reported that the Office of Personnel Management lost personal information on 21.5 million current and former federal employees and their families.

In 2017, the following were reported attacks and breaches:

WannaCry ransomware that infected millions of networks worldwide; and the

Equifax hack exposed millions of American’s credit information to cyber-thieves;

Our nation’s critical infrastructure and civilian government agencies depend on the cybersecurity talent and resources that the Department of Homeland Security can provide on the frontline to defend against attacks.

As cyber threats continue to evolve and become more sophisticated, so must U.S. efforts to confront them.

The Department of Homeland Security plays a central role in the federal government’s cybersecurity apparatus and in coordinating federal efforts to secure critical infrastructure.

DHS is charged with coordinating agency efforts to secure the (.gov) Domain, while also serving as the hub for cybersecurity information sharing between and among the private sector and federal government.

Earlier this Congress, I introduced H.R. 3202, the Cyber Vulnerability Disclosure Reporting Act, which was passed by the full House and is now in the Senate.

H.R. 3202 requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on the policies and procedures developed for coordinating cyber vulnerability disclosures.

The report will include an annex with information on instances in which cyber security vulnerability disclosure policies and procedures were used to disclose details on identified weaknesses in computing systems that or digital devices at risk.

The report will provide information on the degree to which the information provided by DHS was used by industry and other stakeholders.

The reason that I worked to bring this bill before the committee is the problem often referred to as a “Zero Day Event,” which describes the situation that network security professionals may find themselves when a previously unknown error in computing code is exploited by a cybercriminal or terrorist.

As with other threats that this nation has faced and overcome, we must create the resources and the institutional responses to protect our nation against cyber threats while preserving our liberties and freedoms.

We cannot accomplish this task without the full cooperation and support of the private sector, computing research community and academia.

This level of engagement requires the trust and confidence of the American people that this new cyber threat center will be used for the purpose it was created and that the collaboration of others in this effort to better protect computing networks will be used only for protection and defense.

There are people with skills and those with the potential to develop skills that would be of benefit to our nation’s efforts to develop an effective cybersecurity defense and deterrence posture.

It is my hope that as we move forward the Committee on Homeland Security will continue in a bipartisan manner to seek out the best ways to bring the brightest and most qualified people into the government as cybersecurity professionals.

With this policy objective in mind, I look forward to working with the Committee on H.R. 1981, the Cyber Security Education and Federal Workforce Enhancement Act.

I urge my Colleagues in the House to join me in voting for H.R. 5074.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5074, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

AIR CARGO SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4176) to strengthen air cargo security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4176

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Air Cargo Security Improvement Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR CARGO SECURITY DIVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 44947. Air cargo security division

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall establish an air cargo security division to carry out all policy and engagement with air cargo security stakeholders.

“(b) LEADERSHIP; STAFFING.—The air cargo security division established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be headed by an individual in the executive service within the Transportation Security Administration and be staffed by not fewer than four full-time equivalents, including the head of the division.

“(c) STAFFING.—The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall staff the air cargo security division with existing Transportation Security Administration personnel.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item related to section 44946 the following new item:

“44947. Air cargo security division.”.

SEC. 3. FEASIBILITY STUDY AND PILOT PROGRAM FOR EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, shall submit to Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a feasibility study regarding expanding the use of computed tomography technology for the screening of air cargo transported on passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation, interstate air transportation, or interstate air commerce. Such study shall consider the following:

(1) Opportunities to leverage computed tomography systems used for screening passengers and baggage.

(2) Costs and benefits of using computed tomography technology for screening air cargo.

(3) An analysis of emerging computed tomography systems that may have potential to enhance the screening of air cargo, including systems that may address aperture challenges associated with screening certain categories of air cargo.

(4) An analysis of emerging screening technologies, in addition to computed tomography, that may be used to enhance the screening of air cargo.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than 120 days after submission of the feasibility study required under subsection (a), the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall initiate a two-year pilot program to achieve enhanced air cargo security screening outcomes through the use of

new or emerging screening technologies, such as computed tomography technology, as identified through such study.

(c) **UPDATES.**—Not later than 60 days after the initiation of the pilot program under subsection (b) and every six months thereafter for two years, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the progress of implementation of such pilot program.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AIR CARRIER.**—The term “air carrier” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) **AIR TRANSPORTATION.**—The term “air transportation” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code.

(3) **FOREIGN AIR CARRIER.**—The term “foreign air carrier” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code.

(4) **INTERSTATE AIR COMMERCE.**—The term “interstate air commerce” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code.

(5) **INTERSTATE AIR TRANSPORTATION.**—The term “interstate air transportation” has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 4. AIR CARGO REGULATION REVIEW.

(a) **REVIEW.**—Not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on actions to improve the Certified Cargo Screening Program as established by the Administrator in September 2009. The report shall—

(1) review the degree to which the Program is effective at fully addressing evolving threats to air cargo, particularly as air cargo volumes fluctuate;

(2) review any vulnerabilities in the Program and effectiveness of information sharing with air cargo security stakeholders; and

(3) include information on actions to be taken to address findings in paragraphs (1) and (2), including information on plans to issue new rulemaking, if necessary.

SEC. 5. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) review the Department of Homeland Security's analysis and intelligence pre-screening processes and procedures for air cargo entering the United States;

(2) review the pilot program conducted pursuant to section 3;

(3) assess the effectiveness of the Department's risk-based strategy for examining air cargo and ensuring compliance with air cargo security rules and regulations; and

(4) review the Department's information sharing procedures and practices for disseminating information to relevant stakeholders on preventing, mitigating, and responding to air cargo related threats.

SEC. 6. KNOWN SHIPPER PROGRAM REVIEW.

The Administrator shall request the Air Cargo Subcommittee of Aviation Security Advisory Committee (established under section 44946 of title 49, United States Code) to—

(1) conduct a comprehensive review and security assessment of the known shipper pro-

gram under sections 1546.215 and 1548.17 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) recommend whether the Known Shipper Program should be modified or eliminated considering the full implementation of 100 percent screening under section 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code; and

(3) report its findings and recommendations to the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. **ESTES**) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. **THOMPSON**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **ESTES** of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ESTES** of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4176, the Air Cargo Security Improvement Act of 2018.

The Transportation Security Administration is responsible for securing all modes of transportation, and implicit in this responsibility is the security of air cargo. Air cargo represents more than 35 percent of global trade by value, which translates to approximately \$6.8 trillion worth of goods annually.

Given the impact that air cargo has on the U.S. and global economy, it is not surprising that this sector remains an appealing target for terrorists. Several incidents have demonstrated that terrorists may seek to target U.S.-bound shipments by exploiting weaknesses in air cargo security overseas.

In 2010, explosive devices concealed in packages bound for the United States from Yemen went undetected by initial screenings. Authorities indicated that the explosives were probably intended to detonate mid-flight over a U.S. city.

More recently, in July 2017, bomb-making materials were transported undetected from Turkey to Australia in an air cargo shipment.

H.R. 4176, the Air Cargo Security Improvement Act of 2018, is a timely and necessary step towards a more secure and resilient industry.

This legislation establishes an air cargo security division within the TSA to carry out all air cargo security policy and stakeholder engagement. Unlike the TSA's operational role in passenger screening at checkpoints, the TSA functions in an oversight and regulatory capacity with respect to air cargo screening.

Initiatives like the Certified Cargo Screening Program and the Known

Shipper Management System enable the TSA to leverage key partnerships with manufacturers, shippers, freight forwarders, passenger airlines, and all cargo airlines to meet the 100 percent screening mandate of all freight on passenger aircraft.

H.R. 4176 requires the review of the Certified Cargo Screening Program and the Known Shipper Program to ensure that applicable regulations enhance program effectiveness. These initiatives are aided by cargo screening technologies designed to meet the logistical demands of the industry.

H.R. 4176 requires the TSA Administrator to conduct a feasibility study and a subsequent pilot program on expanding the use of computed tomography—CT—and other emerging technologies for air cargo screening.

Through October 2017, air cargo activity increased more than 10 percent from 2016 levels, the largest year-over-year growth in more than a decade, with the largest growth seen among international shipments to and from the United States.

In coordination with the cargo industry, the Customs and Border Protection—CBP—and the TSA have been pilot testing a risk-based approach to vet air cargo shipments known as the Air Cargo Advanced Screening system, with an emphasis on improving inspections on overseas shipments. Accordingly, H.R. 4176 requires the full deployment of ACAS for inbound international air cargo.

The Air Cargo Security Improvement Act of 2018 is a sensible and progressive solution that will help to modernize the security of air cargo shipments and operations while ensuring the flow of commerce.

I thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. **THOMPSON**, for advancing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **THOMPSON** of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4176, the Air Cargo Security Improvement Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4176 seeks to improve the Transportation Security Administration's ability to address air cargo-based security threats.

Last July, then-Secretary of Homeland Security, John Kelly, identified such acts as a major concern, explaining that there are people out there, very smart people, very sophisticated people who do nothing but try to figure out how to blow up an airplane in flight.

Later that month, Australian authorities charged four men with plotting to bring down a passenger plane on behalf of ISIS with a bomb in the air cargo hold. This foiled terror plot underscores the need for the TSA to

give focused attention to this clear and present security threat. The increased risk to air cargo comes at a time when the volume of goods being moved by air cargo has multiplied, with 2016 volumes nearly back to pre-recession levels.

If enacted, my bill would require the TSA to establish an air cargo security division to carry out air cargo security policy and stakeholder engagement responsibilities. Further, it would direct the TSA to pilot emerging technologies for screening cargo, such as computed tomography, for integration into current security programs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in advancing this necessary and straightforward Homeland Security legislation.

Mr. Speaker, while passenger and baggage screening efforts are the most visible part of aviation security, protecting against air cargo-based threats is just as critical.

Enactment of H.R. 4176 will ensure that the TSA is positioned to stay ahead of this ever-evolving security threat that face all who navigate our skies.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 4176, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support this common sense piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, a former chairman of the Transportation and Protective Security Subcommittee, and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4176, “Air Cargo Security Improvement Act of 2017.”

H.R. 4176 will strengthen the nation’s air cargo security networks by requiring the Transportation Security Administration to establish an air cargo security division within the agency.

Within 120 days of enactment, TSA would conduct a feasibility study on the expanded use of computed tomography for air cargo.

Following the study, TSA would be required to initiate a pilot program to achieve enhanced air cargo security screening through the use of new or emerging technologies.

Within 150 days of enactment, TSA would be required to report to Congress on actions to improve the effectiveness of the Certified Cargo Screening Program.

The Government Accountability Office is tasked with reviewing the effectiveness of

DHS’ approach to addressing the air cargo security risk, including the risk-based strategy for examining air cargo and ensuring compliance with air cargo security rules.

TSA would be required to request that the Aviation Security Advisory Committee’s Subcommittee on Air Cargo conduct a comprehensive review of TSA’s Known Shipper Program.

Mr. Speaker, thirteen years ago, the U.S. National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (9/11 Commission) expressed concerns “regarding the screening and transport of checked bags and cargo.”

The Commission called for called for more attention and resources to be directed to reducing or mitigating the threat posed by explosives in vessels’ cargo holds.

Today, the threat of a terrorist attack using air cargo is significant.

In fact, in July, then-Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly identified cargo-based aviation attacks as a major concern, explaining “there are people out there, very smart people, very sophisticated people who do nothing but try to figure out how to blow up an airplane in flight.”

Secretary Kelly also said “There is a fair amount of cargo, what we would attribute to just cargo flown on passenger airplane on space available. Terrorists are constantly looking for ways to do this.”

This increase in the air cargo security risk comes at a time when the volume of goods being moved by air cargo has increased, with 2016 volume back to approximately 98.4 percent of pre-recession levels with airlines transporting 52 million metric tons of goods.

In response to this security risk, H.R. 4176 directs the Transportation Security Administration to take a number of steps to enhance its responsibilities for air cargo and require the agency to aggressively move towards addressing current and future threats to air cargo.

Specifically, H.R. 4176 clarifies air cargo security responsibilities at TSA, encourages further technological developments for screening air cargo, directs a review of existing air cargo programs, and requires the Department of Homeland Security to make the Air Cargo Advance Screening Program permanent.

The threat posed by terrorists’ abilities and desires to exploit vulnerabilities cannot be understated and they have demonstrably set their targets on air cargo.

We need to be timely and precise in addressing air cargo security, as we cannot afford, nor should the American public tolerate, otherwise.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 4176 so we can make Americans more

secure from the threat of an air cargo-based terrorist attack.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following cost estimate for H.R. 4176, the Air Cargo Security Improvement Act of 2018, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, which was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4176, the Air Cargo Security Improvement Act of 2018.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Megan Carroll.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, Director.

Enclosure.

H.R. 4176—AIR CARGO SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018

As passed by the House of Representatives on March 19, 2018

SUMMARY

H.R. 4176 would require the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to establish an Air Cargo Division to carry out activities related to ensuring that cargo transported aboard passenger aircraft does not pose a threat to aviation security. The act also would require TSA to study the feasibility of expanding the use of certain types of explosive-detection systems to screen air cargo and initiate a two-year pilot program to test such systems. H.R. 4176 also would require TSA and the Government Accountability Office to meet other administrative and reporting requirements related to air cargo security.

Using information from TSA, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 4176 would cost \$7 million over the 2019–2022 period; such spending would be subject to appropriation.

Enacting H.R. 4176 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4176 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 4176 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA).

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary effect of H.R. 4176 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 400 (transportation).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—					
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2018–2022
INCREASES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Estimated Authorization Level	0	1	3	3	0	7
Estimated Outlays	0	1	3	3	0	7

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

CBO assumes H.R. 4176 will be enacted near the start of fiscal year 2019 and that the necessary funds will be appropriated each year.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 4176 would cost \$7 million over the next five years—primarily for TSA to initiate a two-year pilot program to test new and emerging technologies to screen air cargo. Using information from TSA about the cost of similar efforts, CBO estimates that the pilot program would begin late in 2019 and cost \$6.5 million over a three-year period. Meeting

other administrative and reporting requirements under the act would cost about \$500,000, bringing total costs to \$7 million over the 2019–2022 period.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS

None.

INCREASE IN LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING AND DEFICITS

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4176 would not increase net spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

MANDATES

H.R. 4176 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

ESTIMATE PREPARED BY

Federal Costs: Megan Carroll; Mandates: Jon Sperl.

ESTIMATE APPROVED BY

H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4176, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENHANCING DHS' FUSION CENTER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM ACT

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5099) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a fusion center technical assistance program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5099

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Enhancing DHS’ Fusion Center Technical Assistance Program Act”.

SEC. 2. FUSION CENTER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection (j):

“(j) FUSION CENTER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with officials from the National Network of Fusion Centers and, to the greatest extent practicable, other relevant stakeholders, shall establish a fusion center technical assistance program.

“(2) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—In carrying out the fusion center technical assistance program established under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) provide technical assistance to fusion centers regarding—

“(i) grants administered under sections 2003 and 2004;

“(ii) terrorism prevention activities; and

“(iii) intelligence and information sharing;

“(B) provide to fusion centers notice of any changes to the activities referred to in subparagraph (A);

“(C) make available best practices regarding—

“(i) fusion center operations;

“(ii) information sharing and analysis of homeland security threats, including cyber threats;

“(iii) protecting privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties; and

“(iv) such other best practices as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

“(D) carry out such other activities as the Secretary determines appropriate.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas

There was no objection.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 5099, the Enhancing DHS’ Fusion Center Technical Assistance Program Act.

Today, the Nation is facing a complex and evolving threat. Terrorist attacks, like the New York City vehicle attack and the Pulse nightclub shooting, have been carried out by individuals inspired by ISIS and other terrorist organizations. These type of lone wolf attacks appear to be the new normal.

This means that now, more than ever, it is imperative that we have strong preventive activities in place, including intelligence and information sharing.

Since 9/11, States and major urban areas established fusion centers to build up the preventive activities by creating an avenue for greater collaboration between Federal, State, and local governments with regards to terrorism and information sharing.

These State and locally owned fusion centers have largely evolved from terrorist-focused centers to all-crimes, all-hazard centers working on a range of relevant Homeland Security issues, including cybersecurity.

I was able to see the work of one of these fusion centers firsthand when I visited my home State’s fusion center, the Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center—KIFC—earlier this year. I was very impressed with their operation. I

want to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is fully supporting this center and the other 78 fusion centers across the United States.

That is why I was troubled to hear about a key fusion center resource in the DHS not living up to its potential.

In 2009, the DHS created a fusion center technical assistance program to provide fusion centers with assistance on a range of topics, including suspicious activity reporting and other relevant trainings. However, based on the findings from the committee’s recent fusion center report and my meetings with fusion center personnel, this program is not meeting the needs of the National Network of Fusion Centers.

This is why I introduced H.R. 5099, the Enhancing DHS’ Fusion Center Technical Assistance Program Act. This bill provides formal authorization for the DHS fusion center technical assistance program and a clear set of directives on the services to be provided by the program, including assistance related to available grant funding and DHS terrorism prevention programs, as well as intelligence and information sharing.

The bill expands the role of the program to include being a repository of best practices relevant to fusion center activities, including cybersecurity. This is a commonsense bill that should help strengthen the Nation’s ability to prevent and protect against terrorist attacks and other Homeland Security relevant events.

Earlier this month, this legislation was passed out of the Committee on Homeland Security by a voice vote. I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Mr. GALLAGHER for cosponsoring this legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5099, the Enhancing DHS’ Fusion Center Technical Assistance Program Act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5099 would authorize the Department of Homeland Security’s existing fusion center technical assistance program. Currently, there are 79 fusion centers operating in the United States. Each fusion center relies on the DHS to help assist with intelligence products and information-sharing activities, terrorism prevention initiatives, and Homeland Security grant programs.

This bill seeks to solidify engagement between representatives at the fusion centers with their partners in the departments like FEMA and the DHS intelligence branch. Specifically, the program provides technical assistance on topics like best practices for information sharing regarding threats and operating a fusion center.

By codifying this existing program, H.R. 5099 seeks to strengthen the DHS' partnership with fusion centers to ensure that they are well-positioned to address a wide range of diverse security threats that may emerge.

The bill passed committee unanimously and would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the security and well-being of our country is dependent upon the timely sharing of threat information between our law enforcement and intelligence personnel.

Importantly, one of the key areas where the DHS will provide expertise to fusion centers under H.R. 5099 is with respect to the protection of privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 5099, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the ranking member for his support on this legislation. I would once again urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5099.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VEHICULAR TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2018

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4227) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to examine what actions the Department of Homeland Security is undertaking to combat the threat of vehicular terrorism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4227

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Vehicular Terrorism Prevention Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. STRATEGY ON VEHICULAR TERRORISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) assess the activities the Department of Homeland Security is undertaking to support emergency response providers and the private sector to prevent, mitigate, and respond to the threat of vehicular terrorism; and

(2) based on such assessment, develop and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a strategy to improve the Department's efforts to support the efforts of emergency response providers and the private sector to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such threat.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An examination of the current threat of vehicular terrorism.

(2) Methods to improve Department of Homeland Security information sharing activities with emergency response providers and the private sector regarding best practices to prevent, mitigate, and respond to the increasing threat of vehicular terrorism.

(3) Training activities the Department can provide, including possible exercises, for emergency response providers to prevent and respond to the threat of vehicular terrorism.

(4) Any additional activities the Secretary of Homeland Security recommends to prevent, mitigate, and respond to the threat of vehicular terrorism.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROVIDERS.—The term "emergency response providers" has the meaning given such term in section 2(6) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101(6)).

(2) VEHICULAR TERRORISM.—The term "vehicular terrorism" means any action that utilizes automotive transportation to inflict violence and intimidation on individuals for a political purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4227, the Vehicular Terrorism Prevention Act, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

H.R. 4227 requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to examine the threat of vehicular terrorism and develop a strategy to improve DHS support for the efforts of emergency responders and the private sector to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such a threat.

Terror groups, including ISIS and al-Qaida, have urged supporters to carry out attacks in their home countries using any means necessary, including vehicle ramming. Terrorists and inspired homegrown extremists have heeded this directive and have carried

out vehicle-based attacks in the past several years, including in France, England, Spain, Ohio, and, most recently, New York City.

The majority of prevention, mitigation, and response activities related to vehicle attacks are carried out by first responders and the private sector. DHS has existing resources and programs that can be better utilized to prepare frontline personnel in local communities to address this threat. This includes guidance related to the use of existing grant programs, increased information sharing, promoting suspicious activity reporting, increasing available exercises and training programs, dedicated research and development targeting mitigation measures, and utilizing critical infrastructure protection programs for vehicle ramming prevention.

H.R. 4227, the Vehicular Terrorism Prevention Act, requires the Secretary to develop a plan on how to improve and increase those capabilities. This bill passed by voice vote in the Committee on Homeland Security in early March.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative LATTA for his work on this important measure, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4227, the Vehicular Terrorism Prevention Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, terror groups have urged their supporters to carry out acts of violence by any means necessary, including by ramming a vehicle into a crowd. In fact, both ISIS and al-Qaida have published propaganda encouraging such vehicle-based terrorist attacks.

Sadly, over the past few years, vehicle-based terrorist attacks have been carried out at home and abroad, taking the lives and injuring too many innocent people. One of the most shocking attacks was carried out on July 14, 2016, when a truck plowed into a crowd celebrating France's Independence Day, which resulted in the deaths of 86 people and injured nearly 500.

More recently, in October of 2017, a driver took the lives of eight people when he purposely careened his truck into a path in Lower Manhattan that was full of pedestrians and cyclists.

This tactic has not confined itself to one ideological group. On August 12, 2017, a self-professed neo-Nazi drove his car into a crowd of counterprotestors demonstrating the march held by alt-right activists in Charlottesville, Virginia. The attack killed Heather D. Heyer and injured 35 others.

Just this month, a former Marine Corps reservist rammed his pickup truck into a convenience store in Watson, Louisiana. Later, we learned that

he mistakenly believed the store was owned by Muslims.

To address this emerging threat, H.R. 4227 would require the Department of Homeland Security to report to Congress on support provided to emergency responders and private sector partners to counter the threat of vehicle-based attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I support this timely legislation and believe that enactment would improve DHS' efforts to prevent and reduce impacts of such attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 4227, the Vehicular Terrorism Prevention Act.

This bipartisan legislation requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess the activities the Department is undertaking to combat the threat of vehicular terrorism and submit a strategy to Congress on its findings and recommendations.

Over the past several years, I have been alarmed with the increased frequency that terrorists in Europe and around the world have used vehicles—oftentimes, rental vans or trucks—to commit heinous acts of violence. From Paris to Barcelona and Jerusalem to London, at least 138 people have been killed and countless others injured because of these attacks.

With the October attack in New York City showing that these extremist groups will not hesitate to carry out the same attack on American soil, it is critical that the Department of Homeland Security is doing their due diligence regarding this threat.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would specifically require DHS to assess the activities the Department is undertaking to support emergency response providers and the private sector to prevent, mitigate, and respond to the threat of vehicular terrorism.

Within 6 months of the bill's enactment, the Department must complete this assessment and submit to Congress a strategy that includes an examination of the current threat of vehicular terrorism, methods to improve information-sharing activities with emergency first responders and the private sector, and training activities the Department can undertake to prevent and prepare to respond to these attacks. The Secretary must also include any additional activities that DHS recommends to address the threat of vehicular terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, Representative DONOVAN, and the entire House Homeland Security Com-

mittee for their work in advancing this bill to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in taking the next step to addressing this dangerous threat by passing H.R. 4227.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the emergence of lone wolves who choose to ram vehicles into innocent people to advance their violent ideologies is a modern-day homeland security challenge. As threats to our homeland continue to evolve and as violent extremists continue to exploit soft targets, the risk to innocent bystanders grows. We must do our part to ensure that first responders in our cities, towns, and all places of living throughout the country have access to the necessary resources to keep themselves safe and secure. This legislation seeks to ensure that DHS does all it can to support such efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note that this bill complements H.R. 5131, which is also being considered today and which directs DHS to disseminate best practices to stakeholders regarding ways to enhance transportation security against the threat of vehicle-based attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 4227, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ranking Member THOMPSON.

I once again urge my fellow colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following cost estimate for H.R. 4227, the Vehicular Terrorism Prevention Act of 2018, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,

Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4227, the Vehicular Terrorism Prevention Act of 2018.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Robert Reese.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director*.

Enclosure.

H.R. 4227—VEHICULAR TERRORISM
PREVENTION ACT OF 2018

As reported by the House Committee on
Homeland Security on March 19, 2018

H.R. 4227 would direct the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to assess its current activities related to supporting emergency response providers and the private sector in preventing, mitigating, and responding to vehicular terrorism. Following that assessment, DHS would be required to de-

velop and submit to the Congress a strategy to improve its efforts.

Using information from DHS on the effort required to complete the assessment and strategy, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 4227 would have no significant effect on the federal budget.

Enacting H.R. 4227 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4227 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 4227 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Robert Reese. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4227, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DHS FIELD ENGAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5079) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5079

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS Field Engagement Accountability Act".

SEC. 2. ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY WITH FUSION CENTERS.

Section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h) is amended by—

(1) redesigning subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively; and
(2) inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) FUSION CENTER INFORMATION SHARING STRATEGY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall develop and update at least once every five years a strategy for Department engagement with fusion centers. Such strategy shall be developed and updated in consultation with the heads of intelligence components of the Department, the Chief Privacy Officer of the Department, the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department, officials of fusion centers,

officers designated as Homeland Security Advisors, and the heads of other relevant agencies, as appropriate. Such strategy shall include the following:

“(1) Specific goals and objectives for sharing information and engaging with fusion centers—

“(A) through the direct deployment of personnel from intelligence components of the Department;

“(B) through the use of Department unclassified and classified information sharing systems, including the Homeland Security Information Sharing Network and the Homeland Secure Data Network, or any successor systems; and

“(C) through any additional means.

“(2) The performance metrics to be used to measure success in achieving the goals and objectives referred to in paragraph (1).

“(3) A five-year plan for continued engagement with fusion centers.”.

SEC. 3. OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS FIELD PERSONNEL SUPPORT TO FUSION CENTERS.

(a) **PERFORMANCE METRICS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security shall—

(1) consider the effectiveness of existing processes to identify and prepare field personnel for deployment to support fusion centers and internal mechanisms to ensure oversight and accountability of such field personnel, including field personnel assigned to one center and field personnel assigned to multiple centers; and

(2) publish and disseminate performance metrics, taking into account, as appropriate, regional and threat diversity, for—

(A) field personnel from the Office of Intelligence and Analysis assigned to an individual fusion center;

(B) field personnel from the Office of Intelligence and Analysis assigned to multiple fusion centers; and

(C) regional Directors of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis to ensure accountability for monitoring all field personnel under the supervision of such Regional Directors.

(b) **TRAINING.**—In consultation with the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department shall develop and implement a formalized training module for fusion center personnel regarding the classified Homeland Secure Data Network of the Department, or any successor system.

(c) **FUSION CENTER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “fusion center” has the meaning given such term in section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h).

SEC. 4. DHS COMPONENT USAGE OF THE HOMELAND SECURITY INFORMATION NETWORK.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Chief Information Officer of the Department, shall—

(1) develop policies and metrics to ensure effective use by components of the Department of the Department's unclassified Homeland Security Information Sharing Network, or any successor system; and

(2) develop policies for posting unclassified products on the Homeland Security Information Sharing Network, or any successor system.

(b) **TECHNICAL ENHANCEMENTS.**—The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department, shall assess and implement, as appropriate, technical enhancements to the Homeland Security Information Sharing Network (HSIN) to improve usability, including search functionality, data analysis, and collaboration capabilities.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on the implementation of the following:

(1) The fusion center information sharing strategy required under subsection (j) of section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h), as added by section 2 of this Act, based on performance metrics developed pursuant to such strategy.

(2) Field personnel deployed to fusion centers (as such term is defined in section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h)) in accordance with section 3, based on performance metrics developed pursuant to such section.

(3) Policies that seek to ensure the effective use of the Homeland Security Information Sharing Network in accordance with section 4, based on the metrics developed pursuant to such section.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5079, the DHS Field Engagement Accountability Act. The sharing of counterterrorism and other homeland security information with State and local officials is vital in our efforts to protect the homeland.

Fusion centers as hubs for information sharing and analysis play a critical role in the domestic homeland security information-sharing environment. Over the years, there have been vast improvements in DHS' support for these key stakeholders, including the Nebraska Information Analysis Center, known as NIAC, in my home State of Nebraska.

H.R. 5079, the DHS Field Engagement Accountability Act, builds on ongoing efforts to hold DHS more accountable for supporting fusion centers and fully

utilizing them as a resource to the Federal Government.

First, it requires DHS to develop a strategy for engagement with fusion centers. With the maturation of the national network, many fusion centers have adopted an all-threats, all-hazards mission to ensure they are keeping pace with the changing threat environment. A strategy that incorporates all the components of the Department will ensure DHS is supporting and leveraging fusion centers effectively and efficiently.

Second, this bill mandates performance metrics to hold DHS personnel in the field accountable. Among other responsibilities, these personnel serve as ambassadors of the Department and are integral in shaping and strengthening the relationship between fusion centers and DHS. As such, the Department must have appropriate performance objectives and metrics in place to ensure greater transparency in the expectations of these officers and accountability when issues arise.

Finally, this bill requires additional training and improvements for both the classified and unclassified information-sharing systems that the Department makes available to fusion centers and other law enforcement agencies.

While DHS has made strides in facilitating fusion center access to information and information systems, there are gaps in the Department's efforts to ensure these partners are adequately trained to utilize these systems.

So, for example, while all fusion centers now have access to DHS' classified HSDN, many fusion center personnel are not proficient in this system, and DHS does not currently provide any standardized, in-person HSDN training. Granting the appropriate clearances and credentials to access DHS systems is just as important as ensuring competency when using these systems.

Additionally, I have learned that many DHS components do not routinely share analytic products on the Homeland Security Information Network-Intelligence portal, and many documents are not posted on a timely basis.

□ 1645

It is incumbent on the Department to ensure the appropriate policies and metrics are in place to incentivize component use of this critical information-sharing program.

In that regard, I am pleased to report that, as of this month, both the Federal Protective Service and the United States Coast Guard have started participating on the HSIN-Intel Partner Products page. I encourage other components of the Department that do not participate to follow suit. This is a commonsense bill with bipartisan support that will enhance DHS' relationship with State and local fusion centers across the country.

In short, we have learned many lessons this past year in analyzing and studying fusion centers. This bill fixes the multiple problems that we have encountered.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5079, the DHS Field Engagement Accountability Act.

H.R. 5079 would require the Department of Homeland Security to develop a fusion center engagement strategy. One of the tragic lessons of the September 11 attacks was what can happen when information is not shared at all levels of law enforcement.

Since 2006, the committee has supported the Department's efforts to deploy intelligence analysts to many of the 79 fusion centers across the country. These fusion centers are charged with connecting the dots at the State or local level to prevent terrorist or extremist violence. H.R. 5079 continues in this vein by directing DHS to focus on strengthening its relationship with the fusion centers.

At a time when violent attacks in Florida, New York, Las Vegas, and Charlottesville are tragically all too much a part of our new normal, we need this improved relationship between the Department and fusion centers more than ever.

In addition to requiring an engagement strategy, the bill requires DHS to have metrics in place to hold the personnel it deploys to fusion centers accountable for their performance.

Finally, this legislation seeks to encourage use of the Department's intelligence and document-sharing systems to promote greater engagement among the Department and fusion centers across the country.

Specifically, H.R. 5079 would create policies for information sharing via Department networks that are developed and updated in consultation with the Department's experts on privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

In closing, with the emergence of lone wolves and small terrorist cells, the decentralized terrorist threat in the United States poses serious threats to local communities across our country from big cities to small towns. Whether the target is a church in South Carolina, a Sikh temple in Wisconsin, a mosque in Illinois, a synagogue in New York, a concert venue in Las Vegas, or a school in Florida, State and local law enforcement need a clear line of communication with Federal agencies. As such, DHS must ensure that fusion centers throughout the country have access to the resources—including personnel, training, and access to information—necessary to keep the U.S. homeland safe and secure.

H.R. 5079 directs DHS to do just that by requiring the Department to have a strategy to enhance engagement with fusion centers and provide fusion center personnel. Additionally, H.R. 5079 would ensure that DHS' information-sharing policies include strong privacy and civil liberty safeguards. I, therefore, encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 5079.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her comments and her support making this bill a bipartisan bill. Part of the work that we are doing is we are going to improve 70 different fusion centers with this bill and standardize the performance of all of them.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5079, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5131) to improve the effectiveness of Federal efforts to identify and address homeland security risks to surface transportation, secure against vehicle-based attacks, and conduct a feasibility assessment of introducing new security technologies and measures, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5131

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Surface Transportation Security Improvement Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(2) PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS.—The term "public and private sector stakeholders" has the meaning given such term in section 114(u)(1)(C) of title 49, United States Code.

(3) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ASSET.—The term "surface transportation asset" includes

facilities, equipment, or systems used to provide transportation services by—

(A) a public transportation agency (as such term is defined in section 1402(5) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-53; 6 U.S.C. 1131(5)));

(B) a railroad carrier (as such term is defined in section 20102(3) of title 49, United States Code);

(C) an owner or operator of—

(i) an entity offering scheduled, fixed-route transportation services by over-the-road bus (as such term is defined in section 1501(4) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-53; 6 U.S.C. 1151(4))); or

(ii) a bus terminal; or

(D) other transportation facilities, equipment, or systems, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY REVIEW.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the degree to which the 2016 Biennial National Strategy for Transportation Security, as required pursuant to section 114(s) of title 49, United States Code, that was issued on August 11, 2016, by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, is reflected in Federal transportation security programs, budgets, research, staffing levels, and related efforts and, in carrying out such evaluation, shall consider the degree to which—

(1) such strategy is sufficiently forward-looking to guide future Federal efforts relating to transportation security;

(2) Federal transportation security programs, budgets, research, staffing levels, and related efforts for fiscal year 2018 and beyond are guided by such strategy; and

(3) the annual progress reports submitted to Congress pursuant to such section subsequent to the issuance of such strategy provide information on the degree to which such strategy guides Federal efforts relating to transportation security.

SEC. 4. RISK SCENARIOS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall annually develop, consistent with the transportation modal security plans required under section 114(s) of title 49, United States Code, risk-based priorities based on risk assessments conducted or received by the Secretary across all transportation modes that consider threats, vulnerabilities, and consequences.

(b) SCENARIOS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that the risk-based priorities identified pursuant to subsection (a) are informed by an analysis of terrorist attack scenarios for each transportation mode, including cyber attack scenarios and intelligence and open source information about current and evolving threats.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after each development of risk-based priorities under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) Copies of the risk assessments for each transportation mode.

(2) A summary that ranks the risks within and across modes.

(3) A description of the risk-based priorities for securing the transportation sector that identifies and prioritizes the greatest security needs of such transportation sector, both across and within modes, in the order that such priorities should be addressed.

(4) Information on the underlying methodologies used to assess risks across and within each transportation mode and the basis for any assumptions regarding threats, vulnerabilities, and consequences made in assessing and prioritizing risks within each such mode and across modes.

(d) **CLASSIFICATION.**—The information provided under subsection (c) may be submitted in a classified format or unclassified format, as appropriate.

SEC. 5. ASSESSMENTS AND SECURITY PLANS; FRONTLINE EMPLOYEE SECURITY TRAINING.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security a report on—

(1) the status of regulations requiring assessments and security plans as specified in sections 1405, 1512, and 1531 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1134, 1162, and 1181) that includes a timeline for the issuance of a final rulemaking subsequent to the December 16, 2016, publication in the Federal Register of an advance notice of proposed rulemaking; and

(2) the status of regulations for a security training program to prepare transportation employees for potential security threats and conditions as specified in sections 1408, 1517, and 1534 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1137, 1167, and 1184) that includes a timeline for the issuance of a final rulemaking subsequent to the December 16, 2016, publication in the Federal Register of a notice of proposed rulemaking.

(b) **INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.**—Not later than 120 days after submission of the report under subsection (a), the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a review of such report that includes information on—

(1) departmental efforts to finalize rulemaking; and

(2) recommendations, as necessary, to ensure implementation of the regulations referred to in such subsection.

SEC. 6. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **EMERGING ISSUES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security and in coordination with the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a feasibility assessment of modifying the security of surface transportation assets by—

(1) introducing next generation technologies to be integrated into systems of surface transportation assets to detect explosives, including through the deployment of mobile explosives detection technologies to conduct risk-based passenger and property screening at such systems;

(2) providing surface transportation asset operators with access to the Transportation Security Administration's Secure Flight Program or a similar passenger vetting system maintained by the Transportation Security Administration;

(3) deploying a credential authentication technology or other means of identification document inspection to high-risk surface transportation assets to assist operators conducting passenger vetting; and

(4) deploying scalable, cost-effective technology solutions to detect chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosive threats within high-risk surface transportation assets that are capable of passive, continuous, and real-time sensing and detection of, and alerting passengers and operating personnel to, the presence of such a threat.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out the assessment required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security and in coordination with the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, shall address the technological, privacy, operational, passenger facilitation, and public acceptance considerations involved with each security measure contemplated in such assessment.

SEC. 7. BEST PRACTICES TO SECURE AGAINST VEHICLE-BASED ATTACKS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall disseminate best practices to public and private sector stakeholders regarding how to enhance transportation security against the threat of a vehicle-based terrorist attack.

SEC. 8. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION STAKEHOLDER SURVEY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall begin conducting a survey of public and private stakeholders responsible for securing surface transportation assets regarding resource challenges, including the availability of Federal funding, associated with securing such assets that provides an opportunity for respondents to set forth information on specific unmet needs.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after beginning the survey required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding the results of such survey and the Department of Homeland Security's efforts to address any identified security vulnerabilities.

SEC. 9. INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND CAPABILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration may establish a task force to collaborate with public and private sector stakeholders to identify and develop an innovative technology or capability with the potential to enhance transportation security, including by—

(1) conducting a field demonstration of such a technology or capability in an operational environment;

(2) gathering performance data from such a demonstration to inform the acquisition process; and

(3) to the extent practicable, providing funding and promoting efforts to enable participation in a demonstration by a small business that has an innovative technology or capability but does not have adequate resources to participate in a field demonstration under paragraph (1).

(b) **COMPOSITION.**—The task force authorized under subsection (a) shall be chaired by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration's designee and comprised of representatives appointed by the Administrator, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (established pursuant to section 44946 of title 49, United States Code).

(c) **ACTIVITIES.**—The chair of the task force shall—

(1) evaluate technologies and capabilities for field demonstrations with potential to enhance surface transportation security, in addition to technologies and capabilities with potential to enhance aviation security;

(2) coordinate with the Science and Technology Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security to leverage such technologies and capabilities; and

(3) submit to the Secretary of Homeland Security an annual report regarding the task force's activities that identifies, for each such technology or capability, what mode of transportation could be enhanced by the integration of such technology or capability into security operations and, as appropriate, plans for deploying such technology or capability.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to acquire an innovative technology or capability.

(e) **NON-APPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the task force.

SEC. 10. SECURITY TECHNOLOGIES TIED TO FOREIGN THREAT COUNTRIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of terrorist and other threats to the transportation sector, including surface transportation assets, posed by the use of security technologies, including software and networked technologies, developed or manufactured by firms that are owned or closely linked to the governments of countries that are known to pose a cyber or homeland security threat.

SEC. 11. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY INSPECTORS.

(a) **STRATEGY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the Comptroller General of the United States a strategy to guide operations of surface transportation security inspectors that addresses the following:

(1) Any limitations in data systems for such inspectors, as identified by the Comptroller General.

(2) Alignment of operations with risk assessment findings, including an approach to identifying and prioritizing entities and locations for inspections.

(3) Measurable objectives for the surface transportation security inspectors program.

(b) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.**—Not later than 180 days after the submission of the strategy required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review such strategy and, as appropriate, issue recommendations.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5131, the Surface Transportation Security Improvement Act of 2018, as amended.

As you may be aware, TSA was created in response to the terrorist attacks on September 11. While the impetus behind its creation was the threat to aviation security, TSA is responsible for securing all transportation modes, including surface transportation assets such as railroads, mass transit, pipelines, buses, and ports. Given the persistent threats facing aviation in the post-9/11 era, TSA's main focus has been securing the aviation sector. However, in recent years, threats emanating against surface transportation modes, especially mass transit hubs, have steadily increased.

Attacks against these surface targets often require less sophistication than attacks against aviation, making them especially attractive to lone wolves or homegrown violent extremists.

Surface transportation systems are also a very attractive target due to their large volume of daily ridership and open infrastructure. The most recent example of an attack targeting surface is the attempted suicide bombing in December 2017 at New York City's Port Authority Bus Terminal.

Given the current threat environment, a review of TSA's approach to securing all transportation modes and an assessment of the degree to which surface transportation security should be prioritized is certainly warranted. Specifically, this bill mandates a GAO review of the national strategy for transportation security, the development of risk-based priorities for all transportation modes, and a feasibility assessment of utilizing security technologies for surface transportation assets.

Furthermore, the bill requires TSA to disseminate best practices for enhancing security against vehicle-based terrorist attacks and authorizes a surface-focused Innovation Task Force.

Finally, the bill requires a threat assessment of certain security technologies tied to foreign countries and a strategy for TSA's surface transportation inspectors. In the face of emerging threats, it is imperative that Congress ensure TSA is adequately executing its mission to protect all transportation modes, not just aviation.

I thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, for authoring this legisla-

tion, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. KATKO, for his support and leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5131, the Surface Transportation Security Improvement Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's surface transportation systems are central to Americans' daily life. Subways, buses, trains, and pipelines move millions of people and goods every day. Given their criticality, it is no surprise that terrorists have targeted these systems for attack. In recent years, attacks overseas have proven lethal, even more so, on average, than attacks against aviation. In December 2017, the threat against these systems hit home when a would-be attacker detonated a bomb within New York City's Port Authority Bus Terminal subway station.

My bill, H.R. 5131, would require the Department of Homeland Security to take meaningful steps to address this emerging threat. First, it would require TSA to take a more comprehensive approach to transportation threats when it comes to assessing risk and setting strategies and priorities. Second, it would require TSA to take a hard look at integrating new technologies and security measures into mass transit and other surface transportation systems.

Importantly, H.R. 5131 also would require DHS to assess cyber threats posed by foreign technologies and to disseminate best practices for securing transportation systems against vehicle-based attacks, such as the truck attack we witnessed in New York City last October.

Finally, it would require TSA to develop a risk-based strategy for its surface inspectors and answer to Congress for its failure to issue long overdue regulations that are required by the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007.

Consideration of H.R. 5131 today is timely, given the cuts to surface transportation security programs proposed by the President in both the fiscal year 2018 and 2019 budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure to improve surface transportation security.

In closing, as we have seen around the world, the threats to surface transportation systems are real and evolving. A major attack on any one system could be devastating and result in significant loss of life. My bill will push TSA to increase and enhance its efforts to secure these critical systems.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this. I appreciate the support from my colleague and the support from Mr. KATKO.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to commend the gentlewoman from New Jersey's work on this bill and Mr. KATKO, the chairman of the subcommittee.

This is obviously very important. Airports aren't the only target. We have bus transportation, we have seen those targeted in Europe; our rail centers are also targets. We have seen that in Europe, and we have seen indications of those attacks being planned here as well.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5131, the "Surface Transportation Security Improvement Act of 2018," which would increase the nation's readiness to deal with national security threats.

H.R. 5131 requires the Government Accountability Office to review the effectiveness of the Transportation Security Administration's Biennial National Strategy for Transportation Security.

H.R. 5131 would also require the Department of Homeland Security to develop risk-based priorities across all transportation modes.

This would be informed by analysis of terrorist attack scenarios for each mode of transportation.

The work directly under this will also include cyber-attack scenarios, which poses an increasing threat to the well-being of our public and private infrastructures.

H.R. 5131 requires DHS to explain overdue surface transportation security rulemakings and the Inspector General to review DHS's explanations, and report on its findings.

It directs DHS to conduct a feasibility assessment of introducing next generation technologies to detect threats to surface transportation systems.

DHS would also disseminate best practices for enhancing transportation security against the threat of vehicle-based attacks.

The bill also requires DHS to conduct and report to Congress on a survey of surface transportation stakeholders regarding resource challenges, including the availability of Federal funding and specific unmet needs.

It authorizes a TSA task force to identify and develop innovative technologies and capabilities to enhance transportation security, including surface transportation security.

It also directs DHS to assess the threats posed by the use of security technologies developed or manufactured by firms owned or closely linked to the governments of countries known to pose cyber or homeland security threats.

This is extremely important given the ongoing threats to our democracy from a rising number of malevolent global actors, including North Korea and Russia.

Finally, the bill requires the TSA to develop a strategy to guide surface transportation security inspector operations, which would be subject to GAO review.

In sum, H.R. 5131 enhances TSA's surface transportation security operations across a

range of activities, while taking into consideration the role of computers in the modernization of our nation's transportation systems.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this measure.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following cost estimate for H.R. 5131, the Surface Transportation Security Improvement Act of 2018, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, which was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 5131, the Surface Transportation Security Improvement Act of 2018.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Megan Carroll.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, Director.

Enclosure.

H.R. 5131—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION
SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018

As reported by the House Committee
Homeland Security on March 19, 2018

H.R. 5131 would require the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to complete a variety of reports, analyses, and other administrative activities aimed at promoting the security of surface transportation systems. The bill also would require the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the status of certain existing efforts related to surface transportation security. Under current law, TSA oversees, regulates, and coordinates with operators of surface transportation systems to safeguard those systems.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 5131 would not significantly affect the federal budget. Some of the bill's provisions would require TSA to expand existing efforts, but using information from the agency. CBO expects that any increase in federal spending (including costs incurred by GAO) under the bill would total less than \$500,000. Such spending would be subject to appropriation.

Enacting H.R. 5131 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 5131 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 5131 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Megan Carroll. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESTES of Kansas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5131, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STRENGTHENING AVIATION SECURITY ACT OF 2018

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4467) to require the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize risk-based strategies, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4467

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Aviation Security Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. USE OF RISK-BASED STRATEGIES BY FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 44917 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(9) shall require the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize a risk-based strategy when allocating resources between international and domestic flight coverage, including when initially setting its annual target numbers of average daily international and domestic flights to cover;

"(10) shall require the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize a risk-based strategy to support domestic allocation decisions;

"(11) shall require the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize a risk-based strategy to support international allocation decisions; and

"(12) shall ensure that the seating arrangements of Federal air marshals on aircraft are determined in a manner that is risk-based and most capable of responding to current threats to aviation security."

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that describes the compliance of the Federal Air Marshal Service with the requirements specified in paragraphs (9) through (12) of subsection (a) of section 44917 of title 49, United States Code, as added by this Act, and the documented methodology used by the Federal Air Marshal Service to conduct risk assessments in accordance with such paragraphs.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Transportation Security Administration shall begin carrying out the requirements specified in paragraphs (9) through (12) of subsection (a) of section 44917, United States Code, added by this Act, by not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Nebraska (Mr. BACON) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

□ 1700

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4467, the Strengthening Aviation Security Act of 2018.

Described by Chairman MCCAUL in his State of National Security Address as "the crown jewel of ISIS and other terrorist groups," the American aviation industry remains a key target of terrorism.

The Transportation Security Administration has made great strides in securing commercial flights, but the threat of evolving terror tactics requires a comprehensive, multilateral approach informed by data collected from industry.

The TSA's risk management strategy for passenger aviation security is characterized by a multilayered approach, whereby the TSA deploys a variety of security countermeasures to detect and deter threats.

Federal air marshals, also known as FAMS, are armed law enforcement officers deployed on passenger flights as part of the TSA's comprehensive security strategy to protect air passengers and crews against criminals and terrorists.

Due to the high volume of passenger flights and limited resources at the TSA, it is imperative that FAM deployment is risk-based and strategic in order to achieve the greatest security value. However, a recent GAO report from September 2017 found that the TSA does not measure data on the efficacy and deterrence value of FAMS.

Without viable metrics, it is impossible for the TSA to truly employ a calculated risk management strategy for passenger aviation security. Accordingly, the Strengthening Aviation Security Act of 2018 requires the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize risk-based strategies for international and domestic flight coverage.

This bill ensures that FAMS are deployed in a manner that adds strategic value to the TSA's multilayered security approach. As amended, the bill also requires the TSA to take their risk-based approach a step further by ensuring that FAMS are seated in tactical positions when deployed on the aircraft.

Strategic seating arrangements will provide FAMS with a distinct advantage in the event of a threat to aviation security and ensure that they are more relevant to the important mission for which they are tasked.

The Strengthening Aviation Security Act emphasizes the importance of intelligence-driven, risk-based decisions to make the best use of the Federal Air Marshal Service's resources and personnel.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) for authoring this legislation, as well the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. KATKO, for his work on this bill. Additionally, I wish to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MCCAUL, for moving the bill through the committee process.

This bill will promote public confidence in the security of the Nation's aviation system and ensure that armed Federal law enforcement officers are deployed on passenger flights, where they are most needed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4467, the Strengthening Aviation Security Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, it has been over 16 years since the September 11 terrorist attacks. Since that time, our transportation security systems have evolved in a number of ways, from the creation of the TSA to the hardening of cockpit doors. An important change to security has been the evolution of the Federal Air Marshal Service. Federal air marshals are armed law enforcement officers who are deployed on domestic and international passenger flights to protect passengers and crew against terrorist attacks.

On 9/11, the FAA employed a small number of Federal air marshals to serve as in-flight security on a small percentage of flights. After 9/11, the Federal Air Marshal Service expanded rapidly; and, in 2005, it was transferred to the TSA, where it operates today.

Today, air marshals contribute to aviation security by deploying on many domestic and international flights. They also help secure surface transportation systems and public airport areas as major participants in the TSA's Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response—or VIPR—teams.

To ensure the continued effectiveness of the air marshals, H.R. 4467 requires the TSA to ensure that officers are deployed in a risk-based manner that is focused on maximizing effectiveness. As amended, the bill also ensures risk-based seating of air marshals on passenger aircraft to enable officers to respond effectively to security threats.

This is a sensible bill to improve aviation security, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 4467, the Strengthening Aviation Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, last year, I learned that, while the Federal Air Marshal Service considers its travel budget and the number of personnel when determining which flights will be covered by air marshals, they do not consider risk.

This current system might maximize the number of flights covered by air marshals, but it does not ensure that the highest risk flights—those likely to be hijacked by a potential terrorist—would be covered by air marshals. The Strengthening Aviation Security Act would fix this flawed policy by requiring the Federal Air Marshal Service to incorporate risk in its deployment strategy in three ways:

First, this legislation requires the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize a risk-based strategy when allocating resources between international and domestic flight coverage. Currently, the Federal Air Marshal Service does not account for risk when it sets its annual target numbers of average international and domestic flights to cover.

Second, this legislation requires the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize a risk-based strategy to support domestic allocation decisions. Currently, these decisions are made based on the professional judgment of subject matter experts. Without documented risk assessments, the Federal Air Marshal Service cannot justify to the TSA, the Department of Homeland Security, or Congress why it chooses to deploy air marshals on certain flights and not on others.

Third, this legislation requires the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize a risk-based strategy to support international allocation decisions.

Shockingly, the Federal Air Marshal Service does not currently document the rationales for their international allocation decisions. Without this documentation, there is no verifiable method to determine whether the decisions are intelligence-driven, risk-based, or even in compliance with the TSA or DHS directives. Unless the Federal Air Marshal Service accounts for risk at every level of its deployment strategy, it cannot ensure that it is devoting its resources to cover the highest-risk flights.

It is incumbent upon us in Congress to address any vulnerabilities to our national security and to enable our Federal agencies to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt any attacks planned by our enemies, and this legislation does just that.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Chairman KATKO for their strong support of this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the threats to aviation continue to require constant vigilance and effective security solutions.

The Federal Air Marshal Service does not have unlimited budgetary resources to deploy marshals on every passenger flight. As such, resources must be allocated based on risk. H.R. 4467 will help ensure that the TSA does just that, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes total sense. If you are going to use Federal air marshals where they are needed most, it should be analytical and scientific-based so that we get the most bang for the buck.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, the following cost estimate for H.R. 4467, the Strengthening Aviation Security Act of 2018, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, which was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4467, the Strengthening Aviation Security Act of 2018.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Megan Carroll.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director*.

Enclosure.

H.R. 4467—STRENGTHENING AVIATION
SECURITY ACT OF 2018

As reported by the House Committee
Homeland Security on March 19, 2018

The Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS), part of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), promotes the safety of the U.S. aviation system, particularly by protecting airline passengers and crewmembers against the risk of criminal and terrorist violence. H.R. 4467 would require FAMS to use a risk-based strategy when allocating resources between international and domestic flights, and to report to the Congress on its compliance with that requirement.

Using information from TSA, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 4467 would not significantly affect the federal budget. Because the bill's requirements are consistent with existing administrative policy, CBO expects that any change in federal costs to meet them would be negligible. Such spending would be subject to appropriation.

Enacting H.R. 4467 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4467 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 4467 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Megan Carroll. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4467, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STRENGTHENING LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CAPABILITIES ACT OF 2018

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5089) to improve threat information sharing, integrated operations, and law enforcement training for transportation security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5089

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS.**—The term “public and private sector stakeholders” has the meaning given such term in section 114(u)(1)(C) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) **SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ASSET.**—The term “surface transportation asset” includes facilities, equipment, or systems used to provide transportation services by—

(A) a public transportation agency (as such term is defined in section 1402(5) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53; 6 U.S.C. 1131(5)));;

(B) a railroad carrier (as such term is defined in section 20102(3) of title 49, United States Code);

(C) an owner or operator of—

(i) an entity offering scheduled, fixed-route transportation services by over-the-road bus (as such term is defined in section 1501(4) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53; 6 U.S.C. 1151(4))); or

(ii) a bus terminal; or

(D) other transportation facilities, equipment, or systems, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) **TRANSPORTATION FACILITY.**—The term “transportation facility” means a bus terminal, intercity or commuter passenger rail station, airport, multi-modal transportation center, or other transportation facility, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. THREAT INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) **PRIORITIZATION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall prioritize the assignment of officers and intelligence analysts under section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h) from the Transportation Security Administration and, as appropriate, from the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, to locations with participating State, local, and regional fusion centers in jurisdictions with a high-risk surface transportation asset in order to enhance the security of such assets, including by improving timely sharing of classified information regarding terrorist and other threats.

(b) **INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTS.**—Officers and intelligence analysts assigned to locations with participating State, local, and regional fusion centers under this section shall participate in the generation and dissemination of transportation security intelligence products, with an emphasis on terrorist and other threats to surface transportation assets that—

(1) assist State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies in deploying their resources, including personnel, most efficiently to help detect, prevent, investigate, apprehend, and respond to terrorist and other threats;

(2) promote more consistent and timely sharing of threat information among jurisdictions; and

(3) enhance the Department of Homeland Security’s situational awareness of such terrorist and other threats.

(c) **CLEARANCES.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall make available to appropriate owners and operators of surface transportation assets, and any other person that the Secretary determines appropriate to foster greater sharing of classified information relating to terrorist and other threats to surface transportation assets, the process of application for security clearances under Executive Order 13549 (75 Fed. Reg. 162; relating to a classified national security information program) or any successor Executive order.

SEC. 4. INTEGRATED AND UNIFIED OPERATIONS CENTERS.

(a) **FRAMEWORK.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate offices or components of the Department of Homeland Security, shall make available to public and private sector stakeholders a framework for establishing an integrated and unified operations center responsible for overseeing daily operations of a transportation facility that promotes coordination for responses to terrorism, serious incidents, and other purposes, as determined appropriate by the Administrator.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate regarding the establishment and activities of integrated and unified operations centers at transportation facilities at which the Transportation Security Administration has a presence.

SEC. 5. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT SECURITY TRAINING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with public and private sector stakeholders, may develop, through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, a training program to enhance the protection, preparedness, and response capabilities of law enforcement agencies with respect to terrorism and other serious incidents at a surface transportation asset.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—If the Secretary of Homeland Security develops the training program described in subsection (a), such training program shall—

(1) be informed by current information regarding terrorist tactics;

(2) include tactical instruction tailored to the diverse nature of the surface transportation asset operational environment; and

(3) prioritize training officers from law enforcement agencies that are eligible for or receive grants under sections 2003 or 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604 and 605) and officers employed by railroad carriers that operate passenger service, including interstate passenger service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5089, the Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2018.

As evidenced by recent attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere around the world, the threat against surface transportation is real and unwavering. While the Department of Homeland Security, the Transportation Security Administration, and other Federal entities have made significant progress in providing support to State and local surface transportation assets, the current threat environment necessitates a coordinated approach.

Intelligence sharing is the backbone of informed, risk-based security, yet the top-down dissemination of this information is often stymied by bureaucracy and classification barriers.

This begs the question: How effective is intelligence collection and analysis if it does not reach the front line and inform subsequent decisionmaking?

H.R. 5089, the Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2018, requires the DHS Secretary to prioritize the assignment of officers

and intelligence analysts and, as appropriate, the DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis—or I&A—to fusion centers in jurisdictions with high-risk surface transportation assets.

High-risk surface transportation assets transport millions of people and commodities daily and are critical for the vitality of the American economy. This legislation will streamline and enhance the intelligence-sharing process so these high-risk systems are better prepared to be resilient against emerging threats.

A common complaint from owners, operators, law enforcement, and first responders is that the TSA, and the Federal Government in general, does not provide sufficient information for them to adequately prepare for threats. This is primarily due to issues surrounding classification, where key personnel at the State and local levels do not have access to pertinent security information.

As such, this bill requires the Secretary to make security clearances available to appropriate stakeholders, thereby making important and relevant threat information more accessible to the people who are heavily involved in the day-to-day security operations of surface transportation systems.

H.R. 5089 also requires the TSA Administrator to share with owners and operators a framework for unified operation centers to ensure robust response to security incidents.

Recent terror attacks and plots illustrate the challenges of effective coordination in a “system of systems.” This bill will streamline coordination efforts between Federal, State, and local entities to bring the right information to the right people.

The interconnected, diverse, and readily accessible nature of surface transportation systems creates unique security challenges that are best addressed by communication, coordination, and collaboration.

H.R. 5089 will create a structural framework to connect the Department of Homeland Security, the Transportation Security Administration, and surface transportation stakeholders, and it will facilitate timely information sharing.

I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for her leadership on this issue. I also thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, Mr. KATKO, as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, for their dedication to improving surface transportation security.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 5089, the

Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, in 2013, my home airport, Los Angeles International Airport, came under attack when a gunman opened fire at a TSA security checkpoint, killing TSA Officer Gerardo Hernandez and injuring many others.

□ 1715

This shooting was just one of several recent attacks on relatively soft targets such as public airport areas and surface transportation systems.

In the wake of the shooting at LAX, Congress passed the Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015, which made several important security improvements, including directing airports in high-risk surface transportation systems to install incident response plans and requiring TSA to provide active-shooter training to all of its screening personnel. Now, over 2 years later, it is time to take the next step in improving security for these soft targets. Enactment of my bill, H.R. 5089, is that next step. H.R. 5089 is focused on enhancing the capabilities of local transportation security stakeholders to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and other serious incidents.

State and local stakeholders, including transit system owners and operators and law enforcement agencies, play a significant role in securing surface transportation systems against threats; yet many stakeholders cite a lack of sufficient information from TSA and the Federal Government to adequately prepare for these threats.

The Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2018 requires DHS to prioritize the assignment of officers and intelligence analysts to fusion centers in jurisdictions with a high-risk surface transportation asset, thus improving information sharing.

Further, it directs TSA to make a framework available to stakeholders for establishing operation centers responsible for overseeing daily operations of transportation facilities, allowing for improved communications.

Finally, it authorizes DHS to develop a training program through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers to enhance the capabilities of law enforcement agencies operating at surface transportation assets.

Taken together, the provisions build upon previous efforts to secure our transportation systems by enhancing protection, preparedness, and response capabilities of State and local partners working to protect these critical systems.

Mr. Speaker, the shooting at LAX, along with attacks on surface transportation systems and public airport areas in New Orleans, Fort Lauderdale, New York City, and overseas have proven

that acts of terror are not limited to the aviation sector. To effectively address threats to surface transportation systems, State and local stakeholders must be able to communicate not only with TSA and the Federal Government, but amongst themselves during an incident. My bill seeks to bridge potential gaps in communication and coordination capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5089, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we have important information we can't serve to the right decisionmakers at the local level, we fail, which we have learned from 9/11 and other places where information is bottled up and doesn't get to the people who need it. This bill helps solve that.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection to speak in strong support of H.R. 5089, “the Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2018.”

Thank you Representative BARRAGÁN for introducing this important measure, as former Chairwoman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection I understand the value and importance of this bill.

I have long supported bolstering our Nation's transportation system security through improving coordination of local jurisdictions with federal law enforcement agencies.

H.R. 5089 does just that by requiring the Department of Homeland Security to prioritize the detailing of personnel from the Transportation Security Administration and the DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis to be stationed with participating state, local, and-regional fusion center in jurisdictions with a high-risk surface transportation asset.

In 2013, the Port of Houston which receives over 200 million tons of cargo a year was the 8th busiest container port in the nation.

Houston, also home to George Bush International Airport, the 14th busiest airport in the nation, will benefit directly from the resources provided in H.R. 5089.

Our transportation system facilitates economic growth through creating jobs, transporting goods, and connecting communities to one another.

This bill requires officers and analysts to participate in the generation and dissemination of transportation security intelligence products.

Additionally, H.R. 5089 directs TSA to make available to public and private sector stakeholders a framework for establishing integrated and unified operations centers responsible for overseeing daily operations of transportation facilities to promote coordination for responses to terrorism and other serious incidents.

Finally, it authorizes DHS to develop, through Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, a training program to enhance the

protection, preparedness, and response capabilities of law enforcement agencies with respect to terrorism and other serious incidents at surface transportation assets.

Taken together, the bill's provisions enhance the capabilities of local transportation security stakeholders to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and other serious incidents.

We should support this effort to improve our National security and transportation capabilities against terrorism.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5089.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5089, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

KENNEDY-KING NATIONAL COMMEMORATIVE SITE ACT

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4851) to establish the Kennedy-King National Historic Site in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4851

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) SITE.—The term "Site" means the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site as designated by section 3(a).

(3) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Indiana.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL COMMEMORATIVE SITE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Landmark for Peace Memorial in Martin Luther King, Jr. Park in Indianapolis, in the State, is hereby designated as the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site.

(b) AFRICAN AMERICAN CIVIL RIGHTS NETWORK.—The Site shall be part of the African American Civil Rights Network established under Public Law 115-104.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with appropriate public or private entities for interpretative and educational purposes related to the Site.

(2) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The Site shall not be a unit of the National Park System.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this Act—

(A) authorizes the Secretary to interfere with the rights of any person with respect to

private property or any local zoning ordinance or land use plan of the State or any political subdivision thereof; or

(B) authorizes the Secretary to acquire land or interests in land through condemnation or otherwise.

(d) SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the Site to evaluate the national significance of the Site and determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Site as a unit of the National Park System. The Secretary shall also consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the Site by Federal, State, or local government entities, or private and non-profit groups. The study shall be conducted in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code. Not later than three years after the date on which funds are made available to conduct the study, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the results of the study and any recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4851, introduced by Congressman ANDRÉ CARSON and cosponsored by Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS, would establish the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Additionally, the bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to include the site in the newly established African American Civil Rights Network, and it authorizes a special resource study to evaluate the national significance of the site and determine the suitability and feasibility of including the site as a unit of the National Park system.

On April 4, 1968, Senator Robert F. Kennedy had scheduled a speech in Indianapolis during his campaign for the Presidency of the United States. Just prior to giving his remarks, Mr. Kennedy was informed of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He then changed his planned remarks to, instead, inform the large gathering of Dr. King's death.

In this historic speech, he called upon Americans to embrace non-violence in reaction to the news of Dr. King's assassination. Senator Kennedy stated: "What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not vio-

lence and lawlessness, but is love and wisdom and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be White or whether they be Black."

The site where Senator Kennedy delivered the speech is currently located in a city park established in 1961 and has since served as a community gathering place. In 1994, the Landmark for Peace Memorial sculpture was erected on the site of Senator Kennedy's speech. April 4, 2018, marks the 50th anniversary of Robert Kennedy's speech and Dr. King's assassination.

I commend Representative CARSON and Representative BROOKS for working across the aisle on this bipartisan and important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Representative HANABUSA for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of my bill, H.R. 4851, the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site Act. I also thank my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee for their very prompt consideration of this bill, including Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4851 is a bipartisan and bicameral bill with the full support of the entire congressional delegation, including my good friend and colleague Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS; including my mentor, one of my heroes, Representative JOHN LEWIS; and my buddy, Representative JOE KENNEDY. I thank them for joining the delegation of original cosponsors of Hoosiers.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site Act at the request of my constituents to provide formal National Park Service recognition to the site where Senator Robert F. Kennedy gave an extraordinary speech in Indianapolis in the spring of 1968.

This recognition, as well as addition to the African American Civil Rights Network, will help this location—set on a community board over there—remain visible and accessible for the inspiration of present and future generations.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues may have heard the story, as it was previously mentioned by my other colleague, that Robert Kennedy had a scheduled speech in the great Hoosier State in the city of Indianapolis during his campaign for the Presidency. However, just before he was to give those remarks, Mr. Speaker, he was told of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Before the news became widely known, his advisers said he shouldn't

speak at all. They suggested he should stand back. But Robert F. Kennedy wanted to speak. Despite the risks of outbursts or interruptions, he had something important to say in person and face-to-face for all who were gathered.

He changed his planned remarks on the fly and broke the news of Dr. King's assassination to the large crowd assembled in the park. He called for a nonviolent response to Dr. King's death. Robert Kennedy's speech has been described as one of the greatest addresses of the 20th century, as a call for unity and nonviolence in a time of great unrest.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the speech in today's RECORD.

FULL TEXT OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S SPEECH:
INDIANAPOLIS, APRIL 4, 1968

Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm only going to talk to you just for a minute or so this evening, because I have some very sad news for all of you. Could you lower those signs, please? I have some very sad news for all of you, and, I think, sad news for all of our fellow citizens, and people who love peace all over the world; and that is that Martin Luther King was shot and was killed tonight in Memphis, Tennessee.

Martin Luther King dedicated his life to love and to justice between fellow human beings. He died in the cause of that effort. In this difficult day, in this difficult time for the United States, it's perhaps well to ask what kind of a nation we are and what direction we want to move in.

For those of you who are black considering the evidence evidently is that there were white people who were responsible you can be filled with bitterness, and with hatred, and a desire for revenge.

We can move in that direction as a country, in greater polarization black people amongst blacks, and white amongst whites, filled with hatred toward one another. Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand, and to comprehend, and replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand, compassion, and love.

For those of you who are black and are tempted to fill with hatred and mistrust of the injustice of such an act, against all white people, I would only say that I can also feel in my own heart the same kind of feeling. I had a member of my family killed, but he was killed by a white man.

But we have to make an effort in the United States. We have to make an effort to understand, to get beyond, or go beyond these rather difficult times.

My favorite poet was Aeschylus. And he once wrote:

Even in our sleep, pain which cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart,
until, in our own despair,
against our will,
comes wisdom
through the awful grace of God.

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but is love, and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black.

So I ask you tonight to return home, to say a prayer for the family of Martin Luther

King yeah, if's true but more importantly to say a prayer for our own country, which all of us love a prayer for understanding and that compassion of which I spoke.

We can do well in this country. We will have difficult times. We've had difficult times in the past, but we and we will have difficult times in the future. It is not the end of violence; it is not the end of lawlessness; and it's not the end of disorder.

But the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country want to live together, want to improve the quality of our life, and want justice for all human beings that abide in our land.

And let's dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of this world. Let us dedicate ourselves to that, and say a prayer for our country and for our people.

Thank you very much.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 50th anniversary of RFK's speech, it becomes very clear that America needs this national treasure to be preserved and promoted beyond the residents of Indianapolis. This powerful message of nonviolence in response to violence is more timely and important than ever.

The Smithsonian has described 1968 as "the year that shattered America." It was a time when divisions were sharp and the morale of this country was low. Many stirred up hatred and fear with venomous rhetoric, which drove people long left out of America's bounty to the limits of their very humanity. Many cities erupted in flames and violent riots.

When other cities expressed their justified pain, anger, and disenfranchisement with destruction, Robert Kennedy's calm voice of reason changed the hearts and minds of people who were feeling so much pain. Indianapolis was the only major city in America that did not burn in that season of pain and violent disruption.

JFK was assassinated. Martin Luther King was assassinated. And just 2 months after RFK's emotional speech in Indianapolis, he, too, was assassinated. But in his youth and his ability to feel the pain of others, RFK called on those who were hurting to turn away from violence and hate and practice what MLK practiced.

This message and this special place needs to be shared with all Americans across the country today and into the future. The amendment approved by the committee will add the Kennedy-King site to a new civil rights network, Mr. Speaker, and it will designate the location as a commemorative site.

This is a timely first step, and I look forward to seeing the bill signed into law this year. And after this step, our constituents and I will continue to count on congressional support for our efforts to establish the Kennedy-King National Historic Site as a unit of the National Park system in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my good friend, Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this great bill.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 50 years ago, on April 4, 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was shot and killed in Memphis, Tennessee. That same night, Senator Robert F. Kennedy was scheduled to deliver a campaign speech in Indianapolis, the city which my friend and colleague, Representative ANDRÉ CARSON, and I both represent in Congress.

Instead, Senator Kennedy broke the news to Hoosiers about what had just happened. His speech calmed a volatile crowd and called for a nonviolent reaction to the assassination. He pleaded with the crowd to remain committed to the ideals and peaceful movement of Dr. King during a time of turmoil, confusion, and despair. It has been called one of the most important and historic speeches of the 20th century.

Unlike other cities which erupted into violence and riots following Dr. King's assassination, Indianapolis did not burn. The hallowed grounds where Senator Kennedy's remarks were delivered is known in Indianapolis as Kennedy-King Park.

□ 1730

Thanks to H.R. 4851, it will be given the national recognition it deserves for its significance in the civil rights movement. I am proud to support this legislation to honor this historic moment.

I thank Chairman BISHOP; Ranking Member GRIJALVA; especially my colleague and good friend from across the aisle, Representative CARSON, who has led the charge to recognize this park.

Before I close, I want to share a small portion of the words shared by Senator Kennedy just about 50 years ago that I think we cannot recite enough in this country:

"What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence or lawlessness; but love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice towards those who still suffer within our country."

As my good friend has just said, Senator Kennedy's words are still very relevant today. Maybe even more relevant today. I encourage all of my colleagues to remember and reflect upon them as we approach the 50th anniversary of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

I am also happy to share that anyone traveling to or from Indianapolis in the coming weeks will be able to hear and

read Senator Kennedy's remarks at an exhibition prominently displayed at the Indianapolis International Airport to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Dr. King's assassination in April. I am proud that this body will be adding this special place to the African American Civil Rights Network.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4851 establishes the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site in Indianapolis to honor the site where Robert F. Kennedy gave a stirring speech shortly after learning of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination. The speech was a moment of unification and a rallying cry to remain committed to the values of nonviolent resistance preached by Dr. King.

The location of the speech has become a source of pride and inspiration for the local community, so much so that they named the park after Dr. King and developed the Landmark for Peace Memorial to commemorate Senator Kennedy's moving remarks. Designating the memorial as a national commemorative site is a fitting tribute and honor to the legacies of both Dr. King and Senator Kennedy.

I thank Representatives CARSON and BROOKS and the entire Indiana delegation for their hard work moving this bill through the legislative process. I support the adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4851, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FLORISSANT FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT MAP MODIFICATION

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 835) to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 835

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MAP UPDATE; MAXIMUM ACREAGE AVAILABLE FOR INCLUSION IN THE FLORISSANT FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT.

The first section of Public Law 91-60 (83 Stat. 101) is amended—

(1) by striking “entitled ‘Proposed Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument’, numbered NM-FFB-7100, and dated March 1967, and more particularly described by metes and bounds in an attachment to that map,” and inserting “entitled ‘Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument Proposed Boundary Adjustment’, numbered 171/132,544, and dated May 3, 2016,”; and

(2) by striking “six thousand acres” and inserting “6,300 acres”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 835 is a bill that I am very pleased to have introduced with bipartisan support from my friends, Congressman SCOTT TIPTON and Congressman JARED POLIS, both of Colorado. Specifically, H.R. 835 would increase the current 6,000 acres to 6,300 acres and allow the National Park Service to accept the donation of 280 acres currently being held by the Palmer Land Trust and Coalition for the Upper South Platte into the monument's boundaries.

The Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument was designated by Congress in 1969 to preserve and study one of the most diverse fossil deposits in the world and to interpret its geologic significance.

Located in a high mountain valley just west of Pikes Peak in my congressional district and 35 miles west of Colorado Springs, Colorado, the monument features detailed fossils of insects, plants, and giant petrified redwood stumps that teach visitors about prehistoric Colorado.

The park also maintains a collection of over 12,000 fossil specimens, conducts inventory and monitoring of the fossil sites, has ongoing collaborations, and continues to be the subject of scientific publications. Many of these extraordinary fossils from the monument can be found in some of the most prominent natural history museums in the world, with the largest exhibit of perhaps 10,000 specimens located close by here in the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History.

The monument also offers a variety of recreational experiences, including sightseeing, stargazing, interpretive visitor center exhibits, hiking, picnicking, daily ranger-guided programs during the summer, junior ranger programs, and curriculum-based education programs for visiting school groups. It is truly an excellent addition to the National Park Service.

Expanding the monument will provide critical access to the park's western boundary for wildfire protection and opportunities for completing future hazardous fuel mitigation projects, while also providing additional wildlife habitat. In addition, the donated acreage could, and will, provide visitors with more recreational opportunities, including hiking, snowshoeing, cross-country skiing, and wildlife watching, all with no supplement funding or staff needed.

The proposed monument boundary expansion has received unanimous local support from all stakeholders; including, the State of Colorado, the Friends of the Florissant Fossil Beds, Sanborn Western Camps, Teller Historic and Environmental Coalition, Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Palmer Land Trust, Coalition for the Upper South Platte, the Pikes Peak Historical Society, and the Teller County Board of Commissioners.

This bipartisan bill is a great example for how the Antiquities Act should be applied, with strong local support, consensus, and engagement to identify and conserve the “smallest area compatible with proper care and management of the objects to be protected.”

That language, Mr. Speaker, is from the original Antiquities Act itself.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill expands the boundaries of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in Colorado to include an additional 300 acres. The expanded boundary will further the monument's paleontological research objectives and facilitate access for projects designed to decrease wildfire risk, a critical issue in this forested region. During our subcommittee hearing on this bill, we heard that the expansion is broadly supported by the local community and a critical addition to a monument that was established, thanks to enormous public interest in preserving a unique natural treasure.

The story of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument is an excellent example of the importance of conservation, and it is encouraging that we can work together in a bipartisan fashion to further this mission. I want to congratulate Representative LAMBORN for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to encourage the Members to please support this wonderful bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Hawaii for her support and great work in committee. This is something that has a lot of bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 835.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE ORIENTAL REPUBLIC OF URUGUAY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-102)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Uruguay, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay," and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed at Montevideo, Uruguay, on January 10, 2017.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security totalization agreements already in force with most European Union countries, Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign so-

cial security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the lost benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Agreements to me.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay and the Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 2018.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 835, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 4851, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

FLORISSANT FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT MAP MODIFICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 835) to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 3, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—385

Abraham	Comstock	Gohmert
Adams	Conaway	Gonzalez (TX)
Aderholt	Connolly	Goodlatte
Aguilar	Cook	Gottheimer
Allen	Cooper	Gowdy
Amodei	Correa	Granger
Arrington	Costa	Graves (GA)
Babin	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Bacon	Courtney	Graves (MO)
Banks (IN)	Cramer	Green, Al
Barletta	Crawford	Green, Gene
Barr	Crist	Griffith
Barragán	Crowley	Grijalva
Barton	Cuellar	Grothman
Bass	Culberson	Guthrie
Bera	Curbelo (FL)	Hanabusa
Bergman	Curtis	Handel
Beyer	Davidson	Harper
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Harris
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Bishop (MI)	DeFazio	Hastings
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Heck
Blum	Delaney	Hensarling
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Herrera Beutler
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Hice, Jody B.
Bonamici	Demings	Higgins (LA)
Bost	Denham	Higgins (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	Dent	Hill
F.	DeSantis	Himes
Brady (TX)	DeSaulnier	Holding
Brat	DesJarlais	Hollingsworth
Bridenstine	Deuch	Hoyer
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Dingell	Huffman
Brown (MD)	Doggett	Huizenga
Brownley (CA)	Donovan	Hultgren
Buchanan	Doyle, Michael	Hunter
Buck	F.	Hurd
Bucshon	Duffy	Issa
Budd	Duncan (TN)	Jayapal
Burgess	Dunn	Jeffries
Bustos	Emmer	Jenkins (KS)
Byrne	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Espallat	Johnson (LA)
Carbajal	Estes (KS)	Johnson (OH)
Cárdenas	Esty (CT)	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Evans	Johnson, Sam
Carter (GA)	Faso	Jordan
Carter (TX)	Ferguson	Joyce (OH)
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Fleischmann	Keating
Castro (TX)	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Chabot	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Cheney	Foster	Kennedy
Ciilline	Fox	Khanna
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Kihuen
Clarke (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Clay	Fudge	Kilmer
Cleaver	Gabbard	Kind
Clyburn	Gaetz	King (IA)
Coffman	Gallagher	Kinzinger
Cohen	Galleo	Knight
Cole	Garamendi	Krishnamoorthi
Collins (GA)	Garrett	Kuster (NH)
Collins (NY)	Gianforte	Kustoff (TN)
Comer	Gibbs	LaHood

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran

O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)

Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—3

Amash Biggs Massie

NOT VOTING—41

Beatty
Black
Blackburn
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Chu, Judy
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Eshoo
Farenthold
Gomez

Gosar
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (WV)
Jones
Katko
Kelly (IL)
King (NY)
Labrador
Lipinski
Marchant
Meeks
Messer
Mooney (WV)

Moore
Murphy (FL)
Pelosi
Pingree
Poe (TX)
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rush
Sires
Thompson (CA)
Tsongas
Vargas
Walz

□ 1852

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE HONORABLE LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the late Honorable LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER.

KENNEDY-KING NATIONAL COMMEMORATIVE SITE ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4851) to establish the Kennedy-King National Historic Site in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—391

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert

Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene

Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Español
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer

Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard

Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—38

Black
Blackburn
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Chu, Judy
Cummings

Davis, Danny
Duncan (SC)
Eshoo
Farenthold
Gomez
Gosar
Gutiérrez

Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Jones
Katko
Kelly (IL)
King (NY)
Labrador

Lipinski
Marchant
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Murphy (FL)

Pelosi
Pingree
Poe (TX)
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rush

Sires
Thompson (CA)
Tsongas
Vargas
Walz

□ 1902

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A Bill to establish the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4566, ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5247, TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK MONGIELLO, JORDAN MCINN, AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT TO TRY ACT OF 2018; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-613) on the resolution (H. Res. 787) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4566) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

EXPRESSING THE PROFOUND SORROW OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 788

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Louise McIntosh Slaughter, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of applicable accounts of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO HONOR VICTIMS OF TRAGIC PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE COLLAPSE AT FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I am joined here today by members of the Florida delegation to honor the victims of the tragic pedestrian bridge collapse at Florida International University.

Last week, a pedestrian bridge that was designed to protect students and other campus personnel and visitors from the traffic on one of our busiest thoroughfares collapsed, taking the lives of six innocent people and leaving others gravely injured.

So many of us, particularly in south Florida, have a close and meaningful relationship with FIU, or Florida International University, and its students. This tragedy has hit our community exceedingly hard. We also know that, today, six grieving families are mourning in the wake of this horrific event.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak on behalf of my colleagues when I say we are truly heartbroken after Thursday's horrendous bridge collapse. We are thinking of the victims, those injured, and are mourning with their families during this very difficult time.

This Florida delegation, Mr. Speaker, and this Congress, will leave no stone unturned to ensure something like this never happens again anywhere in our great country.

Alexa Duran;
Navaro Brown;
Brandon Brownfield;
Rolando Fraga-Hernandez;
Osvaldo Gonzalez; and,
Alberto Arias.

We will never, ever forget them. We will remember them and grieve the lives cut short by this tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, may their legacy live on with all of us, with our community, and in the hearts of their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask that the House observe a moment of silence in honor of these victims.

CONGRATULATING YOUNGSVILLE HIGH SCHOOL ON WINNING IRISH BAND COMPETITION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Youngsville High School Marching Band for winning the 48th annual Limerick International Band Championship in Ireland.

The Youngsville Marching Eagles stole the show as they were crowned the overall winners in the band competition. The Warren County students braved blizzard-like conditions to bring home the top prize. Snow was piled high on umbrellas, hats; and even big brass instruments were coated in snowflakes. But the weather couldn't dampen the spirits of the musicians or the spectators. Spirits are also flying high for the proud parents, friends, and supporters in Youngsville, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, the Youngsville Marching Eagles worked hard to fundraise to make this international trip possible. For many, it was the first time they traveled outside the Commonwealth, let alone the country. The band also performed in Dublin at the St. Patrick's Festival Parade, where they were named "Best Small Band."

These Youngsville teens really dazzled the crowd, and I am so proud of their incredible international achievement. Congratulations to the band and Band Director Cindy Scheid.

REMEMBERING DR. STEPHEN HAWKING

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Dr. Stephen Hawking, who passed away last week at the age of 76.

Stephen Hawking was a brilliant student of the universe, a giant of the world stage, an inspiration to me personally and to us all. Through his discoveries about black holes and quantum mechanics, Professor Hawking challenged humankind to ponder the mysteries of the cosmos. He was curiosity personified, having once remarked: "My goal is simple. It is a complete understanding of the universe, why it is as it is and why it exists at all."

Yet Professor Hawking, who was diagnosed with ALS, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease, at the age of 21, also personified the unconquerable human spirit. He took on the challenges of his disability with unparalleled tenacity and a trademark sense of humor, all the while reminding us "to look up at the stars and not down at your feet."

Mr. Speaker, in short, he was a force of nature. He made a difference.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on the vote on H.R. 835. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

HONORING THE LIFE OF STAFF SERGEANT CARL PHILIPPE ENIS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep respect that I recognize the tragic loss of Staff Sergeant Carl Philippe Enis, pictured here, who was one of seven brave U.S. servicemembers killed in a helicopter crash last Thursday, March 15, 2018, in western Iraq.

Carl, a south Florida native who grew up in my congressional district in Pinecrest, was an Air Force pararescueman serving in a combat role in Iraq for the 308th Rescue Squadron from Patrick Air Force Base supporting Operation Inherent Resolve when his helicopter went down.

Sergeant Enis was a Reserve Citizen Airman combat rescue and recovery specialist who supported Air Force special operations. His job truly embodied his heart and spirit, where he consistently put his own life at risk to save others both in combat and humanitarian environments. He always tackled every challenge with a smile on his face, no matter the danger or difficulty.

Carl was also an active outdoorsman who embraced his passion for fishing, hiking, hunting, and scuba diving, and lived his life to the fullest. He was a graduate of Gulliver Prep, in my congressional district, and Florida State University.

Carl is survived by his wife, Angela; his mother, Colleen; and his brother, Edward. Their families, our community, and all Americans can be proud knowing that Sergeant Enis gave his last full measure performing his mission and serving the most noble pararescue creed: "These things we do, that others may live."

□ 1915

NEWARK COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Newark Community Solutions for its continued work on reducing crime and strengthening connections between courts and the community.

Newark Community Solutions works with young people who are at risk of being victims or perpetrators of gun violence. They provide job training, counseling, and peer mentorship. The organization also develops support networks for crime victims and provides mental health counseling for veterans and schoolchildren to avoid expulsion.

Mr. Speaker, Newark Community Solutions produces real results, and they are felt throughout Essex County. In cities throughout my district, we are seeing safer streets, reduced incarceration, and improved neighborhood perceptions of justice.

The program at Newark Community Solutions can be a model for cities throughout the country. Newark Community Solutions shows that, by investing in the community, we can build a foundation for sensible and thoughtful criminal justice reform.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BLOOMINGTON CHEERLEADING CHAMPIONS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the Bloomington Jefferson High School cheerleaders for their national championship victory. This season the team looked to replicate their historic success, having won five State titles and two national championships in just the past five seasons.

The team qualified for the national championship at the Universal Cheerleaders Association Ten Thousand Lakes Regional competition back in October, and in February, they made the trip down to the 2018 UCA National High School Cheerleading Championship in Orlando, Florida.

At the national championship, they competed against 28 other teams from across the country. They placed first in the preliminary rounds and then advanced to the final round. In the final round, they were able to best seven other teams and emerged with their third national title in 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the consistent hard work and skills of these student athletes is impressive, and it is a credit to their dedication, their perseverance, their coaches, and all of the families that offered them support.

Congratulations again to Bloomington Jefferson on their national championship.

Go Jaguars.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate

the University of Houston men's basketball team on their remarkable performance in the 2018 NCAA Tournament.

The Cougars entered the tournament as the number six seed from the American Athletic Conference, led by the 2018 AAC Coach of the Year Kelvin Sampson. This was the Cougars' first NCAA tournament appearance since 2010, and their spectacular win in the first round against San Diego State was the Cougars' first NCAA Tournament win since 1984. Their loss against Michigan in the second round was hard fought and truly a heartbreaker.

As an alumnus of the University of Houston and on behalf of the city and the fans, we are proud at what they accomplished this season. I wish the team the best of luck for next season.

I would also like to give special congratulations to seniors Devin Davis, Wes VanBeck, Nura Zanna, and Rob Gray for an exciting season.

Go Cougars.

HAPPY 110TH BIRTHDAY TO GOLDIE SMALL

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a distinguished constituent from my district named Goldie Small from Binghamton, New York. Goldie currently resides at the Good Shepherd Fairview Home in Binghamton, where she will turn 110 years old on April 1.

Goldie was born in Paris, New York—on Paris Hill as we call it—on April 1, 1908, and lived there until 1940, when she moved to New Milford, Pennsylvania.

As a child, Goldie went to a one-room schoolhouse until she attended high school in Waterville, New York. In order to get to and from the schoolbus, she either had to hitch a ride, walk 1 mile to catch a train, or use a horse and carriage to travel all the way to Waterville.

After high school, Goldie went to school in Rochester, New York, to the famous Eastman School to become a dental hygienist. Shortly after, the Depression hit and very few people could afford the luxury of dental care, so she went back to school to become a secretary.

After getting married and moving to Pennsylvania, Goldie had two children, Glenn and Marion.

Goldie has an amazing memory, never forgetting any of the birthdays of her six grandchildren and, now, nine great-grandchildren.

To this day, she continues to play bridge and other card games as well as completing the daily crossword puzzle in the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to have everyone join me in wishing Goldie a very happy 110 years. She is an inspiration to all of us on a long, clean life.

FIRING OF ANDREW MCCABE

(Mr. POCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, President Trump had Andrew McCabe, the Deputy Director of the FBI, fired.

His offense?

Well, he is about to be a witness in the Mueller investigation and had copious notes about his conversations with the President. What better way to nullify damning testimony than to fire the person about to give it, all while signaling to anyone else the consequences of crossing the President.

But it is worse than just that. The President fired Andrew McCabe in a way completely devoid of human decency: 2 days before his full retirement.

The message to McCabe and anyone else who would cross him was: I won't just go after you, but your family and your future, too. I will destroy you.

Like a thug in a mafia movie, Trump made his move. Fortunately, the Founders of this country made sure we had checks and balances in the system to avoid this dangerous style of governing.

I and others have offered Andrew McCabe, a 21-year law enforcement professional in the FBI, a job to ensure he will be able to get his hard-earned pension.

No one should fear harm to their family, their pension, their future by a petulant man-child or a ruthless demagogue, depending on the mood of the day.

I stand with you, Andrew McCabe, and so do the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING HERITAGE UNIVERSITY FOUNDERS DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I want to honor three incredible women who have had an enormous impact on central Washington State: Martha Yallup, Violet Lumley Rau, and Sister Kathleen Ross, who founded what would become Heritage University in 1982. With a vision to create a community and inspire others to serve, they brought education to the underserved populations of the Yakima Valley.

Today, Heritage University has grown immensely and now offers more

than 50 undergraduate and graduate majors. The high-quality education and inclusive environment has led to over 9,500 graduated students who will continue to grow their legacy.

Martha, Violet, and Sister Kathleen saw an opportunity to have an impact on the lives of their friends and neighbors, and it is safe to say they exceeded their goal.

Their perseverance, ambition, and service to the community are an inspiration for all of us in central Washington, and it is a privilege and honor to serve them during Women's History Month.

BENEFITS OF ONSITE CHILDCARE

(Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, study after study has shown that employers and employees find that on-site childcare provides the greatest value of any employer-provided childcare option. Despite this, only 11 percent of all private sector workers in the U.S. receive childcare assistance through their employers. Of that 11 percent, only 7 percent have access to childcare at or near their place of work.

As childcare costs dramatically increase each year relative to family income, the time has come for new approaches that provide affordability and flexibility for working families and increased productivity for businesses. Onsite childcare accomplishes this and has been repeatedly shown to reduce absenteeism and increase staff retention.

That is why I am introducing the Child Care At Responsible Employers Act this week: to incentivize employer investment in onsite childcare by providing a small preference in government contracting to those who do so.

With childcare costs rising, we can't afford not to act, and onsite childcare helps both businesses and families.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HOUSTON'S SUGAR LAND METHODIST HOSPITAL

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln used the term "four score and 7 years ago" at Gettysburg. If President Lincoln reappeared today, he might say: One score and zero years ago, a new Houston hospital, Houston Methodist, was brought forth in Sugar Land, Texas, a new hospital, conceived in medicine, and dedicated to the proposition that all Texans have the best care.

Seven thousand patients in 1998 became 225,000 in 2017. Over the 20-year

score, Houston's Methodist Sugar Land Hospital scored numerous awards, like the best metro area hospital from Fortune magazine.

There is a very simple reason for this amazing success, I CARE values: I, integrity; C, compassion; A, accountability; R, respect; E, excellence.

As CEO Chris Siebenaler said in a recent interview in the Fort Bend Focus: "Houston Methodist Sugar Land is committed to cultivate a safe, spiritual, and healing environment for every single patient."

Congratulations on 20 amazing years, 20 more to come.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JENNIFER IRVINE

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Jennifer Irvine. She attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Jennifer Irvine devoted her life and career to defending people in family court and criminal court. She opened her own law firm in downtown San Diego, California, where she worked tirelessly to defend each of her clients.

In her free time, Jennifer loved snowboarding, hot yoga, cats, and sailing. She had even earned a black belt in tae kwon do. She hoped to one day learn indoor rock climbing and to later experience skydiving.

Jennifer is remembered by all those who knew her as loyal, fierce, and passionate. She had a genuine devotion for helping people and was always driven to be her best self.

I would like to extend my condolences to Jennifer Irvine's family and friends. Please note that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF THOMAS RUSSO

(Mr. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Thomas Russo. Tom was born in New Orleans and grew up in Louisiana, where he received a degree in broadcast journalism from LSU.

I got to know Tom in his role as assignment manager at the WPMI television station in Mobile, Alabama. Tom was a consummate professional, always with a smile on his face and a contagious positivity about himself. In all of my experiences, Tom was a true joy to work with.

Tragically, Tom passed away, unexpectedly, on March 3 at the young age of 56.

To Tom's wife, Kristine, and his children, Ryan and Nick, please know that

Tom helped make southwest Alabama and the world a better and happier place. His legacy will live on in each of you.

□ 1930

CALLING FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, so many of us, when we go home, get the question of what is going on in Washington and why this behavior continues.

I think it is important for the American people to know that we have the responsibility of oversight. And I believe, as a senior member on the Judiciary Committee, that we need to address the question of the firing of Andrew McCabe. We understand there may be a report, the IG report. I don't challenge it, but it has not been rendered or made public. The precipitous and heinous, unfair firing, in the manner that it was done—I think that our Nation is better than that. I believe it is important for the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings.

And we should also hold hearings on the Cambridge situation. As a member of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Subcommittee for Homeland Security, Judiciary should hold and find out why the private information of millions of Americans through Facebook has been utilized to skew the election of 2016. No, I am not complaining, Mr. Speaker, about the results. What I am saying: The American people are owed a fair and just election, and the responsible people are the Members of the United States Congress to determine how their private information has been skewed and used and is still being used without their permission.

It is time for us to exercise our oversight, Mr. Speaker. Let's do it now.

CONGRATULATING THE GIRLS AND BOYS BASKETBALL TEAMS OF GRANDVIEW HIGH SCHOOL ON THEIR 5A STATE CHAMPIONSHIP TITLES

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate both the Grandview High School boys and girls basketball teams. These two teams from Grandview High School are now Colorado's 5A school basketball champions. The Grandview Wolves' boys team triumphed over George Washington High School from Denver by a score of 57 to 52. The girls team prevailed over Regis Jesuit High School by a score of 67 to 61.

The Grandview boys basketball team had a spectacular season, finishing the season with an impressive 24-4 record. And the culmination of its season was the first ever boys basketball State championship title. The Grandview girls basketball team also had a tremendous season, finishing with an equally impressive 23-3 record. And the culmination of its season was the second consecutive girls basketball State championship title.

The teams were led to their respective championship titles by their coaches: Josh Ulitzky for the girls team and Michael Rogers for the boys team. I also commend these two coaches, their coaching staffs, and their supporters at Grandview High School for all they have contributed to the success of the school's boys and girls basketball programs.

Again, congratulations to Grandview High School girls and boys basketball teams on this impressive victory in Colorado's 5A State championship.

MCCABE FIRING

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, our law enforcement and intelligence community—most notably, the FBI—is sustaining an unprecedented, coordinated attack led by the President of the United States. No one is above the law in our country, including the President.

FBI Director Andrew McCabe, a 20-year veteran of the FBI, is the latest to fall to this concentrated effort to undermine Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation into the Trump campaign's entanglements with Russia during the 2016 Presidential election.

Incidentally, former FBI Director Mueller has served our Nation for 36 years: as a soldier in the U.S. Navy with a Purple Heart; as a U.S. attorney; and also as FBI Director, including after 9/11 when he oversaw the transformation of the FBI from a domestic law enforcement agency into a global counterterrorism and counterintelligence agency. Wow.

This administration is making every effort to degrade our Federal law enforcement institutions and, even more insidiously, by a negative media campaign to erode public faith in these institutions. Let truth hit out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

REMEMBERING THE HONORABLE LOUISE SLAUGHTER

(Mr. REED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to stand with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as well as those on our side, in recognition of a life well done; that is, the passing of our colleague LOUISE SLAUGHTER. To me, tonight, it is something we should take a moment to reflect upon and recognize: her life, her commitment to this body.

Having served with her on the Rules Committee, I can personally attest, being a fellow New Yorker, that we shared a commitment to our home areas; that we always brought the passion of our beliefs, both on the left and the right, into the room; but at the end of the day, LOUISE SLAUGHTER represented us well, in the sense of how she represented and carried herself in this Chamber as she represented her people, her folks back home in Rochester, New York.

And I am proud to call her and remember her this evening as a Member of this body and her service to all of us. She was a Southern lady at heart, had a good wit, and she will be missed by many Members, if not all Members, on both sides of the aisle.

HONORING JOCELYNE AND MONIQUE LAMOUREUX OF THE U.S. WOMEN'S OLYMPIC HOCKEY TEAM

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as we observe Women's History Month and continue celebrating the historic Olympic Gold Medal won by the U.S. women's hockey team, I rise to recognize two remarkable sisters from Grand Forks.

Jocelyne and Monique Lamoureux grew up in one of North Dakota's premier hockey families. These sisters have played together since they were teenagers and were standouts at the University of North Dakota. The first set of twins to play women's ice hockey in the Olympics, they brought home silver medals in 2010 and 2014. In last month's championship game against Canada, they helped make this win golden: Monique's goal tied the game, and Jocelyne flawlessly executed the game-winning shootout goal.

Since returning home, they have joined Team USA in appearances across the Nation, inspiring a new generation of women athletes. A cheering crowd filled the Engelstad Hockey Arena in Grand Forks, many of them young girls and women on area hockey teams who came to congratulate their hometown champions who brought the U.S. women's hockey team their first Olympic Gold Medal.

On behalf of all North Dakotans, I salute Jocelyne and Monique. You have set a high bar for women athletes across the Nation, and North Dakota honors your excellence.

RECOGNIZING FARMERS ON NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

(Mr. ARRINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this National Agriculture Week, I rise to recognize the hardworking farmers across this great Nation who get up every day and, by the sweat of their brow, grow the food we eat. The district I represent in west Texas is home to 14 million acres of farmland, making it one of the largest agriculture production regions in the world. Our farmers and ranchers feed and clothe the American people and help fuel the American economy.

Agriculture contributes to 20-plus million jobs, and it is our country's number one export. But, more importantly, it provides a safe, affordable, and abundant supply of food for our citizens, which has tremendous national security implications. We can never put ourselves in a position where we depend on other countries for our food. That is not a vision for a safe, strong, and free America.

When we sit down with our families to eat dinner this week, let's remember to thank God for our food and for the farmers he uses to help make it. Mr. Speaker, these folks work hard and take enormous risks so this country can maintain its greatness so that America can continue to be the most powerful, the most prosperous, and the most generous country in the history of the world.

God bless our farmers. God bless America.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO VENEZUELA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-103)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), I hereby report that I have signed an Executive Order with respect to Venezuela that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13808 of August 24, 2017. The Executive Order prohibits, as of its effective date, all transactions related to, provision of financing for, and other dealings in, by a United States person or within the United States, any digital currency, digital coin, or digital

token, that was issued by, for, or on behalf of the Government of Venezuela on or after January 9, 2018.

I have authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including promulgating rules and regulations and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the Executive Order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 2018.

POSITIVE IMPACTS OF TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is helping folks around the United States and throughout the Third District of Georgia.

In fact, over 400 major companies across our great Nation have announced bonuses, pay raises, and new investments in their businesses and communities that will offer benefits to over 4 million Americans. I am thrilled that a number of great Georgia companies are included in this; such as, Columbus, Georgia-based, Aflac and Total Systems Services; as well as companies like Home Depot, Carl Black, Yancey Bros., Cox Enterprises, SunTrust, and United Parcel Service, just to name a few. These are all major companies in my home State of Georgia that are making investments in their people and their industries so that they can better serve their customers, and it is paying big dividends.

It is always exciting to hear about these announcements from major employers around the State, but the benefits of tax reform are not just felt by employees at major corporations, they are being felt by the job creators here on Main Street and right here in Georgia's Third District. Two that I will highlight at some point tonight will be Shred-X in Griffin, Georgia, and Custom Truck and Body Works in Woodbury. Both of these businesses are expanding and hiring more workers, and this is a great story for the State of Georgia and the Third District. We are awfully proud of them.

The positive impacts of tax reform have been felt by millions more Americans just this month as the updated withholding tables took effect. As employers implemented these tables, Americans across the country have seen these tax cuts reflected in bigger paychecks. This means keeping more of your hard-earned money to spend as you see fit. I have long said that Amer-

icans know how to spend their hard-earned money far better than the bureaucrats here in Washington. I look forward to seeing how our economy continues to improve.

Mr. Speaker, our next speaker is my good friend PAUL MITCHELL. Representative MITCHELL has become a dear friend and does a wonderful job of representing Michigan's 10th District. I want to thank him for setting up these Special Orders to tell the truth about tax reform and how it is helping Americans.

In Mr. MITCHELL's district, people who are making the median household income will see a tax cut of just over \$1,500.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from West Point, Georgia, and I want to also thank the Georgia and Alabama delegations' Members who, as part of the Tax Truth Squad, have come here tonight to share examples of the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act on their districts.

The last major tax reform was conducted 31 years ago. I believe many people, many businesspeople and workers, had simply given up on the idea that we would actually achieve what we achieved at the end of last year. In less than three months since the tax reform bill passed, as my colleague said, more than 440 companies have given a pay raise, bonuses, increased 401(k) contributions, or, in the case of utility companies, lowered their rates dramatically. In Michigan, rates will be lowered this year by \$400 million.

This number of 440 doesn't even include small mom-and-pop businesses on Main Street. At least 4 million Americans are receiving special tax reform bonuses, announced already this year, in 3 months. The direct bonus announcements have already passed \$4 billion. Small-business owners are showing unparalleled confidence in the economy as the optimism index reached record high numbers in February according to the NFIB Small Business Economic Trend Survey. Let me say that again: record high numbers, all as a result of what we achieved at the end of the year.

This optimism in economic strength is reflected in data recently released. Last month, the United States economy created 313,000 new jobs.

□ 1945

More importantly, 800 million people reentered the labor force who weren't trying to go to work. The unemployment rate remained the same at 4.1 percent, what most people call full employment. Equally important, wage growth over last year increased 2.6 percent; 2.6 percent already in terms of wage growth.

These are good things for Americans, for wage earners; and, as my colleague

said, even more importantly, a good thing because they keep money in the pockets of workers and families to make decisions on what to do with their hard-earned money rather than depend on those of us here, frankly, in Congress or, worse, bureaucrats, to spend it for them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all the Members of Georgia and Alabama as part of the Tax Truth Squad to put their stories forward tonight.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, one of the most important and recognizable companies in the Third District of Georgia is Aflac.

Aflac was one of the first companies to announce benefits to its employees. Shortly after Christmas, Aflac announced that they would increase their investments by \$250 million in the U.S., increase the company's 401(k) match for employees, and make a one-time contribution of \$500 to each employee's account. This is a long-term investment in Aflac's employees and into the United States economy. Our new Tax Code helps companies like Aflac to reinvest in their workers and their communities.

Mr. Speaker, my next speaker is Mr. PALMER, who represents the Sixth District of Alabama. Households earning the district's median income would see a tax break of \$1,534.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for setting this up, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia for leading it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the impact that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is having in Alabama's Sixth Congressional District.

Millions of Americans across the country are now reaping the benefits of tax reform in the form of higher paychecks, and my district is no exception. I would like to give just a few examples of how my constituents are using the additional money to benefit their families.

One woman from Mountain Brook noted that her employer was paying out bonuses of \$1,000 as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and that she will deposit that money in her health savings account.

Another woman from Trussville talked about how the savings would help with tuition payments for her two college-age daughters. The ability to help with tuition payments was a common theme among my constituents.

Another gentleman from Birmingham noted that his family used their larger paychecks to help pay for college and have placed additional money in savings.

A man from Hoover shared that he was able to make additional payments toward his mortgage principal, increase the amount he was contributing

to his 401(k), and was able to take his wife out to dinner and a movie.

It seems the Tax Cuts and Jobs Acts may be having an additional benefit for marriages in a way we hadn't considered.

Finally, another gentleman from my district noted, and I would like to quote him here: "We now have an additional \$250 a month thanks to the tax plan. We love the crumbs."

That was the same message I got from a lady in our church who received a \$1,000 bonus from her company.

These are just a few of the numerous examples of the individuals and families in my district that continue to benefit from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. But the benefits don't stop there.

Regions Bank, which is headquartered in Birmingham, recently announced that they would be making a range of investments as a result of the tax cuts, including raising the minimum hourly wage in their branches to \$15 per hour, and that is without a government mandate. They are also contributing \$40 million to the company's charitable foundation and increasing their capital expenditures budget by \$100 million in 2018.

It is not just the big companies that are doing this. Smaller businesses are getting in on the act as well.

One small business in my district, Wadsworth Oil, sent a note along with their employees' paycheck letting them know that, as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, they would be getting cumulatively \$22,000 in bonuses.

Despite fierce opposition from those who wanted to maintain the broken status quo, Republicans in both Houses of Congress were able to deliver a significant win for the American people.

Going forward, we must maintain this momentum and continue to enact policies that strengthen our economy, create jobs, and increase the pay and benefits for American workers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, as I said early on, we are seeing tremendous growth in businesses both large and small. Previously I highlighted a great American company, Aflac, but an example of a small company that is seeing the benefits of tax reform is a company called Shred-X in Griffin, Georgia.

Shred-X is a small business offering paper shredding and recycling services to approximately 3,000 clients throughout Atlanta and central Georgia, and they are using their tax savings to invest in their business. They are planning on buying a new truck and hiring a potential employee.

Now, for a company like Shred-X, that is a true small business that employs ten people, the addition of one truck and another employee makes a big difference. Shred-X owner Cade Joiner told me: "This is just one practical example of how tax reform is helping us here on Main Street."

It is really exciting to see our small-business owners really beginning to see the benefits of tax reform and beginning to see the benefits with their employees as well.

Mr. Speaker, my next guest is Mr. Buddy Carter. Representative CARTER has been an outspoken advocate for the benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. He represents a district where the median household income in the First District of Georgia will see an average savings of \$1,220.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank him for his leadership in this area and for putting this together tonight. This is an important message that all Americans should hear and that all Americans will share in.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the benefits already impacting the First Congressional District of Georgia since the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was signed into law.

A few weeks ago, I traveled the district and visited with businesses, with students, and with senior citizens to discuss how tax reform is helping them.

Nine Line Apparel, a business in Savannah, told me that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act allows them to give more to their employees, a small difference helping their employees to take vacations, buy Christmas presents for their children, and make it easier to provide for their families.

Lee Container Company in Homerville, which I visited a couple of weeks ago, said the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will enable them to purchase more equipment and grow their business.

I also had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to visit with students at Savannah State University. I shared my excitement that, for upcoming graduates, job creation from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will generate high demand for employees, increasing wages and making the job search easier than it has been in years past. Needless to say, they were excited to hear this good news.

Mr. Speaker, the results from my trips around the district were encouraging, and I am proud we could pass tax reform benefiting all income levels, American businesses, and our whole economy.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will truly go down as some of the most significant tax reform this country has ever seen. It is certainly the most significant tax reform in the last 30 years.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will put money in people's pockets, will stimulate our economy, will create jobs. It is good for our economy and good for our country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, as we go through tonight and begin to highlight some of the benefits of tax reform, we have talked a lot about a

large business such as Aflac, a small business such as Shred-X, but this is having an effect on individual families as well.

I have heard from people all over Georgia's Third District who are telling me that it is having an impact in their paychecks, and that is helping their families.

Robert from Thomaston wrote in to my office to say that he had checked his check, and he had more money in his retiree account statement on his military pension because of tax reform, and this is helping him meet his monthly financial goals.

Erin from LaGrange told me that she has \$132 more in each paycheck. She said, while it may not seem like a lot to some, it is her money and every little bit helps.

These are just two of the millions of Americans who are seeing larger paychecks because of comprehensive tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone is not sure if tax reform is helping them, I want to encourage them to check their check, see how much more money they are saving each and every month.

Mr. Speaker, my next guest is the distinguished gentleman from Georgia's 12th District, Mr. RICK ALLEN. Mr. ALLEN represents a very broad swath of the eastern part of our State. The median income family in his district will receive a tax savings of \$875 a year thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Augusta, Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman for doing this tonight and for giving me the opportunity just to give you some news from the other side of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the significant impact that comprehensive tax reform has had on Georgia's 12th District.

As a businessman, I bring a different perspective to the Halls of Congress. During my tenure in Congress, I have been focused on three goals: grow the economy, get folks back to work, and reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government.

Like me, President Trump is a businessman; and under his leadership, we are getting our economy back on track. Nothing can compare to the effect that tax reform is having on jumpstarting our economy and expanding small businesses and creating jobs.

Over the past few months, I have had the opportunity to meet with several small businesses as I have traveled across Georgia 12 to discuss how tax reform is making real changes for them and their employees.

I would like to share the story of Georgia Tire Company, a 72-year-old business located in Vidalia, Georgia.

In 1946, two brothers, after World War II, decided to buy a small gas station.

One of their sons, Rusty, began working alongside his father and uncle during the summer of 1965, and then began working full time at the family business in 1972, with a third generation of workers not far behind. Now they are known as a reputable business selling tires across the district and providing automotive repairs in Toombs County.

The Moses family has built their business through hard work; treating customers fairly; a little bit of luck; and, most importantly, through their employees, who are treated like part of their family.

When I had the opportunity to speak with Rusty Moses about the success of his family business, he told me that his employees are hardworking, honest, law-abiding people, but high taxes and complex laws continued to stifle their income. Mr. Moses promised his employees that if the tax laws were changed, they would share in the business tax savings through performance bonuses and salary increases. Thanks to tax reform, this promise has become a reality.

Georgia Tire Company has seen an increase in take-home pay, and it plans to issue employee bonuses at the end of this fiscal year.

There are so many family businesses like Georgia Tire Company that are truly the lifeblood of our communities. Before tax reform, these businesses were struggling to make ends meet and unable to provide their employees with well-earned benefits.

Don't just take my word for it. There are more than 4 million Americans who have already seen the positive impacts of tax reform, just like at this tire company.

With Congress and the President working hand-in-hand, we have made great strides. I can't tell you how happy I am to see our local businesses thriving in the new American economy, growing this economy, and giving all Americans the opportunity to have a good job.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my fellow colleagues and President Trump for their support of comprehensive tax reform for all Americans.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for those great words.

As I mentioned earlier, another great company in the Third District of Georgia is a company called Total System Services, as we refer to it, TSYS.

Right in Columbus, Georgia, TSYS is a major credit card processor and employs thousands of people in our area. Because of tax reform, they were able to give their employees a bonus, and, just as importantly, they have been able to invest in their business to grow at a more profitable rate and continue to return the benefits to the community.

I have heard a lot of folks talk about tax reform being just crumbs, but to

middle class Americans in my district, if you talk about crumbs, it is not about tax reform.

Tax reform is making a difference in middle American lives every single day. It is helping families make their ends meet—they are going on the vacation that they have worked so hard for—or to invest in their home.

These tax cuts are making a difference. Companies like TSYS, that are returning these benefits to their employees and making investments in their business, are continuing to do their part to make this Nation the most competitive place in the world to do business.

Mr. Speaker, I now call on my colleague from Georgia, Representative LOUDERMILK. Representative LOUDERMILK represents Georgia's 11th District. The median household income in his district will see an average savings of \$1,780.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

□ 2000

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I especially thank my good colleague and friend from West Point, Georgia, for managing this hour so that we can share, really, the excitement that we are seeing back home for what adding a little bit of money in the people's paycheck is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have often contemplated what transformed America from an enthusiastic ragtag rabble that had this idea of freedom into the strongest economy, the freest Nation, and the strongest military in the entire world?

The reality of that is the freedom that this government and the rights that were given by God that we protect has given to the American people. When you think about the innovation that has come from America, innovation that has changed the face of the world, most of it came from here because of the freedom that we have.

Now, if you go right down the road here to the Smithsonian's Air and Space Museum, you will see a testament to that freedom in that building where two bicycle mechanics from Ohio were able to accomplish to what, for centuries, scientists and engineers couldn't accomplish, because they had the freedom.

We have taught our children in this Nation to dream big. In America, you can accomplish anything that you want to dream. But in the past couple of decades, we have squelched the dreams of these kids because, as we have put out the fire that we tell them they can have in America, we are quenching that fire with wet blankets of bureaucracy and obstacles.

But I want to share with you a story from back home. It was a letter I received from a young man, a 14-year-old,

thanking me for the tax reform bill, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which put more money in the back pocket of his parents.

You see, he had a dream. He dreamed of being a pilot. He wanted to be a pilot. But I can tell you, as a pilot myself, that is a difficult thing to accomplish. Not only is the training difficult, but it can be very expensive.

But he wrote me this letter thanking me. Because of the bonus that his dad received from his company because of the corporate tax cut, and the money that they are going to save because of the individual tax cuts, his parents are using that money to ensure that he gets flight lessons at 14 years old. He is accomplishing a dream because we removed government out of the way.

And one thing, quite frankly, is we need airline pilots. Up here, we start looking at what government programs we can put in or incentives to get people to fly, when all we have got to do is get out of the way and let our children, once again, dream big. That is all that we are doing, is getting us out of way.

When you look at Georgia, the results have been astounding. Even Home Depot, which is headquartered in my district, is investing \$50 million to train 20,000 tradespeople to fill the gap.

With this closing, Mr. Speaker, let me bring up that the number of jobs that we have available in this Nation is about equivalent to the number of people we have unemployed. We need to continue to get out of the way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia's 11th District. The gentleman is right, if we get the Federal Government out of the way, great things happen.

As I mentioned earlier, another small company that is now doing big things as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is Custom Truck & Body Works in Woodbury, Georgia. This small company creates specialty vehicles for first responders. They had been hoping to grow their business, but they felt hampered by a burdensome Tax Code. After tax reform passed, they were finally able to move on with a building expansion, able to hire new workers, and give their current employees additional benefits.

I got to see the impact on this business firsthand on a recent visit to their facility in Woodbury, Georgia. Everyone was excited about the company's growth, and it really brought home, for me, the difference the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was already making in the Third District of Georgia.

Next is my colleague from Alabama, Congressman MIKE ROGERS. Congressman ROGERS represents Alabama's Third District. We are neighbors along the Georgia-Alabama line, and the median family household in his district will see a tax cut of almost \$1,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Georgia for leading this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is having in east Alabama and across America.

After working under an outdated Tax Code for over 30 years, businesses and families from the Third District of Alabama and the entire country are feeling some relief. From bigger paychecks to bonuses and raises, many companies in the U.S. have already distributed over \$4 billion in bonuses.

In my district, Russell Lands in Alexander City distributed \$500 bonuses to each of their 500 employees as a direct result of the tax overhaul.

Three companies in Columbus, Georgia, which is right across the State line from my district, have already rewarded their employees because of tax reform, including, as you have heard earlier, Aflac, Synovus Financial, and Total System Services. This is putting more money back in the pockets of some of my constituents right across the State line in Russell County.

Regions Bank and Protective Life in Birmingham, Alabama; Cogent Building Group in Point Clear, Alabama; Overseas Hardwoods in Stockton, Alabama; and DTI and Xante in Mobile are other companies across our great State that have been giving bonuses to their employees.

I am proud of Ben Russell of Russell Lands and the other companies I mentioned leading the way on this important front.

Because of the tax reform, over 4 million workers have already received a bonus or a pay increase across our great country. These bigger paychecks and bonuses can help families save for their kids' school or help pay for a new household appliance. It helps with making a car payment or paying off student debt.

This extra money represents opportunity. At a time when every penny counts, I am proud to see tax reform is giving hardworking Americans more money to take home to their families.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his remarks and for taking the opportunity to share some of the great things that are happening just across the State line to our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that tax reform was so important to me, and one of the things that I campaigned so hard for is growing up in a community where we lost our manufacturing backbone, where we lost our job base.

We saw families just begin to lose everything. They began to lose their homes, their cars, their small family businesses. We saw a generation move away from our communities to look for better opportunities because the jobs simply weren't there.

I know that every single job is important. So every time that we are able to do something in this great Nation to create the environment, where this is the best place on the planet to do business, and we can grow jobs, it is good for our communities; it is good for our friends; it is good for our families; it is good for our neighbors. It makes our community stronger.

One of the things about tax reform that is so important to remember is not simply about lowering the rates, but it is about helping American families, because now companies are now making decisions based on their employees and what is best for their bottom line, not arcane provisions that exist in the Tax Code.

So every time that I hear someone from the other side say, "All we did was give a tax break," I think it is being disingenuous. I think, quite candidly, it shows a lack of willingness to dig down into what this tax reform is really about; and that is changing how American companies operate so they can be very competitive on the world stage, so that they can make this place the greatest place in the world to do business and hire more of our friends and our family members, your neighbors, in the best-paying jobs on the planet.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to call on my colleague from Georgia's Seventh District, Congressman ROB WOODALL. Congressman WOODALL is on the Budget Committee, on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and on the Rules Committee. I thank Congressman WOODALL for his leadership on those committees. I thank the gentleman for the opportunity that he has spent with me as a freshman guiding me along the way. I know that the folks back home truly appreciate his efforts, because, as a result of tax reform, families making the median income in his district receive a \$1,866 increase in their paychecks as a result.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia's Seventh District (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you know that he may call himself a freshman, but Mr. FERGUSON—Dr. FERGUSON has made his weight felt around here since day one. He ran on a commonsense platform that said: Dadgummit, let's just go and get something done. Let's go and make a difference. Let's stop fussing about it. Let's start doing something about it.

He has developed a reputation as a doer, and I am proud to serve with him. I appreciate him putting together this opportunity tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about tax reform as if it is a line item somewhere. The truth is that it is a feeling. It is a collective sigh of relief that has gone

on in every single congressional district represented here.

We have all gotten those calls. I got one just the other day, Mr. Speaker, from a father whose adult daughter had fallen on hard times and has a tough time making the bills work. As someone who had been strapped for the last, 6, 7, 8 years, he was trying to figure out how he was going to help his daughter make the bill balance when he wound up with \$1,000 bonus from one of our local employers. It came at exactly the right time to make a difference in his family's life.

It is that collective sigh of relief that better days are coming tomorrow than we had yesterday. I have heard it from the biggest companies in the district and I have heard it from the smallest companies in the district.

The Home Depot is a proud Georgia company. My friend, Mr. LOUDERMILK mentioned it is headquartered in his district. We have got about seven stores in my district and a distribution facility in our district. Mr. Speaker, \$1,000 bonuses from The Home Depot went not to their upper-level management employees, but to their rank-and-file hourly employees at the store. That is real money in somebody's pocket back home. Now, that's just the kind of company that Home Depot is.

We remember that during the economic crisis, when folks were cutting back on everything to try to make the books balance. They kept that program going on Saturday mornings, where you could come out with your kids, where you could build a birdhouse together, where you could build a train together, where you could come together as a family. Even when you didn't have enough dollars to go to a ball game, you could come to your local Home Depot and be present with your children. That is the kind of company they are.

Same thing with UPS. My friend from Georgia knows, UPS has a proud tradition. We won them over from Connecticut. Years ago, Oz Nelson made that decision. Folks in UPS brown, 1,700 employees in my district, are getting bonuses because UPS now has more money to go around.

Now, all the money didn't go into bonuses. Let's be clear, it didn't. UPS put \$5 billion in their pension fund.

Mr. Speaker, how many times have we talked about pension funds being underfunded in this country and wanting somebody to do something about it?

UPS got some extra dollars and they put those dollars in the pension fund for their employees.

They announced last month, Mr. Speaker, 14 additional 747 purchases. Now, Boeing is not headquartered in my district, but if you live in Washington State or you live in South Carolina, the news that 14 more planes are going to be purchased means some-

thing to those families, to those suppliers, to those subcontractors.

Four new 767s being purchased as a result of extra money that wasn't coming to the Federal Government that is, instead, being reinvested.

My friend from Georgia said it best: companies are now, for the first time in a long time, making decisions based on what is best for them, for their customers, for their employees, and for their communities.

Mr. Speaker, we can argue about what kind of public policy we should have, but can't we agree that one where we are prioritizing people and communities first is one that we can all be proud of?

I was pleased to support the bill. I am pleased to be down here with my friend from Georgia tonight talking about the impacts. I am grateful both to the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and to my friend from Georgia, for your leadership on this tax reform issue, for making it possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia's Seventh District for his remarks. Well said.

Mr. Speaker, as I close out tonight, I first want to thank all of my colleagues who joined us here tonight to share some of the amazing stories from their districts and their States about what is happening as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. It is clear that this is having a real impact. The benefits are clearly more than just crumbs. They are meaningful to every single family.

I think one of the things that I see—and I am beginning to see more and more of—is not just simply that an employee is getting a bigger paycheck, which is great, but that enthusiasm that they have; because not only are they being rewarded for the job well done, but they are now seeing new opportunities because of growing businesses that they never had before.

It is exciting and it is wonderful to see our friends, our family, and our neighbors, the people who we care about, who we represent, being affected in a positive way. As our economy grows and as we do things here to put more and more back into our communities in the forms of people's freedoms for them to make livings and to raise their children and to do with their family what they feel like is best, I see a bright future for this Nation.

Just looking right now, 4 million people just recently receiving bonuses on top of their tax cuts, it has been a huge impact. It is making a difference. This is a promise that was made and it is a promise that has been kept.

□ 2015

And because of our growing economy, we will have a chance to keep our other promises: our promise to defend this Nation against foreign invaders, our

promise to make sure that our important safety nets are there in the future, making sure that we can keep every promise made to our seniors in terms of Social Security and Medicare, making sure that we can keep our promises to the men and women of the armed services who were willing to die for our freedoms.

We can keep our promises to our children to make this Nation a wonderful and great place for them because we are beginning to have the resources that we need to tackle one of the most important challenges that we will ever face, and that is the \$21 trillion in debt that we have burdened future generations with. A growing economy gives us the resources to do just that, and I cannot wait to see what this future looks like because I know that it is strong, I know that it is bright, and I know that it is right because we will be able to keep our promises.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

2018: THE YEAR OF THE BLACK WOMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to anchor this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour. I thank the Congressional Black Caucus chairman, CEDRIC RICHMOND, for his leadership in this effort.

For the next 60 minutes, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus and the millions of constituents whom we represent. Tonight's Special Order hour topic is Women's History Month.

Mr. Speaker, during Women's History Month, we salute phenomenal women who refused to sit on the sidelines of history. After the passage of the 19th Amendment, millions of women have continued to march like the women who came before them.

For generations, women, particularly Black women, have been on the front lines fighting for key rights for America's women, including the right to equal pay, the right to equal access to educational opportunities, and the

right to equal access to opportunities in the workplace.

In that spirit, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus in reclaiming 2018 as the Year of the Black Woman. 2018, the Year of the Black Woman—I like the sound of that. Black women are a force to reckon with, and we shall not be moved.

New York, my hometown, has a long-standing and illustrious legacy of leading the way to advance women's rights, from Seneca Falls to the United States Congress, and even on the road to the White House. It was where Madam C.J. Walker and Billie Holiday laid down their roots. It was the home of the late great Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first African-American woman to serve in this distinguished House and whose congressional district I represent today.

"I am not a candidate of Black America, although I am Black and proud. I am not a candidate of the women's movement of this country, although I am a woman, and I am equally proud of that. . . . I am the candidate of the people of America." These are the words she spoke.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of Shirley Chisholm's election to the House of Representatives as the reformer from Brooklyn and the 46th anniversary of her historic bid for the Presidency. In doing so, Shirley Chisholm blazed a pathway for millions of girls and women to dream unthinkable dreams.

Shirley Chisholm's labor and contribution to Brooklyn, Congress, and the Nation continues to bear fruit today. She paved the way for many of the women, myself included, to run for elected office at all levels.

Shirley Chisholm opposed war, racism, sexism, and inequality. She stood up to Republicans and demanded more from her own party. She won; she lost; she never backed down.

Forty-six years ago, the unbossed and unbought Shirley Chisholm announced her candidacy for President of the United States, making her the first woman in history to run for the highest office in the land. I can because she did.

Congresswoman Chisholm used the authority of her experience to create nutrition assistance programs, expand healthcare services for parents and children, increase the minimum wage, support the veterans of our Armed Forces, and provide opportunities for women in college, graduate school, and collegiate and professional sports with the enactment of title IX.

But that is not all. Shirley Chisholm pushed this country forward. I can recall growing up in Brooklyn and just being so proud as a young girl growing up knowing that there was a woman who looked like me who came from my neighborhood, who came from my origins, sitting here in the House of Rep-

resentatives. She was somewhat of a rock star in Brooklyn.

Her intellect, her ability, her savviness was something that she exuded in every environment that she found herself. She was pretty stylish as well. But it was, indeed, her strategic thinking and her ability to be a voice for the voiceless that really propelled Shirley Chisholm into the hearts and minds of all Americans.

Shirley Chisholm pushed this country forward, and for this and other reasons, she deserves a permanent place among other figures of United States history right here in the Capitol.

In January, I introduced H.R. 4856, what I have named the Shirley Chisholm Statue Bill. The bill would do just that, honor Shirley Chisholm's legacy with a permanent statue among those statues in our hallowed Halls. H.R. 4856 directs the United States Joint Committee on the Library, which is responsible for oversight of the operations of the Library of Congress and the management of Statuary Hall Collection, to obtain a statue of Chisholm for permanent placement in the United States Capitol. I am very pleased to say that over 70 Members of the United States House of Representatives are cosponsors.

My sister, colleague, and friend, Senator KAMALA HARRIS of California, in late February, introduced the companion bill. Among Senate cosponsors are the CBC members Senator CORY BOOKER of New Jersey, in addition to Senators Warren and Sanders, and my Senators, CHUCK SCHUMER and KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, as well.

Senator HARRIS and I agree, Shirley Chisholm created a path for Black women Members of Congress who have served after her. "Her legacy encourages us to keep up the fight for our most voiceless and vulnerable," Senator HARRIS stated.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa and Sojourner, giant figures in American history and the only two African-American women cemented permanently here in the Capitol, are lonely. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will join us in this effort. Let's pass the Shirley Chisholm Statue Bill right away.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), one of the staunch supporters of women's rights here on Capitol Hill and co-chair of the Bipartisan Women's Caucus.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman CLARKE for all of her strong leadership as a Member of Congress and also as a co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Black Women and Girls as she advocates for awareness, fairness, and equality for all.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today during Women's History Month to acknowledge the impact and legacy of Black women in America. Black women have blazed trails, set stand-

ards, and broken barriers in every job sector, elected position, and civil rights movement in America.

I am especially proud of the strong leadership of African-American women during the suffrage movement. The suffrage movement was the demand and struggle for the right for all women to vote and run for office and was a very important part of the overall women's rights movement.

Faced with constant opposition and threats of violence, women of various social classes, economic classes, and race traveled across the country to make their proclamation loud and clear. They have a voice, and they deserved a vote.

As women fought and marched for their right to be treated as first-class citizens, in addition to their gender, African-American women were also faced with the barriers of racism in America. While women were united by gender, they remained divided by race. In the march for respect and dignity, Black women were asked to march at the back of the suffrage parade.

Despite being asked to go to the back of the parade, 22 founders of the amazing Delta Sigma Theta sorority marched. This sorority was the only African-American women's organization to participate in the parade. I am proud to say I am a proud member of Delta Sigma Theta.

Another member of Delta Sigma Theta sorority, Ida B. Wells-Barnette, marched for the right to vote. A journalist, antilynching crusader, and outspoken suffragist founded the first African-American women's suffrage organization, the Alpha Suffrage Club of Chicago. The members of the Ida B. Wells organization joined her in marching in the women's suffrage march parade in Washington in 1913.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one of the examples of how Black women have faced, head-on, the double barrier of being Black and being a woman in America. As a Black woman of Congress and as vice chair of the Democratic Women's Working Group and the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I stand on the shoulders of women who refused to accept the status of being a second-class citizen, a second-class woman, or a second-class race.

I stand on the shoulders of Shirley Chisholm, as my colleague has outlined this amazing woman being the first African-American woman of Congress.

I stand on the shoulders of women like Erma Henderson. She was a Detroit civil rights activist who became the first Black woman to be elected to the Detroit City Council. She was the first woman I was able to look up to as a little Black girl growing up in the city of Detroit. She inspired me to believe that one day I, too, could have a seat at the table.

Mr. Speaker, the legacy of Black women is far from over. I am proud of

how far we have come, and I am encouraged by the hope of what is next. I am encouraged by my colleagues—White, Black, men, and women—who continue to fight for fairness, justice, and equality for all women and for Black women in this country.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her extraordinary comments this evening, really highlighting the triumphs and the challenges of both race and gender when we talk about Black women.

This is Women's History Month. We want to bring a unique lens to the conversation of Women's History Month because oftentimes, indeed, Black women tend to be the hidden figures.

□ 2030

Having said that, it is now my honor to yield to the gentlewoman from California, the honorable BARBARA LEE, one of the outstanding mentors and Black women here in Congress who has done extraordinary work, whether it is in leading the conscience of this Congress around the Iraq war or many other causes that we have seen her leadership as a north star to really making this Nation the best that it can be. It is my honor to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman for those kind remarks, and also let me thank Congresswoman LAWRENCE for her tremendous leadership and all she has done not only through this Special Order, but through all of their work with the Congressional Black Women and Girls Caucus. They have really lifted up Black women and shown the world that Black women lead, and I am very proud of both of them for doing that. You know, hidden figures, we are not hidden anymore thanks to them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just take a minute and begin by saying what a huge void it is on the floor of this House tonight without the presence of our beloved warrior woman Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER. She was a brilliant and beautiful woman: the first woman to chair the Rules Committee and the only microbiologist in the House. My heart is broken tonight.

Louise sat right there. She encouraged us; she supported our agenda, whatever we were doing; and she was a true mentor. I know, on behalf of all of us, we are praying for her family and her constituents tonight, and it feels different without Louise being on this floor.

I am glad to be with my sisters this evening and Congressional Black Caucus member Mr. EVANS because this is a moment that we have to kind of pull together in her absence.

Each year, in March, we pause to honor the countless contributions that women have made to this Nation. As a Black woman, I am uniquely aware that our stories tend, really, to be lost

in the mainstream celebration of Women's History Month. That is why I am glad to be here with my CBC colleagues to declare that, yes, 2018, this is the year of the Black woman.

For generations, Black women have blazed trails throughout this Nation: Madam C.J. Walker, Mary McLeod Bethune, Ruby Bridges, Audre Lorde, Mae Jemison, and Michelle Obama. This list of historical Black girl magic, it could go on. It could go on and on because, in every chapter of American history, Black women have stood up, spoken out, and pushed this Nation closer to freedom and justice and equality for all.

Last year, we saw the clearest indication of the influence that Black women have on our society through the emergence of the Me Too movement against sexual assault and misconduct.

Many don't know this, but the Me Too movement was started by a Black woman 12 years ago to support victims and survivors of sexual violence. Tarana Burke's work and the phrase "me too" have revolutionized the way we approach sexual assault in this country. But as has been the case throughout American history, Tarana's story, the story of Black women, is often lost in mainstream coverage of this movement, and what a shame it is.

But, once again, 2018, this is the year of Black women, and thank you for giving us a chance to highlight some of these hidden figures.

Courageous, bold, and brilliant women like Tarana have been fighting for the soul of this country for generations. And despite being locked out of opportunity and left behind in consideration, like our beloved, brilliant, the late Dr. Maya Angelou said so wisely: And still we rise.

We rise in the spirit of Black women like Ida B. Wells, who happens to have been born on July 16, which is my birthday—different year, though, but July 16. She was a revolutionary journalist and crusader for justice who spoke truth to power and exposed the atrocity of lynchings across the country.

We rise with the hope and determination of Black women like my mentor—and Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE has so boldly taken up her agenda, and she is standing on her shoulders—Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first major party African-American candidate and the first woman candidate who ran for the United States Presidency.

Miss C., as we called her, broke many barriers while tirelessly advocating for the most vulnerable in our Nation and our world. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman CLARKE for laying her record out.

I have to say, I got to know her very well. I was honored to have coordinated her northern California campaign, and I saw the many obstacles that she overcame as a Black woman in politics.

I happen to have been honored to have been a Shirley Chisholm delegate in Miami at the convention, and I have to just say, you talk about mentors, Congresswoman Chisholm encouraged me, and she was a catalyst for change, and she was unbought and unbossed.

I think Black women today are unbought and unbossed, and we are the catalyst for change, and so I can't help but honor Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm tonight and thank her for her contributions to our country, but also for being so special in my life, because I shared many, many, many moments with her.

So thank you again, and we want to recognize her on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, we also rise with the courage of fearless Black women like Anita Hill, who held her head high and spoke out against sexual harassment despite being humiliated by a committee of White male Senators.

I was reminded by Andrea Mitchell last week, on her show, that Congresswoman SLAUGHTER was one of those House Members who marched over there to that committee and held that hearing up for a couple of days.

When we rise, when we stand up together. When we refuse to be silenced, Black women and women can change history.

Because Anita Hill refused to let the abuse she was subjected to dissuade her from working to create a world where other young female professionals wouldn't be made to accept sexual harassment as simply part of the job, a movement was begun because of that.

The movement led to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 that allowed employees to sue for damages related to sex discrimination and harassment, and Anita reminded us that it was a Black woman who filed the first sexual harassment lawsuit in the mid-eighties.

Now, this movement led to more women being elected to office, tripling the number of women Senators from two to six; and because of that movement, there are now 22 women Senators and 104 Members of the House.

Make no mistake, we still have a long way to go to achieve full and lasting equality for Black women in this country. Black women still make only 60 cents for every dollar that White females make. We still have to fight for access to healthcare, and structural sexism continues to stand in the way of Black women being able to fully achieve the American Dream. But still we rise.

I am confident that, no matter what obstacles we face, as long as we stand up, speak out, and fight for what is right, we will win—because we are winning.

And let me just say as a Black woman who has been fighting for social justice and equality my entire life, the fight is worth it.

So I am proud to stand here with you tonight in memory of my mother, who was a fearless warrior woman, who taught me never to back down if I thought what I said or what I did was right.

Had Black women, like Ida B. Wells, my mother, Mildred Parish Massey, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, and Anita Hill given up, I might not be standing here today. I am the 17th African-American woman in Congress, the 74th African American, and the 163rd woman to serve in the House of Representatives in the United States' history. I know I would not be here if it weren't for these phenomenal African-American warrior women.

Mr. Speaker, thank you again for giving us a chance tonight to talk about our great sheroes, and I hope we continue to educate the public and to lift up Black women so the entire country will really understand and value and know where we have been so they know where we are going, and that is to achieve liberty and justice for everyone in this country.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her eloquent presentation this evening.

It is now my honor and privilege to bring to the floor the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania, the great city of Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love and sisterly affection, the honorable DWIGHT EVANS of the Second Congressional District.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from the great city of Brooklyn, particularly the great part of New York in terms of Brooklyn. She always reminds me that there is not a better place than Brooklyn. And if you haven't been there, I encourage you to go to Brooklyn.

What can I say about my colleague Congresswoman LAWRENCE from Michigan? As they both lead this effort, I compliment both of them.

I want to thank my colleagues for holding this Special Order hour to talk about our queens, our rocks, and our Black women. I say that because I was raised by a Black woman who was a single head of household, better known as my mom, Jean Evans. She was someone then and now who always was very consistent in her message in terms of stay strong and always look forward.

As we paint a picture of the Black community in 2018, it is clear that we have a lot to lose, because too many of our neighborhoods, unfortunately, are still plagued by rampant poverty, dysfunction, and crime. They are very serious issues.

But as I seek to tie together last week's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order with tonight's theme, it is important to remember that, when the Kerner Commission report was issued, and even today, Black women

had to deal with racism and, add to that, sexism. I am comforted by the fact that the excellence of Black women continues to outshine the gloom and doom that some of these problems bring. In fact, the fastest growing category of entrepreneurs are Black women.

Fortunately, I don't have to look too far because of Philadelphia, home of some of the most dynamic women and Black women in America. There is a woman there who is very good, and I have known her an awful long time, City Councilwoman Janine Blackwell, six terms in the council, born and raised in Philadelphia. She is a seasoned advocate for social change and has a 30-year reputation for serving community members and the poor and underprivileged in the city of Philadelphia, making her a leader in our city, Councilwoman Janine Blackwell.

Della Clark, president of The Enterprise Center, has played an integral role in the creative, technical, and professional progress of minority business development over the course of her life.

Estelle Richman, former Secretary of Public Welfare and Chief Operating Officer of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Richman oversaw agency efforts that resulted in an increased percentage of foster children finding permanent homes and a drop in the waiting list for mental retardation services.

Julia Coker Graham is the president and the CEO of the Philadelphia Convention and Visitors Bureau, where she oversees all of the organization's departments and operational duties. Prior to being named to the position, she served as the senior vice president of the convention sales and management staff, 25 people. She leads that organization, and she represents the face of Philadelphia.

The late C. Delores Tucker, who was the first African American to serve in the cabinet of a governor in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

And last but not least is Sarah Lomax-Reese, president and general manager of WURD, better known as Wurd in the African-American community, a Black-owned radio station.

□ 2045

All of these women I have mentioned have, in one way or another, affected me personally and have played a very key role in my life. So I want to join with my colleagues and talk about these beautiful women—our queens, our rocks, our great women. I thank both of my colleagues for allowing me to have this opportunity to join this discussion.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for really bringing to the fore all of these extraordinary Black women in Philadelphia. It is unfortunate that our history, when it comes to

gender parity, does not extol the virtues of everyone who is really laboring in the vineyard, oftentimes trailblazers and making things happen for communities, municipalities, and States across this Nation. Again, we are illuminating hidden figures this evening, and I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for doing such a tremendous job.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor and privilege to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who is just across the river from the district that I represent in New York.

The gentleman has been an extraordinary advocate for communities of color in the State of New Jersey. He has done a tremendous job in work on the Committee on Homeland Security. I know he has been an advocate for promoting and putting forth Black women in leadership positions. He was responsible for electing the very first Black woman to be Lieutenant Governor of the State of New Jersey. The Honorable DONALD PAYNE, JR., represents of the 10th District of New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Representative CLARKE and Representative LAWRENCE for hosting tonight's Special Order hour. These are two dynamic colleagues of mine. Ms. CLARKE, as she stated, is right across the river from me and has really been a mentor to me since my arrival here in Congress. There is never anything that I have ever asked her to do that she hasn't done. I just want to acknowledge the great support that she has been for me since I have arrived at this body. She is a true leader from across the river.

Also, Mrs. LAWRENCE, who is from the great State of Michigan, has joined us in her second term here in Congress. She has demonstrated her leadership day in and day out as well.

Mr. Speaker, of course, every year is the year of the Black woman for me. Just as Black women like the late great Shirley Chisholm and Barbara Jordan paved the way for other Black women to run for office, the work that these gentlewomen do has inspired a new generation of Black women to change the course of our Nation. For that, we are all grateful.

Throughout American history, Black women have been undervalued and undercompensated. Nationally, Black women who work in full-time jobs make only 64 cents for every dollar a White man makes. In New Jersey, Black women only make 58 cents for every dollar a White man makes. Black women both in New Jersey and nationally make persistently less than White women, despite the fact that Black women have the highest labor force participation rate in the United States among women.

Regardless of their educational level, Black women are less likely than other workers to be employed in higher paying careers. They are more likely than

other groups to be employed in service-industry jobs with low pay, no benefits, and outside the scope of the labor laws of this country.

Black women are key to building long-term success in our communities, yet they are disproportionately incarcerated. They are more likely to face employment discrimination and housing discrimination. They are more likely to be disciplined at school, and they are still undervalued and underrepresented in our society.

What should we be doing in Congress and in our communities?

First, we should be strengthening Black women's political participation. We need more Black women in office at all levels of government. Each of us should mentor young Black women who want to serve. We should uplift their voices, give them the microphone, and build infrastructure that gets them into office.

Secondly, we must protect the right to vote for Black women and all people of color. Over the past 5 years, the Supreme Court has gutted the Voting Rights Act. Legislators in States like Texas and South Carolina have passed voter ID laws that disproportionately restrict the right to vote for people of color, and Russian social media accounts have targeted the Black community to sow division and discord in our elections.

As Members of Congress, we have the power to restore the Voting Rights Act, protect the right to vote, and ensure our elections are secure from foreign interference.

Third, we need to support increased employment and higher earnings for Black women. That includes raising the Federal minimum wage to make it a liveable wage. That means strengthening collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, there are many examples of women in New Jersey who have made great accomplishments. Throughout 2018, the Year of the Black Woman, it is vitally important that we elevate Black women's voices and their experiences. Here are just a few Black women from my district who are making a difference.

Ibtihaj Muhammad, a Black woman from Maplewood, New Jersey, became the first African-American Olympian to wear a hijab during her event. She was also a model for the first hijab-wearing Barbie doll. Ibtihaj Muhammad is a trailblazer. She fenced in this year's past Summer Olympics.

Sheila Oliver, as Ms. CLARKE intimated, a Newark native, just became the first African-American Lieutenant Governor in New Jersey's history. She had already broken the glass ceiling by becoming the first African-American woman to serve as assembly speaker in New Jersey, and only the second African-American woman in the country to lead a State legislature. The first, of course, was our colleague from Cali-

fornia, KAREN BASS. Sheila Oliver and KAREN BASS are trailblazers.

Mattie Holloway from Hillside, New Jersey, has spent nearly 40 years helping young women in her community. For the past three decades, she has led Hope, Inc., a community service organization that helps pregnant teens and young mothers stay on track during and after their pregnancy. Mattie Holloway is a trailblazer.

In Bayonne, New Jersey, there is a young woman named Jae Wilson. She is 9 years old. Jae was at the mall one day when she noticed a homeless man wasn't wearing socks. Jae saw a need and stepped up to fill it. This young woman now spends her spare time collecting socks and shoes to distribute to people in need. Jae Wilson is a trailblazer.

There are countless Black women whose contributions to our collective freedom have gotten us to this point today. Too often, they have been sidelined and, as I stated, undervalued and disrespected. Let's do a better job to celebrate, uplift, and empower our sisters this year and every year.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, thank the gentleman from New Jersey for highlighting all of the ways in which Black women have excelled beyond expectation, despite all the challenges and the obstacles that they have faced.

We continue to see Black women rise, and I want to thank the gentleman for his observations, for his experience, and his interactions as part of this Special Order hour. We know that, again, these are hidden figures, but today I say hidden no more. They are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I thank the gentleman for adding such richness to the RECORD this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE will be sharing with us her insights during this Special Order hour as we highlight the accomplishments and we speak to the concerns in the Year of the Black Woman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and tenacity, and that of her co-anchor, the Honorable BRENDA LAWRENCE. They are so correct. This is the year of Black Woman Rising.

I can't help but celebrate the quote from the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, whom I had the privilege of introducing more than once as a younger woman. One will never forget that experience and never forget the experience of just being around the Honorable Shirley Chisholm and the Honorable Barbara Jordan. They both came from similar stock on opposite sides of the Nation, but they were strong, stern, committed, and ready to serve; and serve, I like to think, without foolishness.

So I love the quote of Congresswoman Chisholm that said: If there is

no chair for you at the table, then bring a folding chair.

I am paraphrasing.

What a celebration. Let me be very clear, it can go for Black women today in the 21st century.

I do want to acknowledge and to thank all women in this Women's History Month for their leadership and service. I want to particularly take note of our lost, late colleague, the Honorable LOUISE SLAUGHTER, and say that if there was ever a mighty woman of great leadership, tenacity, and strength, it was our dear friend, LOUISE SLAUGHTER. We honor her now and as well in the months to come.

As we talk about women of color, and in this instance, Black women, let me tell my colleagues that was about 400 or 500 of my sorors on Saturday. I must make mention of Marsha Penn, our president, and we were talking about the famous number 98.

Let me make sure I note all of the sorors in different sororities. For those of you who are not familiar with the sorority, that is a particular unique and special part of Black women's lives. I know there are other sororities, but we take it very seriously. You can be many colors. I happen to be pink and green, but there are many colors. I call them all my sorors. They are my sisters.

But we were talking about the power, and I use the number 98. I used that same number when I spoke with Stacey Abrams in Georgia just a few weeks ago. She may, in fact, be the first African-American woman nominee for Governor. She is running for that position in Georgia. She may be one of the great leaders coming forward.

But the 98 number is, as my colleagues know, 98 percent of African-American women cast their vote that catapulted Senator DOUG JONES into the United States Senate. They are change makers and tree shakers. That is what I want to say about Black Woman Rising. They are, in fact, those tree shakers.

Might I say and pay tribute to Ivalita Jackson, my mother; Valerie Bennett; Sarah Jackson; Sybil Gooden; Olive Jackson, my grandmother; Vannie Bennett, my grandmother; Mrs. Simms, my great-grandmother; Audrey Reed, my aunt; Vickie Bennett, my aunt; along with Valerie Bennett, my aunt. All of these women surrounded me and gave me the kind of tenacity and strength that I can be proud of.

□ 2100

I also want to acknowledge women like Dr. Alexa Canady, the first African-American woman neurosurgeon; Oprah Winfrey, a Mississippi native who has turned into a multi-multi-millionaire and upwards of a billionaire; and the story of Sojourner Truth, who was left off of the suffragette statue; but women like myself gathered together. Senator Clinton carried the legislation, but C. Delores Tucker was the

inspiration. She did not rest until Sojourner Truth found her place in the United States Congress.

There was Rosa Parks, who now sits in Statuary Hall in tribute to many members of the Congressional Black Caucus. I certainly thank our chairman, Mr. RICHMOND, for creating these opportunities for us to have this kind of experience.

Let me now get to the crux of what we need to do to be fair to Black women.

First of all, we need to quash, extinguish the stereotypes of welfare queens, incarcerated women, women with children and no spouses, and really talk about the mountains that Black women have climbed to raise children and to create heroes across the specter of leadership, from science to medicine, to education and, yes, to sports.

Let's make sure that we never have a President that says "sons of a B" to malign the many mothers, many of them African American, who are the mothers of sports persons who, only because of their upbringing, had a sensitivity to criminal justice reform.

Let us always characterize the mothers of the movement for what they are: not individuals who are against law enforcement or order, but mothers who have lost their children in an unfair way.

We need to work toward how things should change in criminal justice reform and improve police-community relations so we don't have mothers who have lost their children, such as Eric Garner, Michael Brown, Walter Scott, Tamir Rice, Trayvon Martin, and Jordan Davis. Some of these were not directly police issues, but they were sons who lost their lives, African-American young men. Also, Sandra Bland. Her mother is a dear friend of mine.

They lost their lives in ways that should not have been. There are also the same mothers of those law enforcement officials who have lost their lives. They mourn. What about bringing them together? Many of the mothers of young African Americans are obviously people of color, but we have lost many in the law enforcement in the same way.

My point is that the pain of mothers, the pain of African-American mothers, should be treated with dignity. The idea of a mother being on assistance to provide for her children and living in public housing should carry no label. There should not be a definition of supplemental food stamps as a handout, as much as it is a hand-up.

No one should be trying to save money in the United States Congress by providing boxes of food versus a nutrition system that food stamps allow, which is to allow someone to go and buy what their family needs or buy the formula or what their child with allergies needs.

Let's, first of all, establish dignity. Then, of course, if young women who happen to be African American happen to be incarcerated, let's make sure that we are looking to end mandatory minimums so that for these young women who are caught up in a conspiracy where the law wraps everyone up because of some elements of a spouse or a significant other or a boyfriend, and they get caught up in the criminal justice system, we can respond to them as mothers and recognize that they should be having an opportunity to not be entrapped with mandatory minimums so that they are never able to return to their children.

What about women who are pregnant and incarcerated, many of them Latino and African-American women?

We should be able to have a situation where those women are not separated from those children.

I heard Mr. PAYNE mention the 64 cents per dollar that many African-American women make in those kinds of hourly wage jobs. Therefore, we must have an increase in the minimum wage, but, more importantly, an increase in wages for women working in all capacities so that the stagnant wages that have not been impacted positively by the \$2 trillion-dollar tax cut, we must ensure that.

We must ensure the ability of all persons to vote without obstruction and without the dastardly voter ID laws that have been put in place specifically to stymie the vote of people of color: Latinos and African Americans. I would hope that the courts would find them unconstitutional.

Motherhood must be promoted, as I indicated, for those incarcerated, but also for those who are not. Also, the support of healthcare, which is what the Affordable Care Act was all about. It was to equalize and to give a protective system for our working mothers or our mothers who could not afford insurance in another way. It is unfortunate, though we have tried—the Republican Congress has attempted to unravel a very strong healthcare system.

There are women in the United States military. First, I salute them all, but I also salute those African-American women who have served in the military and have become generals.

I do want to take note of an organization that I have a deep affection for, and that is NASA. I am going to make it very clear that I want NASA to be on notice that I am still going to focus on the precipitous removal of an African-American, well-qualified astronaut without any explanation. The only explanation is: We did this wrong, and we really need to fix it.

But it needs to be explained why this person is not put back on the astronaut list and what excuse you had to remove her, other than the fact she was an African-American woman. In this month and this time we are honoring women,

if you have a reason, you need to come forward to discern or explain why an African-American woman with the credentials, who is an M.D., who has been in training for a large number of years, was precipitously removed with no explanation.

These are the kinds of challenges that we face. So, I guess my message is: Let us give dignity to these women who are characteristically different.

Sojourner Truth represents a powerful example of that. She was a tall, dark, regal woman. The story goes that, when she was at the suffragette meeting in the Midwest, she either raised her hand or attempted to be recognized, and the person in the front said: Yes, sir, what do you want, the gentleman in the back?

She began this long statement that said: Ain't I a woman? I have born 13 children and seen most all sold into slavery. Although I may be strong looking and manly looking, you may not have recognized that I am a woman that has born children and had them snatched away from me.

So I think the underlying premise of what we need to do for girls is to stop having the bias of young boys and girls who are African American being expelled or suspended from school in larger percentages than others. We need to make sure that the schools in our communities that happen to be Latino and African-American neighborhoods are equal to other schools.

We need to invest in education. We need to invest in Historically Black Colleges and Universities. We need to invest in technology and coding. We need to invest in giving our young people opportunity.

I want to conclude my remarks by saying that this is an amazing array of outstanding women. I cannot recall all of their names, but I hope that, as I call their names, you understand my singular thing of dignity. Dignity doesn't write legislation, but it causes us to write legislation and policies that give women of color—in this instance, African-American women—as we honor them in Women's History Month, dignity and whatever the tools there are that give them dignity: better access to jobs, better access to housing, better respect for the work they do. We had the dismissal of an astronaut without any explanation and no explanation that they can find.

Tracey Norman is a model. Oprah Winfrey. Shirley Chisholm. Leontyne Price. Maya Angelou. We know them for their work in civil rights.

Aretha Franklin, a historic, wonderful artist in her own right. Hattie McDaniel. Marian Anderson. Ella Fitzgerald. Althea Gibson. Dorothy Dandridge. Chemist Marie Daly. Sarah Goode, an inventor. We know the wonderful movie that talked about NASA women.

Della Reece. Ms. Muhammad, an athlete. Ms. Butler, an author. Mae

Jemison, my friend, a doctor and astronaut. Tyra Banks. Whoopi Goldberg. Loretta Lynch. Patricia Roberts Harris. Many of us are familiar with her work as a secretary in our United States. Mary Jane Patterson, an educator. Alice Coachman. There are so many.

I conclude by simply saying that what we want is dignity, respect, and the ability to serve and to be Americans, as we should.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for bringing to the floor so many of the issues that Black women have been in the lead on or have been fighting for, such as social justice and criminal justice reform, which is the hallmark of the leadership of Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE. We are grateful to her for expressing today all of these obstacles that we must overcome and that we are focused on here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to close with some words of wisdom from Black women who absolutely have inspired me.

"It's not the load that breaks you down, it's the way you carry it," Lena Horn.

"I did what my conscience told me to do, and you can't fail if you do that," Anita Hill.

"Mistakes are a fact of life. It is the response to the error that counts," Nikki Giovanni.

"Don't feel entitled to anything you didn't sweat and struggle for." That is the legendary Marian Wright Edelman.

And I close on an amazing woman we have talked so much about:

"Service is the rent that you pay for room on this Earth," Shirley Chisholm.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to be a woman in America and to be blessed by God with this beautiful, Black skin and to be a Black woman in America.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for sharing those quotes with us this evening.

It is so important, in terms of inspiration and motivation, that we are able to pull from the work that is being done by Black women and those who have preceded us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment, because I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to honor another distinguished woman from New York, the dearly departed Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER from New York's 25th District.

Words cannot adequately express the sense of sadness that I and many in my delegation feel to have received word of the passing of Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER, the dean of the New York delegation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER dedicated her life's work to the people of western New

York and, indeed, all Americans across our great Nation. She embodied a spirit of strength, wisdom, grace, and beauty, inside and out.

She represented the very best of the American spirit, our values, and our ideals. She was a trailblazer. She was the first woman to serve as chair and ranking member of the powerful House Rules Committee. She commanded the respect and admiration of her colleagues.

Having had the honor of serving with her has enriched my passion for service and my commitment to fight for the most vulnerable amongst us. She is, indeed, a woman on whose shoulders I stand. The United States Congress has lost an esteemed leader, the New York delegation has lost a beloved dean, and I have lost a cherished friend and mentor.

My thoughts and my prayers are with her three daughters, Megan, Amy, and Emily; and her grandchildren and great-grandchildren. In this time of their bereavement, we extend our deepest condolences.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we stand today in honor and in awe of the many accomplishments of black women in America. Despite seemingly insurmountable odds, black women have led iconic movements that have come to define the standard of equality and fairness throughout our society.

Every black woman stands on the shoulders of those who have paved the way for the continued freedom we enjoy, drawing their inspiration from the strength of our ancestors and our peers. The accomplishments of black women are part of a storied legacy of achievement made all the more meaningful by the challenges that we've had to overcome. As black women, the heavy burden of both systemic racism and sexism are not new realities, just circumstances that we have long worked to dismantle through civil rights movements, equal pay rallies, and organized civic engagement.

Black women and girls possess a unique understanding of the trials and adversities unique to our own experiences. Black women have always made do with less than their fair share, earning only 63 cents for every dollar a white man makes for the same work. More than 80 percent of black mothers are the breadwinners in their households, tasked with raising our future generations with just scarcely enough to pay for essentials while earning a fraction of what other segments of the population earn.

Black women are also sorely underrepresented in one of the fastest growing and highest paying career fields in America—engineering. Black women make up less than 1 percent of American engineers. Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics are fields that black women are being excluded from through cultural exclusion, lack of role models, and pay inequities. STEM fields offer incredible opportunities for the African American community, and we must do more to en-

sure that we encourage more women of color to pursue these opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, America needs black women to fulfill the roles as chemists, engineers, physicists, and engineers. Black women have and continue to engineer solutions to many of the problems we face in the 21st Century. The coming age presents unique technological challenges that must be met with unique perspectives capable of grand problem solving. Supporting funding for STEM after school programs, workshops, and boot camps is an investment in the future faces of computer science, engineering, and the continued leadership of the black woman. Historically, when the Black woman succeeds, our nation succeeds. This year, let us do more for black women in America so that they can continue to do more for our country.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today during Women's History Month to honor the extraordinary accomplishments made by Black women throughout our nation's history.

In 1987, Congress declared March to be National Women's History Month, giving the nation the chance to reflect on and salute the trailblazers who paved the way for many of the rights women have today.

I am blessed to be able to stand upon the shoulders of such great Black women, who sacrificed so much to help secure equal rights for all Americans, including generations yet unborn.

Some are household names, such as Rosa Parks.

In her defiance to give up her bus seat on a Montgomery City Bus in December 1961, she sparked the peaceful 381-day Montgomery bus boycott, leading to the desegregation of our nation's public transportation systems.

There is also Shirley Chisholm who in 1968 became the first Black woman elected to Congress.

Only four years later, she became the first woman to seek the Democratic presidential nomination.

In my own state of Ohio, there is Ellen Walker Craig-Jones, the first Black woman to be elected mayor in the United States by popular vote.

Ohio also gave us Irene Long, the first female chief medical officer at the Kennedy Space Center.

These women, and so many others, helped make it possible for me to stand here, on the floor of the House of Representatives, with my fellow women of the Congressional Black Caucus.

We owe them a debt of gratitude.

But, this Women's History Month, not only should we honor the history that has been made; we should look forward, to the history that will be made.

We are so fortunate to have Black women who continue to lead the way:

Public servants like new Atlanta mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms;

Organizers and advocates like those who led the Women's March; and Patrisse Cullors, who co-founded Black Lives Matter; and Tarana Burke, who first used "Me Too" to raise awareness of the pervasiveness of sexual harassment and assault in our society.

Women continue to face workplace discrimination, a higher risk of sexual assault, and an earnings gap that will cost the average woman hundreds of thousands of dollars over the course of her working lifetime.

"Me too," a simple phrase turned hashtag, has galvanized millions into action, letting those who continue to treat women as second-class citizens know that time's up.

Countless more Black women are unknown outside of their own families and communities, but still deserve admiration:

The Black women who sent a message to this administration, by showing up in Alabama to vote in the first Democratic Senator from the state in 25 years;

The Black women who have marched and continue to do so to have their voices heard; The Black women who will attend school and college against the odds, who will run for office, who will fight for what they believe.

All are part of our history and their courage and dedication have helped to sustain the American spirit by breaking down barriers, creating new opportunities, and inspiring the next generation.

Still, there is more work to be done to provide women with the economic security and opportunities they deserve and their families need.

We must diversify our workplaces to reflect what our communities look like.

Statistics show that companies with more racial, ethnic, and gender diversity are more likely to be successful.

When women—and in particular, women of color—are allowed to succeed, then we all succeed. That has been true throughout our nation's history.

It is my honor to celebrate Women's History Month by recognizing all those who came before me, to continue to work every day to create an even brighter future for all Americans.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the legacies of some Black history makers as a tribute to them during Women's History Month.

I speak of women who paved the way for other Black women and me to stand in the U.S. House of Representatives advocating for the benefit of our constituents. Women who stood their ground, fought for justice and broke through glass ceilings.

Black women like Ida B. Wells, who fought against lynching in the south during a time when remaining quiet would have been easy and a lot safer. Ida B. Wells saw what we called "low hanging fruit" and waged war against the murderous practice and the hooded cowards who hung those fruit. She gave new meaning to the phrase "the pen is mightier than the sword."

Women like Barbara Jordan—the Gentlewoman from Texas—who was the first Black woman to be elected to the Texas Senate (1966) and to later serve as State Senate President Pro Tem. She was also the first African American woman from the Deep South to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Like Ida B. Wells, Congresswoman Jordan saw injustice and took action. She helped create the first minimum wage bill in Texas, and the state's Fair Employment Practices Commission. As a member of the House Judiciary

Committee during the Watergate hearings, Barbara Jordan showed the world her strength as a guiding figure on the committee despite being a freshman member. She stood her ground among her colleagues, strongly advocating for the sanctity of the Constitution and President Nixon's impeachment.

Another of my heroes is Shirley Chisholm—unbought and unbossed. The first Black woman elected to the United States Congress (1968), Shirley represented Brooklyn, New York for seven terms and was a founder of the Congressional Black Caucus in 1969. She broke through the presidential candidates' glass ceiling in 1972 when she became the first African American to seek a major party nomination—the Democratic Party—for President of the United States.

Last, but not least, I salute my dear friend and predecessor Stephanie Tubbs Jones. A former Chief Prosecutor for Cuyahoga County, Tubbs Jones was the first African-American woman elected to the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio. As a Member of Congress, she fought tirelessly to expand health care coverage, support the re-entry of the formerly incarcerated into their communities and halt predatory lending practices.

These women have left indelible footprints in the history of America, and exemplify the determination and courage of black women. Notably, they shared another common bond through Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. They were trailblazers whose labor too often goes unmentioned, but this month WE CELEBRATE.

I thank Ida B. Wells, Barbara Jordan, Shirley Chisholm, and Stephanie Tubbs Jones for their contributions to our country, and for being inspiring examples for so many, not just Black women.

I see them. I salute them. I honor them.

□ 2115

FBI INVESTIGATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, with so much going on these days in the way of investigations, we still have Robert Mueller, special counsel—of course, he was supposed to look into potential illegal collusion between President Trump and Russia, and it has morphed into basically whatever he wants to pursue.

It is kind of like the investigation that James Comey as the Deputy Attorney General recommended that the then-Attorney General John Ashcroft should recuse himself, which he followed that advice, and then Mr. Comey was able to appoint his very dear friend and his child's godfather, Patrick Fitzgerald, to be the special attorney.

Special attorney, special counsel, and Mr. Comey apparently knew at the time the investigation began that the person who leaked Valerie Plame's identity as CIA agent was named Rich-

ard Armitage, somebody they did not want to go after even though it was supposed to have been a crime. But they weren't interested in the crime. They were interested in nailing a person or persons.

And it really appears that is not only what Patrick Fitzgerald did. He wanted somebody's hide, and apparently it was Dick Cheney's. He might have settled for Karl Rove. Apparently, the offer was made more than once. It was reported that Fitzgerald was offering Scooter Libby.

If you can just give me anything that will convict Vice President Cheney, then we will make sure you don't have anything to worry about.

But Scooter Libby was not going to lie to get himself out from under the gun, and as was reported, a witness against him, Judy Miller, later believed, when she found some notes, whoops, Libby had not lied as she apparently thought. Apparently, he was innocent, just as he had contended and, apparently, would have walked away without any problems, without the full force of the Federal Government going after him if he had just given him anything—that is Comey's child's godfather—given him anything that would have allowed him to convict Vice President Cheney.

It appears Mueller's investigation now has ceased looking for a crime involving Trump and Russia and is focused on just finding something—kind of like the effort that Comey's buddy—if it is Comey's buddy, since we are told that Comey and Mueller are basically joined at the hip, then it must have been Mueller's friend, too. But they wanted Vice President Cheney, and when Scooter Libby wouldn't lie and do that, well, they convicted him of lying when, apparently, he did not lie. He was innocent.

You can go back and find these type of things in Robert Mueller's wake, whether it was as the assistant U.S. attorney in charge of criminal investigations in Boston when they were found later to have had people who worked for Mueller who were in bed with Whitey Bulger, the mob leader, and Mueller kept insisting that these four people who were framed by FBI agents should remain in prison and not be paroled. Two of them died in prison. There was ultimately a settlement, but Mueller couldn't be bothered with a settlement because of the actions of the people who worked for him.

Just like he went after Dr. Hatfill, claiming that he was the anthrax killer, and some say that was the highest profile case this FBI Director had handled. Others would say it was the prosecution and conviction of Ted Stevens, U.S. Senator, which we later found out was a frame-up. The FBI is reported to have hidden evidence that completely exonerated him and manufactured evidence. After that came to light, his

conviction, all of the case was dropped, as it should have been, well before it was ever even pursued. But they got the intended result.

The trial, a week or so before his election, he was convicted and, therefore, lost the election. Kind of like what Mueller, as FBI Director, had his FBI do to Curt Weldon whom I saw stand at this podium numerous times and talk about the FBI had some information before 9/11 that showed that they could have stopped it, something like that. But he just kept beating up on the FBI.

I didn't have any idea whether what Curt Weldon was talking about was true or not, but I do know that just a few weeks before his reelection, after he had been easily reelected a number of times and after he was shown to have a decent lead over a very good Democratic opponent, 3 weeks before the election, the FBI stormed his daughter's office, and Mueller's FBI had leaked the information, apparently, because the place was covered up with reporters of all kinds so that they could document the raid on Curt Weldon's daughter's office.

Shortly thereafter, protesters with signs showed up at Curt's office, claiming that he had been caught red-handed, and the implications were clear from the FBI that Curt Weldon was guilty of something, and that brought about his defeat by about 2 percent.

As I understand it, the year after that raid on the Weldons, the FBI contacted Curt Weldon's daughter and said: You need to come pick up all this stuff up.

There was never a grand jury that we know of. There was no indictment. There was no real investigation. Mueller's FBI got tired of Curt Weldon making allegations from this podium I am standing at now, and they silenced him as a Representative.

There is much more, but we find out, and there is an article in the American Thinker by Daniel John Sobieski, and it talks about Uranium One. It says: "Back in July, I called for a criminal investigation into Hillary Clinton's collusion with Russia to turn over control of 20 percent of our uranium supplies to Russian interests in return for some \$145 million in donation to the Clinton Foundation. Now it turns out that there was one, an FBI investigation dating back to 2009, with current Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein and Special Prosecutor Robert Mueller up to their eyeballs in covering up evidence of Hillary's collusion, bordering on treason, with a Vladimir Putin's Russia."

"Before the Obama administration approved a controversial deal in 2010 giving Moscow control of a large swath of American uranium, the FBI had gathered substantial evidence that Russian nuclear industry officials were engaged in bribery, kickbacks, extor-

tion, and money laundering designed to grow Vladimir Putin's," says a report by the Hill.

John Solomon, Alison Spann of the Hill, said this:

"Federal agents used a confidential U.S. witness working inside the Russian nuclear industry to gather extensive financial records, make secret recordings, and intercept emails as early as 2009 that showed Moscow had compromised an American uranium trucking firm with bribes and kickbacks in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, FBI and court documents show."

So from today's report, we find out that the investigation was supervised by then-U.S. Attorney Rod Rosenstein, who is now President Trump's Deputy Attorney General, and then-Assistant FBI Director Andrew McCabe, who is now the Deputy FBI Director under President Trump.

Robert Mueller was head of the FBI from 2001 through September 2013, until James Comey took over as FBI Director in 2013. They were both involved in this Russian scam being that this case started in 2009 and ended in 2015.

Let me insert parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, I don't know who recommended the U.S. attorney investigating Russian collusion with Hillary Clinton and with the trucking firm, with others here in the United States, but whoever recommended Rod Rosenstein to President Trump as Deputy Attorney General should be fired, whoever that was. They are not there to help President Trump.

Further down, the article says: "Tuesday, on Fox Business Network, 'Lou Dobbs Tonight,' Breitbart editor at large and the author of 'Clinton Cash,' Peter Schweizer said there needs to be a Federal investigation into the Russian uranium deal then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's State Department approved after the Clinton Foundation receiving \$145 million from the shareholders of Uranium One. . . ."

So it is rather interesting. The article goes on to point out that about the investigation into Hillary Clinton, and it points—it quotes from Schweizer, saying: "A lot of people don't realize it now, in parts of the Midwest American soil is owned by Vladimir Putin's government because this deal went through."

He goes on and makes some interesting observations.

At the conclusion, he says: "Actually, we no longer need an investigation of Hillary Clinton and Uranium One. This FBI investigation in conjunction to what we already knew is prima facie evidence of criminal corruption and intentionally putting of American national security at risk for personal financial gain."

Then this article from Lee Smith, March 13, titled, "Robert Mueller's

Beltway Cover-Up." This points out that if the deep state here—and it does cross party lines. They wanted somebody to effectively cover up all of the leaks, each one of which is a crime punishable by time in prison. If the deep state here in Washington wanted somebody who could protect all of these criminals who are working in intelligence, or FBI, that regularly leak information to hurt people who threaten their power here in Washington, then they could not have a better person as special counsel than Robert Mueller, as overseen by Rod Rosenstein.

It points out that "Mueller took his job not at the behest of the man who by all accounts he is likely to professionally and personally disdain, Donald Trump, but of the blue-chip Beltway elite of which he is a charter member. Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein appointed him nearly a year ago to lead an investigation without parameters. That's because Mueller's job is to obscure the abuses of the U.S. surveillance apparatus that occurred under the Obama administration.

"The fact that someone at the level of former FBI Director was called in to sweep up the mess left by bad actors in the Bureau and Central Intelligence Agency and other parts of the intelligence bureaucracy suggests that the problems are even worse than previously thought. And that means the constituency from Mueller's political intervention is enormous."

Mueller is said to believe that the Eric Prince meeting, the reference back in January of 2017 with the Russian banker—that would be well after the election, obviously—was to set up a back channel with the Kremlin.

□ 2130

But that makes no sense. According to the foundational text of the collusion narrative, the dossier allegedly written by former British spy Christopher Steele, the Kremlin had cultivated Trump himself for years.

So what is the purpose of a back channel when, supposedly, Vladimir Putin already had a key to the front door of Mar-a-Lago?

Further, the collusion thesis holds that the Trump circle teamed with high-level Russian officials for the purpose of winning the 2016 election.

How does a meeting that Erik Prince had a week before Trump's inauguration advance the crooked election victory plot?

It doesn't. It contradicts it. Erik Prince may well be involved with questionable practices that would make people's blood run cold—and he talks some about Erik Prince—but the idea that whenever anyone who supported Trump, or even voted for him, met with a Russian national, the dish on the menu was treason is the stuff of Cold War "B" movies. But it is also

evidence of something more than prosecutorial overreach.

The fact that Mueller has zeroed in on Prince points to a key motive behind his ongoing investigation. And he talks about Prince was thrown into the middle of Russiagate after an April 3, 2017, Washington Post story reported his meeting with the Russian banker.

But how did anyone know about the meeting?

After the story came out, Prince said he was shown specific evidence by sources from the intelligence community that the information was swept up in the collection of electronic communications and his identity was unmasked. The U.S. official or officials who gave his name to the Washington Post broke the law when they leaked classified information.

Then on further it says Mueller presumably knows whether Prince's name was indeed unmasked and then leaked to the press, and that the leak was a crime. Mueller certainly knows that most of the case he has regarding Russian interference in the 2016 election was built by abuses of the foreign intelligence surveillance apparatus and other related crimes that are punishable with jail time.

The identity of Trump's short-term National Security Advisor, Michael Flynn, was swept up and leaked to the press in the same way as Prince's. It was leaked to the same newspaper, The Washington Post. As I explained last week, the identity of Attorney General Jeff Sessions was also unmasked from an intelligence intercept and leaked to The Washington Post. The fact that the FBI had secured a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act warrant on Carter Page was also leaked to The Washington Post. The warrant on Carter Page was secured on the basis of findings in the Christopher Steele dossier, an unverified piece of opposition research paid for by the Clinton campaign and Democratic National Committee.

As Director of the FBI during the post-9/11 period, when foreign intelligence surveillance and its abuses made regular, front-page headlines, Mueller knows exactly how the system can be abused and what the penalties are. He also recognizes that Russiagate is evidence of how it was abused and who abused it, including some of the same people he worked with during his 12-year tenure as FBI Director.

The purpose of the Mueller inquiry is, therefore, not to investigate the most ludicrously seeming charges in the Christopher Steele dossier, but to protect the institution of the FBI, former colleagues, as well as the National Security Surveillance System. Therefore, the inquiry has to cover up the sinful origins of the collusion narrative itself, which was borne in repeated abuses of power and subsequent crimes committed by U.S. officials in

the intelligence bureaucracy and the Obama administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what anybody thinks of President Donald Trump—and I know there are some Republicans who are unhappy that he was elected President and want him gone at all costs. And I know that most of the Democrats I know, it just grieves them to no end that he was elected; they want him gone at all costs. But at some point Members of Congress in the House and Senate have got to wake up to the fact that we have crimes being committed in the FBI and in our intelligence apparatus. There are people who are being paid with government checks who are out to destroy people who disagree with their power grabs and their crimes.

This article points out Mueller's investigation has got to drag on as long as necessary to prevent any of the people who have committed the crimes of leaking and other crimes—leaking, lying, perjury, obstructing justice, trying to create an insurance policy to take out a sitting President of the United States. It is time we wake up.

When elected officials in this city have to fear for their political lives by people who they have given power in the FBI, DOJ, CIA, NSA, then the system is broken. It is out of control. And it is how you lose a democratic republic like we have, or like we used to have. It is time to get it under control.

Mueller is not the answer. He is the problem. He is the poster child for the problem that he has created during his entire tenure. And if he had any decency, he would have never accepted this special prosecution on anything involving Russia because he had been involved in that investigation and because he remained silent or perhaps spoke up to keep it hush-hush.

But he and Rosenstein both, they should have stopped the sale of 20 percent of our uranium to a national enemy. Apparently the Obama administration was so intent on that reset because they felt like, you know, George W. Bush just overreacted; all Putin did was invade Georgia, one country invading another smaller, weaker country. They felt like Bush overreacted and said: You shouldn't be doing this; put some sanctions in place.

So they wanted to show: We are just fine with you invading adjoining countries. Maybe even those that don't adjoin. But, sure, at least adjoining countries.

Whether they knew it or not, they gave the green light to Putin to invade Crimea, to invade Ukraine. And they gave the green light—they had to know this, because it was part of what they did—to the sale of 20 percent of our uranium to a country that most recently had its dictatorial leader bragging that he had missiles that he could put those nukes on that the United States couldn't stop. And those nukes

can be tipped—at least 20 percent of them—with what Hillary Clinton, Mueller, Rosenstein had to be complicit in giving them, in letting them have.

This is serious stuff. But until the leakers and the abusers of our intelligence system are brought to justice, then nobody who believes in representative government is safe. We end up like China, like Russia, where you are scared to death of the people behind the scenes, behind the government, or even the dictatorial leader because you know they made you and they can destroy you.

And when the free press is not free, they are complicit in the assisting of the committing of crimes by gladly accepting the leaks, publishing them to complete the crime, we are in big trouble.

So I would say, if Mueller had any decency, he would just resign. And he doesn't even have to explain how wrong it was for him to accept the appointment. I had hoped that the damage he did to the FBI would have come to an end when his 10 years were up. But, oh, no. President Obama was so thrilled with the things he was doing, he extended his term 2 years and pushed it through Congress.

People wouldn't listen to me when I said: Oh, no, this is not a guy you want for 2 more years. He has done enough damage.

And any Republican who says, "Oh, he will be fair," is either desperately wanting President Trump gone or is intentionally ignoring the facts of Mueller's background from the days as the assistant U.S. attorney in charge of crime in Boston, up through the present.

There are a lot of innocent people who lie in his wake. Some of them got multimillion-dollar settlements for the damage Mueller did to them, but most didn't even get an apology. Mueller couldn't be bothered with how many millions were paid out in Boston because of what he oversaw. He couldn't be bothered with the \$5.8 million that was paid to Hatfill because the FBI, under Mueller, and under his direction, apparently—from what the article said, he took direct oversight over the Hatfill investigation, assuring, when there was no evidence that he committed any wrong, that he was still the one.

It is time that Mueller's investigation come to an end. I think Lee Smith had it right. I think the article by Daniel John Sobieski had things right. We have already had an investigation of Russian collusion, and it was done by U.S. Attorney Rod Rosenstein and FBI Director Robert Mueller, and they shut her down, shut up the information so the Clinton Foundation could be the beneficiary. And goodness' sake, they were big-time beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the need to be with his wife of 51 years, who is undergoing surgery, and to care for her during the initial stages of her recovery.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and March 20.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 15, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1177. To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States the condition that certain lands conveyed to the City of Old Town, Maine, be used for a municipal airport, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 788, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., for morning-hour debate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4288. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Expiration Date Required for Serial and Subserials and Determination of Expiration Date of Product [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0028] (RIN: 0579-AD06) received March 15, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4289. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Campanula spp. Plants for Planting in Approved Growing Media From Denmark Into the United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2016-0051] (RIN: 0579-AE31) received March 15, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4290. A letter from the Director, National Institute of Food Agriculture, Office of Grants and Financial Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities (HSACU) Certification Process (RIN: 0524-AA39) received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4291. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4292. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2017 Merger Decisions Report, pursuant to Sec. 18(c)(9) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4293. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program [Docket ID: ED-2017-OPE-0112] (RIN: 1840-AD28) received February 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4294. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0365; FRL-9973-20] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4295. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to Method 301: Field Validation of Pollutant Measurement Methods from Various Waste Media [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0069; FRL-9975-62-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT17) received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4296. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0517; FRL-9975-68-Region 7] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4297. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0208; FRL-9975-69-Region 7] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4298. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; City of Philadelphia; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0509; FRL-9975-38-Region 3] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4299. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; City of Philadelphia; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0453; FRL-9975-33-Region 3] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report covering the period from November 9, 2017, to January 8, 2018 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 1501A-422); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's reporting on designations of entities of particular concern, pursuant to Sec. 301 of the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act of 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4302. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on the Millennium Challenge Corporation's FY 2017 obligations and expenditures for assistance provided to each eligible country, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 7712; Public Law 108-199, Sec. 613(a); (118 Stat. 221); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4303. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Rocky Mountain National Park; Bicycling [NPS-ROMO-24625; PPIMROMO6A PPMRSNRIL.Y00000] (RIN: 1024-AE31) received February 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5131. A bill to improve the effectiveness of Federal efforts to identify and address homeland security risks to surface transportation, secure against vehicle-based attacks, and conduct a feasibility assessment of introducing new security technologies and measures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5099. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a fusion center technical assistance program (Rept. 115-603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5089. A bill to improve threat information sharing, integrated operations, and law enforcement training for transportation security, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4176. A bill to strengthen air cargo security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5079. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5074. A bill to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4467. A bill to require the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize risk-based strategies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4227. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to examine what actions the Department of Homeland Security is undertaking to combat the threat of vehicular terrorism, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5094. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to improve suspicious activity reporting to prevent acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5081. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish within the Transportation Security Administration the Surface Transportation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4851. A bill to establish the Kennedy-King National Historic Site in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 787. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4566) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed

with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 115-613). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 5323. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to establish an exemption from the credit valuation adjustment calculation for uncleared derivatives transactions with end-users so that United States companies are not disadvantaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 5324. A bill to improve school safety and mental health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5325. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to reauthorize regional economic and infrastructure development programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 5326. A bill to amend titles 14 and 46, United States Code, to make technical corrections with respect to Coast Guard and shipping authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 5327. A bill to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to create comprehensive opioid recovery centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 5328. A bill to authorize the return of surplus property, including Federal land, to the government of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BARTON, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 5329. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and enhance the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5330. A bill to provide for the imposition of sanctions on persons who are officials of the Government of Iran or persons acting on behalf of that Government who are responsible for or complicit in human rights

abuses committed against citizens of the United States or United States legal permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 5331. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for additional disclosure requirements with respect to content from registered foreign agents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself and Mrs. HANDEL):

H.R. 5332. A bill to improve school safety; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 5333. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved new drug application, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 5334. A bill to repeal the funding authorization sunset and the total funding cap for the Essex National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 5335. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions reclassified to title 34, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TONKO:

H. Res. 788. A resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Louise McIntosh Slaughter; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota):

H. Res. 789. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2018 as "Second Chance Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H. Res. 790. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2193), a bill to grant States authority to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws on remote transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

169. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1279 Joint Resolution, memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Congress to exclude the State of Maine from offshore oil and gas drilling and exploration activities; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

170. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 222, to express support for the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and oppose any reduction in

its boundaries; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

171. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a resolution memorializing the United States Department of the Interior to limit the proposed expansion of the National Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program and to protect the waters off the coasts of the Commonwealth and New England; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 5323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Subsection 3: to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the Several States, and with Indian Tribes

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 5324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers, and all other power vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 5326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 5327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 5328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2; Article I, Section 8, Clause 17; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 5331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 5332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 5334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 34, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 103: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 299: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 504: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 548: Mr. REED.

H.R. 686: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 741: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 846: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 881: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 942: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1054: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1206: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1267: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 1279: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1375: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1444: Mr. GHANFORTE.

H.R. 1530: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1556: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1596: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1606: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1661: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1817: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1820: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1828: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1861: Mr. WOMACK, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HILL, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1884: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1904: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1928: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1953: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2055: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2147: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2242: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2276: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 2439: Ms. NORTON and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2556: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2583: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2584: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2599: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2851: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2856: Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 3207: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3301: Mr. BUCK, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3330: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3349: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 3520: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3545: Mr. BANKS of Indiana and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 3577: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3605: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3635: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3642: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3654: Mr. VELA, Mr. VARGAS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 3666: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 3692: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3847: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3883: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3962: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3988: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 3999: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 4024: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4052: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 4067: Mr. ROYCE of California.

H.R. 4099: Mr. McEACHIN.

H.R. 4143: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 4215: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 4227: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4229: Mr. McEACHIN.

H.R. 4241: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 4265: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WOODALL, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4267: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 4392: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 4471: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 4548: Ms. MENG and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4575: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4649: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4659: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 4673: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 4677: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4706: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 4775: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4800: Mr. COSTA and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 4846: Mr. WALZ and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4851: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4886: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4915: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COOK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 4922: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 4949: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 5004: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 5012: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 5041: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 5065: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 5097: Mr. DAVIDSON.
 H.R. 5102: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 5124: Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 5139: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 5153: Mr. HUIZENGA.
 H.R. 5161: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 5164: Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H.R. 5180: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 5199: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 5210: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. HURD.
 H.R. 5218: Ms. NORTON and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 5247: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 5264: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 5272: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 5275: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. GIANFORTE.
 H.R. 5283: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 5292: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 5315: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 5321: Mr. NORMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. KHANNA.
 H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. KHANNA.
 H. Res. 69: Mr. BARR.

H. Res. 282: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H. Res. 318: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H. Res. 370: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H. Res. 403: Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H. Res. 570: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H. Res. 763: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H. Res. 768: Mr. TAKANO.
 H. Res. 772: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H. Res. 775: Mr. POSEY.
 H. Res. 777: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. MEEKS.
 H. Res. 781: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H. Res. 786: Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. KAPTUR.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 5247 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative WATERS (CA) or a designee to H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burden to Help Investors Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

89. The SPEAKER presented a petition of city Council of Akron, OH, relative to Resolution No. 64-2018, calling on the Ohio General Assembly to enact a ban on the sale of assault-style weapons, ammunition magazines in excess of ten rounds, and modifications that simulate automated fire such as bump stocks and trigger cranks; and declaring an emergency; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING JOANNE POWELL

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a staple of the San Angelo community and an invaluable asset on my team, Mrs. JoAnne Powell. Later this week, she'll be honored as the 2017 Special Friends of Conservation by the Tom Green Soil & Water Conservation Board.

JoAnne has assisted constituents in the Concho Valley throughout my entire tenure, a service that started in 1984 while working for then Rep. Tom Loeffler and eventually Rep. Lamar Smith. Since then, JoAnne has tirelessly worked with constituents on issues they may be experiencing with federal agencies, such as the Social Security Administration, the VA, and the NRCS. The relationships JoAnne has built with these agencies have led to thousands of these cases being resolved for these constituents.

JoAnne also serves as coordinator for our annual service academy application nominations, which is a year-round process for her. With JoAnne's assistance, many of the young men and women in our district go on to serve our nation and attend one of our distinguished service academies.

Through her big heart and drive to serve Tom Green County, JoAnne works closely with many agriculture groups that support West Texas. Her compassion and dedication has made her a special member of my team.

I congratulate JoAnne, and cannot think of a more deserving recipient of this year's Special Friends of Conservation Award.

HONORING THE WARTBURG
COLLEGE WRESTLING TEAM

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Wartburg College wrestling team for winning this year's NCAA Division III National Championship. Wartburg College is located in Waverly, Iowa and this is their third-straight title out of the fourteen they have won in NCAA National Championship history.

These young men have sacrificed much of their lives to hold this title—spending more time in the gym and more time practicing to continue improving. Through their hard work, dedication, and sacrifice, they have made their family, friends, Wartburg College, and north-east Iowa proud.

With that being said, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Wartburg College wrestling team,

Coach Keller, Coach Ortnier, and the Wartburg College community, on their well-deserved championship.

Go Knights.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for roll call votes on March 15, 2018 as I had to return to California to attend a funeral.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "YES" on Roll Call Vote No. 109, "YES" on Roll Call Vote No. 110, "YES" on Roll Call Vote No. 111, "YES" on Roll Call Vote No. 112, "NO" on Roll Call Vote No. 113, and "NO" on Roll Call Vote No. 114.

HONORING AMBASSADOR MARCH
FONG EU

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long, full life of a political trailblazer, the Honorable March Fong Eu. After more than thirty years in public service, March Fong Eu leaves behind a legacy of respected leadership and broken barriers. Her success opened doors for immigrants and women throughout the state of California.

A daughter of Chinese immigrants, her desire for equality can be traced back to her time in high school, when a school counselor discouraged her from pursuing a career in the sciences because she believed her Chinese ancestry would prevent anyone from hiring her. She was not deterred and she pursued education to the highest levels. After graduating from the University of California Berkeley in 1943 with a bachelor's degree in dental hygiene, she received her master's degree in education at Mills College. She then received a doctorate in education from Stanford University in 1954.

Ambassador Fong Eu built a career that paved the way for women and Asian Americans who followed her. She first became interested in politics while serving as the first female president of the American Dental Hygienists Association from 1944 to 1947. Years later, she entered the world of politics as the first female Asian American to be elected to the Alameda County Board of Education, where she served from 1961 to 1966. She was also the first Asian American woman to be elected to the California State Assembly,

where she represented the 15th District for four terms from 1966 to 1974.

In 1974, she became the first female California Secretary of State, and the first Asian American to be elected to a California constitutional office. At the time, she was the recipient of the highest vote total for a statewide elected office, and won reelection to four more terms. In 1994, President Bill Clinton appointed her as U.S. Ambassador to the Federated States of Micronesia.

Ambassador Fong Eu believed everyone should be treated equally regardless of their gender or ethnicity, and her accomplishments while in office reflect those beliefs. One of her most important campaigns was the successful ban on pay toilets in public buildings. She argued that while men's urinals were free, women were treated as second-class citizens because they were being unfairly charged for the use of public bathrooms. While serving as Secretary of State, she championed voting rights and dramatically expanded access to voting by implementing voter registration by mail, absentee ballots upon request, and allowing voters to register at the Department of Motor Vehicles and other state agencies.

She is an inspiration and role model for all Californians. As more women and minorities are elected to public office, March Fong Eu's legacy will carry on as they continue the fight for equality and justice.

TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF
PIKEVILLE POLICE OFFICER
SCOTTY HAMILTON

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is with great heaviness of heart that I and all of Kentucky mourn the tragic and untimely death of Officer Scotty Hamilton, a 12-year veteran of the Pikeville Police Department.

Eastern Kentucky lost one of its bravest sons on March 13, 2018 when Officer Hamilton paid the ultimate sacrifice while valiantly serving and protecting the community he loved. Since joining the police force in 2006, Officer Hamilton served with immense integrity, earning the utmost respect of his colleagues and courageously giving his all to the City of Pikeville.

In 2013, Officer Hamilton was honored as the Pikeville Police Department's very first Officer of the Year. It was an accolade he rightfully earned as one of the Police Chief's "right hand men"—a dependable and exemplary officer.

Outside of the police force, Scotty Hamilton loved living in the Appalachian Mountains and could often be found hunting and trail-riding with his family and friends. It was perhaps the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

great pride he had for his hometown that drove his desire to serve and protect the people who live there. In fact, he volunteered for numerous assignments and charity events to give back as much as he could.

The value of our rural law enforcement professionals, like Officer Hamilton, is immeasurable. Holding to their core principles of duty and sacrifice with unwavering dedication, our police officers never fail to respond, regardless of the unknown dangers and threats that arise.

I'm reminded of the true definition of love in John 15:13, "Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." What a legacy of love, bravery and sacrifice Officer Hamilton leaves to inspire our nation.

My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our deepest heartfelt sympathies to Officer Hamilton's wife, daughter, parents and his extended family, including his brothers and sisters in blue at the Pikeville Police Department. Let us remember Officer Scotty Hamilton as a true American hero.

RECOGNIZING CONSERVATION BEYOND BORDERS

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize Conservation Beyond Borders and their tireless work to eradicate the illegal poaching of Rhinoceros' and the subsequent trafficking of their horns which are used to fund illicit activities. This form of wildlife terrorism promotes the trafficking of humans, arms, and narcotics as well as other illegal activities around the world.

As a University of Minnesota graduate and wildlife biologist, Nicole Benjamin-Fink serves as the Director of Conservation Beyond Borders and has spent countless hours working to identify the illegal trade of wildlife by global operative networks whose goal is to utilize endangered animals, like the rhinoceros, as trade commodities. Through the creation of Conservation Beyond Borders, Nicole has raised awareness and promoted cross-cultural conservation around the world.

Like Conservation Beyond Borders, I too believe in the importance of identifying the causes and impact of wildlife terrorism. I am honored to recognize outstanding Minnesotans like Nicole for their efforts to preserve our wildlife and end the criminal financing of terrorism.

I commend Conservation Beyond Borders for their efforts to conduct comprehensive research on these criminal networks and for attempting to ensure that all wildlife have the opportunity to flourish in their native homelands.

RECOGNIZING TWO EXEMPLARY OREGONIANS

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of my friends, and two exemplary Oregonians who have dedicated their lives to service of their community and country. Retired Lieutenant Colonel Les Cochenour and his wife, Jody, are stalwart citizens of The Dalles, Oregon—my birthplace—who will be relocating from their treasured home in the Columbia Gorge to start a new chapter in their lives in Bend.

Before Les and Jody's new chapter begins, though, I would be remiss if I did not provide a brief account of their impactful chapters written in Wasco County.

Like me, both Les and Jody were raised in The Dalles. They are both proud alumni of The Dalles High School—high school sweethearts who graduated one year apart from each other and married just a few short months after Jody graduated. The foundation of their 56-year-long marriage began in high school, and so did the start of an inseparable duo of public servants.

Les entered the local National Guard Unit as a private straight out of high school. With a work ethic acquired at a young age on his farm in Dallesport, Les soon went on to officer candidate school and became a second lieutenant.

After more than two decades in the National Guard, Les joined the Army reserve, where he was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel and retired after another decade of service. Les' military record spans 31 years with the Army reserves, and 42 years as a military officer.

Just as his military service was winding down, Les' community service in The Dalles was just beginning. Les served as Mayor of The Dalles for two terms from 1990–1994. His leadership qualities and dedication to his constituents, including the planning of the Fort Dalles Readiness Center, earned him the position of President of the Oregon Mayor's Association in 1994.

A veteran himself, Les made it a top priority in his life to serve his fellow service men and women. He served on the board of the Oregon Veterans' Home for five years, dedicating his time to providing veterans and their families with a place to seek care, rehabilitation, and a roof over their heads.

Les is a founding member of the Mid-Columbia Veteran's Memorial Committee, providing another venue for service to his fellow veterans. All the while, Les has had a partner in this admirable endeavor of service to those who have served our country: his wife, Jody.

Jody, also a public servant who worked for the state in the Building Codes Division, is a board member of Mid-Columbia Veterans and a lifetime member of The Dalles Veterans of Foreign War Auxillary. A trailblazer of her own right, Jody launched the Red Crested Purple Breasted Cronies, a chapter of the National Red Hat Society that donates to a charity of their choosing each month.

Les and Jody have not been without recognition for their unique history of devoted

service to others. Les has been honored with the bronze medallion of the Order of St. George from the U.S. Calvary and Armor Association, a prestigious honor that recognizes the long and honorable service to cavalry and armor, and recognizes the very best cavalryman.

Jody was awarded the Order of St. Joan D'Arc, an equally prestigious recognition for a spouse with "significant voluntary contributions to the morale, spirit and welfare of the armor and cavalry communities."

Suffice to say, today will be just one of many accounts of Les and Jody Cochenour's service to their fellow citizens in The Dalles, and people across America. While their address may change, I know that their commitment to our state and country will not.

Their home will always be in The Dalles, and their legacy of service to others will certainly be passed along to their five grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren, and I imagine it will only be a matter of time before their impact will be profoundly felt by the community in Bend.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the whole House of Representatives and the people of The Dalles, please join me in expressing our sincerest thanks and gratitude to Les and Jody Cochenour for their lifelong dedication to community and country.

RECOGNIZING JUDGE THOMAS PATTERSON "PATT" MANEY

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and pay tribute to a local hero who has dedicated his life to humble service; service to his country, service to others, and service to the bench. One can get a slight understanding of the impact he's had on the lives of others by some of the powerful testimonies his colleagues will give about the man and his work, such as, "you will not find a more forceful advocate for justice" and "he is an irreplaceable asset to Okaloosa County."

The history of the life and work of Judge T. Patterson Maney is nothing short of astounding.

In 1974, he was admitted to the Bars of Kentucky and Florida and after a year of practice in Kentucky, moved to Okaloosa County where he established a general practice. He was appointed Okaloosa County Court Judge by Governor Bob Martinez and took the bench on June 5, 1989.

Brigadier General Maney's military service and experience played an intricate role in shaping his service on the bench. He served in the Army Reserve for almost 37 years in positions of increasing responsibility retiring as a brigadier general in 2007. During his reserve service, he was deployed to Panama, Haiti, Bosnia and Afghanistan for contingency operations. He commanded a reserve civil affairs brigade in Maryland as well as the 350 Civil Affairs Command in Pensacola and later served as the deputy commander of the Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations Command (Airborne) and deputy commandant of

the John F. Kennedy Special Operations School (Airborne) at Fort Bragg. In Bosnia, he served as the special assistant to the chief of staff and later as acting chief of staff of the Office of the High Representative, an international organization created to implement the Dayton Peace Accord. He played a key role in freedom of movement issues and security of meetings of the Bosnian tripartite Presidency and the visit of His Holiness Pope John Paul II to Sarajevo in April 1997. Later, in Afghanistan for 17 months, he served the U.S. Ambassador as senior advisor for the political sector with the status of attaché. In that role, he coordinated with the office of the presidency, various ministers including the Ministers of Justice and the Supreme Court, and the Joint Election Monitoring Commission.

In 2005, Brigadier General Maney was severely injured by a blast in Afghanistan and spent nearly 2 years recovering from those injuries. Brigadier General Maney returned triumphantly to the bench in May 2007. He has since been a staunch champion for veterans, mental health, and civil rights.

Judge Maney's personal experience as a wounded warrior helped inspire him to create a Veterans Court in 2010 that, since then, has helped veterans dealing with issues related to their military service avoid getting caught up in the legal system.

His advocacy and support of mental health has also been a cornerstone of his career. Judge Maney started the Okaloosa Mental Health Court and has been appointed three times to the Supreme Court's Task Force on Mental Health and Substance Abuse, where he advocated for passage of a veterans treatment court bill and for a revision of Florida's mental health laws. The Veterans Treatment Court Act was named for him, a singular honor for a county court judge. Because of his service as the Okaloosa judge supervising Baker/Marchman Act cases, he served on the statutory "Suicide Prevention Coordinating Council", 2010 to 2014. He also served on the statutory "Florida Defense Support Task Force", 2011 to 2015 where he successfully pushed for the passage of a veterans treatment court law. As a judge who fulfilled statutory duties as head of the election canvassing board, he successfully supported two amendments to Florida election law to protect the voting and privacy rights of military service members.

Patt Maney's guidance and expertise has been and will continue to be an invaluable asset to Northwest Florida. His determination and selfless service are an inspiration to all who are blessed to know and work with him.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize and honor Judge Maney for his countless contributions and accomplishments. I'd like to extend my gratitude to him for all that he has done for his country and community. As he will be retiring his gavel soon, I would like it included in the RECORD of the United States Congress, that there is absolutely no doubt that Judge T. Patterson Maney has served fairly, patiently, and followed the law.

IN RECOGNITION OF FONA'S WORKPLACE EXCELLENCE

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it's not every day that long-term sustained excellence can be duly recognized.

FONA International of Geneva, Illinois, provides just such an opportunity, however. I am privileged to extend my enthusiastic congratulations to Joe Slawek and the employees of FONA International for being named a National Best & Brightest Company to Work For by the National Association of Business Resources—for the seventh year in a row.

FONA International creates and produces flavors for many of the largest food, beverage, and nutritional companies in the world. It has been doing this for 30 years—a testament to its sustained excellence and commitment to serving customers through cutting-edge technology and personal attention.

CEO and Founder Joe Slawek calls this the "high-tech, high touch" approach. He founded FONA International in 1987 on these principles. He built a business that could compete with the largest flavor companies but stay connected with customers and his family of employees in a way that only a small business can. The honor of this award speaks to that success.

FONA International has been cited by Fortune magazine as one of the top fifty best places to work for medium-sized businesses nationwide. Fortune also named FONA International as the Number 1 workplace in Chicagoland.

To be selected just once as a National Best & Brightest Company would be a distinguished honor. To receive this award seven years in a row is nothing less than a spectacular achievement.

I congratulate Joe Slawek and the employees of FONA International for this remarkable recognition. I thank FONA International for its years of service to the local community and for its leadership in the flavor production industry. I wish you continued success in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 104; YEA on Roll Call No. 105; YEA on Roll Call No. 106; NAY on Roll Call No. 107; YEA on Roll Call No. 108; NAY on Roll Call No. 109; YEA on Roll Call No. 110; NAY on Roll Call No. 111; YEA on Roll Call No. 112; YEA on Roll Call No. 113, and YEA on Roll Call No. 114.

TRIBUTE TO LEE HOLLOWAY

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend Lee Holloway. He served for 20 years in Milwaukee County in many positions including: a Milwaukee County Supervisor and Chairman for the Milwaukee County Board and County Executive of Milwaukee County. Mr. Lee Holloway passed away on March 14, 2018 at the age of 71.

Mr. Holloway was a life-long Milwaukee resident. He was a product of the public school system and a graduate of Lincoln High School where he excelled at football. He was granted an athletic scholarship to the University of Arkansas and graduated in 1969 and earned an M.S. in developmental disabilities from the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee in 1972.

Prior to becoming an elected official, Lee Holloway was a guidance counselor at Messmer High School. He was a health care field innovator and served as the Chief Operating Officer of both the Inner City Development Project-North and the Milwaukee Comprehensive Community Health Center. Mr. Holloway championed healthcare for the poor and unemployed people.

Lee Holloway was initially elected in 1992 as a Milwaukee County Supervisor representing the 5th District and in 2004 became the first African American elected as Chairman of the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors and served in this position for 8 years. In 2010, he became the first African American County Executive of Milwaukee County for a brief period where he served dually in this position and that as Chair of the Milwaukee County Board. Mr. Holloway led efforts to create a county general assistance health safety net program; this program was later expanded statewide as Badger Care. He also successfully led the effort to win voter approval of a county sales tax increase in a 2008 referendum.

Mr. Holloway and his wife Lynda were very involved in the Milwaukee Kickers Club; they guided the Simba League to provide an entrance for inner city youth to participate in soccer through the Milwaukee Kickers Club.

Lee Holloway leaves behind his loving wife Lynda, six sons and two granddaughters and five grandsons and a host of other relatives and friends to mourn his passing. He leaves a strong legacy of leadership for his children and grandchildren to model.

Mr. Speaker, Lee Holloway was a Milwaukee and Wisconsin trailblazer and will be remembered for his service to the 4th Congressional District. I urge you and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in a salute to the late Lee Holloway.

VISIT OF PRESIDENT OF GHANA

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to salute His Excellency Nana Akufo-Addo and the

people of Ghana on the occasion of President Akufo-Addo's visit to the United States.

Ghana tops many lists of Africa's most peaceful and stable democracies, boasting an uninterrupted series of free and fair elections since 1992 that have seen power change hands between the two major parties three times. Freedom House ranks Ghana first on the continent for political and civil liberties. It was the first country in sub-Saharan Africa to achieve the United Nations Millennium Development Goal of halving the number of its people in extreme poverty, achieving this milestone well ahead of the 2015 target. The World Bank places Ghana first in its West African sub-region for ease of doing business.

Since his election, economic growth has surged from 3.6 percent to 7.9 percent. The World Bank projects an additional increase of 8.3 percent in 2018, making Ghana one of the world's fastest-growing economies. At the same time, Ghana's budget deficit as a proportion of GDP has been slashed from 9.3 percent to 5.6 percent even as the government has cut taxes. That would become an international cultural landmark. The school appeared in many movies and television shows until 1971, when portions sustained damage in the Sylmar earthquake, and then were ravaged by fire while awaiting assessment and repair.

Underpinned by a rich endowment of oil, gold and cocoa, Ghana's \$43 billion economy is becoming increasingly diversified. Expansion outside the commodity sector and renewed confidence in the government's ability to manage its finances are seen by analysts as key drivers of the country's current performance and growing attractiveness as a destination for the U.S. and other investors.

During President Akufo-Addo's American visit, he will receive an Exemplary Leadership award from: The Africa Society of the National Summit on Africa; AllAfrica Foundation; The Constituency for Africa; The Corporate Council on Africa; Invest Africa USA; The U.S. Chamber of Commerce/U.S.-Africa Business Center; Africare; and The Whitaker Group. I stand with them to honor his work as Ghana continues to be a beacon of hope, a model for democracy and a leader on the African continent.

CONGRATULATING SERGEANT
THOMAS HOGSHEAD ON HIS RE-
TIREMENT

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Thomas Hogshead, who is retiring from the Village of Cherry Valley Police Department. Sergeant Hogshead has honorably dedicated his service to the citizens of Winnebago and Boone Counties and the Village of Cherry Valley for the past 25 years, and he will be greatly missed.

Sergeant Hogshead entered the line of duty with the Village of Cherry Valley Police Department on November 3, 1993. Since then, he has worked hard to secure the safety of the citizens of Winnebago and Boone Coun-

ties and his community. Through his tireless work ethic and professionalism he has set the tone for the rest of his department to follow. Someone once said, "A leader is one who knows the way, goes the way, and shows the way," and Sergeant Hogshead has proven himself to be a leader to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Sergeant Hogshead for his commitment to the Village of Cherry Valley Police Department and for all of the work he has done to better our communities. I congratulate him again on his well-earned retirement and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF CABARRUS
COUNTY'S DIRECTOR OF EMER-
GENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
ALAN THOMPSON AND HIS SERV-
ICE TO CABARRUS COUNTY

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize EMS Director Alan Thompson on nearly 30 years of service to North Carolina's 8th District and for serving as the Cabarrus County Director of Emergency Medical Services.

Alan has spent his life dedicated to public service. His career began as a volunteer firefighter until he was hired by Rowan County EMS. During this time, Alan also served our country as part of the Army National Guard. Since being hired by Cabarrus County he has applied his knowledge in EMS to our community and helped those who need it most. He has been an integral part of helping me assist our constituents and provide them with the best services possible.

Over the years, Alan has been devoted to bettering lives in Cabarrus County. He worked as a paramedic field training officer, relief supervisor, supervisor and assistant director before he took on the EMS director position. Alan has also served as a tactical paramedic, a state medical assistance team member, ambulance strike team leader, educator, advanced hazardous materials medic and track medic. As you can see, Alan's servant heart never stops, no matter the day or time.

While Alan may no longer be the EMS Director, he will continue his passion for EMS as Director of Curriculum and continuing education programs for EMS and emergency management at Rowan Cabarrus Community College. This position will allow Alan to groom future EMS technicians and paramedics. I have no doubt the students under his leadership and experience will become the best in North Carolina. I am extremely grateful for Alan's service to our community and I wish him continued success.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring EMS Director Alan Thompson for his service to our community.

TRIBUTE TO LOUISE MCINTOSH
SLAUGHTER, MEMBER OF CON-
GRESS, FIRST WOMAN CHAIR OF
RULES COMMITTEE, AND INDE-
FATIGABLE CHAMPION FOR
WOMEN AND FAMILIES, THE
ARTS, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of my dear friend and our beloved colleague, Congresswoman LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER of New York, a trailblazer for women, whose powerful voice was quieted this past Friday morning, March 16, 2018.

LOUISE SLAUGHTER lived a long, full, and consequential life and got the most out of the 88 years she graced this world.

She will be remembered in this House for her service to her constituents and her colleagues, her formidable intellect, her mastery of the legislative process, and her graciousness and kindness to all who came in contact with her.

After serving four years in the New York State Assembly, LOUISE SLAUGHTER was elected to the 100th Congress in 1986 to represent the 30th Congressional District of New York, which at the time included downtown and eastern Rochester, most of eastern Monroe County, all of Genesee County and northern Livingston and Ontario counties.

Reelected to the 15 succeeding Congresses, LOUISE SLAUGHTER carved out a legacy of leadership and accomplishments in the areas of women's rights and empowerment, the arts, health care, battlefield preparedness, economic revitalization, the environment, and social justice.

Born in the coal mining town of Lynch, Kentucky and educated at the University of Kentucky where she earned degrees in microbiology and public health, LOUISE SLAUGHTER understood the connection between public health and a vibrant democracy, and fought to ensure passage of the landmark Affordable Care Act.

In the 112th Congress, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER introduced and shepherded to passage Pub. L. 112-105, the "Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act" or "STOCK Act," which prohibits the use of non-public information for private profit, including insider trading by members of Congress and other government employees, and requires many financial transactions by members of Congress to be reported within 45 days.

Mr. Speaker, since her first years on Capitol Hill, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER was an advocate for women all over the world.

Among her many accomplishments, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER co-authored the landmark Violence Against Women Act, ensured the first federal funding to the National Institutes of Health to research breast cancer, and was a co-founder of the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus.

It is particularly fitting and altogether appropriate that this tireless champion of women, children, and families represented an area

near Seneca Falls, the location of the first women's rights convention in 1848.

The dean of New York's Congressional Delegation, LOUISE SLAUGHTER was the first woman to chair the powerful House Rules Committee, and the first woman to serve as Ranking Member of the Committee, and in both roles she carried the banner and led the fight for progressive values and to make our good country better.

I will always remember and be grateful to Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER for her help in my duties representing the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

I worked closely with Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER and drew upon her counsel and assistance to shepherd scores of bills and amendments to passage that have been beneficial to my constituents.

LOUISE SLAUGHTER was incredibly generous with her knowledge and experience and served as a mentor to new members of Congress, including me.

I will never forget that LOUISE SLAUGHTER's advocacy continued until her last days with us, including the National Women's March in Washington, D.C. on January 21, 2017.

Mr. Speaker, LOUISE SLAUGHTER was an iron fist in a velvet glove.

A native of Kentucky, LOUISE SLAUGHTER never lost her Southern twang and charm.

LOUISE SLAUGHTER effortlessly mixed humor with logic to win over skeptics.

And then after disarming you, LOUISE SLAUGHTER made her move.

Through her words and deeds, LOUISE SLAUGHTER worked to make the lives of all Americans better.

LOUISE SLAUGHTER was a dear friend and her loss leaves a void in my heart.

It is my prayer that the Lord brings comfort to the many people—those whom LOUISE knew and those who felt they knew LOUISE SLAUGHTER—who know that a mighty oak has fallen and are heartbroken at the loss.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of the gentlewoman from New York, Congresswoman LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF GUILD FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Guild for Exceptional Children on its 60th anniversary.

Founded in 1958 by the loved ones of those with developmental disabilities, the Guild for Exceptional Children has been a much-needed non-profit in my district. Starting as a group of parents supporting each other when needed, the Guild eventually evolved into an innovative advocacy organization that has initiated numerous options for community living for those with disabilities. Opening New York City's first group home in 1970, the Guild has been the vanguard fighting for disabled individuals. The impact that the Guild for Exceptional Children has had on our community is

nothing short of incredible. This outstanding organization always advocates for those who need it most.

The Guild for Exceptional Children also provides clinical, educational, social, and career support programs for those with special needs. Everyone involved with this wonderful group can see firsthand how instrumental it is in the lives of adults and children with developmental disabilities. From the parents to the volunteers to the beneficiaries, the combined altruistic work that the Guild does simply speaks for itself. Their efforts cannot be repaid, as they fight to ensure that those with special needs are able to live a normal and fulfilling life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Guild for Exceptional Children on its 60th anniversary. Countless constituents of mine have been helped by their fantastic efforts. For everything they have done, I thank them.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HONORABLE CRAIG D. JOHNSTON

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Honorable Craig D. Johnston on his retirement from a career in public service.

Craig received his bachelor's degree from Dickinson College before serving as an infantry officer during the Vietnam War. After returning home, Craig earned a law degree from the University of Virginia. He practiced law in Manassas for 30 years where he was a board member and past president of the Prince William County Bar Association. Additionally, he represented Prince William County on the Virginia State Bar Council for two terms.

In 2004, Craig was appointed as a judge of the Prince William General District Court of the 31st Judicial District of Virginia. In recognition of his leadership and knowledge, Craig was appointed to the Prince William Circuit Court of the 31st Judicial Circuit of Virginia in 2009. Craig was selected to serve as chief judge of both the Prince William General District Court and the Prince William Circuit Court.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking the Honorable Craig Johnston for his service to Virginia. I wish Craig and his wife, Joyce, the best as they spend more time with their children and grandchildren in retirement.

IN CELEBRATION OF MS. BETTYE JEAN WILSON FRANKLIN'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Ms. Bettye Jean Wilson Franklin's 90th birthday.

Ms. Franklin was born on March 18, 1928 to the late Winburn Wilson and Ruby Cass Gray.

A native of Fort Worth, Texas, Ms. Franklin attended and graduated from historical I.M. Terrell high school. Her passion for education inspired her to work for Fort Worth ISD for 27 years until her retirement in 1990.

But it's her everlasting commitment to her faith that is well-known among her friends and family. Ms. Franklin has been a faithful member of Saint James Baptist for the past 77 years, which she contributed in various capacities, including her participation in the senior choir for 52 years.

In addition, she serves her community as a member of The Greater Fort Worth Area Negro Business and Professional Women's Club and Fort Worth Zeta Amicae Auxiliary of the Zeta Phi Beta Sorority.

Ms. Franklin is also a member of the Eastern Star Southern Beauty chapter 446 and served as Grand Secretary of the Masonic Grand Chapter Order of Eastern Star of Texas for 13 years.

She is the proud mother of two daughters, Brenda Williams and Willie Mae McQueen, grandmother of four grandchildren, and great-grandmother to her seven great grandchildren.

WELCOMING THE AGA KHAN TO TEXAS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man who has dedicated his life in service to humanity. It is my pleasure to welcome His Highness the Aga Khan IV, the 49th hereditary Imam of the world's 20 million Shia Imami Ismaili Muslims, to my home state of Texas in celebration of his Diamond Jubilee.

The ethics of compassion and care, tolerance and equality, selflessness and service center His Highness' deeply held belief in and practice of the Muslim faith. Particularly in recent years, the Aga Khan has pledged his voice to articulate the values of peace, generosity and brotherhood that unquestionably compose the core of Islam. He often says his obligations to his community and to humankind are inseparable. This has driven the Aga Khan to call on us to celebrate our differences of religion, culture, language and ethnicity as evidence of humanity's great beauty. Our inherent diversity, he says, should propel humankind to embrace pluralism.

Ismaili Muslims have a deep connection to Texas, the DFW Metroplex and myself. For more than a decade, I have partnered with the Ismaili Muslim community to host the Youth Summit and Diversity Dialogue, which we held first in 2007 during the Aga Khan's Golden Jubilee. It brings together students from my district with youth of all backgrounds to think critically about the challenges we can address through global citizenship. The program brings to light the positive impact young Ismaili Muslims make on the world around them.

Alongside his role as Imam, the Aga Khan has established many global humanitarian organizations, one of which is the Aga Khan Development Network. The AKDN promotes

human dignity and self-sustaining growth by administering education and healthcare in many of the most impoverished and isolated parts of the developing world. Three of the most distinguished AKDN projects are the Aga Khan Academies, which offer world-class educations to children in remote, school-deprived regions. When I visited the Aga Khan Academy in Nairobi, Kenya in 2015, I was emotionally struck by the undeniable love of human-kind evident in the AKDN's work to help those children reach their full potential. It became clear to me that the driving force behind each of the Aga Khan's endeavors is his desire to foster progress and peace through hope. For hope, he says, is the most powerful source of human motivation.

It is this spirit, born of the example of the Aga Khan, which led 2,500 Ismaili Muslim volunteers to help their neighbors in Houston recover from the devastation triggered by Hurricane Harvey last August. For this selfless generosity, they were presented one of the five Points of Light awards by the five living former presidents. The Ismaili Muslim community's response to the unsounded call of duty exemplifies their unrelenting effort to serve humanity at large.

Mr. Speaker, His Highness the Aga Khan—through his work, rooted in the Muslim faith—is a testament to Islam being a religion of both the intellect and humility, of both tradition and progress. The celebration of the Aga Khan's Diamond Jubilee is a monumental occasion for Ismaili Muslims across the world. I wish to congratulate the American Ismaili Muslim community and convey to His Highness the Aga Khan that he and the values of tolerance, diversity and pluralism that Ismaili Muslims uphold will always be welcome in the United States of America.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF POLLY MILLHOUSER

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the 100th birthday of Polly Millhouser.

Polly was born March 22, 1918, in Waukegan, Illinois. In 1937, at the age of 19, she threw caution to the wind and moved to Honolulu, Hawaii with a friend, working as a secretary for the U.S. Navy at Pearl Harbor. Shortly after the tragic attack of 1941, she met Charles, a U.S. Marine Corps sergeant, when he stopped by her office one day; she caught his eye and by way of introduction he threw a paper clip in her direction. They married in Honolulu in 1943.

After the war Polly and Charles moved to his hometown of Evanston, Illinois, where their children Mary (Latta), Jean and Robert were born. Later they lived in Arlington Heights, Illinois, where Polly was a homemaker and school volunteer. Polly and Charles retired to Mountain Home, Arkansas in 1987 where she quickly became active in the community, volunteering at the elementary school and the Mountain Home library. Charles passed away in October 1990 at 71 years of age.

She loved listening to the first-graders practice reading, and she spent many happy hours shelving books at the library, working at the library book sales and hosting/attending Friends of the Library meetings. She was honored for her years of service to the library when Baxter County proclaimed April 25, 2009 as Polly Millhouser Day. Polly is a member and former Deacon of the First Presbyterian Church of Mountain Home, Arkansas.

Polly stayed active as a member of a casual walking group of friends who for years walked a 3-mile loop at a local park three times a week. She finally quit putting up her own storm windows when she turned 93. By her grandson David and Amy (Downs) Latta, she has two amazing great-grandchildren, Hannah and Jack.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing Mrs. Millhouser a very happy 100th birthday.

HONORING MISSISSIPPI IRONMAN CHAMP, GINI FELLOWS

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Virginia "Gini" Fellows, a resident in my district and 71-year-old Ironman triathlete.

Gini was born and raised near Detroit, Michigan, became a Registered Nurse, and married Dr. William Fellows in 1970. In 1978, the couple was recruited by Gulf Coast Medical Center and moved to Long Beach, Mississippi, making the coast their home.

A skiing injury in her twenties resulted in knee surgery and many years later, rehabilitative therapy. Meanwhile, their son Patrick, a race event organizer, saw an opportunity to put his mom's freshly revived knee to work in an upcoming all-women's triathlon held in April 2007. She agreed to do the race, vowing to set her own pace, and won her age division at age 59.

That first race gave Gini the confidence to enter more races, and over the next couple of years, she completed two Ironman half-marathons leading up to competing in the Florida Ironman Triathlon in 2016.

Winning her age division in Florida qualified Gini for the 2017 World Championship Ironman Triathlon in Kona, Hawaii. Husband Bill encouraged Gini to keep training in spite of his own bout of lung cancer. Sadly, six weeks before her race in Kona, Bill passed away.

When asked how one mentally handles the physical challenge of a triathlon, Gini explained that she focused her thoughts on her various friends within each portion of the event. During the 112-mile bike ride, she thought of her friends with whom she likes to ride; likewise with the 26.2 mile run. During the 2.4-mile swim, she thought of the lifeguards who look after her as she trains and races. She reflected on her family, their children and 11 grandchildren, but she saved her "Last Mile" for Bill, focusing her thoughts on their 47½ years of marriage, the love they shared, and the lifetime of memories created between them.

Gini is an inspiration and encourager to those who show interest in running or competing. Gini says to start with that first step and to start by walking. At age 71, Gini has found a passion for triathlons and says, "I plan to stick with it, as long as I'm able." I am proud to honor Gini Fellows, an inspirational triathlete and Ironman from Mississippi's Fightin' Fourth District.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STAFF SERGEANT CARL PHILIPPE ENIS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep respect that I recognize the tragic loss of Staff Sgt. Carl Philippe Enis, one of seven brave U.S. service members killed in a helicopter crash last Thursday, March 15, 2018 in western Iraq.

Carl, a South Florida native who grew up in my Congressional District in Pinecrest, was an Air Force pararescueman serving in a combat role in Iraq for the 308th Rescue Squadron from Patrick Air Force Base supporting Operation Inherent Resolve when his helicopter went down.

Sergeant Enis was a Reserve Citizen Airman combat rescue and recovery specialist who supported Air Force and special operations.

Carl's job truly embodied his heart and spirit where he consistently put his own life at risk to save others both in combat and humanitarian environments.

He always tackled every challenge with a smile on his face, no matter the danger or difficulty.

Carl was also an active outdoorsman who embraced his passion for fishing, hiking, hunting and scuba diving and lived his life to the fullest.

Sergeant Enis was a graduate of Gulliver Prep and Florida State University.

Carl is survived by his wife Angela, his mother Colleen, and his brother Edward.

Their families, the community, and all Americans can be proud knowing that Sergeant Enis gave his last full measure performing his mission and serving the most noble Pararescue creed: 'These things we do, that others may live'.

YEAR OF THE BLACK WOMAN

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the black women in our country who have, for decades, led this nation's fight for justice without the recognition they deserve.

Some are calling 2018 the year of the black woman. This year, black women are proving the strength of their voice at the ballot box,

black women are running for office in record numbers, and black women are leading movements against sexual harassment and police violence. But I believe that 2018 is the year of the black woman because, after decades of activism and advocacy, this is our year to give black women the recognition they deserve.

As we celebrate women's history month, let's reflect on the fact that today's story of the suffrage movement so often imagines America's suffragettes as uniformly white. That was not the case. From Sojourner Truth to Nannie Helen Burroughs, we must remember the courageous black women who stood up for their right to vote.

Let us remember Ida B. Wells, who led the fight for women's rights but was asked to march at the back of the women's suffrage parade because she was black. She refused, she persisted, and she marched with her state's delegation for her right to vote.

Black women have not only led our nation's fight for justice for decades, but they have understood the true nature of injustice for just as long.

Today's social justice movements have taken ahold of the concept of intersectionality—the fact that race, class and gender, do not exist separately but create interwoven systems of discrimination.

It was a black woman—Kimberlé Crenshaw—who originally coined the term “intersectionality” in 1989. But even before intersectionality was a word, it was black women who knew the truth about the injustices of discrimination in America.

It was 1893 when a black suffragette named Anna Julia Cooper said,

“The colored woman feels that woman's cause is one and universal; and that not till the image of God, whether in parian or ebony, is sacred and inviolable; not till race, color, sex, and condition are seen as the accidents, and not the substance of life; not till the universal title of humanity to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is conceded to be inalienable to all; not till then is woman's lesson taught and woman's cause won.”

Generations of black women have fought, bled and died for their right to vote. And so many of these heroes are from my home state of Alabama. It was the death of four little black girls in the bombing of Birmingham's 16th St. Baptist Church that awakened our nation to the realities of violent racism. Heroes like Recy Taylor, Rosa Parks, Claudette Colvin and Autherine Lucy Foster—to name only a few—stood up against brut violence to build a world where men and women of every race and class have the opportunities they deserve.

As we celebrate Women's History Month, we must not only remember the sacrifices they made, but the work that remains to be done in their fight for justice. These women passed onto us the rights and the opportunities that we enjoy today, but they also handed down a responsibility to carry on their work, fighting not just for women, not just for African Americans, but for all people, against all injustice.

Today, I'm proud to see so many black women leading that fight. From the Black Lives Matter movement to the Me Too movement, their contributions and their leadership are changing the way our society understands and addresses discrimination and injustice.

This Women's History Month, in the Year of the Black Woman, I want to use this moment to recognize the countless black women who have spent their lives fighting to make America live up to its ideals, as well as all those black women who are still alive today carrying on that fight.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 20, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 21

- 10 a.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. SD-406
- Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kirsten Dawn Madison, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs), and Thomas J. Hushek, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, both of the Department of State. SD-419
- Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael Y. Scudder, of Illinois, and Amy J. St. Eve, of Illinois, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, and Charles J. Williams, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa. SD-226
- Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold hearings to examine election security. SH-216
- 10:30 a.m.
Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President. SD-608

- 2 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Near East, South Asia, Central Asia, and Counterterrorism
To hold hearings to examine stability and security challenges in Lebanon. SD-419
- Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for veterans' programs and fiscal year 2020 advance appropriations requests. SR-418
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program. SR-232A
- Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense policies and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program. SR-222
- Committee on Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 1250, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and S. 2515, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for Indian Programs. SD-628
- MARCH 22
- 9:30 a.m.
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine the Good Friday Agreement at 20, focusing on achievements and unfinished business. RHOB-2200
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the challenges in the Department of Energy's atomic energy defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program. SH-216
- Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Housing and Urban Development. SD-538
- Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard
To hold hearings to examine enhancing the Marine Mammal Protection Act. SR-253
- Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Theodore J. Garrish, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary

(International Affairs), and James Edward Campos, of Nevada, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, both of the Department of Energy, and James Reilly, of Colorado, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine S. 2539, to amend the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015, to reauthorize certain projects to increase Colorado River System water, S. 2560, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and S. 2563, to improve the water supply and drought resilience of the United States.

SD-366

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the President's 2018 trade policy agenda.

SD-215

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of John B. Nalbandian, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kari A. Dooley, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Dominic W. Lanza, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, Jill Aiko Otake, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii, and Thomas T. Cullen, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Virginia, Robert K. Hur, to be United States Attorney for the District of Maryland, and David C. Joseph, to be United States Attorney for

the Western District of Louisiana, all of the Department of Justice.

SD-226

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

Closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters; to be immediately followed by a closed hearing to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

POSTPONEMENTS

MARCH 21

2 p.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine unleashing America's economic potential.

SD-G50

SENATE—Tuesday, March 20, 2018

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, teach us how to praise You at all times, constantly glorifying Your Name and expressing gratitude for Your prevailing providence.

Lord, thank You for sustaining our lawmakers as they strive to fulfill Your purposes for our Nation and world. Set them free from all fears, reminding them that You have been their help in the past and should be their hope for the years to come.

Forgive us all for duties unperformed, promptings disobeyed, and beckonings ignored.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SASSE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO OKSANA MASTERS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, during Sunday's closing ceremonies at the Pyeongchang Paralympics, the American flag was held high by a special member of Team USA. Oksana Masters of Louisville, KY, was elected by her teammates to represent our Nation at the ceremonies, capping off her remarkable trip.

Born in Chernobyl with radiation poisoning, Oksana was adopted at the age of 7 and came to the United States. She underwent a number of medical procedures at a young age, including the amputation of both of her legs, but that didn't stop her. Regardless of the obstacle, she pushed through.

This year marks her fourth Paralympics. She entered Pyeongchang with a silver and two bronze medals, but this time, this talented multisport athlete set her sights on the gold, and I am happy to report that Oksana, once again, achieved her goal. She ascended to the top of the podium, not once but twice.

Kentucky is very proud of Oksana and all that she has accomplished. She is a fine representative of our Commonwealth and our Nation.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on a totally different matter, the Senate continues to consider a bill that would strike back against the evils of sex trafficking. The topic is all too familiar to me and many of my colleagues who have fought against child exploitation for decades. In recent years, as trafficking has migrated from street corners to smartphones, reports of child sex trafficking have ticked up dramatically.

My friend and colleague from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, has been especially committed to rooting out the cause of this crisis. He has built a broad bipartisan coalition in support of the legislation currently before the Senate. It is designed to close a loophole in existing law that allows websites to avoid responsibility, even as they knowingly facilitate trafficking. It would ensure that any institutions that are party to this reprehensible practice are subject to strict penalties—the ones they deserve.

I urge each of my colleagues to join us in taking decisive action for our Nation's children.

YEMEN RESOLUTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, later today the Senate will vote on a resolution offered by the junior Senators from Vermont and Utah. Their goal is to end U.S. support for the Saudi Arabian-led coalition fighting the Houthi insurgency in Yemen, and they propose to do this using provisions of the War Powers Resolution and the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act.

I oppose their resolution for two reasons. The first reason is that my colleagues' substantive policy aim is actually misguided. Supreme Leader Khamenei and his regime know what their goals are: Preserving their rule, expanding Iranian hegemony across the region, and harming the United States and Israel. That is what they want to do. That is why Iran exports violence, intimidation, and coercion. That is why Iran expands its ballistic missile program. That is why Iran uses proxies, such as the Houthis, Hezbollah, and other Shia militias, along with cyber attacks and other terrorism, to meddle in Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Bahrain, and beyond.

During the Obama administration, America drew down our forward-deployed military and conventional force structure. We chased after a flawed nuclear agreement. We reduced our commitment to our Sunni Arab partners. Iran noticed our reticence and saw an opportunity. It expanded its support of proxies and built strategies to exploit the unrest following civil wars in Yemen and Syria and the rampage of ISIL into Iraq.

If this meddling is to be confronted, if terrorist threats are to be countered, and if arms shipments are to be curtailed, the United States will need the help of our regional partners. One key partner is Saudi Arabia. We have shared common interests for decades. We have worked together to counter Iran, support the Free Syrian Army, and combat ISIL. Today the support the United States provides to the Saudi-led coalition, including aerial refueling over the Red Sea, contributes to greater precision in their air campaign and actually leads to fewer civilian casualties. So let me say that again: Withdrawing U.S. support would increase, not decrease, the risk of civilian casualties, and it would signal that we are not serious about containing Iran or its proxies. The Houthi presence would continue threatening shipping lanes in the Red Sea. Iranian missiles would continue threatening Riyadh, and Iran would be further

emboldened. That is why the goal of this resolution is bad policy.

But my colleagues' resolution is also procedurally mistaken. The expedited authorities they wish to draw upon are meant for removing U.S. forces from actual participation in hostilities, but our support for the Saudi coalition has not caused us to enter active warfare or hostilities in Yemen.

The Department of Defense and Secretary Mattis have made clear that U.S. forces are not engaged in exchanges of fire with hostile forces. According to the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense: "The limited military and intelligence support that the United States is providing to the [KSA-led] coalition does not involve any introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities for purposes of the War Powers Resolution or of section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985."

I support that assessment. The refueling of aircraft over the Red Sea does not equate to introducing U.S. forces into hostilities nor does intelligence sharing. U.S. forces are not transporting Saudi forces into combat within Yemen by air, land, or sea. So the expedited procedures this resolution seeks to exploit simply do not apply here.

If Senators disagree with my assessment of the merits and oppose our support for the coalition, they have several legislative tools available to them. They could try to restrict funds through the appropriations process, amend the Arms Control Export Act for the licensing of defense services or the National Defense Authorization Act. Instead, we face a resolution which purports to require the President to withdraw U.S. forces from hostilities in Yemen—hostilities which we have not entered.

In a recent speech, Secretary Mattis explained:

History proves that nations with allies thrive. . . . Working by, with and through allies who carry their equitable share allows us to amass the greatest possible strength.

Imagine how challenging that would become if every advise-and-assist mission our forces undertake around the globe becomes subject to misapplication of the War Powers Resolution.

Thus, I oppose this resolution on grounds of policy and on grounds of procedure, and I urge our colleagues to join me this afternoon.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on a final matter, later this week, the Senate will consider an omnibus spending package to address a number of critical priorities, from rebuilding America's infrastructure to fighting the opioid epidemic. In particular,

building on the funding agreement passed in February, the measure will deliver the resources and certainty that America's military deserves. To be specific, this legislation will provide the largest year-on-year increase in defense funding in 15 years. After years of disproportionate cuts to our armed services, Congress has begun to provide adequate resources to put an end to the harmful decline in combat readiness, to fulfill our commitments to American families who sacrifice through service—many of them in my home State of Kentucky.

For our men and women in uniform, this means a well-deserved pay raise. For our veterans back home, it means increased oversight and modernization in the Veterans' Administration care system, thanks to a record level of VA funding. Our warriors on the frontline deserve to be trained to the highest standards, as do the units that replace them. Now our commanders can work to restore combat readiness—and not a moment too soon. Threats around the world are only growing in number and intensity. By strengthening our investment in missile defense, by funding new weapons systems, by scaling up shipbuilding and aircraft procurement, and by investing in our all-volunteer servicemembers, we will send a strong message to our allies and our foes alike that America's military is regaining dominance.

This week, my colleagues will have the opportunity to follow through and address the pressing needs of the defense community. I hope each of them will join me in voting to swiftly pass the omnibus, thus giving our Armed Forces the resources they need and deserve.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, while the Senate conducts an important debate today on Yemen, we continue to negotiate an omnibus spending bill. It will follow through on the bipartisan budget deal we struck in February that, for the first time in a long time, will robustly fund our military and provide substantial investment in our middle class.

For too long, the arbitrary and pointless sequester caps held back Federal investment in jobs, scientific research, healthcare, and education. They also handicapped our military and prevented long-term planning at the Pentagon. The budget deal paved the way to do away with the harmful sequester caps, and now the omnibus will put the nail in the coffin.

Negotiations continue between the four leaders. A few sticking points remain but we are very close to signing off on legislation that both Houses will be able to take up and pass by the end of the week.

Mr. President, on the omni, I agree with the leader. Hopefully, we can come to an agreement and pass it this week. It has some things no one likes, and it has a lot of things not everybody likes but most people like. The basic structure of it was a fair compromise, and, hopefully, we can come to an agreement. Our staffs are working really hard.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS HURRICANE RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to say a word about Puerto Rico. Today marks the sixth anniversary of Hurricane Maria's landfall on the island—the 6-month anniversary. We all know that the storm in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands was one of the most powerful and devastating ever to have struck those islands. There was terrible damage to schools, hospitals, water systems, roads, homes, and businesses.

For months and months, people didn't have electricity or clean water or cell service. Far too many people are still waiting for relief. There are 120,000 people without electricity. Hundreds of thousands continue to lose power on a temporary basis. Calculating the hours of lost electricity service, Puerto Rico has experienced the longest blackout in the history of the United States.

Tens of thousands are still awaiting permanent shelter, and 10,000 small businesses are closed.

Puerto Rico struggled with a severe debt and healthcare crisis before Hurricane Maria came to its shores. The damage wrought by the hurricane has set the island even further back, despite the valiant efforts of its people.

Congress has passed significant relief as part of the bipartisan budget agreement earlier this year. We have to make sure that the aid goes to where it needs to go and that we provide additional aid if it is required.

To the long-suffering citizens of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the thousands who have relocated to the mainland, we haven't forgotten you. We are here to help you. You are on our minds, and we are going to keep fighting to help you rebuild your homes, your communities, and your beloved islands.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on the tax bill, I just note that, once again, every day the more people learn about this tax bill, the more they don't like it. Stock buybacks continue

at a hugely rapid rate. Aid to workers is much, much smaller, and the American people are learning this bill was of, by, and for the wealthiest Americans and the most powerful corporations. That is wrong. We welcome the debate on the tax bill because the more people learn about it, the more they don't like it.

Since the beginning of the tax debate, Republicans have insisted their bill is about cutting taxes for working Americans. Even though the bill would direct 83 percent of the benefits to the top 1 percent, Republicans said workers were the focus. Even though they made corporate tax cuts permanent but let the individual tax cuts expire, they said the middle class would be the real winners.

Democrats warned that if you gave big corporations and the wealthiest Americans the lion's share of the tax cuts, those benefits wouldn't trickle down to employees and the middle class. We warned that corporations would do what they always do when they have profits—distribute them amongst themselves. Even though big companies like AT&T were already paying low effective corporate rates, they had been shedding jobs and investment for years even before the tax bill.

Unfortunately, our warnings proved prescient. Almost every day, we hear a new story about a corporation using the savings from the Republican tax bill to purchase its own stock, called a stock buyback, which boosts the corporation's stock price to provide a reward for wealthy executives and shareholders.

Just this morning, the Kentucky-based chemical company Ashland announced a brand-new \$500 million share repurchasing program. And last night, the total amount of corporate share buybacks surpassed \$225 billion since the Republican tax bill became law.

Stock buybacks are a big reason why workers no longer see the benefits of record corporate profits. Why? Because instead of investing corporate profits in things that benefit the long-term health of the company and its workers—like higher wages, new equipment, research and development, or new hires—corporations spend the money on share buybacks.

In fact, stock buybacks were illegal until 1982, which is about the same time that wages stopped increasing with corporate profits.

Republicans dutifully remind us that companies are also handing out bonuses. Yes, a few. But let me highlight the disparity between buybacks and investment in workers: According to a recent analysis by Just Capital, only 6 percent of the capital allocated by companies from the tax bill's savings has gone to employees, while nearly 60 percent has gone to shareholders.

The theory behind the Republican tax bill was to allow corporations and

the richest Americans to keep more of their already outrageous wealth, and maybe the benefits will trickle down to everyone else. As we are already seeing, that idea was a folly, and the American middle class will eventually pay the price.

Because of the enormous cost of the Republican tax bill, \$1.5 trillion, the deficit and debt will grow over the next several years and Republicans are already targeting Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare for cuts to make up the difference. So on top of a tax cut that mostly goes to the folks who need it the least, the Republican tax bill is an excuse for Republicans to come after Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

That is why the bill is so unpopular that Republicans have abandoned it in last two special elections in Virginia and Pennsylvania.

The American people are already waking up to the reality that the Republican tax bill was not the middle-class miracle the Republicans promised, and in November, they will have the chance to move America in a dramatically different direction by voting for a party that actually wants to focus tax relief on working America, not corporate America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, H.R. 1865, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

S.J. RES. 54—MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, fiscal years 1984 and 1985, and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I make a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 54 from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there is 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

Mr. SANDERS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states in no uncertain terms that "Congress shall have power to . . . declare war."

Let me repeat it. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states it is Congress that has the power to declare war.

The Founding Fathers gave the power to authorize military conflicts to Congress, the branch most accountable—not to the President but to Congress—and that is the issue we are going to be debating today.

For far too long, Congress, under Democratic and Republican administrations, has abdicated its constitutional role in authorizing war. The time is long overdue for Congress to reassert that constitutional authority, and that is what today is about.

That is why I and 14 cosponsors of this resolution—Senators LEE, MURPHY, WARREN, BOOKER, DURBIN, LEAHY, MARKEY, FEINSTEIN, WYDEN, MERKLEY, BLUMENTHAL, GILLIBRAND, SCHATZ, and BALDWIN—that is what we are doing with S.J. Res. 54.

What we are saying is, if Congress wants to go to war in Yemen or anywhere else, vote to go to war. That is your constitutional responsibility. Stop abdicating that responsibility to a President, whether it is a Republican President or, as in the past, Democratic Presidents.

I expect that colleagues today will be arguing about what the word "hostilities" means within the context of the 1973 War Powers Resolution. What does the word "hostilities" mean? Some will argue that American troops are not out there shooting and getting shot at, not exchanging gunfire with their enemies, and that we are not really engaged in the horrifically destructive Saudi-led war in Yemen. That is what some will argue on the floor today—that we are really not engaged in hostilities; we are not exchanging fire.

Well, please tell that to the people of Yemen whose homes and lives are being destroyed by weapons marked "Made in the USA" and dropped by

planes being refueled by the U.S. military on targets chosen with U.S. assistance. Only in the narrowest, most legalistic terms can anyone argue that the United States is not actively involved in hostilities alongside Saudi Arabia in Yemen.

Let me take a minute to tell my colleagues what is happening in Yemen right now because a lot of people don't know. It is not something that is on the front pages of the newspapers or covered terribly much on television.

Right now, in a very poor nation of 27 million people—that is the nation of Yemen—in November of last year, the United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator told us that Yemen was on the brink of “the largest famine the world has seen for many decades.” That is from the United Nations. So far, in this country of 27 million people—this very poor country—over 10,000 civilians have been killed and 40,000 civilians have been wounded. Over 3 million people in Yemen, in a nation of 27 million, have been displaced—driven from their homes. Fifteen million people lack access to clean water and sanitation because water treatment plants have been destroyed. More than 20 million people in Yemen—over two-thirds of the population of that country—need some kind of humanitarian support, with nearly 10 million in acute need of assistance. More than 1 million suspected cholera cases have been reported, representing potentially the worst cholera outbreak in world history. That is what is going on in Yemen today as a result of the Saudi-led war there.

Here is the bottom line: If the President of the United States or Members of Congress believe that support for this war is in the U.S. interests—and I think some do—if you think that the United States right now, for our own interests, should be involved in the civil war in Yemen, being led by Saudi Arabia, then Members of the U.S. Senate should have the courage to vote for U.S. participation in that war. It is nothing more complicated than that.

If you want to come to the floor of the Senate and make the case as to why you think it is good public policy for us to be involved in the civil war in Yemen, come to the floor and oppose our resolution, but what I hope very much that we will not see today is the tabling of this motion and the refusal by Members of the Senate to vote up or down as to whether we wish to continue aiding Saudi Arabia in this humanitarian disaster.

If you believe, as I do, that we should not get sucked into this civil war, which has already caused so much human suffering, please vote against tabling the motion to discharge and vote with us on final passage. If you believe the United States should continue to assist Saudi Arabia in this war, I urge you to have the courage to tell

your constituents that is your decision and why you have made that decision when you vote against final passage. In other words, if you support the war, have the courage to vote for it; if you don't, support the resolution Senator LEE, Senator MURPHY, and I have introduced.

Let me give my colleagues at least two reasons why Congress must reassert its constitutional authority over the issue of war and why we cannot continue to abdicate that responsibility to the President, and those have everything to do with the two most significant foreign policy disasters in the modern history of the United States—the war in Iraq and the war in Vietnam. In both of these cases, Congress sat back and failed to ask the hard questions as two administrations—one Republican, one Democratic—led us into conflicts with disastrous consequences.

Interestingly, today is a historically significant day for us to debate this resolution. Fifteen years ago today, on March 20, 2003, the war in Iraq began, and the bombs started falling in Baghdad—15 years ago today. I was one of those who opposed the Iraq war in the beginning, and today it is now broadly acknowledged that the war—that war—was a foreign policy blunder of enormous magnitude. That war created a cascade of instability around the region that we are still dealing with today in Syria and elsewhere and will be for many years to come. Indeed, had it not been for the war in Iraq, ISIS would almost certainly not exist.

That war deepened hostilities between Sunni and Shia communities in Iraq and elsewhere. It exacerbated a regional conflict for power between Saudi Arabia and Iran and their proxies in places like Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen, and it undermined American diplomatic efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The devastation experienced by Iraq's civilians was enormous. A recent academic study by U.S., Canadian, and Iraqi researchers found that over 400,000 Iraqi civilians—nearly half a million people—were killed directly or indirectly as a consequence of that war.

That war led to the displacement of nearly 5 million people, both inside and outside Iraq, putting great stress on the ability of surrounding countries to deal with these refugee flows.

We have also seen this more recently in Europe as the large numbers of people fleeing the Syrian war have generated a backlash in European countries, giving rise to anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant sentiments.

The war in Iraq led to the deaths—to the deaths—of some 4,400 American troops and the wounding, physical and emotional, of tens of thousands of others, not to mention the pain inflicted on family members. By the way, that

war in Iraq cost us trillions of dollars—money that could have been spent on healthcare, education, infrastructure, and environmental protection.

The Iraq war, like so many other military conflicts, had unintended consequences. It ended up making us less safe, not more safe.

It must be said that the Bush administration and the President lied when he told the American people: “[Saddam's] regime is seeking a nuclear bomb, and with fissile material could build one within a year.” That was not true.

Vice President Dick Cheney lied when he told us:

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us.

Dick Cheney—not true.

No one disagrees that Saddam Hussein was a brutal, murderous dictator, but it is now known he had nothing to do with 9/11. The Bush administration lied to the American people. Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction. It was not connected to 9/11.

The American people were misled by the Bush administration into believing that the Iraq war was necessary to prevent another 9/11, and Congress did not challenge them on those claims in a way that Congress should have—with disastrous consequences.

That was a Republican administration. Now let me tell you about a Democratic administration where, once again, Congress refused to assert its constitutional responsibility.

Let us go back to 1964, to a conflict that began under similarly false premises. President Lyndon Johnson cited an attack on a U.S. ship in the Gulf of Tonkin as a pretext for escalating the U.S. intervention in Vietnam and sending more and more and more troops into that quagmire.

But we now know from declassified recordings that Johnson himself doubted that the USS *Maddox* had come under fire on August 4, 1964. As we all know, that alleged attack was used to push for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution authorizing Johnson to escalate U.S. military involvement in Vietnam, and we now know that the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, misled Congress and the public in order to generate support for that resolution.

You don't have to believe me. This is what LCDR Pat Paterson wrote in a paper for the U.S. Naval Institute: “The evidence suggests a disturbing and deliberate attempt by Secretary of Defense McNamara to distort the evidence and mislead Congress.”

Paterson, interestingly enough, also quotes another author who wrote:

To enhance his chances for election, [Johnson] and McNamara deceived the American people and Congress about events and the nature of the American commitment in Vietnam. They used a questionable report of a

North Vietnamese attack on American naval vessels to justify the president's policy to the electorate and to defuse Republican senator and presidential candidate Barry Goldwater's charges that Lyndon Johnson was irresolute and "soft" in the foreign policy arena.

Interestingly enough, that author is H.R. McMaster, President Trump's current National Security Advisor.

Lyndon Johnson's administration misled both Congress and the American people into that war, just as the Bush administration misled us into the war in Iraq, and what disasters both of those wars were. The war in Vietnam nearly destroyed an entire generation of young people. Almost 60,000 died in that war, and God knows how many came back wounded in body and in spirit. It almost destroyed an entire generation. Yet Congress abdicated its responsibility in Vietnam, as it did in Iraq.

The truth about Yemen is that U.S. forces have been actively engaged in support of the Saudi coalition in this war, providing intelligence and aerial refueling of planes whose bombs have killed thousands of people and made this humanitarian crisis far worse. U.S. involvement in the Yemen war has also proved counterproductive to the effort against al-Qaida's affiliates. The State Department's "Country Reports on Terrorism 2016" found that the conflict between Saudi-led forces and the Houthi insurgents has helped al-Qaida's and ISIS's Yemen branch to "deepen their inroads across much of the country." In other words, as we see again, when there is chaos, when there is mass confusion, ISIS and their allies are able to jump in.

Furthermore, while Iran's support for Houthi insurgents is of serious concern for all of us, the truth is that this war has increased, not decreased, the opportunities for Iranian interference.

The Trump administration has tried to justify our involvement in the Yemen war as necessary to push back on Iran. Well, another administration told us that invading Iraq was necessary to confront al-Qaida, and another told us that the Vietnam war was necessary to contain Communists. None of that turned out to be true.

The Congress, at those times, should have asked the hard questions, which they didn't ask. The Congress should have taken its constitutional role seriously and should have done what the Constitution demands that it do, and that is what my cosponsors and I are doing today.

I see my colleague Senator LEE here. He has been very active in standing up for the Constitution on this issue, and I will yield to him in a minute. But here is the bottom line—and it is not a complicated line; the Constitution is clear: The U.S. Congress decides whether we go to war. There is no question in my mind that by aiding Saudi Arabia in the way that we are doing, we are assisting in war. We are in a conflict.

If Members of the Senate think that conflict makes sense and is good public policy for the United States of America, vote down our resolution. If you agree with Senator LEE and me that it is a bad idea, support us. But what I would urge in the strongest possible terms is that Members of the Senate have to end the abdication of our constitutional responsibility. Accept it; vote yes or vote no. Do not vote to table this resolution and duck the constitutional responsibility that we have.

I yield the floor to my colleague, Senator MIKE LEE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the issue we are confronting today is one that deals with the separation of powers outlined in the U.S. Constitution.

Our system of government was set up in such a way as to protect the people from the dangers associated with the excessive accumulation of power in the hands of a few. We knew from our experience under British rule that bad things happen, especially at a national level, when too few people exercise too much of the power. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of the war power. In fact, much of the Revolutionary struggle that led to the creation of our Nation resulted from wartime activities undertaken by a monarch thousands of miles and an ocean away. It is important today that we remember those same concerns and the constraints placed in our Constitution as we run our government nearly 2½ centuries later.

I am happy to be here with my colleague, Senator SANDERS, to file a discharge motion for our resolution, S.J. Res. 54.

Whether you are present in the Chamber today, physically with us, or whether you are tuning in at home, I hope you will listen closely so that we can fill you in on the unauthorized Middle East war that your government—the government of the United States of America—is supporting and actively participating in as a cobelligerent.

This war in Yemen has killed tens of thousands of innocent civilians—human beings, lest we forget—each one of them possessing innate, immeasurable worth and dignity. This war has created refugees, orphans, widows; it has cost millions of dollars; and, believe it or not, at the end of the day, it actually has, quite arguably, undermined our fight against terrorist threats such as ISIS. I will expand on these unfortunate facts in a moment, but for now, let's just focus on one thing. Our military's involvement in Yemen has not been authorized by Congress as required by the Constitution.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states that the Congress shall have the power to declare war—Congress, not the President, not the Pen-

tagon, not someone else within the executive branch of government, but Congress. Yet in 2015, then-President Obama initiated our military involvement in Yemen and did so without authorization from Congress.

The current administration has continued Obama's war. Senator SANDERS, Senator MURPHY, our cosponsors, and I are now giving Congress a chance to fix this error by debating and voting on our Nation's continued involvement in this unauthorized, illegal war in Yemen.

If, as our opponents claim, this war is necessary, then surely they can defend that argument before this body and before the House of Representatives and, ultimately, secure authorization from Congress, just as the Constitution demands under article I, section 8. But if, on the other hand, they cannot defend this war and they cannot persuade a majority of the Members of this body and a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives that this is a war that needs to be fought, then it needs to end. Let's have an honest reckoning about this war today.

Before this debate gets underway in earnest, there are a few points that I would like to clarify.

First, let's talk about Iran for just a moment. Yes, the Houthis did fire on a U.S. Navy vessel. This only reinforces the fact that Yemenis view the United States as a participant in this war, regardless of whether or not Congress wants to acknowledge that participation or approve it, as the Constitution requires. But overall, there are conflicting reports about the extent of Iranian support for the Houthi rebels.

What we do know is this: The Houthis are a regional rebel group that does not itself threaten the United States. While the Houthis are no friends of ours, neither are they a serious threat to American national security. The longer we fight against them, the more reason we give them to hate America and embrace the opportunists who are our true enemy in the region—Iran. And the more we prolong activities that destabilize the region, the longer we harm our own interests in terms of trade and broader regional security.

The bottom line is this: We are spending a great deal of time and treasure to defeat a regional rebel group with no desire to attack the homeland and unclear ties to Iran. Iran's influence is much clearer in other parts of the Middle East with other groups—for example, with the murderous terrorist group, Hezbollah.

If we want to counter Iran, let's have that debate in Congress and vote to equip this administration with the necessary authorization to use our vast and fearsome military resources to defeat its proxies—not to create new proxies by turning rebel groups against us.

Let's talk about ISIS for a moment. Our resolution would not impede the military's ability to fight terror groups, like ISIS, inside Yemen. The resolution itself requires the removal of U.S. forces from hostilities in Yemen, except—except, and I quote—“United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at Al Qaeda or associated forces.” That is a direct quote from the text of the resolution itself. It should put to rest the notion that this would somehow jeopardize our ability to fight terrorists.

The Pentagon and the executive branch have long insisted that they have adequate authority under the authorization for the use of military force enacted in 2001—adequate authority under the 2001 AUMF to fight against ISIS.

If those at the Pentagon and elsewhere in the executive branch or any of my colleagues now claim that this resolution specifically needs to exempt operations against ISIS, then what are we to make of their previous confidence in the 2001 AUMF? Have they suddenly lost faith in that document overnight or are they merely using this argument as a pretense to oppose our resolution?

I personally believe that the 2001 AUMF has been stretched too far. Our resolution, however, is completely agnostic on this point. It is entirely agnostic about whether counterterror operations against al-Qaida and ISIS can proceed in the wake of the resolution. Our resolution is specific, and our resolution relates specifically to the Houthis. Nothing in this bill may be interpreted as an AUMF.

Lastly, with regard to Saudi Arabia and the ongoing visit of Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman in Washington, DC, at the moment, I have been deeply concerned about our illegal war in Yemen since its inception and have taken steps to end our involvement in that war. I presented questions to our combatant commanders on the topic, just as I have for other unauthorized operations in the past. I had hoped the new administration might take prompt action to end our unauthorized activities in Yemen. Sadly, that has not occurred.

Last fall, after countless missed opportunities and some broken assurances, my colleagues and I decided it was time to take matters into our own hands. By “matters,” I mean those matters that are specifically already in our hands, those matters that are already granted to the Congress and to no other branch of government.

There may be some short-term impact on the U.S.-Saudi relationship, but overall the Crown Prince should understand that this protracted and clearly nonconclusive war only hurts his government's stability and legitimacy. He, too, should want a quick end to this conflict. Saudi Arabia is an

indispensable partner in the region, without which the United States would be less successful. But the Saudis themselves are at an inflection point within their own government. Working with the United States should be a goal for the Crown Prince and should be a credibility-lending endeavor.

The resolution before you is the product of years of effort. It was not timed in any way, shape, or form to coincide with the Crown Prince's visit. It was drafted with one thing in mind, which is to make sure that before we put U.S. blood and treasure on the line, before we put the sons and daughters of the American people who have served in harm's way into an area in which hostilities are ongoing, to get involved in combat capacities in an area where conflict is brewing, we owe it to them, we owe it to their parents, we owe it to their families, and we owe it to ourselves, having taken an oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, to do it the right way—not just because the Constitution requires that but also because of the reasons the Constitution requires that.

It makes sense that when we are doing something that has a greater capacity to impact our government, our standing in the world, our own security, and the lives of those who were sworn to protect us, we do it in the right way, not just through the appropriate branch of government but through the appropriate branch of government in part because that is the only place where an open, honest, public debate can occur.

It is one thing to make a decision somewhere within the military chain of command on whether to undertake a particular action, but this is one of the reasons why, in order to declare war, in order to get us involved in a war in the first place, it requires action by Congress, because this is the branch of the Federal Government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals.

Over the course of many decades, under the leadership of Congresses and White Houses of every conceivable partisan combination, we have seen a gradual shift of power in a number of areas—including regulatory policy, trade policy, and the exercise of the war power—over to the executive branch of government. When we don't exercise that power, it starts to atrophy; the Constitution means less, and it is less able to protect the American people. That is why this resolution matters. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let's do this the right way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague from Utah a very simple question? Whether or not he agrees with me that we are talking about two separate issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. It seems to me we are talking about two separate issues, one of which is really a no-brainer. The no-brainer is that the Constitution is very clear that it is the Congress, not the President, that determines whether we go to war; that we are currently in an unauthorized war in Yemen; and that the first vote—if there is an attempt to table this, that would be absolutely unacceptable because we would be abdicating our decisionmaking. And then the second vote is the vote on whether we think it is a good idea to be in Yemen.

Would the Senator agree with me that at least on the motion to table, every Member of the Senate should allow us to go forward and vote against tabling so that people in the Senate accept their constitutional responsibility to vote yes or no on the war in Yemen?

Mr. LEE. I would certainly agree that the answer is yes in response to that question. It is Congress that gets to decide whether we go to war; it is not the executive branch.

For that very same reason, when we have brought up this resolution calling into question whether we have authorized that war and whether we should continue in the absence of an authorization for that war—if we are asked to table that, that very request amounts to a request for abdication of our constitutional responsibility.

A favorite song of mine called “Freewill” by the band Rush came out several decades ago, and it says: “If you choose not to decide, you still have made a choice.”

If we choose in this moment to table this resolution, we are making a choice to be willfully blind to the exercise of a power that belongs to us, to allow someone else to exercise it without proper authority. That is wrong. That cannot happen, not on our watch.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me concur with what Senator LEE just said. There may be disagreements about the wisdom of being allied with Saudi Arabia on the war in Yemen. There will be honest disagreements about that. But there cannot be and there must not be an abdication of constitutional responsibility in terms of making that decision.

If you think that U.S. participation in the war in Yemen is a good idea, you can vote against our resolution. If you agree with us that it is a bad idea, support our resolution. But simply to abdicate your responsibility on this issue would be absolutely irresponsible.

I hope we have virtually unanimous support in voting against the effort to table. Then let's get into the debate about the wisdom of the war and vote it up or down. Needless to say, I hope the Members support our resolution. Let's at least have that vote and not abdicate our responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, some of our colleagues from time to time may ask us how we would define the term “hostilities” and what the United States might be doing that triggers that definition. I welcome that discussion. It is important to note that the U.S. Code is somewhat vague on that question, defining “hostilities” broadly to mean any conflict subject to the laws of war. I don’t necessarily view that broad definition as problematic. It is something that allows Congress to assess the unique circumstances in each instance on specific grounds at each point in time.

Our involvement in war and in conflict has greatly changed over the years, and it will continue to change as the nature of international relations changes and as the technology we use in war changes and develops. It doesn’t mean we are not involved in hostilities. I welcome further discussion on this matter.

Let’s look at the facts of our involvement in Yemen today. Since 2015, U.S. forces have aided the Saudi coalition with midair refueling and target selection assistance, or, as Defense Secretary Jim Mattis said in December 2017, our military is helping the Saudis “make certain [they] hit the right thing.” In other words, we are helping a foreign power bomb its adversaries in multiple ways. If that doesn’t include and amount to and itself constitute hostilities, then such words have lost their meaning.

There are those within the executive branch of government who would define the term “hostilities” so narrowly that it would apply only when our armed services personnel are on the ground firing upon or being fired upon by an enemy force. It is understandable in some respects that they would want to define it that way because if they define it that way, that puts the executive in power.

That is one of the reasons we have to remember that there is a natural tension built into our constitutional structure to make sure that not all power is concentrated in any one branch of government. It is one of the reasons Alexander Hamilton pointed out in Federalist No. 69 that war power would not be exercised by the Executive in our system of government. In this instance, as in many others, the Executive in our system of government would differ from the monarch under the old system, the one that was based in London. The King had the power to take Great Britain to war. The King didn’t have to seek a declaration of war from Parliament; the King could act in and of himself to decide when to take us to war. It is one of the reasons why it matters here.

When we see the definition of “hostilities” narrowed to the point that it very often will not exist given the way we engage in hostilities today, given

modern technologies that frequently allow us to engage in acts that anyone would have to acknowledge amount to combat, amount to conflict, amount to hostilities, they can still explain it away as something the Executive can do independently of Congress.

This resolution will not do anything, according to some, because we are not engaged in hostilities in Yemen. I am building upon this argument that is based upon a very narrow, cramped, distorted interpretation of the word “hostilities.”

When people ask what we think the resolution would do if it were to pass—first of all, it is clear that we are engaged in hostilities because when we are involved as a cobelligerent, involved in midair refueling in combat flights, when we are identifying targets for the Saudi-led military coalition in Yemen against the Houthis, those are combat operations, and those are clearly hostilities. But even if we were to suppose that U.S. activities in Yemen somehow did not constitute hostilities according to the War Powers Resolution, the text of our resolution is crystal clear about what constitutes “hostilities” for its purpose; namely, “aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling.” Our resolution would end those very specific activities against the Houthis in Yemen—nothing more and nothing less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I speak only for myself on this issue and will tell you why I am so motivated about this resolution.

If we think back on the modern history of our country and if we think of the two most significant foreign policy decisions—the war in Vietnam and the war in Iraq and the unbelievable unintended consequences that those two destructive wars had—what we conclude is that in both of those wars—one under a Democratic President and one under a Republican President—the Congress abdicated its responsibility. It did not ask the right questions. In both instances, we got into those terrible wars based on lies. The Johnson administration lied as to why we should get involved in the war in Vietnam, and the Bush administration lied as to why we should get involved in the war in Iraq.

It just seems to me that if nothing else, based on those two examples of what the war in Vietnam did and what the war in Iraq did, Congress has to take a deep breath and understand that the people who wrote the Constitution were not fools when they said it must be the elected people who are closest to the constituents who have to debate these issues and who know that decisions being made will result in the loss of lives of the people in their own States, and we have abdicated that responsibility.

No one can predict whether the decisions made by Congress are going to be good decisions with regard to war and peace, whether we are going to do better than Presidents did. I don’t know. At the very least, we have to accept our responsibility and not simply take the word of Presidents who in the two most recent, significant wars have lied to the American people.

Once again, I know there may be differences of opinion regarding the wisdom of involvement by the United States in the war in Yemen. If you think it is a good idea, vote against our resolution. There should be no difference of opinion about accepting our responsibility under the Constitution and voting on whether it is a good idea.

I yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, Senator SANDERS mentioned some previous wars and how this may or may not relate to those previous wars. One of the other questions we get from time to time is also a related question: How does this impact or influence operations somewhere else in the world where the United States is engaged? Would the passage of this resolution mean that every other type of operation anywhere else in the world would have to stop too? What about our global counterterrorism activities? We sometimes get those questions.

The main reason we drafted this resolution was to bring our activities in Yemen into line with our laws as expressed in the Constitution. So if we are fighting unauthorized wars in other places around the globe, then those wars need to be authorized by Congress, or else they would need to end. Importantly, however, this resolution does not itself make law or set precedent for other operations. This resolution applies just to this conflict in Yemen against the Houthis. Each conflict or operation ought to be evaluated on its own merits and measured against our national interest and any existing authorizations for the use of military force. We can’t evaluate this resolution as being something that requires us to swallow the entire elephant at once. This is just focusing on one issue in one part of the world. We need not take any kind of a “sky is falling” approach that will say this will immediately jeopardize everything else we are doing in any and every other part of the world.

Global counterterror operations under title 10 or title 50 involve U.S. action but arise in different ways, and any other activity that we undertake or authority that we cite in introducing our armed service personnel into hostilities cannot serve as a substitute for congressional action as contemplated by the Constitution. The power to declare war belongs to Congress and not to the Executive. Just

because government breaks the rules often—and sometimes with impunity—it does not mean it has the right to break the rules, nor does it mean, certainly, that we shouldn't call out rule-breaking when we see it going on, but that is a debate for another day.

The resolution before us today is specific to our activities against the Houthis in Yemen. It does not authorize or deauthorize military force in any other part of the globe or against any other foe. In fact, the resolution specifies that it does not interfere with existing operations against al-Qaida and its affiliates. Our resolution is narrowly tailored to end our efforts to assist forces that are fighting against the Houthis. It is deliberately narrow in order to address a black-and-white situation that is clearly not covered by any existing authorization for the use of military force. Counterterror operations that are supported by the 2001 AUMF and other legitimate authorizations would not be affected by this resolution.

I yield to Senator MURPHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am grateful to join for a few moments the cosponsors of this resolution—Senator LEE and Senator SANDERS.

It is important to pick up on what Senator LEE was just putting down—the notion that this is a limited resolution that speaks to our participation in an unauthorized, illegal partnership with the Saudis to bomb the country of Yemen. It does not affect our partnership with Saudi Arabia and others in the gulf region to continue to confront terror, to continue to confront al-Qaida—a specific carve-out in this legislation that allows for 2001 AUMF authorized activities to go forward.

It is also important to note that if you care about the priority of taking on al-Qaida and taking on ISIS in the region, then you should support debating our resolution because all of the evidence suggests that the continuation of this civil war inside Yemen is making ISIS and AQAP, which is the arm of al-Qaida that has the clearest intentions of attacking the homeland, both more powerful. The AQAP controls much more territory inside Yemen than it did in the beginning of this civil war.

If you take the time to meet with Yemeni-Americans, they will tell you that inside Yemen, this bombing campaign is not perceived as a Saudi bombing campaign; it is perceived as a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign. What we are doing is radicalizing the Yemeni people against the United States. Add to this the new information that suggests that some of our partners in the coalition, although not directly working with al-Qaida, are starting to arm some very unsavory Salafi militias inside Yemen that are filled with the types of peo-

ple—the types of extremist individuals—who could take the training they have received from the coalitions and the weapons they have received from the coalitions and easily turn against the United States.

If you care about the mission against terrorism, then you should support debating our resolution.

Just to recap the reasons we are here today, we need to have a debate on the lack of authorization for military force because it is time for Congress to step up and do our constitutional duty.

The administration wrote in its letter to us that we do not have the authority as the U.S. Congress to weigh in on military activity that is waged by the administration unless there are two armies firing at each other on the ground in an area of conflict. That is the administration's definition of "hostilities," and admittedly that is a definition that has been used by Democrats and Republicans. This is not exclusive to the Trump administration. The problem with that is that it would allow for the United States, through Executive decision only, to wage an air campaign against a country that wipes it out without there being any say from the U.S. Congress.

Clearly, what is happening in Yemen today meets the definition of "hostilities." We have shown pictures on this floor before of entire cities that have been wiped out. More than 10,000 civilians have been killed in the largest outbreak of cholera in the history of the world in terms of what we have recorded. Those are hostilities, and the United States is clearly engaging in those hostilities because we are helping with targeting and refueling the planes that are supplying the munitions. If we cede to unlimited Executive authority with respect to this engagement, there will be no end to that.

Lastly, let me speak to what is happening on the ground. There is zero evidence that U.S. participation in this coalition has made things better. Civilian casualties are not getting better. The day after Christmas, over 60 civilians were killed in a series of airstrikes. Reports are that last month, the Saudis engaged once again in something called double tapping, by which they targeted an area in which civilians lived, waited for the emergency responders to arrive, and then hit again—something that is not allowed by international humanitarian law. The humanitarian catastrophe itself is getting worse, not better.

Maybe most important is that the battle lines inside Yemen are not changing. The Saudis have been telling us for years: Stick with us. If you keep on helping us bomb the Yemeni people, we will win this war. We will get back control of Hudayda and of Sana'a.

That is not happening. At the beginning of this war, the Houthis controlled about 70 percent of the popu-

lation inside Yemen. Today, the Houthis control about 70 percent of the population inside Yemen. If we continue to support this bombing campaign, nothing will change except that more people will die, except that more civilians will be hit by the bombs we help to drop, except that al-Qaida will continue to control big portions of that country.

While Senator LEE notes that this resolution is actually not on the merits of our engagement there and that it is whether we have the legal justification to be there, let's admit that if you do consider the merits, other than backing the play of our historic ally, there is nothing to suggest that our participation there is making things better rather than worse.

I yield to Senator SANDERS.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me ask my friend from Connecticut the same question I asked Senator LEE, and that is whether he agrees with me that we are really dealing with two separate issues here.

The first issue is really, in a sense, a no-brainer. It is whether the Congress or, in this case, the Senate of the United States accepts its constitutional responsibility on issues of war. We are now engaged in a war in Yemen with Saudi Arabia. The Constitution is very clear in article I, section 8 that it is the Congress that determines whether this country goes to war.

I believe what will happen in a few hours is that a motion to table will come up. Would you agree with me that it would be an act of cowardice, in a sense, an irresponsibility, an abdication of congressional responsibility, for somebody to vote to table that resolution?

Mr. MURPHY. By voting to table the consideration of this resolution, you are voting to stop a debate, a conversation, from happening in the Senate about whether proper authorization exists.

Let's be honest about what this first vote is. This first vote is, do we want to talk about whether there is authorization to perpetuate this war? By voting to stop debate, by voting to table this motion and refrain from proceeding to a conversation about this topic, we are, in a very clear way, signaling to the administration and to the American public that we are not interested in exercising our article I authority on the issue of war-making.

Mr. SANDERS. In other words, no matter what one's view may be about the wisdom of the war, to vote to table is to abdicate our constitutional responsibility?

Mr. MURPHY. It sends a very clear signal to the administration that we are not interested in even having a debate here about complicated questions of legal authority for serious military engagements overseas.

Mr. SANDERS. All right. Let me just concur with Senator MURPHY.

If you think it is a good idea for the United States to be involved in the war in Yemen with Saudi Arabia, you can vote against our resolution. Yet I can think of no reason at all as to why any Member of Congress would vote to table this resolution and prevent that discussion, and I would hope that we would have strong support against any motion to table and allow that debate to go forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this week we are discussing, among other topics, the sad fact of sex trafficking online. The reason is because yesterday we voted to advance a piece of legislation called SESTA, or the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act. The purpose of this legislation is crystal clear. We want to put an end to this abominable practice, and we want to stop shielding or protecting those web platforms that promote it.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. Over the past year, like many of my colleagues, I met with law enforcement and victims' rights groups across the country who talk about this as a continuing problem. I met with technology providers who want to end the practice but want to make sure they maintain their independence from Federal regulation writ large. I have been in regular contact with my colleagues over at the House to make sure this bill is considered and passed in a timely fashion. I think it is fair to characterize the negotiations as delicate.

A small group of Senators, including our colleague JOHN MCCAIN, the senior Senator from Arizona, wanted to make sure that everyone understood what this bill does and what it does not do. What it does do is to protect our children. It provides justice to victims, and it makes sure that Federal laws don't protect those who profit from sex trafficking online. What it does not do is somehow to stymie free speech. It does not restrict web platforms from publishing objectionable content.

For example, under the Communications Decency Act, now websites have to screen for child pornography. That is one of the explicit exceptions to the Communications Decency Act, which basically provides immunity to these web platforms from liability. What we are doing is adding to that human trafficking, and it is appropriate that we do so.

This does not discourage websites that are already taking steps to proactively remove improper conduct and police their own networks. I would say to those who do: Keep up the good work.

Today the internet and other forms of technology have made certain forms of predatory behavior easier to engage

in. This bill addresses this development head-on. It would allow sex trafficking victims to have their day in court by eliminating Federal liability protections for technology providers who knowingly facilitate online sex trafficking. It would allow State and local law enforcement to investigate and prosecute providers that violate Federal sex trafficking laws.

This bill was introduced last summer after a 2-year inquiry by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which produced a report. That report found that not only had sex trafficking run rampant in certain online spaces but also that some websites had tried to cover it up.

Well, no longer. Last fall, the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously approved SESTA, the bill on the floor that the House passed last month. Now it is our turn.

Senator PORTMAN, the junior Senator from Ohio, has been this bill's greatest champion since its inception. I believe he was one of the members of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which produced the report I mentioned. He has been involved in this issue for a long time. He has been informing us time and again of the ways in which sex trafficking has morphed from the street corner to the smartphone.

In the committee's investigation, one website in particular came up time and again, and the name is no stranger to the Senate or the Congress. It is backpage, a notorious publication now online that is responsible for three-quarters of all child trafficking reports.

It eventually became clear that even though that site was actually helping to sell young women for sex, and even the victims and their families were suing backpage, none of the lawsuits were successful because of what some people are coming to believe is an outdated immunity protection for technology providers under the Communications Decency Act, which I mentioned a moment ago.

The original law was intended to protect free speech online, which is important. I am a firm believer in the First Amendment, as I know we all are, but free speech is no license to engage in criminal activity.

At last count, 67 Senators have joined our effort as cosponsors. We are joined in support of SESTA by anti-human-trafficking advocates, law enforcement, State attorneys general, the civil rights community, faith-based groups, and tech companies like Facebook and Oracle.

Our colleague from Oregon has introduced two amendments, which I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose. The first would appropriate new money for the Attorney General to investigate and prosecute website operators that criminally facilitate sex trafficking.

The problem is that this would violate the blue slip rule and subject the bill to a point of order. In other words, there are constitutional issues raised about where that sort of legislation would originate. It has to originate in the House. It would almost certainly guarantee the demise of this legislation. In other words, it is a poison pill. It is not that we will not support funding to prosecute traffickers. In fact, we will provide ample funding through the Department of Justice later this week. It is that those funds should be appropriated through the usual process and then handed over to State and local officials who can use them effectively.

The second amendment that will be offered is the "Bad Samaritan" amendment. This would prevent websites from being held accountable for any efforts to moderate content, even when those efforts are taken in bad faith or obviously intended to miss their mark and instead protect sex traffickers. In some States courts have found that websites like backpage might be held liable when they selectively edit sex trafficking ads to make them more difficult to be identified by law enforcement.

The "Bad Samaritan" amendment could protect platforms like backpage.com from liability for bad-faith editing practices, leaving victims with even less of a recourse than they have today. Simply put, it could eviscerate the steps we are taking in SESTA. I am confident that our colleague does not intend this result, but that would be the consequence of adopting either one of those amendments.

So I hope my colleagues will join me in voting in favor of SESTA this week and opposing these two amendments. That is the best way we can ensure that these websites and online platforms can be held accountable for facilitating sex trafficking.

Mr. President, later today the Senate will be voting on a privileged resolution that I spoke on yesterday, offered by three of our colleagues. Simply put, it would direct the President to cut off all U.S. support for the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen.

Now, some people may be looking at a world map to figure out where Yemen is and what the import of this conflict may be, but suffice it to say that this is another proxy war being conducted against the United States and its allies by Iran, now in Yemen, just to the south of Saudi Arabia, our ally.

So as to the motion to table, I was interested to hear my friends from Connecticut and Vermont suggesting that the motion to table would stop debate. Well, that is not exactly true. What it will do is to facilitate full debate and full consideration of the merits of the underlying resolution, starting with the Foreign Relations Committee. It is very unusual for resolutions like this to come immediately to

the floor, where 100 Senators vote on it, because, frankly, not all of us are as up to speed on the details of this or what the unintended impact might be as the Foreign Relations Committee that is set up for the purpose of examining legislation with regard to our international relationships in matters like this.

This is an important and timely matter, as high-level Saudi officials are in Washington this week. The Crown Prince is scheduled to meet with President Trump today. I met with him this morning, along with other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Saudi Arabia is an important partner in our counterterrorism operations and as a counterpoint to Iran. In Yemen, we see both terrorist operations—that is, ISIS and al-Qaida—and Iran actively deploying missiles and using Yemen as a launching pad to shoot missiles into Saudi Arabia.

I mentioned that this support for our Saudi coalition is narrowly circumscribed. It takes the form of intelligence sharing, military advice, and logistical support, including air-to-air refueling. This is part of a plan that started under the Obama administration and now has continued under the Trump administration not to put American troops on the ground—boots on the ground, as we frequently refer to it—but rather to facilitate for our allies by working by, with, and through those allies to address the threat not only to them but ultimately to the United States and to peace in the region.

The role we play in Yemen is clearly a noncombat support role, and it is meant to minimize civilian casualties by improving the processes and procedures and increasing compliance with the international law of armed conflict. In other words, we are trying to help them target the terrorists and the Iranian-backed rebels and not innocent civilians, something they are not able to do as well without our assistance.

Contrary to the resolution's sponsors' claims, the United States is not engaged in hostilities in Yemen, as it has been traditionally understood, since it is not in direct conflict with the Houthi rebels. We are not fighting the Houthi rebels. U.S. soldiers are not fighting the Houthi rebels directly. We are providing support.

Proponents of this legislation rightly point out that there is a humanitarian crisis in Yemen. Unfortunately, what they sometimes leave out is that the humanitarian crisis only started when the Iranian-backed rebels overthrew the existing government. Our military assistance is helping the Saudis with their targeting to help prevent civilian casualties, to restore law and order, and to create conditions necessary to provide aid.

Let's remember, too, that it was President Obama who first imple-

mented the refueling and logistical support policy. This is not a political matter. There is no real difference in the way that the Obama administration and the Trump administration provide this support by, with, and through our allies the Saudis and the Emiratis.

It is clear why this has been the policy of the last two administrations. Yemen is a place of great geopolitical concern. When I visited Bahrain recently with our colleagues—the U.S. Fifth Fleet is housed in Bahrain—we heard concerns about a chokepoint near an area called the Bab el Mandeb. I probably butchered that pronunciation, but we have all heard more frequently about the Straits of Hormuz, through which a lot of the world's commerce and oil flow.

Bab el Mandeb is off to the west of Yemen, only 18 miles at its narrowest point, connecting the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean. That is one of the reasons why it is so important geopolitically—because 3.8 million barrels of oil pass through it each day, many of them in route to the Suez Canal and beyond. Bab el Mandeb shows the geopolitical importance of Yemen in the surrounding region. When rebels attempt to shut down shipping in this passage, the impact is global, including on the United States, and our Nation has every right to be concerned.

I fear the resolution I mention deals with our shared concerns in the wrong way. We all want to avoid civilian casualties. Most everyone is aware that Yemen has been suffering from a severe humanitarian crisis for years, including a terrible cholera outbreak. But if we were to remove U.S. involvement and logistical support for the Saudi coalition, the humanitarian crisis would likely get even worse.

The Department of Defense has critiqued the resolution on which we will be voting on the grounds that it would undermine our ability to foster long-term relationships with allies in the Gulf region. We also benefit from increased interoperability, burden-sharing, and strong security architectures throughout the world. In other words, the alliances we have in the Middle East fight the common enemy of ISIS and al-Qaida and try to contain Iran, which has been at war with the United States since 1979 in the Iranian Revolution in one form or another. All of these are on the table and all of these should be matters of our concern, but they are best considered, at least initially, in the context of the Foreign Relations Committee. They can then make a recommendation to us, and we can have the sort of fulsome debate that people have come to expect in the Senate, I hope, on matters of global importance. So all of the reasons I have mentioned here suggest that the need for our auxiliary and limited role in Yemen remains important.

Secretary Mattis, the Secretary of Defense, has said that a withdrawal of our noncombatant support could embolden Iranian-backed rebels in the area, enable further missile strikes on Saudi Arabia, our ally, and threaten the shipping lanes in the Red Sea, like the one at Bab el Mandeb. All this combined could stoke the embers of an even greater regional conflict in the Middle East.

So I hope our colleagues will vote for a tabling of this resolution, which does not cut off debate but just moves that debate, at least initially, to the Foreign Relations Committee, where, under the able leadership of Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member MENENDEZ, I have every confidence that they will explore every nook and cranny of this issue and come out with a reasoned and reasonable recommendation to the Senate and the Congress on how the U.S. Government should conduct itself.

I believe in a strong congressional role when it comes to wars and military conflict. This has been a fight, though, that has been going on for a long time between the executive branch and the legislative branch. We have the ultimate tool. We can cut off money, but that is a rather blunt instrument. I think this administration, like previous administrations, needs to recognize that the Congress is a partner in making these decisions, not an adversary. It is important that we each play our respective role, and I am confident that we will play that role responsibly, which is really what this is all about.

If the Senate takes this vote and passes this resolution, we lose the chance for that kind of careful, deliberate, informed consideration that starts in our standing committees. We lose the chance to have the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issue a thoroughly researched recommendation.

So I hope our colleagues will vote to table the resolution and not to close off debate but to insist that this debate take place, at least initially, where it belongs, in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and that this debate then continue among all 100 Members of the Senate. We will be better informed, we will be better prepared, and we will be better able to prevent unintended consequences from taking a rash action like voting for the resolution today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senators LEE, SANDERS,

and MURPHY, as well as the other cosponsors of the resolution we are debating, for their commitment to elevating this debate in the Senate. I agree with my colleagues that this is an important debate with significant implications. As the elected representatives of the American people, we must serve as an effective check on the executive branch, fulfill our commitments to protect the national security interests of the United States, and be responsive to our constituents.

This debate is about how we best leverage the tools in our national security toolbox, including military tools, to protect U.S. national security. Although the resolution focuses on one particular element of U.S. policy, limited military support—basically, refueling, intelligence, and advice—to the Saudi coalition, I encourage my colleagues to expand the aperture of this debate so we may call on the administration to assert real leadership, diplomatic heft, and nonmilitary resources to move the conflict in Yemen toward a political tract.

As the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I remind my colleagues that it is this committee that has the jurisdiction over the questions of use of force. I remind my colleagues that it was also under my leadership as chair of this committee that it twice voted on authorizations for the use of military force—once in 2013, in response to the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons against the Syrian people, and once in 2014, in response to the rapid rise and spread of the Islamic State. I remind my colleagues of these two committee votes to underscore my commitment to open debate, my willingness to take tough votes, and my enduring commitment to a robust role for the legislative branch of the U.S. Government in the use of force and oversight of that force.

Now, I am pleased that Chairman CORKER has agreed to hold a public hearing with administration witnesses on the war in Yemen—I think a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is critically important—to look at the U.S. military support to the Saudi coalition and our overarching U.S. policy for resolving the war in Yemen. I appreciate that the chairman has also made a commitment to a markup in the committee in the near future on legislation that deals with the question of Yemen, and I also welcome his commitment to markup an AUMF, or an authorization for the use of military force, in the committee. Those are significant and actually will go a long way toward an informed process about how we deal with this challenge.

In considering S.J. Res. 54, I encourage my colleagues to assess the best way to promote core U.S. security interests in the Middle East, including pushing back on Iran's aggressive and

destabilizing actions across the region, countering terrorism, and ensuring the freedom of navigation. To achieve these goals, our longstanding policy has been to partner with the members of the Gulf Cooperation Council to promote the security and stability of the Arabian Peninsula.

As we consider this resolution, we must fully grasp the situation on the ground and the scope of attacks on one of our traditional security partners. Saudi Arabia has endured Yemeni-originated attacks inside its territory on a scale that no American would accept—ballistic and Scud missile attacks aimed at major Saudi population centers, cross-border attacks by Iran-backed Houthis. Those are significant.

Now, having said that, I share the concerns, I think, of a majority of my Senate colleagues regarding the conduct of the Saudi-led coalition operations, the unacceptable scale of civilian casualties, the severity of the humanitarian crisis, and the seeming lack of momentum on all sides toward a political tract to negotiate an end to this conflict.

The Saudi coalition bears significant responsibility for the magnitude of human suffering and the scale of destruction in Yemen. Seventy-five percent of the population is in need of humanitarian assistance, and more than 8 million are on the brink of famine. The conditions have also led to the worst outbreak of cholera in modern history, with an estimated 1 million people suspected to be infected.

While the Houthis bear much responsibility for the violence, the Saudi-led campaign has played a significant role in exacerbating, however, the current humanitarian catastrophe. We must remember that the Houthis overthrew the internationally recognized and lawful government of Yemen and continue the conflict by resisting a political solution. So we ask the Saudis to have a political solution, but we need the Houthis to engage in a political solution as well. We also have to remember that the Houthi insurgency has vastly expanded the opportunities for al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula.

At the same time, I worry that withdrawal of limited U.S. military support to the Saudi coalition will weaken our leadership and our ability to influence a political settlement, improve humanitarian conditions, and could even make the situation worse.

Let us be clear-eyed about who will most benefit from an absence of American power. As it has done in political vacuums throughout the region, Iran will continue to expand its proxy power, and through its Revolutionary Guard, Iran will continue shipping weapons to the Houthis in violation of the arms embargo. With an emboldened Iran as patron, the Houthis will continue their campaign within Yemen and their attacks on Saudi Arabia.

Meanwhile, other nations in the region will be left questioning the commitment of its long-term security partner, the United States. In Saudi Arabia's darkest hours, as ballistic missiles are launched at major population centers in Saudi Arabia and Lebanese Hezbollah is on their border training Houthi fighters while Iran continues to transfer lethal equipment, we risk sending a signal to our partners and to our adversaries that the United States is not reliable.

Across the world, from Canada to the United Kingdom, President Trump has damaged our credibility as a reliable partner, even to some of our most stalwart allies. We must push against those concerns and show our allies that the United States upholds its international commitments. Consideration of withdrawal of support for the Saudi coalition must be taken in concert with other ways in which the United States is working to end this war—the totality of U.S. policy—which I fear is lacking.

The solution, I believe, is to bolster our diplomatic, humanitarian, and political presence to help solve this crisis, to end the human suffering, and to assert practical, concerted leadership. Thus far, the administration's approach has effectively abdicated leadership on the global stage. Thus far, while we have heard senior officials assure us that there is no military solution to this conflict and a political settlement is necessary, this administration is actively dismantling the State Department and antagonizing the United Nations—the two entities that have the potential to play the most critical roles in moving toward a political settlement and addressing the humanitarian crisis.

We have vacancies at the Assistant Secretary of State level for the Middle East and the Ambassador in Riyadh—a failure of leadership.

With this dangerous approach to our diplomatic institutions, we will not be in a position to promote political solutions, and our military, once again, will be called on to do the critical work of diplomacy and development, distracting their attention from other pressing challenges—a failure of leadership.

Regarding a broader diplomatic strategy, the administration has also failed to develop a comprehensive strategy to confront Iran, including holding Iran accountable for continuing to provide missile supplies and lethal training to the Houthis.

Across land and sea, we know Lebanese Hezbollah operatives are in Yemen. Yet we have seen no sanctions and no action at the Security Council for this illicit, illegal activity. The administration has not made one designation for Iranian violations of arms embargoes, as directed by the legislation passed here 98 to 2, the Countering

America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act—again, a failure of leadership.

I expect the administration to articulate and implement a comprehensive strategy for addressing Yemen that includes requisite conditions for continuing to support the Saudi coalition, a strategic push for a political settlement, efforts to alleviate the human suffering, and a comprehensive strategy to decisively push back on Iran's destabilizing actions in Yemen. This includes tough diplomacy with countries that will continue to facilitate or, at a minimum, fail to push back on Iran's actions.

I will continue pushing the administration to assert critical American diplomatic leadership rooted in the values of democracy, human rights, and human dignity.

Based upon Chairman CORKER's commitments to those hearings and future markups and based upon the totality of the situation, I will vote to table the motion to discharge from the committee because I am not ready to either abandon our partners that face an existential threat from Iran run amok in Yemen, but my support is not unconditional, and I will demand responsive actions.

I want to see, as I told the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia earlier today, a renewed commitment and a rapid movement toward a political track by the Saudi coalition. I want to see consistent demonstrations of commitment to humanitarian access and alleviating the humanitarian crisis. I want to see followthrough in pledges of assistance to stabilize and rebuild Yemen by members of the Saudi coalition. I want to see energy and diplomacy from the Trump administration.

This week's visit of Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman is an opportunity to press forward on a path for ending the war and addressing the civilian suffering. That certainly was my message to him. The limited support the United States provides is leverage. Now the Trump administration needs to use it.

In conclusion, I invite my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to join me in holding the administration to account and pushing the administration to use our leverage to drive this conflict toward a political track. I also invite my colleagues to join me in conducting oversight of our policies and programs to counter Iran's activities in the region, including implementing CAATSA.

Finally, I want to be very clear that my vote today is not a blank check for U.S. military support, nor an endorsement of the current policy and strategy, and, finally, not a thumbs-up for the Saudi coalition that we should continue business as usual. I expect to see improvements on all fronts, as I have previously stated, and I will review fu-

ture decisions with respect to potential arms sales and other votes with that type of extreme scrutiny.

There is no more time to waste. We must move toward a political settlement to end the war in Yemen, and the people of Yemen must see improvements in their situation immediately.

I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to ensure we are working toward a policy that embraces American leadership in promoting a political solution and alleviating the devastating humanitarian suffering in Yemen. I look forward to this continuing debate before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Jersey, my good friend, the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, for his comments.

Today we met with the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia, a very impressive young man who is transforming the country. We talked about the importance of our relationship, no doubt, but we strongly, strongly pushed back on what is happening right now in Yemen and asked them to take strong corrective action. I was there when this occurred, and I certainly expressed the same.

We also talked about the enrichment they are pursuing and some of the concerns that exist there. I want to thank the ranking member for his leadership and the words he just spoke.

Let me just speak to the debate we are having on the floor. This is a very entrepreneurial move. I don't say that to be pejorative. I know one of the Members is on the Judiciary Committee that is bringing this to the floor. I can imagine some highly important judicial issue not being debated in the Judiciary Committee but just being wafted to the floor for a debate. I know that is not the way the Judiciary Committee operates.

One of the other Members is on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I can imagine some complex cap-and-trade bill being offered, and instead of it being worked through the committee—or some ethanol bill or some other type of bill—instead of it being worked through the committee, somebody just decides to bring it directly to the floor. That is what is happening here today.

I certainly don't shy away from this debate. I appreciate the fact that MITCH MCCONNELL understood that very few Members of our body—unless they are on the Foreign Relations Committee, Armed Services Committee, or happen to take a particular interest—even know much about what is happening in Yemen, and a lot is happening there. So I appreciated the briefing that took place last week to

give Members a sense as to what is occurring there, but the proper way to deal with these issues is to deal with them in committee.

One would think that maybe there is some Yemen legislation that the committee is holding and not acting on. That is not the case. Any of these Members could have offered Yemen legislation relative to this issue, and the committee would take it up. That has not occurred.

So let me tell my colleagues what is happening in the committee. We have a bill that is being worked on by Senator YOUNG and Senator SHAHEEN dealing with this very issue. They are building support. They are working with the administration to make sure the definitions are correct, and they have had numbers of people involved with them. We plan to have a Yemen hearing in the next few weeks to deal with this issue but also to take up appropriate legislation. That is the way we typically deal with issues of such importance.

Let me say this: This is an issue of great importance. It not only affects the tremendous humanitarian crisis that is occurring in Yemen and the radicalization of the Houthis, supported by Iran—a proxy of Iran—but also Saudi Arabia's own security. It also affects the way we deal with other countries. I think many people here understand fully that right now, or recently, we have been involved in the same kinds of activities with France, as they have dealt with issues in Mali, including refueling and helping them some with intelligence issues.

So this is something, again, that we need to take up in a serious way, and the committee is committed to doing so.

What I hope will happen today is that Members of this body will let the Foreign Relations Committee do its job and that we will bring a bill forward that we can properly debate and amend.

I am hoping that later today, when I offer a tabling motion, Members of this body will respect the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who deal with this issue and let it go back to committee, with the commitment that we plan to bring forth legislation to actually deal appropriately with many of the issues relative to Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and ourselves.

Let me mention one other thing. We have been working for some time to deal with the authorization for the use of military force. It has been an issue that has been before us for many years. It is the replacement and revision of the 2001–2002 AUMF that many people in this body have had concerns about because it has been so long since they were enacted. We have activities that are taking place around the world still based on those two authorizations. We have a markup on an AUMF on April 19

scheduled to try to revise so we can give people an opportunity to weigh in on this issue on the floor.

By the way, the way the AUMF is being constructed at present, when we go into new countries, when we take on new groups, the Senate would have the ability to weigh in on those issues.

So I just would like to say to the body and those who are looking in, we are not shying away from this debate. There has been no legislation whatsoever that has been held up on this topic. Legislation is being introduced soon in a bipartisan way to deal with this terrible issue that is taking place in Yemen.

We are going to have a hearing. We will have a markup. In addition to that, we are going to have a markup on a new AUMF to deal with the issues our country is dealing with around the world with al-Qaida, ISIS, and other entities that have been associated parties.

With that, I just want to let people know that is kind of the way we deal with things around here. None of us is happy with the current status, but I think a better way for us to come up with a prudent solution to what is happening there is to go through the normal committee process. I hope the other Members of the body will respect that.

I am glad that, by the way, the ranking member—by the way, this policy has been taking place in Yemen. It started under the Obama administration, the same exact policy. The Senate has acted on it by voting for appropriations, so it is not as if we have not taken action ourselves. We have done that through the NDAA. We have done that through various State Department authorizations. So we have acted upon it. There are concerns about what is happening there. Legislation is going to be introduced to try to deal with this, and that is the way we deal with complicated issues. No one is shying away from the debate. We just hope to table this and move it back and deal with it in the orderly, appropriate way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this afternoon there is going to be a vote on the Senate floor which is of historic importance. It is rare that I use those words to describe what is going on in the Senate Chamber. It is equally rare for us to actually take up an issue and debate it in this Chamber, but this afternoon we will face a critical vote.

I can recall, as can most Members, many votes we have cast in the course

of service in Congress, both in the House and the Senate, but the votes that cause loss of sleep and worry, time and again, are votes involving war. You see, part of my responsibility in the Senate, shared by my colleagues, under article I, section 8, is to actually vote to decide whether the United States of America shall go to war.

The Founding Fathers were explicit. They wanted to give to Congress that responsibility so Members of Congress could represent their constituents—House districts and States—whom we all represent. That created an opportunity—in effect, an obligation—for us to really measure this grievous, important, historic decision against the feelings of the families who would be asked to support a war with their tax dollars or with the lives of people they love.

I can recall, back in 2001, what occurred on 9/11. Those of us alive on that date will never forget it, but I also recall that a year later we faced a decision right here in the Senate Chamber about whether, as a result of 9/11, we would go to war against Iraq and Afghanistan.

There was a long debate about whether we should invade Iraq. If you will remember, the leaders of the government told us there were weapons of mass destruction which threatened the region and the world, including the United States, and if we didn't move into Iraq and take out Saddam Hussein in his capacity, we would leave the United States in danger.

The debate went on for a long period of time, and the final vote was cast in the early morning hours in October of 2002. I remember it well and, for reasons I can't explain, I stayed on the floor after the vote. There were only two or three Members of the Senate still here. It was one of those moments where we had voted to go to war and weren't certain about what the next step would be. There were 23 of us—1 Republican and 22 Democrats—who voted against the invasion of Iraq. I think it was one of the most important votes I ever cast.

The representations about weapons of mass destruction turned out to be false. We had no intelligence to back up that assertion. Yet that was the reason we were off to war. Well, here we are, some 16 years later, still engaged in a war in Iraq. I don't believe there is a single Member of the Senate who that night cast a vote for the invasion of that country who believed that 16 years later we would still be engaged in a war in Iraq.

Subsequently, there was a vote on the invasion of Afghanistan. It was a different circumstance. We believed Afghanistan had literally been the sourcing point for the terrorists who struck us on 9/11 and killed 3,000 innocent Americans. The argument made by the administration was, no one can do that to the United States of Amer-

ica without paying a price. I joined the overwhelming bipartisan majority supporting the invasion of Afghanistan to go after Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida.

I voted against invading Iraq. I voted for the invasion of Afghanistan. I can tell you, I would never ever have been able to stand here and say, with any certainty, that 16 years later, we would still be engaged in a war in Afghanistan, but we are.

The obvious question to ask is, In 16 years of war in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places in the world, how many other times has the United States and the House of Representatives come together to debate the wisdom of a decision about continuing a war or declaring a war? The answer is none—not once.

For 16 years, we have been observers and bystanders, through Presidents of both political parties, and the Congress has stood by and observed military action being taken all over the world.

Brown University did a survey called the Costs of War Project and recently published data saying that the United States fought terror in 76 countries, between October 2015 and October 2017, using its own troops and bases, through training of host country counterterrorism forces or through drone and air strikes.

In 76 different countries, we are engaged in military operations. How often has the Senate or the House come together to debate the wisdom or to even question whether those military actions were authorized? I think none. Perhaps someone could point to one, but I can't think of one time we have done it.

This afternoon is going to be different because we are being asked, as Members of the Senate, whether we are going to exercise our constitutional authority and responsibility when it comes to an ongoing war in a country most Americans couldn't find on a map—the country of Yemen.

Yemen now is embroiled in a civil war and an invasion by Saudi Arabia, and we are part of that military operation. There has been no vote in the U.S. Senate on those military activities. There is a loose connection to al-Qaida, which was referenced in the invasion of Afghanistan, as a rationalization for going after this terrorist operation now being found in Yemen, but there is more to that war in Yemen than just the presence of al-Qaida. There is an ongoing surrogate battle between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and the United States is engaged. I believe we are engaged because of our friendship with Saudi Arabia; some have argued because we sold them the planes we are now refueling.

At the very least, we ought to bring this case to the American people. That is our constitutional responsibility, and that is why this vote is important: Because we took an oath—each of us—

when we became Senators, to uphold the Constitution of the United States against enemies foreign and domestic. That Constitution says the people of the United States—the ones I represent in Illinois, the ones who are represented in Oregon or in Texas—are going to have a voice in this decision through us, through our debate, through our decision.

I thank the Senators who have brought this matter to the floor today: Mr. LEE, a Republican Senator from the State of Utah; Mr. SANDERS, a Democratic Senator from Vermont; and Mr. MURPHY, another Democratic Senator, from Connecticut. I have joined in cosponsoring this effort. It really is going to put us to a test to justify what we are doing in Yemen today.

What is happening in Yemen has been characterized by the United Nations as the worst humanitarian crisis in the world—and that is saying something. Some 8 million people are dying of famine in Yemen because of this war. Some 16 million are in desperate need of humanitarian assistance immediately.

This is no skirmish. This is not just an exchange of fire. This is carnage and destruction the likes of which the world has never seen, and we are part of it. If we are part of it and should be part of it, then we should make that decision as a Senate and a House of Representatives, as the Constitution requires, but going to the bleachers, standing by the sidelines, and watching more and more military operations take place around the world without asserting our constitutional responsibility is a mistake. That is why I have cosponsored this measure this afternoon and look forward to voting for it to move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, America is very involved in a war in Yemen, and it is time we have a debate as envisioned under our Constitution.

Our Constitution did not lay out the power of deciding when to go to war with the executive branch. It places it very clearly here, with article I, Congress is to act, but we have participated very directly, in partnership with Saudi Arabia, in the assault on Yemen, on the Houthis, and the result is a dramatic, dramatic humanitarian crisis. So we should absolutely hold that debate on this floor, as envisioned in our Constitution.

Article I, section 8 states, unequivocally, that “the Congress shall have Power . . . to declare War.” It is only Congress that is given this power under our Constitution.

If anyone has any doubts, then let’s pay attention to the other words of our Founders, James Madison himself: “In no part of the constitution is more wis-

dom to be found, than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department.”

The Founding Fathers’ vision was reinforced by the War Powers Resolution of 1973, also often referred to as the War Powers Act. That act was necessary because the executive branch tends to put our forces into conflict without the permission of Congress, in violation of the Constitution. So it is important to lay out the parameters under which they are allowed to do so under emergency action and the circumstances under which they are not allowed to do so.

The War Powers Act says: “It is the purpose of this joint resolution to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States and insure that the collective judgement of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities.”

It goes on to say that “the constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities . . . is clearly indicated by the circumstances, are exercised only pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States.”

In the case of the Saudi war we are participating in against the Houthis, it is not triggered by an attack upon the United States, nor is there any specific statutory authorization—that is why we are going to have this debate today—nor is there a declaration of war.

So the standards of the War Powers Resolution have not been met, and I call upon my colleagues to shoulder your constitutional responsibility to have this debate and hold the Executive accountable when they are violating the law of the United States of America.

There are two components to our presence in Yemen which should not be confused. One is where we are directly involved against forces associated with al-Qaida. This debate is not about that. The administration contends and we do not dispute today whether that is covered by the 2001 authorization for use of military force.

I think many of us feel that initial 2001 AUMF, authorization for use of military force, has been stretched beyond recognition. That is a debate for a different day. This argument is directly about our support of Saudi Arabia in bombing the Houthis in Yemen. That is the central question.

For us to understand why this is so important is, one, the integrity of the Constitution. If we do not hold the Executive accountable to the Constitution of the United States of America, then we are essentially taking that

key, critical clause that gave us responsibility for when military force is used by the United States out of the Constitution and delivering it to the Executive. That certainly is not the vision. If people want to have that vision, they will introduce a constitutional amendment to that point. Introduce a resolution to declare war to make this action in concert with the Constitution. Create specific statutory authority in concert with the Constitution. But do not fail your constitutional responsibility to hold this debate.

The War Powers Resolution lays out clearly that our participation in the support of foreign forces engaged in hostilities is engagement under the vision of our Constitution and certainly under the law of the War Powers Resolution. It says under section 8:

Authority to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances shall not be inferred—(1) from any provision of law . . . including any provision contained in any appropriation Act, unless such provision specifically authorizes the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

Again, specific authorization is required.

It goes on. In this section titled “Interpretation of Joint Resolution,” it states:

“[I]ntroduction of United States Armed Forces” includes the assignment of member of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country . . . in hostilities.

Clearly, the law states that our engagement, our coordination with a foreign power engaged in war, is covered by this act. Our participation in the movement of their military forces into hostilities is covered by this act.

Therefore, we have to understand the details of our engagement.

First, the United States refueling the Saudi planes as they go to bomb the Houthis is very directly participation in the movement of military forces into engaged hostilities. We are refueling the planes en route. How can that not be participation in the movement? Certainly a plane is a part of a military force. Certainly refueling it is participation in the movement of that plane. Could this be any clearer? This is black and white. Not many things are. In terms of the violation of the War Powers Resolution and the offense against our Constitution, this is black and white.

Second, we provide intelligence.

Third, we provide the weapons.

Fourth, we provide targeting assistance.

Fifth, we established a joint combined planning cell operation center to conduct military and intelligence activities in partnership with Saudi Arabia.

All of that fits into this direct section of the War Powers Act regarding coordination or participation in the movement of a foreign force engaged in hostilities. If this were a minor involvement—it is not. We have participated thousands of times in this manner. On a daily basis, we are involved in coordination.

The airstrikes Saudi Arabia is conducting have produced one of the worst humanitarian situations in the world. Think about the reports on these different strikes.

There were 3 airstrikes in Sa'dah last month, killing 5 civilians and wounding 14 more, including 4 children, as well as killing the paramedics who were trying to pull the survivors out after the first bomb dropped.

We had a strike on a hotel last August that turned the building's ceiling black with the charred blood of 50 farmers who were in that building.

It is one horrific circumstance after another as these bombs drop on civilians in Yemen. It is time for us to reckon with the fact of our participation in this carnage. This carnage has resulted in 10,000 Yemeni civilians killed, and there are 8 million people on the brink of starvation. Why is it that humanitarian aid has not gotten to those folks? Because Saudi Arabia has blocked it. We are partnering with a country that is blocking humanitarian aid. Does that square with the principles of the United States of America, to participate in partnership with a country starving 8 million people?

Then we have the fact that the Saudi bombs have been dropping on the infrastructure of Yemen, and they have destroyed the water systems. When you destroy the water systems, the sewage contaminates the fresh water, and a direct consequence of that is cholera. At this moment, the cholera epidemic in Yemen has affected 1 million people. That is the single largest cholera epidemic in the recorded history of mankind.

There are 8 million people starving and 1 million people sick with the worst cholera epidemic ever. We are participating in creating this.

To my colleagues who say Saudi Arabia has partnered with us against ISIS, fine and good, as they should. However, this issue is different. This is about whether we are helping them and participating directly in the hostilities of dropping bombs on civilians, Houthis, and creating a massive famine and a massive cholera epidemic and massive deaths. A lot of children are dying every day.

The Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, Mark Lowcock, warned that this famine could become "the largest famine the world has seen for many decades, with millions of victims."

Every day, about 130 children die from hunger and disease. We pride ourselves on going to the assistance in the world when children are being slaughtered or starved or decimated by disease. In this case, we are participating in this carnage. Does any Member of this Senate want to stand up and say that is an appropriate mission for the United States to participate in, this carnage? I certainly hope not.

The death and destruction in Yemen is unimaginable. It is appropriate that we debate on the floor the Sanders-Lee-Murphy resolution, a bipartisan resolution to say: Let's honor the Constitution. Let's abide by the 1973 War Powers Act. Let's hold the administration accountable because it is not just this issue—although this issue is massive—it is also the standard by which the Executive will operate in every potential war theater around the world for a decade to come.

If we proceed to say that it is OK that you trample the Constitution in Yemen, that you disregard the War Powers Resolution in Yemen, then we will be giving carte blanche to this administration to do so in one nation after another. We have long abdicated our responsibility. Let's abdicate no more. Play the role, the responsibility the Founding Fathers gave us in the Constitution, and bring an end to our participation without authorization in this horrific conflict.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

S.J. RES. 54—MOTION TO DISCHARGE—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

JUDICIAL VACANCIES

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, 1 year ago today, the Senate Judiciary Committee opened its hearing on the nomination of Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch. The Stanford Law & Policy Review has now published my article on one of the opposition's arguments made in that hearing and sure to be repeated should President Trump have the opportunity to make another Supreme Court nomination.

Today, I want to look at the lower courts because no fewer than 138 positions on the Federal district and appeals courts are vacant. That does not include 33 vacancies that we already know will occur in the next year or so. Everyone must understand both the seriousness and the cause of this crisis.

By itself, 138 is just a number. It is a big number, but it needs a frame of reference or a standard for us to know whether this number of judicial vacancies is normal or a serious problem that has to be addressed. I certainly don't want to be accused of partisanship, so I will rely solely on the standards and criteria used in the past by my Democratic colleagues. Let's first use some Democratic standards to evaluate the number of judicial vacancies that we face today.

One standard is that the Democrats have specifically identified how many vacancies are unacceptable. In February 2000, with a Democrat in the White House, the Democrats said that 79 vacancies were "too high." In September 2012, with the Democrats both in the White House and controlling the Senate, they declared a "judicial vacancy crisis" when there were 78 vacancies.

If 78 vacancies is a crisis, what is the label for 138 vacancies? This is the highest judicial vacancy total since September 1991, but more than half of those vacancies were fresh from Congress's having created new judgeships several months earlier. So I think it is fair to say that in either total or percentage terms, we face today the most serious judicial vacancy crisis that anyone in this body has ever seen.

A second Democratic vacancy standard is that, as they did in April 2014, we can compare judicial vacancies today with vacancies at the same point under previous Presidents. If that Democratic standard is valid, vacancies today are 35 percent higher than at this point under President Obama and 46 percent higher than at this point under President George W. Bush.

There is a third Democratic vacancy standard. In June 2013 and at least as far back as April 1999, the Democrats have complained that the Senate was not confirming enough judicial nominees to keep up with normal attrition. Well, judicial vacancies today are 30 percent higher than when President Trump took office, and, as I said, at least 33 more have already been announced.

Finally, the Democrats have frequently said that the 107th Congress—the first 2 years of the George W. Bush administration—should be our judicial confirmation benchmark. During that time, the Senate confirmed an average of just over four judicial nominees per month. The Senate has so far confirmed 28 of President Trump's district and appeals court nominees or fewer than two per month.

Take your pick. By any or all of these Democratic standards, we face a much more serious judicial vacancy crisis than in years past. In addition to the gravity of this crisis, however, the American people need to know its cause. I can tell you what is not causing this vacancy crisis. President

Trump started making nominations to the Federal district and appeals courts on March 21, 2017, just 61 days after taking office, as you can see on this chart. By August of last year, he had made more than three times as many judicial nominations as the average for his five predecessors of both parties. President Trump has nominated 86 men and women to the Federal bench since he took office 14 months ago.

If the President is making so many nominations, perhaps the problem lies somewhere in the Senate confirmation process. Once again, my Democratic colleagues can help figure this out. In November 2013, then-Judiciary Committee Chairman PATRICK LEAHY spoke about obstructing judicial nominees "in other ways that the public is less aware." The Democrats are using such below-the-public-radar obstruction tactics at each stage of the confirmation process.

The first stop in the confirmation process is the Senate Judiciary Committee. Under Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY's leadership, the committee has held a hearing for 62 of President Trump's judicial nominees—more than under any of the previous five Presidents at this point. So that is clearly not the problem. The first sign of Democratic obstruction is the unwarranted and partisan opposition to reporting judicial nominations from the Judiciary Committee.

In February 2012, 3 years into the Obama administration, the Democrats complained that five nominees to the U.S. district court had been reported by the Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote. This, they said, departed dramatically from Senate tradition. Today, just 14 months into the Trump administration, eight nominees to the U.S. district court have been reported by the Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote. The present rate of such party-line votes in the Judiciary Committee is more than four times what the Democrats criticized just a few years ago.

The below-the-radar obstruction tactics continue when the Judiciary Committee sends judicial nominees to the full Senate. The Democrats, for example, refuse to cooperate in scheduling confirmation votes. They can't prevent confirmation votes altogether because they abolished nomination filibusters in 2013, but if they can't make judicial confirmations impossible, they are determined to make them very difficult. Here is how they do it.

The Senate must end debate on a nomination before it can vote on confirmation. The majority and minority have traditionally cooperated to end debate and set up confirmation votes. In March 2014, not for the first time, the Democrats said that refusing consent to schedule votes on pending nominees was obstruction. When the minority refuses that consent, the only

way to end debate and set up a confirmation vote is by the formal cloture process, which requires a cloture vote and can add up to several days to the confirmation timeline, as seen here.

Since President Trump took office, the Democrats have forced the Senate to take 28 cloture votes on judicial nominations, compared to just two cloture votes at this point under the previous five Presidents combined. Even when cloture is invoked, Senate rules provide for up to 30 hours of debate before a confirmation vote can occur. Nearly half the time under President Obama, a judicial nomination cloture vote was followed by a confirmation vote on the same day. Under President Trump, that has plummeted to 17 percent. The average time between cloture and confirmation votes for President Trump's judicial nominations is more than 55 percent longer than it was under President Obama.

When a judicial nomination gets out of the Judiciary Committee, survives an unnecessary cloture vote, and then is subjected to postcloture delay, Democratic obstruction is still not over. In March 2012, the Democrats complained about Senators having voted against nominees to the U.S. district court who were supported by their own two Senators. In fact, the Democrats called this a new standard of obstruction because it departed so far from Senate tradition.

OK. Let's assume for the moment that this Democratic standard is also valid. At this point in the previous five Presidencies—from President Reagan to President Obama—U.S. district court nominees had received a combined total of 10 negative votes. So far, under President Trump, his confirmed district court nominees have received 72 negative votes.

Two weeks ago, the Pew Research Center released a new analysis showing that President Trump's confirmed judges have "faced a record amount of opposition." In fact, this analysis concluded that President Trump's judges have each received an average of more than 22 negative votes, "by far the highest average for any president's judges since the Senate expanded to its current 100 members in 1959." This level of opposition is more than four times what it was under President Obama—or should I say oppositional delay.

These tactics don't involve high-profile filibusters or headline-grabbing confirmation defeats but, rather, internal Senate rules and unwritten traditions. That is why they operate below the radar. Yet the Democrats have criticized these tactics precisely because they take their toll. Individually and especially in combination, they can add days and weeks to the time it takes to confirm a single judicial nomination even when the final confirmation vote is unanimous.

In November 2013, for example, the Democrats said that taking cloture votes on unopposed nominees amounted to "obstruction and abuse of Senate rules." At that point, almost 4 years into the Obama administration, the Senate had taken one cloture vote on a judicial nominee who was later confirmed without opposition—just one. We are only 14 months into the Trump administration, and the Democrats have already forced the Senate to take five cloture votes on nominees who were later unanimously confirmed. It has already happened twice this month. If doing this once amounted to obstruction and abuse, what would my Democratic colleagues call doing it five times as often in one-fourth the time?

These are just a few of what then-Chairman LEAHY called obstruction tactics that the public may not be aware of. Believe me. There is more where these came from. As I said, I want to avoid partisanship. Each of these is a Democratic standard. These are Democratic criteria. If my colleagues who once thought these were valid standards want to abandon them now, then perhaps they were also wrong the first time around. Otherwise, we have to face the conclusions that follow from applying these Democratic standards and criteria.

We face an unprecedented judicial vacancy crisis. Since President Trump is making nominations and the Judiciary Committee, under Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership, is steadily processing them, there remains only one explanation for the vacancy crisis we face today—plain, old-fashioned, partisan obstruction. The Democrats are manipulating this process at every stage, using the very tactics that they have loudly condemned in the past to make confirmations as difficult and time-consuming as possible.

Even in politics, actions speak louder than words. In July 2012, when there were 76 judicial vacancies, Chairman LEAHY said that "we should be doing better." Today, with nearly twice as many vacancies, I challenge my Democratic colleagues to put actions to those words.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concern about the continued deterioration of the situation in Yemen and to share my views about the resolution that is currently before us.

The military conflict going on in Yemen has gone on for far too long and

has affected tens of millions of civilians who face displacement, famine, and a widespread cholera outbreak. According to the United Nations, more than 15,000 Yemenis have been killed or injured since the war began in March of 2015. The humanitarian situation there has been described as the worst in the world, with more than two-thirds of Yemen's approximately 29 million people facing severe food shortages. An outbreak of cholera has already infected at least 1 million people, marking the worst such outbreak in decades.

Continued instability in Yemen also benefits our adversaries. While we have sought to maintain pressure on al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, or AQAP, and ISIS, the lack of a functioning government or state security apparatus inhibits our ability to go after these groups. Additionally, it is clear that Iran has taken advantage of the current situation to spread its malign influence and provide lethal support to the Houthis, thereby further undermining regional stability and security.

Unfortunately, we have yet to hear any strategy from the administration as to how they would propose to use U.S. diplomatic leadership to help bring about an end to the conflict in Yemen. We still do not have an Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, and occasional visits by White House officials are not a replacement for sustained diplomatic efforts by our experts in the Foreign Service. I am encouraged, though, by the appointment of a new United Nations Special Envoy to Yemen, Martin Griffiths, and hope that the U.S. Government will seek to support his efforts wherever possible.

While the primary conflict in Yemen is between an Iranian-backed Houthi insurgency and a Saudi-led coalition, the United States is involved.

As stated in a letter sent by Secretary Mattis to congressional leadership last week, "Since 2015, the United States has provided limited support to Saudi-led coalition military operations to restore the U.N.-recognized government of Yemen and preserve Saudi territorial integrity from Houthi aligned forces in Yemen." Moreover, according to Secretary Mattis, U.S. forces are not authorized to use force against the Houthis but do support the Saudi-led coalition with "intelligence sharing, military advice, and logistical support, including air-to-air refueling."

Last week, the commander of U.S. Central Command, General Votel, testified before the Armed Services Committee that our support to the Saudi-led coalition is "primarily defensive" in nature and focused on the Iranian-supported ballistic missile threat to Saudi Arabia that originates in Yemen, maritime threats to international shipping in the Bab el Mandeb Strait and the Red Sea, the defense of Saudi Arabia's southern border, and counterterrorism.

However, General Votel also acknowledged that when the United States provides aerial refueling to coalition aircraft, we do not know where those aircraft then go; therefore, they could be going to conduct offensive strikes against Houthi targets, which may result in civilian casualties, which is a major concern for me. Even more troubling, if these aircraft went to conduct strikes against targets outside of Yemen, the United States would be complicit in a much more dangerous and provocative activity.

I have significant concerns about persistent reports of civilian casualties and damage to civilian infrastructure caused by the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen. Far too many of the strikes by the coalition have killed or injured civilians and resulted in the destruction of infrastructure needed to provide basic services to the population, thereby exacerbating the humanitarian crisis.

It is also clear that more must be done by both the coalition and the Houthis to facilitate the flow of humanitarian aid into and throughout Yemen. The United Nations and humanitarian organizations continue to express concern about their ability to access seaports and airports and difficulties in distributing aid to vulnerable populations once it is inside the country.

It is important that shipments into Yemen be subject to inspection by the U.N. Verification and Inspection Mechanism to help prevent the transit of illicit materials in violation of the U.N. arms embargo, but all parties to the conflict in Yemen have a responsibility, including under international humanitarian law, to allow access to aid by those in need.

We are faced with a very difficult set of issues, and I certainly understand and commend my colleagues, Senators SANDERS, MURPHY, and LEE, for bringing this issue to the floor. The Saudi-led coalition clearly must do more to end this war and must prosecute this war in a way that limits civilian casualties and the humanitarian crises. On the other hand, Saudi Arabia and the United Emirates, or UAE, remain important partners for the United States, and we share many common interests in the region, including in the fight against al-Qaida, ISIS, and other violent extremist groups.

The resolution before us would establish a blanket prohibition on all assistance to the Saudi-led coalition except for the purposes of countering al-Qaida and associated forces. While I understand the argument for this approach, I believe it would prevent us from exerting influence to limit and hopefully end the conflict. Indeed, it may even cause harm as both sides potentially act more violently.

We can and should engage if there is a possibility that we can help minimize

collateral damage by providing the coalition with training and advice on best practices. General Votel testified last week that U.S. assistance has contributed to improvement by the coalition on these issues. Specifically, the Department of Defense told us that engagement by U.S. military personnel has resulted in the introduction of a "no-strike" list. That is a process which actually puts targets off-limits and ensures that pilots and others understand those targets. They also caused a cessation—an ending—of the use of cluster munitions by Saudi-led forces and the formation of a body to investigate noncombatant casualties. These are positive steps, but it is clear that much more must be done to minimize the impact of the war on Yemeni civilians. I support our continued engagement for that purpose.

Both Saudi Arabia and the UAE face a significant threat from Houthi rebels armed with ballistic missiles, apparently with the technical assistance of the Iranians. There have reportedly been dozens of attacks against Saudi Arabia since the spring of 2015, including against civilian targets like the international airport in Riyadh, which was attacked in December. I strongly support the right of our partners to defend themselves against these threats and believe that continued sharing of U.S. intelligence for defensive purposes is appropriate, especially in light of the fact that tens of thousands of U.S. civilians, military, and diplomatic personnel also face these threats while living and working in the region around Riyadh and throughout Saudi Arabia.

I also have concerns that ending all support to the Saudi-led coalition may cause the conflict to escalate. As Secretary Mattis wrote to congressional leadership this past week, restrictions on our "limited U.S. military support could increase civilian casualties, jeopardize cooperation with our partners on counterterrorism, and reduce our influence with the Saudis—all of which would further exacerbate the situation and humanitarian crisis." Secretary Mattis also expressed concern that withdrawal of our support would "embolden Iran to increase its support to the Houthis, enabling further ballistic missile strikes on Saudi Arabia and threatening vital shipping lanes in the Red Sea, thereby raising the risk of a regional conflict."

Therefore, I believe that support by the U.S. military of the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen should not be absolutely prohibited but should be explicitly limited to the following objectives: No. 1, enabling counterterrorism operations against al-Qaida and ISIS; No. 2, defending the territorial integrity of Saudi Arabia and the UAE, including against ballistic missile threats; No. 3, preserving freedom of navigation in the maritime environment around Yemen; and No. 4, enhancing the training and

professionalism of their armed forces, with a primary focus on adherence to the law of armed conflict and prevention of civilian casualties.

Our support for the Saudi-led coalition needs to be considered in a thoughtful and deliberate manner. From a policy perspective, we should distinguish between assistance that is provided for defensive or noncombat purposes and that which could be used to enable offensive military operations in the Yemeni civil war.

Let me be clear. I am not in favor of giving the Saudi-led coalition a blank check. In fact, I believe we should no longer provide aerial refueling assistance unless it is used to enable aircraft conducting counterterrorism missions pursuant to the 2001 authorization for use of military force or countering specific identified threats to Saudi territorial integrity. Indeed, use of our military assets to support Saudi-led coalition efforts or the efforts of other nations to conduct other operations outside this narrow scope would raise very serious legal questions.

Given its comprehensive approach, I do not believe the Sanders resolution is the appropriate vehicle for these issues to receive the careful and deliberate consideration they are due. I understand the Foreign Relations Committee may soon take up this issue, and I urge them to do that. I look forward to engaging further in those discussions when presented with the opportunity.

The administration must make clear to both the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis that there is no military solution to this conflict and that the time has come to reach a negotiated settlement. Congress also has an important role in setting the policy framework for the use of U.S. Armed Forces overseas and ensuring that U.S. military capabilities are only used for authorized purposes. At the same time, we should not take action that would unduly restrict our engagement with partners for legitimate purposes and, in doing so, undermine our ability to help bring an end to the conflict in Yemen, ease civilian suffering, and defend the territorial integrity of our partners.

With that Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is about time we had a debate, if only for a few hours, on the participation of the U.S. military in the civil war in Yemen. Frankly, I cannot comprehend nor am I able to explain to my Vermont constituents the ongoing involvement of U.S. troops in support of the Saudi-led coalition as it flies U.S.-origin planes and drops U.S.-made bombs—purchased at a discount thanks to American taxpayers—amid continued reports of indiscriminate targeting and horrific civilian casualties.

These are not isolated incidents in Yemen. They have occurred time after

time over the past 3 years. Houses, health clinics, and markets are destroyed, millions of people uprooted from their homes. Whether extreme negligence or intentional and a war crime, the effect is the same for those who are killed, wounded, or displaced. There is no evidence that U.S. military involvement nor the recurrent appeals of international humanitarian and human rights organizations has improved the situation.

This is not just a matter of the carnage we have observed. It is that we are supporting these military operations at all. Only Congress has the power to declare war, and the ongoing participation of U.S. forces in the Saudi-led coalition's war against the Houthis in Yemen clearly meets the definition of the "introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities" under the War Powers Resolution. The War Powers Resolution also authorizes Congress to direct the removal of U.S. forces if their introduction has not been authorized by law, as is the case in the war against the Houthis.

That is why I support the resolution before us, S.J. Res. 54, which would exercise Congress's prerogative to limit the involvement of U.S. forces, in this case to the narrow purpose of combating al-Qaida, which does serve our national security interests in the region. I recognize, as some others have pointed out, that the war in Yemen is part of a larger conflict of interests and ideology between Iran and Saudi Arabia. If there are other legitimate and compelling national security interests that justify the deployment of U.S. forces in that region, let us debate them.

We should also be doing more to demand greater transparency and accountability for civilian casualties in Yemen, regardless of the context in which they occur. If the Saudis want U.S.-taxpayer subsidies, they need to focus their efforts on terrorists, take effective steps to minimize civilian casualties, and credibly investigate such casualties when they occur.

I have heard Senators who oppose this resolution say they intend to hold hearings and focus more attention on what is happening in Yemen. I welcome that, but I have to wonder why it has taken so long and whether anything will change as a result. Yemen has been a humanitarian disaster for years, and there is no end in sight. The Foreign Relations Committee should have held hearings and voted to invoke the War Powers Resolution when the U.S. military first became involved in Yemen.

This is not a new crisis, and other than the increasing toll of death and destruction, the facts on the ground have not materially changed. The Saudis have seemingly done nothing to improve the conduct of their air force in Yemen.

The least we can do is support this sensible resolution to put an end to the unauthorized involvement of the U.S. military in this civil war, as the War Powers Resolution compels us to do. The alternative is conceding unchecked power to the executive branch to use U.S. troops in support of any armed conflict, without congressional debate or authorization. That is just what the War Powers Resolution was designed to prevent. It is time to live up to the responsibility entrusted to us in the Constitution. Only Congress can declare war. If we are unwilling to do so, we have no business asking the men and women of the U.S. military to risk their lives in Yemen today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Mr. President. As you know, our Chamber is focused on a heavy subject at the moment—human trafficking.

An estimated 25 million people are victims of human trafficking all around the world. Smuggling people for forced labor and sex slavery is a heinous crime. It is the kind of crime that we tend to think happens in some far-off place, but these atrocities are happening all across the globe—sadly, including, unfortunately, here in the United States. In fact, human trafficking appears to be on the rise in our country, according to data released by Polaris, which shows a 13-percent jump in cases reported to the help lines it runs.

Since Polaris began operating over 10 years ago, its help lines have received reports of 203 cases of human trafficking from my home State of Arkansas. Almost half of those were reported in the last 2 years. Fortunately, our State is fighting back. Last year, Arkansas legislators approved a law requiring State-licensed truckers to be trained in spotting the red flags of human trafficking. Using their position on the road, these drivers have the tools to recognize the signs of human trafficking and alert the authorities to any suspicious activity.

Congress is also increasing its efforts to combat human trafficking. In September, the Senate unanimously passed two pieces of legislation to renew existing programs in support of survivors and help bring perpetrators of these horrific crimes to justice.

The Abolish Human Trafficking Act provides more resources to law enforcement in its effort to combat human trafficking and establishes human trafficking justice coordinators at every U.S. attorney's office and at the Department of Justice. In addition, the legislation helps survivors rebuild their lives by extending the Department of Justice Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act reauthorizes key programs to help

survivors in their recovery, as well as offering specialized training on human trafficking to judges and Federal investigators.

We have made progress, but more needs to be done, and the legislation on the floor this week will help by giving law enforcement and prosecutors additional tools to crack down on crimes involving exploitation of the vulnerable. It will help us to take on nefarious actors like backpage, which hid behind the Communications Decency Act to avoid prosecution for trafficking crimes.

It is time to rip the cover away from these bad actors. We are going to do that by making narrowly crafted changes to the law to ensure that websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking online are held accountable. “Knowingly” is the keyword here.

During the last session of Congress, the Homeland Security Committee, under the leadership of Senators PORTMAN, MCCASKILL, and JOHNSON, uncovered just how much backpage knew. It was a lot. In fact, backpage’s operators helped customers modify their ads to hide references to underage prostitutes. I think we can all agree that rises to the threshold of knowingly facilitating sex trafficking online.

Should this bill pass—and I believe it will in a very bipartisan way—these bad actors will not be able to fade quietly into the dark, as we are going to give State attorneys general the authority to prosecute websites that violate sex trafficking laws. That is why I support this bill. That is why I cosponsored similar legislation here in the Senate. It is also why I supported the inclusion of at least \$90 million in Federal funding to combat human trafficking. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I will continue to support funding for these important programs, and I look forward to the Senate’s completing work on fiscal year 2018 funding bills.

I am pleased to see all levels of government lending their support to help fight this crime. Together we can end this attack on human rights in our State, our country, and around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in light of the vote later today on the Sanders-Lee-Murphy legislation, or S.J. Res. 54, I rise today to discuss the situation in Yemen and the path forward. As many know, over the last year I have focused persistently on the humanitarian crisis in Yemen.

My activities have been manifold. I have issued letters to the administration and the Saudi Government, an administration nomination, hearings, a Senate resolution, and countless meetings, briefings, and phone calls with

senior administration officials, Saudi officials, and leaders of the NGO community.

My goal? My goal has been to address impediments to the delivery of humanitarian assistance—food, fuel, and medicine—into the country of Yemen.

Now, we have seen some progress, and I have been encouraged by this. The USAID-funded World Food Programme cranes have been delivered, and the Red Sea ports have been opened. According to the United Nations, since the ports were open, we have seen more than 884,000 metric tons of food and more than 410,000 metric tons of fuel delivered to the ports of Hodeidah and Saleef alone.

Of course, we understand the importance of the food. But why is the fuel so important? Well, without the fuel, you can’t run the water treatment facilities and, therefore, the cholera epidemic that has broken out in Yemen will only get worse. So 884,000 metric tons of food and more than 410,000 metric tons of fuel have resulted in the saving of countless of lives in Yemen.

Look, there is a continued humanitarian crisis in Yemen. A lot of problems persist, and we need to address those. We have seen progress with respect to the delivery of some of the humanitarian assistance I mentioned, but commercial and humanitarian vessels have been offloading their lifesaving cargo less quickly than we would like. So there is a lot left for us to do.

The National Security Council presidential statement issued on March 15 related to Yemen indicated that there are still over 22 million people in need of humanitarian assistance. This is the world’s largest humanitarian disaster. The risk of famine persists for millions of Yemenis.

The Saudi-led coalition continues, unfortunately, to impose unacceptable delays on ships carrying food and fuel into Yemeni ports. According to the U.N., the Saudi-led coalition caused 5.9 days of additional delay in the month of February on ships going to the major ports of Hodeidah and Saleef. Those delays continue this month.

Now, why does this matter? Well, this matters, of course, because we don’t want people to suffer. It is inconsistent with our basic human values. It is inconsistent with what we Americans believe. When people suffer, it also exacerbates a national security crisis. It facilitates radicalization.

In fact, last week I chaired a Foreign Relations Committee subcommittee on this very topic—the connection between food insecurity, specifically, and the instability or radicalization of those who are food insecure. The hearing demonstrated that there is now a strong, evidentiary, and academic basis to conclude that it is in America’s clear national security interest to address food insecurity, as well as a lack of fuel and medicine. A retired Marine

Corps general testified at that hearing, Lieutenant General Castellaw. I thought he put it succinctly. He said: “Food crises [can] grow terrorists.” Well, we have seen a lot of terrorists grown in Yemen in recent years.

The longer the civil war persists in Yemen, the worse the humanitarian crisis will grow. This will radicalize yet more people and provide even further opportunities to Iran to undermine our national security interests and those of our partners.

What are our objectives in Yemen? That is a fair question. It is one that all of us as policymakers and, really, all Americans ought to be asking. Well, consistent with our humanitarian principles and our national security interests, I believe we have to continue to pursue two primary objectives. First, we want to address the largest humanitarian crisis in the world, and, second, we want to press all parties to end the civil war.

The real question here—because I don’t think there is agreement on those two primary objectives—is how can we best achieve these two goals? That takes me to the Sanders-Lee-Murphy resolution before us today. We, of course, need to fulfill our article I constitutional responsibilities. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution indicates that it is Congress’s responsibility to declare a war, and it is Congress’s responsibility to authorize the use of military force. I share Senator LEE’s conviction, Senator SANDERS’ conviction, and Senator MURPHY’s conviction that we need to take that responsibility very, very seriously. This is why I introduced an authorization for the use of military force last year. It is also why I have been working with Chairman CORKER of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator KAINE, and other members of the committee to break a logjam in negotiations—some principled disagreements that exist with respect to what the authorization for the use of military force should look like moving forward.

We have finalized an updated AUMF against Islamic terrorist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS that will merit consideration in coming weeks. In fact, we heard from Chairman CORKER. He has now offered a public assurance that there will be hearings on the issue of authorizing military force and there will be marking-up and reporting of legislation so that this 17-year-old authorization for the use of military force can be re-upped. My own view is that whatever one thinks of the legal merits of this long war under the authorizations given in 2001 and 2002, the further away we get from that point in time, where a past Congress authorized force, the more attenuated that argument is and the less power it has. Moreover, we owe it to the men and women in uniform to consistently debate our involvement in overseas conflicts. So I commend the chairman for

agreeing with other members of the committee that we need to have hearings and to pass legislation specifically on this matter through the committee of jurisdiction through what we call regular order.

Let me share with those who are watching my remarks here today what I believe the wrong approach is. I believe S.J. Res. 54 is the wrong approach. That resolution sidesteps the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It doesn't lead to the sort of fulsome debate. It doesn't allow us to hear from professional witnesses and members of the administration the way a formal committee hearing and markup would allow.

Moreover, the legislation is never going to become law. It will never become law. It is an exercise in messaging. Now, messaging is important. We need to make the argument, and I respect my colleagues for making their principled arguments. They are strong in conviction, and they make each of them quite articulately. But the administration has already indicated that the President wouldn't sign this into law. The administration has already indicated that they do not regard, under the law, that we are engaging in hostilities, which is required to trigger the law they have invoked. So this will never become law.

Moreover, we most certainly will not be overriding a Presidential veto should this pass out of the Senate and the House and go to the President, whereupon he would veto it. So this will never become law.

The last reason I think S.J. Res. 54 is the wrong approach is because it will not achieve our shared objectives. It would fail to achieve its stated objective because the administration rejects the premise of the Sanders-Lee legislation related to hostilities, as I have already stated.

So there is a better approach. Rather than just criticizing S.J. Res. 54—and let me be careful to distinguish between criticizing the legislation that we will be voting on later and my colleagues, because I have great respect for my colleagues and their motives. I wanted to play a more constructive role in this debate. So I wanted to introduce legislation that would provide leverage to pressure the Saudis to actually end the civil war in Yemen and to actually improve the humanitarian situation. At the same time, we have to acknowledge and respond to Iran's malign behavior in Yemen, as well as the presence in Yemen of ISIS and AQAP—al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. This is arguably the most aggressive and most dangerous al-Qaida franchise in the world. We also have to recognize Saudi Arabia's legitimate right to not have ballistic missiles launched into their cities. This is our partner.

So I wanted to develop a bipartisan compromise that could actually pass

out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, be passed by both Chambers, and signed by the President of the United States. I think we are well on our way to doing that. I wanted to develop legislation that would actually further its stated purpose and our objectives in Yemen—ending the civil war and addressing the humanitarian crisis.

So that is why I and Senator SHAHEEN introduced S.J. Res. 55 on March 8. Now, since then, we worked with the committee, we have worked with members of both parties, and we have worked with the administration and outside experts to further refine our legislation, making numerous substantive changes and principled compromises.

The current version of our legislation would require the Department of State to certify in an unclassified and written report that Saudi Arabia is undertaking the following: No. 1, an urgent and good-faith effort to conduct diplomatic negotiations to end the civil war in Yemen; No. 2, appropriate measures to alleviate the humanitarian crisis in Yemen by increasing access for Yemenis to food, fuel, and medicine, including through Yemen's Red Sea ports, the airport in Sana'a, and external border crossings with Saudi Arabia; and, No. 3, demonstrable action to reduce the risk of harm to civilians and civilian infrastructure resulting from its military operations in Yemen, including by complying with applicable agreements and laws regulating the use of cluster munitions and other defense articles and services purchased or transferred from the United States.

Now, if the Department of State can't make that certification, then U.S. air refueling missions, which are essential to the Saudi coalition's operations, would end. They would be prohibited under our law. Given the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and our national security interests there, I appreciate Chairman CORKER's commitment today to mark up Yemen legislation in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when we return from recess in April.

So based on this reasoning, which I have laid out quite clearly here today, I plan to oppose the Sanders-Lee-Murphy legislation today. Instead, I will support legislation like ours that could actually become law and would provide the administration the leverage they need to result in real change in Yemen.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I note that the Senator who was to be on the floor is not, so I ask to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to participate in the discussion on the conflict in Yemen.

In 2015, I received a phone call from a Saudi official informing me that the kingdom was about to take military action in Yemen. The official said the conflict would not last long. They would launch airstrikes to push the Houthis out of Sana'a, restore Hadi to power, and broker a political compromise. That was nearly 3 years ago, and the conflict has since grown into the world's worst humanitarian disaster.

More than 10,000 civilians have died, and more than 40,000 have been wounded. More than half of Yemen's healthcare facilities have been destroyed. Three-quarters of the population—almost 22 million people—need humanitarian assistance. Eleven million require urgent assistance to survive, which means they are close to starvation.

The situation for children is especially dire: 1.8 million children under the age of 5 are malnourished. Of that, more than 400,000 are so malnourished that they are now 10 times more likely to die.

On top of the bloodshed and famine, the people of Yemen are facing a horrific outbreak of cholera. More than 1 million cases of cholera have been reported, potentially the worst cholera outbreak in world history. More than 2,200 people have died from it, almost one-third of whom are children. Cholera has spread because more than 80 percent of the population lack clean drinking water.

We can't turn away from suffering because we are a party to this conflict. The United States is providing intelligence, military advice, logistical support, and aerial refueling to Saudi Arabia. The fact is, we are enabling a major proxy war between Saudi Arabia and Iran.

We do all that despite there being no military solution. This has not been a brief war. It has turned into a major war that must end. The longer we permit suffering to continue, the more innocent men, women, and children are going to die. Instead of facilitating endless fighting, we should be pushing for reconciliation.

I have personally urged Saudi and Iranian officials to meet to discuss their differences. To my great disappointment, they have refused to do so. Iran is expanding its influence across the Middle East. It continues to arm Hezbollah, back President Assad in Syria, and support the Houthis. Saudi Arabia and its partners will not back down. Just last week, Crown Prince Salman said his nation would pursue the same nuclear capabilities as Iran. What does that say to us?

Their fight in Yemen offers no military solution. Only a political resolution will end this miserable war.

It is time we separate ourselves from this bloodshed. The United States must make it clear that we will not continue

to support unending conflict. That is why I support the Sanders-Lee resolution, which would require the United States to stop refueling Saudi and Emirati aircraft.

Now, this seems like just a small step, and it certainly will not immediately end the war, but it is a deeply symbolic one. This resolution will send a clear message that we will no longer enable this proxy war.

There is no reason a diplomatic solution can't be found to end this violence, and a strong push for reconciliation will save the lives of thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children in Yemen, but that peace is only achievable if we speak with one voice and pass the Sanders-Lee resolution, otherwise we will continue to enable this barbaric war.

Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor with a series of my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Democratic side to enter into a colloquy about this administration's chaotic and incoherent approach to foreign policy—an approach that has left our allies confused and our adversaries emboldened and undermines the standing of the United States on the global stage.

To be fair, the President's own national security strategy echoes decades of bipartisan recognition that the founding values of the United States—democracy, the rule of law—should continue to drive our foreign policy. Yet the President himself has shown a fundamental disrespect for these very principles: declining to publicly champion the importance of human rights and good governance, refusing to condemn dictators around the world who brutally repress their own citizens, sow instability across the world, or even attack those who attack the United States—something I fear will ultimately weaken our ability to promote the security and prosperity of all Americans.

Last week's unceremonious firing of our Nation's top diplomat was the President's latest and brazen example of disrespect for the role of diplomacy, diplomats, and of the State Department itself. While I had my differences with Secretary Tillerson, the reality is, it does not serve the interests of the United States when the President undermines his top diplomat on major foreign policy initiatives, from the crisis in the gulf to, ironically, his outreach to North Koreans.

Secretary Tillerson's legacy will be shaped not just by the President's misguided efforts but also his own ill-advised attempt to dismantle the State Department, leaving the United States without key voices to advance our interests around the world.

The administration has failed to even nominate critical, high-level positions—Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries—leaving a void of empowered voices. Meanwhile, there are gaping vacancies in some of the world's most troubled regions. For example, as we confront a nuclear-armed North Korea, the President has yet to nominate an ambassador to South Korea, our critical ally on the peninsula—one that has historically relied upon American assurances and allegiance.

Similarly, the President took more than a year to nominate an Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. The impact of these vacancies was on full display last week when the President—without the knowledge of his top diplomat—announced a meeting with North Korean Dictator Kim Jong Un, an assertion that was then ultimately walked back and modified by his Secretary of Defense and his White House Press Secretary.

In the Middle East, as the President continues to send more and more American troops and we face an emboldened Iranian regime creeping further into Syria, facilitated by the Kremlin's military support, he has yet to appoint Ambassadors to consequential posts, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar, Turkey, and Jordan, which has proved a critical partner in our fight against terrorism in the region and in supporting refugees—two essential components of U.S. policy in the Middle East.

How can we possibly expect to assert American leadership and secure our interests with these posts unfilled and with no empowered individuals at the Department itself? Under the President's watch, the number of career Ambassadors, which is basically the State Department's equivalent to four-star generals at the Department of Defense, has plummeted by 60 percent. If we were shedding four-star generals this quickly, we would be sounding the alarm of a national security crisis.

We have just one career-level Ambassador left at the State Department. Let me say that again: One career-level Ambassador left, and this administration has seen fit to ship him off to an academic institution rather than to engage him in frontline diplomacy.

We are witnessing a mass exodus of experienced diplomatic and security professionals who have dedicated their lives to this country. This is a forced exodus, and I am deeply alarmed to see reports revealing what we have feared for some time.

We just started to learn about disturbing efforts to purge the Broadcasting Board of Governors and impose a partisan editorial voice on U.S. international media. Alarmingly, last week, press reports highlighted emails that provided concrete evidence of the administration's efforts to effectively purge the Department of anyone they

do not believe would be a purist for the President's vision. Emails showed political leadership describing some civil servants as “turncoats, leakers, and troublemakers.”

The conversations showed senior political appointees working with outside organizations engaged in vicious smear campaigns against career civil servants and dismissing death threats against some of these same career officials. Diplomats who have served Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, who have spent their careers working to build a more prosperous and secure world so a Commander in Chief would not have to send our sons and daughters into war.

This is America. Our government functions because of apolitical civil servants across agencies who dedicate their lives to advance the interests of their fellow citizens, from distributing Social Security checks to negotiating nuclear arms treaties. It is outrageous. It is disgraceful. It is dangerous.

We face challenges from every corner of the globe. We simply cannot confront them if we are not present, and we cannot overcome these challenges when the President himself does not acknowledge them.

As China's political leadership consolidates power and as the country expands into the South China Sea and pursues an aggressive economic agenda around the world, the President, for his part, praises these dictatorial moves. Meanwhile, he has failed on his promise to deliver better trade deals.

In Latin America, while the President calls our neighbors to the south drug dealers, criminals, and rapists, China is expanding its economic and cultural presence in our own backyard.

In Mexico, one of our most integral bilateral partners—Mexico is the second largest market for U.S. goods and services in the world—we will soon lose our Ambassador, as we hear about how the Russian Government is seeking to interfere in their upcoming elections.

When it comes to Russia, again and again, the President's own intelligence officials have made clear that the Russian Government not only meddled in our election in 2016 but continues its interference in the American political system to this day. Yet the President refuses—refuses—to condemn Vladimir Putin or impose congressionally mandated sanctions to hold them accountable for their attack on the United States. I understand today he congratulated him on his “election.” That is not an election. Putin is seeking to be a czar, not to be a President.

The Russian Government continues its military aggression in the Ukraine and its disinformation campaigns across Europe.

In the Middle East, it continues to enable Bashar al-Assad's slaughter of innocent civilians and Iran's efforts to expand its presence and threaten

Israel. In a brazen move this month, the Kremlin used an unlawful chemical agent to commit murder on British soil, showing how far they will go if they are unchecked.

Beyond these great power threats, we must also confront nonstate actors and new tools designed specifically to destabilize free and democratic societies.

We must demand more information to learn about Cambridge Analytica and the efforts of this organization to exploit private information from social media users across the world to promote particular political agendas.

The only way to confront old and emerging threats is to stand united with our allies. We have spent decades building these alliances based on mutual respect, accountability, and vigorous engagement in the international institutions and security agreements that are essential to promoting peace and security around the world. We ourselves must be a reliable ally and partner. We must speak with an authoritative voice. We must have our national security agencies executing clear, integrated, coherent strategies.

The President himself must champion the fundamental ideas that have made America secure and prosperous: democracy, human rights, free expression—values we champion not because simply they are right but because they are also strategic. We stand for these values because, globally, governments that uphold the rule of law, that respect human rights and freedom of expression, that welcome economic competition—these are the nations that form America's most reliable allies, most prosperous economic partners, and most strategic security relations.

Let me close with this: The American people and the institutions we have built remain resilient. Now more than ever, Congress must exercise its role as a coequal branch of government when it comes to our foreign policy. We need Republicans and Democrats in Congress to uphold our duty to conduct oversight, to ensure that bipartisan values that have guided American foreign policy for decades can be executed by an experienced, empowered, fully funded and fully staffed State Department.

Together, we must ensure that our reputation as a leader of nations is not eroded by a President and an administration that thus far, in my view, far from putting America first, threaten to leave America isolated and behind. That is our challenge. That is our choice. I appreciate my colleagues who join us in this regard.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I would like to say how glad I am to have Senator MENENDEZ back in the saddle as our ranking member on Foreign Rela-

tions, and I thank him so much for his speech and for his leadership on our very important committee.

I join my colleagues from the Foreign Relations Committee in their critique of President Trump's handling—or maybe we would call it mis-handling—of foreign policy. I am most concerned about how U.S. power, prestige, and diplomacy have been weakened across the world as a direct result of this President. The United States has stood as a world leader of liberal democracy, the rule of law, and human values since the end of World War II. Our actions abroad have not always been perfect, but over the decades, we have earned the world's respect because we have acted on our principles.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, authoritarian regimes were in retreat. Today, authoritarianism is back on the march. The President himself even cheers them on, praising Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, and others who fashion themselves President for life of one-party, repressive regimes.

In this President's short but raucous and chaotic tenure, he has diminished our standing within the world community by grossly offending other nations and their leaders, including many of our closest allies, by abruptly changing foreign policy with no clear policy basis, and by denigrating countries and an entire continent with comments laced with racism. The President issues conflicting messages. World leaders and international diplomats cannot rely on his word or his tweets. He has plenty of criticism for our friends and allies but little for strongmen like Vladimir Putin. The world is alarmed. It is less stable under this Presidency.

Secretary Tillerson had disagreements with the President, and early on, the President undercut and sidelined him. The day before Mr. Tillerson was shown the door, the Secretary broke with the White House by directly pointing the finger at Russia for using a chemical weapon on the ex-British spy in his homeland, and this incident shows that the President will not tolerate daylight between his own corrupt political beliefs and the views of his lieutenants.

During confirmation hearings for Mr. Pompeo, our committee must find out whether he will hold fast to traditional American values or bend to the President's servility to Vladimir Putin and other autocrats around the world.

The President's own diplomacy has been chaotic and dangerous. He has alienated one of our closest friends and biggest trading partners—the country of Mexico. He insists that Mexico will pay for this offensive wall that he says is necessary to keep out rapists and criminals.

The President has imperiled our relationships with both Mexico and Canada with his threats to tear up NAFTA, which he seems to say over and over

again. In my home State of New Mexico, border communities rely on the integrated border, and border communities rely on the economy that has been built up over the last 24 years. We have a trade surplus with Mexico. NAFTA negotiations continue, but there has been a chill on economic activity in States like New Mexico, Texas, California, and Arizona.

The President has shaken the world with his grade-school taunts about nuclear weapons—a deadly serious subject. He chided Secretary Tillerson that talking to North Korea won't work, undercutting the Secretary once again, and then suddenly agreed to meet and even negotiate with Kim Jong Un without the careful diplomatic work needed to ensure success. I support diplomacy as the best solution, but rash diplomacy can easily lead to rash wars, and impulsive decision-making is extremely risky.

I hope the President seriously studies the issues between now and any meeting, brings an experienced team, and sets realistic and achievable goals for any negotiation. He must understand that diplomatic failure is potentially catastrophic. A war would likely result in 20,000 casualties a day in the opening week, and Secretary Mattis has warned that there would be, in his words, “the worst kind of fighting in people's lifetimes.”

I do not trust this President to follow the constitutional process required to go to war. That is why I am cosponsoring S. 2047, prohibiting any President from launching a preemptive strike on North Korea. Starting a war with North Korea would only undermine the security of the United States and our regional allies and should not be done without approval of the American people through the Congress.

The President's attitude toward Russia and Vladimir Putin complicates our ability to gain support for our efforts overseas. Russia interfered with our democracy and continues to interfere in the affairs of our allies.

There is no good explanation why he has not directed our Nation's security agencies to take all possible action in response to Russia's interference with the 2016 election, and increasingly we see in the special counsel's investigation how Russia is playing a bigger and bigger part. There is no reason why this administration took so long to begin to implement Congress's sanctions against Russia. Special Counsel Mueller's investigation has already produced indictments against Russians and key officials from President Trump's campaign, but the President himself does not send the message to deter future interference by Russia. The President's failure to fight back, his resistance to sanctioning the Russians, and his subservience to Putin betray the national trust.

The President's hostility toward Iran's agreement to disarm its nuclear

weapons program is mind-boggling. Director Pompeo reportedly shares this hostility. But just last week, the commander of U.S. Central Command, Army GEN Joseph Votel, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Iran deal is in our national interest. Defense Secretary Mattis and the Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, Gen. Joseph Dunford, also agree. Our close allies—also signatories to the deal—agree it is in the international community's interests.

This is not the United States the world has come to know, rely upon, and believe in. The President's failure to protect our national interest weakens our position within the world community.

Morale at the State Department is suffering as our foreign policy suffers. Any new Secretary of State must work to reverse this. This Congress and the world have watched as the President and the Secretary of State have hollowed out the State Department.

Highly experienced and talented Foreign Service officers have been fired, pushed out, reassigned to menial tasks, and ignored. Many senior diplomats have just packed up and left. Nicholas Burns and Ryan Crocker, who served as Ambassadors in both Republican and Democratic administrations, have warned that "we are witnessing the most significant departure of diplomatic talent in generations." On top of retirements, the number of people who took the Foreign Service exam dropped by more than half between 2016 and 2017. There is real concern that this will have a lasting and negative impact long after the Trump administration.

Director Pompeo will need to answer tough questions during confirmation: Will he impose congressionally mandated sanctions on Russia? What actions will be taken to counter Russia's ongoing cyber warfare? We are on the razor's edge with North Korea. As chief diplomat, does he support a preemptive strike against North Korea? What will he do to avoid a disaster? Does he agree with our military leaders about staying in the Iran denuclearization deal? Will he certify Iranian compliance if the facts show compliance? Does he support the President's proposal to decimate the State Department's budget? Will he continue Secretary Tillerson's plan to decrease staff by 8 percent? What will he do to recover agency morale, which we hear over and over is at an alltime low? Will he stand up to this President when long-held American values are at stake?

Director Pompeo will need to prove to the Senate that he will put the State Department and the U.S. standing in the world back on track. Our international partners do not view the United States as the reliable and strong partner they had in the past. Dictatorships and harsh regimes are emboldened by our lack of attention to free speech and human rights.

President Ronald Reagan said at the Berlin Wall that "the totalitarian world produces backwardness because it does such violence to the spirit, thwarting the human impulse to create, to enjoy, to worship."

Dictators now smirk and echo our President, saying "fake news" about any news outlet that shines a light on their indiscretions. Leaders like Vladimir Putin are emboldened to continue to try to undermine our democracy and sow conflict and division within the American public.

The world is less stable without a strong, principled United States to lead. It is imperative that the United States preserve and strengthen its diplomatic power, not sabotage it.

With lack of leadership in the executive branch, Congress must step up, particularly the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As I said at the beginning, I am so pleased that Senator MENENDEZ is back to work with Senator CORKER to try to assert the role that Congress should be playing in these very important issues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Mexico, a key member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, for his insight, input, and continuing efforts to make sure we have a diplomacy in the world that ultimately pursues our national interests and security.

I understand there are some colleagues who are on their way to the floor—Senator SHAHEEN and Senator CARDIN. When they get here, we will hopefully have the Chair recognize them at that point.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator MENENDEZ, the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and my colleagues from the committee to talk about the importance of diplomacy as we look at the many challenges and conflicts that the world is facing right now.

From North Korea to Syria to Venezuela, there is really no end in sight for growing tensions and conflict in the world. Our military presence in Afghanistan is growing, we have approved lethal weapons for Ukraine, and we are forging a new partnership with NATO in Iraq. I support these efforts, but without a vigorous diplomatic capability to back our military, these ini-

tiatives risk failure. Sadly, instead of providing for a robust diplomatic corps, the administration has laid the foundation for a weakened U.S. hand on the international stage. Ultimately, this places Americans at risk. As Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis said, it forces his men and women to buy more bullets. Equally critical is the opportunity this provides for the great power conflicts to continue and to fester.

In November, I wrote to then-Secretary of State Rex Tillerson with the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, to express bipartisan concern over the administration's State Department hiring and promotion rates. I was told that the statistics we had received from the American Foreign Service Association were wrong and that the redesign of the State Department is not forcing anyone from their jobs.

Unfortunately, since that time, the State Department has lost even more precious, diplomatic talent. Congress has received a budget request that cuts even more personnel, and Foreign Service hiring and promotion rates continue to plummet. Last month, the highest ranking senior Foreign Service officer, Tom Shannon, announced that he, too, would be retiring. With his retirement, we will have no senior Foreign Service officers serving in the Department's leadership.

To date, we have only one active career ambassador who will serve in the entire State Department, and he is not even working in the building. Aside from the mass exodus of critical talent, we are allowing decades of investments made by our country and our diplomats to dwindle along with their ranks.

For the past 2 years, the Senate has also received abysmally low budget requests for the State Department and USAID.

Meanwhile, our problems aren't declining. The Kremlin continues to sow chaos across the globe. China increasingly flexes its muscle by buying strategic properties throughout Europe, Africa, and the Middle East. We are facing the greatest refugee crisis since World War II. Our intelligence community repeatedly warns that in this year's midterm elections, Russia will repeat another hybrid operation against the U.S. election. The obvious response to these challenges should not and cannot be to reduce the operational capacity and personnel of the lead agency that is responsible for alleviating global crises and promoting the United States' public face throughout the global outreach. That is the State Department.

Just this month, the New York Times revealed that the State Department had failed to spend any of the \$120 million allocated to fund the Global Engagement Center, which is aimed at countering state-led misinformation

campaigns. While America is under attack and Western democracies are under attack by misinformation campaigns, the State Department's response has been totally insufficient. It has been not to spend any of the money that Congress has allocated. It seems the administration is completely unaware of Special Counsel Mueller's indictment against Russia's Internet Research Agency.

I wish to spend a minute to read from excerpts of Mueller's indictment of 13 Russians, which came out last month. If we can look at this through objective eyes, it reminds us all of the threats we face because of Russia's interference.

This is stated in Mueller's document:

The [Internet Research Agency] is a Russian organization engaged in operations to interfere with elections and political processes.

I am quoting now from the indictment.

By in or around September 2016, the [Internet Research Agency's] monthly budget for Project Lakhta (its interference operation in the U.S.) exceeded 73 million Russian rubles (over 1,250,000 U.S. dollars).

They are spending, on a regular basis, 1.25 million in American dollars on this interference operation. For all of the people out there who think this is a partisan issue, this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue about interfering in our democracy. We can see how much they are willing to spend to do that.

Continuing to quote from the indictment:

Defendants and their co-conspirators also traveled, and attempted to travel, to the United States under false pretenses in order to collect intelligence for interference operations.

In or around 2016, the defendants and their co-conspirators also used, possessed and transferred, without legal authority, the social security numbers and dates of birth of real U.S. persons without those persons' knowledge or consent. Using these means of identification, defendants and their co-conspirators opened accounts at PayPal; created false means of identification, including fake driver's licenses; and posted on Internet Research Agency-controlled media accounts.

That is the Russian entity that is doing this.

Think about that. We know of the Kremlin's efforts to influence and use the American people to its own advantage. It is laid out pretty clearly in this indictment from Robert Mueller. Yet, somehow, the State Department is incapable of spending \$1 of the money that has been allocated by Congress toward countering Russia's most overt, public messages against the United States.

This is truly remarkable and, sadly, disappointing. The American people deserve better. Unfortunately, the Global Engagement Center is not alone in its lack of support from the administration. According to an analysis of data from the Office of Management and Budget, last year the State Depart-

ment spent just 79 percent of the money that Congress had authorized for the conduct of foreign affairs, the lowest level in the last 15 years.

Many of us on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would agree that most of our greatest global achievements—the Marshall Plan, the end of the Cold War, and the reduction of nuclear weapons—have been secured through diplomacy. Without it, I fear we will stray far from President Trump's ideal of brokering deals and instead cause irreparable damage to one of America's most precious resources—our diplomatic corps. That will harm this country's standing in the world and will have us viewed as weak by our great power adversaries.

The hollowing out of the State Department under this administration will cause irreparable damage to America's diplomatic efforts, and it will harm our country's standing in the world. Congress has to step in and make sure this doesn't happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and under the leadership of Senator MENENDEZ to point out that now—I guess it has been 14 months under President Trump's leadership—we have seen a dramatic shift in U.S. foreign policy that jeopardizes our standing globally and our national security. It starts with this administration's hollowing out the State Department and our capacity to participate in diplomacy.

As my colleagues have pointed out, so many vacancies exist today, unfilled by this administration. It is not the slowness of the Senate in confirming the positions. Many of these positions are not even positions that require Senate confirmation. We have seen an exodus of the most experienced people in the State Department, and the capacity of the State Department has been dramatically reduced. President Trump's budget speaks volumes about his support for diplomacy, as we see 30-percent reductions in the State Department budget being proposed by this administration.

The role of diplomacy in solving international issues is at an all-time low. There are many times I disagreed with Secretary Tillerson, but he at least was an independent voice in the White House as it related to certain issues on Iran or climate change. Now his voice has been silenced in this administration.

America first is America alone. It is the isolation of our country. We have seen that with the United States under President Trump and pulling out of the climate talks—the only country in the world. We see it now, potentially, in Iran, with reports that the President may unilaterally withdraw the United

States from the nuclear agreement, putting the United States as the outlier where we should be putting our attention on Iran. This is reflected in the Gallup polls, showing that the global opinion toward the United States has dropped dramatically. We see the President embracing oppressive leaders around the world, such as the leaders of Russia, China, Turkey, and Egypt, and embracing the autocratic practices of the President of the Philippines. Then, he attacks our closest allies, calling into question the transatlantic partnership.

Perhaps more than anything else, this administration has trampled on America's values. As Secretary Tillerson said early in this administration, America's interests will no longer be dictated by our values. That is not what the trademark of America is about. The President over and over has questioned universally what America stands for when he gave space to hate in his response to Charlottesville and when he implies that people who come to our country of certain religions or certain races are less favored than others. When he suggests he cannot have a conflict because he is President of the United States and does not have to divest of his business interests or when he says things that we know are not true and the President of the United States is standing up for matters that are outright lies, it diminishes the value and strength of America and our global leadership.

One issue I want to talk about in the time I have is that of ignoring one of our greatest national security threats—what Russia is doing to the United States under Mr. Putin. We just saw in Russia's most recent election that it was neither free nor fair. The opposition candidates were not allowed to participate, as they were handpicked by Mr. Putin, and he controlled the media. As the OSCE observed, the election took place in an overly controlled legal environment, and it had pressure on the critical voices of the Russian people.

We find a Russia today under Mr. Putin that is contrary to the values we stand for. In January, I authored a report on Russia, with the other Democrats on the committee, that talked about the asymmetric arsenal Mr. Putin uses that includes propaganda. We saw this on display when he was asked about what happened in the United States. According to the transcript, as reported by the Washington Post, these are Mr. Putin's own words: "Maybe they're not even Russians," in his talking about who attacked our country and referring to those behind the election interference. "Maybe they're Ukrainian, Tatars, Jews—just with Russian citizenship." He also speculated that France, Germany, or Asia might have interfered in the election or even Russians who were paid by the U.S. Government.

That type of rhetoric is straight out of the Soviet and Russian playbook to cast Jews and other minorities as undesirables—enemies of the state. As an American Jew who has family roots in Eastern Europe and Russia, I find that kind of rhetoric to be dangerous and frightening, but at its most basic, such rhetoric is part of Mr. Putin's grand design. That is what he does.

We saw it play out in the UK just 2 weeks ago when a person was poisoned in England who was an enemy of Mr. Putin's. We see it play out over and over again. Prime Minister May spoke out. She called it for what it was. She sent a clear signal to Moscow that that type of behavior by the Russian state against the British people would not be tolerated and that there would be consequences. This is how a leader of a great nation should speak out in defense of its people to counter a major threat from a global adversary.

Yet what happened here in Washington with the threat we saw to our own country by Mr. Putin? The President has said virtually nothing. His spokesperson condemned the crime but ignored that likely Russian link. The Secretary of State later did what the President could not or would not do by calling out the Russians. Maybe that was his swan song because it was the last thing we heard before he was silenced by Mr. Trump.

Never before in America's history has such a clear threat to our national security been so clearly ignored by the President of the United States. The President's difficulty in publicly acknowledging the Russia threat and leading our country forward to combat that threat is one of the most perplexing and reckless pieces of Mr. Trump's disastrous foreign policy. We in Congress took action. We passed legislation. We passed mandatory sanctions against Russia. Yet this administration has not taken full advantage of the law we passed. The President needs to protect America's interests, not appease Mr. Putin.

Congress's role in shaping and advancing U.S. foreign policy has never been more important. I will continue to advance legislation, conduct oversight, and speak out about these important issues in the name of the American people and the values and norms that define us and our place in this complicated world. I am proud to be a part of the group of Senators who will stand on this floor and work to make sure we protect our national security interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to share my deep concern over the Trump administration's approach to North Korea.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey, the leader of the Democrats on the

Foreign Relations Committee, for asking the Members to come out here to speak to the Trump administration's foreign policy.

North Korea is a serious and ever-worsening threat to its people, to our allies and partners in the region, and to the United States. Unfortunately, the Trump administration has mismanaged our North Korea policy, and the potential consequences of failure are too great to ignore. North Korea may have bent over backward to appear conciliatory during the Winter Olympics and through its offers of talks with South Korea and the United States, but Kim Jong Un has not stopped his dangerous activities—far from it. While the North Korean regime is all smiles and open arms, its malign behavior continues.

Its engineers race to perfect a nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missile. North Korean laborers around the world—modern-day indentured servants—send paychecks home to the regime to help fund its illicit military programs. Illegal ship-to-ship transfers of refined petroleum products continue. North Korea's army of cyber warriors grows more capable, and the Kim regime's thugs make no efforts to scale back rampant human rights abuses.

However, President Trump's approach to date threatens to make an already bad situation even worse. Despite his recent announcement that he would accept a meeting with Kim Jong Un, President Trump has systematically undermined the effectiveness of the very agency—the U.S. Department of State—he will need to make talks successful. By so doing, he has harmed U.S. foreign policy right as the United States is poised to embark on a crucial diplomatic effort with North Korea.

By firing Rex Tillerson, President Trump threw the State Department further into chaos when what we need right now is more consistency. This is indicative of a President who considers himself to be his own diplomat, negotiator, and strategist. Yet the gutting of the State Department goes much deeper. It has been badly depleted of both staff and resources by the Trump administration and is consistently ignored in the opaque process the White House is using to try to conduct American foreign policy.

President Trump has stifled dissent, ignored experience, politicized key diplomatic and national security agencies. The Special Representative for North Korea Policy, Ambassador Joseph Yun—the lead American negotiator with North Korea—has stepped down. One wonders whether he felt his advice was being heeded. We still don't have a U.S. Ambassador to South Korea more than a year into the Trump administration. We still don't have a confirmed Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. We still don't have a

special envoy for North Korean human rights issues. We no longer have a sanctions coordinator.

Going into talks at the senior-most level with a hollowed-out State Department is no way to peacefully resolve a crisis. To the contrary, it exposes us to greater risk, and as if these vacancies were not enough, it gets worse.

The Trump administration's recently released budget request for fiscal year 2019 would drastically cut State Department funding. The State Department is already alarmingly underresourced and understaffed to handle the significant and increasing threats from North Korea. Yet there is no explanation as to why the President believes it is prudent to cut diplomatic resources, especially in the middle of a crisis.

We deserve an answer as to why the administration believes the State Department deserves fewer resources while trying to execute a wide-ranging strategy of diplomatic engagement and pressure. All the while, the White House is subjecting our allies and partners to contradictory statements that cause confusion and dampen the prospects of a peaceful solution.

We hear different thoughts on different days. Before firing him, President Trump routinely undercut Secretary Tillerson and, with it, our diplomatic high ground. Confusing our allies in South Korea and Japan, whose assistance in helping resolve the North Korean crisis is indispensable, only serves to embolden Kim Jong Un, who seeks to drive a wedge between the United States and our allies.

We cannot afford to fail. I am concerned that if these talks do not go well, President Trump will be able to claim he tried both economic pressure and diplomacy, with neither path having solved the problem. He will be left with the conclusion that the only approach remaining will be military force. We must be clear. There is no military solution to the North Korea crisis.

Today marks the 15th anniversary of the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Although the current situation we face with North Korea is not identical to the one we faced in the runup to the Iraq war in 2003, the North Korea situation is, in fact, worse, and the consequences are even more severe. Unlike Iraq, North Korea has nearly completed the development of long-range nuclear-armed missiles that will be capable of creating nuclear mushroom clouds in our cities.

We all agree we need to act to ensure that this never happens. The only responsible course of action is for the administration to use all tools of American statecraft to reduce the threats from North Korea. We have an obligation to American families, service-members, and our allies to say, unequivocally, that we did everything in

our power without resorting to armed conflict.

Let's return the United States of America to the forefront of statecraft and allow for our diplomats to advance our interests without having to risk a frivolous loss of life. That is what is at stake as the President moves further away from using the kinds of tools which are available that can try to peacefully resolve this conflict with North Korea.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators COONS, CARDIN, LEE, SANDERS, and I be recognized for up to 5 minutes each and then Senator CORKER be recognized for up to 15 minutes prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I just returned from a trip to a major transatlantic conference in Europe. While the Europeans have spent a lot of time over the course of the last 12 months hand-wringing about whether the United States is committed to Europe, committed to NATO, committed to our common defense, my feeling upon going to Brussels for this particular conference is, they are kind of over the hand-wringing. They are now just making plans to move on without us. They are making plans to protect themselves without us. They are making plans to set the rules of the road economically, politically, and culturally around the world without the United States. The evidence of that was very clear.

The Europeans are setting up something called the European Defense Initiative, in which they are going to start doing military planning and purchasing outside of NATO because they are just not convinced, not confident that the United States is going to be seriously engaged in NATO. That compromises our security as the Europeans start to make plans for their defense without us, even though we still have an obligation under the treaty to protect them.

Over and over, you see the world moving on as they watch this massive withdrawal of America from the world. The President said at a rally in Alabama a few months ago that the world is starting to respect the United States of America again. That could not be further from the truth. The Pew organization charts other countries' opinions of the United States. It also charts whether other countries believe the United States is going to act in the best interests of the world. The numbers are, frankly, startling.

Of the 37 countries they surveyed, only two of them have higher con-

fidence in the United States under Trump than they did under Obama. One is a rather statistically significant increase, that being Russia, which by 42 percentage points is more confident that the United States is going to act in that country's best interests. South Korea had 88 percent confidence under Obama and has 17 percent confidence under Trump. Canada had 83 percent confidence under Obama and has 22 percent confidence under Trump. Germany is 86 to 11. They have come to this belief because, as my colleagues have mentioned, the Trump administration had signaled its unwillingness to try to set a moral tone for the world in the way that it budgets. The budget they presented to us reduces accounts dedicated to countering Russian aggression around its periphery by 63 percent. It is a clear telegraph to Europe that they are on their own, that countries that are trying to fight back against a country that wants to reestablish a new version of the Soviet Empire will have no help from the United States.

In this budget, the National Endowment for Democracy is cut by \$100 million. It is no secret that countries like Hungary and Poland are starting to slip away from traditional democratic norms. Countries like the Philippines are doing the same because there is not a moral force here in the United States committing to bring them closer to the ideals of participatory democracy.

There is a \$1.6 billion cut in humanitarian aid, telling the rest of the world: If you want to solve these enormous problems of humanitarian catastrophe—famine and refugee displacement—you can't look to us anymore. You are on your own again.

There is a 35-percent cut in overall international narcotics and law enforcement funding, just at a time when record amounts of fentanyl are finding their way into the United States.

The moment of panic is over for the world. They have watched this administration walk away from its traditional obligations to try to stand up for the rule of law, to try to promote democracy and human rights, and to try to protect America's interests and our allies. They are simply making other plans. I hope the next administration will be able to correct that, but those plans are hard to break once they are made.

I hope Republicans and Democrats will stand up to make sure that America does not become any weaker in the world than it already is today, 15 months into this administration. We are less safe as a nation because of this wholesale withdrawal from the global stage. It is not too late to try to turn it around.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on the floor this afternoon

to address the mounting concerns we have with the foreign policy of the Trump administration. I want to thank my colleague, Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and comment at the outset on two things that have been widely said that I don't think are true.

First is that Democrats are bottling up the President's vitally needed nominees for senior ambassadorial positions or senior Department of State nominations and that we are holding key nominees.

Frankly, nothing could be further from the truth. Earlier today, in a business meeting, our Foreign Relations Committee, which works well on a bipartisan basis, voted out a whole series of Ambassadors, treaties, and Assistant Secretaries of State.

Second, I heard it said by some pundits that Democrats wish President Trump ill, that we are working to do everything we can to hold him back and prevent him from being successful.

Let me start by saying that I think all of us know that we are strongest when we stand together and work together. All of us have at some point heard the old adage that politics should stop at the water's edge, and nothing would make me happier then to see our foreign policy, our military, and our diplomatic efforts succeed around the world.

I do not wish our President ill or our State Department a lack of success, but I think it deserves mentioning for the few minutes I am taking on the floor today that President Trump, who promised as a candidate to be unpredictable and nontraditional, has overperformed in that category. His foreign policy has been defined by inconsistency, volatility, unpredictability, and at times, a failure to advance our values. This comes exactly at a time, as my colleague from Connecticut was just reciting, when our allies and partners crave stability and leadership and when the threats to our democratic way of life from Russia and China are on the rise.

Trump's "shock and awe" style of governing was demonstrated recently by his abrupt firing of the Secretary of State in a tweet and his further humiliation of the Secretary of State in stories that dribbled out about exactly how and when and where he was fired. We should not be conducting foreign policy in the same way that one might host a reality TV show like "The Apprentice."

In just a year, as I have attended a variety of conferences and meetings around the world, I have been struck by the number of ways in which the President has undermined alliances and friendships that have taken decades to build. Let me briefly review a few of the ways our European and Asian allies have been puzzled or confounded—by our withdrawal from the

Trans-Pacific Partnership; by imposing a travel plan on citizens from majority Muslim countries; by withdrawing from the Paris climate accord; by imposing tariffs on steel and aluminum, including against our close North American and European allies; by questioning our commitments to NATO; and by denigrating an entire continent when discussing the value of potential immigrants from Africa.

Real and consistent leadership around the world that reflects American values is needed now more than ever. In the dozen countries I have visited for regional security conferences in the past year, I have heard the same from our vital allies. Senator McCAIN and I traveled to Halifax in Canada and to Singapore in Southeast Asia for a series of bilateral meetings of representatives of close and trusted allies. Senator FLAKE and I have traveled to Africa. Senator GRAHAM and I have traveled to the Middle East. In all of these trips, what I have heard is that our allies are concerned, that they need reassurance about how and where we stand, and that in many cases, yes, they are beginning to move on past us and to reach accommodations with China or Russia, having concluded that we are not committed to engagement with the world.

Every time I go on a visit to a foreign embassy—an embassy of the United States overseas—I sit down with our Foreign Service officers and I ask about their work and service, and I am overwhelmingly impressed with the professionalism and dedication of our career development professionals and our diplomats. Yet, overwhelmingly, the big number of vacancies at the State Department and a budget that proposes a more than 30-percent cut in the State Department and USAID have had a significant, demoralizing impact on these people whom we count on to advance America's interest and values around the world.

Let me also say briefly that on the continent of Africa, where I have spent a great deal of my time on the Foreign Relations Committee, we are missing Ambassadors to some of the biggest and most important countries—South Africa and Tanzania being just two, for example. It is a continent where China's pervasive presence is not being countered by an America that is robustly engaged. Why does this matter? Because in this century, Africa will become the fastest growing and largest market for our goods and should be the continent in which we have the closest alliances and partnership. But instead of building partnerships and helping to extend markets here at home, the Trump administration is squandering the current momentum and watching from the sidelines as democratic norms deteriorate.

As a member of both the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Commit-

tees, I was gravely concerned that for a second year in a row, the Trump administration budget proposed deep cuts in diplomacy and development. We must recognize that while these investments serve a humanitarian purpose, they also make us stronger by spreading American values, safer by building coalitions, less susceptible to terrorism by creating a more stable world, and more prosperous by creating stronger export markets for our goods. If we want to remain a global leader, we need a strong State Department and USAID that are sufficiently funded.

Let me turn to the matter of Russia before I conclude. Throughout his administration, President Trump has not only turned away from some of our critical allies and weakened our commitments to international coalitions but has also refused to head-on, clearly address the real and multifaceted threats we face from Russia.

Russia's activities, as has been testified to by senior administration officials over many hearings, now are directly interfering with our democracy—our last election and likely our next election, as well as those of our closest allies throughout the world. Rather than sending a clear and forceful signal to Russia that our political affairs are not to be meddled with, President Trump has instead at times turned aside from this challenge and failed to address it.

Let me conclude by simply saying that now more than ever, the United States must lead in the world, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee on a bipartisan basis to advance our interests.

Thank you, Mr. President.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time because I think this issue is an extremely important issue. I am talking about the authority of the Congress of the United States versus the President on the introduction of our troops into war or hostilities. This has been a struggle we have been debating for a long time. Congress passed the War Powers Act over the objections of the President because we recognize that the Constitution gives us the power to introduce troops into harm's way.

The resolution says very clearly that the introduction of the U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities will allow Congress to have an expedited process if the administration has not gotten the authorization for the use of that military force. The Supreme Court decision made it very difficult for us to enforce that, causing us to pass, in the State Department authorization, a process in which a joint resolution could be filed in order for Congress to express itself if the President has not sought the au-

thorization for the use of military force.

We now have a circumstance where the United States, in my view—the President has introduced American troops into hostilities by assisting the Saudis in refueling missions in regard to the campaign in Yemen. To me, that is introducing troops. Whether it is right or wrong, Congress has a responsibility to respond to this. I say that knowing that our Presiding Officer has been very articulate about the need for us to pass an authorization for the use of military force in regard to our campaign against ISIS.

Here is the challenge we have. The administration and previous administrations have interpreted hostilities in such a narrow way, it would take away from Congress our ability to have the authorization for the introduction of American troops into hostile circumstances. Yet compare that with this administration's and previous administrations' interpretations of the 2001 authorization for use of military force, which we passed after the attack on our country on 9/11. They would have you believe that authorization, which was limited to those who planned the attack against us in 9/11, applies to our military campaign against ISIS in Syria or ISIS in Yemen or wherever we may find ISIS anywhere in the world. I think that is an absurd interpretation.

Yes, I know the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is on the floor. I think our committee needs to take up this issue. We need to take up what is happening in Yemen with our support of the Saudis and what is happening in regard to the authorization for the use of military force. But this campaign has been going on for a long time. Congress needs to weigh in whether we are for or against it. We need to exert our jurisdiction, and we haven't done that. It is very frustrating that those of us who believe very deeply in our constitutional responsibilities, assume that responsibility—and I have a lot of confidence in the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but I question whether we are going to get more time in the future to debate this issue. I know the chairman will give us time in committee, but will we have time on the floor of the Senate to debate this issue? I think we need to debate it and vote up or down whether American troops should be assisting in this mission.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand to urge a "no" vote on the motion to table. We are involved as cobelligerents in hostilities in someone else's war—in a civil war in Yemen.

It is very difficult to dispute the contention that there is no decision made

by a government that is more severe, more serious, that carries with it more dire consequences than sending brave young men and women sworn to protect us into harm's way, into battle, into hostilities.

We have been faced with the debate here about what amounts to hostilities. We have the executive branch of government that understandably has defined that term narrowly but in this case so narrowly as to obliterate any meaning behind that word, basically suggesting that we are not in hostilities unless we have people on the ground firing upon an enemy and being fired upon. That is not always the way modern warfare is conducted and hasn't been for some time.

The fact is that we have our uniformed military personnel who are engaged in things like midair refueling on combat missions, refueling the combat aircraft of another country when those combat aircraft are in route to a battlefield, to a theater of warfare. If those aren't hostilities, I don't know what is.

We have been told that we need to do this in regular order. Let's talk about regular order for a minute because, as I mentioned a moment ago, there is nothing more serious than sending our uniformed military personnel into hostilities. We have in this body adopted laws and procedures making it possible for us to receive fast-track consideration of measures that indicate that the executive branch of government has overstepped its power.

We are in our third year involved in this civil war in Yemen—3 years—and yet this hasn't come up for a vote; 3 years and we haven't had anything come out of committee and voted on the Senate floor. Three years ought to be long enough. In fact, the War Powers Resolution gives us expedited consideration. It gives the committee 10 days to consider that. The committee has now had more than twice that time to consider that, and the committee has not put anything out. This is why we are well within our rights, well within the boundaries of what is appropriate, in fact, and well within what the Constitution already grants us, which is the power to declare war. That power, with good reason, was not vested in the executive branch of government. It was vested only in Congress—that branch of government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals.

The reason this is so important is that before we send our young people into a place where they could die, we want to make sure that an open, honest debate is held in public view, not behind closed doors at the Pentagon or at some other government office building, but right here on the Senate floor and in the House of Representatives. We cannot exercise that power capably, we cannot claim to be mindful, and we

cannot be deemed faithful to our oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States if we don't look out for our authorities and if we don't make sure that someone else isn't exercising authority that was granted to this body. That authority belongs not to any one person; it belongs to the people.

If we refuse to take this vote today, if we choose instead to table this measure rather than to allow it to come up for a vote on the Senate floor, we are choosing not to decide, and we will still have made a choice—a choice to abdicate our responsibility. If we make that decision today, then shame on us. It is our prerogative as a coequal branch of government to make sure that we do our job, to do that which only Congress can do.

This is, in fact, a war. There are, in fact, grave humanitarian concerns presented by that war, and that makes it all the more important, not less important, for us to debate this and for us to discuss this under the light of day, in public, and on the Senate floor.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest terms I am capable of communicating to vote against the motion to table.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I have enjoyed hearing the discussion about the item before us. I must say that I would feel a whole lot better about this debate if it were focused on our refueling French jets going into Mali—the same exact debate. I assume these individuals would consider those to be hostilities, but, somehow or another, that doesn't rise to congressional approval.

This one, I think, is politically tinged. Saudi Arabia certainly has issues. They have conducted themselves in manners that we wish were better. The Crown Prince was here today, and all of us who met with him “demarched” him, if you will, on the conduct relative to Yemen. Yet, at the same time, we know that because American folks are involved in refueling and because we are helping, to a degree, with intelligence, we know that less civilians are being killed there. We know that. We know that our being there has affected their conduct.

I wish to talk about process here. The sponsors of the resolution, who I have great respect for, have used a very entrepreneurial method to bring this to the floor, and I don't say that to be pejorative. They have reached into the War Powers Act and pulled out something that was unintended for this purpose. I think everyone understands that, and I think everyone understands that if we don't table this, we will be setting a precedent here. It will be a situation of first impression where from now on, when our Air Force is refueling jets in the air, we are involved in hostilities. I don't think that is a standard that we wish to set.

I want to argue this on a different level. It is hard for me to believe that we would take up an issue of this serious nature and not allow the committee of jurisdiction to work its will. We had a hearing last week that Senator MCCONNELL set up for all Senators to come in and be briefed on Yemen. His stated reason for doing that was that most people in the Senate don't know much about what is happening in Yemen. People on the Foreign Relations Committee do, and the people on Intel do, and the people in Armed Services do. But most of the Senate has not really been involved recently in that issue.

Typically, the way we work around here is that the committee does its work. It does its recommendation. It works with the administration, and you come forth with a piece of legislation. Can we imagine, for instance, with tax reform, if we just had some kind of entrepreneurial way of bringing tax reform to the floor without the Finance Committee working, or bringing FISA to the floor without Intel working? That is not the way we are supposed to do things here.

So we have a bill that is being generated right now—it is a bipartisan bill—by JEANNE SHAHEEN and TODD YOUNG. It may not be the bill we deal with on Yemen, but it is just now being developed.

By the way, I skipped a beat here. I want to refresh people's memory as to what we are voting on. We are not voting on anything but a decision to discharge the Yemen issue from the committee without the committee taking any action, without the committee having any hearings. This is a vote to say that we are going to skip the Foreign Relations Committee and we are going to set precedent here on the floor in this entrepreneurial way and that we have reached into the War Powers Act to find a clause to bring it to the floor, which was never intended for this purpose.

So what I would say to people is that a better way of handling this would be to table this motion, to let the Foreign Relations Committee do the work that you have assigned the Foreign Relations Committee to do. We are going to have a hearing on Yemen. We have a piece of legislation that is being developed in a bipartisan way, with the Republicans and Democrats, to deal with this issue. Let us work our will in the appropriate way—by the way, in a way that actually will generate an outcome.

In addition, I know there are Members on the floor who have been frustrated, as someone referenced earlier, that the 2001–2002 AUMF is still being used. The Presiding Officer has been very involved in trying to develop a new AUMF that would supersede those two AUMFs and give the Senate and the House the ability to weigh in every

4 years on these types of actions. We are going to have a markup on a bill that our Presiding Officer, Senator KAINE from Virginia, Senator YOUNG from Indiana, and many people have been involved in. That markup is going to take place on April 19.

So, hopefully, the Senate will not only have an ability to deal with a real bill on Yemen that actually will generate a real outcome coming through committee but also will have the ability to deal with an AUMF that will set aside the fact that for years the Congress has not weighed in on this issue. To me, that is a much better outcome.

I urge everyone in this body, instead of following this unique process that is not going to generate an outcome regardless, to allow the Foreign Relations Committee to do its work and to bring a bill to the floor that will generate an outcome. I am going to make a motion in a moment to table it, but I realize there may be one more speaker before I do so.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief moment?

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the leadership of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I agree with his proposed outcome on this vote. That is not to diminish the importance of the issues raised by the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Vermont, but I do agree with him that it is the preferred, careful, cautious way of dealing with competing interests in a complex world.

I just ask the Senator further to that point whether he can confirm my understanding that actually using this unique process—is it his understanding, as it is mine—that there would actually be a vote-arama; that is, we would end up voting on multiple different proposals, not just this one proposal, and create perhaps some confusion and some more chaos in what is admittedly a complex and sensitive foreign relations and national security matter?

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, that is correct.

So, in closing, I would just ask—just like every other committee here in the Senate that hopefully takes its work seriously and does work especially on important matters like this that affect people's lives—that this body would think that a better recommendation would be to table this effort to have this wild West debate on the floor over the course of the next several hours and, instead of doing it in that manner, to give the committee of jurisdiction the ability to work its will with Yemen through hearings, through a process on the committee that would actually bring a bill to the floor that has been thought through and where we had worked with other bodies of govern-

ment to get it in a place where then it could be amended and dealt with in a more methodical and appropriate way.

I would like to remind people one more time that we also plan to mark up an AUMF on April 19 to deal with the lingering issue of having an open situation where we are still dealing with ISIS and al-Qaida and others based on something that was authorized to be done in Afghanistan years ago.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the resolution that we will soon be voting on is really very simple. It has two basic points. Point No. 1, I and the 14 other cosponsors of this resolution believe that under the definitions laid out in the 1973 War Powers Resolution, U.S. forces have been introduced into the Saudi-led war in Yemen, a war which is causing a humanitarian disaster.

I would say to my good friend Senator CORKER, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that this war has been going on for 3 years. Some 10,000 civilians in Yemen are dead and 40,000 have been wounded. A million are dealing with cholera right now, and millions have been displaced. You come tonight on the floor and you say: We are going to hold a hearing. That is good, but it is 3 years too late.

The issue that we are dealing with right now is whether or not the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress accepts its constitutional responsibility on the issues of war. This is not a complicated issue, and I don't think anybody here disagrees. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution says not that the President can make war and send our young people into harm's way. It is the Congress of the United States that should make war.

Our role now in Yemen working with the Saudi-led intervention there is one of hostilities under the War Powers Resolution of the United States. It is not just my view on this. As many may know here—as I suspect the chairman of the committee knows—last November, by a vote of 366 to 30, the U.S. House of Representatives agreed with the essence of what Senator LEE and I are trying to do, and the House passed a nonbinding resolution stating that U.S. involvement in the Yemen civil war is unauthorized. Every Member of the Democratic leadership voted for that, as did the Republican chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE.

An editorial in the New York Times today states:

The United States initially deployed forces to combat Al Qaeda in Yemen under post-Sept. 11 congressional authorization measures. But Congress never specifically approved military involvement in the Saudi-Houthi war even though the Constitution and the 1973 War Powers Act give lawmakers a role.

The New York Times:

For too long, Congress has abdicated its role as America prolonged its stay in some wars and expanded into others. And presidents have been too reluctant to share these crucial decisions with lawmakers. Resolutions like this—

The one we are debating—

can and must force serious debate and accountability.

I say this to my friend the chairman: I think now of the two major foreign policy disasters that have taken place in our lifetime—No. 1, the war in Vietnam. In that war—a Democratic administration under an otherwise very good President, Lyndon Johnson—he and the Secretary of Defense misled and lied to the American people with regard to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. That is now established fact as a result of declassified information. The United States got sucked into that war, and my generation—the young men of my generation—suffered so terribly. Over 60,000 died, and many others came home wounded in body and in spirit. The U.S. Congress abdicated its responsibility at that point in 1964.

Fifteen years ago—oddly enough, on this day—there was the war in Iraq, under a Republican administration, and the administration lied to the American people again. Where was Congress getting the facts? We had the Vice President of the United States: Oh, Saddam Hussein is building weapons of mass destruction. There is a connection between Saddam Hussein and Iraq and the 9/11 perpetrators.

It was a lie. It was a lie. Mistakenly, Congress voted to approve the war based on false information.

So what I say today is that it is time for the Congress to accept its constitutional responsibility. I don't know how well we will do. Maybe we will screw it up as well. It is very possible. But that is what the Founding Fathers suggested, and I think they were right. We are closer to the people—the House and the Senate—than is the White House, this White House or any other White House.

So there are two issues today. Do we accept our constitutional responsibility to vote on matters of war? I would suggest that every Member of the Senate vote yes. Don't duck your responsibility. Don't abdicate your responsibility. Second of all, this war in Yemen, in my view, has been a humanitarian disaster as a result of Saudi intervention. But the most important vote is, do we actually have a vote on whether American troops are involved in the war in Yemen?

I hope very much we will vote against Senator CORKER's motion to table, and I hope that after we do that, we will vote for the resolution that says it is time for the United States to get out of Yemen.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, very briefly, I just want to set the record straight. The House of Representatives voted to say that the war in Yemen is not covered by the 2001–2002 AUMF, and I think this body would agree. They did not do as was just mentioned by the Senator from Vermont. As a matter of fact, they decided not to take up this measure that we are taking up today because they thought it was not a good measure to take up.

I don't want anybody in this body to think that the House has already supported this effort. The House not only didn't support it, they wouldn't take it up because they thought it was damaging to our country's foreign policy.

I hope that today people will join me in voting to table this motion and to let the committee do its work as it is supposed to do. Let's bring something to the floor that will actually have an outcome, and then let's have a debate down the road on the AUMF—the 2001 and 2002 AUMF—which I hope will be given floor time.

With that, I think all time has expired.

Mr. President, I move to table the Sanders motion to discharge S.J. Res. 54, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote 58 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Reed
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Coons	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Jones	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Whitehouse
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Nelson	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Collins	Hirono
Bennet	Daines	Kaine
Blumenthal	Duckworth	King
Booker	Durbin	Klobuchar
Brown	Feinstein	Leahy
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Lee
Cardin	Harris	Markley
Carper	Hassan	McCaskill
Casey	Heinrich	Merkley

Moran	Schatz	Udall
Murphy	Schumer	Van Hollen
Murray	Shaheen	Warner
Paul	Smith	Warren
Peters	Stabenow	Wyden
Sanders	Tester	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, last night I came to the floor to talk about legislation we are debating in the Senate this week that has to do with combating human trafficking, an issue that every Senator in the Chamber cares about. Last night, I talked about some of the women and children who have been exploited online, their stories—some of the heartbreaking stories.

This opportunity we have before us is to pass legislation that addresses that very directly because we are seeing in this country, in this century, unbelievably, an increase in trafficking right now. The experts all say it is for one primary reason; that is, because the trafficking is moved online.

The ruthless efficiency of the internet, the dark side of the internet—Mr. President, you have been involved with this issue in our committee. As you know, we spent a couple of years coming to this point, an 18-month investigation of what is happening online, why it is happening, and then coming up with a legislative solution. The reports of human trafficking to one of the major anti-trafficking groups in the country, called Polaris, through their hotline and through their text line, have increased 842 percent over the past 10 years. This is consistent across the board in talking to other experts. There is this increase. When they look at it, where they see it is happening is online. Victims have told me, have told you and other Members, this has now moved from the street to the smartphone, from the street corner to the internet.

According to National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, nearly 75 percent of the child trafficking reports it receives from the public involve one single website; that is, backpage. That is why we spend a lot of time looking into backpage, why this was happening, and how we could address it.

According to Shared Hope International—another advocacy group—the number is even higher than 75 percent. We researched this through a process that many in this body were involved with. CLAIRE MCCASKILL was the ranking member of the Permanent Subcommittee On Investigations. We in-

vestigated that. I see she is on the floor now. She and I, along with our subcommittee, along with you, Mr. President, and other members of the full committee, looked into this issue. What we found was even more shocking than we expected. We knew people were being trafficked online by this website. We knew they had to be complicit with some of this. What we didn't know was they were actually taking ads and altering the ads, editing the ads to try to hide the fact that people were selling underaged girls online. As they put it, they were cleaning the ads for illegal transactions and then covering up the evidence of these crimes in order to increase their profits.

Last night, I talked about three brave mothers who shared the tragic stories of their daughters who were exploited and sold for sex on backpage.com. Their daughters were between the ages of 14 and 16 when they were trafficked. Kubiiki Pride was one of the women we talked about. She is also part of a documentary called “I am Jane Doe.” It tells the stories of her family and other families. It is a powerful, powerful presentation, and it is powerful in that you can feel their frustration, feel their pain. It is not easy to see, but it is important to see, and I recommend it. You can go on Netflix and find “I am Jane Doe.”

Unfortunately, for those mothers and countless others, backpage has gotten away with this. It is not because people haven't tried to sue them, prosecutors haven't tried to go after them; it is because the courts have consistently said they are shielded from prosecution, they are shielded from these lawsuits. They are shielded by a Federal law, one we passed in this Chamber 21 years ago. It is called the Communications Decency Act. It was a well-intended law. In 1996, the focus was, when the internet was in its infancy, trying to ensure there could be freedom of the internet.

Ironically, part of the original intention of the Communications Decency Act was to protect children from indecent material on the internet by letting websites remove and block some of that explicit material. Now that same law is being used as a shield by online sex traffickers who promote and engage in this with immunity. This Federal law is being used by websites to get away with something that would be illegal, criminal if they were to do it on the street corner.

Congress did not intend this broad immunity, but numerous courts across the country have made it clear their hands are tied because of the illegal precedents that have been set the way the courts have interpreted this law. As the lawmaking branch of the Federal Government, it is up to us to fix this injustice. No one else can do it.

One of the Federal courts said this cannot be fixed by litigation; it has to be fixed by legislation. That is why

America's district attorneys, 50 of the State attorneys general in this country, judges all over the country, and many others have called on Congress to amend the Communications Decency Act and fix this injustice.

In one of the most direct calls for congressional action yet, in August of last year, a Sacramento judge cited the broad Communications Decency Act in dismissing pimping charges against backpage.com. The court opinion stated: "If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking."

This judge issued an invitation to Congress to act. Others have as well. Websites that knowingly sell vulnerable women and children for sex are profiting and getting away with sex trafficking because of a Federal law. It is up to Congress to do the right thing, to fix this loophole. That is why my co-author, RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, who is on the floor this evening, and I introduced the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA, alongside a bipartisan group of four other original cosponsors: Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL, Senator JOHN CORNYN, and Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP. Soon, others joined us. In that first day, we had 24 cosponsors, bipartisan. Soon, we had a majority of Republicans and majority of Democrats cosponsoring this legislation. I want to thank those five original cosponsors because they helped us put together legislation that was targeted, focused, and actually fixes the problem.

SESTA will provide justice for victims of online sex trafficking and hold accountable the websites that knowingly facilitate these crimes by making two very narrowly focused changes to Federal law. First, it allows victims to get the justice they deserve by removing the Communications Decency Act's broad liability protections for a narrow set of bad actors, specifically for websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking crimes. Second, it will allow State prosecutors and State attorneys general to prosecute these websites that violate Federal trafficking laws.

SESTA says if you are violating sex trafficking laws and you are doing it knowingly, you are facilitating it, then you have to be held to account. That is common sense. This bill includes legislation from the House side that creates new criminal penalties. It creates a new Federal crime for websites that have the intent to promote or facilitate illegal prostitution.

All of these changes will help to hold bad actors accountable while doing nothing to impair the free internet. In fact, SESTA will protect websites that do not actively and knowingly engage in online sex trafficking. We do that by

preserving the Communications Decency Act's Good Samaritan provision, which protects good actors who proactively block, and screen for, offensive material, thus shielding them from frivolous lawsuits.

SESTA's fair, commonsense approach is why this bill has an extraordinary coalition of support. National law enforcement organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police, faith-based groups, the civil rights community, major businesses, even including a number of tech companies, support this legislation. Most importantly, anti-trafficking advocates and trafficking survivors are the ones who support SESTA. They are the ones we listened to when we drafted this legislation. They are the folks back in Ohio, back in Connecticut—back in our States—who came to us and talked to us about this issue. They are the ones we not just listened to but actually worked with to help draft something that would work to close this loophole.

This bill makes all the sense in the world, and it will do its part in helping to close this gap, in helping to deal, in this century, in this country with the amazing ability that people have to exploit someone online criminally and not be held liable.

I thank Leader MITCH MCCONNELL for his leadership, for his commitment to combat sex trafficking, and for putting this bill on the floor for a vote.

I thank Senator JOHN THUNE, who chairs the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, and BILL NELSON, who is the ranking member. They held a hearing on this bill and marked it up, and it addressed some of the concerns that had been expressed by the tech community.

Here in the Senate, we now have over 60 cosponsors. This has not been an issue of politics or partisanship. It has been an issue of the heart. It is about preventing exploitation. It is about providing justice. There are some in this Chamber who will want to change this legislation over the next couple of days as we debate it.

I have a great deal of respect for my colleague from Oregon, Senator RON WYDEN. I talked about him last night on the floor. I talked about the work he has done to combat human trafficking. I talked about the legislation I did with him to provide better data for sex trafficking, which was his legislation. He was also a leader in passing the Communications Decency Act, which we are amending through this legislation. I understand he is passionate about that bill that passed 21 years ago.

We took a very targeted approach here, which is why the Internet Association, which represents much of the tech community—not all but much of it—actually endorses our efforts. This is the Senate's immediate opportunity to help stop online sex trafficking

while protecting a free and open internet. It is the right balance. It has already passed the House of Representatives. The White House has shown a commitment to it and is willing to sign the legislation. Now it is the Senate's turn to act.

So let me tell you where I stand. I stand with law enforcement officials all around the country and with prosecutors all around the country who have asked us to pass this legislation to give them the tools they need to stop this exploitation. I stand with Kubiiki Pride, whom I talked about earlier, Nicole S., Yvonne Ambrose, and the mothers across the country who have had their children exploited at the hands of online sex traffickers. I stand with the young women and children I have met in Dayton and Columbus and Akron and Toledo and Cincinnati and Cleveland—all over Ohio—who are sex trafficking survivors, who are victims who want justice.

I know that, together, we will all stand on the right side of history when the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act is voted on, has passed this Chamber, and eventually becomes law so as to immediately help provide justice for these victims. Justice cannot be seen, but its absence is felt. Those who have been trafficked online, who see the websites that have knowingly facilitated in this prosper and escape legal consequences, are the ones who have experienced real injustice. They have felt that injustice. We can right this wrong. Let's pass the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act to provide these victims the justice they deserve.

I notice again, as I mentioned earlier, the coauthor of this legislation—my colleague—is on the floor. He is a former Federal prosecutor. He has dealt with these issues both as a prosecutor and as a legislator. We are the cochairs and cofounders of the Caucus to End Human Trafficking, which we started 6 or 7 years ago. I thank him for his work on this important legislation.

I yield my time to Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, at the very start, I am grateful, and I praise my cosponsor, Senator PORTMAN, who has helped to lead in the championing of this measure. He has really been steadfast in the face of a lot of challenges. It was a difficult bill to draft and then to redraft and change again in response to suggestions that we received from friends and adversaries, but Senator PORTMAN has been really stalwart throughout it.

I join him in thanking our partners, Senator MCCASKILL, Senator MCCAIN, Senator HEITKAMP, Senator CORNYN, and, of course, Senator THUNE, who is the chairman of the committee, and Ranking Member NELSON.

This road began for me more than 10 years ago when I was the State attorney general in Connecticut, and I wanted to pursue legal remedies against the websites. Back then, it was Craigslist or MySpace that promoted sex trafficking and prostitution as well as pornography. My staff informed me that there was a provision of Federal law—section 230 of the Communications Decency Act—that would stop me in my tracks. Indeed, it has stopped others, most recently some of the survivors of sex trafficking who were told by a Federal court of appeals, in effect, that what happened to you is outrageous, and there should be a remedy for you, but section 230 of the Communications Decency Act blocks your day in court. It closes the courthouse doors to you in your seeking a legal remedy.

Along the way, there were many who said to Senator PORTMAN and to me that we could never pass this legislation because it would hold trafficking websites accountable. They said the opponents of this change were too powerful, too big, too entrenched. They said the victims and survivors were too powerless, too invisible.

We have met them. We know their stories. They are heartbreaking. They are children—some younger than the pages in this Chamber today—who have endured torture that is unspeakable and unthinkable for anyone of any age, and they deserve their day in court, rights, and remedies—real remedies that make the rights real.

So I thank Senator PORTMAN, and I thank, as he has also done, those survivors who have come forward and been the faces and voices of our cause. Their courage and strength and that of their family members have enabled us to reach this point.

I emphasize that this measure is very carefully and narrowly written to address a specific harm, and I want to take a couple of minutes to correct any misunderstanding that there may be in this Chamber.

First, some of the legislation's critics have claimed it will impose liability on the so-called Good Samaritan. In reality, this bill explicitly preserves subsection 230(c)(2)(A) of the Communications Decency Act, commonly called the Good Samaritan provision. This provision ensures that websites cannot be held liable on account of actions taken in good faith to restrict objectionable material. SESTA is crystal clear on this point. A website operator's good deeds cannot be used against him.

This measure is also technology neutral. It imposes no requirement that website operators use a particular technology to screen their sites for objectionable content. They are free to use whatever technology they wish. That is why the Internet Association and its member companies support this legislation. They know that if tech-

nology companies work to prevent human trafficking and not to profit from it, they have nothing to fear from this measure.

I understand that an amendment has been offered to restate SESTA's Good Samaritan provision. Even if the amendment only protected Good Samaritans, it would be unnecessary and potentially confusing to the courts. I emphasize that point. It would obfuscate and confuse the good intent of the Good Samaritan provision. It would also derail this widely popular legislation by sending it back to the House, where special interests will have another chance to kill it. Unfortunately, this proposed amendment—perhaps unintentionally—would not simply protect Good Samaritans; it would also protect websites that operate in bad faith. It would also protect websites that identify sex trafficking ads and then leave them up in order to continue profiting from them.

I will briefly talk about one other amendment that has been offered—again, while being well-intentioned—that threatens to derail this legislation.

The amendment would provide additional money to Attorney General Sessions to investigate and prosecute websites that criminally facilitate human trafficking. I believe law enforcement ought to have additional resources. I firmly support more funding to investigate and prosecute this criminal activity, but this bill is not the means by which to do it.

In fact, law enforcement and the community against human trafficking are strongly against these amendments. Let me repeat. These law enforcement groups include the Fraternal Order of Police, the Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, the FBI Agents Association, and I could go down the list. In fact, there is no need to.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters from these groups be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MCCONNELL AND SCHUMER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act," which includes language from S. 1693, the "Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act," which the FOP also supports.

This legislation will allow law enforcement to investigate and prosecute individuals and businesses that advertise or facilitate sex trafficking more effectively. The bill will create a new Federal offense prohibiting the

use or operation of an in-state facility, like a website, that promotes or facilitates illegal prostitution.

The FOP is opposed to the two pending amendments because they may have the unintended consequence of derailing this important legislation. Amendments to this bill will only continue to deprive the survivors and victims of sex trafficking of getting justice.

On behalf of the more than 335,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we urge you both to pass this legislation without any amendments on the Senate floor. If we can be of any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor, Jim Pasco, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

MARCH 19, 2018.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER SCHUMER: We, the undersigned organizations, representing prosecutors, chiefs of police, sheriffs, rank and file officers and chief executives of state investigative agencies at the federal, state, and local level, write to urge a clean vote this week in the Senate on the House-passed FOSTA/SESTA package so that victims and federal and state law enforcement can better seek to hold all responsible parties accountable for the facilitation of sex trafficking. At the same time, we urge you to reject the proposed amendment that would create a shield for companies vaguely attempting to filter content on their websites and the proposed amendment that would provide additional funding through the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute website operators that criminally facilitate sex trafficking. Simply put, the amendment to create a liability shield is bad public policy and the funding amendment is a poison pill that is dead on arrival if sent back to the House.

As membership organizations charged with protecting our communities, we can't afford to sacrifice the opportunity to pass good public policy to hold facilitators of sex trafficking accountable. Through extensive discussions over the past couple of years, a delicate balance has been struck among a wide variety of stakeholders to achieve the legislation pending before the Senate. The House passed version, which included language from the Senate SESTA version, was a carefully crafted piece of legislation to help state and local law enforcement bring more of these sex trafficking cases forward and we encourage you to provide us with the tools needed to achieve that goal.

Sincerely,

Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies;
FBI Agents Association;
Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association;
International Association of Chiefs of Police;
Major Cities Chiefs Association;
Major County Sheriffs of America;
National Association of Police Organizations;
National District Attorneys Association;
National Fusion Center Association;
National Sheriffs' Association.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, my colleagues should take heed of

what these groups are saying because they see through the potentially derailing impact of these amendments.

I close by again thanking my friend and partner, Senator PORTMAN, as well as Senator McCASKILL, Senator HEITKAMP, Senator CORNYN, and Senator MCCAIN.

This measure is truly bipartisan, as it should be. There is nothing partisan about sex trafficking. There is nothing excusable or tolerable about it. I hope the Senate will do its job tomorrow and send this legislation to the President's desk.

I yield the floor to my partner, Senator PORTMAN, with my thanks.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I know there are other Members who are interested in speaking.

Let me just say, Senator BLUMENTHAL's role as a prosecutor has informed him; therefore, the legislation is better for it.

We just heard what Senator BLUMENTHAL said. He understands this bill inside and out and the fact that there are well-meaning amendments that are being offered that would derail this legislation, which is something we want to avoid. We want to get this to the President's desk for his signature and begin to save people.

I notice my other colleague, Senator McCASKILL, whom I mentioned earlier a couple of times, is on the floor. She was the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee that investigated this issue of looking at the websites and that came up with not just how it was happening and why it was happening but a legislative response.

I yield a few minutes to Senator McCASKILL.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I thank Senator PORTMAN, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and my other colleagues for allowing me to jump in here for a couple of minutes.

This body—this entire body—is really responsible for where we are right now because it was during the investigation package that we realized that section 230 was being used as a shield for the bad guys. All of the attorneys general around the country and various law enforcement agencies and individuals who were trying to sue backpage were met every time with a 230 defense. They were not even able to penetrate to get the documents from backpage in order to learn about what backpage was really up to. It was an investigation by which backpage thought it would be able to win again in court and deny us our opportunity to look at the documents and to look at the underlying evidence that one should always look at in an investigation.

Frankly, our getting the contempt-of-the-Senate resolution through this body almost unanimously—I think it was unanimously, wasn't it, I ask Senator PORTMAN?

Mr. PORTMAN. Yes.

Mrs. McCASKILL. And then our going all the way to the Supreme Court and winning was finally the first time backpage had to turn over the dirty evidence of its knowingly facilitating sex trafficking on its page. That is why this language is “knowingly facilitate”—just to make sure that in going forward, no bad guys can hide behind section 230.

The other part of this bill that, I think, is very important and that, I think, a lot of people forget—and with all due respect to my friends who are in this Chamber who were U.S. attorneys—is that over 90 percent of the crime that is prosecuted in this country is prosecuted by local prosecutors, State prosecutors, who are called prosecutors or district attorneys, depending on the State's term that is used. They have been handcuffed in terms of being able to bring these kinds of cases. This legislation not only opens up the courthouse doors to victims who have been victimized by this but also so that the full force of American law enforcement can be brought to bear on this problem, not just the limited jurisdiction that was available around the problem of sex trafficking.

This is so important to getting to the bottom of it because many U.S. attorneys don't have the time, and, frankly, many attorneys general don't have the time or the jurisdiction to get after crime, but the local prosecutors don't get to decide which cases to go after. If there is a 9-1-1 call, they have it. The Feds can come in later and say: We have it, and we are going to take it. But they are the ones who day after day are in the trenches of sex crimes, and they are the ones who now have the ability to go after these cases in a way that will be very meaningful.

I am proud of the bipartisan nature of this. I am proud of the partnership we have, Senator PORTMAN, on the Subcommittee on Investigations. I know we will get a big vote on this. I think people see through these amendments as ways to slow this bill down or possibly kill it, and I hope we will all can join together and take this to the finish line tomorrow.

I thank my colleagues for giving me a few minutes.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank Senator McCASKILL, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and the other Members who came to speak. We will continue this dialogue tomorrow on the floor before passage.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank Senator PORTMAN and Senator BLUMENTHAL for their work on this. Senator PORTMAN and I have spent untold hours, and he has been a leader on this. I thank him for his leadership, in Toledo and Cincinnati, but especially in Toledo, where the sheriff, the community, Celia Williamson, and so many

others have been so important in combating this terrible affliction in our society. I thank them.

WALL STREET AND AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. President, last week, the House passed another giveaway to Wall Street, siding with special interests and rolling back accountability on some of the biggest banks at the expense of taxpayers. It comes on the heels of last year's tax giveaway that will benefit those same megabanks. This Congress bends over backward to help Wall Street while working families continue to struggle.

It is not just that we are helping Wall Street with tax breaks, we are helping Wall Street with rolling back regulations. Let me outline what exactly all that means.

In a series over several months, I am laying out the case for how Wall Street undermines America's workers and some of the changes we need to make in this country to grow our middle class and make work pay off.

Remember, one of the points I made was that American Airlines announced that they were going to increase workers' wages, as did Chipotle, and Wall Street hit them with a lower stock price as a result.

In each installment of this series, we have talked about these issues. I want to talk specifically this time about what Wall Street's war on workers does to employment. You can follow each installment on my medium page at www.medium.com/@SenatorBrown.

Last time, I talked about workers' paychecks. Today, I want to talk about layoffs.

Wall Street's singular focus on padding their own pockets is bad enough, but worse, it comes at the direct expense of American workers. Corporations focus almost exclusively on their quarterly performance on the stock market. That is how a CEO's performance is evaluated. They are compensated in large part with company shares. They do better when their stock price goes up. They do things to make their stock price go up, and then they do even better because they are compensated in large part with company shares.

Wall Street analysts like it when corporations minimize their cost to boost their short-term profits; hence the stock price goes up even when the company is already profitable, and that leads directly to layoffs. Corporations lay off workers to show they are serious about cutting expenses, and their stock prices often rise as a result. Wall Street's war on workers means not only smaller paychecks but also pink slips for those workers.

How did we get to a point where stock prices are more important than workers? It didn't happen overnight.

I was talking with Senator WHITEHOUSE about this, and whether it is Cranston, RI, or Mansfield, OH, companies used to consider their employees,

their customers, and even the people in the town they did business in, as stakeholders. They cared about their community, they cared about their workers, and they cared about their customers. They felt a duty to fulfill obligations to a broader community, not just their own corporate board members and their own corporate executives.

I grew up in Mansfield, OH, a city of about 50,000 in North Central Ohio halfway between our State's two largest cities, Cleveland and Columbus. I remember that there were so many companies in our town. I didn't know those company presidents—they were the big people in town, and I was a kid—but I do remember what those companies did. They sponsored Little League teams. They were involved in local Kiwanis clubs. They cared about workers, and they cared about the community. They cared about their customers. They weren't always interested in shareholders; they were interested in stakeholders, in all of us as a community. All the workers, all the customers, and all of the community were stakeholders. But now the focus has narrowed to just shareholders.

As Wall Street's influence has grown, corporate priorities have shifted from shareholders kind of writ large, and the way success is measured has changed fundamentally to stockholders. Businesses have become beholden to those quarterly earnings reports. They have left employees, communities, and customers behind in many ways. They do everything possible, including laying off workers, to make sure their balance sheets and profit margins look as good as they can—the impact on the workers and the long-term health of the company be damned.

In the 1980s, investors began to pursue hostile takeovers of companies that failed to maximize profits. Executives at other companies began to fear takeovers if they didn't keep profits and stock prices high. The pay packages of top management became greater and greater and became more and more closely tied to short-term stock performance.

Wall Street's and Main Street's interests began to diverge. Folks in the corporate boardroom were no longer forced to consider what was in the long-term interests of their workers and of their small-time investors. For top corporate executives, workers became nothing more than a line item in the budget, a cost to be minimized.

By the 1990s, even profitable companies started laying off workers to boost profits even further. Look at what happened to Xerox, an iconic American company that had never had a major layoff in its history. In 1993, the company announced plans to cut 10,000 workers despite being profitable. The company was doing fine. It wasn't a case of an industry moving south, fac-

ing an agonizing decision with bad options, but the CEO justified the job cuts as necessary "to compete effectively" and to have a "lean and flexible organization." He also said he expected to see higher profits because of the layoffs the following year.

Xerox wasn't alone. In the first 10 months of 1998, when the economy was booming, corporations laid off over half a million U.S. workers—200,000 more than were laid off the year before. This is the definition of profits before people, and things have gotten worse and worse since the late 1990s.

In 2015, Sysco announced a 3-year plan that included reducing its workforce—corporate-speak for laying off workers. It might have made sense if the company had experienced a year of sluggish sales, but guess what—the opposite was true. Their sales had increased. They generated \$1 billion in cash flow, and they were able to pay \$700 million in dividends to the company shareholders. If the large dividend payout the year before wasn't generous enough, the CEO said that one of the goals of the 3-year plan and its layoffs was to "maximize shareholder returns"—not stakeholders, not employees, not the communities, not the customers, but shareholder returns.

The next year, 2016, Tyson Foods announced layoffs despite having a good quarter in beef sales. The following year, the company's president touted "exceptional financial results." What was the reason for those results? Cost-cutting. It is always cost-cutting—more corporate-speak for laying off workers. Do you know what else he cited as the company's good health? Not great sales, not new products or investments in more workers, but the ability of the company to buy back billions of dollars of its own stock. So an accounting trick that funnels money to executives is what the company cited as a measure of its success. Buying back means executive compensation goes up. That is the key to what it was doing with cost-cutting. The company buys up shares of its own stock to drive up the price and increase the value for shareholders and the compensation for executives whose pay is tied to stock performance. Sounds familiar.

It is no coincidence that since the biggest corporations reaped their tax windfalls in September, they have announced billions of dollars in buybacks. It is always about the executives—about the executives' tax cuts, about the executives' compensation, about the executives' buybacks. Again and again, we see Wall Street consider workers as simply a cost to be cut but executive pay as essential to a company.

Last year, Humana announced that it was eliminating 2,700 jobs despite \$13 billion in revenue. In the same call that the CEO announced the layoffs, he also announced an increase in execu-

tive pay. Workers lose their jobs to pay for more money for corporate executives. Sound familiar again and again and again? And the cherry on top? A month later, Humana announced \$3 billion in stock buybacks. Again, what is that about? Higher executive compensation.

Of course, cost-cutting measures typically include workers losing their jobs. Cost-cutting measures almost never include pay cuts for corporate executives. In each of these examples, the company cited cost cuts that were so necessary, they had to fire workers, upend thousands of employees. I wonder how many of those executives and how many of those corporate leaders actually brought some of those workers into their offices and looked them in the eye and told them they were laying them off. My guess is that they had a much lower paid employee make that announcement and face the media and, more importantly, face the employees who lost their jobs.

How many of these executives actually listened to the story of an employee who loses her job, loses her house, whose total life is upended? How many of them ever listened to the stories of what happened to their workers who got fired? The company cited cost cuts that were so necessary, they had to fire those workers.

The shortsighted approach to running a company may work for top executives who can squeeze as much value out of the company in the short term without considering the business's long-term value. It is not just bad for the employees and communities, it is usually bad for the long-term health of the company. Making short-term decisions pays off if you are already well paid, but it doesn't work for those employees. Mainstream investors and workers only make a profit when a company's stock value continues to rise over time, but the corporate executives are no longer forced to consider what is in the long-term interest of workers and small-time investors. As long as Wall Street's analysis of one-size-fits-all measure of corporate success continues to be cost-cutting, workers are at constant risk of losing their jobs. As long as CEOs get paid based on stock prices instead of the company's long-term success, workers will keep getting fired from hostile companies.

We need to break this cycle of greed between Wall Street and CEOs. In the end, companies can't be profitable without good workers. We need policies that restructure our economy so workers share in the profits they create and Wall Street doesn't determine when workers keep their jobs or how much is in their paycheck.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, we are more aware than ever of the accelerating pace of climate change and of the serious threat that rising seas, higher temperatures, and changing weather poses. I suppose I don't need to lecture the Presiding Officer from Florida on the threat of rising seas.

The real-time effects of climate change are becoming clearer and clearer every year. Here is a telling example unfolding right now in the Arctic.

In this graphic, we see the mean area of Arctic sea ice over the last several decades. The maximum yearly extent of the ice, which occurs around this time of year, continues to shrink each decade.

This line tracks the sea ice in the Arctic in millions of square kilometers, running from February through to May. This is the track of the sea ice extent during the 1980s. If you take all the years in the 1980s and you average them together and you run through the calendar, it is like a clock going this way through these months. You would see the sea ice growing and fading away as spring came to the Arctic.

That is where the ice was when averaging the 1980s. This green line is the exact same thing; it is just for the 1990s. So we can see how much sea ice has been lost averaged decade over decade.

The blue line here is for 2000. Once again, we see a loss of sea ice—a considerable loss from the levels back as recently as the 1980s.

The purple line right here is the average of the years in this decade so far, from 2010 to 2017—that is the average of those 7 years. This dot is the high, the maximum ice extent recorded in 2016. This lower dot is the lower high of the ice recorded in 2017. So you can see that even though this is the average, the trend remains downward.

This red line is what we have measured so far in 2018. Here we are right now in March of 2018, and it is well below. Decade after decade, we see the ice melting away.

As these facts and so many others relentlessly pile up, it has become harder and harder for the fossil fuel industry and the web of front groups and the Trump administration officials who do its bidding to claim that there is nothing to see here: Folks, move along; it is all just a big hoax.

The University of Alaska is our closest university to the Arctic. The University of Alaska actually has a climate science center where they are studying and teaching the science of climate change. The University of Alaska also actually has the Ocean Acidification Research Center. As I have pointed out in these speeches over the years, one of the most obvious and pernicious consequences of climate change is that when you ramp the CO₂

concentration in the atmosphere, the oceans, which cover 70 percent of the surface of the world, absorb not only excess heat, but they actually chemically absorb the carbon dioxide. When that happens, they become more acidic. In the wee hours of a morning months and months ago, I actually did the experiment right here, where I blew the carbon dioxide from my breath through an aquarium bubbler into a glass of water that had pH-sensitive dye in it, and you could see, in the moment that it took for me to exhale that carbon-dioxide-rich breath through the water, how the color changed, and you could measure it against the color chart for pH and see how just that one breath changed the acidity of the water and made it more acid.

That is happening across the planet, and it affects creatures like terrapods, which are a very important species for salmon, which is, in turn, a very important industry for Alaska. That is why Alaska has the Ocean Acidification Research Center—some hoax.

For this, my 201st “Time to Wake Up” speech, I wish to get into some of the reasons why I remain optimistic even in the face of relentless attacks on the environment, both from the fossil fuel industry and from the Trump administration. There are success stories, including bipartisan wins in Congress and major advances outside of Congress. We are still making progress on climate and energy policy, even under political siege by the fossil fuel industry.

First, there is an explosion in renewable energy. In 2017, renewables provided nearly 20 percent of electricity generation in the United States. Wind and solar energy costs fell, and utilities across the country, even in red States, invested heavily. The renewable energy industry in America hit 3.3 million jobs—more than all fossil fuel jobs combined. The private sector is leading renewables purchases. One example is AT&T. AT&T recently signed onto the World Wildlife Fund's Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers' Principles, a criteria to help energy producers meet the needs of large customers like AT&T. As part of that commitment with the World Wildlife Fund, AT&T has signed two agreements with NextEra Energy for wind power—220 megawatts from an Oklahoma wind farm and 300 megawatts from a Texas wind farm. It is one of the largest corporate renewable energy purchases in history. I congratulate my Texas and Oklahoma colleagues for these new, home-State, renewable energy jobs, and I congratulate AT&T for its foresight and leadership.

Another business breakthrough came when the massive asset manager BlackRock helped break Exxon's and Occidental Petroleum's resistance and forced through shareholder resolutions requiring those oil producers to report

their climate risk to their shareholders, to their investors. I, for one, don't think those shareholders are yet getting the full story.

The multinational insurance firm, AXA, announced that it would divest from its tar sands holdings and it would stop providing insurance for pipelines that transport tar sands oil.

Credit rating agency Moody's announced that it will consider climate risk in rating coastal communities' municipal bonds. So our coastal municipalities in Rhode Island, the Presiding Officer's coastal communities in Florida, and coastal communities across the country are now going to have to take into account the climate risk, what infrastructure and what hazards they face from sea level rise and increased storm activity, and all of the things we associate with climate change. It is going to be part of how the rating agencies value their municipal bonds. That is going to change behavior, and it doesn't matter whether you are a red State or a blue State.

Companies like Microsoft and Unilever have baked into their own internal accounting their own internal carbon prices to help them reduce the carbon intensity of their operations. And, of course, virtually every Republican who has thought the climate change problem through to a solution has come to a price on carbon as being the market-based solution to that problem.

When the President announced that he would withdraw the United States from the historic Paris Agreement, leaving us as the pariah nation—the only one in the world to reject this global pledge—many American companies pledged that, as to that Paris Agreement, they are still in.

The corruption of the Trump administration by fossil fuel interests has not affected many State and local officials. In Colorado, for instance, the Colorado State Public Utility Commission is working with Xcel Energy to build out a cleaner energy mix and retire older fossil fuel units. Specifically, Colorado is looking to retire 660 megawatts of coal-fired generation—close it down—and replace it with renewables. Their recent request for bids brought a flood of new renewable energy proposals at costs that came in beating out existing coal and natural gas facilities. New-built renewables on price beat out existing fossil fuel. The market is speaking, and it is saying that fossil fuel, even with all its scandalous and well-defended subsidies, can't compete. Fossil can't compete.

On the Paris Agreement, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Virginia, Washington State and—I am proud to say—Rhode Island all declared that they, too, are still in. They will meet their goals. Alaska announced that it would meet its Paris Agreement goals. What is

more, California and Washington State have combined with Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico in a plan to put a price on carbon that would reach up and down virtually the entire Pacific coast of the Americas—from Canada all the way down through Chile.

One problem for the fossil fuel folks' political influence, which is so deadly effective here in Congress, is that it doesn't do so well in government agencies where the rule of law, not politics, prevails. So the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, a Federal administrative agency bound by rule of law, more or less blew off a preposterous proposal by fossil fuel flunkies at the Department of Energy to subsidize coal even more. Instead, FERC recently finalized a rule for energy storage in America's electric grids. This will not only expand energy storage, but it will also accelerate renewables like wind and solar. A recent study predicted that the rule could spur—hold on—50,000 megawatts of additional energy storage across the United States, enough to power roughly 35 million homes. This estimate could turn out to be conservative, if renewables prices keep heading in their current trajectories. That FERC rule, by the way, was unanimous and bipartisan.

FERC oversees the system operators, like ISO-New England, which are steadily improving the role of renewables in regional markets, removing the obstacles that had kept renewables from competing fairly in capacity auctions and dispatch decisions. With wind power being such a large part of Iowa's energy mix, for example, its midwestern ISO figured out the algorithms to treat wind as reliable, baseload power. FERC's storage rule will give these system operators a new avenue for further progress on clean, renewable energy.

Believe it or not, even Congress has acted. Just last month, Congress passed a bipartisan budget agreement that included legislation I cosponsored with Senators HETTKAMP, CAPITO, and BARRASSO to spur investment and innovation in next-generation carbon capture, utilization, and storage technologies. Our bill attracted what I would call an unlikely coalition of energy, industrial, agricultural, and technology companies, as well as environment and labor groups.

This bill puts a positive price on carbon reduction through a tax credit for projects that capture and utilize or store carbon dioxide emissions. Without that price signal, there was little incentive to innovate how to turn carbon pollution from powerplants and industrial facilities into something safe or even useful. The bill even incentivizes technologies to pull carbon pollution directly from the atmosphere. The key is that Congress, for the first time, put a dollar value on reducing carbon pollution.

The Senate also just passed a nuclear innovation bill written by Senator CRAPO and me to increase collaboration between private industry, universities, and national laboratories in advanced nuclear technologies. Our bill was also cosponsored by Senators BOOKER, MURKOWSKI, RISCH, HATCH, and DURBIN. It would put private innovators together with our National Labs, with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and with the Energy Department—all working together on safe, new nuclear technologies.

My goal here is not only to help bring new carbon-free technologies forward, ultimately to a carbon-free power grid, but also to explore technologies that just may allow us to turn our present hazardous nuclear waste stockpiles to productive use—to generate clean energy, to move those waste stockpiles from the liability to the asset column on our Nation's books. What an achievement that would be.

Although Congress may be blockaded still by fossil fuel interests, it is nevertheless the law of the land that administrative agencies must take into account the social cost of carbon—the cost that fossil fuels carbon pollution imposes on society—in making energy-related decisions. That test will remain, and lawsuits are slowly closing in on the moment of discovery, when lawyers finally get access to the fossil fuel industry's files, and decades of lies, denial, and political manipulation are exposed for all to see.

The well-funded climate denial machine, with its front groups and trickpony scientists and political muscle operation, can only keep the denial castle propped up for so long. But until that battlement of lies collapses—and it will—until it collapses, nevertheless, progress still continues all around us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are quickly turning to the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act legislation, coupled with the legislation that has come over from the House of Representatives, and I hope we will get a big bipartisan vote in support of that legislation when it is voted on, probably tomorrow.

Let me just say that for more than two decades, the commercial internet has been an undeniable force for good. It has delivered economic opportunity to people who would not otherwise have had it. It has empowered marginalized citizens around the world to fight back against oppressors. It has expanded educational opportunities and made news and information more accessible, and more. But like any tool, the internet can be used for evil as well as good, and right now, certain corners of the internet are being exploited to

facilitate sex trafficking, including the widespread trafficking of children.

Each year, thousands of children are sexually trafficked within the United States. That is right. Thousands of children are trafficked each year in the United States—not in some faraway country but right here at home in our communities. More and more every day, this trafficking is being facilitated via the internet. Three out of four children who have been sexually trafficked in this country have been trafficked online.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children reported an 846-percent increase in reports of suspected child sex trafficking from 2010 to 2015. The increase, the national center reports, is “directly correlated to the increased use of the internet to sell children for sex.”

Obviously, dedicated prosecutors and law enforcement around the country are working every day to combat the proliferation of sex trafficking on the internet, but some of their efforts have been stymied by a provision of a 1996 law called the Communications Decency Act. The provision in question—section 230—was meant to protect websites from being held accountable for material people create and post on their sites. It is thanks in part to this provision that such popular sites as Facebook, YouTube and Twitter have been able to flourish. But certain websites have used this provision to defend themselves in court cases dealing with criminal activity that they have knowingly allowed or participated in—specifically, sex trafficking.

Needless to say, Congress never intended this provision to be used to protect websites that knowingly and deliberately facilitate trafficking, but courts have generally held that this provision does not permit them to hold websites accountable for knowingly facilitating sex trafficking.

Courts have also made clear that if Congress wants to ensure that these trafficking accomplices can be prosecuted, it needs to provide some more clarity on this provision. That is what we are here to do today.

Senator ROB PORTMAN of Ohio has been a leading voice in the Senate in the fight against human trafficking, and the legislation before us today includes his legislation, the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, which will prevent section 230 from being used as a defense by those who are knowingly cooperating with sex traffickers. Under this Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, State law enforcement officials will be able to prosecute websites that knowingly assist in or facilitate sex trafficking, and victims will be allowed to sue websites that violate the Federal sex trafficking statute. State attorneys general will now also be allowed to file civil suits against websites that knowingly facilitate trafficking.

The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act is an outstanding bill and a great credit to Senator PORTMAN and the others he worked with to get it considered here on the Senate floor. It addresses a hole in our laws that is allowing sex traffickers to exploit the internet to facilitate their trafficking, but it ensures that only bad actors are targeted, and it maintains the key freedoms that have allowed the internet to flourish. Under this legislation, websites can only be prosecuted if they knowingly facilitate or support trafficking.

This bill is strongly supported by Members of both parties. In fact, 67 out of the 100 U.S. Senators are cosponsors of this bill. This bill is supported by the White House. It is supported by law enforcement organizations. It is supported by organizations that fight sex trafficking. It is supported by faith-based organizations. It is also supported by a number of major technology companies. I was proud to help facilitate conversations with a number of technology companies that resulted in solid support for this bill among members of the technology community.

The process of getting this bill to the Senate floor today has been characterized by a wonderful degree of bipartisanship. I am hoping that continues as we debate this bill over the next couple of days, and I encourage my colleagues to reject any attempts to slow this bill down with amendments. We have a remarkable degree of consensus on the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, both within and without Congress, and we should not disturb this momentum. We need to get this bill over the finish line. Every day that we wait for this bill to be enacted into law is another day in which websites in the dark corners of the internet can facilitate the heinous practice of sexually exploiting vulnerable human beings.

During the Commerce Committee hearing that I chaired on this bill, we heard testimony from Yvonne Ambrose, whose daughter, Desiree Robinson, was sexually trafficked repeatedly before being murdered. Desiree was just 16, a bright and loving girl who dreamed of becoming a doctor in the Air Force. Instead, she was raped and murdered by a man twice her age who had sought her for sex after seeing her advertised on an internet site.

Every day across this country, there is another Desiree being trafficked. Some of these children are not yet teenagers. They should be going to basketball games and birthday parties. Instead, they are being taken to homes and hotels and being violated by strangers. Some, like Desiree, will die there.

Fighting trafficking has to be a priority for all of us.

I am proud to have helped draft two bills that became law earlier this year

to address human trafficking in commercial vehicles. But while we have passed some good legislation over the past few years, there is a lot more work that needs to be done. There are many more Desirees out there in danger, and we have an obligation to do everything we can to protect them.

The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act will strike an important blow against this new wave of traffickers exploiting the internet to sell children, and the bill it is now part of, a bill that we are considering today—the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act—will further boost SESTA's impact by establishing new criminal penalties for facilitating sex trafficking.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and to get it to the President as soon as possible. There are a lot of children out there who are waiting for our help.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 735, 736, 737, 738, and 739.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The bill clerk read the nominations of William M. McSwain, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years; Matthew D. Harris, of Utah, to be United States Marshal for the District of Utah for the term of four years; Johnny Lee Kuhlman, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Oklahoma for the term of four years; Joseph D. McClain, of Indiana, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of four years; and David A. Weaver, of Colorado, to be United States Marshal for the District of Colorado for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate;

that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McSwain, Harris, Kuhlman, McClain, and Weaver nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this week I joined my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, in introducing the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. This bill would update and reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs, which have provided lifesaving services and housing for America's homeless youth for more than 40 years.

Homelessness is affecting youth in unprecedented numbers. According to a recent study by Voices of Youth Count, an initiative of Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago, approximately 4.2 million young people experience homelessness in the United States each year. Some of these youth may stay away from home for only 1 or 2 nights, and others have been living on the streets for years. Approximately 73 percent experienced a homelessness episode lasting more than 1 month. The study also found that homelessness is as prevalent in rural communities as it is in urban communities.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act would reauthorize and strengthen the programs that help homeless youth meet their immediate needs, and secure long-term residential services for those who, sadly, cannot be safely reunified with family. Three programs—the Basic Center Program, Transitional Living Program, and Street Outreach Program—help community-based organizations reach these young people

when they need the most support. These programs help runaway and homeless youth avoid the juvenile justice system, and early intervention helps these young people escape victimization.

As chairman of the Senate Housing Appropriations Subcommittee, working to end the scourge of homelessness—in both youth and adults—has been one of my top priorities. According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, there has been a 27-percent drop in chronic homelessness since 2007. We must build on this success so that homeless youth have opportunities to succeed just as other youth. This bill is an important step in that direction.

The RHYA programs have produced powerful success stories. In 2015, the Housing Appropriations subcommittee held a hearing during which Brittany Dixon, a former homeless youth from Auburn, ME, testified about her personal experience as a homeless youth. After becoming homeless at age 18, she connected with New Beginnings, a service provider in Lewiston, ME, where she received the help and support she needed to develop critical life skills and become self-sufficient. She went on to earn a college degree and obtain a full-time job as an education technician at an elementary school.

New Beginnings has used RHYA resources to connect with youth who need food, a safe place to sleep, health services, and education support. More than 135 young people were served at its 24-hour youth shelter in 2016, where they gained the support to return home safely, find independent living options, and deal with trauma, substance abuse, and mental health challenges. The Street Outreach Program, which would be reauthorized by our legislation, allows New Beginnings to operate an outreach drop-in center that reaches more than 500 youth annually.

Staff at Preble Street, a youth shelter in Portland, leveraged a grant from the Transitional Living Program, also reauthorized by our bill, to support First Place, a program that helps young people break out of homelessness and plan for independent living. They work with local landlords to secure affordable apartments for youth who cannot safely reunite with their families and help them develop the life skills they will need to achieve their goals.

For more than 25 years, Shaw House, in Bangor, has served Maine youth living in five rural counties. The Basic Center Program, BCP, reauthorized in our bill, helps Shaw House offer food, clothing, and other basic needs assistance, with the goal of increasing family reunification and reducing youth homelessness across Maine. In fiscal year 2014, 94 percent of the minors who entered BCP exited these programs safely and appropriately, and 69 per-

cent were reunited with their families. One of the improvements in our bill would allow BCP grantees to serve youth for up to 30 days, instead of the current 21 days.

Teens run away and become homeless for many reasons. They are also at high risk of victimization, abuse, criminal activity, and death. The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children estimates that, in 2017, 1 in 7 of nearly 25,000 youth reported to them as runaways were sex-trafficking victims. In Maine, recent reports show that, of the more than 10,000 reported human-trafficking cases last year, 26 percent involved minors. Several hundreds of these victims identified as runaway or homeless youth. This population is at greater risk of suicide, unintended pregnancy, and substance abuse. Many are unable to continue with school and are more likely to enter our juvenile justice system.

Our bill focuses on this tragic problem by supporting trauma-informed, wraparound services for victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation. Congress has passed legislation in recent years to combat these horrific crimes and support survivors, and the policies and tools included in the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act are important pieces of the Federal response to human trafficking.

Homeless young people need access to safe beds at night and oftentimes services during the day. A growing number of homeless youth identify as LGBT. According to the Voices of Youth Count report, LGBT young people are twice as likely to be homeless. Our bill would ensure that those seeking services through these Federal programs are not denied assistance based on their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act will support those young people who run away, are thrown out, or are disconnected from families. A caring and safe place to sleep, eat, grow, and develop is critical for all young people, and the programs reauthorized through this legislation help extend those basic services to the most vulnerable youth in our communities.

I thank Senator LEAHY for his leadership on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

NATIONAL STOP THE BLEED DAY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I would like to speak today about National Stop the Bleed Day.

Our country will recognize National Stop the Bleed Day on March 31, 2018. Stop the Bleed is a program offered by the American College of Surgeons to help educate the general public on techniques to assist victims suffering from uncontrolled bleeding using di-

rect pressure, gauze and bandages, and tourniquets.

Each year, more than 180,000 people die from traumatic injuries sustained as a result of events including vehicle crashes, falls, industrial and farm accidents, shootings, and natural disasters. The most common preventable cause of these deaths is losing too much blood in the minutes before trained responders arrive. Just like CPR training, a civilian familiar with basic bleeding control techniques is better equipped to save a life. The effort to make this training available to the public is driven by the goal to reduce or eliminate preventable death from bleeding.

I urge my colleagues to join me and rise in support of National Stop the Bleed Day and help to end the loss of life from uncontrolled bleeding by getting trained to “Stop the Bleed.”

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS M. CONWAY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of a World War II hero: Lt. Rev. Thomas M. Conway, born April 5, 1908, in Waterbury, CT. Father Conway, who was born 110 years ago next month, was an American hero who, after the sinking of the USS *Indianapolis*, went from lifeboat to lifeboat in shark-infested waters to care for his fellow sailors in a manner far above the call of duty.

The courage of the brave men who served on the USS *Indianapolis*, who delivered critical parts to the first atomic bomb used in combat, helped bring about the end of World War II. After their mission was complete, they were intercepted on their way to join with the rest of the Pacific fleet for the invasion of mainland Japan. Two torpedoes from a Japanese submarine struck the *Indianapolis* on July 30, 1945, sinking the battleship and immediately killing 300 of the 1,196 sailors aboard. The remaining 900 sailors were left to fend for their lives in the shark-infested Pacific, spending 3 days with few lifeboats or supplies and no way to notify the Navy of their peril.

Father Conway, as chaplain, disregarded his own safety by swimming back and forth among the men, administering aid, helping to gather those who had drifted from the mass of survivors, and continuing to minister and organize group prayers. His heroism gave comfort to the dying and helped save the lives of the 321 sailors who were rescued from the sea. Father Conway's acts of bravery took a physical toll, and he succumbed to the elements shortly before rescuers arrived. As one surviving sailor said of Father Conway, “He was the most visible person keeping the men together, giving them hope and sacrificing himself to keep his fellow sailors united, calm, and alert.”

The legacy of Father Conway continues to inspire his family, fellow sailors, and the people of Connecticut. That is why next month, in recognition of his birthday, we pause to reflect upon and celebrate his courageous actions. His selflessness and bravery are the epitome of an American hero.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHARCILLEA "CHARCY" SCHAEFER

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to LTC Charcillea "Charcy" Schaefer for her exemplary dedication to duty and service as an Army congressional fellow and congressional budget liaison for the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller. Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer is transitioning from her present assignment to serve as a battalion commander for the 19th Military Police Battalion of the 25th Infantry Division, Schofield Barracks, HI.

Born in Ipswich, England, into an Air Force family, Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer was commissioned as a military police officer after her graduation from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point with a bachelor of science degree. She then went on to earn a master's degree in administration with a focus in leadership from Central Michigan University and another in legislative affairs from the George Washington University.

Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer has served in a broad range of assignments during her 15-year Army career. Her assignments took her across the country including Fort Bliss, TX; Fort Leonard Wood, MO; Fort Bragg, NC; and Fort Campbell, KY. She has four combat deployments encompassing over 45 months in theater, with 23 months advising host nation forces in policing and Army tactics and operations. Three of Charcy's deployments were to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and the fourth was to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

I had the privilege of working with Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer in my office in 2016 during her year as an Army congressional fellow, as well as during her subsequent assignment as a congressional budget liaison for the U.S. Army. Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer worked tirelessly with Members of Congress and their staff to accurately articulate the Army's budget positions to the Appropriations Committees. Her professionalism, diligence, and commitment to the mission are unmatched, and her work both as a fellow and as a liaison exemplify the best of the U.S. Army and the Department of Defense to the U.S. Congress.

The foundation of Charcy's military success is her family. Her parents, Parks and Mary Schaefer of New Bern,

NC, provided the base of selfless service evident in all that she and her siblings, Chas and MaryLynne, do. Charcy is a devoted wife to Rachel Brant, an accomplished attorney and herself a captain in the U.S. Army Reserve Judge Advocate Corps. Rachel anxiously awaits their family's reunion, to include dogs Rocco and Stevie, in Honolulu. Their attitude of service and care for others permeates in each organization and activity they participate in, and they are both truly examples of extraordinary leaders in the Army and the communities they serve.

Throughout her career, Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer has positively impacted the soldiers, peers, and superiors around her. Our country has benefited tremendously from her extraordinary leadership, judgment, and passion. I join my colleagues today in honoring her dedication to our Nation and invaluable service to the U.S. Congress as an Army congressional liaison.

It has been a genuine pleasure to have worked with Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer over the last 2½ years. On behalf of a grateful nation, I proudly recognize and commend Charcy for her service to our country and wish her all the best as she continues her service in the U.S. Army.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONOR FLIGHT NORTHERN COLORADO'S 20TH FLIGHT TO DC

• Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish today to recognize the veterans of Honor Flight Northern Colorado who have made their 20th trip to Washington, DC, to visit memorials that stand in their honor. This group consists of veterans from various wars and generations, but all are linked by their service to our country.

Founded in 2005, the Honor Flight program was originally formed to honor veterans that had served in World War II. The program has expanded and now welcomes veterans from across the country to fly to Washington, DC, free of charge, so that they can visit the national memorials dedicated to their service. These veterans have preserved our rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Few words sufficiently express the gratitude and respect we all have for these brave men and women. Of the 123 veterans on the most recent Honor Flight, 9 served in World War II, 25 served in Korea, and 89 served in Vietnam.

Please join me in honoring Carl Curtis, Eugene Doty, Ben Gutfelder, Fred Heinze, James Ingram, Elwood Johnson, George Kunz, Stuart Mundt, Merwin Waterman, John Anderson, Ralph Ashton, William Bohn, Gerald Briggs, Joseph Carney, Dale Doty, Ernest Garcia, Charles Gustafson, Fred Hagen, Richard Hornung, Phillip

Kaspar, Dixon King, George Lanes, John Lark, Don Moritz, August Roemer, Melvin Salter, Paul Salvador, Arlen Sarian, Walter Slocum Jr, Arthur Smith, Willard Unrein, Robert Wallen, William Webster, Reginald Willcox, Edward Aitken, Charles Ashbaugh, Harry Ashbaugh, Frank Atwood, Thomas Barker, Lanny Benninger, Eldredge Blain, William Bjorlin, Leslie Burns, Joel Champion, James Chopp, Willis Corcoran, William Damewood, Anson Derby, Clarence Dye, Clifford Echols, Roy Echols, David Fanning, Wesley Feeney Jr, Budd Finch Jr, Errol Ford, Michael Gail, Alonzo Garza, Dennis Gordon, Eldon Harrell, Larry Hartman, Allan Havens, John Hendrickson, Nicholas Herrera, Donald Hull, Raymond Johnson, John Kask, Paul Kornmueller, Charles Klutsch, Joseph Long, Michael Long, Edward Longhini, Joseph Maes, Loren Maes, Gary Malara, David Mathis, Michael McClure, Jerry McDaniel, Mark McKinley, Oscar Metzgar, Steven Moskowitz, Allan Nelson, Robert Nelson, Russell Ness, Paul Nobles, Sven Nylander, Max Oesterle, Dale Olson, David Painter, Thomas Parker, Raymond Patch, Rudolf Peralez, Robert Perlenfien, John Perrine, Wayne Peterson, Louis Price, Jerry Purdy, Ernie Pyle, Ronald Ramirez, Richard Reininger, Frank Ross, Joe Roybal, John Ryan, Genaro Salazar, Raymond Sautter, Robert Schawo, Rudy Schenk, Larry Schwindt, Robert Schaeffer, Dan Shaffer, Roger Smith, Daniel Sorensen, Andrew Stephenson, Marjorie Stephenson, Walter Stolpa Jr, Dwight Strandberg, Barton Thompson, Norman Toman, Richard Tompkins, Samuel Trujillo, Terrence Urista, Myron Wagner, James Wetzler, and Charles Winkleman.●

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD BLATTIE

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Harold Blattie, the outgoing executive director of the Montana Association of Counties, for his longtime commitment to public service in the State of Montana.

Mr. Blattie has dedicated his life to helping preserve our Montana way of life through countless public works projects.

He has served as the executive director of MACo for over a decade, providing strong leadership for Montana's counties and facilitating cooperation between local, State, and Federal leaders to deliver for the residents of Big Sky Country.

Throughout his respected career, he has secured critical resources for citizens from Libby to Baker and Dillon to Plentywood. The residents of our great State owe him a debt of gratitude, and I rise today with a small token of our appreciation.

Mr. Blattie has built his life around building stronger communities.

He is a role model for all Americans, and Montana is a better place because of his work.

I rise today to thank him for all he has done for the Treasure State and wish him all the best of luck in whatever comes next.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT RELATIVE TO EXTENDING TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR THREE YEARS—PM 32

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Today, I am requesting that the Congress extend trade authorities procedures for 3 years. As required under section 103(c)(2) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (Trade Priorities Act), I have attached to this message the report describing the progress that has been made in trade negotiations by my Administration and the reasons why the extension is necessary.

As noted in the 2018 Trade Policy Agenda, my Administration has launched a new era in American trade policy, driven by a determination to use the leverage available to us as the world's largest economy to open foreign markets, and to obtain more efficient global markets and fairer treatment for American workers. One of the major pillars supporting my trade policy is the pursuit of better trade deals.

As you know, my Administration is pursuing the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement—something many have promised but have failed to deliver. In addition, my Administration is exploring potential trade agreement partners, including in Africa and Southeast Asia.

I hope my Administration can continue to work with the Congress to pursue

new and better trade deals for America's workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses. Extension of trade authorities procedures is essential to fulfill that task and to demonstrate to our trading partners that my Administration and the Congress share a common goal when it comes to trade.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2018.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2030. An act to deem the compliance date for amended energy conservation standards for ceiling fan light kits to be January 21, 2020, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 835. An act to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument.

H.R. 4176. An act to strengthen air cargo security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4851. An act to establish the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5074. An act to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5079. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5099. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a fusion center technical assistance program.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 788. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Louise McIntosh Slaughter, a Representative from the State of New York.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2154. An act to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 835. An act to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4176. An act to strengthen air cargo security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5074. An act to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5079. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5099. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a fusion center technical assistance program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4619. A communication from the Director of Defense Pricing and Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Amendment to Mentor-Protege Program" ((RIN0750-AJ05) (DFARS Case 2016-D011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4620. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William C. Mayville, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4621. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4622. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Security Education Program for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4623. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4624. A communication from the Deputy White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, eighteen (18) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4625. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Encouraging Vaccine Innovation: Promoting the

Development of Vaccines that Minimize the Burden of Infectious Diseases in the 21st Century"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4626. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on mining activities as required by the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4627. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the use of the exemption from the antitrust laws provided by the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4628. A communication from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2017 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4629. A communication from the Chairperson of the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission, transmitting, pursuant to D.C. Code 1-204.34(d) (1), the nomination of Rahkel Bouchet to be an Associate Judge for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4630. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River, Letart, WV" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0075)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4631. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Monte Foundation Snowfest Fireworks, Tahoe City, Lake Tahoe, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0117)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4632. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; St. Francis Yacht Club Fireworks, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0119)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4633. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Wando Terminal Crane Movement; Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0074)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4634. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Black River, Port Huron, MI" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket

No. USCG-2017-1047)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4635. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Sturgeon Bay, Sturgeon Bay, WI" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0050)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-186. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging the United States Department of the Interior to limit the proposed expansion of the national outer continental shelf oil and gas leasing program and to protect the waters off the coasts of the Commonwealth and New England; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, on January 4, 2018, the United States Department of the Interior announced the publication of a Draft Proposed Program in support of its National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program, and

Whereas, as evidenced in Executive Order 13795, issued by the President of the United States on April 28, 2017, and Order 3350 issued by Secretary Ryan Zinke of the United States Department of the Interior on May 1, 2017, publication of the Draft Proposed Program is a critically important step in an effort by the Federal Government to open up offshore oil drilling in most coastal waters of the United States; and

Whereas, to gauge public reaction and receive substantive input, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management will conduct a public hearing in the city of Boston; and

Whereas, the Draft Proposed Program purports to open up approximately 1.5 billion acres of territory to oil drilling and exploration, including important areas off the coast of Massachusetts and New England, and would approve as many as 47 drilling leases, which would be the largest number of such leases, offered in the history of the United States; and

Whereas, the administration's actions threaten to jeopardize the environmental well being of the Commonwealth and, more particularly, its coastal communities and waters; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth supports Energy Diversity, but the environmental and economic importance of the waters off the coast of the Commonwealth must be weighed against the benefits claimed for speculative offshore drilling; and

Whereas, offshore drilling could threaten the enjoyment of recreational fishing and the vitality of the Commonwealth's Fishing Industry, which provides income and employment for commercial fishermen, vessel manufacturers, restaurants and other businesses throughout Massachusetts; and

Whereas, according to the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Massachusetts Fishing Industry generates 83,000 jobs and approximately \$1.9 billion in income annually; and

Whereas, there is the potential for irreversible damage to areas such as Stellwagen

Bank, Georges Bank and Jeffreys Ledge, which are among the richest fishing grounds in the world and are home to a diverse array of Marine Life; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth possesses a pristine and biodiverse coastal zone, which is an essential driver of tourism for the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth's economy is reliant on tourism, which is its third largest economic sector and responsible for more than 100,000 jobs; and

Whereas, inhabitants of, and visitors to, our coastal communities support many important business sectors ranging from boat manufacturing and repair to tourism activities such as whale and bird watching; and

Whereas, the risk posed by speculative oil exploration initiatives to all of these economic and other existing and known benefits is not justifiable; and

Whereas, on January 9, 2018, the United States Department of the Interior announced that the State of Florida would be exempted from the National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program, and

Whereas, the Massachusetts Senate opposes the United States Department of the Interior's Draft Proposed Program to vastly expand offshore drilling in America's coastal waters off New England; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Massachusetts Senate hereby memorializes the United States Department of the Interior to take all possible action to protect the waters off the coast of the Commonwealth and New England, in particular Georges Bank, Stellwagen Bank, and Jeffreys Ledge, and exempt these areas from oil exploration initiatives; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to Ryan Zinke, Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, Charles Baker, Governor of the Commonwealth and to the Members of Congress from the Commonwealth.

POM-187. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California relative to a new 5-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program on the Outer Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 73

Whereas, California's iconic coastal and marine waters are one of our state's most precious resources, and it is our duty to protect our coast and ensure the long-term viability of California's wildlife and fisheries resources, as well as the multibillion dollar commercial and recreational fishing and tourism industries; and

Whereas, Hundreds of millions of California residents and visitors enjoy the state's ocean and coast for recreation, exploration, and relaxation; and tourism and recreation comprise the largest sector of the state's \$44.5 billion ocean economy; and

Whereas, 500,000 jobs rely on a clean California coast, including California's \$7 billion commercial fishing industry; and

Whereas, There have been no new offshore oil and gas leases in California since the 1969 blowout of a well in federal waters; and

Whereas, Beginning in 1921, and many times since, the California Legislature has enacted laws that withdrew certain offshore areas from oil and gas leasing, and by 1989 the state's offshore oil and gas leasing moratorium was in place; and

Whereas, In 1994, the California Legislature made findings in Assembly Bill 2444 (Chapter 970 of the Statutes of 1994) that offshore oil and gas production in certain areas of the

state's waters poses an unacceptably high risk of damage and disruption to the marine environment; and

Whereas, In the same bill, the Legislature created the California Coastal Sanctuary Act, which included all of the state's unleased waters subject to tidal influence and prohibited new oil and gas leases in the sanctuary, unless the President of the United States has found a severe energy supply interruption and has ordered distribution of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the Governor finds that the energy resources of the sanctuary will contribute significantly to alleviating that interruption, and the Legislature subsequently amends Chapter 970 of the Statutes of 1994 to allow that extraction; and

Whereas, Section 18 of the federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. Sec. 1331 et seq.) requires the preparation of a nationwide offshore oil and gas leasing program that sets a five-year schedule of lease sales implemented by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management within the United States Department of the Interior; and

Whereas, Consistent with the principles of Section 18 and the resulting regionally tailored leasing strategy, the current exclusion of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas development is consistent with the longstanding interests of the Pacific coast states, as framed in the 2006 West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health adopted by the Governors of California, Washington, and Oregon; and

Whereas, In November 2016, the federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management released a final 2017–22 leasing program that continues the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the undeveloped areas of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf; and

Whereas, Governor Brown, in December 2016, requested that then President Obama permanently withdraw California's Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas leasing, and along with previous California Governors, has united with the Governors of Oregon and Washington in an effort to commit to developing robust renewable energy sources to reduce our dependence on fossil fuel and help us reach our carbon emission goals; and

Whereas, The California Legislature has led the nation with its landmark climate change legislation, requiring ambitious greenhouse gas emission reductions of a 40-percent emissions reduction below 1990 levels by 2030, and achieving a renewables portfolio standard of 50 percent by 2030. California must lead the nation in fostering the transition away from offshore fossil fuel production to protect both our climate and oceans from the damaging impacts of climate change, which will affect all life on earth for generations to come; and

Whereas, A Field/IGS (Institute of Governmental Studies) poll in 2016 found 90 percent of Californians believe that protecting the coastline is important and a Public Policy Institute of California 2017 survey found support for drilling here at an all-time low of 25 percent; and

Whereas, President Donald Trump's proposed five-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program represents a renewed call for opening offshore areas for drilling and for lifting moratoriums on energy production in federal areas, that could lead to more oil spills, increased dependence on fossil fuel, and more damaging impact from climate change; and

Whereas, The California Legislature considers new oil and gas development offshore of the Pacific coast to be a threat to the na-

tion's economy and national security, and to the state's ambitious renewable energy goals; and

Whereas, The California State Senate has previously adopted Senate Resolutions 35, 44, and 51 in 2017, which support the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore California, oppose attempts to modify the prohibition, and defend the National Marine Sanctuaries of the United States; and

Whereas, Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke announced plans on January 4, 2018, for a Draft Proposed Program that would include nearly the entire U.S. Outer Continental Shelf for potential oil and gas lease sales pursuant to President Trump's executive order on American energy that was issued on April 28, 2017; and

Whereas, The proposed program would open up 6 leases off the coast of California, which would be the first sale in the Pacific Region since 1984; and

Whereas, Despite the Trump administration's assertion of support for the program from state and local governments, the States of Washington, Oregon, and California have been consistently united in their opposition to any new oil and gas activities off their coasts, which has resulted in the exclusion of the Pacific coast's Outer Continental Shelf from any National Outer Continental Shelf Program since the 1989–92 program; and

Whereas, Republican and Democratic Governors alike are opposed to the expansion of lease sales off the coast of the United States; and

Whereas, The Trump administration announced on January 9, 2018, that it retracted its plan to expand offshore oil leases off the coast of Florida after receiving feedback from Florida Republican Governor Rick Scott, and the Senate believes California should receive this same exemption; and

Whereas, The Trump administration has taken the position that state and local input is an important part of the leasing process; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate strongly urges the President and the Congress of the United States to permanently safeguard and protect the Pacific coast's Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas leasing, and declares the Senate's unequivocal support for the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore of the Pacific coast, its opposition to the proposed 5-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program on the Outer Continental Shelf or any attempts to modify that prohibition, and its determination to consider any appropriate actions to maintain the current prohibition; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the National Program Manager of the federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management as the public comment of the Legislature in opposition to the proposed new 5-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program on the Outer Continental Shelf; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Governor of California, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, to the Director of the federal

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and to each member of the California State Senate and Assembly.

POM-188. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to exclude the State of Maine from offshore oil and gas drilling and exploration activities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.P. 1279

Whereas, the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management 2019–2024 National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Draft Proposed Program has already been released and the programmatic environmental impact statement could be released as early as May 2018; and

Whereas, over 46,319 jobs and more than \$2,300,000,000 of the State's gross domestic product depend on clean, oil-free water and beaches and abundant fish and wildlife; and

Whereas, over 65% of the State's ocean-derived income stems from our tourism and recreation sector, contributing over \$1,200,000,000 to the State's economy, and this economic sector benefits from and depends upon a healthy ocean and coast; and

Whereas, offshore oil and gas drilling and exploration activities place coastal communities at economic and ecological risk from oil spills and the pollution brought by routine drilling operations and onshore industrialization, threatening the quality of life and livelihoods of the State's citizens and important industries, such as tourism and recreation and commercial and recreational fishing, and small businesses that rely on a clean and healthy ocean and beaches; and

Whereas, the State recognizes that our communities and industries depend on a healthy coastal environment for the benefit of current and future residents, property owners and visitors; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That We, your Memorialists, believe that offshore oil and gas drilling and exploration risks our economic and ecological health and therefore oppose any plan or legislation that encourages oil and gas exploration offshore that would negatively affect the citizens of the State; and be it further

Resolved: That We, your Memorialists, on behalf of the people we represent, take this opportunity to respectfully request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress direct the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to exclude the State and its offshore areas from the 2019–2024 National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Draft Proposed Program; and be it further

Resolved: That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, to Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke, to National Oil and Gas Leasing Program Development and Coordination Branch Chief Kelly Hammerle, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-189. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing their support for the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and opposing any reduction in its boundaries; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 222

Whereas, The Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary is one of fourteen U.S. marine protected areas and the only one located in the Great Lakes. The 4,300-square-mile sanctuary holds nearly 100 known shipwrecks—covering more than 150 years of Great Lakes commerce—remarkably preserved in Lake Huron's cold, fresh waters; and

Whereas, Jointly managed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the state of Michigan, the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary plays an important role in preserving our nation's marine heritage and providing opportunities for future discovery, research, and education. In addition to shipwrecks, the sanctuary encompasses other important cultural and natural features related to maritime heritage including lifesaving stations, lighthouses, historic boats and ships, commercial fishing camps, and working ports. Geological evidence suggests undiscovered prehistoric archaeological sites may also exist; and

Whereas, The United States Secretary of Commerce is currently conducting a review of all designations and expansions of national marine sanctuaries within the last 10 years. Under Executive Order 13795, Implementing an America-First Offshore Energy Strategy, the President of the United States directed the review of the budgetary impacts of the costs of managing the sanctuary, the adequacy of consultations with affected state and tribal governments prior to designation, and opportunity costs associated with potential energy and mineral exploration; and

Whereas, Nearly 3,900 square miles of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary could be impacted by the federal review. Just 448 square miles when initially designated in 2000, the sanctuary was expanded in 2014 to cover 4,300 square miles. The expansion increased the number of protected shipwrecks and opened up new opportunities to study shipwreck sites and maritime history in America; and

Whereas, Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary attracts shipwreck divers and tourists and provides an economic boost to charter boat businesses, dive shops, bike rentals, outfitters, and travel and tourism companies. In past years, recreational activity associated with the sanctuary has provided \$92 million in annual sales, \$35.8 million in personal income to residents of coastal cities located near the sanctuary, and 1,704 jobs. In 2015, over 95,000 people visited the Great Lakes Maritime Heritage Center which is associated with the sanctuary; and

Whereas, Energy and mineral exploration is not appropriate within the sanctuary. Michigan has banned offshore drilling of oil in the Great Lakes since 1982. Congress enacted a temporary ban on offshore drilling in the Great Lakes in 2001 and made the federal ban permanent in 2005. The oil and gas drilling ban is necessary to protect this unique natural resource that provides drinking water and recreational opportunities and supports food production, business, and transportation for all U.S. citizens; and

Whereas, Maintaining the current boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary supports the rural coastal communities of northeast Michigan as well as protects the health and safety of millions of people who call the Great Lakes Basin home: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives, That we support the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and oppose any reduction in its boundaries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and the United States Secretary of Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2325. A bill to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-214).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 85. A resolution calling on the Government of Iran to fulfill repeated promises of assistance in the case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 432. A resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Robert Frank Pence, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland.

Nominee: Robert Frank Pence.

Post: Ambassador to the Republic of Finland.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$5,000.00, 3/19/2013, Heartland Values PAC (Senator Thune); \$2,500.00, 5/13/2013, Ryan For Congress; \$1,000.00, 6/19/2013, Rounds For Senate; \$1,000.00, 9/17/2013, Rounds For Senate; \$2,600.00, 9/18/2013, Capito For West Virginia; \$20,000.00, 9/23/2013, Republican National Committee; \$1,000.00, 9/26/2013, Friends Of Barbara Comstock*; \$2,600.00, 10/16/2013, Texans For Senator John Cornyn Inc.; \$2,600.00, 10/23/2013, McConnell Senate Committee '14; \$2,500.00, 11/26/2013, Tom Cotton For Senate; \$1,000.00, 12/12/2013, Friends Of Randy Forbes; \$2,600.00, 3/05/2014, Texans For Senator John Cornyn Inc.; \$1,000.00, 3/26/2014, Suzanne Scholte For Congress; \$1,000.00, 3/27/2014, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$2,600.00, 3/28/2014, Ed Gillespie For Senate; \$2,600.00, 6/13/2014, Tom Cotton For Senate; \$1,000.00, 6/19/2014, Forbes For Congress; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Comstock For Congress; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Ed Gillespie For Senate; \$2,600.00, 7/10/2014, Terri Lynn Land For Senate; \$2,600.00, 9/05/2014, Rob Wittman; \$2,600.00, 9/08/2014, McConnell Senate Committee*; \$1,000.00, 9/29/2014, Cory Gardner For

Senate; \$32,400.00, 9/30/2014, NRSC; \$5,200.00, 9/30/2014, Ernst For US Senate*; \$2,000.00, 9/30/2014, Sullivan For US Senate; \$1,000.00, 9/30/2014, Sasse For US Senate; \$2,000.00, 9/30/2014, Scott Brown; \$1,000.00, 10/03/2014, Bill Cassidy For US Senate; \$1,000.00, 10/10/2014, Perdue For US Senate; \$2,500.00, 10/24/2014, Heartland Values PAC (Senator Thune); \$-2,700.00, 8/04/2015, Marco Rubio For President (error); \$2,700.00, 8/04/2015, Marco Rubio For President (error); \$5,400.00, 8/04/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$33,400.00, 10/01/2015, Republican National Committee; \$1,600.00, 10/01/2015, Republican National Committee; \$5,400.00, 11/10/2015, Ryan Zinke For Congress; \$2,700.00, 2/29/2016, Scott Walker, Inc.; \$50,000.00, 2/23/2016, Marco Rubio-Cons. Sol. PAC; \$50,000.00, 2/26/2016, Marco Rubio-Cons. Sol. PAC; \$50,000.00, 3/02/2016, Marco Rubio-Cons. Sol. PAC; \$2,700.00, 3/15/2016, Portman For Congress; \$2,700.00, 3/15/2016, Portman For Congress; \$-2,700.00, 3/18/2016, Johnson For Senate (error); \$2,700.00, 3/18/2016, Johnson For Senate (error); \$5,400.00, 3/18/2016, Johnson For Senate; \$2,700.00, 3/21/2016, Royce For Congress; \$2,700.00, 3/21/2016, Royce For Congress; \$5,400.00, 3/23/2016, Roy Blunt****; \$-2,700.00, 3/23/2016, Roy Blunt****; \$2,700.00, 3/23/2016, Roy Blunt****; \$5,400.00, 3/30/2016, Friends Of Joe Heck; \$2,700.00, 3/30/2016, Friends Of Joe Heck (error); \$-2,700.00, 3/30/2016, Friends Of Joe Heck (error); \$2,700.00, 3/31/2016, Friends Of Kelly Ayotte; \$2,700.00, 3/31/2016, Friends Of Kelly Ayotte; \$5,000.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul 2016; \$-2,300.00, 4/23/2016, Rand Paul 2016 (error); \$2,300.00, 4/23/2016, Rand Paul 2016 (error); \$-2,700.00, 5/13/2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,500.00, 5/27/2016, Carlos Lopez-Cantera For Senate check; \$2,700.00, 6/06/2016, Charles Grassley; \$2,700.00, 6/06/2016, Charles Grassley (error, repeated); \$2,700.00, 6/07/2016, Goodlatte For Congress; \$2,700.00, 6/08/2016, Randy Forbes; \$5,400.00, 6/13/2016, Todd Young*; \$5,000.00, 6/27/2016, Team Ryan; \$2,300.00, 6/27/2016, Paul Ryan For Congress (error); \$2,300.00, 6/27/2016, Paul Ryan For Congress (error); \$10,800.00, 6/30/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate; \$10,800.00, 6/30/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate (error, repeat); \$1,600.00, 6/30/2016, NRSC; \$33,400.00, 6/30/2016, NRSC; \$2,700.00, 6/30/2016, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$-5,400.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate; \$2,700.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate (error); \$-2,700.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate (error); \$25,000.00, 9/14/2016, Trump Victory; \$22,300.00, 9/14/2016, RNC****; \$2,700.00, 9/14/2016, Donald Trump For President****; \$5,400.00, 9/22/2016, Friends Of John McCain; \$2,700.00, 9/28/2016, Friends Of Patrick Toomey; \$5,000.00, 10/06/2016, John Bolton Super Pac; \$2,700.00, 10/14/2016, Richard Burr Committee; \$15,000.00, 11/03/2016, NRSC; \$2,700.00, 11/10/2016, John Kennedy For US; \$2,700.00, 11/10/2016, John Kennedy For US (error, repeat); \$5,000.00, 12/05/2016, Republican Majority Fund ***.

Spouse: Susan Sarbacher Pence: \$2,500.00, 5/13/2013, Ryan For Congress; \$2,600.00, 10/16/2013, Texans For Senator John Cornyn Inc.; \$2,600.00, 10/23/2013, McConnell Senate Committee; \$2,600.00, 12/23/2013, Texans For Senator John Cornyn Inc.; \$2,600.00, 3/28/2014, Ed Gillespie For Senate; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Comstock For Congress; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Ed Gillespie For Senate; \$2,600.00, 9/08/2014, McConnell Senate Committee; \$2,600.00, 9/30/2014, Cotton For US Senate; \$32,400.00, 9/30/2014, NRSC*; \$2,000.00, 10/02/2014, Brown For US Senate; \$1,000.00, 6/28/2015, Carly For President; \$5,400.00, 6/30/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$-2,700.00, 6/30/2015, Marco Rubio For President (error); \$2,700.00, 6/30/2015, Marco Rubio For President (error); \$5,400.00, 8/04/2015, Rubio For President

(error) \$1,700.00, 8/12/2015, Carly For President (C.A.R.L.Y.PAC); \$2,700.00, 2/29/2016, Scott Walker, Inc.; \$5,400.00, 3/15/2016, Rob Portman*; \$-2,700.00, 3/18/2016, Ron Johnson (error); \$2,700.00, 3/18/2016, Ron Johnson (error); \$5,400.00, 3/18/2016, Ron Johnson; \$-5,400.00, 3/23/2016, Friends Of Roy Blunt****; \$-2,700.00, 3/23/2016, Friends Of Roy Blunt****; \$2,700.00, 3/23/2016, Friends Of Ray Blunt****; \$10,800.00, 3/23/2016, Friends Of Roy Blunt****; \$2,700.00, 3/21/2016, Ed Royce Campaign Committee; \$2,700.00, 3/21/2016, Ed Royce Campaign Committee; \$2,700.00, 3/31/2016, Kelly Ayotte; \$-2,300.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul For US Senate (error); \$2,300.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul For US Senate (error); \$5,000.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul For US Senate; \$-2,700.00, 5/13/2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 6/30/2016, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$-2,700.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate; \$2,700.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate*; \$5,400.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate*; \$5,400.00, 9/15/2016, Young Victory Committee; \$35,000.00, 10/10/2016, NRSC***; \$2,700.00, 10/14/2016, Richard Burr Committee; \$5,000.00, 12/05/2016, Republican Majority Fund****.

Note: With respect to the various contributions and credits to the Rubio Senatorial campaign by Robert Pence, the second \$10,800.00 contribution shown on 6/30/2016 was not made, it is a repeat of the entry that precedes it. With respect to the various contributions and credits to the Rubio Presidential campaign by Susan Pence, the \$5,400.00 contribution shown on 8/04/2015 was not made. The true net result of all of the contributions shown to the Rubio campaigns is that Robert and Susan Pence each gave \$2,700.00 to each of the Presidential primary campaign, the Senate primary campaign, and the Senate general campaign. These numbers were confirmed with the Rubio campaigns on 12/6/2017.

*This contribution was not included on the FEC report.

**The FEC report erroneously repeats these three contributions (it shows the same reference number, 201610170200, except that the “-2,700.00” is turned into a positive “2,700 00”). The three repeated entries are not shown on this form.

***FEC report incorrectly shows only \$1,600.00 but uses the same reference number as the 8/24/16 Rubio contributions/credit.

****This is posted erroneously to Susan Pence in the FEC report.

*****I do not understand this accounting but the result is the same: \$5,400 (net) to Roy Blunt from Robert Pence and \$5,400.00 from Susan Pence. Both were contributed via one (1) credit card charge of \$10,800.00 on 3/21/16.

*****I believe these entries reflect a double counting of 9/14/16 Trump Victory contribution.

3. Children and Spouses: Stephen P. Pence: \$2,600.00, 6/30/2016, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$2,700.00, 7/10/2017, Rob Wittman For Congress; Joelle Pence: None; Geoffrey W. Pence: \$12,000.00 9/26/2016, NRSC; \$2,700.00, 7/07/2017, Rob Wittman For Congress; Stacy P. Pence: None; Brian F. Pence: \$2,600.00, 6/30/2016, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$2,700.00, 7/07/2017, Rob Wittman For Congress; Leigh Pence: \$12,000.00, 9/26/2016, NRSC.

4. Parents: Frank W. Pence—Deceased; Estella A. Pence—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Frank M. Pence—Deceased; Bess W. Pence—Deceased; Edna Baker—Deceased; (Unknown) Boyer—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Richard O. Pence—Deceased; Ronald E. Pence—None.

7. Sisters and Spouses—None.

*Edward Charles Prado, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Argentine Republic.

Nominee: Edward Charles Prado.

Post: United States Ambassador to Argentina.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 0;
2. Spouse: 0;
3. Children and Spouses: 0;
4. Parents: 0;
5. Grandparents: 0;
6. Brothers and Spouses: 0;
7. Sisters and Spouses: 0.

*Trevor D. Traina, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Nominee: Trevor Traina.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)¹

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self:

Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts \$500, 8/11/14, Unlocking Potential PAC; \$50,000, 3/31/15, Right to Rise USA.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees \$1,000, 4/24/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$1,000, 6/18/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$600, 6/24/14, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; \$32,400, 6/27/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 8/22/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$400, 8/26/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$2,600, 10/1/14, Gardner, Cory via Cory Gardner for Senate; \$4,800, 10/9/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$1,000, 10/11/14, DeMaio, Carl via Carl DeMaio for Congress; \$250, 11/6/14, NRSC; \$5,000, 2/24/15, Right to Rise PAC, Inc; \$2,700, 6/26/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$1,500, 11/11/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 12/31/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc; \$2,300, 1/11/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 1/11/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 2/10/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck, \$500, 3/11/16, Johnson, Ronald Harold via Ron Johnson for Senate Inc; \$2,700, 6/26/16, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$2,700, 7/19/16, Portman, Rob, via Rob Portman for US Sen-

¹In addition to my family members listed in this report, my former step-father (now deceased) had five children, by former wives, and my former step-mother had two children by former husbands. Of these seven children of my former step-parents, one is deceased and I do not know, and have not stayed in contact with, any of the others. I have not included these step-relatives in this report.

ate; \$25,000, 9/19/16, Republican National Committee; \$50,000, 10/10/16, Republican National Committee; \$5,000, 1/1/17, Trump Transition; \$1,100, 3/1/17, Republican National Committee; \$33,900, 3/1/17, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 5/15/17, Handel, Karen Christine via Handel for Congress, Inc.

Joint Fundraising Contributions \$25,000, 3/31/14, Boehner for Speaker; \$5,200, 9/3/14, Rubio Victory Committee; \$5,000, 10/24/16, Young Victory Committee; \$5,000, 11/3/16, Young Victory Committee; \$100,000, 2/23/17, Team Ryan.

Recipient of Joint Fundraiser Contributions \$19,800, 3/31/14, NRCC; \$2,600, 3/31/14, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$2,600, 3/31/14, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$2,080, 9/31/14, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$3,120, 9/3/14, Reclaim America PAC; \$2,700, 10/24/16, Young, Todd Christopher via Friends of Todd Young, Inc; \$2,300, 11/2/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc, \$5,000, 12/23/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc; \$5,000, 2/23/17, Prosperity Action, Inc; \$2,700, 2/23/17, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 2/23/17, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$33,900, 2/23/17, NRCC.

2. Spouse: Alexis Traina

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees \$2,700, 6/26/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$25,000, 9/19/16, Republican National Committee.

3. Children: Johnny Traina: None. Delphina Traina: None.

4. Mother: Diane B. Wilsey

Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts \$250,000, 1/14/14, Republican Governors Association; \$25,000, 8/14/14, John Bolton Super PAC; \$25,000, 8/25/14, Unlocking Potential PAC; \$100,000, 1/14/15, Right to Rise USA; \$5,000, 2/27/15, Leadership Matters for America PC, Inc.; \$25,000, 4/13/15, Conservative, Authentic, Responsive Leadership for You and America; \$11,824.15, 5/4/15, Right to Rise USA; \$30,000, 9/21/15, Growth Political Action Committee (“GROWTH PAC”); \$50,000, 3/27/17, Citizens Supporting Gavin Newson for Governor 2018; \$3,500, 11/8/17, Congressional Leadership Fund.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees \$32,400, 1/22/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 2/11/14, Strickland, Anthony A via Strickland for Congress; \$32,400, 2/19/14, NRSC; \$2,600, 3/11/14, Condley, Kerri—For Congress 2014; \$2,500, 3/20/14, San Francisco Republican Party; \$1,000, 3/27/14, Hill, James French via French Hill for Arkansas; \$500, 3/31/14, Emily’s List; \$5,200, 4/17/14, Ernst, Joni—For US Senate; \$32,400, 4/14/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 4/20/14, CAWG PAC; \$36, 4/22/14, National Republican Senatorial Committee—Sustaining Membership; \$2,600, 4/29/14, Issa Darrell, for Congress; \$2,600, 5/9/14, Gillespie, Edward W via Ed Gillespie for Senate; \$500, 5/27/14, DCCC; \$500, 6/1/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,100, 6/1/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$1,500, 6/19/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTT PAC); \$1,000, 6/9/14, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 8/28/14, California Democratic Party; \$300, 9/3/14, California Republican Party Federal Acct; \$500, 9/5/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$500, 9/9/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTT PAC); \$2,600, 10/6/14, Scott, Timothy E via Tim Scott for Senate; \$500, 10/9/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$1,000, 10/15/14, DeMaio, Carl via Carl

DeMaio for Congress; \$32,400, 1/20/15, Republican National Committee; \$500, 1/26/15, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; \$1,000, 2/4/15, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$33,400, 2/6/15, National Republican Senatorial Cmtee—Majority Makers; \$7,971.14, 3/10/15, Boehner, John; \$500, 3/12/15, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; \$100, 3/20/15, NRCC; \$1,000, 3/23/15, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 3/31/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$5,400, 4/11/15, Boozman, John via Boozman for Arkansas; \$2,700, 6/30/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc.; \$2,700, 9/8/15, Ayotte, Kelly A via Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc.; \$1,000, 9/8/15, CAWG PAC; \$2,000, 9/14/15, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$1,000, 9/22/15, Lee, Mike via Friends of Mike Lee Inc.; \$2,700, 9/23/15, Fiorina, Carly via Carly for President; \$2,700, 10/8/15, Kirk, Mark Steven via Illinois Lincoln PAC; \$2,700, 10/8/15, Kirk, Mark Steven via Illinois Lincoln PAC; \$1,300, 10/9/15, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,000, 10/23/15, Del Beccaro, Thomas via Del Beccaro for Senate; \$1,000, 10/23/15, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 11/4/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc.; \$11,000, 11/11/15, California Republican Party; \$2,700, 11/11/15, Christie, Chris for President, Inc.; \$98,800, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$100,200, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$10,000, 11/18/15, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; \$2,700, 11/23/15, Scott, Timothy E via Tim Scott for Senate; \$2,700, 12/30/15, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$250,000, 2/8/16, Republican Governors Association (2015 Membership); \$33,400, 2/10/16, NRSC; \$1,300, 2/25/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,400, 2/25/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$4,400, 3/2/16, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$1,000, 3/18/16, Condeley, Kerri via Kerri Condeley for Congress; \$2,700, 3/31/16, Kasich John R via Kasich for America, Inc.; \$2,700, 4/28/16, Conlon, Greg via Greg Conlon for US Senate; \$1,000, 5/2/16, Toomey, Pat (Friends of Senator); \$5,400, 5/24/16, Johnson, Ronald Harold via Ron Johnson for Senate Inc.; \$1,000, 5/25/16, CAWG PAC; \$300, 5/31/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$700, 5/31/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 6/13/16, Ayotte, Kelly A via Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc.; \$2,700, 6/14/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 6/22/16, College Republican National Committee; \$5,400, 8/10/16, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for Senate; \$50,000, 9/15/16, Committee on Jobs—Govt Reform Fund; \$5,000, 9/30/16, San Francisco Republican Party; \$1,400, 9/30/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$25,000, 9/30/16, Republican National Committee; \$5,000, 10/18/16, North Carolina Republican Party; \$1,000, 10/19/16, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$2,700, 10/21/16, Burr, Richard M via Richard Burr Committee; \$15,000, 10/24/16, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; \$500, 11/11/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$33,900, 2/15/17, NRSC; \$66,100, 2/15/17, NRSC; \$2,700, 2/17/17, King, Angus Stanley Jr via Angus King for US Senate Campaign; \$100,000, 2/21/17, Republican Governors Association; \$2,700, 3/23/17, Barrasso, John A via Friends of John Barrasso; \$3,400, 4/7/17, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$50,000, 4/18/17, Republican Attorneys General Association; \$2,700, 5/17/17, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,000, 6/13/17, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$11,000, 8/9/17,

Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$1,000, 8/24/17, Wicker for Senate (Scott Wicker); \$2,700, 9/13/17, Wicker for Senate (Scott Wicker); \$5,400, 11/10/17, I Like Luke (Luke Messer for Senate, Indiana); \$5,400, 11/15/17, Denham, Jeff for Congress; \$5,000, 11/15/17, Great America Committee; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Knight, Steve, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Rohrbacher, Dana, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Royce, Ed, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Walters, Mimi for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Valadao, David for Congress; \$10,000, 11/15/17, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; \$200, 11/17/17, Thompson, Mike, for Congress; \$5,400, 12/13/17, Fagg, Russ, Senate Committee; \$5,400, 12/22/17, Mortensen, Michelle via Mortensen for Congress; \$33,900, 12/28/17, Republican National Committee (RNC); \$5,400, 1/16/18, Harkey, Diane, for Congress.

Joint Fundraising Contributions \$5,200, 3/24/14, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$42,600, 8/22/14, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$5,200, 9/3/14, Rubio Victory Committee; \$1,000, 9/4/14, MRP Victory; \$10,400, 9/24/14, Winning Woman for the US Senate; \$10,000, 10/28/14, Targeted State Victory; \$20,000, 10/31/14, Boehner for Speaker; \$100,200, 4/15/15, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$5,000, 2/18/15, Leadership Matters for America PAC; \$500, 9/2/15, Boehner for Speaker; \$10,000, 10/1/15, Kamala Harris Victory Fund; \$254,600, 3/21/16, Ryan-McCarthy Victory; \$200,000, 6/10/16, NRSC Targeted State Victory Committee; \$1,000, 10/19/16, Woman Making History Fund; \$43,800, 1/26/17, McCarthy Victory Fund; \$120,000, 2/13/17, Team Ryan; \$15,400, 3/31/17, Ernst Victory Iowa; \$50,000, 4/21/17, Iowa Values; \$5,400, 4/28/17, Sasse Leadership Committee; \$33,900, 6/13/17, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$10,800, 9/21/17, Team Graham; \$1,000, 11/10/17, Independent Women's Voice.

Recipient of Joint Fundraiser Contributions \$5,000, 3/24/14, Invest in a Strong and Secure America; \$10,400, 8/18/14, NRCC; \$32,200, 8/18/14, NRCC; \$2,080, 9/13/14, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Wehby, Monica via Dr Monica Wehby for US Senate; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Capito, Shelley Moore Ms. via Capito for West Virginia; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Land, Terri Lynn via Terri Lynn Land for Senate; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Land, Terri Lynn via Terri Lynn Land for Senate; \$3,333.33, 10/28/14, Republican Party of Iowa; \$10,000, 10/31/14, Ohio Republican Party State Central & Executive Committee; \$3,333.33, 10/31/14, North Carolina Republican Party; \$5,000, 10/31/14, Freedom Project; The; \$100,200, 4/15/15, NRCC; \$500, 9/2/15, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$10,000, 12/1/15, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 3/21/16, Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC; \$33,400, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$100,200, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$100,200, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$2,700, 3/21/16, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 3/21/16, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 3/21/16, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$2,700, 3/21/16, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania; \$50,000, 6/10/16, NRSC; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Arizona Republican Party; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Missouri Republican State Committee—Federal; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Nevada Republican Central Committee; \$10,000, 6/27/16, Oklahoma Leadership Council; \$10,000, 7/8/16, Republican Party of Florida; \$10,000, 8/26/16, New Hampshire Republican State Committee; \$10,000, 10/4/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc.; \$10,000, 10/25/16, Republican Party of Iowa; \$10,000, 10/26/16, Republican Party of Kentucky; \$10,000, 11/16/17, Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC;

\$33,400, 1/26/17, NRCC; \$2,700, 1/26/17, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$2,700, 1/26/17, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$500, 2/13/17, NRCC; \$5,000, 2/13/17, Prosperity Action Inc.; \$2,700, 2/13/17, Ryan, Paul D via Paul for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 2/13/17, Ryan, Paul D via Paul for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Ernst, Joni K via Joni for Iowa; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Ernst, Joni K via Joni for Iowa; \$5,000, 3/31/17, Jobs Opportunity and New Ideas PAC; \$2,700, 4/7/17, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$5,000, 6/13/17, Invest in a Strong and Secure America; \$2,700, 6/13/17, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$26,200, 6/13/17, NRCC.

John A. Traina: Deceased.

5. Ruth H Buchanan: None; Wiley T Buchanan: Deceased; John A Traina: Deceased; Lea C Traina: Deceased.

6. John Todd Traina:

Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts \$20,000, 7/22/15, Growth Political Action Committee.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees \$500, 7/3/14, Logue, Daniel via Friends of Dan Logue for Congress; \$500, 10/8/14, Gorell, Jeff via Gorell for Congress; \$500, 7/1/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 9/3/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc.; \$2,700, 9/29/15, Kefalas, Chrysovalantis P via Kefalas for Maryland Inc.; \$1,000, 5/18/16, Harris, Kamala via Kamala Harris for Senate.

Katie Orr Traina: None; Maximillian John Alexander Traina: None.

7. Samantha L Traina: None; Vanessa D Traina: None; Charles de Viel Castel (spouse): None; Victoria L Traina: None; Zara Traina: None.

—
Name: Trevor Traina.

Position nominated for: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this attachment is complete and accurate.)¹⁾

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Trevor Traina, Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts: \$500, 8/11/14, Unlocking Potential PAC; \$50,000, 3/31/15, Right to Rise USA.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees: \$1,000, 4/24/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$1,000, 6/18/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$600, 6/24/14, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; \$32,400, 6/27/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 8/22/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$400, 8/26/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$2,600, 10/1/14, Gardner, Cory via Cory Gardner for Senate; \$4,800, 10/9/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$1,000, 10/11/14, Demaio, Carl via Carl Demaio for Congress; \$250, 11/6/14, NRSC; \$5,000, 2/24/15, Right to Rise PAC, Inc.; \$2,700, 6/26/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc.; \$1,500, 11/11/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 12/31/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc.; \$2,300, 1/11/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 1/11/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 2/10/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of

Joe Heck; \$500, 3/11/16, Johnson, Ronald Harold via Ron Johnson for Senate Inc; \$2,700, 6/26/16, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$2,700, 7/19/16, Portman, Rob via Rob Portman for US Senate; \$25,000, 9/19/16, Republican National Committee; \$50,000, 10/10/16, Republican National Committee; \$5,000, 1/1/17, Trump Transition; \$1,100, 3/1/17, Republican National Committee; \$33,900, 3/1/17, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 5/15/17, Handel, Karen Christine via Handel for Congress, Inc. Joint Fundraising Contributions: \$25,000, 3/31/14, Boehner for Speaker; \$5,200, 9/3/14, Rubio Victory Committee; \$5,000, 10/24/16, Young Victory Committee; \$5,000, 11/3/16, Young Victory Committee; \$100,000, 2/23/17, Team Ryan.

Recipient of Joint Fundraiser Contributions: \$19,800, 3/31/14, NRCC; \$2,600, 3/31/14, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$2,600, 3/31/14, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$2,080, 9/3/14, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$3,120, 9/3/14, Reclaim America PAC; \$2,700, 10/24/16, Young, Todd Christopher via Friends of Todd Young, Inc; \$2,300, 11/2/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc; \$5,000, 12/23/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc; \$5,000, 2/23/17, Prosperity Action, Inc; \$2,700, 2/23/17, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 2/23/17, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$33,900, 2/23/17, NRCC.

State and Local Contributions: \$15,000, 2014, Brown Jr., Edmund, Governor of California; \$5,200, 2014, Martinez, Susana & Sanchez, John, Governor and Lieutenant Governor of New Mexico; \$3,500, 2014, Walker, Scott & Kleefisch, Rebecca Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin; \$2,500, 2014, Harris, Kamala, Attorney General of California; \$1,000, 2014, Baker, Catharine, Assembly District in California; \$250, 2014, Raimondo, Gina, Governor of Rhode Island.

2. Alexis Traina, Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees: \$2,700, 6/26/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$25,000, 9/19/16, Republican National Committee.

State and Local Contributions: \$3,800, 2013, Christie, Chris & Guadagno, Kim, Governor and Lieutenant Governor of New Jersey.

3. Johnny Traina: none; Delphina Traina: none.

4. Diane B. Wilsey, Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts: \$250,000, 1/14/14, Republican Governors Association; \$25,000, 8/14/14, John Bolton Super Pac; \$25,000, 8/25/14, Unlocking Potential Pac; \$100,000, 1/14/15, Right To Rise USA; \$5,000, 2/27/15, Leadership Matters for America PC, Inc; \$25,000, 4/13/15, Conservative, Authentic, Responsive Leadership for you and America; \$11,824.15, 5/4/15, Right to Rise USA; \$30,000, 9/21/15, Growth Political Action Committee (Growth Pac); \$50,000, 3/27/17, Citizens Supporting Gavin Newson for Governor 2018; \$3,500, 11/8/17, Congressional Leadership Fund.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees: \$32,400, 1/22/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 2/11/14, Strickland, Anthony A via Strickland for Congress; \$32,400, 2/19/14, NRSC; \$2,600, 3/11/14, Condley, Kerri—for Congress 2014; \$2,500, 3/20/14, San Francisco Republican Party; \$1,000, 3/27/14, Hill, James French via French Hill for Arkansas; \$500, 3/31/14, Emily's List; \$5,200, 4/17/14, Ernst, Joni—for US Senate; \$32,400, 4/14/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 4/20/14, CAWG PAC; \$36, 4/22/14, National Republican Senatorial Committee.

Sustaining Membership: \$2,600, 4/29/14, Issa Darrell for Congress; \$2,600, 5/9/14, Gillespie,

Edward W via Ed Gillespie for Senate; \$500, 5/27/14, DCCC; \$500, 6/1/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,100, 6/1/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$1,500, 6/19/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (Scott Pac); \$1,000, 6/9/14, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 8/28/14, California Democratic Party; \$300, 9/3/14, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$500, 9/5/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for; \$500, 9/9/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (Scott Pac); \$2,600, 10/6/14, Scott, Timothy E via Tim Scott for Senate; \$500, 10/9/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$1,000, 10/15/14, Demaio, Carl via Carl Demaio for Congress; \$32,400, 1/20/15, Republican National Committee; \$500, 1/26/15, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$1,000, 2/4/15, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$33,400, 2/6/15, National Republican Senatorial Cmtee—Majority.

Makers: \$7,971.14, 3/10/15, Boehner, John; \$500, 3/12/15, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$100, 3/20/15, NRCC; \$1,000, 3/23/15, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 3/31/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$5,400, 4/11/15, Boozman, John via Boozman for Arkansas; \$2,700, 6/30/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$2,700, 9/8/15, Ayotte, Kelly A via Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc; \$1,000, 9/8/15, CAWG PAC; \$2,000, 9/14/15, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$1,000, 9/22/15, Lee, Mike via Friends of Mike Lee Inc; \$2,700, 9/23/15, Fiorina, Carly via Carly for President; \$2,700, 10/8/15, Kirk, Mark Steven via Illinois Lincoln Pac; \$2,700, 10/8/15, Kirk, Mark Steven via Illinois Lincoln Pac; \$1,300, 10/9/15, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,000 10/23/15 Del Beccaro, Thomas via Del Beccaro for Senate; \$1,000, 10/23/15, Thompson, Mike Mr via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 11/4/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc; \$11,000, 11/11/15, California Republican Party; \$2,700, 11/11/15, Christie, Chris, for President, Inc.; \$98,800, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$100,200, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$10,000, 11/18/15, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$2,700, 11/23/15, Scott, Timothy E via Tim Scott for Senate; \$2,700, 12/30/15, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$250,000, 2/8/16, Republican Governors Association (2015 Membership); \$33,400, 2/10/16, NRSC; \$1,300, 2/25/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,400, 2/25/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$4,400, 3/2/16, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$1,000, 3/18/16, Condley, Kerri via Kerri Condley for Congress; \$2,700, 3/31/16, Kasich John R via Kasich for America, Inc; \$2,700, 4/28/16, Conlon, Greg via Greg Conlon for US Senate; \$1,000, 5/2/16, Toomey, Pat (Friends of Senator); \$5,400, 5/24/16, Johnson, Ronald Harold via Ron Johnson for Senate Inc; \$1,000, 5/25/16, CAWG PAC; \$300, 5/31/16, Thompson, Mike Mr via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$700, 5/31/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 6/13/16, Ayotte, Kelly A via Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc; \$2,700, 6/14/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 6/22/16, College Republican National Committee; \$5,400, 8/10/16, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for Senate; \$50,000, 9/15/16, Committee on Jobs—Govt Reform Fund \$5,000, 9/30/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$25,000, 9/30/16, Republican National Committee; \$5,000, 10/18/16, North Carolina Repub-

lican Party; \$1,000, 10/19/16, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$2,700, 10/21/16, Burr, Richard M via Richard Burr Committee; \$10,000, 10/24/16, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$500, 11/11/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$33,900, 2/15/17, NRSC; \$66,100, 2/15/17, NRSC; \$2,700, 2/17/17, King, Angus Stanley Jr. via Angus King for US Senate Campaign; \$100,000, 2/21/17, Republican Governors Association; \$2,700, 3/23/17, Barrasso, John A via Friends of John Barrasso; \$3,400, 4/7/17, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$50,000, 4/18/17, Republican Attorneys General Association; \$2,700, 5/17/17, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,000, 6/13/17, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$11,000, 8/9/17, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$1,000, 8/24/17, Wicker for Senate (Scott Wicker); \$2,700, 9/13/17, Wicker for Senate (Scott Wicker); \$5,400, 11/10/17, I Like Luke (Luke Messer for Senate, Indiana); \$5,400, 11/15/17, Denham, Jeff for Congress; \$5,000, 11/15/17, Great America Committee; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Knight, Steve, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Rohrbacher, Dana, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Royce, Ed, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Walters, Mimi for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Valadao, David for Congress; \$10,000, 11/15/17, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$200, 11/17/17, Thompson, Mike, for Congress; \$5,400, 12/13/17, Fagg, Russ, Senate Committee; \$5,400, 12/22/17, Mortensen, Michelle via Mortensen for Congress; \$33,900, 12/28/17, Republican National Committee (RNC); \$5,400, 1/16/18, Harkey, Diane, for Congress.

Joint Fundraising Contributions \$5,200, 3/24/14, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$42,600, 8/22/14, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$5,200, 9/3/14, Rubio Victory Committee; \$1,000, 9/4/14, MRP Victory; \$10,400, 9/24/14, Winning Woman for The US Senate; \$10,000, 10/28/14, Targeted State Victory; \$20,000, 10/31/14, Boehner for Speaker; \$100,200, 4/15/15, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$5,000, 2/18/15, Leadership Matters for America PAC; \$500, 9/2/15, Boehner for Speaker; \$10,000, 10/1/15, Kamala Harris Victory Fund; \$254,600, 3/21/16, Ryan-McCarthy Victory; \$200,000, 6/10/16, NRSC Targeted State Victory Committee; \$1,000, 10/19/16, Woman Making History Fund; \$43,800, 1/26/17, McCarthy Victory Fund; \$120,000, 2/13/17, Team Ryan; \$15,400, 3/31/17, Ernst Victory Iowa; \$50,000, 4/21/17, Iowa Values; \$5,400, 4/28/17, Sassee Leadership Committee; \$33,900, 6/13/17, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$10,800, 9/21/17, Team Graham; \$1,000, 11/10/17, Independent Women's Voice.

Recipient of Joint Fundraiser Contributions \$5,000, 3/24/14, Invest in a Strong and Secure America; \$10,400, 8/18/14, NRCC; \$32,200, 8/18/14, NRCC; \$2,080, 9/13/14, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Wehby, Monica via Dr. Monica Wehby for US Senate; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Capito, Shelley Moore Ms. via Capito for West Virginia; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Land, Terri Lynn via Terri Lynn Land for Senate; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Land, Terri Lynn via Terri Lynn Land for Senate; \$3,333.33, 10/28/14, Republican Party of Iowa; \$10,000, 10/31/14, Ohio Republican Party State Central & Executive Committee; \$3,333.33, 10/31/14, North Carolina Republican Party; \$5,000, 10/31/14, Freedom Project; The; \$100,200, 4/15/15, NRCC; \$500, 9/2/15, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$10,000, 12/1/15, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 3/21/16, Majority Committee PAC-MC PAC; \$33,400, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$100,200, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$100,200, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$2,700, 3/21/16, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 3/21/16, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 3/21/16, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$2,700, 3/21/16, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress;

\$10,000, 6/10/16, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania; \$50,000, 6/10/16, NRSC; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Arizona Republican Party; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Missouri Republican State Committee-Federal; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Nevada Republican Central Committee; \$10,000, 6/27/16, Oklahoma Leadership Council; \$10,000, 7/8/16, Republican Party of Florida; \$10,000, 8/26/16, New Hampshire Republican State Committee; \$10,000, 10/4/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc.; \$10,000, 10/25/16, Republican Party of Iowa; \$10,000, 10/26/16, Republican Party of Kentucky; \$10,000, 11/16/16, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 1/26/17, Majority Committee PAC-MC PAC; \$33,400, 1/26/17, NRCC; \$2,700, 1/26/17, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$2,700, 1/26/17, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$500, 2/13/17, NRCC; \$5,000, 2/13/17, Prosperity Action Inc.; \$2,700, 2/13/17, Ryan, Paul D via Paul for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 2/13/17, Ryan, Paul D via Paul for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Ernst, Joni K via Joni for Iowa; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Ernst, Joni K via Joni for Iowa; \$5,000, 3/31/17, Jobs Opportunity And New Ideas PAC; \$2,700, 4/7/17, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$5,000, 6/13/17, Invest in a Strong and Secure America; \$2,700, 6/13/17, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$26,200, 6/13/17, NRCC.

State and Local Contributions: \$100,000, 2016, Safety for All, Newsom Ballot Measure Committee; \$100,000, 2016, San Franciscans Against Wasteful Spending; \$75,000, 2016, Yes on Public Health & Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A; \$56,400 2015 Newsom, Gavin, Governor of California; \$50,000, 2016, SF Alliance for Jobs & Sustainable Growth PAC; \$25,000, 2016, Great Schools for All (Prop A); \$20,000, 2015, SF Housing Now; \$20,000, 2016, San Franciscans Against Wasteful Spending; \$20,000, 2016, Farrell, Mark, for SF DCCC; \$19,000, 2015, Committee for a Progressive and Affordable SF; \$15,000, 2014, Children and Family First Committee (Prop C), CA; \$15,000, 2014, Cmtee For Reliable Transport, & Better, Safer Streets (Prop A); \$15,000, 2016, SF Alliance for Jobs & Sustainable Growth PAC; \$14,600, 2017, Kounalakis, Eleni Lieutenant Governor of California; \$14,600, 2017, Padilla, Alex Secretary of State of California; \$14,000, 2016, Ma, Fiona Treasurer for California; \$13,600, 2014, Newsom, Gavin Lieutenant Governor of California; \$10,400, 2014, Martinez, Susana & Sanchez, John Governor and Lieutenant Governor of New Mexico; \$10,000, 2014, CCAAG (Concerned Citizens about Casino Gambling) RI; \$10,000, 2015, San Franciscans for Clean Power, Yes on H, No on G; \$10,000, 2016, Anderson, Kat, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Baraka, Keith, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Hsieh, Tom A., for SF DCCC; \$10,000, 2016, Jung, Mary, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, McNeil, Trevor, for SF DCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Murase, Emily, for SF DCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Philhour, Marian, for DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Pimentel, Leah, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Prozan, Rebecca, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Rosenthal, Alix, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Safety for All, Newsom Ballot Measure Committee; \$8,800, 2017, Wiener, Scott, for State Senate 2020; \$9,600, 2017, Cohen, Malla, for State Board of Equalization 2018; \$8,400, 2015, Wiener, Scott California Senate; \$7,600, 2017, Yee, Betty Controller for California; \$7,000, 2015, Yee, Betty, for Controller 2018; \$6,100, 2016, McCrory, Patrick Governor of North Carolina; \$5,172.34, 2016, Breed, London, for DCCC 2016; \$5,000, 2016, Breed, London for DCCC 2016; \$5,000, 2017, Early, Eric, for Attorney General 2018; \$5,000, 2016, Breed, London for DCCC 2016; \$5,000, 2016, San Franciscans for

the Arts & Ending Family Homelessness; \$5,000, 2017, Cohen, Malla, for State Board of Equalization 2018; \$4,400, 2017, Baker, Catherine, for Assembly 2018; \$4,200, 2016, Ting, Phil Assembly District in California; \$4,200, 2015, Wiener, Scott for State Senate; \$4,200, 2015, Wiener, Scott for State Senate; \$4,200, 2016, Baker, Catherine for Assembly 2016; \$4,300, 2015, Baker, Catherine, For Assembly; \$4,100, 2014, Ting, Phil Assembly District in California; \$4,000, 2017, Baker, Catherine, for Assembly 2018; \$3,500, 2014, Haley, Nikki Governor of South Carolina; \$3,400, 2014, Swearingin, Ashley Controller for California; \$3,100, 2014, Yee, Betty Controller for California; \$2,600, 2017, Bottoms, Keisha Lance, for Mayor; \$2,500, 2017, Breed, London, for DCCC; \$2,500, 2016, Pence, Mike Governor of Indiana; \$2,500, 2014, Baker-Polito Inaugural Committee; \$2,500, 2017, Pedroza, Alfredo, Friends of; \$2,000, 2017, Ting, Phil, for Assembly 2018; \$1,000, 2014, Rauner, Bruce & Sanguinetti Evelyn Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Illinois; \$1,000, 2014, Citizens for Rauner, IL; \$1,000, 2017, Safe Neighborhoods for All; \$1,000, 2014, Migden, Carole—for DCCC 2016; \$1,000, 2015, FarmPAC; \$1,000, 2015, Friends of Mark Luce for Supervisor 2016; \$1,000, 2015, Friends of Scott Walker; \$1,000, 2015, Migden, Carole—for DCCC 2016; \$1,000, 2016, Committee to Elect Shepp for Supervisor 2016; \$1,000, 2017, Walker, Scott, Friends of; \$1,000, 2018, Walker, Scott, Friends of; \$750, 2014, Dunn, Damon Mayor of Long Beach, California; \$600, 2014, Newsom, Gavin, Lieutenant Governor—2014; \$500, 2017, Josefowitz, Nick, for Supervisor 2018; \$500, 2014, Adachi, Jeff—For Public Defender; \$500, 2017, Sheehy, Jeff for Supervisor 2018; \$500, 2016, Hsieh, Tom A., for SF DCCC; \$500, 2016, Lee, David, for supervisor; \$500, 2014, The Baker Committee; \$500, 2017, Chu, Carmen—for Assessor-Recorder; \$500, 2014, The Polito Committee; \$500, 2014, Chu, Carmen—for Assessor-Recorder, CA; \$500, 2014, Lee, Ed for Mayor 2015; \$500, 2014, Yee, Betty—for Controller 2014; \$500, 2014, Breed, London, For Supervisor; \$500, 2015, Herrera, Dennis, for City Attorney 2015; \$500, 2018, Breed, London, for Mayor 2018; \$500, 2015, Philhour, Marjan, for Supervisor 2016; \$250, 2014, Ammiano, Tom—2014 Officer Holder;

John A. Traina: Deceased.

5. Ruth H Buchanan: None; Wiley T Buchanan: Deceased; John A Traina: Deceased; Lea C Traina: Deceased.

6. John Todd Traina: *Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts:* \$20,000, 7/22/15, Growth Political Action Committee.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint, Fundraising Committees: \$500, 7/3/14, Logue, Daniel via Friends of Dan Logue for Congress; \$500, 10/8/14, Gorell, Jeff via Gorell for Congress; \$500, 7/1/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 9/3/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc; \$2,700, 9/29/15, Kefalas, Chrysovalantis P via Kefalas for Maryland Inc; \$1,000, 5/18/16, Harris, Kamala via Kamala Harris for Senate.

State and Local Contributions: \$1,500, 2014, Deramel, Guillaume Secretary of State of Rhode Island.

Katie Orr Traina: None; Maximillian John Alexander Traina: None;

7. Samantha L Traina: None; Vanessa D Traina: None; Charles de Viel Castel (spouse): None; Victoria L Traina: None; Zara Traina: None.

¹In addition to my family members listed in this attachment, my former step-father (now deceased) had five children, by former wives, and my former step-mother had two

children by former husbands. Of these seven children of my former step-parents, one is deceased and I do not know, and have not stayed in contact with, any of the others I have not included these step-relatives in this attachment.

*Erik Bethel, of Florida, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

*Judy Lynn Shelton, of Virginia, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

*Andrea L. Thompson, of South Dakota, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

*Sean Cairncross, of Minnesota, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

*Kevin Edward Moley, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Organization Affairs).

*Josephine Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

*Marie Royce, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

By Mr. INHOFE for Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Timothy J. Hilty, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Matthew J. Kohler, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Vincent K. Becklund and ending with Brig. Gen. Stephen C. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. James W. Bierman, Jr. and ending with Brig. Gen. Thomas D. Weidley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018, (minus 1 nominee: Brig. Gen. Norman L. Cooling)

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Timothy M. Ray, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. David D. Thompson, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Christopher W. Grady, to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Timothy J. White, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. David A. Welch, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Scott A. Stearney, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. INHOFE for Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Arthur W. Primas, Jr., to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Gregory J. Payne, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Michael J. Patterson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Brad R. Matherne, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jonathan A. Morris, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Rachel L. Adair and ending with D014124, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Rose Abido and ending with Joseph P. Wzorek II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with John P. Kilbride and ending with John J. Neal, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Gregory J. Abide and ending with G010452, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Steven Abadia and ending with G010479, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nomination of Steven M. Hemmann, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Hayley R. Ashbaugh and ending with Jordan N. Yolles, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Jeffrey A. Anderson and ending with D012878, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Ahmad B. Alexander and ending with Steven D. Zumbrun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Ashley K. Aiton and ending with Tracy L. Zinn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nomination of Wilson R. Ramos, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Curtis D. Bowe, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Carl E. Foster III, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael A. Fowles, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Andrew K. Sinden, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with D013264 and ending with D013298, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nomination of Christopher F. Ruder, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with John J. Morris and ending with Min S. Ro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 12, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher M. Bell and ending with Adriana B. DeJulio, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 12, 2018.

Army nomination of Mikal L. Stoner, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Eric G. Burns and ending with David P. Sheehan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Thesolina D. Hubert and ending with Timothy W. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 18, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Benjamin S. Adams and ending with Carl L. Zeppegno, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Marine Corps nomination of Aaron J. King, to be Major.

Navy nomination of Jeffrey G. Bentson, to be Commander.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2572. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2573. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to reauthorize the appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2574. A bill to provide rental assistance to low-income tenants of certain multifamily rural housing projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 2575. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of audiologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing audiology services under the Medicare program, to improve access to the audiology services available for coverage under the Medicare program and to enable beneficiaries to have their choice of a qualified audiologist to provide such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 2576. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a proceeding to determine whether certain activities by licensees of the Commission are undertakings under division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, or major Federal actions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELLER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2577. A bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2578. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to provide advanced notice to Congress before changing any questions on the decennial census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2579. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and expand a program of surveillance and education, carried out by the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, regarding infections associated with injection drug use; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2580. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to make clear that each decennial census, as required for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, shall tabulate the total number of persons in each State, and to provide that no information regarding United States citizenship or immigration status may be elicited in any such census; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 440. A resolution designating April 2018 as "Second Chance Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 661

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr.

SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to assist entrepreneurs, support development of the creative economy, and encourage international cultural exchange, and for other purposes.

S. 905

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 905, a bill to require a report on, and to authorize technical assistance for, accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1917, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1988

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1988, a bill to streamline broadband infrastructure permitting on established public rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to amend the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 to streamline application processes and reduce the administrative burden for the commodity supplemental food program, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a

bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2244

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2244, a bill to create opportunities for women in the aviation industry.

S. 2278

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2278, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve health care in rural areas.

S. 2343

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2343, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force for meeting the connectivity and technology needs of precision agriculture in the United States.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2387

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2387, a bill to provide better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and their caregivers while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure.

S. 2421

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2495

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2495, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from South Caro-

lina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2500

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2500, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the vehicles, weaponry, and ammunition to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 2502

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2502, a bill to address gun violence, improve the availability of records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, address mental illness in the criminal justice system, and end straw purchases and trafficking of illegal firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2515

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2515, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 2563

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2563, a bill to improve the water supply and drought resilience of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2565

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2565, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide child care assistance to veterans receiving certain training or vocational rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Hawaii

(Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 224

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 224, a resolution recognizing the 5th anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Paya Sardinias, and commemorating his legacy and commitment to democratic values and principles.

S. RES. 376

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 376, a resolution urging the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh to ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military.

S. RES. 407

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 407, a resolution recognizing the critical work of human rights defenders in promoting human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and good governance.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 432, a resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence.

AMENDMENT NO. 2213

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2213 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1865, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State

criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELLER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2577. A bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 40701) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “2014 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “2014 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”; and

(2) in subsection (j), by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SEC. 3. TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 303(b) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40722(b)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(d)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 440—DESIGNATING APRIL 2018 AS “SECOND CHANCE MONTH”

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 440

Whereas every individual is endowed with human dignity and value;

Whereas redemption and second chances are values of the United States;

Whereas millions of individuals in the United States have a criminal record;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of individuals return to their communities from Federal and State prisons every year;

Whereas returning individuals have paid their debt after committing a crime but still face significant legal and societal barriers

(referred to in this preamble as “collateral consequences”);

Whereas collateral consequences are mandatory and take effect automatically, regardless of—

(1) a nexus to public safety;

(2) the seriousness of the offense;

(3) the time passed since the offense; or

(4) the efforts of the individual to make amends or earn back the trust of the public;

Whereas gaining meaningful employment is 1 of the most significant predictors of successful reentry and reducing future criminal activity;

Whereas many individuals who have previously been incarcerated struggle to find employment because of collateral consequences which are often not directly related to the offense committed or any proven public safety benefit;

Whereas many States have laws which prohibit an individual with a criminal record from working in certain industries or obtaining professional licenses;

Whereas education has also been shown to be a significant predictor of successful reentry;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record often has a lower level of educational attainment than the general population and has significant difficulty acquiring admission to and funding for educational programs;

Whereas an individual convicted of certain crimes is often barred from receiving the financial aid necessary to acquire additional skills and knowledge;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record also often faces collateral consequences in securing a place to live;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record is often barred from seeking access to public housing;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record also often faces other collateral consequences, such as an inability to regain voting rights, volunteer in the community, and secure identification documentation;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record may incur significant debt as a result of conviction and incarceration of the individual;

Whereas collateral consequences prevent millions of individuals in the United States from contributing fully to their families and communities;

Whereas collateral consequences can contribute to recidivism, which increases crime and victimization and decreases public safety;

Whereas the inability to find gainful employment and other collateral consequences of conviction inhibit the economic mobility of an individual with a criminal record, which can negatively impact the well-being of the children and the families of the individual for generations;

Whereas the President in the 2018 State of the Union address expressed that, “As America regains its strength, this opportunity must be extended to all citizens. That is why this year we will embark on reforming our prisons to help former inmates who have served their time get a second chance at life”;

Whereas April 9, 2018, marks the 10-year anniversary of the passage of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-199; 122 Stat. 657), which has provided reentry services to over 166,000 individuals in 49 States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas the anniversary of the death of Charles Colson, who used his second chance following his incarceration for a Watergate-

related crime to found Prison Fellowship, the largest outreach program to prisoners, former prisoners, and their families in the United States, falls on April 21; and

Whereas the designation of April as “Second Chance Month” can contribute to increased public awareness about the impact of collateral consequences, the need for closure for those who have paid their debt, and opportunities for individuals, employers, congregations, and communities to extend second chances: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2018 as “Second Chance Month”;

(2) honors the work of communities, governmental institutions, nonprofit organizations, congregations, employers, and individuals to remove unnecessary legal and societal barriers that prevent an individual with a criminal record from becoming a productive member of society; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States to observe Second Chance Month through actions and programs that promote awareness of those unnecessary legal and social barriers and provide closure for individuals with a criminal record who have paid their debt.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORKER. Mr President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10:10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John J. Bartrum, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, both of the Department of Health and Human Services.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing en-

titled “The Need to Reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.”

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWERS

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, INSURANCE, AND DATA SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Update on NHTSA and Automaker Efforts to Repair Defective Takata Air Bag Inflators.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 434 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 434) recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 434) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 14, 2018, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ENSURING THAT THE REQUIREMENTS THAT NEW FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES ARE PROVIDED LEAVE FOR PURPOSES OF UNDERGOING MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR SUCH DISABILITIES APPLY TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 899 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 899) to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 899) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 899

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LEAVE POLICY FOR DISABLED VETERANS TO EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION AND RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING LEAVE TRANSFER PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 74 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 7423 the following new section:

“§ 7423A. Personnel administration: leave

“(a) LEAVE TRANSFER PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary shall establish a leave transfer program for the benefit of health-care professionals in positions listed in section 7401(1) of this title. The Secretary may also establish a leave bank program for the benefit of such health-care professionals.

“(2) To the maximum extent feasible—

“(A) the leave transfer program shall provide the same or similar requirements and conditions as are provided for the program established by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under subchapter III of chapter 63 of title 5; and

“(B) any leave bank program established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be consistent

with the requirements and conditions provided for agency leave bank programs in subchapter IV of such chapter.

“(3) Participation by a health-care professional in the leave transfer program established pursuant to paragraph (1), and in any leave bank program established pursuant to such paragraph, shall be voluntary. The Secretary may not require any health-care professional to participate in such a program.

“(4)(A) The Secretary and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may enter into an agreement that permits health-care professionals referred to in paragraph (1) to participate in the leave transfer program established by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under subchapter III of chapter 63 of title 5 or in any leave bank program established for other employees of the Department pursuant to subchapter IV of chapter 63 of title 5, or both.

“(B) Participation of such health-care professionals in a leave transfer program or a leave bank program pursuant to an agreement entered into under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed in such agreement.

“(5) The Secretary is not required to establish a leave transfer program for any personnel permitted to participate in a leave transfer program pursuant to an agreement referred to in paragraph (4).

“(b) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LEAVE POLICY FOR DISABLED VETERANS.—Section 6329 of title 5 shall apply to all health-care professionals in positions listed in section 7401(1) of this title.”.

(b) REPEAL OF TRANSFERRED AUTHORITY.—Section 7423 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7423 the following new item:

“7423A. Personnel administration; leave.”.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Wednesday, March 21; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1865, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:26 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MIKE POMPEO, OF KANSAS, TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE REX W. TILLERSON.

STEPHEN AKARD, OF INDIANA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE GENTRY O. SMITH, RESIGNED

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SHARON FAST GUSTAFSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE P. DAVID LOPEZ, RESIGNED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RONNY L. JACKSON

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

WILLIAM M. MCSWAIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

MATTHEW D. HARRIS, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JOHNNY LEE KUHLMAN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JOSEPH D. MCCLAIN, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DAVID A. WEAVER, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on March 20, 2018 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

STEPHEN AKARD, OF INDIANA, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE ARNOLD A. CHACON, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 8, 2018.

JOHNATHAN MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE LINDA I. ETIM, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 18, 2018.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 20, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY K. WEBER, Sr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about Russian interference in our elections.

In the last 18 months, the United States intelligence agencies and our allies abroad have decisively concluded that Russia interfered with our elections. We have sworn testimony from men and women with impeccable records, Democrats and Republicans alike. Their testimony overwhelmingly states that Russia interfered in our elections and that Russia has done so as well in other Western democracies for years.

Russia's goal with election interference is to destabilize Western democracies. Destabilizing our democracy will weaken our ability to defend ourselves against foreign adversaries like Russia, China, and Iran.

Democratic institutions and systems are the foundation of how we govern ourselves and defend our borders. When the integrity of democratic institu-

tions is doubted, the power of our democracy is weakened.

Make no mistake: attacking the integrity of our democratic institutions is an attempt to weaken our Nation and our way of life. We must ensure that neither Russia nor any other foreign power interferes in our election process in the future.

The House of Representatives seems to have abdicated its official role in investigating Russian interference. It is my hope that the Senate will continue its investigation in a bipartisan manner. Thus, Special Counsel Robert Mueller must be allowed to continue his investigation, following the evidence wherever it leads, and write a comprehensive and complete report without intrusion or obstruction by political power plays.

This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. This is an American issue.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, our first responsibility is to protect our Nation. We take an oath of office every 2 years to defend and protect our Nation from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I call upon my colleagues, my fellow Americans, to join me in putting partisanship aside, putting our country first, and doing everything we can to prevent foreign interference in our elections in the future.

TARIFFS AND TRADE

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to speak about U.S. trade and the recently raised tariffs on steel and aluminum.

We all want to secure American jobs and increase the opportunity in the U.S. economy, but raising far-reaching tariffs will do just the opposite. The most likely effect of raising tariffs will be other countries adjusting their trade measures to protect their economies and their workers. This is known as a trade war, and no one wins in a trade war.

What's more, American agriculture is always the target of international reactionary and retaliatory trade behavior. California agriculture, which I am a strong advocate of and represent, feels the most intense direct pain from these tariffs. California farmers and ranchers earned roughly 44 percent of their total revenue from international trade in 2016.

But this pain will radiate across the country. Manufacturers, processors, merchants, and farmers will face negative impacts to their businesses as foreign markets close, which will cost both American jobs and profits.

Yes, we have an international trade imbalance that must be addressed, but raising these tariffs, I think, is the wrong strategy, plain and simple. This is why both Republicans and Democrats have publicly expressed grave concern with these recent actions.

The way to address these trade imbalances is to successfully renegotiate and modernize NAFTA and other trade agreements with our European allies. The President and Congress must work together on trade agreements; it is that simple.

Our best approach for successfully renegotiating trade agreements in a way that serves the entire Nation is by Republicans and Democrats coming together and putting in the hard work required for bipartisan negotiations, serious policymaking, and getting the job done. That is what we are supposed to do.

OUR JOB IS TO KEEP STUDENTS SAFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, as a parent with kids in school, I believe that no parent should have to worry if their child will come home safe at the end of the day. That is why I rise today to join President Trump in urging the Senate to immediately pass the STOP School Violence Act. The House overwhelmingly passed this legislation last week, and now it is time for the U.S. Senate to act and pass this bipartisan, commonsense bill.

Among other positive steps forward, this bipartisan bill would provide funding to enable local schools to make physical and technological improvements to keep students safe.

Southwestern High School in my district has been called the safest school in America because of its focus on security, training, and coordination with local law enforcement. I have had the opportunity to visit Shelby County's Southwestern High School and speak with the leadership there and the Shelby County Sheriff's Department leadership as well, and, frankly, I could not have been more impressed.

If the STOP School Violence Act is enacted, more schools could follow the example set by Southwestern High School. The U.S. Senate needs to do its job now and act quickly to pass this commonsense legislation to secure our schools and keep America's children safe.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Michael S. Lewis, Roswell Street Baptist Church, Marietta, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we enter into Your presence this day with thanksgiving in our hearts for the gracious gift of life and the opportunities that You have set before us. We bless You for being our Creator and for providing a living relationship of love through Your Son and our Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.

We humble ourselves before You as men and women of this special body whom You have appointed with the responsibility of serving the people of this Nation. May You fill the minds of each leader with wisdom which is from above, fill each heart with passion for Your glory and the greatest good of others, and fill each decision with the guidance of Your Spirit.

My heart is grateful to voice this intercessory prayer on this day in our Nation's history with fellow citizens. May You unite our hearts to glorify Your name. May You bless the cities and communities of our Nation with peace. May You bless the United States of America, for I humbly make this prayer in the name of Jesus.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCHNEIDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING DR. MICHAEL S. LEWIS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr.

LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor of introducing our guest pastor, Dr. Michael Lewis, from my home district and from the great city of Marietta, Georgia.

Dr. Lewis graduated in 1996 with a master of divinity degree from Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. In May of 2005, he received an honorary doctor of divinity degree from Liberty University. He has had the honor of serving in churches in South Carolina, Texas, and Florida as their pastor.

Currently, Dr. Lewis serves as pastor of Roswell Street Baptist Church in Marietta, Georgia, where he lives with his wife of 25 years, Lillian, and their three wonderful daughters.

It is my privilege to introduce Dr. Michael Lewis, who opened us this morning in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CELEBRATING WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Women's History Month. Every March, we celebrate the trailblazing women who have enriched our history, our society, and our communities.

This month, it is important to recognize the hardworking women in today's workforce. Today, more than 70 percent of women work outside of the home, and these women account for nearly half of the workforce, while 40 percent of women are their family's top earners.

Because of tax reform, the women of America's workforce will be able to keep more of their hard-earned cash to spend on their families, rather than sending it to Washington. Additionally, working moms and their families will receive double the child tax credit to ensure they have the means to care for their children.

Mr. Speaker, to the naysayers who claimed that tax reform would only benefit rich men, I say that is categorically false. Tax reform already has and will continue to empower the wonderful women in America's workforce to make history worth recognizing.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REV-EREND JAMES HAWLEY MCKINNON, JR.

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great North Carolinian, a friend to many, and a man of God, Reverend James Hawley McKinnon, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, Jim passed away on Sunday, March 11, at the age of 77. Jim McKinnon preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ in eastern North Carolina for decades. His ministry inspired and motivated so many individuals, both in his home of Wilson, North Carolina, and elsewhere.

Ordained as a minister of the Presbyterian church on September 22, 1968—shortly after the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Senator Robert F. Kennedy—Jim served congregations throughout North Carolina; first as an associate pastor in Fayetteville, and then as a senior pastor in Morehead City, Charlotte, and Wilson, where he retired after 26 years as senior pastor of First Presbyterian Church.

Jim McKinnon was a strong, strong pillar in our community and he will be missed. Jim McKinnon is survived by his wife of 51 long years, Louise Cherry McKinnon; and their two sons, also Presbyterian ministers, James, III—we call him Trip—and his wife, Angie, from Brunswick, Georgia; and John and his wife, Darci, from Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

His beloved four grandchildren are: John Brandon and Rebecca Louise from Brunswick, Georgia; Aidan Gayle and Ian McKay from Oklahoma City.

Jim was preceded in death by his grandson, James Hawley McKinnon, IV—Jamie.

Let it be said, Mr. Speaker, that Reverend Jim McKinnon made a difference in this world as he helped change lives for so many Americans.

CONGRATULATING THE BELLEVILLE WEST BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. BOST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly honor the Belleville West basketball team for winning the 2018 4A State tournament.

It was truly a "March Madness" in Peoria, Illinois, this weekend as the Maroons played in a back-and-forth State title game against Whitney Young Dolphins. It took overtime, but Belleville West held off Whitney Young for a 60 to 56 victory to take home the championship trophy. This is the first basketball State title in school history.

I extend a heartfelt congratulations to the players, coaches, staff, school officials, families, and friends who supported these young men on this incredible journey. Illinois 12th is proud of you.

Go, Maroons.

HEALTHCARE SHOULD BE A HUMAN RIGHT FOR ALL

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this Friday marks the eighth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act being signed into law. In the richest country in the world, healthcare should be a basic human right, not a privilege for some.

While the ACA is far from perfect—we know that—it made great progress, ensuring millions and millions of Americans that they could have health insurance, that they could have healthcare when they need it, making it more affordable, making sure that Americans with preexisting conditions were not denied coverage because they were sick or kicked off their coverage because they got sick.

Unfortunately, though, this House has spent a good deal of the last year or so trying to take back some of those advances that we have made, essentially, putting more families in the position of having that economic uncertainty of not knowing whether or not their premiums will continue to go up or their copays will go up, or prescription drugs will be available but completely unaffordable to them; putting families back in the place where they are, essentially, one illness away from losing everything that they have worked for.

We should work together because we know there are improvements that we need to make. We should work across the aisle to improve this law and move forward.

BEST BUDDIES FRIENDSHIP WALK

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Best Buddies International for a successful 5K walk in downtown Miami this past Saturday, March 17.

Best Buddies International was founded in 1989 by one of my constituents, Anthony K. Shriver, and it promotes the idea that every person has a gift and that every person can contribute. This message is emblematic of what makes America successful, and it has made Best Buddies a thriving global organization serving thousands of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

The Best Buddies Friendship Walk allows those who are often excluded be-

cause of their differences the opportunity to create one-on-one friendships that last a lifetime. It is that model that has allowed Best Buddies to make extraordinary advancements in the autism community to increase understanding and acceptance of the disability.

I would like to extend my congratulations for a successful Best Buddies Friendship Walk. I am so delighted to see my constituents giving the gift of friendship to individuals in south Florida with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

BOOTS TO BUSINESS

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the Boots to Business program.

Running a small business requires a wide variety of skills. One day you are the company's accountant, the next day you are researching marketing strategies.

Many of our servicemembers have the temperament and experience to excel as small-business owners and entrepreneurs, but they lack the industry-specific skills to turn their dream into a reality.

The Boots to Business program helps bridge this gap by offering exiting servicemembers and spouses a 2-day in-person course on business ownership, followed by more in-depth instruction through an 8-week online course.

Since the program launched in 2013, more than 50,000 servicemembers and spouses have participated, learning how to start and grow businesses and, thereby, grow our economy.

This month, I introduced the bipartisan Veteran Entrepreneurship Training Act with my friend from Iowa, Congressman ROD BLUM. The bill would codify the Boots to Business program. Our veterans serve our country with honor. They deserve our support as they transition from military to civilian life. I urge my colleagues to join me on this bipartisan effort.

CREATING TRANSPARENCY THROUGH DISCLOSURE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Foreign Influence Transparency Act, which requires organizations, such as the Confucius Institute, to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA, if they promote the political agenda of a foreign country.

The goal of this legislation is to increase transparency between foreign

governments, universities, and students. Americans have the right to know if they are consuming propaganda that is produced by a foreign government.

Currently, FARA contains a technicality that allows foreign governments or organizations to push their political agenda under the facade of an "academic pursuit." The Foreign Influence Transparency Act will clarify the intent and ensure that all propaganda funded by foreign governments at least contains a disclaimer.

The Foreign Influence Transparency Act also decreases the monetary threshold of foreign donations that universities are required to disclose. Currently, universities only report on donations they receive of \$250,000 or more, while organizations, such as the Confucius Institute, operate below that level. This results in a lack of disclosure to students and parents. The goal of this legislation is simple, and that is to create transparency through disclosure.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LEW VANDERZYL

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lew Vanderzyl, a dedicated educator; a veteran; and a devoted father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, who passed away last month.

Lew's lifetime of service included a deployment with the 40th Infantry Division during the Korean war, followed by a half century as a teacher and administrator, and 17 years as a Riverside school board member.

As school board president, Lew demonstrated his moral courage by insisting that a local high school be named after Martin Luther King, despite a wave of protests and intense opposition. He will be remembered by the Riverside community as someone who cared deeply for his students.

Lew Vanderzyl, an avid reader, crossword puzzler, and traveler, and a constant source of wisdom and kindness, will be dearly missed by our community. May his memory be a blessing to the friends and family he leaves behind.

□ 1215

HONORING LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

served the people of Rochester in Monroe County, as well as the city of Buffalo, in the United States Congress from 1987 until her untimely death last week.

LOUISE SLAUGHTER was a champion of progressive causes and a liberal lioness in the United States Congress. She knew who she was fighting for, and she knew how to fight.

For the homeless, the hopeless, and the voiceless, LOUISE SLAUGHTER championed all their causes because her political ethos was forever to defend the dignity of every citizen. She never deviated from that cause and reinforced it each and every day on the floor of this Congress, the institution that she loved.

She served as chair and ranking member of the Rules Committee and championed the first \$500 million earmark for breast cancer research to the National Institutes of Health and the Violence Against Women Act. These are among a long list of impressive accomplishments that were championed by LOUISE SLAUGHTER.

Her friends and her family will miss her, but her accomplishments will forever be enshrined on this institution representing the people that she loved in Rochester and Monroe County.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 20, 2018, at 11:18 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3731.

Appointments:
Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.
United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4566, ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5247, TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK MONGIELLO, JORDAN MCINN, AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT TO TRY ACT OF 2018; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 787 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 787

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4566) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-65 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of March 23, 2018.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 22, 2018, or March 23, 2018, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 5. Section 3(a) of House Resolution 5 is amended by striking "the first session of".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 787 provides for the consideration of two important bills whose focus is to empower the people of this Nation by removing governmental obstacles standing in the way of life and prosperity in this country.

The first bill, H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, is a bipartisan effort from the Committee on Financial Services under Chairman JEB HENSARLING, authored by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

The second piece of legislation in today's rule, H.R. 5247, the Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2018, authorizes the use of certain drugs to eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or a condition for which there is a reasonable likelihood that death will occur in a matter of months.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, equally divided between the Chair and the ranking members of the Committee on Financial Services.

The rule makes one amendment in order, authored by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member. Further, the rule provides for the consideration of one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

For H.R. 5247, the Right to Try Act of 2018, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the Chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Although no amendments to the bill were made in order, the rule does provide for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak about the substance of the two bills under consideration in the rule before us today, I do want to take a minute to honor our colleague and the Rules Committee's ranking member, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, who passed away unexpectedly last week.

I have known Ranking Member SLAUGHTER since I first joined Congress in 2003. We spent countless hours debating every issue one can imagine in the Rules Committee upstairs, often long into the night.

When I joined the Rules Committee in 2013, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER

was then the ranking member, but it was under her chairmanship where she ushered through the Affordable Care Act, where my largest memories reside. During the debate for the Affordable Care Act, I went up to H-313, the Rules Committee hearing room, with 18 amendments under my arm, a small selection of the many ways I felt the law needed to be changed.

Certain that I would only be able to get through a small portion of those amendments before I was cut off, I began my testimony. To the chairwoman's credit, she let me go on and on and on, and despite my being convinced that she was going to gavel me down at any second, she allowed me to finish speaking on all 18 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't until I actually became a member of the Rules Committee several years later that I discovered there is, in fact, no time limit for Members and witnesses to speak, much to the chagrin of many Members when we debate the National Defense Authorization Act.

Ranking Member SLAUGHTER was always proud of her background as a microbiologist, and it served her well during her tenure in Congress, because, after all, we deal with, sometimes, almost miniscule, microscopic issues, so time as a microbiologist would be good preparation.

One moment where I was glad to be able to work with Ranking Member SLAUGHTER was in 2007. This was right after the Democrats took control of the House. Ms. SLAUGHTER had been pushing for years for legislation that would prohibit the discrimination of employees based on genetic information.

The legislation was forward leaning, long before companies offered DNA testing kits in every pharmacy of the country. And, in fact, it was former Speaker Newt Gingrich himself who brought this bill to my attention, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, which I was proud to support as it moved through the Energy and Commerce Committee and was eventually signed into law by President Bush.

I would also like to mention Don Sisson, the staff director for the minority on the Rules Committee. Don has been with the committee for years—even at one point working under Chairman Drier—and has been with the ranking member of the Rules Committee through many events in the past years, including the death of her own husband, who, in fact, often sat in the audience of the Rules Committee and joined Ms. SLAUGHTER during our late-night Rules hearings.

Don is, indeed, a loyal staffer, himself hailing from Rochester, New York, and is a great example of how Ms. SLAUGHTER's life and passing is affecting so many people. I do want to thank Don for his written remarks that were read into the record of the Rules Com-

mittee last night from the staff perspective on the passing of Ranking Member SLAUGHTER.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to hold off making further comments on the legislation before us to allow others to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, like my friend from Texas, I was overcome with sadness by the tragic news of LOUISE's passing, who was not only the ranking member of the Rules Committee, but the first and only woman to have chaired the committee.

For 30 years, LOUISE poured every ounce of energy she had into serving her constituents in upstate New York. She never hesitated to speak her mind, and she never wavered in espousing her beliefs. I will always be truly grateful for the time that I had to serve alongside her.

LOUISE was one of my dearest friends in Congress, having not only served with her on the Rules Committee but also on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Helsinki Commission.

Her legacy speaks for itself. She was not just a champion of women's rights. She was a champion of working families everywhere. This Nation has lost one of our fiercest public servants, and her absence will leave an unfillable void.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my deepest condolences to LOUISE's daughters: Megan Secatore, Amy Slaughter, and Emily Minerva; her seven grandchildren and one great-grandson; as well as to her friends, constituents, and congressional staff during this extremely difficult time. Her spirit and loving memory will forever live in the Halls of Congress. She will be dearly missed.

Mr. Speaker, turning to today's rules, this rule brings the number of closed rules for the 115th Congress to 74. In other words, more than 50 percent of the legislation coming to the Rules Committee has been closed off from an open and honest debate by my Republican friends.

At the beginning of this Congress, we were told by my Republican colleagues that they would run the government in an open manner. They even championed regular order. Well, that spirit has clearly been jettisoned in favor of an overly partisan approach to governing.

By way of example, one of today's bills, H.R. 5247, was introduced last Tuesday, brought to the House floor for a vote on the same day without the committee of jurisdiction holding one single hearing on the bill or Members

having the opportunity to offer their amendments.

□ 1230

Not surprisingly, the measure failed to pass under suspension of the rules.

What was the response of my friends on the other side of the aisle when the vote failed? Did my Republican colleagues insist that the Energy and Commerce Committee hold hearings on the measure? Did my Republican colleagues on the committee of jurisdiction invite experts to speak on what the consequences would be if this bill were to become law? Did my Republican colleagues work with Democrats to come up with a bipartisan solution? No.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you what did happen. The Republican leadership ignored the problems with the measure and brought it to the Rules Committee last night for it to be considered on the House floor today.

Now, this flies in the face of regular order, to ask the entire membership of the people's House to vote on something for which no one can honestly say they know what the unintended consequences would be if this bill were to become law.

Bad process makes bad bills, and the process we have witnessed with this bill can't get much worse. Yet it did get worse when the Republican majority blocked the ranking member's, Mr. PALLONE's, substitute amendment, an amendment which was both germane and had bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, the Republican majority took it a step further when they extended the Holman rule for the remainder of the 115th Congress. My friends on the other side of the aisle are yet again seeking to scapegoat Federal employees, make cuts to the Federal workforce, and politicize the civil service system that was established to professionalize agencies and offices, all while ignoring the waste and abuses in the reality show of the Trump administration.

Madam Speaker, challenged by the American people to bring up comprehensive gun reform, House leadership instead brings up one bill that hasn't gone through anything resembling regular order and another bill that weakens and undermines a valuable tool that gives financial companies and regulators an opportunity to identify and correct problems before they could lead to another financial crisis.

Every year, roughly 35,000 people are killed by guns. Moreover, 2,700 children and teens are shot and killed, and over 14,000 more are shot and injured every year. That is an average of 47 American children and teens shot every day.

And the effects of gun violence extend far beyond those struck by a bullet. Gun violence shapes the lives of the millions of children who witness it,

know someone who was shot, or live in fear of the next shooting. We have witnessed the effects over the last month with the students from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

This weekend, hundreds of thousands of students and their supporters will descend on Washington, D.C., to demand that the Federal Government take action to stop the epidemic of mass shootings, which have become all too familiar.

No less than this morning when I turned on the television, less than an hour and a half away from here, in yet another school, yet another shooting. Fortunately, it appears that the resource officer there engaged the shooter early on and may have caused there to be less damage, although some people were injured, and one or two critically.

We can no longer ignore what gun violence really is in this country. It is an epidemic.

But do not just take my word for it or the students who witnessed 14 friends' and 3 teachers' lives brutally cut short. The American Medical Association, following the tragedy at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, declared gun violence in this country "a very public health crisis," a crisis which the Republican majority's only answer is to offer thoughts and prayers and further block any Democratic measures to address this crisis and to continue to block the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention from even researching gun violence.

Instead of finally making permanent the status of Dreamers in this country as full citizens, the Republican majority ignores their calls and the calls of the vast majority of Americans and, instead, brings up one bill that undermines a valuable early warning system of our Nation's economy and another bill that has gone through a completely closed process.

Enough is enough. President Donald John Trump says he wants to fix this problem. The Speaker says he wants to fix this problem. We on this side of the aisle clearly want to fix this problem. So let's do it already.

Madam Speaker, last week, when I was managing yet another useless financial regulation, I commented and I asked the American public to respond:

Would you rather us stop banks from having stress tests or would you prefer that we deal with the deferred action for children in this country, 800,000 of whom are Dreamers, 120 of whom lose their status every day?

Would you prefer that we deal with the measure that is on the floor today or that we deal seriously with a variety of issues having to do with gun violence in our society, which I have described as an epidemic?

Would you prefer as a priority, America, that we deal with these trivial matters that are going nowhere fast or

that we center ourselves and focus on those measures that are vital to the survival, security, and safety of all Americans?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it was indeed incredibly disappointing last week when our Democratic colleagues did not join us in supporting what was very carefully crafted right-to-try legislation.

The President came and talked to us at the beginning of February, and right to try was one of the issues that he highlighted there from the podium. So it should be to no one's great surprise that this House would indeed take up and work on that issue that the President himself highlighted. Right to try was the one piece of legislation that President Trump specifically promised to the American people in the State of the Union address.

Today, I want it to be known that I stand with the President. I stand with the thousands of Americans with terminal diseases and their families and their friends in getting this important bill passed.

Since 2014, 37 States, including my home State of Texas, have passed a version of a right-to-try law, and through a strong grassroots movement, they have accomplished that.

Today, the House is considering H.R. 5247, the Right to Try Act of 2018, which would improve access to experimental treatments for terminally ill patients and offer them a chance—a second chance, a third chance—at life.

Over the course of the last decade, our Nation has achieved unprecedented innovation and scientific breakthroughs. Thanks to researchers in our academic institutions and those working in the pharmaceutical and medical device industries, American patients have access to innovative treatments.

Regardless of these achievements, I hear from patients with serious life-threatening conditions, including my constituents from north Texas, who are frustrated with what they see as regulatory barriers from trying and experimenting with new therapies when every other avenue has failed.

It does seem we are at a crossroads when lifesaving treatments, while not yet approved, both exist and remain unavailable to patients.

As a physician, I understand that access to investigational drugs and therapies is a deeply personal priority for those seeking treatment for themselves or loved ones with a serious and life-threatening condition.

It is crucial to mention the multi-stakeholder efforts that have gone into improving the original right-to-try bill. Chairman WALDEN of the Energy and Commerce Committee led negotiations with the Commissioner of the

United States Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Scott Gottlieb, and with other stakeholders to ensure that this legislation opens the door to innovative experimental drugs for these patients without necessarily compromising the vital work and the mission of the Food and Drug Administration. The product of those negotiations is a bill that strikes the proper balance between ensuring patient safety and granting access to these treatments.

I also want to mention that the Subcommittee on Health did have a hearing in this regard October 3. We heard from the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration during that hearing. We heard from a number of patient groups and stakeholders who felt that it was, in fact, in their best interest for us to advance legislation.

Currently, the Food and Drug Administration conducts an expanded access program aimed at helping patients who do not qualify for clinical trials to gain access to therapies that the agency has yet to approve. While this program makes a good faith effort to help those patients, right to try would create an alternative pathway for those individuals, allowing them to access eligible investigational drugs.

The fact is that individuals may not qualify for a clinical trial if they do not meet very specific patient inclusion criteria, which may include factors such as age, gender, type and stage of disease, previous treatment history, and other medical conditions. There are also many patients for whom participation in a clinical trial is not feasible, especially those who live in rural areas far from where those academic clinical trial sites exist.

Most, if not all, of the patients with a terminal medical condition fall into one of these categories. This legislation allows those patients to participate in the alternative pathway so long as they are certified by a physician who is in good standing and abides by the rules laid out in the bill.

Again, we worked closely with the Food and Drug Administration to ensure that the new alternative pathway does not hinder or conflict with the critically important oversight that that agency conducts. While some people may have reservations about the safety of a new pathway, this bill protects patients from manufacturers mislabeling or misbranding drugs, requires sponsors and manufacturers to report adverse events to the Food and Drug Administration, and provides certain liability protections for parties participating in the new pathway. This alternative pathway would also be limited to individuals who have exhausted all FDA-approved treatment options.

Additionally, only certain investigational drugs are considered eligible under this legislation. In order to qualify, the drug must have completed a phase one clinical trial, must have an

active application, must be under active development or production by the manufacturer, and must not be the subject of a clinical hold.

Eligible patients include those suffering from a stage of a disease or condition for which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur in a matter of months or that would result in significant irreversible morbidity that is likely to lead to premature death.

This revised right-to-try bill also provides certainty to manufacturers in the drug approval process. It is essential that we do not create additional hurdles in that process. The legislation clearly states that the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services “may not use a clinical outcome associated with the use of an eligible investigational drug . . . to delay or adversely affect the review or approval of such drug.”

□ 1245

Since the Health Subcommittee first considered the right-to-try legislation, the bill has passed in the Senate, and we have had many conversations with patients, advocates, the administration, and stakeholders on all sides of this complex topic. That collaborative effort was necessary, and I am certainly grateful to all who participated in those discussions.

Madam Speaker, this represents months of hard work and thoughtful discussions and decisions. I believe this legislation is a positive step forward in our shared goal of improving care for American patients. Again, this was the one aspect of the President's State of the Union Address where he asked us specifically to act on this legislation.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, last night in the Rules Committee, I had dialogue with the author of this legislation and also the ranking member, Mr. PALLONE. I indicated to them that I have very strong sympathies regarding persons who are in the apparent throes of death and seeking some hope, and medication can have its advantages, and experimental medication can have its advantages.

My quarrel with the legislation is that it didn't go through regular order. I don't understand why, with all of the experts. I introduced into the RECORD in the Rules Committee last night a substantial number of organizations and individuals who have come forward. They all agree that something along the lines of what is being sought ought be undertaken, but it would allow for those persons to have added

input into what ultimately may be significant legislation. But my friends on the other side plow right ahead on this matter that I reiterate was brought on suspension last week that failed, and then brought here last night for purposes of a rule along with financial stress legislation.

So it is not that many of us are not sympathetic to the underlying principle that is being offered. It is that it is rank process and that we should not allow legislation to continue to come to the floor of the House of Representatives that blocks out a significant number of persons who may have input that would make the measure be much more salient to a more significant number of people.

It is for that reason that I continue to ask the questions: What are our priorities here? What is the rush with reference to this matter while we are ignoring a significant number of other matters that we could be undertaking?

In addition to that, we were supposed to go to the Rules Committee this afternoon on the omnibus bill; and now, evidently, there is wrangling going on between the parties and bicameral between the Senate and the House, and that measure isn't ready to come to the floor.

Yet we are dealing with something that isn't the highest priority of the moment. I commented last night, anything that will help a person who is facing death is the kind of thing that we would want that person to have that opportunity to deal with. But we have children who have been killed and we have children who are facing the potential for that kind of horror, yet we are doing nothing.

So, Madam Speaker, once again, I rise to appeal to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Please, listen to the American people and do more to help end the epidemic of gun violence that has plagued our Nation and that the American people are demanding Congress to do more.

For example, in a recent Gallup Poll, nearly two-thirds of adults wanted stricter laws on the sale of firearms. According to a recent NPR/Ipsos poll, 75 percent of respondents said they think gun laws should be stricter.

As I indicated earlier, just this morning there were reports of another school shooting just an hour and a half from Washington, D.C., in Great Mills, Maryland. The American people are begging this body to do something to end this epidemic, so I offer the majority this opportunity:

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up four commonsense gun safety bills: H.R. 4240, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act; H.R. 3464, the Background Check Completion Act; H.R. 2598, the Gun Violence Restraining Order Act; and H.R. 1478, the Gun Violence Research Act.

These bills would close the dangerous gun show and internet sale background check loopholes, prevent the sale of guns without a completed background check, ensure that people who are a danger to themselves or others can be prevented from possessing a gun, and lift the prohibition on government-sponsored scientific research on the causes of gun violence.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can finally do something to address gun violence.

Through you, Madam Speaker, I would advise my friend from Texas that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close when he is prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), who is a fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), as well as the good gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), because I want to take just a minute.

I think it is appropriate at this time during this debate on a rule to remember Ms. LOUISE SLAUGHTER, our ranking member of the Rules Committee, a historical position. She was the very first woman to be the chairman of the Rules Committee. She gave three decades of service to our Nation through the U.S. Congress. As importantly—or, to me, more importantly—she was someone whom I consider a personal friend.

LOUISE was an individual who I said yesterday could really transcend between politics and personal relationships. We had some very heated debates—a good example is today—and very strong differences of opinions, but we can do that. That is our job to do that. But LOUISE also taught us that we could do that without being negative to each other in a personal way. She was great at that. She embodied and personified the ability to have an objection without being objectionable, and I admired that greatly about her.

She was a senior Member and I was a very junior Member. She didn't have to do this, but in many ways she took me under her wing when I became a Member of Congress. We served on the Rules Committee together, and I very much relished that relationship that we had.

Another thing that we had in common was we joined a very exclusive club, one that several other Members of this body belong to, and that is those people who have lost their spouses. When I was going through that very personally difficult time, LOUISE had the similar experience. She was very gracious to me to be able to help me through that very difficult time. We exchanged books. Many Members of Congress have read books by C.S. Lewis. LOUISE and I had many discussions about some of the things in some of his writings. In kind of a funny way, as she would do in manipulating me into thinking I was helping her, she was actually having me help myself through that very challenging time. I will always be forever grateful to her for doing that.

She stood strong, and she was a formidable opponent. When she was managing the rule for the Democrats on the other side of the floor, it was always a challenging task, and you had to be on your game when you were on this side making the debate with her.

I count myself very fortunate to have been able to know her and to have been able to work with her. I join together with all of my colleagues and her family to be able to remember her and honor her memory; and I will continue to do so, as she has truly left a large mark on this institution.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would say to my friend from Washington what I said last night: We would do a great service to LOUISE's memory if we were to make more open rules here on the House floor; and I will argue for her in that regard.

Madam Speaker, before I close, I want to again reiterate the tremendous loss felt in this Chamber with the passing of our longtime colleague, Congresswoman LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER. She was a champion of all the issues she cared about and a giant here in the House of Representatives. Her wisdom will be missed every day.

Madam Speaker, the people's House should be approaching our work in a manner that is fair to all Americans, in a manner where the appropriate committee of jurisdiction holds hearings and markups, in a manner where experts in the field are consulted, and in a manner where Members of both parties have the opportunity to offer amendments and debate the contents of the bill.

The process we are witnessing here today is truly a slap in the face to regular order. A bill that has zero input from members on the Energy and Commerce Committee or that has been the subject of any thoughtful discussion is suddenly on the House floor for a vote.

Now, I respect my friend from Texas' view that last year in the Senate, and even perhaps since that time, and throughout the country, right-to-try

measures have passed in several States to some degree. But this particular bill that is on the floor that we are making a rule for has not gone through regular order; and that, then, disallows a significant number of persons who would have an opportunity to have input to what could be legislation that all sides could agree upon. Our failure to undertake to do that is a disservice, in my view, to the institution and to the measure that is being sought to be passed here today.

This is not just an affront to normal House procedure; it is downright undemocratic and emblematic of the Republican majority's inability to govern. I think it will redound to their discredit that they are not allowing this House to proceed under regular order.

As I indicated earlier, more than 50 percent of all of the measures that have come to the Rules Committee and have ultimately come to the floor of the House of Representatives have been under closed rules, which means that Members who represent millions of people in America do not have opportunities to offer amendments that might make the measure better or, at the very least, have their views heard with reference to substantive legislation that is moving through this body.

□ 1300

If we continue down this path for the remainder of this session, we will probably break the 100th barrier on closed rules. We have already had more closed rules than in the history of legislating in this country.

That is not fair. That is basically all we are arguing. Open up the process. Let every Member have an opportunity for input on behalf of his or her constituents. It is the right thing to do. What has been happening is the dead wrong thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Dallas Morning News from 2010. The title of the article—and I am not going to read the whole thing—is: "Pelosi Pulled Strings to Let Dying Dallas Lawyer Try Experimental Cancer Drug."

[From the Dallas Morning News, 2010]

PELOSI PULLED STRINGS TO LET DYING DALLAS LAWYER BARON TRY EXPERIMENTAL CANCER DRUG

(By Todd J. Gilman)

WASHINGTON.—Dallas' top Democratic donors will cut big checks to share dinner later this month with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi. Most will be motivated by a desire to protect the party's congressional majority.

Lisa Blue will have an extra reason: to say thanks for Pelosi's efforts when her husband, Fred Baron, was dying of bone marrow cancer. His only option was an experimental drug whose manufacturer refused to give permission to use it for Baron's condition.

"He was a big fan of hers, and now I am as well," Blue said.

Baron, the "King of Toxic Torts," built a fortune suing on behalf of asbestos victims. He died the week before Election Day 2008 at age 61.

A prolific Democratic fundraiser, he served as finance chief that year for his friend John Edwards, who also made his fortune in court. Baron later acknowledged funneling large sums to Edwards' mistress—a scandal that gave ammunition to those who already despised trial lawyers.

But to Blue, first and foremost, Baron was a husband.

The tale she tells of his final weeks is not so different than any widow might tell, except, of course, that the couple had friends in especially high places—friends like Pelosi, who will headline the Aug. 24 dinner to raise cash for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

In 2002, Baron was diagnosed with multiple myeloma. By October 2008, his doctors at the Mayo Clinic were telling him he had just days to live.

They also offered a glimmer of hope. Over the years, the couple had donated about \$1 million to Mayo. The staff was especially diligent, Blue said. They tested an arsenal of drugs and finally discovered that Baron's cancer responded surprisingly well, in the lab, to a drug called Tysabri.

Mayo had an ample supply, but the drug was—and still is—approved only for treatment of multiple sclerosis and Crohn's disease. The manufacturer, Biogen Idec, refused to give permission, even under special "compassionate use" rules that protect a drugmaker from a black mark in case of an adverse outcome.

Biogen said it didn't want to jeopardize the drug's availability to other patients. (The company did not respond to a request for comment last week.)

"I told Mayo, 'I'll sign anything, I'll release anything. Just give him the drug,'" Blue said.

Blue, also a top lawyer, began making calls. She started with Lance Armstrong, the bicyclist and cancer survivor, whom she had represented.

"I started going through Fred's Rolodex," she said. "I called every politician, every celebrity that I knew and just begged them to help. . . . I must have made 200 calls."

She called clinics in Canada, trying in vain to find doctors willing to administer the drug without Biogen's OK. She hired a lawyer and prepared to sue Mayo to force it to dispense the drug. She even bought some Tysabri online from Australia, intending to send stepson Andrew Baron to smuggle it back, she said.

The younger Baron posted an open plea online to Biogen, noting that Bill Clinton, Sens. John Kerry and Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, Sen. Tom Harkin of Iowa and even the head of the Food and Drug Administration had urged the company to reconsider.

"You talk about mental anguish," Blue recounted. "Fred, every day, would wake up and he said, 'Am I going to get the drug?'"

Others were supportive, she said, but Pelosi "put her heart and soul" into the cause, as did Harkin.

Somehow—Blue still isn't sure how—Pelosi cajoled the FDA to find a legal justification that let Mayo administer the drug, even without Biogen's consent.

"Nancy figured out a way," she said.

The drug beat back the cancer for a few days, but not enough.

Blue has no illusion that a typical family could pull such strings.

"There are so many cases like Fred's," she said. "One thing he taught me was politics matters. What a personal experience for me to understand how politics matters."

And no, she added, "It's not fair that other people can't pick up the phone and make the government give them a drug. . . . It was just such an awakening about how the drug companies have so much power."

That's what she'll tell Pelosi over dinner.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this article references events that occurred in 2008.

In 2002, this individual was diagnosed with multiple myeloma. By October of 2008, his doctors were telling him that he had just days to live. They also offered a glimmer of hope. There was perhaps one chance of therapy. It was an unproven therapy that might, in fact, be helpful to him.

The family made inquiries, made entreaties, but they were not successful until they invoked the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, who actually helped this lawyer get access to this medication. Unfortunately, it was not successful. His disease spread to a point where the therapy was not helpful. But the family observed, "NANCY figured out a way."

How about that. The Speaker of the House figured out a way to get this medication to an individual who was dying of a disease, who obviously was very important—a large Democratic donor, and I get that.

But the Speaker of the House intervened because the clinic where he was being treated felt that they did not have the authority to give him the medication. The company that was manufacturing the medication did not feel that it was in anyone's best interest to give him the medication. But NANCY found a way.

Well, Mr. Speaker, today, we are going to find a way. The President asked us, and we are going to find a way for those millions of Americans who are asking for that same chance.

So today's rule provides for consideration of two important consumer-driven pieces of legislation:

H.R. 4566, by Mr. POLIQUIN, will help alleviate some of the regulations that were put in place under the Dodd-Frank Act.

H.R. 5247, the right-to-try bill which garnered a majority of bipartisan support last week, will give patients who have nowhere else to turn another option to fight the potentially fatal health conditions with which they have been diagnosed.

I do want to thank President Trump and Vice President PENCE for their leadership on this issue and helping us understand here in this body how important it is to move forward with this patient-centered legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support today's rule and the two underlying pieces of legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 787 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 6. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4240) to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 4240 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3464) to prohibit firearms dealers from selling a firearm prior to the completion of a background check. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 3464 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2598) to provide family

members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. Immediately after the disposition of H.R. 2598, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1478) To repeal the provision that in practice prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from sponsoring research on gun violence in fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4240, H.R. 3464, H.R. 2598, or H.R. 1478.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House

being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1340

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia) at 1 o’clock and 40 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 787; and

Adoption of House Resolution 787, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4566, ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5247, TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK MONGIELLO, JORDAN McLINN, AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT TO TRY ACT OF 2018; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 787) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4566) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Gosar	Palazzo
Aderholt	Gowdy	Palmer
Allen	Granger	Paulsen
Amash	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Perry
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Babin	Griffith	Poe (TX)
Bacon	Grothman	Poliquin
Banks (IN)	Guthrie	Posey
Barr	Handel	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harper	Reed
Bergman	Harris	Reichert
Biggs	Hartzler	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Holding	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rokita
Brat	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Bridenstine	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas J.
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Roskam
Buchanan	Hurd	Ross
Buck	Issa	Rothfus
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Budd	Jenkins (WV)	Royce (CA)
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Russell
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Chabot	Katko	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Cole	King (IA)	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Shuster
Collins (NY)	Kinzing	Simpson
Comer	Knight	Smith (MO)
Comstock	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Labrador	Smith (NJ)
Cook	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Smucker
Cramer	Lamborn	Stefanik
Crawford	Lance	Stewart
Culberson	Latta	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Curtis	LoBiondo	Tenney
Davidson	Long	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Denham	Love	Tipton
Dent	Lucas	Trott
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Turner
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Valadao
Donovan	Marino	Wagner
Duffy	Marshall	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Walden
Duncan (TN)	Mast	Walker
Dunn	McCarthy	Walorski
Emmer	McCaul	Walters, Mimi
Estes (KS)	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Faso	McKinley	Wenstrup
Ferguson	McMorris	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Williams
Fleischmann	McSally	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Meadows	Wittman
Fortenberry	Meehan	Womack
Fox	Messer	Woodall
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Yoder
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Yoho
Gallagher	Mullin	Young (AK)
Garrett	Newhouse	Young (IA)
Gianforte	Noem	Zeldin
Gibbs	Norman	
Gohmert	Nunes	
Goodlatte	Olson	

NAYS—181

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Barragán	Blunt Rochester	Bustos
Bass	Bonamici	Butterfield
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan F.	Capuano
Bera	Brady (PA)	Carbajal
Beyer		Cárdenas

Carson (IN)	Himes	Pascarell
Cartwright	Huffman	Payne
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Cicilline	Jeffries	Peters
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Pocan
Clay	Keating	Polis
Cleaver	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Khanna	Quigley
Cohen	Kihuen	Raskin
Connolly	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Cooper	Kilmer	Richmond
Correa	Kinder	Rosen
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Crist	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lawson (FL)	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lee	Schiff
Delaney	Levin	Schneider
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
DeBene	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
Demings	Loeb sack	Scott, David
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Serrano
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Dingell	Lowey	Shea-Porter
Doggett	Lujan Grisham,	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	M.	Sinema
F.	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires
Ellison	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Engel	Maloney,	Soto
Eshoo	Carolyn B.	Speier
Esparillat	Maloney, Sean	Suoizzi
Esty (CT)	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
Evans	McCollum	Takano
Foster	McEachin	Thompson (MS)
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Titus
Fudge	McNerney	Tonko
Gabbard	Meeks	Torres
Gallego	Meng	Tsongas
Garamendi	Moore	Vargas
Gomez	Moulton	Veasey
Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Gottheimer	Nadler	Velázquez
Green, Al	Napolitano	Visclosky
Green, Gene	Neal	Wasserman
Grijalva	Nolan	Schultz
Gutiérrez	Norcross	Waters, Maxine
Hanabusa	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman
Hastings	O'Rourke	Welch
Heck	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Higgins (NY)	Panetta	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)
Black	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Jones	Rush
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Walz

□ 1405

Ms. MENG and Ms. McCOLLUM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ZELDIN was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF SEVEN AIRMEN KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY ON THE IRAQ-SYRIA BORDER

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, today we rise to honor the service and sacrifice of seven airmen fallen in the line of duty last week on the Iraq-Syria border.

There are no words that fully describe the profound sorrow and immense gratitude that consume us today. There are no words to describe the emptiness this loss leaves in the hearts of communities all across our Nation. There is, however, no shortage of ways to describe these seven servicemen: selfless, heroes, patriots, and ev-

everything we aspire to be as a people, as a nation, and as Americans.

These fallen airmen are the best of who we are. They are the embodiment of what makes this country the greatest in the world, the willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our exceptional Nation.

There is no doubt these brave men, and the so many who have fallen before them, are the reason we have the opportunity to stand here today in the well of the House of Representatives, in the heart of the United States Capitol, which should always serve as a beacon of hope and freedom for so many in our country and around the world.

Each and every day, these seven Americans answered the call of duty, to defend the liberties on which our Nation were founded, to defend their neighbors and communities, but, most selflessly, to defend the millions of Americans whom they would never know.

Four of these airmen served with the 106th Rescue Wing in Westhampton Beach, New York, located in the First Congressional District. This amazing unit is made up of the best of the best our Nation has to offer, with a long, rich history of service and sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the families of these seven great airmen have the unwavering thanks and appreciation of every American across our country, but, most of all, they have our utmost respect. We stand shoulder to shoulder with every one of them as they go through, undoubtedly, the most difficult moment of their lives.

Captain Andreas B. O'Keefe, Center Moriches, New York; Captain Christopher T. Zanetis, Long Island City, New York; Master Sergeant Christopher J. Raguso, Commack, New York; Staff Sergeant Dashan J. Briggs, Port Jefferson Station, New York; Captain Mark K. Weber, Colorado Springs, Colorado; Master Sergeant William R. Posch, Indialantic, Florida; Staff Sergeant Carl P. Enis, Tallahassee, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of these seven dedicated, selfless, and courageous airmen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARPER). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 183, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

AYES—225

Abraham	Gowdy	Paulsen
Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Allen	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Pittenger
Babin	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Bacon	Griffith	Poliquin
Banks (IN)	Grothman	Posey
Barr	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Barton	Handel	Reed
Bergman	Harper	Reichert
Biggs	Harris	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hill	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Holding	Rokita
Brat	Hollingsworth	Rooney, Francis
Bridenstine	Hudson	Rooney, Thomas
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	J.
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Hunter	Roskam
Buck	Hurd	Ross
Bucshon	Issa	Rothfus
Budd	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Russell
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Scalise
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Cheney	Katko	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Shuster
Comer	Kinzing	Simpson
Conaway	Knight	Smith (MO)
Cook	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Labrador	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Crawford	LaMalfa	Smucker
Culberson	Lamborn	Stefanik
Curbelo (FL)	Lance	Stewart
Curtis	Latta	Stivers
Davidson	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Tenney
Denham	Long	Thompson (PA)
Dent	Loudermilk	Thornberry
DeSantis	Love	Tipton
DesJarlais	Lucas	Trott
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Duffy	MacArthur	Upton
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Valadao
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Wagner
Dunn	Marshall	Walberg
Emmer	Mast	Walden
Estes (KS)	McCarthy	Walker
Farenthold	McClintock	Walorski
Faso	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Ferguson	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Wenstrup
Flores	Meehan	Westerman
Fortenberry	Messer	Williams
Fox	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gaetz	Mullin	Womack
Gallagher	Newhouse	Woodall
Garrett	Noem	Yoder
Gianforte	Norman	Yoho
Gibbs	Nunes	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Olson	Young (IA)
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Zeldin
Gosar	Palmer	

NOES—183

Adams	Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)
Aguilar	Brown (MD)	Clay
Amash	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Barragán	Bustos	Clyburn
Bass	Butterfield	Cohen
Beatty	Capuano	Comstock
Bera	Carbajal	Connolly
Beyer	Cárdenas	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Correa
Blumenauer	Cartwright	Costa
Blunt Rochester	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Crist
Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline	Crowley
F.	Clark (MA)	Cuellar

Davis (CA)	Kind	Pocan
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi	Polis
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)
Delaney	Langevin	Quigley
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Raskin
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)
Demings	Lawrence	Richmond
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)	Rosen
Deutch	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Levin	Ruiz
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Ruppersberger
Doyle, Michael F.	Lieu, Ted	Ryan (OH)
Ellison	Loeb	Sánchez
Engel	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Espallat	Lowe	Schiff
Esty (CT)	Lujan Grisham, M.	Schneider
Evans	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schrader
Foster	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Frankel (FL)	Maloney	Scott, David
Fudge	Carolyn B. Maloney	Serrano
Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Gallego	Massie	Shea-Porter
Garamendi	Matsui	Sherman
Gomez	McCollum	Sinema
Gonzalez (TX)	McEachin	Sires
Gotthelmer	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Green, Al	McNerney	Soto
Green, Gene	Meeks	Speier
Grijalva	Meng	Suozzi
Gutiérrez	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Hanabusa	Moulton	Takano
Hastings	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Heck	Nadler	Titus
Higgins (NY)	Napolitano	Tonko
Himes	Neal	Torres
Huffman	Nolan	Tsongas
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Vargas
Jayapal	O'Halleran	Veasey
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Visclosky
Kaptur	Panetta	Wasserman
Keating	Pascarell	Schultz
Kennedy	Payne	Waters, Maxine
Khanna	Pelosi	Watson Coleman
Kihuen	Perlmutter	Welch
Kildee	Peters	Wilson (FL)
Kilmer	Peterson	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Arrington	Hoyer	Meadows
Barletta	Johnson, E. B.	Mooney (WV)
Black	Jones	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Cummings	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	McCauley	Vela
Diaz-Balart	McSally	Walz

□ 1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO MODIFY AMENDMENT NO. 1 PRINTED IN HOUSE REPORT 115-613 TO H.R. 4566, ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS ACT

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-613 with the modification placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 1 PRINTED IN HOUSE REPORT NO. 115-613 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 1, line 10, strike "and".

Page 2, after line 7, insert the following:

(D) in clause (vi), as so redesignated, by striking "clause (ii)" and inserting "clause (iii)"; and

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 787, I call up the bill (H.R. 4566) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 787, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-65, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4566

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act".

SEC. 2. STRESS TEST RELIEF FOR NONBANKS.

Section 165(i) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by striking "and nonbank financial companies"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "are regulated by a primary Federal financial regulatory agency" and inserting: "whose primary financial regulatory agency is a Federal banking agency or the Federal Housing Finance Agency";

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "Each Federal primary financial regulatory agency" and inserting "Each Federal banking agency and the Federal Housing Finance Agency"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) SEC AND CFTC.—The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission may each issue regulations requiring financial companies with respect to which they are the primary financial regulatory agency and that have total consolidated assets of more than \$10,000,000,000 to conduct periodic analyses of the financial condition, including available liquidity, of such companies under adverse economic conditions."

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council under section 120 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5330).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 115-613, as modified by the order of the House of today, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), one of the most hardworking, enthusiastic, cheerful members of the House Financial Services Committee for all the work that he has done to advance this very strong piece of bipartisan legislation, which, incidentally, passed the Financial Services Committee again with another strong bipartisan vote of 47-8.

Now, the financial crisis led to questions, both domestically and internationally, about how to address financial stability and create a regulatory framework to mitigate systemic risk, all the while ensuring robust economic growth.

At the heart of this bill of the gentleman from Maine is a recognition that our economy can suffer when we get it wrong, when government attempts to dictate the business models and operational objectives of so many of our businesses. It is also a recognition that one-size-fits-all regulations can stifle economic growth and ultimately harm consumers and harm our constituents.

Current bank-centric standards and assessments to nonbank industries, such as the asset management industry, have needlessly saddled Main Street investors with increased costs while they are trying to save for college or retirement or some other important need, and this is perhaps no clearer than in this stress testing regime.

As a former SEC chief economist observed in 2016, who said that, in the current law, “stress test the big banks; and, oh, you might as well go ahead and do the asset management companies.” That is his take of what the law says.

In other words, asset management firms that, again, our constituents depend upon for their retirement security or for their financial planning are now subject to bank regulations simply because they operate under the financial services umbrella, even though such firms plainly have legal, structural, and operational characteristics that make them very, very different from banks.

By the way, none of the asset managers had anything to do with the financial crisis that brought about the legislation that we are debating in the first place. For example, unlike banks, asset managers do not have access to the deposit insurance fund or the Fed’s discount window.

If that is not enough for you, Mr. Speaker, here is more. Asset managers are legally separated—legally separated from the funds they manage, meaning that the asset and liabilities of the manager are distinct from the assets and liabilities of the funds.

On the other hand, the bank business model directly subjects the bank to the risks and obligations of its assets and liabilities. Again, applying a one-size-fits-all regulatory structure—in this case, a bank-centric model—is not only bad for the asset management industry, but, far more importantly, for our constituents that they serve, who choose to save and invest.

Registered funds are the investment vehicle choices for millions of Americans seeking to buy a home, pay for college, plan for financial security and retirement. Application of unnecessary, ill-suited, bank-centric stress testing requirements to register funds and advisers will undoubtedly increase cost for these funds and advisers, and, ultimately, this gets passed on to investors without any corresponding benefits that we can discern.

The recent asset management and insurance report issued by the Department of Treasury confirms these concerns. The bill of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) would fix this unequal regulatory structure by exempting certain nonbank financial institutions that have not been designated for supervision by the Federal Reserve Board from the act’s stress testing requirement.

Further, in the true spirit of bipartisanship, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for recognizing the underlying need for this relief and for working with Mr. POLIQUIN to offer an amendment during markup that allows the SEC and the CFTC to issue regulations to require certain financial com-

panies they supervise to conduct periodic analysis of the financial condition of such companies under adverse economic conditions.

The approach is common sense. It is not one size fits all. It recognizes that the primary regulator of nonbank financial companies is better suited than a bank regulator to determine whether these stress tests might be useful to address risk. And it recognizes that, as a general matter, stress testing asset managers is difficult and often needless.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this great bipartisan legislation. I believe we have an amendment forthcoming from the ranking member, which I expect our side of the aisle to support. I am led to believe that, with the adoption of her amendment, she would support the underlying bill. I hope that proves to come to fruition, in which case we can have a very strong bipartisan vote on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 4566, the so-called Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, which would make it harder for regulators to identify and mitigate hidden systemic risks at nonbank financial companies before they undermine our economy.

Last Wednesday marked 10 years since global investment bank Bear Stearns imploded as a result of its failure to manage risk associated with its highly leveraged balance sheet and exposure to the subprime mortgage market. American taxpayers were forced to come to the rescue to prevent the firm’s collapse from spreading to other overleveraged Wall Street institutions.

The demise of Bear Stearns was the canary in the coal mine for the ensuing financial crisis, which ravaged the United States economy, destroyed trillions of dollars of wealth, and put millions of Americans out of their jobs and their homes.

Democrats responded to the 2008 financial crisis by passing the Dodd-Frank Act, which, among other reforms, required rigorous stress tests of the Nation’s largest financial institutions. The Dodd-Frank Act also gave the Federal Reserve Board the discretion to quickly intervene and stress-test firms that could pose financial stability risk.

If regular stress testing had been conducted on firms like Bear Stearns from 2006 to 2008, it might have revealed major threats to the economy sooner, giving both the companies and Federal financial regulators a better chance to take remedial action to

avoid a catastrophic near collapse of the global financial system.

H.R. 4566 would eliminate the Federal Reserve’s authority to stress-test nonbank financial companies, even in situations where the firm’s designation as systemically important is pending before the Financial Stability Oversight Council, FSOC.

Additionally, the bill would weaken the Dodd-Frank mandate that large financial companies under the SEC and CFTC’s purview conduct internal stress tests to determine the company’s ability to withstand a recession.

Combined, these rollbacks would allow the Bear Stearns of the world to take on increasing amounts of risk while regulators are tied up in lengthy administrative processes.

As former SEC Chair Mary Jo White stated in a December 2014 speech: “Stress testing is an important tool routinely used by banking regulators. Implementing this new mandate in asset management, while relatively novel, will help market participation and the Commission better understand the potential impact of stress events.”

I agree with Chair White’s comments about the importance of stress testing and think that it simply does not make sound public policy to eliminate this tool.

Members of the asset management industry have also recognized that stress testing is critical to effectively managing risk. In a 2015 letter to the SEC, the Asset Management Group of the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, that is SIFMA AMG, whose members manage more than \$30 trillion in assets, wrote: “Stress testing is one part of an effective and coherent risk management process for asset managers, the objective of which is not to test for solvency or capital adequacy, but to complement other approaches in assessing investment risk.”

In fact, in a 2015 survey of SIFMA AMG members, nearly two-thirds of the asset managers surveyed reported that they already stress-test their funds. It seems imprudent that Congress would repeal a requirement for large interconnected hedge funds that may have 15-to-1 leverage to periodically determine whether they could withstand a down economy.

Moreover, given how rapidly failures at large nonbank financial companies can spread across the highly interconnected financial system, regulators must be able to quickly identify problems that could undermine U.S. financial stability. The Federal Reserve should continue to have the discretionary authority to step in to identify and mitigate systemic risk at any financial company whose failure could pose a threat to our economy.

H.R. 4566 appears to ignore that nonbank financial companies like Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, and AIG

played a central role in the financial crisis. When these firms collapsed as a result of their failure to mitigate their own internal risk, their losses sent shockwaves throughout the banking system.

Stress testing these kinds of nonbank financial institutions provides a valuable early warning system for our economy and gives both the companies and regulators a chance to correct problems before they have catastrophic effects on our financial stability. That is why I intend to offer an amendment that, if adopted, would restore the Fed's discretionary authority to stress test any nonbank, provided that the test meet certain conditions, including approval by a majority of FSOC members. It would also allow the Fed to use alternatives to capital, as appropriate, when stress-testing systemically important nonbanks and broaden the SEC's and CFTC's authority to require internal testing for entities under their purview.

This amendment would ensure that large financial institutions, like investment companies that manage trillions of dollars of hardworking Americans' retirement savings, can be appropriately evaluated for their ability to survive in a stressed economy.

While I oppose H.R. 4566 in its current form, I would support an amended version of the bill that preserves the bill's ability to identify and mitigate future systemic risk at nonbanks before they lead to another crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time, and I thank the chairman for moving this very important piece of legislation through our committee, the Financial Services Committee, and onto the floor.

This is a commonsense bill, Mr. Speaker, that I encourage everybody, Republicans and Democrats, to support, H.R. 4566.

Throughout the great State of Maine and across America, Mr. Speaker, we have millions and millions of small savers and small investors who are planning for their retirement or for the college education for their kids or their grandkids.

The people of Maine, Mr. Speaker, are the most honest and hardworking folks you can find anywhere, and every week thousands and thousands of Maine families are setting aside small parts of their paychecks into an IRA or a 401(k) plan so they will have enough money for their retirement, or setting aside small amounts of money for their son or their daughter to attend a college, a community college, a university, or a technical school.

Today, Mr. Speaker, almost 55 percent of all American families, about 100 million of our fellow Americans, entrust these savings to mutual funds and other pension advisers such that they are able to grow and to provide them with a larger nest egg down the road.

These asset managers, Mr. Speaker, are currently operating under the uncertainty of whether or not they will be subjected to very costly and, in many cases, unnecessary stress test regulations which are designed for large money center banks with very different functions in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, when a bank takes in deposits from its customers, it is obligated to return those deposits and, hopefully, with interest. Now, it is important that those banks have enough reserves to make sure that, during a recession, they are able to meet those obligations. For many of these banks, stress testing does make sense.

However, Mr. Speaker, mutual fund and other asset managers perform a very different function. If one invests for their retirement or their college savings, their goal is to grow that nest egg, but it is not guaranteed to be the case by the asset managers who are performing that job. In effect, Mr. Speaker, these asset managers of mutual funds serve as an agent for the investor and the small saver, with no liability to return these savings in full; but, of course, they take the risk for a better return down the road.

Now, if you do have a huge money center bank with tentacles running throughout the economy and that bank fails, it could represent a systemic risk to our economy. But investors in a poorly performing mutual fund are simply able to switch their account to a better performing mutual fund house in order for a better return down the road with no systemic risk to the economy, in part, Mr. Speaker, because the assets themselves are held at a bank custodian. They are not even held at the mutual fund company or at the asset management firm.

Now, my bill, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4566, exempts most nonbank financial institutions, like mutual funds, from costly stress test requirements. And this, Mr. Speaker, is so important to our small savers across the country because, when you have costly, cumbersome, and unnecessary regulations, they are paid for by the savers in these mutual funds and by these pension fund investors. And when they are paid out of their rate of return, their rates of return drop, and, therefore, the value of their nest eggs drop.

Mr. Speaker, government should be in the job of helping our families live better lives with more financial security, and H.R. 4566 helps us do just that by removing one-size-fits-all regulations that fit for lots of banks but not for the asset management community.

Today, Mr. Speaker, approximately 4 percent of the expenses of asset managers are for complying with regulations. If we do nothing, that number is expected to go up to 10 percent of their expenses, just on compliance, within 5 years. Now, that makes a big difference because the higher the expenses, the lower the rate of return, the smaller the nest egg for those who are saving for college or for retirement.

To give support to my point, Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years, economists at our own Securities and Exchange Commission and at our own Treasury have not been able to design a stress test for asset managers and for thousands and thousands of mutual fund companies across the country, and that is because it makes no sense to try to do so.

Stress testing as a prudential regulation simply does not fit every participant in the United States financial services sector. There are intrinsic differences between banks and asset managers, and my bill, Mr. Speaker, recognizes that difference and properly exempts most nonbank financial institutions from stress tests. That, in turn, again, Mr. Speaker, will lower the cost and increase the rates of return for Main Street investors across our great State of Maine and across America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for the opportunity to address this very important issue, and I encourage everyone, Republicans and Democrats, both sides of the aisle, to please vote "yes" for H.R. 4566, Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle and my chairman, Mr. HENSARLING, for indicating their acceptance of the amendment.

I think it is extremely important for both sides of the aisle to appreciate the necessity and the importance of stress testing, and I think we both do that. The discretion that we afford to the Feds in this bill, I think, is very important. So this is one of those instances when both sides can come together and recognize that there were important indications of what is needed to understand what should be done to avoid another meltdown in our financial services industries and our banks.

Again, I don't think there is any need for us to continue to talk about what we don't like about stress testing, but, rather, we are coming together to talk about how it is done and why it is important. I have a great appreciation for that, and I would like to thank my colleagues for that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), who is the vice chairman of our Financial Services Committee and the chief deputy majority whip.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding time today on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act. It rolls off the tongue to some, maybe BRUCE POLIQUIN's, the bill's sponsor, but it is an important thing for us to discuss here today.

Now, hindsight bias is a very dangerous thing. It allows us to overstate our ability to predict an outcome, and it is something that lures us into creating a new system that while excellent at solving the last financial crisis or the last crisis, the last event, it fails to see the next event coming.

Now, it is not something that just fortune tellers use. It is not something that just those with an NCAA pool would use to say that all along they knew UMBC would beat Virginia. It is not just used there. Here in Washington, it is done by bureaucrats that are susceptible to these same fallacies.

So in the wake of the financial crisis, policymakers here in Washington raced to give regulators new tools to help predict future risks so that such a crisis would never happen again.

One of those tools was stress testing. The idea was to provide a method to test financial firms to differentiate between solid institutions that can weather a financial storm and those that would need help. But this crystal ball has flaws. One of the biggest flaws is treating all large financial firms the same, a one-size-fits-all approach, and this includes lumping in nonbank financial firms that don't use leverage with financial firms—bank firms—that do use leverage.

Despite this widely understood concept that capital adequacy standards do not fit neatly into assessing the risks of the asset management industry, for instance, regulators have instead stuck to their rigid methodology to try to square the circle, or circle the square, whatever that phrase is.

Thankfully, Representative BRUCE POLIQUIN has crafted a very solid bill to address this truth and bring it into reality legislatively. The stress tests built after the financial crisis do not work for nonbank financial firms. This is a security show rather than security in fact.

Thus, in a world that constantly throws big and unexpected events our way, understanding the limitations of predicting risk is one of the most important steps we can take to avoid future harm, and that is what this bill does. I encourage my House colleagues to vote in support of and in favor of it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am just amazed that anybody from North Carolina, after being beaten by Texas A&M by 21 points, would make any allusion to basketball whatsoever. I trust our next speaker will not make that mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman can be assured that since my team was one and done, I will skip the bracket discussion here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) for his work on this very reasonable legislation.

Stress tests are a good idea that should be standard practice in any company. What is not a good idea—and, quite frankly, not terribly helpful in promoting systemic financial stability—is the cryptic and arbitrary manner in which stress tests are handled today.

Today, the Federal Reserve imposes these stress tests on all financial firms with more than \$10 billion in consolidated assets. This doesn't apply just to banks, despite the fact that the Fed is a bank regulator. This requirement to submit information extends to nonbank financial firms as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to walk you through what one of these stress tests looks like. A financial firm is given cryptic instructions to run a number of scenarios to test the fortitude of the institution. That firm then submits tens of thousands of pages to the Fed. In some cases, that number can climb to more than 100,000 pages at a cost of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, to give you an idea of what 20,000 pages is, in our committee hearing, we had a visual aid there with a table about this size right here in front of me today, about 3 feet tall, and boxes all around. That is 20,000 pages. Some of these stress tests, Mr. Speaker, are 100,000 pages, five times that amount, hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of dollars to do these stress tests; and, quite frankly, there is very little evidence that the Fed actually reads all the paperwork. In fact, one day you will probably get a call from the Fed, and they will tell you whether you passed or not. It is a very subjective test. There is no real explanation offered if a firm fails. The message is just to try again and keep trying until you finally pass the test and guess what the model is. This is not a productive exercise for anyone.

The truth of the matter is that the Fed has no business conducting and analyzing stress tests on nonbanks. Those firms have functional regulators, like the SEC and CFTC, which better understand the business models and

performance of nonbanks and, as such, the risks those firms pose to the financial stability of the United States. The actual supervisor of these companies should be the only entity with the ability to require these sorts of activities, and Mr. POLIQUIN's bill allows for that.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about promoting thoughtful and effective legislation. It is about curtailing a one-size-fits-all—as the chairman mentioned earlier—approach to regulation, something Members from both sides of the aisle have claimed to support.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Maine for his leadership on this issue, and I urge support of this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Maine, BRUCE POLIQUIN, for sponsoring this bipartisan legislation.

The Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act amends the Dodd-Frank Act to make some commonsense changes to stress testing requirements for asset managers and the investors whom they serve.

Congressman POLIQUIN has worked very hard to make sure this bill is bipartisan. In fact, he was able to win the support of two-thirds of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee.

I believe this is one of the many bills that Chairman HENSARLING has suggested be part of our negotiations with the Senate on their regulatory relief package. I agree. Why shouldn't a bill with such strong bipartisan support at least be part of the conversation?

The idea behind the stress testing for financial institutions under Dodd-Frank is to make sure that they have enough capital on hand to cover losses in the case of a market disruption like the one that was encountered during the financial crisis. However, registered funds have a very different business model than banks. They do not guarantee any return to investors or promise that investors will get their principal back. Furthermore, these funds are not on the adviser's balance sheet.

The idea that an asset manager should hold capital like a bank does not comport with its business model. Or in the words of Mark Flannery, a former chief economist of the SEC, there is a false parallel for stress testing asset managers: "The parallel to bank stress tests is really extremely misleading. It is as if Dodd-Frank said 'stress test the big banks, and, oh, you might as well go ahead and do the asset management companies.'"

Fortunately, BRUCE POLIQUIN has sponsored commonsense legislation to provide some regulatory relief in a way that I think Democrats and Republicans should be able to agree.

The Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act would eliminate the bank-like stress testing requirements in Dodd-Frank but would empower the SEC, the primary Federal regulator of the asset management industry, to require stress testing as it deems appropriate.

In short, what this bill says is that we should only stress-test asset managers as their primary regulator determines is in the best interest of the investors instead of arbitrarily applying bank-like stress testing requirements as proposed by the Federal Reserve.

It comes as little surprise that the SEC, including under the leadership of Mary Jo White, seems to agree. The SEC has not been able to come up with stress testing standards that are consistent and comparable with those of the Federal Reserve and other banking regulators, likely because there is no way to account for capital adequacy in these companies.

Furthermore, this bill does nothing to undermine the significant regulatory authority to the Financial Stability Oversight Council. The FSOC would still be able to make recommendations to the SEC for additional regulation of asset managers.

I am not necessarily endorsing this concept, but I would like to emphasize this in the hopes that it would encourage even more Democratic colleagues to join in support of this bill. This bill, again, is true to its name. It cuts costs that are borne by investors without subjecting our financial system to any additional risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who is the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to commend my friend and colleague from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) for his leadership on this important issue. H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, would help nonbanks not currently under supervision of the Federal Reserve from stress testing requirements.

In addition to alleviating burdensome requirements, the bill allows the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to issue regulations requiring financial companies with more than \$10 billion in consolidated assets

to conduct a periodic analysis of their financial condition, including their liquidity.

This legislation would properly tailor Dodd-Frank's stress test requirements in a way that is appropriately focused. This bill retains the SEC's ability to issue stress testing as it believes appropriate. The bill does not limit the Financial Stability Oversight Council's authority to request the SEC to adopt suitable requirements for advisers and funds.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank the gentleman from Maine for his commitment to this important piece of legislation. I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill on the floor.

In God We Trust.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), who is a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, which was introduced by my colleague, Representative POLIQUIN.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans rely on registered funds to invest and save for their future, and they rely on asset management advisers to assist them in making major financial decisions, such as paying college tuition, saving for retirement, or buying a home.

However, too often these advisers have their hands tied complying with burdensome regulations that were not intended for the type of financial institutions that they serve. Following the enactment of Dodd-Frank, a framework was created to assess systemic risk posed by financial institutions, and this framework looked at the risk from a bank-centric approach.

In addition, Dodd-Frank required all financial companies with total consolidated assets of more than \$10 billion to conduct various annual stress tests to comply with the law. Now, unfortunately, this broad definition sweeps in registered investment companies and requires that these nonbank institutions be held accountable for the same stress tests as banks.

This particular stress test does not make sense for the asset management industry and only adds costs that will end up putting the burden on investors who rely on these funds.

Again, the U.S. asset management industry is critical in promoting diverse investment and savings opportunities for individuals, for families, and for businesses. This important legislation would eliminate unnecessary costs for nonbank financial institutions that have not been designated as system-

ically important by removing Dodd-Frank's bank-centric, mandatory stress test requirement.

As we continue to explore new ways to help families save for their future or buy a new home, we should remain focused on improving their ability to invest. I want to thank Representative POLIQUIN and Chairman HENSARLING for their important work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bill.

□ 1500

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased about the work that staff has done on this particular legislation.

I do believe that we all agree that stress tests are important; it is a matter of who, how, and when.

Someone has likened stress tests to car testing, where, in the manufacture of new cars, you take them out on the road and you test them to see if they can withstand what they may be presented with in the terrain and with the kind of things that you would experience perhaps on the roughest roads that they test on. When they determine that there are weaknesses that can be corrected, that is what they do in order to make sure that this new vehicle that they are testing can withstand whatever the difficulties are that may be presented to them when they test a car.

That is what this stress testing is all about. It all about whether or not, in the event of a downturn in our economy, you have the ability to withstand the downturn, whether or not you have the ability to not only withstand what you are presented with in a downturn of the economy, but how you can fix what you have determined is wrong with what you are doing.

So I am, again, very pleased that we all agree that stress testing is extremely important and that we know what your concerns are about hedge fund and asset managers and all of that. But the discretion that we give to the Feds, I think, is very important. The fact that all of the businesses that we are concerned with will be doing their internal stress testing is extremely important.

So, again, I am very grateful for the acceptance of my amendment, and I am hopeful that, with this amendment, it demonstrates that, when we work very hard to reconcile our differences, we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that, with this amendment, all of the Members of the House vote for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4566, the legislation from the

gentleman from Maine. I want to commend him once again. He is one of our most hardworking members on the committee, and he cares passionately about his constituents in Maine.

I also want to commend him for once again working on a very bipartisan basis. He has managed to change his bill from its original concept many times to try to garner more support from the other side of the aisle.

With the acceptance of the ranking member's amendment, again, I am hopeful that we will have a very, very strong vote in the House. Again, this came out of committee with a very strong bipartisan vote of 47-8.

Mr. Speaker, very often we debate regulation. I think that now, fortunately, we have a 3 percent growth Tax Code which has been passed by Congress, but, unfortunately, I do not believe we have a 3 percent growth of finance in the banking system.

That is important. It is important to our constituents who still need credit to buy that first home, a factory worker who needs to get their transmission repaired so that they can go to work, some parent trying to send a kid to college, or people trying to plan for their retirement.

Too often, I think we have a dichotomy between regulation and deregulation, when the real dichotomy is between smart regulation and dumb regulation. It is always incumbent upon us in Congress to look very carefully at these regulations. Sometimes they look very good on the chalkboard, but in reality, they don't quite render the results or benefits that we had hoped for. So we always have to take a look at what this is doing not just to consumer and investor protection, but what it is doing to economic growth as well.

I agree with the ranking member. Stress testing is a good concept. It is one of the reasons why banks and other financial firms typically stress-test themselves daily, weekly, monthly, annually.

What doesn't make sense, though, is that there be no recognition to the cost that it imposes, as the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of our Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, was very articulate in reminding us that these submissions can cost us millions and millions of dollars. The reports are not measured in pages; they are measured by the pound. There can be 10- and 20-pound submissions of paper that we wonder if anybody ever reads.

But what especially doesn't make sense is trying to apply a bank stress test to a nonbank financial institution, particularly an asset manager. I know the ranking member was talking a little bit earlier about using an analogy to auto inspections: It makes no sense to have the home inspectors inspect your auto; it makes no sense to have the auto inspectors inspect your home.

The gentleman from Maine is ensuring that whatever stress test is applied, it is applied properly to the business model that needs to be tested for its potential stress of our financial system.

So, again, I just want to commend the gentleman from Maine for his hard work, and I urge all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 4566 because, indeed, maybe it is not a catchy title, but it is an accurate title. As we alleviate stress test burdens, we do help investors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY
MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1, as modified, printed in House Report 115-613.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Page 1, strike lines 8 and 9 and insert the following:

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)—
(A) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (v) as clauses (iii) through (vi), respectively;
(B) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) may conduct the evaluation required by this subsection utilizing alternatives to the capital adequacy test described in subparagraph (A), as the Board may determine appropriate;”;

(C) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, provided that such tests of any nonbank financial company—

“(I) are requested by a majority vote of the Council;

“(II) are conducted in accordance with the company's business model, including by utilizing alternatives to the capital adequacy test described in subparagraph (A), as the Board may determine appropriate; and

“(III) are not already required by the company's Federal primary financial regulatory agency”;

(D) in clause (vi), as so redesignated, by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “clause (iii)”;

Page 2, beginning on line 10, strike “and that have total consolidated assets of more than \$10,000,000,000”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 787, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, in its current form, H.R. 4566 eliminates the Fed's discretion to require stress testing on nonbanks that have not yet been designated as systemically important and weakens the Dodd-Frank Act's mandate that the

SEC and CFTC require nonbank financial companies under their authority to conduct annual stress tests. Together, these repeals create a loophole that would allow large brokerage firms and mega insurance companies to ignore risks while regulators are tied up in lengthy rulemaking or the FSOC designation process.

My amendment, if adopted, would restore the Fed's discretionary authority to stress-test any nonbank financial firm, provided that the test is requested by a majority vote of the FSOC, is conducted with consideration of the company's business model, and is not already required by the company's primary regulator.

My amendment would also allow the Fed to consider alternatives to the existing capital adequacy test, where appropriate, when conducting stress tests on nonbanks, including those designated as systemically important.

One of the key safeguards created by Dodd-Frank is the Fed's ability to identify and mitigate risks in the financial system before they undermine the U.S. economy. By preserving the Fed's ability to stress-test nonbank financial companies on a discretionary basis, my amendment will give regulators a better chance of preventing the next Bear Stearns or Lehman Brothers from dragging down our financial system.

Finally, my amendment would broaden the SEC's and CFTC's authority under the bill by striking the provision that would limit future company-run stress testing requirements to entities with more than \$10 billion in assets. This would ensure that the SEC and CFTC can require any financial company under their purview to evaluate their own ability to survive in a stressed economy.

While I oppose H.R. 4566 as currently drafted, with this amendment, the bill would represent a truly bipartisan effort to strengthen Dodd-Frank. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am not thrilled with the amendment, but in the spirit of compromise and the spirit of bipartisanship, we have worked with the ranking member and the sponsor of the legislation. It wouldn't be my preferred approach, but that is often what we do around here.

I want to thank the ranking member for working with the majority side in

order to advance this, again, as a very strong bipartisan vote in the House, which I hope and anticipate with the inclusion of this amendment.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, again, I am very happy. On the other side of the Capitol, they have recently advanced a number of kind of smart regulatory measures and capital formation measures. We look forward to negotiating with our friends in the Senate. I am hoping that an overwhelming vote on a bill like H.R. 4566 is one that could be in a final package before it goes to the President's desk.

Again, I still think that, although we have all compromised a little something here, I think we all advance our principles. I think it is something that will help, actually, both financial stability and investor protection, including protecting their opportunities to have a better future.

So again, I want to thank the ranking member for working with us, and I would urge the House to adopt her amendment and adopt H.R. 4566 by Mr. POLIQUIN of Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, who says that a terrific Representative from one of the most urban areas in the country, Los Angeles, California, cannot get together with a Representative from one of the most rural parts of America up in the great State of Maine?

I thank Ranking Member WATERS for her extension of bipartisanship. I also thank Chairman HENSARLING very much for brokering this. This is going to be a great day for America, a great day for Maine, and a great day for California.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind words, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The question is on the amendment, as modified, by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 19, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—395

Abraham	Davis (CA)	Issa
Adams	Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee
Aderholt	DeFazio	Jeffries
Aguilar	DeGette	Jenkins (KS)
Allen	Delaney	Jenkins (WV)
Amash	DeLauro	Johnson (LA)
Amodei	DelBene	Johnson (OH)
Arrington	Demings	Johnson, Sam
Babin	Denham	Jordan
Bacon	Dent	Joyce (OH)
Banks (IN)	DeSantis	Kaptur
Barr	DesJarlais	Katko
Barragán	Deutch	Keating
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)
Bass	Dingell	Kelly (PA)
Beatty	Doggett	Kennedy
Bera	Donovan	Kihuen
Bergman	Doyle, Michael	Kildee
Beyer	F.	Kilmer
Biggs	Duffy	Kind
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	King (IA)
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (TN)	King (NY)
Bishop (MI)	Dunn	Kinzing
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Knight
Blackburn	Engel	Krishnamoorthi
Blum	Eshoo	Kuster (NH)
Blumenauer	Estes (KS)	Kustoff (TN)
Blunt Rochester	Esty (CT)	Labrador
Bonamici	Evans	LaHood
Bost	Farenthold	LaMalfa
Brady (PA)	Faso	Lamborn
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	Lance
Brat	Fitzpatrick	Langevin
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Larson (CT)
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Latta
Brown (MD)	Poster	Lawrence
Brownley (CA)	Fox	Lawson (FL)
Buchanan	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Buck	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)
Bucshon	Fudge	Lewis (MN)
Budd	Gabbard	Lieu, Ted
Burgess	Gaetz	LoBiondo
Bustos	Gallagher	Loeb
Butterfield	Gallego	Lofgren
Byrne	Garamendi	Long
Calvert	Garrett	Loudermilk
Capuano	Gianforte	Love
Carbajal	Gibbs	Lowenthal
Cárdenas	Gohmert	Lowe
Carson (IN)	Gomez	Lucas
Carter (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Luetkemeyer
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham,
Cartwright	Gosar	M.
Castor (FL)	Gottheimer	Luján, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Gowdy	Lynch
Chabot	Granger	MacArthur
Cheney	Graves (GA)	Maloney,
Cicilline	Graves (LA)	Carolyn B.
Clarke (NY)	Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean
Clay	Green, Al	Marchant
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Marino
Clyburn	Griffith	Marshall
Coffman	Grothman	Massie
Cohen	Guthrie	Mast
Cole	Hanabusa	Matsui
Collins (GA)	Handel	McCarthy
Collins (NY)	Harper	McCauley
Comer	Harris	McClintock
Comstock	Hartzler	McCollum
Conaway	Hastings	McEachin
Connolly	Heck	McGovern
Cook	Hensarling	McHenry
Cooper	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Correa	Hice, Jody B.	McMorris
Costa	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers
Costello (PA)	Higgins (NY)	McNerney
Courtney	Hill	Meadows
Cramer	Himes	Meehan
Crawford	Holding	Meeks
Crist	Hollingsworth	Meng
Crowley	Hudson	Messer
Cuellar	Huffman	Mitchell
Culberson	Huizenga	Moolenaar
Curbelo (FL)	Hultgren	Mooney (WV)
Curtis	Hunter	Moore
Davidson	Hurd	Moulton

Mullin	Rokita	Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Rooney, Francis	Takano
Nadler	Rooney, Thomas	Taylor
Napolitano	J.	Tenney
Neal	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)
Newhouse	Rosen	Thompson (PA)
Noem	Roskam	Thornberry
Nolan	Ross	Tipton
Norcross	Rothfus	Titus
Norman	Rouzer	Tonko
Nunes	Roybal-Allard	Torres
O'Halleran	Royce (CA)	Trott
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Tsongas
Olson	Ruppersberger	Turner
Palazzo	Russell	Upton
Pallone	Rutherford	Valadao
Palmer	Ryan (OH)	Vargas
Panetta	Sanford	Veasey
Pascarella	Scalise	Vela
Paulsen	Schiff	Velázquez
Payne	Schneider	Wagner
Pearce	Schrader	Walberg
Pelosi	Schweikert	Walden
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Walker
Perry	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Peters	Scott, David	Walters, Mimi
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Wasserman
Pittenger	Sessions	Schultz
Poe (TX)	Sewell (AL)	Waters, Maxine
Poliquin	Shea-Porter	Watson Coleman
Polis	Sherman	Weber (TX)
Posey	Shimkus	Webster (FL)
Price (NC)	Shuster	Welch
Quigley	Simpson	Westen
Raskin	Sinema	Westerman
Ratcliffe	Sires	Williams
Reed	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Reichert	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Renacci	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Rice (NY)	Smith (TX)	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Richmond	Smucker	Yoder
Roby	Soto	Yoho
Roe (TN)	Stefanik	Young (AK)
Rogers (AL)	Stewart	Young (IA)
Rogers (KY)	Stivers	Zeldin
Rohrabacher	Suozi	

NAYS—19

Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Sarbanes
F.	Jayapal	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Serrano
DeSaulnier	Khanna	Speier
Ellison	Lee	Visclosky
Espallat	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva	Sánchez	

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Hoyer	McSally
Black	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Jones	Rush
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Walz

□ 1543

Messrs. KHANNA, ELLISON, and Ms. LEE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MATSUI, Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas, GENE GREEN of Texas, NORCROSS, Mrs. TORRES, Meses. CLARKE of New York, ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. YARMUTH, Meses. SHEA-PORTER, CASTOR of Florida, Messrs. TONKO, ENGEL, TAKANO, and GALLEGO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10

a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MABEL LEE MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4463) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the "Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4463

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MABEL LEE MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMELIA EARHART POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2040) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621 Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, as the "Amelia Earhart Post Office Building", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2040

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMELIA EARHART POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621

Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the "Amelia Earhart Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Amelia Earhart Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPONSOR OF H.R. 756

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of H.R. 756, a bill originally introduced by Representative Chaffetz of Utah, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

BRAIN INJURY AWARENESS DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is Brain Injury Awareness Day, and I welcome those who are in Washington today to share their stories.

This issue is near and dear to my heart. For nearly 30 years, this was my area of practice and expertise as a therapist and rehabilitation services manager. I served as a board member for the Brain Injury Association of Pennsylvania and helped form a brain injury support group.

The theme for this year's campaign is Change Your Mind. This public awareness campaign strives to destigmatize brain injury; empower those who have survived, as well as their caregivers; and promote the many types of support available.

The need to raise awareness is great. More than 2.8 million Americans sustain traumatic brain injuries in the United States each year.

The 13 million Americans living with brain injuries want what we all want: to be defined by who they are as people, not by their injury.

Mr. Speaker, everyone recovers at a different pace, and we should do everything in our power to support and encourage brain injury survivors. They deserve no less.

GET SCREENED FOR COLON CANCER

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge each of my colleagues and the American people to talk to their doctors about getting screened for colorectal cancer.

Each year, I sponsor a resolution to recognize March as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month. By raising awareness about this preventable cancer, we can save lives.

During this Congress, Representative CHARLIE DENT and I introduced H.R. 1017, the Removing Barriers to Colorectal Cancer Screening Act of 2017. This bill would eliminate surprise out-of-pocket costs for Medicare beneficiaries who have polyps removed during colonoscopies.

I also introduced H.R. 1578, the Donald Payne Sr. Colorectal Cancer Detection Act of 2017, which would expand Medicare to cover certain blood-based colorectal cancer screening tests.

Named after my father, who passed away from colorectal cancer, this bipartisan legislation would significantly increase colorectal cancer detection and treatment.

Each year, I lead the appropriations letter to increase the funding for CDC colon cancer research.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me on these important bills. Together, we can save lives from colorectal cancer.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, President Trump has declared today to be National Agriculture Day, a time of celebration and gratefulness to our Nation's farmers and ranchers. Whether we realize it or not, agriculture is a part of all of our daily lives from morning until night. In fact, each American farmer feeds over 144 people, providing vital nutrition, and helping us better connect with our God-given resources.

Every \$1 of United States agricultural products and food exports creates another \$1.27 in business activity. Our country's agricultural exports are valued at more than \$100 billion, including \$4 billion from my own home State of Florida. Every \$1 billion in exports supports approximately 8,000 American jobs. That is over 8 million jobs created by agriculture.

While celebrations such as these mark tremendous achievements for U.S. agriculture, we must continue to construct policies that supports and strengthens all of our farmers and ranchers. As lawmakers, let us make this celebration a time of action and work towards initiatives that continually uplift our ag industry.

HONORING SHANTHI VISWANATHAN

(Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mrs. Shanthi Viswanathan, a teacher at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, whose quick thinking saved lives.

As the second alarm went off that day, Mrs. Viswanathan knew something was wrong and she locked the classroom door, telling her students to take cover.

When the SWAT team arrived and asked her to let them in, she would not because she didn't want to risk falling for a gunman's trick. Instead, she told them: "Knock it down or open it with a key."

When Mrs. Viswanathan knew there was danger, she exemplified the truest form of the Hindu concept of dharma, of duty, in protecting those she was responsible for.

These actions were brought to my attention by the Hindu American Foundation, which continues to support the victims of the shooting as part of their broader commitment to Ahimsa, the Hindu concept of nonviolence.

They have also pursued various measures of gun control, which I wholeheartedly support. I commend them for their efforts here.

Thank you to Mrs. Viswanathan and the Hindu American Foundation for their exemplary work and for making America a better place.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the eighth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act.

Since it was signed into law, Americans have relied on the ACA for access to quality, affordable healthcare; but Republicans have attacked Americans' healthcare at every turn.

Last year, Republicans tried to pass TrumpCare, a bill that would have imposed a crippling age tax, raised out-of-pocket costs, and increased the number of uninsured Americans by 23 million.

After the American people stopped TrumpCare in its tracks, Republicans went after the Affordable Care Act again in their tax scam. On top of that, the administration waged a persistent campaign to discourage people from enrolling in the ACA plans.

Despite GOP sabotage, Americans still signed up for the Affordable Care Act. Americans want better, more affordable healthcare, and that is what Democrats offer: A Better Deal for better healthcare.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TERESA KIMURA

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Teresa Kimura.

Teresa traveled to the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1 with six of her friends. She was known for making every gathering an amazing experience.

Teresa worked at the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration.

She is remembered for her big heart, love of life, beautiful spirit, and infectious laugh.

I would like to extend my condolences to Teresa Kimura's family and friends. Please note that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come before this floor to address a topic that has been front and center in this country since 1973: when the Supreme Court came down with the decisions known as *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, then the subsequent case in the early 1990s, *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

This is a nation that has traditionally—and from the very beginning of the very first founding document, the Declaration of Independence—respected and revered life.

As our Founding Fathers put that language together, and as John Adams coached Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferson put his pen to the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't an accident that the order of these rights that come from God be started out with life, then liberty, then the pursuit of happiness.

Of all the scholars that I have talked to and the times that I have sat in the classroom and in my readings, it just never really claim clear. It is not educating our young people about what they were thinking about when they drafted that language in the Declaration: "We hold these truths to be self-

evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights," but the right to life is listed first. It is not second or third.

They didn't put together a list of four or five or seven or ten different rights. They laid three out in the Declaration. And those three start with life, because life is the most paramount right.

The former Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor BOB CASEY, a Democrat, who has since passed away, was denied an opportunity to speak at the Democratic National Convention some years ago because he was a pro-life Democrat Governor and he would speak in favor of life. He said this: "Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed."

The measure itself.

Now, what does that mean and how do we think about this, Mr. Speaker?

It would be this: when the Frenchmen devised the metric system, they set up a distance that was divided out to mean a ratio of the circumference of the Earth in whatever manner of calculation they had. And they came down to—however many times they divided that around, it came down to the length of the meter.

□ 1600

Then they produced this meter that was a platinum rule that was set at precisely the length of the meter. And, in controlled temperature and pressure, at standard temperature and pressure, what would the length of this platinum rule be? Exactly a meter.

Now, how long is a meter? I guess I could tell you, we can measure it by other measures. We can do some comparisons. But that meter, that original meter made out of platinum that is maintained at standard temperature and pressure, that is the measure itself; and all other measurements of length that are incorporated within the metric system, all of those measures of length are in relation to the meter itself. That meter stick, the original one, is the measure itself against which all other distances are weighed and measured in the metric system.

Human life is the measure itself against which we measure every other value that we have because human life is sacred in all of its forms. And then, once we accept that and this Nation accepts that human life is sacred in all of its forms—Democrats and Republicans do agree to that, I believe, generally speaking, maybe even universally—but the disagreement comes in, well, when does life begin? When does life end?

We can look at any one of the pro-life groups that are here in this country. You can ask the priests and pastors around America: When does life begin? The most consistent answer to that question is life begins at the moment

of conception, the instant of fertilization, the instant of conception. That language is threaded throughout.

I have walked into gymnasiums, or maybe a whole school, K-12, or maybe a high school alone, and I will say to them: You will be faced with a couple of questions in your emerging young adult life, and the counsel that you would give to your friends perhaps, or maybe you, yourself, you will have to answer these two questions: Is human life sacred in all of its forms?

And I will say to them: Look at the person next to you. Is their life sacred? And they will nod their head.

Look at the person on the other side. Is their life sacred? And they will nod their head.

And I said: And they are looking at you, and they are nodding their head at you, too, because everybody in here, your life is sacred. It is precious. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

So once we universally agree that human life is sacred in all of its forms, then we have the next question and ask the question: At what moment does life begin, at what instant? And that is that instant at conception, that instant at fertilization. The rational, moral thought and faithful reasoning comes to that conclusion.

Yet the Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade* and in the accompanying case of *Doe v. Bolton*, on January 22, 1973, brought down a decision that decided that liberty and pursuit of happiness trumped life. They concluded that a mother could decide whether that child was inconvenient, whether they didn't want the child at the time, and allowed for abortion on demand. Coupling the two cases together, they allowed for abortion on demand.

Doe v. Bolton wrote everything in the list that could be exceptions: it could be the mental health; it could be the physical health; it could be even the familial health of the mother, which any of this could be affected by finances themselves. So if you don't think you can afford this baby, *Doe v. Bolton* lets you say: Well, it affected my mental health. It affected my familial health, so I decided to abort the baby.

And any abortion doctor could conduct an abortion at will, staying within this framework that was manufactured by the Supreme Court that turned the principles that are in our Declaration on their head. They no longer recognize that life is the paramount right that is delivered to us from God and that liberty is secondary to life and that pursuit of happiness is tertiary to life.

Now, think of this. If any of us, in our pursuit of liberty, would decide that someone's life is in the way of our liberty, we can't go kill them. We would end up in prison or executed in some States. We can't go kill some-

body because they infringe upon our liberty. Their life is more important than our liberty.

Neither can someone, in their pursuit of happiness, trample on someone else's liberties. Our liberties of freedom of speech, religion, the press, assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, the protections that we have on a reasonable search and seizure, a jury of our peers, the States' rights that are enshrined in the Constitution that are subordinate to the enumerated powers in the Constitution, that is all laid out within a beautiful framework that has never been done better anywhere in the world in the history of the world, but it is based on the prioritization of God-given rights. Life is more important than liberty, is more important than this pursuit of happiness.

By the way, to define pursuit of happiness a little more thoroughly, some of the young people are growing up and they read that and don't give it very much thought. They say, well, pursuit of happiness is a fun tailgate party before the ball game; it is getting together with my friends; it is sitting down with my Xbox and enjoying the video games that are going on. Maybe it is just listening to music. None of those things fit the categories that our Founding Fathers envisioned when they put pursuit of happiness in the Declaration.

Pursuit of happiness was lifted from the Greek term "eudaimonia," which is spelled E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A—because we are friends, Christina. Eudaimonia, the Greek term, means pursuit of happiness in this concept that our Founding Fathers understood, and that was that development of the whole human being, not a party at all, not a joke at all, not a time necessarily of laughter, but it was a component; to develop one's self intellectually, develop one's brain power with a knowledge base that was as strong as it could be, and for a lifetime, to develop one's mind and develop it thoroughly and contemplate deep thoughts to develop themselves. That is the intellectual component of it.

There was a theological component to develop one's self religiously, which they did. Even though they were pagan, in my view, they developed themselves in a belief in a hereafter and in a belief in higher beings. It was plural for the Greeks, the higher beings. But they were developing their intellect. They were developing themselves spiritually and theologically and also physically.

They kept their bodies in shape, and they worked out and they exercised, and they competed in the sports that are the foundation of our Olympics today. All of that was wrapped up in the eudaimonia of the time that our Founders read and understood. Thomas Jefferson thoroughly understood. There is no doubt he understood the meaning of the word "eudaimonia." He

just didn't think the American people would understand it, so he wrote in there, "pursuit of happiness."

We have just kind of given a short and a brief definition of that. We haven't given it the full respect it was intended by the drafter and, in many cases, the author of our Declaration, Thomas Jefferson.

So now that I have reset this, life is paramount and it is the most important, and any of us should be willing to sacrifice at least some of our liberty to protect and save the lives of others because those lives are that precious and that important. Any one of us who is in pursuit of our eudaimonia, our pursuit of happiness, should be willing to give up some of that in order to secure and protect the liberties—not only our liberties, but the liberties of others.

So a nation that is built upon those principles would also be a nation that would do most anything to protect the lives of the most innocent among us, our unborn, our unborn that don't have the ability to scream out for their own mercy. They don't have the ability to come to Congress and lobby for themselves. They are silent. They have no chance to make a noise even until the day that they draw their first breath, if they have the opportunity to draw that first breath.

But the tally for the decision of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* on January 22, 1973, now has reached or exceeded 60 million babies—60 million babies sacrificed on the altar of choice.

Watching the prioritized rights that came from God, we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Our Supreme Court got it wrong, and they set the liberty of the mother over the life of the baby. They set the pursuit of happiness, the eudaimonia, presumably, of the mother, over the life of the baby.

We have a hole in our society; not only a hole that comes from the heavy, heavy guilt of tolerating this throughout these years, but it is a hole that is a multigenerational hole: 60 million babies not born that would otherwise be living, loving, laughing, learning, falling in love, having babies of their own, worshipping, and raising their children with the values that have made this America a great nation.

But that is all denied this Nation. It is denied the world. The solutions that they would have provided, the happiness and the joy they would have delivered, intellectual firepower that would come from 60 million babies is denied to us.

And to go back and look and think, also, a good number of those little girls that were aborted since 1973 would have otherwise been mothers today. And to look at it generationally, and this is a back-of-the-envelope calculation, to take those little girls and predict that maybe each one of them would have had three babies, each one,

that calculates out to be, Mr. Speaker, another 60 million babies—another 60 million.

So the population of this country would be something like 120 million stronger if the Supreme Court had believed and had conviction on what I have just described about the right to life being the paramount right—more important than liberty, more important than the pursuit of happiness, eudaimonia, the right to life.

When the Supreme Court made that erroneous activist decision, they started this country in a downward spiral, a spiral where there is less respect for life than there was before 1973.

Mr. Speaker, if I just take you to the school shooting data and address that, we look back through the history and the records of the school shootings as well as mass killings that have taken place in schools, look back over the last century, the earliest one that we could find was 1924, in Michigan. It was a series of bombs that were planted in the schools there in Michigan, set to go off by alarm clocks, which would be the kind that we would see in the old cartoons today. Those bombs were timed to go off, and the result of that was 40 people were killed in the bombings at the school in Michigan in 1924, mass school killing. That is the largest mass school killing that we could find by sorting through history as deeply as we could research it, 40 killed, bombings, 1924.

Then not another mass school killing or shooting, not another killing until 1940, when an individual went into a school in Pasadena and killed five people with a pistol. Then not another school shooting, mass shooting of any kind at least, took place from 1940 on. It took us all the way to 1963, 23 years after that single mass school shooting in Pasadena.

Twenty-three years later, the Supreme Court came down with another erroneous decision called *Murray v. Curlett*. *Murray v. Curlett* is the case that took prayer out of public schools. Up till that time, we went to school and we went into school and started the day with the pledge and a prayer in the classroom with the teachers, especially in elementary school. I remember that clearly.

But by the time the *Murray v. Curlett* decision came down, I was a freshman in high school, and I remember that order. The Supreme Court commands no more prayer in the public schools. Where did they get the authority to declare that we couldn't exercise our freedom of religion?

Now, I have been challenged on this a good number of times in subsequent years, but I remember them saying: Well, what will you do about the separation of church and state?

Well, first of all, there isn't a separation of church and state, but it is being exercised by Supreme Court decisions

as a separation even not only of church and state, but church and school.

Now, the First Amendment of the Constitution writes, and what it specifically does is it prohibits Congress from establishing a law that creates a state religion. And it denies the ability of Congress to pass that legislation that establishes a state religion, so that is all it does.

And the freedom of religion shall not be infringed. We have a freedom of religion, but they still, the Supreme Court, made the decision to take prayer out of the public schools, an activist act that then began to scrub faith and morality out of our public schools.

□ 1615

I remember that freshman year when I learned this. I remember in that classroom—and these images are in my mind clearly. It was: How are they going to stop us from praying in our schools? What could they possibly do to keep us from praying?

They hadn't invented duct tape yet at that time, Mr. Speaker, but, you know, I am thinking the white adhesive tape that doctors use, the medical tape, and I had images in my mind: Well, they could tape our mouths shut with that tape. We could pray silently. They couldn't stop us from praying by taping our mouths shut.

The only way to stop prayer in the public schools, if we refuse to accept the order, was to empty the schools out themselves. That image is in my mind. Denison Community Schools, where I went to high school, I can still see the central building in my mind's eye, clearing out all the rooms, emptying the rooms, all the students going outside, outside of that school.

And the Army. The Army is in my imagination—Vietnam era—that the Army would come in, and they would have a new chain to roll around those bars that you push inside the doors to open the doors, wrap that chain around there, put a new padlock on it, and post a guard, an Army uniform outside those doors, every entrance into that school. That is the only way they could have stopped prayer in that public school.

But they stopped it because we accepted the order of the Supreme Court. We accepted the beginning of the degradation of the moral core of America that was being taught in every public school in America at that time.

We revered our faith. We understood our history. We knew that our Founding Fathers, who put this country together, who I believe were moved around like men on a chessboard by the hand of God—I believe the Declaration is written not with divine inspiration, like the Bible, but with divine guidance, just a little bit lower standard of proof. We are gifted in this country with the divine grace that God guided the men and women who built this

country in the nearly perfect foundation that they put in place in the Declaration and in also the Constitution.

But we let the Supreme Court, that was never designed to be the most powerful of the three branches of government—we let the Supreme Court rule. And then, now, today, we teach in those schools that there is three equal branches of government. They are not equal. They were not designed to be equal. The Founding Fathers put them together that the judicial branch of government was designed to be the weakest of the three branches of government, and they were not even the branch of government that was designed to come down with a rule on what is constitutional and what is unconstitutional.

The Constitution requires that Congress establish a Supreme Court. And I had made this case to, God rest his soul, Justice Scalia, an awfully hard man to say goodbye to for all that he has done for our country and all the clarity that he has brought to the understanding of the Constitution. I am grateful that Justice Gorsuch is there to replace him in picking up on the things that are so well perfected by Justice Scalia.

But in a meeting with 30 or 40 other members here several years ago, I made the point, Mr. Speaker, to Justice Scalia, and I said to him that Congress is the most powerful branch of government, the legislative branch of government, and the House, in particular, because all spending bills have to start here, and the Constitution doesn't require that we establish all of the Federal circuits that are out there or the Federal district courts below that.

The Congress only—and this is how I put it to Justice Scalia—Congress is only required to establish a Supreme Court. We could abolish all of the other Federal districts if we chose to do so. In fact, Congress did abolish two judicial districts back in about 1802. That is a pattern. It has been established.

So if Congress decided to do so, we could weaken the judicial branch of government, and we could reduce the judicial branch of government down to just a Supreme Court, because it requires that we—constitutionally, we are required to establish a Supreme Court. But there is nothing that requires us to build a building, fund a building, or to fund an administrative staff and team for them.

So I said to Justice Scalia: We could eliminate all the Federal courts, except the Supreme Court. We could reduce the Supreme Court down to the Chief Justice at his own card table with his own candle, no staff.

And I think it was a bit of surprise for the very glib Justice Scalia to hear that out of a Member of Congress, especially in a setting that was, I will say, quasi-public at least.

He thought about it for a little bit. I am not sure if he had ever thought about what I had presented to him, Mr. Speaker, but he thought for a little bit, and he said: Well, I would argue that you could reduce the Supreme Court down to three Justices because, otherwise, if you don't have anything but a Supreme Court Chief Justice, there is nothing to be the chief of. So I would argue for three Justices.

And I said: Well, Justice Scalia, there have always been too many chiefs and not enough Indians.

And we, more or less, declared a case ready to move on for further discussion.

But the point of this exercise, Mr. Speaker, is to make the point that the Court's power exists because Congress empowers it. And if there is a struggle between the legislative branch of government, Article 1; or the executive branch of government, Article 2; or the judicial branch of government, Article 3, I would remind the folks involved in any discussion like that that the branches of government were prioritized in the Constitution in the same fashion that the God-given rights are prioritized in the Declaration—life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

In the Constitution, Articles 1, 2, 3—legislative, executive, judicial branches of government—prioritized because our Founding Fathers envisioned that there would be a struggle between the three branches of the government, and they wanted to set up a static power base so that they expected that each branch of government would jealously protect its constitutional authority, and there would be that tug of war, a struggle, ethically and peacefully, they hoped, between each branch of government.

That is why they put the checks and balances in place. They gave the legislative authority to the United States Congress, and the spending authority to Congress, and the initiation of all bills that initiate spending to the House of Representatives. They didn't give it to the Senate because we were to be the hot cup of coffee, and the Senate was to be the saucer that that coffee cooled in.

That is why we are 2-year terms here, 6-year terms over in the Senate, but they wanted a legislative body that would be a quick reaction for us, a fast response for if things got out of whack, if they needed to be addressed quickly, then they wanted the House of Representatives to perhaps turn over quickly so that the House could respond to these issues in a fast way.

They wanted a judicial body, that legislative body that could sit back, maybe fold their arms a little bit, and wait and be patient and think things through so it wasn't just emotional. It was also kind of a hard-charging reaction force in the House, and seasoned by experience, I might add, Mr. Speak-

er; and a more careful, slower moving body in the Senate, which I think they clearly achieved a more careful, slower moving body in the Senate.

But one of those examples in modern day, when things went against the American people in the elections of 2010, around March 23, 2010—it was March 23—the final passage of ObamaCare passed out from the Senate and the House to President Obama's desk, and he signed that bill as fast as he could get his signature on it. The American people had rejected a Federal Government takeover of our health insurance, at least as a minimum.

And I long said that, you know, our soul is the most sovereign thing that we have, and the government hasn't figured out how to nationalize that yet. I don't believe they ever will.

The second thing that is the most sovereign thing that we have is our bodies, our skin, and everything inside it. ObamaCare nationalized a Federal takeover of the management of our body, our skin, and everything inside of it, took out of our hands the ability to manage our own health in a free market system, and the public rejected such an idea. They rejected ObamaCare.

On March 23, it passed and was signed into law. That election that ensued the following November brought 87 freshmen Republicans to the House of Representatives. Every one of them pledged and every one of them ran on the ticket to 100 percent, rip it out by the roots, repeal ObamaCare. That is the reaction of the public when this body here was not responding to the will of the people. They changed that over in the very next election, which was just months later, from the third month to the eleventh month as—you are only—and 8 months later, the election had taken place, and we had 87 new freshmen Republicans on the way.

We didn't get as far as we needed to get. We didn't get it fully ripped out by the roots, as I wanted to do, but you can see the effects of that election to this day, Mr. Speaker.

That is how our Founding Fathers envisioned it would work—the House of Representatives to be a quick reaction force. They reacted quickly in the 2010 election. The American people weighed in. When the executive branch gets out of line, there are provisions there. If there is going to be impeachment, the House has to initiate that impeachment. But over in the Senate, the impeachment doesn't remove a President from office.

I believe it constitutionally requires a trial in the Senate, but to remove a President from office takes a two-thirds majority in the United States Senate. I don't think they served us very well in 1998, when the impeachment went before the United States Senate, when William Jefferson Clinton was impeached by the House of

Representatives, because the trial in the Senate didn't bring us a verdict. It put all the questions together.

And instead of asking the question, "Did he commit the acts that the House had indicted him for," and in a separate question, "Should he be removed from office for that," they jammed those questions together, and it gave some of the Democrat Senators a way out. They didn't have to answer the question, whether they believed he was guilty or not, so they never really heard the case and gave us a verdict on the conclusion.

It was inconclusive in the Senate. I think that the way they framed those questions that were voted upon by the Senators, I think it was a disservice to the American people, a disservice to our Constitution.

But, nonetheless, there is a check and a balance. If an executive—if a President gets out of line, if his executive branch gets out of line, the House of Representatives can initiate impeachment. The House of Representatives can shut off all funding to that branch of government or—well, it wouldn't do that, obviously, but to a division within that branch of government, we could cut the funds to the funding to bring about the result that is necessary if we have the conviction here and if we believe it is prudent policy.

The House controls the spending. The House initiates any impeachment that might be required, and we don't want to ever exercise that unless it is judiciously done for good reason and good cause. And the Senate, the prudent group of the Senate, come up for election every 6 years, so they can sit back a little bit. Only a third of them have the level of apprehension that all of those who are up for reelection in the House of Representatives do.

But this balance, this check and balance between the three branches of government, was that the branch of government and the division within it—the legislative branch and the U.S. House of Representatives, the division within it was always designed to be able to control the other branches of government and, by the way, able to limit the United States Senate.

The reasons for that are why we are up for election every 2 years so the people would be sovereign. We the people are the ones who really do decide who is right in all of this Republican form of government, which is guaranteed to the American people in the Constitution. We are guaranteed, Mr. Speaker, a Republican form of government. But in this form of government, it is we the people; and we the legislators within the United States House of Representatives are the most accountable to the people, and, by that, we need to be the most responsive to the people as well.

I think history has proven that out. So it doesn't mean either that the Supreme Court gets to decide necessarily

what the Constitution means. I will define what it means here, Mr. Speaker, and that is, the Constitution has to mean what it says. It has to mean literally what it says, but it has to also mean what it was understood to mean at the time of its ratification.

Every one of us takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution. Here, in the House, 435 of us; and over in the Senate, 100 Senators; and a good number of executive branch employees, a long ways down the line, take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I take that oath seriously, and I carry a Constitution in my jacket pocket every day, as close to my heart as it can get, to remember what this means, what it means to me.

But I don't take the oath to support and defend the Constitution with the idea in mind that I am going to shift my oath and the meaning of my oath to conform to a Supreme Court decision that does not reflect the original understanding of the Constitution. None of us can take an oath to a living, breathing, moving interpretation of a document.

This Constitution, Mr. Speaker, this Constitution constitutes a contractual guarantee, an intergenerational contractual guarantee that this God-given liberty, as defined in our Declaration, and the Bill of Rights and the structure of our government and the function of our government, the enumerated powers that are in here, that this is an intergenerational contractual guarantee passed down to us generation to generation, and it can't change its meaning just because five Justices over there in the Supreme Court decided to change its meaning.

□ 1630

Now, I want to respect their jurisprudence and I respect almost all of the decisions that have come down, but there have been times in history when an activist court has decided that they are going to rewrite this society according to their whim.

I have always admired Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas, who is a former judge. He came to this Congress and he ran on this ticket. He has been to Iowa a few times, and he is coming back. He says this:

I found myself on the bench as a judge, and I was constrained to interpret the literal meaning of the Constitution and to interpret the literal meaning of the laws that were passed, and when I felt the urge to be a legislator, I knew my obligation then was to leave the bench and run for Congress.

That is what you need to do when you feel in your heart that you are a legislator, when you reason that you can do more to contribute as a legislator than you can as a judge.

So LOUIE GOHMERT came to this Congress. Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT came to this Congress in the right way for the right reasons, to legislate, be-

cause that was his heart's desire, and that is where he believed, and I hope today he still believes, that he can do the most good for this country.

But the Justices that sit on the bench that decide that they can just ignore the meaning of the Constitution are undermining our God-given liberty. They are undermining the foundation delivered to us by the Founders. They are undermining the Declaration. They are undermining the Constitution itself.

I can think of a few of those decisions. The Kelo decision, where the Supreme Court ruled that private property could be confiscated, condemned, through eminent domain by a local jurisdiction of government and then handed over to another private interest.

Let's just say that there is a widow lady that lives in a certain section of town, and she wants to live in that house the rest of her life, but there are developers that own the rest of the land around her, and they want to put in a shopping mall. So they would come in and say to the lady: Hey, here is our offer. We want to buy your house.

And she says: No. No amount of money can buy my house. I am going to live in this house the rest of my life.

Well, in the Kelo decision, they went to government, and government condemned the property, took that property away from her. It was litigated all the way to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court ruled that local government could condemn property under the Fifth Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, which says "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

And think of this. They didn't say "nor shall private property be condemned and handed over to other private interests, without just compensation," because the Founding Fathers never imagined that government would have the audacity to condemn private property to hand it over to other private interests.

But the function of that decision was, and so now the effect of the Kelo decision is, the Fifth Amendment now reads, in effect, de facto, we say: Nor shall private property be taken without just compensation. They struck out those three words "for public use."

That is the effect of a Supreme Court decision, and it is an erroneous decision. It is a wrong decision. It doesn't reflect the language in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

The dissent was written by Justice O'Connor. I didn't know until after I had made my statement on the floor after that decision that her dissent mirrored almost exactly the statement that I made on the floor in rejection of it. I didn't expect the gentleman at that time from Massachusetts, Barney Frank, to agree with me either, but

Barney Frank, Justice O'Connor, STEVE KING, and many others agreed: an erroneous decision.

A Supreme Court amended the Constitution, in effect. They de facto amended the Constitution of the United States by coming down with a decision that effectively struck the words "for public use" out of the Fifth Amendment, "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

So now there are extra constitutional takings of private property handed over to private property because local government has concluded they can collect more tax dollars off of that private interest that wants to build a shopping mall or a truck stop or whatever it might be to expand. That is the kind of decision that a Supreme Court can make that are activist decisions that effectively amend our Constitution if we let them do that.

So we think of a decision like *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. How did they cook that up? Where does that come from?

Well, it comes from out of the emanations and penumbras, Madam Speaker, and it is rooted back in a decision called the *Griswold* decision from the sixties. I believe it was 1964.

Connecticut, at that time, a strong Catholic State, had decided that they would not allow for contraceptives to be sold in Connecticut. The *Griswold* couple, husband and wife, decided that they had a right to privacy to purchase contraceptives to exercise their liberties.

Now, that decision that was made by the State of Connecticut not to sell contraceptives was a part of the laboratory of the States. It is a State's right to pass a decision like that; and as soon as the people in the State of Connecticut decided they rejected that decision, they can elect some new people to their legislature.

But this was litigated to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court of the United States decided that that couple, the *Griswold* couple, had a right to privacy, and that right to privacy included the right to purchase contraceptives.

So they created a new right, a right to privacy. They created it out of thin air, which we now call out of the emanations and penumbras. That is a little shadow around the edge of the cloud that maybe a Justice in a black robe can see but the rest of us lay people or even the brightest attorneys in the land can't quite see because they aren't seated on the Supreme Court.

Well, if you can find rights out of the emanations and penumbras that you can't find in the very language of the Constitution or statute, for that matter, you are an activist judge, and you are trying to alter our society, amend our society into your own fashion. You are legislating from the bench.

So they created a right to privacy, and this right to privacy was then used as the foundation of the decision in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* that granted, those two cases together, abortion on demand—abortion on demand, at least before viability. And viability is a very vague measure of a baby that would be able to survive outside the womb.

Now, that length of maturity within the womb and the ability to survive outside the womb has changed substantially, Madam Speaker, since *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. Now we have babies who survive clear down as early as into the 20th week. Viability has changed because medicine has gotten ahead of this, and we have saved more babies.

But viability wasn't the only measure, because *Doe v. Bolton* gave all the exceptions that I talked about earlier, made exceptions for the health of the mother, the physical health, the mental health, the familial health, the financial health, anything that might affect her psyche. So it amounts to abortion on demand for the sake of, well, let's wait until it is convenient to take the life of that innocent little baby.

But what we see now, Madam Speaker, what we see now is that we are watching these babies grow in the womb and the ultrasound. My iPhone has a number of little babies and the ultrasounds in it, and you can watch as those little babies will squirm and reach their arm out, suck their thumb. They look like they are trying to talk, stretch their legs out. They move around a lot more than we ever thought they did.

I have talked to mothers who say as they watch their little baby that is 19, 20 weeks along, squirming around in the ultrasound, that a lot of the time they can't yet feel that movement. We know that as we get later on, even us dads get to feel that movement, and it is a glorious thing. This is the development of a miracle, and you can't be a parent or a grandparent and hold a little baby that is flesh of your flesh and not be amazed at the miracle of a little baby.

When I took my firstborn in my hands, little David STEVEN KING, and put him in my hands and looked at him, it was with awe that I saw so many pieces about him: counted the fingers and toes, took a look at his eyes, saw every little feature that is there, that little son.

And I began to ask that question shortly after his birth: Could anyone take his life now within minutes after he was born? As squirmy and beautiful and miraculous, created in God's image as he was, could anybody take his life then? I don't know anybody who would be ghastly enough who could do so.

So I thought, if he is 20 minutes old and we can't take his life, if he is 5 minutes old and we can't take his life,

if he is 1 minute old and we can't take his life, how could we take it a minute before he was born? or 5 minutes? or an hour? or a day? or a week? or a month? Where along this continuum from this moment of conception would there be a time that we could say: Oh, he is only a blob of tissue?

He was never a blob of tissue. He was always a unique human being, joining together the DNA of his mother and his father in a unique fashion that would never be matched again.

Madam Speaker, think of this. Seven billion people on the planet, every one unique. Even the identical twins, the identical quadruplets that are there, their mother can tell them apart. Their father can tell them apart most of the time. And the older they get, the easier it is. But 7 billion faces on this planet, and God created those faces to be unique. No two faces are the same. Even if their DNA is matched up in identical twins or identical quadruplets or identical triplets, as rare as they are, their mothers can look them in the face and know which child is which. The rest of us can figure out everybody else, and we can, a lot of times, figure out the twins, too.

I have twin nieces that I could always tell apart. They would ask me how I could, and I would say: Well, one of you is really intelligent and the other is really beautiful. You two figure out which is which. I am not going to answer the question.

But we can tell them apart. Now, what a gift from God, the creation, to have the imagination to create faces, every one unique. No matter how many people on the planet there are, just the facial features are unique, let alone all the rest of us, let alone all the things that go on in our heads and in our minds and the experiences we have, the personalities that develop differently. That combination of nature or nurture that we will never unlock the mystery of that, that is all a gift from God.

We have aborted 60 million of the gifts from God—60 million—and another 60 million babies not born because their mothers were aborted. Children who never had the opportunity to live to draw that first breath of free air.

When I welcome a new grandchild into the world, I say a prayer over them, Madam Speaker, and I pray that they have a long and a healthy life, a faithful life, and a life that is long and healthy and faithful. And when that day comes that they are called home at the end of that long and healthy and faithful life, I pray that the last breath that they draw is more free than the first breaths that they are drawing on that day. And that is what we need to work for: more freedom, more God-given liberty, more young lives brought into this world.

The very source of all joy comes from little babies, from our children, and if

we stopped having babies, the joy would finally just die down. The laughter, the giggling would just diminish day by day by day until there was no joy left in the world, because that is the source of it. And yet we are aborting 1 million babies a year.

That is why, Madam Speaker, I brought the Heartbeat bill to this House of Representatives, H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act. That is why we have worked so hard to get cosponsors on this legislation, we worked so hard to get the cosponsors.

People like former majority leader Tom DeLay came here to work pro bono. The leader of Faith2Action, Janet Porter, a driving force, worked to get cosponsors on this legislation, worked to send the messages in the right place. We carefully drafted language that reflects our intent to save the lives of as many babies as we can from the moment of the heartbeat.

We require that, if the abortionist is intending to commit an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat, and that heartbeat would be detected at 7 to 8 weeks. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected, because we know that is a unique human being, a sacred human life.

□ 1645

I would like to go back to the moment of conception, but we can't yet medically identify that moment. But we can identify when a heartbeat can be detected. We all know that if there is a beating heart, there is a baby there. That heart doesn't just sit down there on its own beating away. It is in the chest of a baby, a little baby, a little unique boy or a girl who is a gift from God. That baby has at least a 95 percent chance of successful birth once we can detect that heartbeat in the womb.

So how could we allow for the ending of that unique human being's life without that baby ever having a chance to draw a breath of free air or to scream for its own mercy? How could we say no to that? How could we have in our earpieces that ultrasound of that beating heart?

That little granddaughter is 20 weeks along and her heart was beating last week, anyway, at 161 beats per minute. That beat is strong, firm, and solid. She has at least a 95 percent chance of successful birth and being welcomed into this world drawing that breath of free air, and I will pray as freer still on her last day many, many years from now.

But we need to get there. We need to protect these lives, and we need to get a bill before the Supreme Court. So here in this House, we are 170 cosponsors strong. We are far ahead of any other significant piece of pro-life legislation. I drafted the bill with the strategy in mind, Madam Speaker, to get the Heartbeat bill before the Supreme

Court after the next appointment to the Supreme Court.

I am very pleased with what I see with Neil Gorsuch. When I hear the rumors of the potential retirements in the Supreme Court, our three oldest members of the Supreme Court are 84, 80, and 78 years old, Madam Speaker. So we can expect a retirement fairly soon. We need to have a bill out of the House of Representatives sitting on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk long enough and hard enough that we can gin up the effort to get it passed out of the United States Senate.

There are four windows that need to be open before we can start to save lives in significant numbers, Madam Speaker. One of them is a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives. We have that, 237 votes behind the pain-capable 20-week bill.

The next one is a pro-life majority in the United States Senate. Senator ROY BLUNT made mention in our values team here a couple of weeks ago that they have a bare majority, a pro-life majority in the Senate. Fifty-one votes voted for the 20-week bill over there. They didn't break the filibuster, but 51. That is a pro-life majority. If they suspend the rules over there and get rid of the filibuster rule, the votes are there to pass Heartbeat bill over and send it to the President's desk. That is the third window.

The first window is a pro-life majority in the House. The second window is a pro-life majority in the Senate. The third window is a President who will sign the Heartbeat bill to protect these lives from the seventh or eighth week all the way through. I don't have any doubt President Trump will sign such a bill, and I don't have any doubt that Vice President PENCE will be standing right next to him when that day comes. I don't know whether I am going to be standing there, but I am going to do everything I can, Madam Speaker, to get the Heartbeat bill to the President's desk.

Yes, it will be litigated. The pro-abortion people will litigate everything that slows down the abortion mills in this country. So it would be litigated. And the timing of getting it out of the Senate to the President's desk and before the Court after the next confirmation means we are called upon to move the Heartbeat bill out of the House within the next few months because as we get closer to the election, it gets harder. Things get crazy around here. So if it gets passed around July, it is going to be really hard to move the Heartbeat bill.

There is a little rule that was handed down, I think, from the previous Speaker that says that pro-life legislation doesn't move off the floor of the House unless the top three pro-life organizations support it and will actively support it here in the House of Representatives.

Those organizations would be Family Research Council. Tony Perkins supports the bill. The next organization is Susan B. Anthony List. They also have agreed to support the bill. Yes, they have a priority they would like to have move ahead of that, but Marjorie Dannenfelser said:

Of course, I would never stand in the way of something so good as the Heartbeat bill.

The third organization is the one that is not fully on board. In fact, I don't see that they are supporting it in any way, and back channel says to me that there are some statements made to try to slow it down. That is the National Right to Life, the oldest and the largest pro-life organization in the United States of America. They said that they don't oppose the Heartbeat bill.

Madam Speaker, this is right off of their electronic publication, whether it happens to be a tweet or whether it is their website, but here is their statement: National Right to Life, protecting life in America since 1968.

National Right to Life says they do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. I struck through there with a red line and said: Well, neither do they support it. They don't oppose the Heartbeat bill. Well, they don't support the Heartbeat bill.

They are stuck on this. They are hidebound on this. Their mission statement says that they support and protect life from the beginning of life until natural death. They define the beginning of life at the moment of fertilization.

So how can you be National Right to Life and not support the Heartbeat bill?

Their reasoning is that they are stuck in this. They refuse to challenge the Supreme Court. They refuse to challenge the viability standards that were written into *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

If the number one pro-life organization refuses to challenge the Supreme Court on those standards, then what they are really doing is accepting—and some would say accepting the idea that we are going to see 1 million abortions a year in this country, as far as the eye can see, because if you are not willing to challenge the Supreme Court, then you are accepting 1 million abortions.

That is what we get if we are trimming around the edges with pain-capable at 20 weeks. I support all of this legislation. Let's do it all, Madam Speaker. The pain-capable doesn't get the job done. It shies away from challenging the Supreme Court.

We wrote this Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, in order to challenge the viability standard the Supreme Court has. We want to measure life—unique, precious, sacred human life—from the moment of conception until natural death, protected. By the way, protected in the 14th Amendment. We are all protected

in there: life, liberty, and property. So all we need to do is define when life begins, and we are obligated by the Constitution to protect that life.

But the Supreme Court has different ideas. I don't believe they will after the next appointment to the Supreme Court.

So some of the people who agree with National Right to Life have said that not enough States have passed it. Okay. So we went to work. Here are the States that have passed heartbeat protection language: Ohio, North Dakota, and Arkansas.

Now, John Kasich vetoed that legislation.

Who lobbied him to do that?

The arm of National Right to Life and Planned Parenthood; side by side, by the way.

What brings them to do that, Madam Speaker?

Because they don't want to challenge the Supreme Court. There is testimony that went before the Ohio Legislature December 13, 2011, that said: We don't want to force Justice Kennedy to vote "no" on a Heartbeat bill because then Justice Ginsburg might write the majority opinion. If she does that, she might take away the things we have gained. And we should not go before the Court and risk what we have gained.

I would argue instead that every time we have gone before the Court, we have gained. We gain something. We gain ground. The Court is sensitive to the movement of our society. They were sensitive to that when they ran up the *Obergefell* decision that imposed same-sex marriage on America. They decided American society was ready for same-sex marriage, and they gave us an extraconstitutional decision and forced it on everyone in America.

They must have been right because there wasn't a very big fight that was put up. But by their rationale, we are a lot more ready to protect innocent unborn human life than we ever were for gay marriage. Yet we need to get this legislation before the Court.

Tonight at 6 o'clock eastern time, 7 o'clock central time, there is a full hearing before the Iowa House of Representatives on their Heartbeat legislation, which has passed the senate 30-20. It went before the house. It has passed out of committee out of the house last Thursday night in the last hour that was available in what they call funnel week. Now this hearing is called for by the pro-abortion people who want to have a full house hearing. The witnesses will be lined up there. They will stand up for life tonight.

If the hearing goes the way we expect, I expect the bill will come before the Iowa House of Representatives and it will pass. Watching the expressions on our excellent and wonderful first female Governor in the State of Iowa, Kim Reynolds, I can't imagine she

would do anything but sign it. I don't want to put words in her mouth. I am just anticipating a wonderful result.

I believe in 1 week or 2 weeks that becomes law in Iowa. Likely the pro-abortion people will litigate like they did in Mississippi on Mississippi's 15-week bill that we have just seen before today, an injunction that is going before the Sixth Circuit. The viability standards in *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and also *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* will be challenged in the Fifth Circuit on the basis of the Mississippi law. Then that means that the Iowa law that I anticipate also will be litigated.

Why wouldn't we send this standard over to the Senate and on to go before the Supreme Court?

H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act, litigated at the same time before the United States Supreme Court along with Mississippi's 15-week bill and Iowa's Heartbeat bill. That looks to me like a good result. That brings it from several different angles.

I would remind the body that there were three Federal circuits where the partial-birth abortion legislation was heard simultaneously. They arrived packaged up in one case before the United States Supreme Court, and life prevailed in that case, as eventually life will prevail in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2154. An act to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4304. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Vermont; Nonattainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Program Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0589; FRL-9975-16-Region 1] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4305. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Revision to References for Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Sector to Incorporate Latest Edition of Certain Industry, Consensus-based Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0472; FRL-9975-19-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT53) received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4306. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Plans; Pennsylvania; Lebanon County 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard Determination of Attainment [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0479; FRL-9975-00-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4307. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources; Amendments [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505; FRL-9975-10-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT59) received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4308. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lipochitooligosaccharide (LCO) SP104; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0080; FRL-9973-39] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4309. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Washington: Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R10-RCRA-2017-0285; FRL-9974-35-Region 10] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4310. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Logan Airport Parking Freeze [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0590; FRL-9974-96-Region 1] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4311. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Delta, Ohio Area to At-

tainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0256; FRL-9975-46-Region 5] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4312. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Amendment to Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0592; FRL-9975-13-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4313. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0215; FRL-9975-32-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4314. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revisions to the Regulatory Definition of Volatile Organic Compound [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0544; FRL-9975-37-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4315. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluopicolide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0257; FRL-9973-44] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4316. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementation of the 2015 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: Nonattainment Area Classifications Approach [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0202; FRL-9975-23-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT41) received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4317. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Kasugamycin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0519; FRL-9972-96] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4318. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4319. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a semi-annual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to

Department of the Treasury licenses during the period from July 1 through December 31, 2017, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6); Public Law 102-484, Sec. 1705(e)(6) (as amended by Public Law 104-114, Sec. 102)(g)); (110 Stat. 794); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4320. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Energy, Department of the Interior and Department of Energy, transmitting a letter supplementing the certification to Congress, that the Department of the Interior intends to disburse remaining funds in the Treasury account in accordance with Sec. 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act, 30 U.S.C. 191, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7439(f)(2); Public Law 105-85, Sec. 3404(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-107, Sec. 1048(c)(14)); (115 Stat. 1226); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4321. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Consolidated Cruise Ship Security Regulations [Docket No.: USCG-2006-23846] (RIN: 1625-AB30) March 16, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4322. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marine Casualty Reporting Property Damage Thresholds [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0748] (RIN: 1625-AC33) received March 16, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 5336. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5337. A bill to amend section 3903 of title 31, United States Code, to establish accelerated payments applicable to contracts with certain small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. HANDEL:

H.R. 5338. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to repeal authority to make bonus payments to States based on performance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 5339. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 5340. A bill to strengthen the position of the United States as the world's leading innovator by amending title 35, United States Code, to protect the property rights of the inventors that grow the country's economy; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5341. A bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 5342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that the Internal Revenue Service responds promptly to Taxpayer Advocate Directives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 5343. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to nullify certain contractual provisions prohibiting or penalizing a pharmacist's disclosure of the availability of therapeutically equivalent alternative drugs, or alternative methods of purchasing the prescription drug, that are less expensive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 5344. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions which were formerly classified to chapters 14 and 19 of title 25, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 5345. A bill to designate the Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide leadership for the U.S. rocket propulsion industrial base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 5346. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 5347. A bill to facilitate resolution of environmental remediation and reclamation, resolve potential liability of the United States, and promote economic development in Lyon County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5348. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to codify and make permanent

the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 5349. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1320 Autumn Avenue in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Judge Russell B. Sugarmon Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5350. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to benefit the Appalachia region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 5351. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of a nondisclosure agreement based on an individual's employment in the Executive Office of the President if the disclosure of information in violation of the agreement is based on whistleblowing; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. SHEAPORTER):

H.R. 5352. A bill to provide rental assistance to low-income tenants of certain multifamily rural housing projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BARTON, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5353. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and expand a program of surveillance and education, carried out by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, regarding infections associated with injection drug use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 5354. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require United States-based foreign media outlets to submit semi-annual reports to the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 5355. A bill to amend chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify certain due process rights of Federal employees serving in sensitive positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5356. A bill to establish the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Foreign Affairs, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H. Res. 791. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Cesar Chavez's birthday, March 31, as National Border Control Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. SOTO):

H. Res. 792. A resolution urging the Secretary of the Interior to recognize the historical significance of Roberto Clemente's place of death near Piñones in Loiza, Puerto Rico, by adding it to the National Register of Historic Places; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 5336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes and

Article I, Section 8, clause 18—The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. HANDEL:

H.R. 5338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Sec. 8 Clause 1

Article 1 Sec. 8 Clause 18

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 5339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 5340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 8, "to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Rights to their respective Writings and Discoveries,"

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 5342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 5343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress Under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 5344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 25, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 5345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 5347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . .

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 5351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Subsection 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States;

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides Congress the authority to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 5354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 173: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 307: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 392: Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 613: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 721: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 754: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 788: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 820: Mrs. HANDEL.

- H.R. 959: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1017: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1022: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1054: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1111: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1150: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 1173: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1192: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1206: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1212: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1247: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1270: Mr. AMODEI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1300: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1317: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1318: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 1478: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 1596: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1602: Ms. BASS and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1615: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1661: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 1683: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1861: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BERA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1881: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2004: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2293: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 2345: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2452: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2683: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2903: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3030: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3174: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3192: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3207: Mr. POCAN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3528: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3545: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3617: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3641: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 3654: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 3694: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 3738: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3767: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3806: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 3861: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 3871: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3913: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3918: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 3969: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4024: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 4057: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 4119: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 4143: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4177: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 4202: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4206: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 4221: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4265: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4275: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4392: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4471: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4476: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 4518: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4575: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 4655: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 4659: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4681: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 4682: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4706: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4732: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4734: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 4827: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4841: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 4903: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4916: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 4943: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 5034: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 5052: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5076: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 5080: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 5102: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 5126: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 5127: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 5132: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. HANDEL, Ms. MENG, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 5180: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 5199: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 5261: Mr. LATTI.
H.R. 5275: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 5279: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5281: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 5282: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 5305: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5313: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 5324: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.J. Res. 122: Mr. MESSER and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LONG, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BABIN.
H. Res. 128: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. HOLDING.
H. Res. 211: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 307: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H. Res. 433: Mr. RUSSELL.
H. Res. 763: Ms. MENG and Mrs. TORRES.
H. Res. 786: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. DEUTCH.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN
MARCY KAPTUR

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise in honor of my very dear friend and sister in arms, MARCY KAPTUR, who becomes the longest serving woman in the United States House of Representatives on Sunday.

MARCY KAPTUR is a woman who has fought for working people her entire career. She has been a bulwark of support for fair trade that grows American jobs—on NAFTA in the 1990s to today, and on the Trans Pacific Partnership.

MARCY was the ranking Member on the Agriculture before I became the chair, and on issues as wide ranging as food stamps, housing, and manufacturing, she has proven time and again to be one of the brightest, most substantive colleagues I have ever worked with.

Her election paved the way for so many women to run for office. From the Carter Administration to one of the most senior members of the Congress, MARCY, your career has been exemplary of the call of public service.

Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman in the Congress, once said: "You don't make progress by standing on the sidelines, whimpering and complaining. You make progress by implementing ideas." MARCY does that—she has never spent a day on the sidelines in her life.

Congratulations, and here is to many more years fighting together—for the vulnerable, for families, and for the middle class.

RECOGNIZING PROCTOR & GAMBLE
AND MATTHEW 25: MINISTRIES

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Proctor & Gamble and Matthew 25: Ministries for their efforts to help the flood victims in southern and southwest Ohio.

Much of my district in the Ohio River Valley faced widespread damage from flood waters. Following heavy winter rains, the Ohio River surged to its highest level in over two decades. The river that serves as the namesake and lifeblood my state endangered many of the communities along the river bank.

I'm grateful to all those who answered the call to serve: our law enforcement officers, first responders, and state and local government officials, who led the efforts to contain damage and begin the relief efforts.

In southern Ohio, we have been blessed to have volunteer organizations and private citizens who have come to the aid of flood victims, and who know how to be most helpful. In this, Proctor & Gamble and Matthew 25: Ministries are outstanding examples of private partners uniting their resources to provide immediate relief in their communities.

From personal care to cleaning supplies and laundry services, Proctor & Gamble's donated products were an invaluable help to those displaced by, or battling, flooding. Matthew 25: Ministries has been a local leader, offering critical support to victims and disaster relief volunteers.

Matthew 25: Ministries and Proctor & Gamble were among the only entities to respond to the disaster in their communities. Dan, a flood victim just across the river in Kentucky, said that when he received a Proctor & Gamble bag with a handwritten note inside, he "realized that someone cared about me when I had nothing."

Proctor & Gamble and Matthew 25: Ministries didn't have to be there, but they were. They are an example of the strong and generous spirit of the people of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, these two organizations have demonstrated that they are truly good neighbors and good citizens. On behalf of the House of Representatives, I'd like to thank P&G and Matthew 25: Ministries for coming to the aid of flood victims in southern and southwest Ohio.

HONORING SPENCER COLE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Spencer Cole. Spencer is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 255, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Spencer has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Spencer has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Spencer has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Spencer built an educational birdhouse display for the Burroughs Audubon Nature Center in Jackson County.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Spencer for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

JING-MEI FILLMORE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jing-Mei Fillmore for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jing-Mei Fillmore is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jing-Mei Fillmore is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jing-Mei Fillmore for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THOMAS A. DAVIS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thomas A. (Tad) Davis on the occasion of his 80th birthday. Tad was born in Birmingham, Alabama on March 20, 1938, and grew up in Jacksonville, Florida where his family was in the restaurant business. A life-long Gator fan, Tad left Jacksonville to attend the University of Florida. There he earned Bachelor of Arts and Doctor of Jurisprudence degrees, and later served on the Board of Trustees of the University of Florida Levin College of Law. He received his LL.M. in Taxation from the Georgetown University Law Center.

Tad's first post in Washington, D.C. was with the U.S. Army serving as a Strategic Intelligence Officer with the Defense Intelligence Agency. Following his Army career, he was an attorney in the Chief Counsel's office of the Internal Revenue Service. It was there that he became an expert in the taxation of life insurance products and companies, a specialty that still anchors the legal and legislative practices of Davis & Harman LLP, the firm he founded in 1985 with William Harman.

Tad, however, did not limit his tax expertise to life insurance. His detailed knowledge of the law extends to legislative and regulatory issues in the areas of tax, financial markets, and agricultural policy. His expertise on tax issues relating to the horse industry is widely

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

recognized, and he is the author of the Horse Owners and Breeders Tax Handbook, the leading authority on these issues. Over the years, the Kentucky Delegation and the equine industry have been very fortunate to benefit from his thorough understanding of this important area of the tax code. Most recently, Tad was recognized for his leadership in the successful effort to update arcane tax rules affecting withholding and reporting of pari-mutuel winnings.

Throughout a career that has spanned six decades, Tad has been known for his extraordinary tax and legislative expertise. But more importantly, he is known for his honesty, integrity, and loyalty to his friends. It is my honor to join Tad's children Denra and Reilly, his wife Jerri, his colleagues at Davis & Harman, and his many, many friends in wishing him a very happy 80th birthday.

HONORING CLINTON COUNTY FIREFIGHTER'S ASSOCIATION ON ITS 70TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Clinton County Firefighter's Association on its 70th anniversary.

The Clinton County Firefighter's Association and Mutual Aid System were established by Fire Chief Levi Todriff of the Chazy Fire Department with their first meeting taking place on July 18, 1948. Clinton County's Mutual Aid System is proud to be the only Mutual Aid System in the United States that is inter-county, inter-state, and international, as it spans not only throughout upstate New York, but also to Vermont and Canada.

For 70 years, firefighters and other first responders throughout the region have been risking their lives to protect their communities. They have battled large fires, some in subzero temperatures, aided in flooding relief efforts, and saved both people and livestock.

In my district, we are proud of our first responders and respect the sacrifices that they make to ensure our communities are safe. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to thank the Clinton County Firefighter's Association for its dedication to serving Clinton County and beyond. Our courageous firefighters have provided a crucial service for the past 70 years, and I look forward to hearing about their success in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during roll call vote numbers 115 and 116 on March 19, 2018, because of a death in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: on roll call vote no. 115 I would have voted YES, and on roll call vote no. 116 I would have voted YES.

JULIA GABALDON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Julia Gabaldon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Julia Gabaldon is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Julia Gabaldon is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Julia Gabaldon for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CITY OF ORANGE 130TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, It is my honor to rise today in recognition of the 130th Anniversary of the City of Orange, California.

Incorporated on April 6, 1888, Orange was once home to a population of less than 1,000 people.

Since then, it has become home to world-class institutions and award-winning schools.

The Children's Hospital of Orange County and UC Irvine Medical Center are located in Orange, where they serve the local community and families throughout Southern California.

It also boasts 25 Gold Ribbon schools with a nearly 98 percent graduation rate.

Much has changed over the last 130 years, yet Old Towne Orange remains a living time capsule of this community's humble beginnings.

As the antique capital of Southern California, thousands of visitors come each year to see the plaza's traditional architecture and enjoy one of the best Main Streets in the Nation.

Thanks to the hard work and dedication of the community members who live there, the City of Orange has preserved its unique charm and has rightfully earned its place in the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Speaker, Orange is an invaluable cornerstone of Orange County and an important economic driver for our region.

It is with great pleasure that I congratulate the City of Orange on its 130th anniversary.

THE AMAZING KLEIN HIGH ORCHESTRA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the sound of beautiful music filled the air at the Alice Tully Hall at Lincoln Center in New York City. The orchestra playing? None other than the Klein High School Orchestra. The kids who make up the orchestra are some of the best in the nation and we are proud to say they hail from Houston, Texas.

The Klein High Orchestra was in New York City to compete in a nationally recognized competition, rightly named the National Orchestra Championships. The orchestra, comprised of 35 students, took home the grand prize, earning the title of the 2018 National Orchestra Cup Grand Champions. This was the first time Klein High participated at this competition and more impressively, the first for the entire school district.

The orchestra was competing against seven other schools and several of the groups were from high achieving, performance arts magnet schools. This is a remarkable feat for a talented group of young adults. The Grammy Foundation has also recognized the Music Department twice as a Grammy Signature School and all of the orchestras have earned UIL sweepstakes awards. The Klein High Orchestras have performed in the San Antonio Showcase, South Coast Music Festival, Mid-West International Band and Orchestra Clinic in Chicago Invitation at Carnegie Hall, the Circle of Honor series in Chicago at Symphony Hall and have been named Grand Champions several times at the Festival Disney Honors.

Perhaps most impressive, is the dedication and time each student poured into practice, rehearsing song after song, to ensure each note was tuned to perfection. In order to achieve perfect harmony, genuine connections need to be strung between each musician and it's evident that was achieved seamlessly.

Of course, in order to lead a great group of students, you must have a remarkable leader. Orchestra Director, Creston Herron, is to be applauded for his work and contribution to producing an extraordinary group of students.

The Klein High Orchestra has achieved incredible accolades throughout the years, but being named the champion at the National Orchestra Championships could be their crowning jewel. We are honored to represent Klein High School in Washington, D.C. and we are even more proud to say they are from the Lone Star State.

And that's just the way it is.

ANGEL GILLOTTE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angel Gillette for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Angel Gillotte is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angel Gillotte is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Angel Gillotte for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes 115 and 116 on Monday, March 19, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 115 and 116.

IN RECOGNITION OF MIKE NUSSMAN ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE AMERICAN SPORTFISHING ASSOCIATION

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, sportfishing provides outdoor recreation for more than 47 million Americans each year. In Virginia, we are blessed with some of the best fishing opportunities in the nation. From fishing for striped bass on the Chesapeake Bay, to fly fishing for trout in the Blue Ridge, to throwing beetle spins for smallmouth bass on the Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers, to chasing Cobia and Tuna off Virginia Beach—we have great waters and angling throughout our state. Fishing provides opportunities for youth and families to get into the great outdoors and enjoy our public lands and waters.

Like many outdoor industries, sportfishing is often overlooked as a significant job generator and economic engine. Nationwide, it is estimated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that recreational fishing generates \$48 billion in retail sales, \$115 billion in total economic activity and 828,000 jobs.

I should note that in 2016 Congress passed the Outdoor Recreation Jobs and Economic Impact Act—The REC Act. In 2018, for the first time the U.S. Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis included outdoor recreation's impact, including fishing and boating, in our nation's Gross Domestic Product.

Maybe the most important aspect of recreational fishing is that sportfishing manufacturers, anglers and boaters pay for most of

state fish and wildlife agencies fisheries conservation and boating programs.

Through special federal excise and fishing license sales, anglers and boaters are providing more than \$1.2 billion a year in funds that are allocated to the states. As a member of our Committee on Natural Resources, I'm well aware that sportsmen and women pay a large part of the bill rather than the U.S. Treasury.

Much of this is due to the leadership of J. Michael "Mike" Nussman, president and CEO of the American Sportfishing Association (ASA), the trade association that represents the recreational fishing industry.

Since 1993, Mike has served with distinction first as head of ASA's Government Affairs program then as President and CEO. While ASA has been a trade association since 1933, it has really been in the past 25 years that the organization has assumed a leadership role for not only manufacturers of rods, reels, lures, flies, waders and related apparel, but now for the overall fishing community. I might note with some pride that ASA is headquartered in Alexandria, VA.

With the leadership of former House members such as John Dingell and John Breaux and with the support of ASA, the excise taxes I mentioned have been expanded to cover programs such as wetlands restoration, boating safety and infrastructure and the establishment of the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation (RBFF).

In fact, Mike Nussman led the effort to establish RBFF to turn around a decline in recreational fishing which started to appear in the 1990s. The most recent USFWS data indicates an upward trend in recreational fishing including more diverse and urban communities.

Mike Nussman's success should come as no surprise. He worked for the Commerce Committee and Chairman Fritz Hollings of South Carolina over in the other body. Mike was the lead professional staff for the Subcommittee that oversees fisheries policy, NOAA and the Coast Guard. Prior to that he worked for the South Carolina Sea Grant program, earning undergraduate and graduate degrees in science, and an MBA from the University of South Carolina.

Mr. Nussman's tenure at ASA improved the 'business side' of his trade association. The sportfishing industry's annual trade show is now the largest in the world. His leadership made the organization financially strong, helping weather it through economic downturns.

He has served on numerous boards of directors and advisory groups from the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, to Blue Ribbon Panel on Sustaining America's Diverse Fish & Wildlife Resources. He also found time to serve as a United States Commissioner on the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas.

Mike Nussman brought special expertise as a former Senate staffer to the recreational fishing industry and the conservation community. So, I think it's appropriate that he be recognized today for a job well done. Anglers and businesses across this nation can be thankful that he was at the helm.

CASSANDRA GIST

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cassandra Gist for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Cassandra Gist is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cassandra Gist is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cassandra Gist for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

DESIGNATING THE U.S. POSTAL OFFICE AT 1320 AUTUMN AVE. MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE AS THE "JUDGE RUSSELL B. SUGARMON POST OFFICE"

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill I introduced today to designate the U.S. Postal Office at 1320 Autumn Ave. Memphis, Tennessee as the "Judge Russell B. Sugarmon Post Office."

Born in Memphis, Tennessee in 1929, Judge Russell B. Sugarmon is heralded for his contributions to the City of Memphis and his work to reverse the tide of racism in Tennessee, paving the way for future black leaders in the area and inspiring their efforts to increase their representation in elected, Democratic bodies.

In 1959, Russell Sugarmon became the first African-American in Memphis to run for a major city office when he ran for Public Works Commissioner. Sugarmon's tenacity to overcome racial opposition to his candidacy paved the way and inspired other African-Americans in Memphis to seek public office. In 1966, he was elected to the Tennessee General Assembly, becoming the second African-American in Tennessee to be elected to the Assembly post Reconstruction. From 1976 to 1987, Sugarmon was a Referee in the Memphis Juvenile Court System before being appointed to serve as a judge for the General Sessions court. Judge Sugarmon was subsequently elected and re-elected to the bench and held his seat for 20 years until his retirement in 2006.

Working alongside notable Memphis pioneers and leaders in the fight for racial justice

and equality, Judge Sugarmon was instrumental in using the courts to desegregate public transportation, restaurants and public facilities and the desegregation of Memphis public schools. Both the NAACP and ACLU have honored Judge Sugarmon for his contributions to Memphis. He was most recently awarded the 2014 be the Dream MLK Legacy Award.

As a trailblazer for African-American stewardship in public office and a leader in the Civil Rights Movement, it is only fitting that we enshrine our recognition of his contributions to the City of Memphis and the African American community by naming the 1320 Autumn Ave. Post Office in Memphis, TN in honor of his legacy.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure in honoring Judge Russell B. Sugarmon, an exemplary American and titan of his time.

IN HONOR OF MR. TOGO DENNIS
WEST, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding leader and dear friend of longstanding, Togo Dennis West, Jr. Sadly, Togo passed away on Thursday, March 8, 2018. A funeral service will be held on Tuesday, April 24, 2018 at 2 p.m. at the Washington National Cathedral in Washington, D.C.

Togo D. West, Jr. was born to Togo D. West, Sr. and Evelyn E. Carter West in Winston-Salem, North Carolina on June 21, 1942. He graduated from Akins High School in 1965 as valedictorian, was a member of the National Honor Society, and an Eagle Scout with Bronze Palm. He earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering and a Juris Doctorate degree from Howard University, where he graduated first in his law school class in 1968.

In 1969, he entered the United States Army as a Commissioned Officer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. He also served as a staffer in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs for four years.

In 1975, Togo was appointed Associate Deputy Attorney General by President Ford. He then served in several capacities in President Carter's administration including General Counsel to the Department of the Navy from 1977 to 1979; Special Assistant to both the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1979; and General Counsel to the United States Department of Defense from 1980 to 1981. In 1993, President Bill Clinton appointed him the United States Secretary of the Army. As the second African-American to serve in this position, Togo oversaw the transition of the Army from a post-Cold War organization to a contemporary fighting force. He also was the driving force behind initiatives that granted women more opportunities to serve within the ranks and a strong advocate for harsher penalties for sexual misconduct. In 1998, President Clinton appointed him Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs. During his

tenure, he was a strong advocate for increased funding for veterans medical care and benefits.

Outside of his government service, Togo was also actively involved in the community. He presided on a variety of boards and served in a number of organizations at the local, state, and national levels. Over the course of his life, he received numerous awards and commendations, including the Legion of Merit and the Meritorious Service Medal; Distinguished Eagle Scout in 1995; and the Silver Buffalo Award and the Silver Beaver Award.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." We are all so blessed that Togo West, Jr. passed this way and during his life's journey did so much for so many for so long. His leadership, his counsel, and his prominent presence will be greatly missed.

Togo is survived by his loving wife, Gail; his two daughters, Tiffany and Hilary; two wonderful grandchildren; and a host of other family members and friends.

On a personal note, the West family shares a special relationship with the Bishop family. My wife, Vivian, Togo's wife, Gail, and Hilary shared membership in the Metropolitan D.C. Chapter of The Links, Inc. Togo and I are both Eagle Scouts and share the honor of having been named Distinguished Eagle Scouts by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. Moreover, Hilary served as valued member of our congressional staff in Washington as she started her career ascension in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, the members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, along with the more than 730,000 people of the Second Congressional District, honor and salute Togo West, Jr. for his outstanding achievements, service, and public distinction. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest condolences to his family and friends during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith in the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

GOLFER AND SPECIAL OLYMPIAN,
SHAUN LINSEY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on any beautiful day down in Houston, Texas, you can find Shaun Linsey driving perfectly hit golf balls down the range. His father, Mark, is Shaun's biggest fan and competitor. Mark and Shaun have competitions between the two from time to time, but it's always in good fun.

At age three, Shaun's parents were told he was autistic and that he wouldn't ever be able to speak. Shaun has defied the odds, and with the help of his mom, Linda, Shaun is able to both speak and compete in the sport he loves.

Shaun has since picked up the game of golf and has become wildly successful. Even

though his golf skills were impeccable, Shaun found he wasn't accepted in regular competitions. That's when he and his family turned toward the Special Olympics. The great program gave the young golfer a chance to compete and win. Shaun has done more than just compete in golf competitions. He and his dad have won area, state, and even placed in national competitions.

Shaun is one of the best golfers around, and that's a true testament to his determination in continually striving to better himself. Becoming a great golfer takes a lot of hard work and it is evident Shaun has put in many hours on the golf course to get to where he is today.

I am honored to be able to speak of Shaun's accomplishments in his life. I am also honored to say Shaun hails from our beloved Houston. His tenacity and passion for life is incredible and he truly exemplifies what it means to be a Special Olympian.

Keep golfing Shaun. We can't wait to see what else he accomplishes down the road.

And that's just the way it is.

CHARITY GRIMSLEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Charity Grimsley for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Charity Grimsley is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Charity Grimsley is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Charity Grimsley for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 2018 I missed a Roll Call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" No. 105.

CONGRATULATING BAKER'S
CREEK BAPTIST CHURCH**HON. LARRY BUCSHON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Baker's Creek Baptist Church in Eureka, Indiana for 200 years of service and fellowship in Southwest Indiana.

Dating back to 1818, the Baker's Creek Baptist Church is the second oldest church in Spencer County. It has served not just as a place of worship, but also as a refuge for those in times of trouble and means of encouragement for men and women of faith, including influential Americans such as President Abraham Lincoln.

Through the Lord's grace and the devotion of leaders like Pastor James Carl Jones, Baker's Creek Baptist Church has remained a place for the congregation to worship and come together as a community.

I am grateful for Baker's Creek Baptist Church's rich history of service over the past 200 years and excited for what the future holds. Again, congratulations on achieving this tremendous milestone.

ALISON HOWARD**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alison Howard for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Alison Howard is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alison Howard is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alison Howard for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF BENJAMIN FERENCZ

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I along with Representative DEUTCH, am pleased to honor Benjamin Ferencz, an investigator of Nazi war crimes following World War II and the chief prosecutor for the United

States at the Einsatzgruppen trial at Nuremberg.

Benjamin was born in Somcuta Mare, a village in Romania, and emigrated to the United States with his family when he was 10 months old. He attended Harvard Law School and joined the Army following his studies. Assigned to General Patton's Third Army, he was tasked with gathering evidence of the Nazi's war crimes. After the war he was named the chief prosecutor for the United States in one of the Nuremberg Trials, at only 27 years old, and his prosecution resulted in 22 convictions. Mr. Ferencz became a global advocate for the establishment of an international rule of law and the International Criminal Court, and served as an adjunct professor of international law at Pace University in New York.

Benjamin has contributed immeasurably to the international rule of law and his service to our country and the world is worthy of great recognition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A TRIBUTE TO JOYE E. FROST**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that we learned of the death on March 12, 2018 of a true advocate for crime victims and survivors. For most of her professional career, Joye Frost served crime victims through her efforts at the U.S. Department of Justice's Office for Victims of Crime (OVC), our nation's premiere agency dedicated to serving and advocating on behalf of victims of all types of crimes.

Joye Frost began her career as a Child Protective Services caseworker in South Texas and has worked in the victim assistance, healthcare, and disability advocacy fields for more than 30 years in the U.S. and Europe, including several years working at the community and headquarters levels for the Department of Army.

In January 2009, Joye was designated Acting Director of OVC and made the permanent Director in 2013. She was a strong and consistent advocate for the Crime Victims Fund, and developed a very close working relationship with state VOCA assistance and crime victim compensation program managers.

Perhaps her most profound and long-lasting legacy will be her inspiration and leadership encompassed by her landmark achievement: the development and implementation of Vision 21: Transforming Victim Services. Joye's nationwide initiative successfully sought to expand the reach and impact of the victim assistance field; recognize the role of victims in the nation's response to crime and delinquency; identify emerging and enduring challenges in the victims' field; and address the need to build the capacity of victim service providers to meet those challenges. Today and in the future, Vision 21 remains the "blueprint" for comprehensive, quality victim/survivor services nationwide.

She began her working on special projects at OVC in 1997 and, since 2001, directed

OVC's annual observance of National Crime Victims' Rights Week, including its National Service Awards and the NCVRW Community Awareness Projects. As the Principal Associate Director for OVC, she developed national scope training, technical assistance and other resources to help crime victims, including the development of the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) and Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) training and technical assistance project, as well as projects to help crime victims with disabilities. She also implemented grant programs to support comprehensive services for victims of human trafficking.

The U.S. Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, founded by Representative JIM COSTA (CA) and me, recognizes that with Joye Frost's passing, crime victims have lost a strong and outspoken advocate. We have worked closely with Joye to improve the lives of victims for many years, and know that her positive and profound impact on the profession of crime victim/survivor services will endure far into the future.

And that's just the way it is.

KARMA JAMES**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Karma James for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Karma James is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Karma James is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Karma James for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

**HONORING BENJAMIN DANIEL
GRAVES****HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Benjamin Daniel Graves. Ben is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 714, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ben has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the

many years Ben has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Ben has become a Firebuilder in the Tribe of Mic-0-Say while also attending High Adventure at Philmont Scout Ranch and participating in the Peak Scout Camp in Derbyshire, England. As part of the Peak Scout Camp exchange, Ben was able to visit London and Scotland and in return hosted two English Scouts in the summer of 2017. Ben has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Ben cleaned up the park, mulched the landscaping, and repainted the bandstand the Veterans Memorial Park in Edgerton, Missouri.

As Ben's uncle, I am proud of the young man he has become. As an Eagle Scout, I admire the determination he has shown in completing his path to Eagle.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Benjamin Daniel Graves for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING DR. DENNIS FRISCH

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Dr. Dennis Frisch and his induction as the President of the American Podiatric Medical Association.

Dr. Frisch has dedicated his life to serving both his profession and his community.

Dr. Frisch began serving on the American Podiatric Medical Association (APMA) Board of Trustees in 2007 and has served on multiple APMA committees during this time. Before being elected to the APMA Board, Dr. Frisch served at all levels of leadership in the Florida Podiatric Medical Association (FPMA), culminating with his presidency from 1995–1996. He was honored by the FPMA in 2005 when he received the Florida Podiatric Physician of the Year Award for his many years of service.

Dr. Frisch is also very active in the Boca Raton Rotary Club and has served 2 separate terms as president. He volunteered with a variety of youth sports organizations and served for 8 years as a Commissioner for the Greater Boca Raton Beach and Parks District. He is currently an appointed Board member to the City of Boca Raton Parks and Recreation Department Advisory Board.

Today I ask this body to recognize Dr. Frisch as he assumes his new role as President of the American Podiatric Medical Association.

Dr. Frisch exemplifies the hard work and dedication that I see throughout Palm Beach County and the State of Florida. I thank him for his service and congratulate him for this accomplishment.

KAYLA MCNIERNEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kayla McNierney for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kayla McNierney is a student at Warren Tech North and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kayla McNierney is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kayla McNierney for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CLARIFY CERTAIN DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SERVING IN SENSITIVE POSITIONS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, as hundreds of thousands of our federal workers face uncertainty in wages and work, I rise along with my House colleagues ROBERT J. WITTMAN and ANDRÉ CARSON to introduce a bill to clarify certain due process rights of federal employees serving in sensitive positions. Our bill would overturn an unprecedented federal court decision, *Kaplan v. Conyers and MSPB*, which stripped many federal employees of the right to independent review of an agency decision removing them from a job on grounds of ineligibility. The case was brought by two Department of Defense (DOD) employees, Rhonda Conyers, an accounting technician, and Devon Northover, a commissary management specialist, who were permanently demoted and suspended from their jobs after they were found no longer to be eligible to serve in noncritical sensitive positions. In 2014, the Supreme Court declined to hear the case, which allowed the appeals court decision to stand.

Specifically, the decision prevents federal workers who are designated as “noncritical sensitive” from appealing to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) if they are removed from their jobs. Noncritical sensitive jobs include those that do not have access to classified information. The decision would affect at least 200,000 DOD employees who are designated as noncritical sensitive. Even more seriously, most federal employees could potentially lose the same right to an independent review of an agency's decision because of a

rule by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), which went into effect in July 2015, that permits agency heads to designate most jobs in the federal government as noncritical sensitive.

The Kaplan decision undercuts Title 5, section 7701 of the Civil Service Act, which ensures due process rights for federal workers required by the U.S. Constitution. Stripping employees whose work does not involve classified matters of the right of review of an agency decision that removes them from their jobs opens entirely new avenues for unreviewable, arbitrary action or retaliation by an agency head and, in addition, makes a mockery of whistleblower protections enacted in the 112th Congress. Our bill would stop the use of “national security” to repeal a vital component of civil service protection and of due process.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

IN HONOR OF THE SPRING FIRE DEPARTMENT'S 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women of the Spring Fire Department. For 65 years, Spring firefighters have run in where we run out.

On April 29, 1953, seven people bound together with donated fire apparatus to form the Spring Volunteer Fire Department approximately 22 miles north of downtown Houston. Local residents and businesses made donations to fund the department for its first three decades.

As the department celebrated its 30th anniversary, the volunteers worked to form the Harris County Rural Fire Prevention District No. 1 (HCRFPD). For the first time, the Spring Volunteer Fire Department began receiving tax dollars to help build fire stations, buy equipment and train volunteers.

On Texas Independence Day in 1985, the Spring Fire Department suffered its only line-of-duty loss. District Chief Michael F. West died battling a 2-Alarm fire near Old Town Spring. His sacrifice is immortalized in bronze in front of the Spring Fire Department Administration building.

As the population grew, the Spring Fire Department continued to evolve. During the 1990's, as Emergency Services Districts (ESD) began forming to provide stable funding for emergency services in the unincorporated areas of Texas counties, Harris County ESD No. 7 replaced the outdated HCRFPD No. 1.

In 1997, the Spring Volunteer Fire Department hired its first part-time firefighters to staff an apparatus during business hours. Widely known as the duty crew, they responded to calls during the day when most volunteers were at work. As the population and staffing needs continued to grow, the department further evolved.

In 2013, the department's first fulltime firefighters joined the Spring fire family. With a

combination of fulltime, part-time, and volunteer firefighters, the decision was made to change the name to the Spring Fire Department (SFD).

Operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, today the Spring Fire Department is one of the largest combination departments in the state of Texas.

SFD covers 62 square miles of northern Harris County serving an estimated population of 152,000 people. SFD's nine fire stations house a fleet of 25 pieces of fire and rescue apparatus along with 15 support vehicles. The Spring Fire Department is under the leadership of Fire Chief Scott Seifert and today we celebrate their 65 years of dedicated service to the Spring community.

And that is just the way it is.

KALEIGH MELINGER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kaleigh Melinger for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kaleigh Melinger is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kaleigh Melinger is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kaleigh Melinger for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, this week I missed two roll calls. Had I been present I would have voted: Roll Call No. 115—Yes, and Roll Call No. 116—Yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 19, 2018, I was absent from the House Chamber during roll call vote 115. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

HONORING JUSTINE LEE SNYDER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Justin Lee Snyder. Justin is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1028, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Justin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Justin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Justin has become a member of the tribe Mic-O-Say. Justin has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Justin designed a wall to enclose the HVAC unit at his church where the Scout troop meets. He raised the funds with help from the Knights of Columbus, and organized a group of volunteers to build the enclosure.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Justin for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

BROOKE MILLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Brooke Miller for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Brooke Miller is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Brooke Miller is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Brooke Miller for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING PETER G. DAUSEN

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and character of a great American on the occasion of his retirement

from civilian service with the United States Navy. Peter G. Dausen, or simply Pete as he is known to all, has given his entire adult life to the service of his family and country. He has set a towering example to all of us fortunate to know him. As Pete steps down from the position of Deputy and Technical Director for the Naval Support Activity Monterey, we all know that his influence has reached far beyond the strict confines of the job title.

Pete graduated from Kent State University in 1974 and commissioned as a Second Lieutenant into the United States Army. He served in uniform for nearly 30 years as a signals officer with tours of duty across the United States and abroad. He oversaw signals operations in Somalia during the 1993 Battle of Mogadishu. He served as a peace keeper in Bosnia. He led soldiers and mentored young officer and NCOs. Along the way he earned two Masters Degrees and graduated from the Army War College, in Strategic Studies. Upon promotion to Colonel, Pete came to the Monterey Peninsula to serve as the Garrison Commander Presidio of Monterey, home of the Defense Language Institute and Ord Military Community. Although at first Pete was reticent to shift from warrior to city manager, he excelled in this last Army command.

Upon retirement from active duty at the conclusion of his Garrison Command, Pete transitioned into the civilian position managing the facilities for the Naval Postgraduate School also located in Monterey. This role, which grew into the fully fledged Naval Support Activity Monterey during his tenure, became vital to the success of the military missions located in Monterey. He successfully advocated for new investments in the facilities at the NPS, the Fleet Numerical Meteorological and Oceanographic Center, the Navy Research Lab and the Navy War College. These efforts included helping to secure over \$212 million in MilCon funding to update and improve facilities and advance these missions. He was also instrumental in standing up the new RCI housing and strengthening MWR programs for military families. Pete takes particular pride in the new academic fence that rings the public frontage of NPS.

Pete has been a tireless advocate of the broader military mission in Monterey. He has played a vital role in the mission of TEAM Monterey, which has been crucial in advancing our national security interests by fostering long-term, positive community relationships between military facilities and public officials. Throughout his career, Pete has been a role model for the men and women who have been lucky enough to serve under him, as exemplified by his recent selection as a recipient of the Superior Civilian Service Award.

In honor of his service, I would like to express my gratitude for Peter G. Dausen for his dedication to this country and our community. I wish him all the best and I am sure that he is looking forward to continuing his impressive portfolio of artwork, and spending time with his loving family.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH
ANNIVERSARY OF BISCOTTI CAFE

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 20th Anniversary of Biscotti Cafe in Syracuse.

Two decades ago, in March 1998, Geoff and Debbie Camire opened their bakery on Butternut Street. Soon after opening, their business flourished, and became a staple in Syracuse.

Unfortunately, just five years after opening their doors, Geoff and Debbie's business was destroyed in a fire. Despite this massive setback, Geoff and Debbie reopened their bakery and persevered. After a few years on South Geddes Street, the bakery reopened on North Salina Street in 2004, where it remains today. The cafe serves sandwiches, soups and salads for lunch. But throughout our community, the bakery is best known for its Italian and European-inspired pastries, cookies and cakes.

Twenty years later, the Camires and their staff make thousands upon thousands of pastries, cookies, and cakes each year. Businesses and business owners like these form the foundation of our economy, and provide our communities proof that the American Dream is alive and well.

I am proud to recognize the Camires and Biscotti Cafe for celebrating 20 years in business. Geoff and Debbie Camire have become an indispensable part of the Syracuse community and I wish this outstanding business continued success in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING CHAD AND DEB
BREMNER FOR RECEIVING THE
NATIONAL OUTSTANDING YOUNG
FARMERS AWARD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud to rise today, on National Ag Day, to congratulate Chad and Deb Bremner of Pearl City, Illinois on receiving the National Outstanding Young Farmers Award.

Chad and Deb are being recognized for their great contributions to our agricultural community, and for their efforts to foster a deeper understanding of the role farmer's play in our region's economy. In addition to operating their family farm, Chad has gone above and beyond by serving on the Stephenson County Farm Bureau Board for twelve years, the Pearl City School Board for eight years and the State Young Leader Committee for four years. In addition, Deb also serves as a nurse. Their work has without a doubt invested in the future of our region, and the lives of our family farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chad and Deb for their service to better our communities. It is because of hardworking families like the Bremmers, that I am especially proud

to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. I congratulate them again on their well-earned achievement and wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF PROVISIONS BAKERY &
RESTAURANT

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 30th anniversary of Provisions Bakery & Restaurant, located in Armory Square in my district in Syracuse, New York.

In coordination with AccessCNY, Provisions Bakery & Restaurant operates a job training program for individuals living with disabilities in our community. The mission of Provisions is to empower all of its employees, individuals of all abilities, to work in a positive and supportive environment and gain skills needed to secure and maintain competitive employment.

In its three decades, the bakery has sold more than 200,000 of its signature chocolate chip cookies, but more importantly has positively impacted over 1,000 lives.

Provisions trainees work alongside professional staff learning all aspects of the bakery from cooking and baking, to serving and cleaning. Trainees develop employment skills such as time management, interpersonal skills and how to manage workplace expectations, which will improve their access to employment opportunities across Central New York.

Throughout the years, Provisions has become a staple in the Armory Square restaurant and business community, and I am proud to congratulate the employees of Provisions on the occasion of 30 years in business.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
NANCY ANN KUNOVICH

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Nancy Ann Kunovich, age 82, who passed away peacefully on March 11, 2018.

Nancy was born on September 25, 1935 in Youngstown, Ohio. Nancy was married to Charles Kunovich and together they raised 5 children. In addition to being a mom, Nancy worked for the Austintown School District for over 30 years as one of the pioneers behind the "I Can" Program. Nancy's compassion and devotion throughout the program inspired countless young people to turn their lives around.

After retiring in 2005, Nancy moved to Manchaca, Texas. She enjoyed spending her retired life gardening, reading, cooking, and so much more. Her greatest pride and joy came in spending time with her family and friends. Her step-grandchildren and great-grandchildren lovingly referred to her as Grandma Nancy.

Nancy was preceded in death by her husband Charles, her daughter Elizabeth Blockinger, her parents Hannah and William Richards, and her brother William Richards, Jr. Nancy is survived by her children Glenn Johnson and wife Norma, daughter Lynda Self and husband Carl, daughter Christine Johnson; son, Eric Johnson and grandchildren Eric Betts, Kate Kam, and Hannah Blockinger. Nancy also leaves five step-children behind; Kathy Joyce and husband David, Michelle Chance and husband Joe, Charles Kunovich Jr., Mary Jo Cusack and husband Jim, Michael Kunovich and wife Michelle.

I had the pleasure of knowing Nancy's son Glenn. She was a beloved mother and grandmother, and I know she is dearly missed. I extend my deepest condolences to Glenn and his family.

SOCCER STAR AND SPECIAL
OLYMPIAN, MATT WEISER

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Matt Weiser loves nothing more than lacing up his cleats and hitting the soccer field. Matt is a skilled player and is lightning on his feet, but a few years ago, you wouldn't think that could have been possible.

When Matt was in the second grade, he started experiencing epileptic seizures. The seizures started to become so severe his parents and doctors decided it was time to perform surgery. The operation required removing part of his brain, which rendered Matt speechless and paralyzed. After many rounds of therapy and the love and care of his family, Matt performed the unimaginable. He learned how to speak and walk again. Walking turned to running, and running eventually took him back to his first love, soccer.

Matt started playing soccer when he was five. He competed in events all the way up until his surgery. After Matt learned how to walk again, he got right back on the field. His passion for soccer led to competing in the Special Olympics, which led to competing on the national stage. The Special Olympics has allowed Matt to pursue his dream of playing soccer and has been an invaluable resource to him and his family.

As soon as Matt steps onto the soccer field, his exuberance and passion for life shines through. The dedication he has shown, just to get to where he is today, is exceptional. Being able to bounce back after a life altering surgery is a true testament to Matt's determination to better himself. Of course, it wouldn't have been possible without the help of his family and his parents, John and Rebecca. Sometimes life throws you a curve ball, but how you react to it and handle it, makes all the difference.

I am honored to be able to spread Matt's inspiring story today. I am also proud to say Matt is a native of the great city of Houston, Texas. As Texans and Houstonians, we pride ourselves in hard work and Matt exemplifies that very quality. I have no doubt Matt will

continue to dominate in the sport he loves and we will all be there cheering him on.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF MILDRED LESLIE'S
100TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Mildred Leslie on the celebration of her 100th birthday.

I join her friends and family in extending my best to her on this occasion and in celebrating her life and many contributions to our great

state and county. I hope she uses this momentous day to do the same.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Mildred Leslie on her birthday. May her year be filled with happiness and blessings.

IN HONOR OF WILLIAM STRAHAN'S
100TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to William Strahan on the celebration of his 100th birthday.

I join his friends and family in extending my best to him on this occasion and in celebrating his life and contributions to our great state and country. I hope he uses this momentous day to do the same.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to William Strahan on his birthday. May his year be filled with happiness and blessings.

SENATE—Wednesday, March 21, 2018

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Immortal, invisible, God only wise, we praise You that those who trust in You will not lack any good things. We thank You that You are the source of our strength and the strength of our lives.

Guide our lawmakers in all their undertakings. Stay close to them and infuse them with Your Spirit of Wisdom. May they strive for Your approval instead of seeking the approbation of humanity. When our Senators face troubles, rescue them from each one, enabling them to tell of Your excellent greatness. Lord, give them the grace to receive things as they are, while resolving by Your grace to make them what they ought to be.

And, Lord, we pray for the victims and families of the Great Mills school shooting.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like this morning to give an update to my colleagues, given the challenges associated with the weather—and also as we move toward a conclusion of the omnibus.

I have spoken to the Democratic leader. It is my expectation that we will move forward with votes today. We are hoping to move them forward on the sex trafficking bill, moving them up in the day, hopefully, to accommodate safe travel. So we will notify everyone when votes are scheduled.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1865, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1865) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy on this legislation with some of my leadership colleagues who are present: first, Senator JOHN THUNE, the chair of the Commerce Committee, who has been very involved in this issue; Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL as well, who is the coauthor of the legislation and cochair of the trafficking caucus; Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL, who is ranking member of the Subcommittee on Investigations; and Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP, one of the original cosponsors of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues this morning in this Chamber as we begin the process of debating the amendments that are being offered and moving toward a final vote on this important legislation to deal with sex trafficking which, unbelievably, in this century and in this country is actually increasing. All of the experts say it is increasing because of the presence of these organizations online that are using the ruthless efficiency of the internet to sell women and children.

It is fitting that this group is bipartisan, because this process has been bipartisan in coming up with this legislation all along. It is really the culmination of 2 years' worth of work—a lot of great work and investigations being done by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, as well as good work being done by the Commerce Committee through regular order. We would not be on the verge of sending this bill to the President's desk without the hard work of every Senator who will be on the floor this morning.

I would also like to briefly recognize a sixth member of our group who cannot be here but whose passion about this issue means that although his presence is not here, it is felt; and that is Senator JOHN MCCAIN. Both Senator MCCAIN and his wife Cindy McCain have taken on this issue of human trafficking through the McCain Institute, and Senator MCCAIN, through our work on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, also helped us with this legislation. We wish they could be here for the final vote on this bill. I know JOHN MCCAIN is watching right now and wishing he could be here with us, and we look forward to his return to this Chamber. I thank them on behalf of all of us for their hard work on this issue over the years.

We will hear from my colleagues today on a number of things we have done in Congress in this process of putting together the right legislative fix to be able to take away an immunity, unbelievably, that some of these evil websites currently have under Federal law to be able to sell people online. We will hear about the 18-month investigation into online trafficking by backpage.com by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. We will hear stories about online sex trafficking and some of the injustices experienced by some of the victims and survivors who have come to us back home in our States and who have come to testify bravely in the U.S. Congress.

We will hear about some of the calls from courts around the country asking us to pass legislation to fix this problem; the prosecutors, the U.S. attorneys, the people back home who are eager to prosecute these cases but can't because of Federal law.

We will hear about the work of the Commerce Committee, as I said earlier, helping us come up with a common-sense target bill through the regular order to be sure we would have not just the best legislative product but that we would have buy-in from Members of both sides of the aisle.

I commend Senator JOHN THUNE for doing that. He chairs the Commerce

Committee, which held a hearing on this legislation—SESTA—last September. It actually was reported unanimously out of committee after making a few changes to the legislation which clarified the intent in a positive way.

I yield to my colleague JOHN THUNE. Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I, too, want to recognize and say to Senator PORTMAN, who has been a leading voice in the Senate in the fight against human trafficking, what a great job he has done getting us to this point. This was a long, multimonth, as he said, 2-year effort. Senator PORTMAN has been absolutely relentless in pushing and driving this process forward. I commend him for his important work, which will culminate today, I certainly hope, with a big bipartisan vote in support of the legislation in front of us.

I also commend the bipartisan group of Senators who worked hard to draft the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, which includes Senator BLUMENTHAL, whom we will hear from in just a moment; Senators MCCASKILL, CORNYN, and HEITKAMP; and as Senator PORTMAN so very appropriately pointed out, Senator MCCAIN, who has been a passionate advocate for addressing this issue for so many years too. We wish he could be here to participate and vote for passage of this legislation, but we know his work over the years has played an incredibly important role in getting us to where we are today.

This group also helped lead the effort to conduct important investigatory oversight that has helped us to get to the point where we are today.

Last year, as Senator PORTMAN pointed out, I chaired a Commerce Committee hearing on his bill, where we heard testimony from experts on both sides of the issue. We listened carefully to what our witnesses had to say. After the hearing, we worked together to make some targeted changes to the legislation. The bill that ultimately advanced from our committee enjoyed, as Senator PORTMAN pointed out, solid support from the internet industry. It passed the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously.

The bill is strongly supported by Members of both parties. It has racked up lots of bipartisan support: 68 out of 100 Senators are now cosponsors of this bill. The bill is supported by the White House, so we know that as soon as it leaves the Senate, it will land on the President's desk, where it will be signed into law.

It is supported by law enforcement organizations, organizations that fight sex trafficking, and by faith-based organizations.

At our Commerce Committee hearing, we also heard powerful testimony from Yvonne Ambrose, whose daughter Desiree Robinson was sexually trafficked repeatedly before being murdered. Desiree was just 16 years old, a bright and loving girl who dreamed of

becoming a doctor in the Air Force. Instead, she was raped and murdered by a man twice her age who had sought her for sex after seeing her advertised on an internet site.

Ms. Ambrose's powerful testimony helped the members of our committee understand the terrible pain that victims of sex trafficking and their families are exposed to. I am very thankful to her for sharing Desiree's story.

This bill has already cleared the House of Representatives by an overwhelming margin.

I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to reject any attempts to slow this bill down with amendments. This has been very carefully and thoroughly vetted through the many processes that Senator PORTMAN described. We need to get this bill over the finish line and on the President's desk and signed into law because there are thousands of children out there who are waiting for our help.

So, again, I commend Senator PORTMAN and our colleagues in the Senate who have worked tirelessly on this legislation. I hope we have a big outcome today, and I hope we can do something really meaningful to address a scourge that this country needs to get rid of.

I know there are others here who have joined us who intend to participate in this discussion.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, again, I thank my colleague from South Dakota, who has been at the forefront. Getting this bill through the Commerce Committee with a unanimous vote, frankly, exceeded expectations. Many on the outside thought this might be an opportunity for many who are against the legislation to stop the bill but instead we were able, through testimony, to show that this is a commonsense, targeted approach that will make a huge difference in the lives of the people we represent, without affecting the freedom of the internet. That is the right balance Senator THUNE helped us to get.

I see that my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL is here, whom I talked about earlier. He is a coauthor of this legislation and also a former State prosecutor who took on trafficking cases, and so he has a professional background in prosecuting these cases and, therefore, joined me in ensuring that this legislation allows for our State and local prosecutors, who are going to take many of these cases, to be able to sue these websites that are selling people online using the current shield in Federal legislation. But after this legislation, prosecutors will be able to successfully prosecute to stop this criminal activity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to Senator BLUMENTHAL.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am proud to be here as a former U.S.

attorney and the chief Federal prosecutor in Connecticut.

I have been involved in law enforcement for most of my career, and I am proud to stand here now in this Chamber, following the chairman of the Commerce Committee, whose dedication to this cause has brought us to the finish line, and my colleague Senator PORTMAN, whose leadership on this bill is invaluable.

I wish to second a number of points that have been made by Senator PORTMAN and Senator THUNE, most especially about the very collaborative effort involved in this bill—a bipartisan championing of a cause whose time has come—and, particularly, about our colleague JOHN MCCAIN and his wife Cindy McCain, whose energy, spirit, courage, and strength have really been an inspiration to all of us. I also want to thank Senators MCCASKILL, HEITKAMP, and CORNYN, because their contributions have been enormously valuable as well.

There is a face to human trafficking in this country. Here is one of the faces. Desiree Robinson, whose story you just heard from Senator THUNE, is one such face. Her voice is still. Her voice could not be heard directly, but her mother, Yvonne Ambrose, came to our committee and talked about her beautiful daughter, whose life was lost as a result of sex trafficking. She was killed after she was raped and after she was sold. Her story alone helped us to achieve unanimous approval in the Commerce Committee for this bill, and I hope it will lead us to an overwhelming vote today on the bill before us.

I hope, as well, that it will lead us to defeat amendments that would, in effect, kill this bill—amendments that may be well intentioned, but, in fact, have an effect contrary to their stated purpose.

This bill is completely bipartisan from beginning to end. It is the result of tireless work of advocates, sex trafficking survivors, and a bipartisan coalition of our colleagues. It now has 68 cosponsors. Its companion legislation passed in the House 388 to 25.

It is the product of stakeholder consensus. It has the support of every major human trafficking organization, every major law enforcement group, and every part of the tech community—if not unanimous, at least of many of its leaders.

This bill would clarify section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, which was never intended to give websites a free pass to aid and abet sex trafficking. It was never intended to immunize completely those websites so they could knowingly facilitate sex trafficking. Those words are in the bill—"knowingly facilitate."

The purpose of our measure, very simply, is to give survivors their day in court. Right now, the courtroom doors

are barred to them, as a recent court of appeals opinion remarked, outrageously so. It would also open avenues of prosecution to law enforcement where they are currently roadblocked.

My experience combating sex trafficking at the State level led me to co-launch and cochair the Senate Caucus to End Human Trafficking with Senator PORTMAN, seeking to find solutions to this problem. As a State prosecutor, I was told that I could not pursue actions again craigslist or other sites nearly a decade ago because of that section and the interpretation.

Clearly, the websites that facilitate this, knowingly encouraging and profiting from sex trafficking, must face repercussions in the courtroom. For law enforcement to succeed in combating sex trafficking, there have to be consequences. The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children reported an 840-percent increase in reports of suspected child and sex trafficking from 2010 to 2015 alone. It found that spike “directly correlated to the increased use of the internet to sell children for sex.”

Those numbers fail to tell the full story. In fact, this picture is worth a thousand words. This picture of Desiree shows her as a young girl, smiling. In fact, her mom told us that her smile could light up a room. She was a successful student who dreamed of becoming a physician in the Air Force.

When she was in high school, a series of men reached out to her on social media. They pressured and manipulated her into letting them sell her for sex and then advertise her on backpage.com. Her mom, Yvonne, told us what happened next:

On December 23, 2016, a 32-year-old man by the name of Antonio Rosales was looking through Backpage.com for a child to have sex with, just like countless others before him. . . . He knew Backpage.com was a site to go to in order to find young underaged girls to have sex with. During his search, he came upon a picture of my 16-year-old daughter under the posting, “New girl in town looking to have fun,” which was posted by her pimp. Desiree was driven to Antonio’s residence by the pimp with the intent of having sex with this 32-year-old man, a man twice her age.

This was the last night of my daughter’s life. . . . On Christmas Eve, December 24, 2016, Desiree, my baby, was brutally murdered, and now my life has changed forever. She had been beaten, raped, strangled, and if that wasn’t bad enough, he slit her throat, all because she said, no, she didn’t want to do this again. She screamed for help, and there was no one around to help her.

Yvonne Ambrose had the courage to come testify before us, and I have repeated this part of her testimony not because it is ennobling or pleasant, but because it is the hard, ugly truth about sex trafficking. It is the reason that we must pass this measure. It is also the reason why we need to defeat the amendments that would send this measure back to the House and its possible demise.

Every one of the groups I mentioned earlier, including Desiree’s lawyer, have urged us to defeat these amendments. I will read just one or two sentences from a letter that I received today from Desiree’s lawyer about the so-called moderation amendment:

At first glance, it appears that the Moderation Amendment is disguising itself as a good Samaritan amendment. However, in a nutshell, its effect is a really bad faith Samaritan immunity.

This measure is narrowly tailored. It would ensure that State and local law enforcement can join the fight against these criminal websites. It provides survivors a right of action that would not only be a source of relief for them but also a means of remedy. The Good Samaritan amendment, unfortunately—perhaps, unintentionally—would simply protect the websites.

The people who complain and take action certainly deserve protection. It is in the current law. One of the reasons why we want to defeat this amendment is that it would probably have unintended consequences in protecting websites that identify sex trafficking ads and then leave them up in order to continue profiting from them.

I think the letter from the attorney for Desiree Robinson’s estate, Gina DeBoni, objecting to this amendment is a powerful reminder that we need to stick to what we have and what we know will work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BLUMENTHAL: At first glance, it appears that the Moderation Amendment is disguising itself as a good Samaritan amendment. However, in a nutshell, its effect is really a bad faith Samaritan immunity.

Not only does the amendment strip the “good faith” requirement (that is already accounted for in the current CDA), it creates a new and very expansive immunity for companies charged with all crimes—not just sex trafficking. This is in sharp contrast to CDA’s original intent and does nothing but immunize bad actors.

I significantly limits evidence that could be used in any federal criminal action against a website. Because almost every company uses some form of moderation system, the immunity would apply in every case brought under Section 230 going forward.

The CDA has already been crafted to provide immunity to those that are truly using good faith in their screening. This amendment undoes that and instead, creates a new bar to liability.

Moreover, it does not make sense in the real world and has the potential to create devastating consequences. As you know, we represent Yvonne Ambrose, the mother of Desiree Robinson, who was just 16 years old when she was murdered on Christmas Eve 2016. Desiree was not much different than any other 16 year old girl. She was loved by all, and had dreams like all. Like all children, Desiree was vulnerable. It did not take long for her to fall victim to a man who preyed upon her and sold her for a finder’s

fee to her pimp, Joseph Hazely. Hazely sold Desiree for sex on Backpage.com to Antonio Rosales—her killer. Desiree’s case has both a criminal and civil component—Desiree’s traffickers and killer have been charged criminally and are awaiting trial. We are pursuing a civil wrongful death action against all that played a part in her death, including Backpage.com.

You heard from Yvonne who testified before the Senate Commerce Committee. There is no better advocate for the passage of SESTA than a mother who lost her child. Desiree represents hundreds of 1000s of children who are knowingly trafficked on Backpage.com. The proposed Wyden amendment cuts Desiree’s claim off at its knees, giving bad actors, who are not acting in good faith, a way out—giving them a clearly defined immunity to hang their hat on. It is such a drastic departure from that of the Good Samaritan, taking good faith out of the equation entirely. It will create an insurmountable challenge for lawyers who are fighting on behalf of victims of sex trafficking, not to mention, any victims of any other crime, whether criminal or civil, brought under Section 230.

In practical application, in a case such as Desiree Robinson, this is how it plays out:

We know that Backpage makes an effort to identify and flag ads that are objectionable through its strip word feature. It then affirmatively edits ad that it knows are selling children for sex on its website. Under this amendment, even though Backpage knowingly facilitated trafficking of children when it edited the ads, it would be immunized because it took steps to identify this content, even though it didn’t remove it. Surely, immunizing bad actors such as Backpage cannot be the intent of this Congress and all the co-sponsors of this bill.

We know from the Senate report and information obtained via our subpoena to Co-Star Group that Back page’s moderation is relevant and intrinsically connected to their knowing facilitation of sex trafficking. This amendment removes the consideration of the direct evidence of criminal activity because the amendment broadly excludes all evidence of this nature. In fact, it broadly excludes this type of evidence for ALL civil and criminal matters regardless of the type of crime.

Companies such as Facebook, etc. that have the largest risk or burden are supportive of the SESTA language as is. This amendment is not geared towards good actors but rather companies that are not acting in good faith. The Commerce Committee report clearly provides for good faith moderation—“an ICS would not have their good faith efforts to restrict access to objectionable content used against them.” Good faith moderation is already protected by the CDA and the passage of SESTA does not negate that.

For the above reasons, we respectfully encourage Senator Blumenthal to vote NO on the Wyden Amendment. I am available any time this weekend or on Monday to discuss further.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

GINA ARQUILLA DEBONI,
*Attorney for the Estate
of Desiree Robinson
Managing Attorney,
Romanucci &
Blandin LLC.*

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Finally, there is a funding amendment that has been offered. While well-intentioned, it would,

in effect, derail this legislation. It would provide money through Attorney General Sessions to investigate and prosecute websites that criminally facilitate human trafficking.

This amendment, too, is opposed by law enforcement agencies. Yesterday, I put their letters into the RECORD. Every major law enforcement representative agency opposes it because “the funding amendment is a poison pill that is dead on arrival if sent back to the House.”

I will conclude simply by saying that I believe this measure accomplishes some powerfully important purposes. It would not criminalize the so-called harm reduction communication—information designed to ensure that women and men wrapped up in commercial sex trade can avoid violence, prevent HIV, and access community and support services.

H.R. 1865 was not designed to target websites that spread harm reduction information, and the language of the bill makes that clear. The purpose of this bill is much more narrowly focused: A website user or operator must intend to facilitate prostitution. If their goal is to save lives by providing lifesaving information, they have not violated the law.

Finally, I want to make absolutely clear, this legislation is not intended to prejudice the rights of anyone who has been victimized by a crime online other than sex trafficking. For example, I disagree with the courts that have held that the Communications Decency Act immunizes online firearm sales—like Armslist—for facilitating illegal gun sales. While this legislation does not address those cases, nobody should infer that Congress believes they were rightly decided.

Again, my thanks to all of my colleagues and most especially to Senator PORTMAN for his hard work, his leadership, and his courage in tackling this tough problem, which should bring all of us together. Making SESTA the law of the land will help save lives. It will spare others the fate of Desiree Robinson. It will make sure that more parents see justice, that survivors have their day in court, and that law enforcement has the right to pursue these wrongdoers.

Mr. President, I yield back to Senator PORTMAN.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank my colleague for his comments and, more importantly, for his leadership all the way through the process of drafting the legislation.

I am now going to yield to one of my other colleagues. It looks like Senator HEITKAMP will be next to speak. She is from North Dakota, not South Dakota, as we talked about earlier with Senator THUNE, and she has a similar passion for this issue and has been involved in this issue for many years and is also on the committee in which we

did the PSI work we talked about earlier. I appreciate her being one of our six original cosponsors, helping us to draft this targeted, focused legislation that deals directly with the problem we have seen around the country, which was discussed by Senator BLUMENTHAL.

With that, I would like to yield to my colleague Senator HEITKAMP.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, I am so proud to stand here with my five colleagues, but I also have to acknowledge the one who is not here; that is, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, who has been an absolute champion, along with his wife, on attacking this problem. Five years ago when I met Cindy McCain, one of the first things she said was, what can we do about this?

Working within the Homeland Security Committee, where so much of this work got done—both in the Homeland Security Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations—I can’t say enough about the commitment of that committee but more importantly the commitment of the leadership of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, both Senator PORTMAN and Senator MCCASKILL, who worked in tandem, who engaged their very capable staff, who did the investigations that led to the exposure of the issues and led to a bipartisan commitment to develop and pass this bill.

I do want to say that I know that JOHN and Cindy are with us today in spirit. I know that Cindy is probably watching because she is very, very excited that finally we are going to get this done. This is such an important tool. This is such an important piece of stopping human trafficking, which has been her lifelong objective and passion. Today, we stand not just with our colleagues who are here on the floor but also with our great friend, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, and his beautiful, active, and wonderful wife, Cindy McCain.

The other reason I am very proud is that this is why I came to the Senate—to work across the aisle to address major issues and challenges, to make a difference in the lives of some of the most vulnerable human beings in our country.

We are here today on the cusp of passing a bill that will provide victims a real opportunity to seek justice and recover damages from websites that profited from their pain of being sold for sex, while also providing new tools to prosecutors, including my former colleagues, the State attorneys general, to go after these sites and their owners.

Again, I thank Senator PORTMAN and Senator BLUMENTHAL for their tireless work in trying to fashion the right mix of understanding the importance of the Communications Decency Act to the development of this tool we call the

internet but also making sure this is not used as a tool for incredibly bad actors who would prey on the most vulnerable among us.

Driving this bill and forging a compromise was not easy. This was not easy. No one should think that this came together easily or that we didn’t have many moments where we did our own soul-searching, those of us who are committed to the First Amendment and those of us who are committed to free access of means to express our opinions and do our business.

What I will tell you is that this is a big thing. This isn’t a little thing. This is a big thing—not only because we are doing it in a bipartisan way but also because we are speaking on behalf of the most vulnerable human beings in this country.

I can’t imagine a more heinous act than the sale of human beings on the internet for sex. It is happening in all of our communities. It is happening in our States each and every day.

When I began my journey to the U.S. Senate, I engaged and started visiting with my old friends in North Dakota law enforcement. As I have said many times, I am a former attorney general from the great State of North Dakota and have great friends in law enforcement. Their message was simple. They were seeing a lot more drugs. Obviously, North Dakota was experiencing an oil boom, and that was creating some social upheaval, additional crime, additional concern about crime. They then told me something I didn’t expect: We are seeing this incredible rate and increase in prostitution. I thought about that. I thought, well, what does that mean, and how do we investigate it?

So many people would argue that this is a victimless crime and not a priority, and we started looking behind this. My colleagues in law enforcement in North Dakota started doing stings. They did something that peace officers all across the country do: They sat down with the women they were arresting, and they started listening to their stories. The stories were heartbreaking—stories of being preyed on as young girls, either in their home or as they were running away, the stories of how they got in the life. Many of my colleagues in law enforcement began to say: These women are not criminals; they are victims.

We began to look at what led to this huge explosion, and we started examining all the websites, all the places where, with the tweak of a word or with the opportunity to be anonymous—in the old days, you would have to stand out perhaps on the street corner, but now you can be anonymous, and that gave those perpetrators, those evil human beings, yet another avenue.

That is when we started looking at backpage.com and other sites like it that sell human beings for sex. That

occurs in every corner of our country—in the small and big States and in the small and big counties and in oil counties and out east in farming communities. So no one should believe that they are immune or somehow limited because it is going to happen there but not here. One thing we have learned is that it is happening everywhere.

Today, we are saying: No more. The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act would crack down on these horrific crimes online and provide justice for victims. Today, it is going to pass the Senate with broad bipartisan support and head to the President's desk to be signed into law.

In many instances, websites help traffickers skirt law enforcement through online advertising and continue to do so without penalty by claiming their First Amendment rights.

I remember when we in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations subpoenaed and had a chance to question the witnesses from backpage.com, and they started talking about their First Amendment rights. I pointed out to them that nothing this body can do can affect someone's First Amendment rights. They were not alleging or saying they were protected by the First Amendment. They knew that wouldn't fly. They said they were protected by the terms of the Communications Decency Act.

Like Senator BLUMENTHAL, I never believed that the Communications Decency Act protected them from prosecution or protected them from civil penalty if they were complicit and, in fact, abetted these crimes. I never believed that, but there were judges in America who did. We met and saw a lot of those judges and read a lot of those opinions and said: We cannot let a law of the U.S. Congress—a law on the books in our country—allow perpetrators who sell children for sex to absolutely avoid any civil or criminal penalty. We cannot allow that to happen—a law of this country.

We don't have the ability to restrict or modify the First Amendment in this body, but we do have the ability to amend a law that is being used inappropriately to protect the most hideous criminals in America. No law should put anyone above liability if they are actively involved and complicit in selling children for sex.

As we stand here today, we know we are doing something that we hope will happen more often in the Senate. We are standing for those victims, those parents, those children, those women who are still in the struggle of human trafficking, those children who are still in the struggle of human trafficking. We are standing with them today to say: No more. People who will illegally profit from selling children for sex are going to be held accountable. So the message needs to go from this body, it

needs to go from the signature on this bill, that that protection you have been alleging—inappropriately hiding behind the Communications Decency Act—ends, and it ends with the passage of this bill.

I couldn't be prouder of the work my colleagues Senator MCCASKILL and Senator PORTMAN did on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. You exposed the facts that led to the argument that led to the passage of this bill. I am proud to stand with you. I am proud to work to make sure that this bill is appropriately implemented. I look forward to the first prosecution of someone who sells children for sex on the internet, profiting from the web page they created.

With that, Senator PORTMAN, thank you so much for your excellent work. Senator MCCASKILL, thank you for your excellent work. I stand proud with you today and know that we are making a difference today.

Today, the U.S. Senate will make a difference for the most vulnerable human beings in our country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank my colleague for the expertise and experience she has brought to this effort. As she said, in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, we spent 18 months digging deep, trying to figure out why this was happening, why we had an increase in trafficking in this country in this century, and increasingly we were told that this was because of the internet, moving from the street corner to the smartphone. Trafficking survivors and victims told us this, but so did the experts.

Senator HEITKAMP jumped in, and the leadership of that subcommittee included Senator MCCASKILL. She is no longer the ranking member. She has gone on to bigger things—to be ranking member of the full committee—but during this investigation of 18 months, she was the ranking Democrat on our subcommittee, and I appreciate working with her there. She is a former prosecutor. She knows how to dig deep for this information, and she had a good staff. She also was very helpful to us in helping to enforce the subpoenas.

I will let her tell the story, but this is really incredible. We knew this one website, backpage.com, was engaged in this effort because we heard about it all over the country. In my home State of Ohio, women and girls would say they were trafficked on backpage. If I talked to a dozen victims or survivors, 10 would say backpage. The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children said that 75 percent were backpage. Another group said: No, it is 80 percent.

In other words, we knew this was happening, but we couldn't get the information because although we subpoenaed documents and subpoenaed their testimony, they refused to show up and

refused to give us documents. We had to go through an extraordinary process. I will let Senator MCCASKILL talk about it, but for the first time in 21 years, this Senate did something that was critical to our investigation. I want to thank her for her hard work, and I would like to yield time to her to talk about it.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I thank my colleagues. I think we have spent a lot of time on the floor thanking each other, which is a good thing. Unfortunately, too often, we go back to tribal warfare after we thank each other, but this is an example of when we have worked together in a bipartisan way. So I think those "thanks" are justified, particularly in this case when there has been an honest and true bipartisan effort to get at a very serious problem in this country. It was a pleasure to work with my colleague Senator PORTMAN as we did this investigation.

So how do I come to this place? I come to this place as somebody who had spent a significant part of her career in the courtroom prosecuting sex crimes. I think I can say with confidence that I prosecuted more sex crimes than any other Member of the U.S. Senate. I can't speak for the House because I am not familiar with the backgrounds of all of the House Members.

I spent years as an assistant prosecutor. For part of that time, I was the only woman in the office, and for some reason, they thought that was a good reason to have me gain expertise in the area of sex crimes. I was happy to take on the responsibility of handling a lot of those cases as a young assistant prosecutor, going into the courtroom and arguing cases to juries, holding the hands of victims, crying with their families, trying to find that special spot that is called justice in a system that is sometimes stacked against the victims of these kinds of crimes. I went on to be the elected prosecutor in Kansas City and tried to continue our strong stand against all forms of sex crimes, including against the people who were profiting off of selling sex.

It is important to remember that when we began this investigation in the Senate, we were dealing with someone who didn't want to cooperate. What we learned through the investigation was that this law, as it exists now, was their protector. They were being protected for their bad acts by an outdated law that had been twisted and distorted to allow them to make billions of dollars of profit and, frankly, millions, upon millions, upon millions of dollars of profit off of trafficking young women for sex. The prosecution of cases is not driven by headlines. It is not driven by press conferences. It is not driven by photo ops. The prosecution of cases is driven by evidence. You

only get evidence after having a thorough and complete investigation, and it has to be in-depth.

I know that Senator PORTMAN will relate to this. Can you imagine, when backpage said, “We don’t want to talk to you,” if we had said, “OK. That is fine”? Can you imagine, when backpage said, “We refuse to be interviewed,” if we had just said, “OK. No problem. We don’t have any evidence of wrongdoing. Let’s just go on our way”?

Instead, when we were confronted with their stubborn unwillingness to participate in a U.S. Senate investigation, we did what was necessary to hold them accountable, and it involved the cooperation of the entire Senate. Once they rebuffed our subpoenas and refused to show up, and once they said, “No, we don’t have to give you anything because of the current law as it relates to section 230” and we said, “No, that is not true,” we got the entire U.S. Senate to back us up—every single Member.

I don’t know how unusual it is in this day and age to have zero on one side of the ledger in the U.S. Senate. I don’t know about Senator PORTMAN, but I have seen it very few times. Now, there is usually one or two who hang out there for some reason or another, no matter how uncontroversial a piece of legislation is. Yet, in this instance, we got everybody. Everybody who voted said: Yes, let’s take backpage to court and assert our ability under the Constitution and the law to investigate. We took them all the way to the Supreme Court, and we won that case.

What happened after that is really important for people to understand because there were lots of folks around the country who were trying to get at backpage’s conduct, but it was able to use this law to protect itself. There were two things we did that were very important for prosecutors after our investigation.

The first thing we did was to send the whole file over to the Department of Justice for referral. It sits there now—all of the information we have about backpage—at the Department of Justice, and I am hopeful that it is using that information and all of the documentation we were able to obtain to pursue bad acts and criminal violations by backpage.

The other thing we did with the vote of the Senate and the cooperation of the Senate is to open up our files to any prosecutor or attorney general in the country. I would certainly call on the attorneys general of this country and call on the local prosecutors in this country to access these documents that are available to them now and to use them in the investigations they have of people who might have actually used backpage to traffic young women and sometimes children.

Why is this law so important? If I am looking at this through a prosecutor’s

lens, now all of the prosecutors in the country can go after anyone who knowingly facilitates sex trafficking online. I am not saying when it is by accident, and I am not saying when it has slipped through and they don’t know it; I am talking about to knowingly facilitate, which is what backpage was doing. Once we got all of its documents, we learned it was knowingly facilitating sex trafficking on its web page.

Not only can individuals walk in the courthouse and get a moment of justice through civil action, but now attorneys general can take civil action, even in Federal court, against these websites. Most importantly, where most crime is prosecuted in this country, they can go after these folks.

I don’t think most Americans realize—I know a lot of Missourians don’t realize—that upwards of 90 percent of the crime that is prosecuted in this country is done by local prosecutors. FBI agents don’t answer 9-1-1 calls. FBI agents get to pick where they investigate. U.S. attorneys get to choose which cases they take. Local prosecutors do not. They take everything. They have to go after every crime that is committed in their jurisdictions. There may be concurrent Federal jurisdiction, and they may work with the Federal Government on a bank robbery or maybe on a murder when the body is moved across a State line. Yet I don’t think most Americans realize that for most crimes in this country, the Federal Government doesn’t even have jurisdiction. The Federal Government cannot prosecute a rape case anywhere except in the District of Columbia or a territory. That is all done by State and local prosecutors.

The most important part of this bill to someone who is deeply steeped in local prosecutions is the tool it gives our frontline of law enforcement in this country—the people who answer the 9-1-1 calls, the people who respond to the emergency room when a young, 15-year-old girl wanders in, like she did in St. Louis, saying she had been trafficked up and down the interstate and was coming to the emergency room for help. It was not the FBI that responded. It would have been the local police who had responded to that emergency room to find out what the facts had been and who had determined how to go forward. This is a new tool in the toolbox of the frontline of criminal prosecutions in this country, and I am so proud to have been a part of it.

I know there are going to be some amendments offered. I am confident they will be voted down. By the way, everyone wants to support more resources for this. So in an effort to try to amend the bill so that it has to go back to the House, the notion that one of the amendments is of needing more resources is one of those jujitsu moves that we do around here, frankly, that is not always productive.

Of course, we all support more resources for sex trafficking prosecutions and investigations, but we don’t want to amend this bill right now because it has to get to the President’s desk so that we can get busy and get after this crime and do what we need to do in this country in order to hold the people accountable who are profiting off the backs of people who sell children for sex.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I thank my colleague Senator PORTMAN for all of his work and cooperation on this issue.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I thank Senator McCASKILL. She is absolutely right. We are grateful to the entire Senate for jumping in on this because we would not have gotten to the bottom of this without our having gotten the Senate to decide for the first time in 21 years this question: Are we going to enforce the subpoena or not? People stepped up. As a result, through the court system and with the sanction of criminal liability as a possibility, we were able to get these folks to come forward and provide this information.

They never really testified. They came forward, and they claimed their Fifth Amendment rights, but at least we were able to get 1 million pages of documents—1 million pages. Then we sifted through 1 million pages of documents to discover, lo and behold, that these people actually knew what they were doing. In fact, they were altering ads. They would get an ad from somebody who was selling an underaged girl. The ad would read something like “schoolgirl” or “cheerleader” or “young girl.” They would then edit that ad to take out those words that would indicate what was going on, and they knew it was going on. Then they would place the ad anyway. In other words, they would make the money, make the profit, knowing that they were selling an underaged girl online. They were also destroying the evidence that, later, law enforcement could use in going after these people.

This is evil, and this has been happening. We have heard the stories. We have talked about Yvonne Ambrose. We have talked about Kubiiki Pride. We have talked about Nacole S. We have talked about some of these mothers and their daughters who have gone through this horrific situation. You also heard earlier about Desiree. This was the 16-year-old who was being sold on backpage, and on Christmas Eve, she was murdered. Imagine getting that call as a parent.

We have talked before about the testimony we received in the committee with regard to the 14-year-old girl who had gone missing. Kubiiki Pride is her mom. Kubiiki Pride said she had been missing for several weeks when someone finally told her: Why don’t you check on backpage.com. So she did.

She went on backpage.com and found her daughter, who had been missing for weeks. Imagine the mixed emotions there—the relief of finding her daughter but her horror in seeing the explicit sexual photographs of a 14-year-old who was being sold for sex.

She did what you would do as a mom. She called backpage immediately and said: I found my daughter on your website. She is 14 years old. Thank you for taking down that ad and helping me to connect with my daughter.

The answer from backpage.com was this: You didn't pay for the ad. We will not take it down.

Again, talk about evil. Think of the heartbreak.

Then, later, when she was reunited with her daughter, she was one of those brave moms and her daughter was one of those brave victims who said: Do you know what, we are going to file a lawsuit and go public with this and talk about our experience—the trauma that this young, 14-year-old girl had gone through in having been repeatedly raped by older men—and we are going to hold these websites accountable.

Do you know what happened?

The court system said: I am sorry. Under a Federal law that was passed by the Congress—a 21-year-old law—this website is not culpable. It has a shield. It has an immunity.

That is why we are here today.

Justice cannot always be seen, but its absence is felt, and the absence of justice is exactly what we are trying to address here today.

You have heard from my colleagues, and I appreciate all four of them for speaking up and talking about their experiences and how we got to this point. We may hear from a couple of other colleagues later today who were part of helping us put together a sensible approach that targeted this activity. Sure, we have freedom of the internet on the one hand, but on the other hand, this is criminal activity that cannot continue to go on here in America, in this century, at this time.

Again, as we have learned, this is where you see the increase in trafficking. You not only hear this from the experts who give us their data that show huge increases in trafficking reports, but you also hear it and feel it from the victims and the survivors whom I have met with in Cleveland, in Cincinnati, in Columbus, in Dayton, in Akron. They have told me the same story, which is: Yes, I was sold online. It is very efficient.

One 9-year-old girl was sold online by her father. I first met her when she was almost 20 years old and had finally escaped from the clutches of her own father.

Think about that—backpage's going from sporting event to sporting event around the country and, online, one being sold many times on a single night with the efficiency of the internet.

This is legislation that is overdue, in my view, and it is required. The courts have told us that. The district attorneys have told us that. The attorneys general have told us that, and 50 of them sent us a letter, writing to make this change. They have all said: Congress, step forward. They have not just invited us to do it; they have welcomed us to pass this legislation to give these families the justice they deserve and to give our prosecutors the ability to go after them.

One thing that I hope has been made clear from the other comments we have heard today is that one of the important parts of this legislation is to simply allow these local prosecutors we talked about earlier to take these cases while using the Federal standard rather than just relying on the Department of Justice.

Having said that, sifting through those 1 million pages, our report, with all the documents we received, you can go online to see this at the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, PSI.

We did provide this to the Justice Department. We did provide this to the prosecutors around the country who were interested. We did provide it to others who are pursuing lawsuits so they have information now that they never had before, but we also need to change the law, and that is what we are about to do today.

You heard from my colleagues about the amendments that are likely to be offered. There are two amendments. The first amendment is one that is going to be called a moderating amendment, meaning that if somebody is on their website moderating the website, cleaning up the website, they should be given a good-faith acceptance. Let me just be clear. This amendment is a poison pill and will make it easier for those sites that are involved in sex trafficking to continue to do so.

Right now, under current law, there is a good-faith exception. There is a Good Samaritan exception under current law. We actually restate that in our legislation, to be absolutely clear, that if you are one of the good guys—a website online—who wants to be sure your site is not going to have these girls being sold that we talked about earlier, that you should be protected. However, this legislation, having restated the Good Samaritan provision, also says that if you are one of the bad actors, you don't have that protection. The first amendment that is going to be offered includes protections for some of the bad actors. It purposely strips the good-faith element, and I believe it would assist online sex traffickers rather than hold them to account.

For instance, if backpage or another website filters for illegal content and, as a result, learns that their site is being used for trafficking but ignores that activity, I think this amendment

would say that evidence could not be considered in a case against backpage. To me, that is wrong, and I hope the first amendment is going to be handled appropriately, which is to say, we don't want to weaken this bill or have a poison pill in here.

By the way, the law enforcement community represented nationally by their associations agrees with us, as do the victims groups, as do the groups who are concerned about the effect of trafficking on girls, women, and boys online. So we are together on this with all the outside groups.

The second amendment is going to be asking for additional Department of Justice resources specifically to combat online trafficking. I support funding to investigate and prosecute traffickers, of course, but we have to appropriate that funding in the proper manner. This amendment would be subject to a budget point of order because it is not going through the right process. The right process is the bill we are taking up the day after tomorrow, which will be the spending bill.

In fact, there are three budget points of order that the Committee on Budget in the U.S. Senate has found against this amendment. This amendment is subject to points of order. Every law enforcement group in the country opposes the amendment because as law enforcement said, it is a poison pill that is dead on arrival if sent back to the House. We have to defeat these amendments in order to have this legislation move forward. I hope my colleagues will all stick with us on that as they stuck with us through this process of getting the information, coming up with the right legislation, being sure we have the opportunity to take it to the floor and get it to a clean vote, get it to the President's desk and get it signed, and starting in a couple of weeks to be able to make a difference in the lives of the people we represent, stopping the online trafficking that is occurring and providing justice to those who are victims and survivors and ensuring that, indeed, justice can be served.

One of my colleagues has joined us on the floor. Senator NELSON is the ranking Democrat on the Commerce Committee that took up this legislation and clarified some points in the legislation. By the time he was done with it—and, by the way, he was a cosponsor of the legislation long before that—but by the time the Commerce Committee was done clarifying the legislation, listening to the testimony from both sides, he received a unanimous vote in committee. That doesn't happen very often, and I appreciate Senator NELSON being on the floor today. More importantly, I appreciate his leadership on the issue.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent additional material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
March 7, 2018.

MEMORANDUM

To: Hon. ANN WAGNER.

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Ex Post Facto Implications of the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017 (H.R. 1865), as Passed by the House of Representatives.

This is in response to your request for an analysis of the ex post facto implications of the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017 (FOSTA) (H.R. 1865), as passed by the House of Representatives in February, 2018. You expressed particular interest in the ex post facto implication of Section 4 as it relates to Section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (Section 230) (47 U.S.C. §230), originally enacted as part of the Communications Decency Act of 1996.

As discussed below, the Constitution's Ex Post Facto Clauses limit congressional and state authority to pass legislation that applies retroactively. Because Section 230(e)(5)(B) and (C) would amend the Communications Act to allow states to prosecute online facilitators of sex trafficking but would not create any new federal crimes or enhance the punishment for any existing federal crimes, the Ex Post Facto Clause does not appear likely to bar Congress from making these amendments. In addition, Section 230(e)(5)(A), which amends Section 230 to allow civil causes of action under 18 U.S.C. §1595 for 18 U.S.C. §1591 violations, does not appear to violate the Ex Post Facto, Due Process, and Takings Clauses.

DISCUSSION

Among other things, Section 230 of the Communications Act protects online providers of internet services from being treated as publishers of information provided by other entities. Section 230 states: "No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider." Section 230 does not bar criminal prosecutions under federal law.

Courts have found Section 230 to prevent states from enforcing state laws intended to reduce sexual abuse of minors. For example, in 2012, a court found Section 230 to bar state prosecution of an online classified advertising service pursuant to a state law that criminalized advertising commercial sexual abuse of a minor. Other courts have construed Section 230 to immunize online classified advertising services from civil liability.

Among other things, FOSTA is intended to clarify that Section 230 of the Communications Act does not protect providers and users of interactive computer services from federal and state criminal and civil laws relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking. The relevant substantive provisions FOSTA include:

Section 3 (proposed 18 U.S.C. §2421A), which would proscribe "promotion or facilitation of prostitution and reckless disregard of sex trafficking," authorize restitution, and provide a civil cause of action for the victims of such an offense;

Section 4, which would amend Section 230, to "ensur[e] [the] ability to enforce federal and state criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking";

Section 5, which would amend 18 U.S.C. §1591, which proscribes certain aspects of

commercial sex trafficking of children or by force, fraud, or coercion, by defining the term "participation in a venture";

Section 6, which would amend 18 U.S.C. §1595, which establishes a cause of action for damages and attorneys' fees to benefit victims of violations of 18 U.S.C. ch. 77 (18 U.S.C. §§1581–1597) (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons, including commercial sex trafficking), to allow state attorneys general to bring civil actions on behalf of victims of commercial sex trafficking.

Section 7, which would establish a savings clause relating to pending federal and state criminal and civil litigation.

Section 4 of FOSTA addresses the scope of Section 230's grants of civil and criminal immunity. It reads:

(a) In General.—Section 230(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) No effect on sex trafficking law.—Nothing in this section (other than subsection (c)(2)(A)) shall be construed to impair or limit—

"(A) any claim in a civil action brought under section 1595 of title 18, United States Code, if the conduct underlying the claim constitutes a violation of section 1591 of that title;

"(B) any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law if the conduct underlying the charge would constitute a violation of section 1591 of title 18, United States Code; or

"(C) any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law if the conduct underlying the charge would constitute a violation of section 2421A of title 18, United States Code, and promotion or facilitation of prostitution is illegal in the jurisdiction where the defendant's promotion or facilitation of prostitution was targeted.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred, or is alleged to have occurred, before, on, or after such date of enactment.

Section 4(b) clarifies that the Section 4(a) amendments apply retroactively, which raises the possibility of ex post facto issues. With respect to Congress, the Constitution provides that "No . . . ex post facto Law shall be passed," and, with respect to the states, the Constitution provides that "No State shall . . . pass any . . . ex post facto Law . . ."

Proposed Section 230(e)(5)(B) and (C)

Proposed Section 230(e)(5)(B) and (C) concern state criminal prosecutions. Section 4 of FOSTA would amend existing federal law to remove impediments to criminal prosecution under state law as described in proposed Section 230(e)(5)(B) and (C). Strictly speaking, it would neither create new federal crimes nor enhance the punishment for existing federal crimes. Thus, on its face, it would not appear to violate the Ex Post Facto Clause that binds Congress. Because Section 4 does not contemplate state enactment of retroactive legislation, it would not appear likely to violate the Ex Post Facto Clause that applies to states. It is possible, however, that an argument could be made that allowing prosecution for parallel state offenses effectively enhances punishments for 18 U.S.C. §1591 and proposed 18 U.S.C. §2421A violations retroactively.

The Supreme Court has considered two ex post facto cases that involved removing im-

pediments to state prosecution and punishment—*Stogner v. California* and *Dobbert v. Florida*. In *Stogner*, the Supreme Court found a California statute that attempted to revive expired statutes of limitations to violate the Ex Post Clause. The Court stated:

The second category [of *Calder v. Bull*'s inventory of statutes that violate ex post facto]—including any law that aggravates a crime, or makes it greater than it was, when committed—describes California's statute as long as those words are understood as Justice Chase understood them—i.e., as referring to a statute that inflicts punishments, where the party was not, by law, liable to any punishment. After (but not before) the original statute of limitations had expired, a party such as *Stogner* was not liable to any punishment. California's new statute therefore aggravated *Stogner*'s alleged crime, or made it greater than it was, when committed, in the sense that, and to the extent that, it inflicted punishment for past criminal conduct that (when the new law was enacted) did not trigger such liability.

In *Dobbert v. Florida*, the Court considered a Florida statute that sought to revive the death penalty. *Dobbert* had committed murder, then a capital offense, several months before the Court decided *Furman v. Georgia*, which invalidated Georgia's, and by implication Florida's, procedures for determining death sentences. After reinstating the death penalty with constitutionally valid procedures, Florida prosecuted *Dobbert*, and sentenced him to death. The Court found no ex post facto violation. "The new statute simply altered the methods employed in determining whether the death penalty was to be imposed; there was no change in the quantum of punishment to the crime." The Court explained further:

Petitioner's second ex post facto claim is based on the contention that at the time he murdered his children there was no death penalty in effect in Florida. This is so, he contends, because, the earlier statute enacted by the legislature was, after the time he acted, found by the Supreme Court of Florida to be invalid under our decision in *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238 (1972). Therefore, argues petitioner, there was no valid death penalty in effect in Florida as of the date of his actions. But this sophistic argument mocks the substance of the Ex Post Facto Clause. Whether or not the old statute would, in the future, withstand constitutional attack, it clearly indicated Florida's view of the severity of murder and of the degree of punishment which the legislature wished to impose upon murderers. The statute was intended to provide maximum deterrence, and its existence on the statute books provided fair warning as to the degree of culpability which the State ascribed to the act of murder . . . Here the existence of the statute served as an operative fact to warn the petitioner of the penalty which Florida would seek to impose on him if he were convicted of first-degree murder. This was sufficient compliance with the ex post facto provision of the United States Constitution.

Because Section 230(e)(5)(B) revives the prospect of state prosecution for conduct outlawed by 18 U.S.C. §1591, it seems analogous to *Dobbert* and critically distinct from *Stogner*. In *Stogner*, the defendant could not be prosecuted until the impediment was removed. Under proposed Section 230(e)(5)(B), defendants could be prosecuted before the impediment's removal if 18 U.S.C. §1591 proscribed the underlying conduct. In *Dobbert* and under proposed Section 230(e)(5)(B), the

defendant knew beforehand that government authorities considered the underlying conduct criminal and warranting punishment under the law.

Proposed Section 230(e)(5)(C) is different because dual state and federal prosecutions would only occur after proposed 18 U.S.C. § 2421A's enactment and, consequently, any conduct subject to revived state prosecution would not have been a federal crime when the conduct occurred.

However, Section 230(e)(5)(C) would create no new federal crime or enhance punishment for any pre-existing federal crime and only impacts state law. We have been unable to locate any case that indicates that the Ex Post Facto Clause limits Congress's legislative authority in such a situation.

Proposed Section 230(e)(5)(A)

Proposed Section 230(e)(5)(A) concerns civil causes of action. Section 230(e)(5)(A) would remove Section 230 bars to causes of action under 18 U.S.C. § 1595 and predicated on 18 U.S.C. § 1591 (relating to commercial sex trafficking) violations. Ex Post Facto Clauses ordinarily do not apply to statutes providing retroactive civil remedies. The Supreme Court has stated: "Because [the Court will] ordinarily defer to the legislature's stated intent, only the clearest proof will suffice to override legislative intent and transform what has been denominated a civil remedy into a criminal penalty." Section 1595 appears to be remedial in contrast to the criminal provisions in the same chapter of Title 18 of the United States Code, including Section 1591.

Retroactive civil remedial statutes raise Due Process Clause and, occasionally, Takings Clause concerns. The Court has not presumed retroactivity in civil cases unless such legislative intent is clearly indicated. When legislation is explicitly retroactive, the Court's due process analysis generally is more forgiving than its ex post facto analysis. The Court has stated: "Provided that the retroactive application of a statute is supported by a legitimate legislative purpose furthered by rational means, judgments about the wisdom of such legislation remain within the exclusive province of the legislative and executive branches." Section 230(e)(5)(A) appears to have a legitimate legislative purpose—to make facilitators of commercial sex trafficking compensate its victims and, having a narrowly drawn cause of action, its means appear rational.

In rare cases, retroactively imposing liability on private parties raises Takings Clause claims. The Court in a 5-4, plurality decision, *Eastern Enterprises v. Apfel*, found it unconstitutional to require coal companies to cover health care expenses of retired miners whom they had employed before exiting the coal industry. Four members of the Court found the legislation violated the Takings Clause because it "imposes severe retroactive liability on a limited class of parties that could not have anticipated the liability, and the extent of that liability is substantially disproportionate to the parties' experience." Justice Thomas concurred, but wrote separately to suggest revisiting whether to apply the Ex Post Facto Clauses in civil cases. Justice Kennedy concurred in the judgment, but maintained that a Due Process standard provided a more appropriate analysis. The four dissenters agreed that the Due Process Clause should control and that, accordingly, the legislation was constitutional. It is not clear, however, that Section 230(e)(5)(A) would impose retroactively the kind of massive, unanticipated civil liability at issue in *Eastern Enterprises*.

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his gracious comments.

I just simply want to say my part as to why it is so important that we pass this legislation, because it is very obvious that an untold number of women and children in the United States are being sold into sexual slavery via the internet, and we now have an opportunity to do something about it by passing this legislation.

It is so bad. With just a few clicks or a few punches on an iPhone, victims from all walks of life and across all parts of the country are being forced into brutal slavery and unspeakable crimes.

I want to repeat that. I want Americans to understand what is going on behind the scenes. Women and children are being forced into sex slavery in modern-day America. It could very well happen to someone you know.

We have continuing stories in our history of what happened when slavery was brought to the New World—first, to Arabia, off the East Coast of Africa, and then, of course, the European nations later were going down with their ship captains. The Portuguese actually ended up having the most slaves transported to the New World by way of South America. The English and most European nations got into the act of these unspeakable crimes, slave ships going down the west coast of Africa, enslaving Africans themselves or by agreement with a particular tribe that would go out and capture members of an opposing tribe.

We have heard, over and over, the untold stories of the inhumanity of stacking people body-to-body in the holds of these slave ships. It finally took a civil war to settle the issue. That was slavery. That was slavery we opposed and now all of our laws try to protect against, but here in modern-day America, the same thing is happening, and it is happening because of the advances of technology using the internet. If this is not a wake-up call, I simply don't know what is.

According to the human trafficking hotline, my State of Florida has consistently ranked in the top five States in human trafficking cases. Florida was third in the country for the number of cases reported in 2016 and 2017, and that is just what we know about. It is just unacceptable, and it is wrong.

Tens of thousands of Americans, predominantly women and children, are subjected to this horrific reality. You can imagine the pain and the suffering they are subjected to. No one in the country should have to endure this kind of forced slavery. No child or woman in Florida, in America, should ever be trafficked for sex. To even contemplate that should offend any person's sense of decency and humanity.

The question before the Senate today, thanks to the leadership of a number of our colleagues is, Why aren't we going to do everything we can to stop these heinous crimes?

The bill we are considering on the Senate floor would help us shut down despicable websites that enable this sex trafficking. Don't kid yourself. These shady and these highly profitable website operators know full well how their sites are being used. What is more, they are hiding behind a decades-old legal shield to immunize themselves from prosecution. We have to change that legal shield that was set up a decade ago for a different purpose.

The bill sponsored by Senators PORTMAN, BLUMENTHAL, MCCAIN, HEITKAMP, and myself—and now many others—would eliminate the safe harbor in law for sex traffickers, and it would allow State attorneys general, other State and local prosecutors, and the victims themselves to go after the websites that knowingly provide a platform for sex trafficking. It would also make key changes to Federal criminal law to enable law enforcement to better target websites.

The purpose of the legislation is simple. Let's get it passed, get it signed into law, and let all of these various law enforcement entities be able to do their job. This legislation is an extensive bipartisan product by our congressional colleagues. It proves, once again, what we ought to be doing around here on almost everything, and yet we rarely do. It proves, once again, that if you cross party lines and put things together in a bipartisan way, you can tackle the important, lifesaving issues, such as this one, and we can get something done. Let's show today that we can get something done that really makes a difference to Americans.

It is a privilege for me to be involved in a bipartisan way with this legislation and to have worked with our Commerce Committee to get a unanimous vote out of the committee. I hope this legislation is going to serve as a wake-up call to the morally bankrupt website operators: We are coming after you. It seems like every day there are new ways that many bad actors are exploiting internet content and data to undermine society.

Obviously, the internet has been magnificent for so many of us, but now when technology advances, you have to be on your guard about how new technology is used for the bad operators. This bill is going to address that. We can't sit by idly any longer. We have to act today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m., today, Senator WYDEN be recognized for up to 60 minutes to offer and debate concurrently his amendments

Nos. 2213 and 2212; that those be the only amendments in order; and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed with a 60-vote affirmative threshold required for adoption of each amendment; finally, that following disposition of those amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I am pleased to report that the appropriations package is currently being finalized. I will have more to say once the bill has been filed, but I am proud to announce it will meet a number of vitally important objectives. This includes the largest year-on-year increase in funding for our servicemembers in 15 years, along with major steps forward for law enforcement and border security, for the fight against opioid addiction, for our veterans, and for a number of other priorities.

Madam President, before we take up that measure, the Senate has a very important piece of business to tackle. This afternoon we will vote on the anti-sex trafficking legislation we have been considering this week. I want to thank Senator PORTMAN, who has worked hard to advance this reform, and Chairman THUNE, for shepherding it through the Commerce Committee.

Many of us have paid careful attention to the scourge of child trafficking over the years. It has been a high-priority issue for me, for example, since before I arrived in the Senate. But as traffickers move their crimes from the street corner to the smartphone, the data tell us unambiguously that more action is required.

The legislation before us reforms a misused provision in a 1996 telecommunications act, which currently shields companies that facilitate and profit from the disgusting exploitation of women and children.

Later today, my colleagues will have the opportunity to implement commonsense reform with the potential to change vulnerable children's lives for the better.

I urge every one of us to vote to pass it.

TAX REFORM

Now, Madam President, on a final matter, we have been talking for months about the ways tax reform is helping to jump-start the economy, bolster family budgets, and make life better for millions of Americans. Just a few months in, many such stories have already made front-page news—the tax reform bonuses, raises, and benefits for 4 million workers and counting; the new investments and new hiring from businesses large and small;

the bigger paychecks for middle-class Americans as the IRS withholds less of their money.

Other exciting parts of this once-in-a-generation reform aren't receiving the attention they deserve. Today, for example, is an initial deadline for States to nominate areas they would like to be designated as "opportunity zones." This is thanks to a provision incorporated into tax reform through the unflagging dedication of our colleague, Senator SCOTT.

The premise here is simple. The best way to breathe new life into struggling communities is not to invent some new Federal program; it isn't to throw government money into one more top-down, tax-and-spend scheme. No. The best way to help rural areas, small cities, and suburbs left behind by the Obama-era policies is to get the government's foot off the brake and let the free enterprise system flourish. It is to make those communities attractive places to do business, open new facilities, and create good-paying jobs. This is exactly what tax reform does by deferring capital gains taxes on income that is invested in distressed areas that receive this "opportunity zone" designation.

As one estimate has it, three-quarters of all the jobs created from 2010 to 2016 went to major metropolitan areas. Only 3 percent went to rural America. This provision could help change that.

I know there is a lot of excitement in my State of Kentucky. From coal country to farming communities and everywhere in between, Obama-era overregulation was holding our economy short of its full potential. These opportunity zones offer a shot at real relief. According to the Cabinet for Economic Development, Kentucky may designate as many as 144 new zones, prioritizing growth in areas that need it most.

Or take West Virginia. As my friend Senator CAPITO recently noted, her State understands the problem all too well. One recent study suggested that West Virginia has the third highest proportion of its population living in economically distressed communities. Opportunity zones will make a difference to her State. Of course, so will the rest of tax reform.

A few weeks back, Senator CAPITO reported that Worldwide Equipment in West Sulphur Springs plans to reinvest \$8 million in its operations, including more than 1,000 employee bonuses—all thanks to tax reform.

I imagine West Virginians are quite glad that Senator CAPITO used her vote to make tax reform a reality. It is a shame their senior Senator didn't follow suit. It is a shame that he and every other Democrat tried to block it from taking effect. Fortunately, this President and this Congress didn't let that stop us. We accomplished tax reform anyway because we are committed to fighting for all Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased to be on the floor this morning to thank and to support my colleagues, Senator PORTMAN and Senator NELSON, who have led the effort here before us, an effort that would end sex trafficking over the internet or certainly work to reduce it.

As we think about the scourge that is brought upon our children through a means and a way—we like to think of the internet as a powerful tool, but to know that it can be a powerful tool that truly is devastating to our children and devastating to our families calls for action. So I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues today in urging passage of the sex trafficking bill that we have before the Senate.

I think we all know there are many, many reasons why we need to deter the use of internet resources by predators. The wisdom of this is pretty apparent on its face. This legislation is for the protection of our children—the most vulnerable among us.

I have an additional reason for urging the adoption of this legislation, and that is the protection of Native women and girls from predators. I have been talking about the trafficking of Native women and girls for as long as I have been here in the Senate—now some 15 years. At first, the evidence was perhaps anecdotal. FBI agents who were familiar with trafficking patterns would come to us, and they would say that Alaska Native women were a highly desirable commodity. Even using that terminology is just so offensive, but that is how they were viewed—as a desirable commodity for sex trafficking because they could be trafficked either as White women or as Asian women.

There is a body of evidence that when many Alaska Native women or girls left their villages to go into town or to go to the city, they would literally be stalked by predators waiting to recruit them. We certainly see a prevalence of sex trafficking in Covenant House, which is our youth homeless shelter. We have reports that one in four homeless youth in Anchorage are victims of sex trafficking, and 42 percent of them are Alaska Natives.

As I have been here in the Senate over these years, the way these women and girls have been recruited, have been trafficked, has changed. No longer do you have the predators who are lurking, hanging out on the street corners, but it is the internet. Again, it is this powerful tool that is available to do so much good that is now being used for a predatory purpose. While we don't have the internet coverage in Alaska that you have in the big cities of the lower 48, the internet is used to recruit girls for sex trafficking all over, and I certainly had that confirmed in my last visit when I met with the FBI agents in charge in Anchorage.

It wasn't too many weeks ago that the Senator from North Dakota, Ms. HEITKAMP, and I came to the floor to talk about the urgency of addressing the growing number of missing and murdered Native women in America. Senator HEITKAMP characterizes the problem as epidemic, and I agree with her. I do think it is an epidemic. Native women are victims of violence in unprecedented proportions. Not all of these victims are trafficked, but some are trafficked, and then they go missing. When their services are no longer needed or they find themselves controlled by a particularly violent predator, they never become "unmissing" until their bodies may be coincidentally found, at which point they are finally regarded as murdered, gone.

I say today that there is an urgency to keep Native women and girls away from predators. While turning off the internet on-ramp to recruitment may not completely solve the problem, it is a worthy effort in its own right. It is one tool that we need to ratchet back.

We hear from the sponsor of this bill and from so many that enough is enough. It is no longer tolerable. It is time we attack the problem of sex trafficking at the source, and that means doing all we can to make the internet a very inhospitable place for sex traffickers and those who enable the immoral and disgusting trade of our fellow human beings.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1865, the anti-human-trafficking legislation currently being considered here on the Senate floor. Human trafficking is one of the fastest growing criminal enterprises in the world. More than 20 million people in our Nation and around the globe are affected by this modern-day form of slavery.

The criminals who carry out these heinous acts often go after the vulnerable, such as young people who have run away from home or are victims of domestic violence. Women and girls are disproportionately affected. According to the International Labour Organization, 55 percent of total victims worldwide are women and girls. Tragically, children are frequently targeted.

The perpetrators trap their victims in unconscionable and violent situations, forcing them to commit sexual acts against their will. This practice occurs in nearly every area code. It is happening closer to home than we even realize. A report published by Creighton University and the Women's Fund of Omaha found that there are 900 individuals for sale online every month in Nebraska—almost all of them female.

Our government has a responsibility to stand up and do something to protect women and children from exploi-

tation. Fighting the horrific scourge of human trafficking is a priority for me, and it is a priority for the U.S. Senate.

In 2015, we passed the Justice for Victims Trafficking Act, and it was signed into law. I was proud to be a cosponsor of that legislation. The bill set up a deficit-neutral fund to support trafficking victims. Through enhanced reporting and mechanisms to reduce demand, this law provides care for victims of trafficking and child pornography.

Importantly, the law also protects victims in court by treating traffickers as violent criminals. Labeling traffickers in this way means that convicts can now be detained while awaiting judicial proceedings. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act represents a strong effort by Congress to stand against human trafficking.

I am proud that, at home, Nebraskans are also rallying together and taking action to stop human trafficking. This past January, the Nebraska attorney general, Doug Peterson, launched Demand An End, a public awareness campaign to stop child sex trafficking. This campaign aims to build on the momentum from legislative bill 298, passed by the Nebraska unicameral, with significantly heightened penalties for those perpetuating and profiting from human labor and sex trafficking.

While I was a member of Nebraska's unicameral from 2005 to 2013, our State made several important legislative strides to address key policies related to human trafficking.

In 2005, the unicameral passed L.B. 111, which established the Missing Persons Clearinghouse in Nebraska. The law created a centralized database with information on individuals who went missing within our State.

Known as Jason's Law for an Omaha young man who went missing in 2001, L.B. 111 was an important advancement to ensure vital information sharing and to prevent the missing from becoming anonymous.

Additionally, in 2012, the unicameral passed the L.B. 1145 to increase penalties for human trafficking and establish a task force to examine issues in Nebraska pertaining to human trafficking, including its scope, possible solutions, and how to assist trafficking survivors. Most recently, I am proud to have joined the "Demand an End" campaign and offer my support of AG Peterson's work on this front.

Now is the time to build on these collective efforts and be responsive at the Federal level to stop this evil.

That brings me to the legislation before us today, the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA. I am grateful for the hard work of the Senator from Ohio and the Senate Commerce Committee in making it possible for us to be having this conversation today. Not only did this legislation pass com-

mittee, but it received a unanimous vote.

Last fall, during the hearing of the Senate Commerce Committee, Ms. Yvonne Ambrose shared a heart-breaking story with our Members. She told us about her daughter Desiree. Desiree was a wonderful young woman with much potential. She was a high schooler and a member of the Junior ROTC. She dreamed one day of becoming a doctor in the U.S. Air Force.

Like so many teenagers, Desiree was on social media because she wanted to connect with friends and make new friends. By accident, Desiree suddenly found herself in the shadows of the internet on a web page called backpage.com—a platform where men were able to find her, intimidate her, pressure her, and use her to make a profit. On Christmas Eve 2016, Desiree was murdered gruesomely by a 32-year-old man who bought her services online.

Sadly, Desiree's story is not unique. The murky edges of the internet are still enabling predators all over the world to engage in sex trafficking, meanwhile websites like backpage.com continue to sell and exploit people for profit.

Between January 2013 and March 2015, backpage.com earned nearly 100 percent of its profits from adult advertisements. The internet is giving criminals an avenue to commit these crimes, and certain websites are knowingly facilitating their activities as part of an organized network. Compounding the issue, smartphones make it easier for traffickers to complete transactions.

According to the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, reports of online child sex trafficking skyrocketed by more than 800 percent between 2010 and 2015. Analysis of this major increase showed that it is directly correlated to the increased use of the internet to sell children for sex.

In the months following Desiree's murder, a Chicago newspaper headline read: "Teen's tragic death shows it's business as usual at Backpage.com."

The internet can no longer be a place where the perpetrators of these atrocious crimes can hide. It can no longer be business as usual, and that is where SESTA's provisions come in.

SESTA would ensure that section 230 of the Communications Decency Act cannot be used as an excuse anymore for websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking. It also would give State law enforcement clear authority to enforce criminal statutes against websites.

I have been dismayed to hear about the obstacles State law enforcement has faced when attempting to prosecute entities knowingly participating in trafficking activities online.

In its current form, section 230 protects websites and internet service providers from liability for content their

users create. This has allowed websites that depend on user content, like Twitter and YouTube, to flourish, but it has been misused to effectively provide impunity for bad actors maintaining websites that facilitate sex trafficking.

SESTA is critical to empowering survivors, providing the legal tools needed to seek and receive justice from all those involved in these monstrous crimes. As a cosponsor of SESTA, I hope my colleagues will pass this monumental, bipartisan, and bicameral bill to combat human trafficking today, and I urge my colleagues to vote against amendments that would derail this important and vital legislation.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today the Senate is voting to pass legislation to crack down on bad actors who abuse the power and potential of the internet to prey upon the most vulnerable among us in human trafficking rings. Websites like Backpage are repugnant, and I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work in holding these bad actors accountable. I also applaud them for working to address the legitimate concerns of good-faith technology platforms that want to be able to engage in responsible content moderation and take steps to affirmatively stop abuses of their sites.

I am pleased to support this legislation because I believe it achieves the important balance between providing a mechanism to hold accountable sex traffickers while allowing free speech and innovation to continue to thrive. Key to my support is my understanding that this legislation would not allow nuisance lawsuits against technology companies—especially startups—based on bogus claims that they “facilitate” sex trafficking. It is also important to me that I believe the legislation as written does preserve Good Samaritan protections for platforms and website operators who engage in good-faith content moderation. Legitimate efforts to monitor for illegal content, shut down trafficking, or report suspected trafficking to law enforcement should not and cannot be the basis for liability under this legislation.

Finally, I want to note that I have heard concerns that this legislation could be misused or abused to penalize websites that promote important health and safety information to survivors of sex trafficking, including about HIV prevention and treatment, and provide access to community and peer support services. This information is particularly critical to the victims of sex trafficking and others who face high rates of violence and exploitation, like people who use drugs, people of color, and LGBTQ people. I believe the use of this legislation to create any liability for this important work would be an impermissible misreading of the statutory language and legislative intent.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, millions of men, women, and children across the world are victims of human trafficking. But it is not a problem that stops at our shores.

Eight years ago, I held a hearing in the Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law entitled, “In Our Own Backyard: Child Prostitution and Sex Trafficking in the United States” to raise awareness about this problem.

Sadly, not much has changed since then. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children receives about 9,000 to 10,000 reports of suspected child sex trafficking each year. It estimates that more than 80 percent of the trafficking incidents have occurred online. The worst offender is the website Backpage.com, which the National Association of Attorneys General has called a “hub” of human trafficking.

The U.S. Senate’s Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations spent 2 years looking into sex trafficking and its facilitation online. After a thorough inquiry, the subcommittee found that more than 93 percent of Backpage’s ad revenue in 2011 came from its so-called “adult” section, with projected revenue reaching nearly \$250 million by 2019. However, “adult section” is really a misnomer—many of Backpage’s ads were designed to sell children for sex.

One of those children was Desiree Robinson of Chicago. When she was 16, Desiree ran away from home. A pimp soon found her and sold her repeatedly on Backpage. On Christmas Eve, Desiree was taken to a garage to meet a john. Hours later, she was found dead in that garage. She had been raped and beaten, and her throat had been slashed.

Last year, Desiree’s mother, Yvonne Ambrose, testified before the Senate Commerce Committee about her daughter’s tragic murder. She described how her daughter was, quote, “preyed on and sold online by pimps who took advantage of her.” She went on to say:

On . . . December 24th, 2016, Desiree, my baby, was brutally murdered and now my life is changed forever. . . . If there were stricter rules in place for posting on these websites, then my child would still be alive with me today.

The truth is [that] Backpage.com and other sites are making millions of dollars by exploiting our children and allowing them to be taken advantage of by predators. If we don’t speak up now, these websites will continue to profit off trafficking our babies. It could be your child, your niece, your nephew, your cousins, your friend’s children next if you don’t stop this.

Yvonne went on to urge the Senate to pass the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA.

SESTA is a narrowly crafted bill that would ensure that Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act does not provide legal immunity to websites like Backpage that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking. For years,

Backpage and others have successfully exploited this loophole and avoided legal liability, despite hosting advertisements for the sale of sex acts with young victims of trafficking. Their ability to hide behind this reprehensible defense will come to an end with the passage of this bill.

SESTA was incorporated into House companion legislation called the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, or FOSTA. The House overwhelmingly passed this bipartisan, compromise legislation last month, in a 388 to 25 vote.

The combined legislation will ensure that victims and survivors of sex trafficking can seek justice against websites that knowingly facilitated the crimes against them. It would also enable state law enforcement officials—not just the Federal Department of Justice—to take action against individuals or businesses that violate federal sex trafficking laws.

The bill has been endorsed by major anti-trafficking groups, law enforcement organizations, and numerous technology companies.

We need to protect victims of trafficking, and we need to hold websites like Backpage accountable for their exploitative, criminal actions. As we prepare to vote on this bill, consider Yvonne Ambrose’s plea:

I would not wish this pain and hurt on my worst enemy. And I pray that Desiree’s life can make a difference, so no one else has to ever endure this pain again. I’m asking you, the U.S. Senate, to amend Section 230 and be the change you want to see in this world—not only for justice for Desiree, but for all of the countless Jane Does out here and the other little girls to come who don’t have a voice.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am voting for this legislation because, on balance, I believe it will provide important legal recourse to victims of sex trafficking and will help hold accountable those websites that seek to exploit them. Protecting these victims should be our top priority.

There have been concerns raised that this legislation may have an unintended—and harmful—impact on one of the key laws underpinning the free and open Internet. That key law is section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, CDA 230, which promotes free expression and innovation by protecting online platforms from a range of laws that might otherwise hold them unfairly accountable for everything their individual users may say and do online. This law defends free speech online and has encouraged innovations ranging from the earliest online bulletin board systems to today’s platforms for social media and user-generated video. Without the protections of CDA 230, the internet would be a very different place today.

Today’s legislation amends CDA 230 by, among other things, prohibiting

construing that law to limit Federal or State civil liability for conduct that involves “knowingly assisting, supporting, or facilitating a violation of” Federal child sex trafficking laws. Clearly, CDA 230 was never intended to be a shield to protect child sex traffickers, and it should not, but there is concern this legislation could potentially open up providers and websites who operate in good faith to new liability risks for what their users say or do, which could harm free expression. Also, the threat of this liability will fall especially hard on smaller platforms that have fewer resources to fight lawsuits, even ones without merit, which could harm innovation.

As a result, I do not take amendments to this core protection for free expression and innovation online lightly. I am voting in favor of today’s legislation because we must balance those possible risks against the very real scourge this legislation will forcefully combat: sex trafficking, including trafficking of underage youth. Just earlier this week, Senators COLLINS, HEITKAMP, and I reintroduced our bipartisan bill to curb youth homelessness and support young victims of trafficking, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. This is an issue I have long been committed to addressing. Today’s legislation represents a step in the right direction, and I will support it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the online sex trafficking legislation that is before us today. Immediately passing and sending this measure to the President’s desk will help ensure that children and youth are less vulnerable to human traffickers and others who would profit from this terrible crime.

This bill originally was introduced in this Chamber by Senator PORTMAN, and I salute him for his leadership on the issue of online sex trafficking.

Last year, I joined dozens of my Senate colleagues as a cosponsor of this measure after working with the Commerce Committee on the title 18 language in this legislation.

Senator PORTMAN, who chairs the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, introduced the earliest version of this legislation after his subcommittee produced a bipartisan report exploring the link between Backpage and online sex trafficking. Entitled “Backpage.com’s Knowing Facilitation of Online Sex Trafficking,” that report was the result of nearly 2 years of investigation by the subcommittee’s investigative staff. I encourage my colleagues to review the Senate report, which is posted on the subcommittee’s website.

It makes a very strong case for updating the Communications Decency Act and title 18 of the U.S. Code to protect children as the bill before us proposes.

I, too, have made ending human trafficking a top priority as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. One of the first major bills our committee produced in the 114th Congress, under my leadership, was the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. It established a new fund, comprised of assessments imposed on convicted offenders, to provide resources to serve victims of human trafficking. It also equipped prosecutors with new tools to fight the heinous crime of human trafficking. Senator CORNYN introduced that bill, and I was a cosponsor.

Last year, I sponsored legislation to extend the key programs authorized under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. Our committee cleared this bill and a related measure that Senator CORNYN introduced known as “Abolish Human Trafficking Act” in 2017. The Senate passed both bills without a single dissenting vote last September.

These two bills would extend the authorization for a number of the victim-centered programs that Congress established years ago as part of the original Trafficking Victims Protection Act. They also include provisions to promote greater education and awareness of human trafficking in the United States.

For example, the Senate-passed Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017, which I introduced, calls for training of judges, school personnel, and Federal investigators so that they can better identify and respond to human trafficking victims. It would authorize the U.S. Secret Service to offer investigative and forensic assistance to other law enforcement agencies. It would establish an Office of Victim Assistance within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and ensure that the office is staffed by trained victim assistance personnel. Lastly, the measure promotes coordination among and data collection by the Federal agencies that are tasked with helping human trafficking victims and bringing the perpetrators to justice.

The Abolish Human Trafficking Act, which I joined Senator CORNYN in introducing, ensures that victims will receive restitution, authorizes funding of investigations, and enhances penalties imposed for trafficking offenses, including sexual exploitation or abuse, sex trafficking of children, and repeat convictions for transportation for illicit sexual activity.

We currently are working with the other Chamber on a package that would include these two bills, a related measure introduced by Senator CORKER, and the House-passed version of legislation to renew and extend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. Sending this package of four bills and Senator PORTMAN’s online sex trafficking bill to President Trump for his signature sends a very strong message to human traffickers that we will not

tolerate the scourge of human trafficking in the United States.

I close by calling on my colleague to support the immediate passage of H.R. 1865 without any weakening amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, first, let me begin by expressing how honored and humbled I am to be a Member of this body and to represent the great State of Alabama.

Fresh out of law school in 1979, I began my career right here, working as staff counsel to Senator Howell Heflin on the Judiciary Committee. From when I served as a staffer, there are only three Members of the Senate who continue to serve today—Senator LEAHY, Senator HATCH, and Senator COCHRAN. Two of those three, Senators HATCH and COCHRAN, will be retiring this year—Senator COCHRAN, in just over a week—and a grateful nation thanks them for their service.

For me, personally, I am honored to have come full circle with them, from a young staffer to a junior colleague, and I wish them well in their life after the Senate.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for welcoming me to this body, many of whom are here with me today, braving the wintry weather outside. Thank you for your friendship, your advice, and your willingness to include me and my staff in the great work you are doing.

I particularly want to thank my senior colleague from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, and his staff. I appreciate their graciousness and patience in helping me as I navigate my new role as a freshman Senator.

I thank my family: my amazing wife Louise; incredible kids, Courtney, Carson, and Christopher, who so fully supported me in my quest to reach the Senate but more importantly in my life. I have grown with them and certainly because of them; of course, my sister Terrie; wonderful parents, who I am blessed to have around today; and my grandparents who are not. They instilled in me the values of family, faith, patriotism, respect for others, and a work ethic that has guided me throughout my life.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to pay special tribute to my mentor and former Senator whose seat I now hold—the late Howell Heflin of Alabama. He was a remarkable man whose large, lumbering frame and southern drawl would often mask his amazing intellect. His compassion and sense of justice for his fellow man forged a path for myself and so many others who worked for him over the years.

He came to the Senate in 1979, at a time when bipartisanship was more than just a campaign slogan or a sound

bite. In those days, when Senators spoke of bipartisanship, they truly meant it. They would never compromise principles but would compromise with their colleagues on the serious issues of the day in order to move this country forward.

By the time he left the Senate in 1997, Senator Heflin sensed a change in the political climate, and he was concerned about it. In a parting essay he wrote:

Our Constitution itself came about through a great series of compromises; it was not written by ideologues who clung to "their way or no." Compromise and negotiation—the hallmarks of moderation—aimed at achieving moderate, centrist policies for our country, should not be viewed as negatives.

This leads me to the reason I rise today. I want to speak about an issue that has evaded the broad bipartisan discussions and moderation that Senator Heflin spoke of. Instead, it seems to have been an issue where folks quickly take sides and often criticize those with whom they disagree.

It is time that we have a serious, pragmatic, and practical discussion—not a debate or negotiation but a dialogue on the steps that we can take to reduce the harm caused by gun violence in this country.

I know with just those words, people across this country may have already started reaching for their phones to start tweeting or posting without another word and without knowing where I might stand on this issue. That just seems to be the way it is in America these days, which is so unfortunate, because once you take a side, it is hard to come off.

In the wake of yet another mass shooting and the rising voices of young people across the country, it is our responsibility and our duty to have a serious discussion about guns and gun safety, but that conversation has to be twofold. We must acknowledge the deadly consequences that can follow when a gun is in the wrong hands but also recognize and respect the freedom to own and enjoy guns by law-abiding citizens, as guaranteed by the Second Amendment of the Constitution. Those two concepts are not mutually exclusive.

Before I jump into the actions I believe we can take today, I want to go back and explain a little bit about where I come from.

Growing up in Alabama, I learned to shoot from my father and grandfather. I was not much of a hunter in my youth, but whether it was cans or bottles on a tree log or the occasional skeet, we simply enjoyed shooting and always had a few guns in the house. The distinction between a hunter and someone who just enjoys guns and shooting is significant.

To this day, I still have my father's old .22 rifle, my grandfather's pistol that he gave me, and a couple of rifles

and shotguns I got as presents as a kid, but my interest in hunting began to grow when my youngest son Christopher was born, 20 years ago this past Monday. At an early age, he was fascinated with guns and hunting, so with my wife's blessing, I took up the sport so he could learn gun safety and conservation from me. Today I think I am more passionate about it than he is.

I consider myself an avid hunter—deer, turkey, quail, whatever the season might be in Alabama. With the campaign last year and transition into this office, this past deer season was somewhat of a bust for me, but with the start of turkey season, I am anxious to get back into the woods.

Frankly, I also enjoy guns. I enjoy shooting them. I like how they are made, the power, and their history. I own many of them, all stored in a locked gun safe that, quite frankly, is larger than what my wife initially approved of a number of years ago. Collecting them and shooting them at the range or hunting is a bond I share with my son Christopher and with many of my friends.

So while I know that guns and gun control are difficult issues in this country, I can tell you they are complicated for me, too, but as a U.S. Senator today, a Member of the legislative branch of government, I have many obligations, and I believe the first obligation of government is to protect its citizens.

We spend unimaginable amounts of money fighting our enemies abroad and terrorists who would attack us at home. Yet, on many levels, we fail our children and grandchildren every morning when we pack their backpacks and send them into harm's way or when they pick up what they think is a toy or a really cool weapon that they have seen on television or in the movies and it turns out to be a killing machine that they should have never had access to and don't know how to handle.

We fail the abused women, men, and children of our society when we let our family and relationship problems lead to a murder.

We fail parishioners in church, employees at work, and concert and theatergoers when they are caught off guard by a hail of bullets from a disturbed individual.

We fail those who are simply in the wrong place at the wrong time when street violence breaks out and a stray bullet takes an innocent life.

We fail veterans and others in society suffering from depression and post-traumatic stress and other mental disorders who decide that life is simply not worth living.

We fail people of every walk of life, of every age, and in every corner of this country, every day.

Gun deaths continue to rise. In 2016, over 38,000 people died in this country

because of gunfire. Almost 15,000 of those deaths were homicides. Almost 23,000 were suicides—epidemic-type numbers—and nearly 500 were accidental.

We have failed in Alabama, too. In the last few weeks, we lost a police officer in Mobile who was shot and killed when responding to a domestic dispute. We lost a 1-year-old boy who was accidentally shot in the back by his 2-year-old brother with their parents' gun. We lost a beautiful, young 17-year-old girl who was about to head off to college because one of her classmates brought a gun to school and he was showing it off when it was accidentally fired.

We lost a dedicated nurse at UAB Highlands Hospital when a disgruntled former employee showed up at the hospital and opened fire.

Just yesterday, as I was finalizing these remarks, I learned that a former client of mine was shot and killed by his girlfriend's brother as he was picking up his 3-month-old baby from a visit.

The list could go on. Similar tragedies take place every week in every one of our States.

These stories don't grab national headlines, but they are examples of the gun violence that has become commonplace in our communities.

In 2016, Alabama had the second highest rate of gun deaths in the Nation. That means that 1,046 Alabamans were killed by gun violence that year. Worse yet, our gun deaths increased by a staggering 34 percent between 2005 and 2016.

As a former prosecutor, I worked closely with law enforcement. I have seen firsthand what weapons in the wrong hands can do to families, communities, and society. When I was a U.S. attorney, we had a program called Isolating the Criminal Element, and we tried to crack down on illegal weapons in our communities.

As most of you know, my career has been defined by prosecuting the killers of children. It was September 15, 1963, when a bomb placed outside the ladies' lounge window of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham exploded, killing four beautiful young girls. I wish I could turn back time and do something that would have prevented it altogether. Had I or anyone else, at that moment, it might very well be one of those young girls giving this speech today and not me.

I stand in that moment now, and so do you, and so does our country.

I believe we have finally reached a tipping point regarding gun violence now—not because of the shooting in Parkland, FL, but thanks to the millions of young voices across this country, led by students at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

Much like the students who took to the streets of Birmingham in 1963, who were attacked by firehoses and police

dogs, who awoke the conscience of America to civil rights, these young men and women are awakening the conscience of America regarding gun violence. I am pleased that one of those young men, Alfonso Calderon, of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, is with me here as my guest in the Gallery today.

We could spend days in this Chamber debating the meaning of the Second Amendment. We could let our Nation further divide itself while more lives are lost. We can fret about what people are saying about us on social media or whether we might lose campaign contributions. We can again choose the path of inaction in the face of yet another mass shooting and expect different results, or we can take another path.

Let's find what we can agree on, act on it, and begin to make our country a safer place. We can be reasonable here because we all want the same thing—a safer country, a safer world.

At its core, the Second Amendment was an effort to protect Americans. Let us do the same.

But in order to do that, we need to build more trust in this body and encourage camaraderie. More importantly, we need to fundamentally change the way we talk about difficult issues in our country and set an example for our fellow Americans to follow and to dial down the rhetoric.

Remember that “for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction” is not just one of Newton's laws of motion, but it is also one of political rhetoric. Extreme views promote equal but opposite extreme views.

For those who want more gun restrictions instead of focusing your energy on banning a certain weapon—which, frankly, as a practical matter, just simply cannot pass this Congress—focus instead on efforts to keep those weapons and others out of the hands of those who would do us harm. You can't simply demonize the NRA and pro-gun groups.

While I know that these groups sometimes take what many, including me, consider extreme positions, they also represent millions of law-abiding gun owners who are concerned that their right to bear arms is at risk. For millions of Americans, gun ownership and enjoyment is a cultural issue with deeply held beliefs. Addressing that issue is simply not like regulating stock transactions or cutting taxes.

To those who would seek to maintain the status quo, like the NRA or anyone else, please stop using scare tactics to try and convince law-abiding gun owners that the Federal Government is hell-bent on taking their guns away. That is simply not going to happen and everyone knows it.

We also need to get past the idea that more guns in society will make us all safer. The statistics and the data sim-

ply do not support that. We don't need guns in the hands of schoolteachers.

Simply having more “good guys with guns” is not a solution. Americans just simply do not want to return to the days of the Wild West.

This topic, like so many others, has become a space that is less about having a thoughtful conversation and instead has evolved into a clash of cultures. As leaders, we must reject the “us against them” mentality because, ultimately, we are all Americans who are united by a common bond of shared values and love of country.

There will always be forces that seek to sow division and discord. Our challenge and our mission are to prevent them from succeeding.

We can seize this moment by changing the conversation in our country. Let's start a productive dialogue and work toward a comprehensive bill that includes ideas that we should be able to agree on. There are already a half dozen proposals in this body that have bipartisan support. My friend from Connecticut, Senator MURPHY, outlined them just the other day, but they bear repeating here.

Ban bump stocks and make it a crime to possess and manufacture them, as Senator FEINSTEIN has proposed. The President and the Department of Justice should be commended for taking the first steps through regulation, but the Senate of the United States of America should go on record about this deadly accessory.

We should pass the Fix NICS legislation proposed by Senators CORNYN and MURPHY. The NICS system is only as good as the data that goes into it. Their bill would block bonus pay for political appointees who fail to upload records to the NCIS system and reward States that follow the uploading plan. It would create a “domestic abuse and violence prevention program” to give States the ability to share information to prevent someone convicted of a domestic violence crime from purchasing a gun. Fix NICS is a good start toward overhauling our background check system and, as Senator MURPHY said the other day, it is a good base bill on which to build.

But, frankly, we have to do more on background checks. We have to require background checks on all gun sales, whether it is at a gun show or over the internet or between individuals. It can be as simple as going to a licensed dealer or a local police station to have a background check run on a prospective purchaser or a transferee. It may be inconvenient, but it will save lives.

With universal background checks, however, I would also suggest a couple of companion measures. For instance, in my view, it is entirely appropriate for a family member to sell or give a gun to another close family member, as they should be presumed to know whether their relative is prohibited from having a gun.

We can consider other exceptions for those who can produce a valid concealed carry permit or between law enforcement officers. But in carving out those exceptions, we should also increase both civil and criminal penalties for anyone who knowingly transfers a gun to a prohibited person and provide the necessary funds to the Department of Justice to prosecute those individuals when appropriate.

We can also take steps to deter prohibited individuals from even trying to purchase a gun. Senator TOOMEY's NICS Denial Notification Act would allow reporting to State and local authorities when someone has tried to purchase a gun and has been denied, and it would require DOJ to report to Congress on such prosecutions. To his credit, Attorney General Sessions has announced that the DOJ will vigorously prosecute those who make false statements in connection with their background checks. We should ensure that he has the resources to do so.

We should close the so-called Charleston loophole, as proposed by Senator BLUMENTHAL. This loophole allows a purchaser to receive a firearm after 3 days, regardless of whether their background check has been completed or not. We can create certain exceptions for concealed carry permit holders and others, but no one should be allowed to take possession of a firearm until they have cleared a background check.

Current law prohibits a firearms dealer from selling a pistol to anyone under the age of 21. That has been the law for many years, without any real challenge. The same logic behind this prohibition should apply to the sales of pistols and semiautomatic weapons to those under the age of 21.

Senator KLOBUCHAR has filed a badly needed piece of legislation to expand the definition of domestic violence to include dating partners and eliminate the “boyfriend” loophole that allows certain dangerous individuals to access guns and evade laws meant to protect domestic violence victims.

We can implement at least a 3-day waiting period for the purchase of any pistol or semiautomatic weapon, and we can increase penalties for those who steal firearms. States that have implemented waiting periods have seen significant decreases in suicides.

We can also repeal the Dickey amendment and open the door for new research on gun violence prevention. No one—no one—is happy when innocent people die because of a gunshot, and law-abiding gun owners should not be afraid of studies on how to reduce the number of gun deaths in this country.

We can do more to stop mental health issues from turning dangerous by allowing law enforcement or family members to seek a court order when an individual poses an extreme danger to

themselves or others and prevent them from getting access to firearms. Senators FEINSTEIN, BLUMENTHAL, and GRAHAM have all proposed versions of the extreme risk laws.

For too long, gridlock and partisanship have stood in the way of compromise. But I didn't come here to do nothing, and I don't think any of you did, either.

Today we face a difficult problem but not an insurmountable one. To find solutions, we must demand courage of ourselves and one another.

As history has shown, we face greater consequences with inaction—certainly greater consequences with inaction on gun violence.

So I have asked all of us to consider this question: What is our collective legacy as representatives of the American people and the Members of this hallowed institution? I believe it is to leave this body and our country better than we found it. We can only do that if we rise together to confront the unknown.

I have given talks all over the country about the prosecutions of the 16th Street Baptist Church bombing, and I am always reminded of a passage from the poem "The Cure at Troy," which was written by the Irish poet Seamus Haney as a tribute to Nelson Mandela. My friend Vice President Biden often quotes this passage, where Haney wrote:

History says, don't hope on this side of the grave. But then, once in a lifetime the longed-for tidal wave of justice can rise up, and hope and history rhyme.

With the convictions of two former Klansmen for the murder of those four young girls, the longed-for tidal wave of justice rose up, and hope and history rhymed in Birmingham, AL.

For me, and I hope for you, when I walk the halls of the Senate Office Buildings and I come through those double doors onto the Senate floor, I realize that every day we, as a collective body, have that same opportunity. Whether it is for Dreamers or voting rights or victims of sex trafficking or, in this case, our children who are demanding action on gun violence, we have the opportunity to build that tidal wave of justice and have hope and history align. But we have to have the courage to seize the moment.

I don't have all the answers on how to do it, but I am willing to work with each and every one of you to find them because that is why we were sent here—to find those answers, so that the tidal wave of justice will rise up. Please, let us work together to make it happen sooner rather than later.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my bipartisan group of colleagues who have been coming to the floor to talk about the very important

bill that we are debating and are going to be voting on here in about an hour; that is, to help protect our children all across this country from the horrible scourge of human trafficking and sex trafficking. The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act that we are debating right now is important for the whole country, and it is certainly important for my State of Alaska.

We have a big problem in Alaska with the challenges of domestic violence and sexual assault at some of the highest rates in the country. We also have a big problem with the challenges of human trafficking and sex trafficking. A lot of people think that doesn't happen in America. It happens in America. It is a horrible issue to talk about, but it happens in our country.

There was a study done last year on young men and women in Alaska receiving services from a homeless shelter for teenagers. My wife Julie actually works at this homeless shelter, and one in four girls and one in five boys who used the services of this teen homeless shelter reported being victims of sex trafficking. This is a horrible number for a very vulnerable society. We need to do more to address this issue.

In this legislation, we are taking the fight to one of the places in this country where human trafficking and sex trafficking are really exploding, and that is the internet. The bipartisan legislation we are debating right now will ensure that websites and other institutions on the internet and the companies related that knowingly—and that is an important word, "knowingly"—facilitate sex trafficking can be held accountable for their actions. It will also create new Federal crimes related to promoting or facilitating human trafficking over the internet and give more resources to State prosecutors to go after these heinous crimes.

In the remarks from a whole host of Senators this morning, I think we are seeing that we are going to make real progress in the fight against online sex trafficking without threatening the years of progress we have made in creating a free and open internet. Senator PORTMAN, one of the leaders of this effort, along with many others—Senator MCCAIN and his wife Cindy have been real champions and advocates for human trafficking issues throughout America; Senator BLUMENTHAL and so many other Senators have been saying that this is a commonsense, targeted approach to addressing this very big and growing problem.

We are going to vote in about an hour, and I hope all of my colleagues will do the right thing and vote on these amendments that are put out there as helpful amendments, but, to be honest, they are meant to bring down the bill.

We cannot allow our children, whether in Alaska or across the country, to

be lured into this kind of Hell—and the more we hear in terms of testimony, the more we recognize that what is going on over the internet in this area is Hell mostly for the youth of America.

Our children should not be sold online or anywhere else. Unfortunately, it is happening, and it is happening a lot, largely because of the internet. The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children reported, from 2010 to 2015, an 846-percent increase in the number of children being trafficked—an over 800-percent increase in America.

A lot of Americans think: Wait, really? That is a problem in Asia, Southeast Asia, or other countries. But it is a growing problem in the United States of America, and we need to address it.

As others have said on this floor, sex trafficking has moved from the street corner to the smartphone, where it is much more difficult to detect and much more difficult to stop, and it is one of the reasons we see this dramatic increase in rates of human trafficking in our country.

In the Commerce Committee, we had a hearing that covered this bill. Some members of the tech industry were opposed, but I think the overwhelming support that came out of that hearing was driven by the real-world tragedies we started to hear from hundreds—thousands—across the country that have occurred because of really lax laws and immunity on the internet that was not intended for companies or individuals who deal in sex trafficking and human trafficking. What we saw from the report and the investigations that Senator PORTMAN and others did was that actually was what was happening.

For example, Senator BLUMENTHAL earlier today talked about the very tragic, sad, and moving testimony we heard last September in the Commerce Committee from Yvonne Ambrose, whose 16-year-old daughter Desiree Robinson was trafficked online by a pimp on the website, backpage. She was later raped and murdered by a 32-year-old man who found her on that website. She was an American citizen, a 16-year-old girl. If you had watched her mom's testimony of in front of the Commerce Committee, you would be voting for this bill today.

Her mom ended her riveting and very sad testimony by saying: If there were stricter rules in place for posting on these websites, then my child would still be here with us today. It was a wrenching story and, unfortunately, one that too many American mothers and fathers are telling us.

We are going to vote on this today, and I hope all my colleagues vote for more progress. As the Presiding Officer knows, on this issue, there is actually positive progress that has been going on in the Congress. A lot of times,

when they read the news—my constituents back home in Alaska and Americans throughout the country—they are always hearing about conflict and how there is no progress in the Senate. We have some difficult issues; there is no doubt about it. But on a lot of issues there has been bipartisan progress, and in this area of human trafficking, there has been significant bipartisan progress to finally start addressing this growing problem in America—which, again, is remarkable when you think about it—of young men and women trafficked for sex in this country.

In 2017, we passed on a bipartisan basis the Abolish Human Trafficking Act; in 2015, we passed the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Both were introduced by my friend and colleague, Senator CORNYN of Texas. Senator THUNE has been a leader on these issues in the last couple of years in passing the No Human Trafficking on Our Roads Act and Combating Human Trafficking in Commercial Vehicles Act, which focused on the big problem we have seen in terms of the transportation system in America being used for human trafficking. In the Judiciary Committee, we passed Chairman GRASSLEY's bill, the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, which brought more services to victims of these heinous crimes.

We are making progress, no doubt about it. But—and this is a very important point—despite this strong record of addressing human trafficking, when it comes to these crimes, some of the biggest things we need more of in America to address them, because they are growing, are resources—resources. To put it bluntly, there are too many cases, there is too much of this happening, and there are not enough resources, money, or prosecutors to put the bad individuals who are doing this behind bars.

Many of these cases involving human trafficking are Federal crimes that usually require Federal prosecutors to go after these Federal offenses. As we all know, there are limited numbers of assistant U.S. attorneys and Federal investigators to do this. So what have we done? What have we done in the past few years? What are we doing today in this vote to help address this? We have begun to change this issue of resources to go after the perpetrators of these heinous crimes in a much better way by allowing State attorneys general and State district attorneys to actually prosecute these crimes, even though they are Federal crimes. We are doing something in the law that says: We need more prosecutors, we need more investigators, and we need more resources. Let's unleash those in the States to help us address this growing problem throughout our country.

So we are doing that, and we did it for the first time in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act in 2015. This

bill, for which Senator CORNYN was the lead, actually incorporated a bill that I had authored and had a lot of cosponsors on called the Mann Act Cooperation amendment. We put that in as part of the broader bill in 2015.

The Mann Act is the Federal law that makes it a criminal offense to transport someone across State lines for the purposes of prostitution and human trafficking. In my experience back home in Alaska, as attorney general, we had challenges in this regard. As a matter of fact, there was a very notorious case of a bad man—a very corrupt man—who a lot of people knew in Alaska, and he was engaged in this kind of activity with young girls from the Native villages in my State. We investigated it and realized that he violated not a State law but a Federal law. It was very clear that it was a human trafficking violation of the Mann Act.

When I was attorney general, my office went to the Feds, and we said: Here you go. Here is the evidence. This guy violated the Mann Act. He is a bad man. He should go to jail. We need to send a signal.

It is a rather long story. It is a sad story. But for whatever reason—I have wondered for years, and I have looked into this for years—the Federal Government wouldn't take the case.

I said to the Feds: Then, let my prosecutors take the case. We will take the case. You just need to cross-designate us. Let the State attorney general's office take these Federal laws and prosecute them against this guy. We will do it.

They still didn't allow us to do it. There were rumors in Alaska: Hey, what was going on here? Was there some kind of deal cut between the Feds and this guy who was a really bad guy and who was in jail for something else?

When I got to the Senate, I said: We are not going to let that kind of injustice happen again.

That was an injustice. A man who violated the Mann Act and clearly committed the crime of human trafficking is a free man right now. That shouldn't be the case.

As part of the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Act in 2015, we had a provision. My bill essentially said this: If a State attorney general brings a Mann Act case—a human trafficking violation case, Federal case—to the Attorney General of the United States, saying that we need to be cross-designated to prosecute—maybe the Feds don't have the resources; maybe they don't have the time—then, the Attorney General of the United States shall allow the cross-designation for more State attorneys general to prosecute these cases, unless it would undermine the administration of justice. That is in the law. State attorneys generals right now can go prosecute Mann Act cases. That is more resources, more investigators, and more prosecutors.

That is going to be in the law that we are voting on today. One of the elements—an important element—of the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, which we are voting on and debating now, is to allow State attorneys general the power and the authority to bring actions against those who violate Federal law for internet-based sex trafficking.

We are bringing the resources in these kind of cases. That is an important innovation in the development of the bill that we are voting on today. Just like in the previous legislation, State attorneys general can now bring these cases. If we pass this law today, that will mean more resources, more investigators, and more prosecutors for the perpetrators of these heinous crimes. To all the bad guys out there who are undertaking these crimes, when we vote to pass this legislation today, that is going to be a bad day for you because we are going to have more resources and the ability to put you in jail with this vote today.

As I mentioned, we have a big problem in this country. We have a long way to go in terms of human trafficking, sex trafficking, which is hitting all parts of America. Congress is focused on it, and I am hopeful that we will pass this legislation this afternoon for one more step in the right direction on addressing this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

COMMENDING SENATOR JONES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks on the legislation before us, I wish to compliment our new colleague, Senator JONES, on a superb maiden speech. I thought he was so gracious when he remembered Senator Heflin. I served with Senator Heflin, and I think Senator JONES is going to be very much in that tradition. I want to take a quick minute and commend our new colleague for launching his time in the Senate in an extraordinary way.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2212 AND 2213

Mr. President, I call up amendments Nos. 2212 and 2213, as provided for under the previous order, and I ask unanimous consent that they be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] proposes amendments numbered 2212 and 2213.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2212

(Purpose: To clarify that efforts of a provider or user of an interactive computer service to identify, restrict access to, or remove objectionable material shall not be considered in determining the criminal or civil liability of the provider or user for other material)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EFFECT ON LIABILITY OF EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY, RESTRICT ACCESS TO, OR REMOVE OBJECTIONABLE MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) EFFECT OF EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY, RESTRICT ACCESS TO, OR REMOVE OBJECTIONABLE MATERIAL.—

“(A) EFFECT ON CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LIABILITY GENERALLY.—The fact that a provider or user of an interactive computer service has undertaken any efforts (including monitoring and filtering) to identify, restrict access to, or remove material the provider or user considers objectionable shall not be considered in determining the criminal or civil liability of the provider or user for any material that the provider or user has not removed or restricted access to.

“(B) EFFECT ON PROTECTIONS.—The protections under paragraphs (1) and (2) are not limited by or contingent upon an interactive computer service provider’s—

“(i) moderation of content; or

“(ii) use of particular content moderation practices.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred, or is alleged to have occurred, before, on, or after such date of enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2213

(Purpose: To provide additional funding to the Department of Justice to combat the online facilitation of sex trafficking)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROTECTING SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS FROM CRIMINAL WEBSITES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Protecting Sex Trafficking Victims from Criminal Websites Act”.

(b) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS.—Out of funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Attorney General, for use in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to investigate and prosecute website operators that criminally facilitate sex trafficking or the sexual exploitation of children.

(c) AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED.—Amounts appropriated under subsection (b) shall remain available until expended.

(d) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—

(1) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this section shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(2) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this section shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my hour begin now for speaking on this subject. We are a bit behind, but not much. I ask unanimous consent that the hour that has been assigned to me begin at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I stand on the Senate floor today in firm agreement with my colleagues that the Congress must do more to combat the scourge of sex trafficking. It is a profound and tragic failure of American institutions that trafficking continues to plague our country and, in fact, has actually increased.

Federal law enforcement has failed to root out and prosecute the traffickers, even when they have been operating in plain sight. So, too, have the big internet companies failed when it comes to sex traffickers who operate on their platforms.

I fear that the legislation before the Senate now is going to be another failure. I fear that it is going to do more to take down ads than to take down traffickers. I that fear it will send these monsters, these evil people who traffic beyond the grasp of law enforcement to the shadowy corners of the dark web, a place where every day search engines don’t go, and it is going to be even easier for criminals—these vicious traffickers—to find a safe haven for their extraordinarily evil acts.

In many respects, this debate mirrors one the Congress went through a little bit more than 20 years ago. Back then, I think it would be fair to say that not many Senators knew much about the internet. In 1995, this body had a laudable goal. The Senate said it wanted to protect kids from accessing pornography online, but the result of those good intentions was, unfortunately, a bad policy—a policy called the Communications Decency Act of 1996.

Behind that policy was a fundamental misunderstanding of both the architecture of the internet and the modern application of the First Amendment. The law didn’t just go after those targeting pornography to minors. It took speech that was legal in the real world and made it illegal online. And it produced a paradise for the legal trickster, creating new ways to sue over speech and adversely affecting scores of Americans, medical providers, artists, writers of literature, and more.

As should happen with poorly written policy, all but one part of the Communications Decency Act was struck down by the Supreme Court. The one piece of the law left standing was section 230, which I coauthored with former Congressman Chris Cox. What section 230 was all about was laying out the legal rules of the road for the web. There were innovative new businesses sprouting up all over and novel forms of communication and media connecting and informing people in new ways. But it seemed clear that a quick way to strangle this promising set of developments in their infancy was for these new companies to be held legally liable for every piece of content that users posted on their platforms.

When section 230 was written, nobody could have foreseen all of the effects. Here is what we did know back then. First, we wanted small businesses to start out focusing on hiring engineers, developers, and designers rather than worrying about how they had to hire a team of lawyers.

Second, we wanted to make sure that internet companies could moderate their websites without getting clobbered by lawsuits. I think Democrats and Republicans would agree that this is a better scenario than the alternative, which means websites hiding their heads in the sand out of fear that they would be weighed down with liability.

Third, we wanted to guarantee that bad actors would still be subject to all of the Federal laws. Whether the criminals were operating on a street corner or online wasn’t going to make a difference, and we were determined to state that explicitly.

Fourth, we wanted to protect the internet from the whims of State and local legislators. This body has the authority to regulate interstate commerce.

I would ask any of my colleagues to offer an example of how something could be more interstate than the internet.

It may not satisfy some publicity-seeking local official when we talk about the Federal Government’s role here, but there is no question that the role of the Congress, in its leading on something that is clearly interstate in nature, is in the best interest of the American people.

For the most part, the framework worked better than I ever imagined it would. As a result of section 230, the small, gutsy entrepreneur—say an entrepreneur in North Carolina—who has a big dream of working out of his garage has a real shot at succeeding. Marginalized groups of vulnerable Americans have a better opportunity than ever to make their voices heard because of section 230, and small non-profits have the ability to take their causes nationwide.

One scholar, David Post, even wrote that the 230 law created \$1 trillion worth of economic value in the private economy. He said: “It is impossible to imagine what the Internet ecosystem would look like today without it.”

My wife saw that article, looked at me and said: Well, dear, even a blind squirrel occasionally finds an acorn.

Setting aside spousal kidding, to illustrate why the protection that comes from section 230 is so important, I turn next to what things would be like without it.

Imagine if you are starting a forum site that is dedicated to discussing knitting. If ever there were a topic that sounded drama free, that would be it. Yet suppose somebody goes on the site and shares a pattern he didn’t have

the right to share. Suddenly, your website is facing a copyright infringement lawsuit. Maybe the controversy—knitting versus crocheting—gets overheated, and the users start trading barbs. Suddenly, you have people slinging defamation suits at your itty-bitty forum host. Then somebody is injured by an automatic needle threader he reads about in a comment thread. Suddenly, you are a codefendant in a liability suit—all because you didn't have the protection of section 230.

Imagine how hard it would be to launch a platform that would be open to the discussion of any topic when even the simplest, most narrowly focused website on the internet can become a magnet for lawsuits. There are not enough lawyers in the world to handle all of that litigation, and my sense is we will have a lot of constituents who will say: Thank God.

In the absence of section 230, the internet as we know it would shrivel. Only the platforms that are run by those with deep pockets and an even deeper bench of lawyers would be able to make it.

Moreover, section 230 is not just about hobbies and commerce. It protects the coordination of free speech, particularly among vulnerable groups of Americans. That is the reason organizations like the libertarian Cato Institute, the progressive Human Rights Campaign, and the ACLU have voiced serious concerns about the legislation before the Senate. You sure don't see those three groups lined up side by side very often, but they are here now. It is because, without the protections of section 230, civic organizations that exercise their right to free speech could be cowed by their more powerful political opponents.

For this example, imagine that a nonprofit organizes a campaign in support of a local ballot measure. It uses social media to build awareness and promote upcoming rallies and events with online discussion boards. Yet, without section 230, powerful interests that are opposed to its work can just swoop in and effectively silence that nonprofit with an onslaught of litigation. Hostile individuals could pose as supporters and make comments on the nonprofit's website that would expose the group to liability suits. I think it is pretty obvious that there would be an enormous, chilling effect on speech in America.

I ask unanimous consent that the statements from the Cato Institute and the ACLU that are in opposition to the legislation now before the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From CATO at Liberty, Feb. 27, 2018]

THE DEATH OF AN OPEN INTERNET

(By John Samples)

Today the House votes on the Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act (FOSTA), a piece of

anti-sex trafficking legislation. It follows and incorporates an earlier effort by the Senate, the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act (SESTA). The bill at issue today is actually a last minute amendment by Representative Mimi Walters (CA) that brings the worst elements of SESTA into FOSTA, creating a hybrid bill far worse than the sum of its parts. This bill has grave consequences for an open, competitive internet and for some people who use it.

Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act has long shielded internet service providers from liability for user generated content, facilitating the internet we know today. FOSTA would likely reduce these protections. FOSTA creates a new federal crime tied to the intent to promote sex trafficking using the internet. Alone, this might be considered an acceptable, narrowly tailored measure. However, the Walters amendment incorporates SESTA's "knowingly" standard of liability, which withholds CDA Section 230 protections from sites "knowingly assisting, supporting, or facilitating" sex-trafficking. SESTA's standard requires no intent to facilitate sex trafficking, relying upon the mere knowledge that one's app or blog has been used by bad actors.

Preemptive action, driven by effective platform moderation and cooperation with law enforcement, remains the most efficient way to combat online sex trafficking. Unfortunately, FOSTA's incorporation of SESTA's "knowingly" standard would stymie this collaboration. If a platform attempts to prevent sex trafficking by removing and reporting offending user generated content, it risks establishing that it had knowledge of the content, rendering it liable for anything that might slip through the moderation process. Instead of encouraging platforms to combat sex trafficking, SESTA's "knowingly" standard punishes private attempts to prevent the problem, and cripples broader attempts at effective content moderation.

A combined FOSTA/SESTA would benefit established social media platforms and trial lawyers at the expense of an open internet while doing little to prevent sex trafficking. Facebook may be well resourced enough to cope with the increased legal risk imposed on hosts of user generated content, but their nascent competitors are not. Attempts to avoid running afoul of the "knowingly" standard will likely lead to greater reliance on automated filtering.

Other issues have not received the attention they merit. Libertarians (and others) often distinguish law from morality. What is immoral need not be illegal. American law in many jurisdictions does not honor that distinction and criminalizes exchanging sex for payment. Some members of Congress seem pleased this bill will better enforce those laws against people who voluntarily engage in such exchanges.

The consequence of doing so, however, should please no one. Members believe this bill will likely drive women who sell sex for a living off the internet. For them, that is a feature not a bug of the bill. But those engaged in the sex trade are unlikely to give up their work. Instead they will end up on the streets. Why does this change of venue matter? Between 2002 and 2010, Craigslist introduced an "erotic services" section on its front page which was used almost exclusively to advertise illegal sex services. Three economists found that this section led to a 17.4 percent reduction in the homicide rate of the women in the relevant jurisdiction. They also noted "modest evidence" that the Craigslist section reduced female rape of-

fenses. The economists concluded this reduction in violence came from the women moving indoors and matching more efficiently with safer clients. This potential increase in violence and murder should give pause to even those who deem selling sex immoral.

Congress has worked on these bills for some time through their committees. Now both bills have been thrown together, brought to the House floor, and are expected to become law, all in a week or so. Instead of this rush, the House Judiciary Committee could have finished its work, and the whole House debated and voted on the measure. The Senate and House then could have conferred and perhaps produced a bill acceptable to all. That would be "regular order" for Congress in lawmaking. It has once again been ignored.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2018.

Re Oppose H.R. 1865—The "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act".

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) writes to express its opposition to H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act," also referred to as FOSTA, which passed the House on February 27 and may be considered by the full Senate in the coming days or weeks. The bill is a serious, yet unsuccessful, attempt to stop the use of the Internet for sex trafficking without hindering online freedom of expression and artistic innovation. Tech experts say that a thriving Internet requires retaining certain liability protections for online platform providers. Victims' rights advocates, on the other hand, say the sex trafficking problem requires narrowing those protections. The bill misses the achievable legislative opportunity to do both, and in particular leaves the Internet exposed to the uncertain impact of changed protocols on the part of platform providers.

For nearly 100 years, the ACLU has been our nation's guardian of liberty, working in courts, legislatures, and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties that the Constitution and the laws of the United States. With more than 2 million members, activists, and supporters, the ACLU is a nationwide organization that fights tirelessly in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, DC for the principle that every individual's rights must be protected equally under the law, regardless of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or national origin.

The risks to the Internet as the world's most significant marketplace of ideas outweigh the uncertain benefit of the bill to the fight against sex trafficking. Accordingly, ACLU opposes the bill. While the language of H.R. 1865 has been improved to address some of the ambiguities creating the most significant risks, ACLU remains concerned that the bill, if enacted, will foster an atmosphere of uncertainty among online platform providers. This uncertainty will inhibit the continued growth of the Internet as a place of creativity and innovation.

The ACLU has long supported maintaining the statutory immunity provisions of section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to promote freedom of speech and expression. Section 230 became one of the key

factors enabling the robust expansion of Internet-based speech, communications, and commerce. It is a critical factor in maintaining the Internet's diverse ecosystem of speech and art and advancing economic and political dialogue. The rationale for liability protections for online providers is that they should not suffer criminal or civil liability merely for creating online fora to which others may post content, even when some of those communications turn out to be offensive or even unlawful. Any liability should be on those who create and post that content.

We opposed FOSTA's predecessor bill, an onerous bill that would have drastically curtailed protections for online publishers. FOSTA was revised in the House through the efforts of a broad cross-section of victim advocates, law enforcement, and tech experts. The current version creates a new federal facilitation of prostitution crime, but would still impact liability protections for online providers. As finally approved, it also incorporated key aspects of the Senate version of the bill.

ACLU opposed the Senate version of the bill, the "Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act" (S. 1693, SESTA), but also acknowledged improvements incorporated prior to final committee approval. In particular, the modified version of SESTA heightened the intent standard needed to establish a criminal violation—a key distinction separating a typical online platform provider from one that might inject itself into the online content being posted to its platform. Also, in authorizing state prosecutions notwithstanding the federal liability protections for online platforms, the bill would limit state prosecutions to those where the behavior violated the federal law.

The changes to both the House FOSTA bill and the Senate SESTA bill were the result of concerted advocacy efforts by Internet and other tech experts who testified about the critical importance played by section 230 protections. In the days before the section 230 protections were adopted over two decades ago, online providers were subject to lawsuits for allowing the posting of content. The threats were so financially significant that providers would simply bar the posting of third party content, knowing they could never fully insulate themselves from liability except by blocking all content that might be offensive to some. Since the adoption of section 230, online providers have been free to curate their sites' content without fearing liability for what others post.

Even with the improvements in both bills, ACLU continued to oppose both measures because the risks to the vibrancy of the Internet as a driver of political, artistic, and commercial communication is real and significant. Moreover, there is little to suggest that current law could not be used to find and punish the bad actors who are truly facilitating online sex traffickers. In fact there is at least one pending federal court case that makes this very argument. There are a host of state laws outlawing such behaviors and current liability protections are intended to protect only those who are simply providing a channel for others to use, not those who are determining what is posted and who have a malicious intent to do harm to others. Finally, ACLU is concerned that the scope of the bill's language will encompass the actions of sex workers who have no connection to trafficking whatsoever within its enforcement, including effective harm reduction and anti-violence tactics. Such an outcome is directly contrary to the aims of

bipartisan criminal justice reformers who seek to limit the over-federalization of crime where such crimes already exist at the state level.

For the foregoing reasons, the ACLU opposes H.R. 1865 as approved by the House of Representatives. It poses a risk to freedom of speech on the Internet as we have come to know it while purporting to solve a problem that could be addressed in other ways.

If you have questions or comments about ACLU's position on this legislation, please contact First Amendment advisor Michael Macleod-Ball.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,
National Political Director.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the fact is that section 230 was never about protecting the incumbents. I have spent my time in public service taking on a wide array of powerful, established interests. When I wrote this policy, I never envisioned a Facebook, but I did hope it would give the little guy and his startup a chance to grow into something big. The bottom line—the central point here—is that it worked.

Despite the fact that section 230 undergirds the framework of the internet as we know it today, there is a significant effort underway to try to take it down, to collapse it. That is, largely, because the big internet companies—the biggest ones—have utterly failed to live up to the responsibility they were handed two decades ago. I am going to explain exactly what I mean.

For these big companies, section 230 is both a sword and a shield. It offers protection from liability, but it also gives companies the authority and, more importantly, the responsibility to foster the sort of internet Americans want to be proud of. In years of hiding behind their shields, these big technology companies have left their swords to rust. Too many companies have become bloated and uninterested in the larger good, and when they have taken positive steps, as Wikimedia has, for example, their practices haven't been adopted by their peers.

I will describe one case study that was reported last week by the tech news website Motherboard.

In 2012, the website Reddit, on which individuals form communities where they share and discuss content, cracked down on users who posted non-consensual photos of women. These have come to be known as "creepshots." The website Tumblr did not sufficiently police the same inappropriate content, so these reprehensible communities simply relocated from Reddit to Tumblr, and this creepshot problem lived on. That is how easy it is for the creators of vile content to move from one platform to another.

Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart famously observed that he couldn't define hardcore pornography, but he knew it when he saw it. Congressman Cox and I may not have known exactly what content we intended for sites to

be able to take down when we wrote section 230, but I sure know it when I see it. Far too often, the big internet companies refuse to know it even when they see it.

A huge amount of that which populates social media networks each day is every bit as destructive and socially corrosive, if not more so, than the pornography at issue in that famed Supreme Court case. It is the creepshots, the sex trafficking ads, the conspiracy videos about school shootings, and anti-vax nonsense—nonsense that endangers the public health and more.

The tech giants state that no one could track the millions of posts or videos or tweets that cross their services every hour. Nobody is asking them to do that—nobody. Section 230 means they are not required to fact-check or scrub every single post or tweet or video, but there have been far too many alarming examples of algorithms that drive vile, hateful, or conspiratorial content to the top of the sites that millions of people click on every day. Companies seem to aid in the spread of this content as a direct function of their business models.

It is perfectly reasonable to expect some greater responsibility from these giant, multibillion-dollar corporations that were able to thrive as a result of protection that they were guaranteed by law. That was the idea behind section 230. That doesn't carry any obligation to suppress free speech, but it is definitely about being a responsible citizen, a responsible member of the community.

Sites like Facebook, YouTube, and Tumblr constitute the entire internet for millions of users who click through the same group of sites every single day. They have an undeniable role to play in fostering a civil environment. Their failure to do so could very well mean that the internet looks very different 10 years from now, not just for those who spread hateful and conspiracy-driven filth, but for the millions of decent people who use the internet to learn, to find entertainment, and to keep in touch with loved ones.

There was a time when the biggest internet companies had mottos like "Don't be evil." Perhaps it is time for them to aspire to a more modest motto: "Don't spread evil."

With all of that said and done, it is not just the internet companies that fail to properly respond to the challenges of our times. When it comes to sex trafficking, which is the underlying issue the Senate is working on today, our country has failed the victims at almost every level.

(Mr. COTTON assumed the Chair.)

For example, the Justice Department could have and absolutely should have investigated the website backpage years ago for its role in promoting sex trafficking; but the fact is, the Federal Government fell down on the job.

Backpage's activities were no secret. In the absence of action by the Department of Justice, a Senate subcommittee, led by our colleagues Senators PORTMAN and MCCASKILL, conducted their own investigation and subpoenaed key documents. Among those documents were emails that appeared to show that backpage was actively working with sex traffickers to create advertisements. That meant backpage was not due protection under section 230. In fact, a lawsuit in Boston was given the go-ahead based on that precise finding. It has been widely reported that the Justice Department now has its own investigation underway, although it is coming years and years too late. This should have happened eons ago. This is only one example of where the government's efforts have fallen short.

Now, following what I have described, the twin failures of the big technology companies and Federal law enforcement, this body is responding to a very serious moral challenge with flawed policy changes. In my view, the legislation before the Senate will prove to be ineffective, it will have harmful, unintended consequences, and it could be ruled unconstitutional.

I take a backseat to no one when it comes to policies that fight sex traffickers, bring them to justice, and help the victims of their hideous crimes. I have used my position on the Senate Finance Committee to be one of the authors of laws that support victims and provide ongoing funding paid for by those convicted of crimes against children. I have worked with our colleagues, Senator CORNYN, Senator PORTMAN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, to write laws to improve the child welfare system to help prevent kids from becoming victims in the first place. I put my record up against any Member of this Congress when it comes to passing laws that while definitely not going far enough, begin the effort to provide the tools to fight this scourge, but the bill before us today is not going to stop sex trafficking. It is not going to prevent young people from becoming victims, and I am going to describe why that is the case.

First, as I mentioned earlier, the Department of Justice takes the view that an important provision in the bill is unconstitutional. In my judgment, that is another issue that Congress ought to address before sending a bill to the President's desk, but instead it looks like everybody will drive it through as is.

Second—and this is an astounding development—the legislation before the Senate is going to make it harder, not easier, to root out and prosecute sex traffickers. Let me read what the Department of Justice has said recently that proves that this bill is going to make it harder to root out and prosecute sex traffickers. The Department

of Justice recently said this legislation would “effectively create additional elements that prosecutors must prove at trial.” Colleagues, I will just state we are heading in the wrong direction if we have legislation that would raise the burden of proof in cases against sex traffickers. Imagine that, with nationwide concerns about the evils of sex trafficking, the Department of Justice has said this bill would actually raise the burden of proof in cases against sex traffickers.

The Department of Justice wrote a letter to Chairman GOODLATTE of the House Judiciary Committee that lays out the concerns I have just described.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Justice Department letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Washington, DC, February 27, 2018.

Hon. ROBERT W. GOODLATTE, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter presents the views of the Department of Justice (Department) on H.R. 1865, the “Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017.” The Department supports H.R. 1865. We applaud House and Senate legislative efforts to address the use of websites to facilitate sex trafficking and to protect and restore victims who were sold for sex online. The Department appreciates this opportunity to provide technical assistance to ensure that these goals are fully met through narrowly tailored legislation. The Department also notes that a provision in the bill raises a serious constitutional concern.

Every day, trafficking victims in America appear in online advertisements that are used to sell them for sex. The Department works diligently to hold the traffickers accountable for their crimes but faces serious challenges. This is due in part to the high evidentiary standard needed to bring federal criminal charges for advertising sex trafficking, but also because the Communications Decency Act (CDA), codified at 47 U.S.C. 230, bars our state and local partners from bringing any criminal action that is inconsistent with that section. H.R. 1865 addresses both issues and would take meaningful steps to end the industry of advertising trafficking victims for commercial sex.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Section 3(a) of the bill creates 18 U.S.C. 2421A, a new federal offense that prohibits the use or operation of websites (and other means or facilities of interstate commerce) with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution. The bill also provides for an aggravated felony if the defendant recklessly disregards that the crime contributed to sex trafficking as prohibited by 18 U.S.C. 1591(a). Section 2421A would stand as a strong complement to existing federal laws.

However, the Department notes that Section 2421A as originally drafted is broader than necessary because it would extend to situations where there is a minimal federal interest, such as to instances in which an individual person uses a cell phone to manage local commercial sex transactions involving

consenting adults. Therefore, the Department would support amending the language of Section 2421A so that Congress can clarify its intent to target traffickers using or operating interactive computer services, as follows (with a corresponding change to 2421A(b)): “Whoever, using a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, owns, manages, or operates an interactive computer service, as defined in Section 230(f) of Title 47, United States Code, or conspires or attempts to do so, with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.”

The Department believes that any revision to 18 U.S.C. 1591 to define “participation in a venture” is unnecessary. Section 1591 already sets an appropriately high burden of proof, particularly in cases involving advertising. Under current law, prosecutors must prove that the defendant knowingly benefitted from participation in a sex trafficking venture, knew that the advertisement related to commercial sex, and knew that the advertisement involved a minor or the use of force, fraud, or coercion. See *Backpage.com, LLC v. Lynch*, D.D.C., Civil Action No. 15-2155, Docket 16 (Oct. 24, 2016). While well intentioned, this new language would impact prosecutions by effectively creating additional elements that prosecutors must prove at trial. In the context of the bill, which also permits states to bring actions for conduct equivalent to Section 1591, we are also mindful that this language could have unintended consequences as applied by the states.

Section 4 of H.R. 1865 also sets forth critical revisions to the CDA to permit state prosecutors to bring criminal actions related to sex trafficking and the use of the interact with the intent to promote or facilitate prostitution. The Department believes that the existence of this exception to the CDA will alter the landscape of the industry involved in advertising prostitution.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONCERN

We note that Section 4 of H.R. 1865 states that the changes to the CDA “shall apply regardless of whether the conduct alleged occurred [sic], or is alleged to have occurred, before, on, or after such date of enactment.” This raises a serious constitutional concern. Insofar as this bill would “impose[] a punishment for an act which was not punishable at the time it was committed” or “impose[] additional punishment to that then prescribed” it would violate the Constitution's Ex Post Facto Clause. *Cummings v. Missouri*, 4 Wall. 277, 325-326 (1867); see *Beazell v. Ohio*, 269 U.S. 167, 169-170 (1925); U.S. Const. art I, § 3. The Department objects to this provision because it is unconstitutional. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to address this serious constitutional concern.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views in support of this legislation. We hope this information is helpful, and we look forward to continuing to work with Congress on this important legislation. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may provide additional assistance regarding this or any other matter. The Office of Management and Budget has advised us that from the perspective of the Administration's program, there is no objection to submission of this letter.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN E. BOYD,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, that is not the only problem when it comes to

enforcing this law. The bill before the Senate is focused on taking down on-line advertisements, not on catching criminals or protecting victims. Taking down the ads doesn't mean the pimps and predators will stop and say: Oh, good; we see what the Senate is doing. We are now going to start following the rules. When the ads come down, colleagues, the criminals will go as fast as they can to the darkest corners of our society. Instead of stopping trafficking, the bill is going to push it to the dark web, the dark alleys, and overseas. You can't get to the dark web with traditional search engines.

Career Federal law enforcement officers, the expert investigators, are the people who know how to root out the traffickers under these circumstances. They have expertise that State and local law enforcers don't have. So my view is, by handing new authorities to local officials, the bill moves in the wrong direction.

In my view, the right approach is to make sure career, expert Federal law enforcement officers and investigators have the resources they need to get the job done. One of the amendments I will be offering today provides \$20 million a year for 5 years to the Attorney General to spend in coordination with the FBI and Homeland Security to investigate and prosecute those who criminally facilitate sex trafficking. The bottom line, if Senators want law enforcement to do a better job of stopping those like backpage, my amendment gives the right people the resources they need to bring these monsters to justice.

I heard my colleague from Alaska, Senator SULLIVAN, a good friend, talk at some length about how important it was to have resources to fight the scourge of these traffickers who get more and more sophisticated. They are people who are very clever about staying out in front of the law. When they are on the dark web, it is going to take resources to fight them and put them behind bars. So our colleague from Alaska, Senator SULLIVAN, sure ought to be for this amendment because this amendment offers real money right now to prosecute these monsters and get them behind bars.

Finally, the bill before the Senate punches a hole in the legal framework of the open internet. I don't every single day quote the editors of the "Wall Street Journal," but I have always had a motto that I will shout out anybody when they are right. The Journal recently summed up the impact of the bill. They said this is definitely going to be an online "lawsuit bonanza." They predict any website that "should have known" criminal activity took place on its platform will be a target for lawsuits. Any message board or chat room where users interact with each other can become a new target for litigation.

Without specific protections for companies that make good-faith efforts to find and stop criminal behavior on their platforms, this legislation could actually punish companies that try to moderate their users' posts but let something slip through. Just by looking for illegal material, a website could be setting the table to be sued over anything they didn't find.

The second amendment I will be offering would clarify this issue. It is what is known as the Good Samaritan clause, and we felt strongly about it several decades ago. The companies decide, as a result of a poorly written bill, that their only option is to put their blinders on and ignore vile, illicit content. That is bad for everybody except for the criminals. So I want to eliminate that uncertainty, and I want particularly these small startup companies that are so important for our future to know, without a doubt, that they have the right to moderate the content users post.

So, in technical language, what this amendment says is, neither the presence nor the absence of an attempt to moderate content online can, by itself, trigger liability.

The Journal raised more than the Good Samaritan issue. Just as bad, by passing this exception to section 230, courts might make it harder to prosecute websites for other crimes. Here is what the Wall Street Journal editor said: "If Congress provides a carve-out for sex trafficking, courts might conclude that Section 230 was intended to be applied narrowly for other crimes and make it harder to prosecute websites [that are] complicit."

I do fear this bill is going to set off a chain reaction that leads the Congress to cut away more categories of behavior from section 230, dismantle the legal framework that has given the United States the position as a tech economy superpower. This position did not happen by osmosis. It happened because 20 years ago there was an effort to try to lay out a sensible legal foundation, a sensible legal basis for the internet, and that is what is under attack today.

If this legislation that chips away at section 230 is a bad idea for the internet, if you are following this debate, you probably want to know why the biggest internet companies are big cheerleaders for it—the big companies like Facebook. It is because it will pull up the ladder in the tech world, leaving the established giants alone at the top.

As I said, section 230, from the beginning, was all about giving the little guy the best possible chance to succeed. That is what this has always been about. The big guys can take care of themselves. We want to have a policy that encourages innovation for the startups. That has been a bedrock of my time in public service. Chipping away at the law that is going to curtail

the culture of innovation and bare-knuckled competition that has been the defining characteristic of the internet for more than two decades doesn't make any sense to me.

The companies that have reached the top of the internet's economy are kind of worried about whether they are going to be able to keep their place at that altitude. Regulators once feared that Microsoft would dominate the way Americans interacted with the internet, but then a little company called Google appeared on the scene. Facebook, a half-trillion-dollar company got out of its infancy by displacing a competitor called MySpace.

I think colleagues ought to know that these established companies would do just about anything to avoid being displaced themselves. Facebook is trying to make clear that they will do just about anything not to become another MySpace.

Today, Facebook is under attack for allowing the Russians to interfere with our elections. They are under attack for giving hate groups a platform to spread their bile. They are under attack for giving conspiracy theorists, through their algorithms, a platform to lure in the unsuspecting. They are under attack for collecting, monetizing, and storing far more personal information than their users ever suspected. It is a great tool for connecting with family and friends, but it is also something a small team of well-cafeinated coders could duplicate and improve upon in terms of its functionality without a lot of difficulty and without some of the baggage Facebook has picked up over the last 6 months.

So how do they stay on top? One way is to acquire the competition. Young people always tell me that nobody under 30 uses Facebook. The new generation certainly uses Instagram, so they might not even know that it is part of the same megacompany bought out by Facebook. But you can't buy everybody, so then you go to the oldest trick in the book—make it harder for new companies to get in the game. You don't have to compete if there is no competition, and that is where this legislation comes in.

If internet startups are no longer protected by section 230 and they are exposed to the threat of near constant litigation, it is going to be a lot tougher for them to secure injections of funding and grow. Fewer venture capital firms will be willing to risk their deep pockets if their early-round investments are swallowed up by legal fees instead of paying for coders. But in the eyes of the giant, established corporations, a world without section 230 isn't seen as much of a threat. The \$50 million a year in liability statements for these big companies is a drop in the bucket for them. It is the cost of doing business. And it is an added benefit if

the cost is too high for new companies to be able to get in the game.

The biggest of these internet companies are trying to hold on to their position at the top with all their might, and they are certainly very interested in using the government to do it. That has been true of a lot of industries before them, and it should come as no surprise that it happens again in the technology area.

The Facebooks of the world will tell you how important section 230 was to the innovation of the last 20 years. Yet there are technology companies like IBM that haven't done a lot of innovating for the last 20 years that want to see section 230 done away with entirely for trumped-up reasons. So, for business, let's not mistake what this debate is all about for a lot of these big, multinational companies. It is not about right or wrong; it is about dollars and cents.

So what does the future hold? As the Wall Street Journal observed, a lawsuit bonanza is in the works. It is pretty ironic that a Republican Congress and a Republican President are going to create the biggest new source of opportunities for trial lawyers in decades.

For the technology business, this bill means bigger is better—not better for innovation, not better for consumers, but better for the profits of those lucky enough to have reached the top of the mountain first.

It is safe to expect a slew of proposed new exceptions to section 230. When somebody is injured, they and their families want recourse, but our legal system is woefully bad at delivering justice. It is unfortunately far better at facilitating deals—often unjust deals—because numbers are far easier than doing right. This failure means that a line of injured parties will be petitioning to seek the sort of recompense only their Member of Congress can provide.

For America, section 230 is very likely the reason we have a multitude of billion-dollar internet employers and the Europeans have exactly zero. Where countries aren't hiding behind the trade barrier of the great firewall or other artificial market forces, American innovation has won out over the rest of the world.

I think it is pretty hard to see our country thrive and prosper without the kind of legal foundation I have described today, without these 230 protections. And a whole host of scholars have pointed out that this is a unique law in the world. It is the case where the United States got the temperature right from the beginning, and it has led to our dominance in tech. But if the United States goes out and puts all those cracks—those potential cracks, the real cracks—into the foundation of section 230, I would wager that there are plenty of other countries that are going to change their laws to siphon

away our companies and take the jobs they create.

The fact is—and I am not sure we in the Senate think about it every day—we are in a fight for the internet literally every day. Our internet companies aren't engaged in the fight. Their interest is currying favor with nations with which they wish to do business. The Chinese, the Iranians, the Russians, even our European allies are maneuvering to impose a more repressive view of speech and expression on individuals around the world, and unfortunately it has a lot of allies here at home.

Free speech has never been free, and it is often not popular. It was wrested from the grip of a dominating state, and it ought to be—it must be defended by every generation, lest the state reclaim control.

Today, in my view, the Senate is looking at taking a real step backward and down a path that this body will regret.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the budget point of order and the motion to waive, there be 2 minutes, equally divided, prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2213

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 2213 offered by Senator WYDEN would violate the Senate pay-go rule by increasing the on-budget deficit. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this measure pursuant to section 4106(a) of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this is in relation to an amendment that has been offered by my colleague Mr. WYDEN. It has to do with funding for the Department of Justice dealing with trafficking. I appreciate the intent behind it, but I will tell you, as one of the letters from the law enforcement com-

munity, who are opposing this amendment, said, this is a poison pill. This will derail this in the House of Representatives.

We have law enforcement from the Fraternal Order of Police, the National District Attorneys Association, and from all of the national groups opposing this amendment because they believe it is so important to pass the underlying legislation and to do it now to provide the justice that the victims of human trafficking deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I believe strongly that Congress must do more to combat the scourge of sex trafficking and bring these monsters to justice and actually put them behind bars.

I have heard my colleagues from the other side talk again and again about how more resources are needed to fight this evil. This is the only proposal offered to actually put more dollars into the hands of prosecutors to get the criminals behind bars, and it is going to be harder to prosecute them now that they have moved to the dark web.

My colleague has said that prosecutors are against it. It is because my colleague has worked as hard as he could to tell prosecutors that if anything like this is added, it is going to die in the House. Let me just tell my colleague that when we put in more money to prosecute these monsters and it passes, the other body will pass it in about 15 minutes.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the only amendment that actually is going to put these criminals behind bars because we are putting real money into that effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 21, nays 78, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Booker	Hirono	Peters
Cantwell	Jones	Sanders
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall
Gillibrand	Merkley	Van Hollen
Heinrich	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—78

Alexander	Blunt	Cardin
Baldwin	Boozman	Carper
Barrasso	Brown	Cassidy
Bennet	Burr	Cochran
Blumenthal	Capito	Collins

Corker	Heller	Reed
Cornyn	Hoeven	Risch
Cortez Masto	Inhofe	Roberts
Cotton	Isakson	Rounds
Crapo	Johnson	Rubio
Cruz	Kaine	Sasse
Daines	Kennedy	Schatz
Duckworth	King	Schumer
Durbin	Klobuchar	Scott
Enzi	Lankford	Shaheen
Ernst	Lee	Shelby
Feinstein	Manchin	Smith
Fischer	McConnell	Sullivan
Flake	Menendez	Thune
Gardner	Moran	Tillis
Graham	Murkowski	Toomey
Grassley	Murphy	Warner
Harris	Nelson	Warren
Hassan	Paul	Whitehouse
Hatch	Perdue	Wicker
Heitkamp	Portman	Young

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 21, the nays are 78.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak to the body for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2212 WITHDRAWN

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in my view, it is clear that when colleagues face so much political headwind, they don't feel comfortable supporting something I know they all believe in very deeply. I believe every Senator believes there ought to be real money to go after sex traffickers. I have spoken to colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and they have taken a real pounding on these amendments. My sense is that there would also be opposition to what I think is another practical, good idea, which is the Good Samaritan amendment.

As I have stated, because I anticipate having to turn back to this topic in short order after the effects of this bill become clear, I am going to save this topic for a vote at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 2212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remaining amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, with that amendment having been withdrawn, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided, prior to the vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I strongly urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation. Most of

you are cosponsors already. It strikes the right balance. It helps to allow victims to get the justice they deserve and, lastly, to hold these websites accountable through prosecution, while at the same time protecting the free and open internet.

I would like to yield my remaining time to my coauthor and colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I say thank you to my colleague Senator PORTMAN for his hard work. When we began this legislation, no one gave us a chance because of the entrenched and powerful interests against us. This measure will unlock the courthouse doors to survivors and to law enforcement who can stop sex trafficking—a scourge, modern-day slavery in this country. I thank so many of my colleagues for cosponsoring it and for helping to lead this effort that will make a difference in the lives of countless young girls and women and men who are victims and survivors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as I stated several hours ago, I stand firmly with colleagues who believe more must be done to fight the scourge of sex trafficking and, particularly, to put these monsters behind bars. The bill before us, in my view, takes a flawed approach. What is going to happen is that the criminal sex trafficker is going to head toward the dark web. This is a place you cannot access with a traditional search engine. It is going to be harder when they are in the shadowy corners of our country, of the internet, in order to prosecute them. It is also going to chip away at the foundation of the net, which is so important for vulnerable people. It is why the Human Rights Campaign Fund has made it clear that they are opposed to the bill. We shouldn't be putting at risk vulnerable groups and small startups.

Given that, I believe that this bill, which will clearly pass, will be something the Senate will come to deeply regret. I will be opposing the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Gardner	Nelson
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Brown	Heinrich	Rounds
Burr	Heitkamp	Rubio
Cantwell	Heller	Sanders
Capito	Hirono	Sasse
Cardin	Hoeven	Schatz
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Isakson	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Cochran	Jones	Shelby
Collins	Kaine	Smith
Coons	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corker	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Leahy	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Udall
Daines	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Feinstein	Murkowski	
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—2

Paul

Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The bill (H.R. 1865) was passed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 596 and 671.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The bill clerk read the nominations of David J. Ryder, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Mint for a term of five years; and Thomas E. Workman, of New York, to be a Member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council for a term of six years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Ryder and Workman nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, during Women's History Month, as we celebrate the mothers, daughters, sisters, and, for some of us, the granddaughters in our lives, I would like to take a minute and honor a few women from my home State of Illinois.

During the nearly 170-year history of the New York Times, only about 15 to 20 percent of its obituaries have been written for women. Earlier this month, the New York Times announced a new feature called "Overlooked," celebrating the lives of people from underrepresented communities. March, being Women's History Month, the New York Times started by publishing obituaries for 15 women who never received them. The first on the list: Ida B. Wells. Now, Ida is not from Illinois, but her incredible life's journey brought her to Chicago near the end of the 19th century, where she lived until her death in 1931.

Born into slavery, less than a year before the Emancipation Proclamation, Ida B. Wells was an intrepid journalist and a trailblazing activist in the Civil Rights and woman's suffrage movements. Ida was recognized worldwide for her writings exposing the truth behind why Black men were being lynched in the South. Ida B. Wells' work forced her from her home in the South, and after traveling to New York and England, Ida settled in Chicago.

Among her many accomplishments, including helping launch the National Association of Colored Women and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Ida B. Wells became an early pioneer in social work, fighting for justice and equality. Following her death, the Chicago Housing Authority, recognizing the need for affordable housing for African Americans in the late 1930s, began a project to provide 1,662 apartments, two and three story row houses, sitting on 47 acres of land in the Bronzeville and Oakland neighborhoods of Chicago. They were named the Ida B. Wells Homes. She certainly left her mark in Chicago.

Not far from my Chicago office, Ida B. Wells is among the 65 women honored in the Chicago Women's Park & Gardens. The park also includes a beautifully moving monument called "Helping Hands," recognizing the contributions and legacy of Jane Addams, one of the world's most influential social reformers.

In 1888, Jane Addams and her friend Ellen Starr visited a settlement house called Toynbee Hall in the slums of London, which provided a variety of services to poor industrial workers. It sparked what would become their lifelong mission helping the poor and championing the rights of all, including immigrants, women, and children. Jane Addams and Ellen Starr were determined to bring that model to the United States, which was emerging as an industrial giant and in the early years of an immigration boom.

In 1889, Jane Addams and Ellen Starr returned to Chicago and started Hull House, the first settlement house in the United States. Its humble beginnings started by simply inviting people from the community to hear readings from books or look at slides of paintings. They listened to those who came, and it became clear that many of the neighborhood's women were in desperate need for a place to bring their children. So they started a kindergarten and daycare for working mothers. As it expanded, Hull House helped prevent the exploitation of immigrants living on the West Side of Chicago by providing services such as housing, child, medical aid, educational, and vocational classes.

In addition to her contributions in the field of social work, Jane Addams was known as one of the leading antiwar activists in the country. During World War I, she became the chair of the Women's Peace Party and president of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Jane Addams' efforts to end the war earned her the 1931 Nobel Peace, becoming the first American woman to receive the honor.

In the spirit of these remarkable women, I would like to fast forward to today and mention the work of two of my heroes who belong to the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas religious order: Sister JoAnn Persch and Sister Pat Murphy. Between the two of them, they have nearly 200 years of doing God's work here on Earth. As was true in Jane Addams' day, immigrants, refugees, and individuals seeking asylum so often arrive in our country and communities with urgent needs: food, clothing, shelter. For years, they have supported immigration reform, marching at rallies, speaking at news conferences, and lobbying Illinois State senators and representatives in Springfield. They have become so well known in immigration circles, they are simply known as "the Sisters."

In 2007, when "the Sisters" were told they couldn't provide pastoral counseling to immigrant detainees in jails and in the Federal Immigration Detention Center on Broadview, they said: "We'll see about that." So they founded the Interfaith Committee for Detained Immigrants, or ICDI. The next year, the ICDI persuaded the Illinois General Assembly to change the law and allow immigrants, refugees, and asylum-seekers in detention in my home State to receive pastoral counseling, if they choose, and they didn't stop there. ICDI has since grown to provide a broad range of services to immigrants who are detained and those who are awaiting action on their cases, from legal assistance and help learning English, to healthcare, and more. ICDI also runs two hospitality houses in the Chicago area, one for men and the other for women and children in Hyde Park. I have seen the good work being done in Hyde Park, and let me tell you, Jane Addams would be proud.

I will close with a story about one of the many families that ICDI has helped: the Saffaf family. Four years ago, Marwan Saffaf was a banker, living with his wife and their four children in Hama, Syria, a town about 85 miles from Aleppo. This was 2 years into Assad's bloody assault on the Syrian people. Marwan knew that he and his family had to leave Syria after he was kidnapped and threatened by gunmen who mistook him for a government official. The family fled to the United Arab Emirates.

After 2 years, Marwan received permission for most of his family to come to America. But for some reason, his eldest child—his only daughter—was denied permission to join her younger siblings. So Marwan and his wife made one of the hardest decisions of their lives. Marwan and the boys would come to America. His wife and daughter would wait in the UAE for permission to join them. With help from ICDI, Marwan and the boys found a new home, an apartment in Des Plaines, IL, and landed a new job.

Two years after Marwan and his boys arrived in Chicagoland, Marwan's wife and daughter finally received permission to come to America. Then came President Trump's first Executive order—banning immigrants from seven majority-Muslim nations—including Syria—from entering the United States. Marwan's wife and daughter's future in this country was unclear. Fortunately, the President's order was blocked, and after 2 years of living apart and in fear, the Saffaf family was finally reunited. Thank goodness for "the Sisters" and ICDI.

We could use more strong, courageous women like Sister JoAnn Persch and Sister Pat Murphy who fearlessly follow in the footsteps of trailblazing women like Ida B. Wells and Jane Addams. This March, as we once again

honor the women who have moved this country forward and inspired each of us, let's renew the challenge to build on their legacies and fight for the country they envisioned.

RECOGNIZING SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today I would like to honor the exceptional impact made by America's small business development centers on the small business community. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I recognize the importance of the work done by the nearly 1,000 small business development centers across America. This SBA resource partner works tirelessly to support the backbone of our economy, and we thank them for their significant contributions to our small business community.

America's small business development centers, or SBDCs, provide our country's small businesses with high-quality consulting and educational programs, at low or no-cost to the entrepreneur. With centers in all 50 States, this network supports both established small businesses and developing entrepreneurs alike. SBDCs help America's entrepreneurs develop and execute individual business plans tailored to fit their needs, experience, and level of business acumen.

SBDC staff understand the unique local challenges of entrepreneurship specific to their area which is one of the many things that sets their services apart. This tailored approach benefits nearly 500,000 entrepreneurs a year and creates over 95,000 jobs annually. Additionally, sales growth in SBDC clients averages 13.6 percent, a rate four times greater than the national average. These statistics demonstrate America's small business development centers' dedication to excellence, and I congratulate them on their hard work.

In my home State of Idaho, the Idaho small business development center is determined to help businesses grow with consulting and training. Last year, the Idaho SBDC achieved a return on investment of five to one, and created over 1,300 jobs. Their network served over 1,600 clients and helped start more than 100 businesses. One of these clients is House of Design, a robotics and systems firm located in Nampa. House of Design offers engineering consulting, robotic system, and machine vision integration services across a variety of industries. Shane Dittrich, the owner of House of Design, believes that his company would not be where it is today without SBDC assistance. Since its inception in 2008, House of Design has grown into one of the top engineering firms in the region and now partners with multiple firms across Idaho to produce high-quality engineering and robotics products.

House of Design is an example of both the unique entrepreneurial spirit of Idaho as well as the impact SBDCs have on small businesses across America.

I would like to thank and congratulate America's small business development centers for their efforts this past year. The support they provide to small businesses across our country is considerable, and it is my pleasure to recognize today, the March 21, 2018, as SBDC Day. I wish them the best of luck and continued success as they move forward in their work to enhance American entrepreneurs.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today, as the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I wish to recognize America's small business development centers, SBDC, and the vital role this national business assistance and counseling network plays in supporting economic development, job creation, and success at our Main Street small businesses.

The mission of the nationwide SBDC network is to help America's entrepreneurs realize the dream of businessownership and assist existing small businesses in adapting to the changing marketplace and compete in the global economy.

SBDCs are hosted by universities, colleges, and State economic development agencies and funded in part by our Small Business Administration. There are nearly 1,000 SBDC service centers and 4,000 SBDC consultants available to provide free and low-cost business consulting and training to help entrepreneurs write a business plan, access capital, market their products, and recover when a disaster strikes.

SBDCs offer a great return on investment for taxpayers. It is estimated that SBDC small business clients create a new job every 5 minutes and a new business every 30 minutes and generate \$100,000 in capital every 10 minutes. Job growth for SBDC clients is more than 14 times higher than job growth for an average business.

Last year, the Maryland SBDC at the University of Maryland in College Park assisted almost 8,000 businesses, counseled 2,200 entrepreneurs, and helped train nearly 5,700 businessowners. Small business services provided by the Maryland SBDC led to the creation of 208 businesses and 1,251 jobs and access to \$49 million in capital.

Behind the statistics are real Marylanders who realized their small business dream with the help of an SBDC consultant, like a women-owned restaurant in Baltimore called Flavor.

In 2015, Julia and Vanna Belton went to their local SBDC office for help securing a business loan. After months of tinkering with their business plan and adjusting their loan paperwork, their SBDC consultant guided Julia and

Vanna to approval on an \$800,000 SBA loan they used to purchase and renovate a building for their restaurant.

Today, the restaurant has \$1.2 million in revenue and 30 full and part-time employees. Last year, they were named Maryland's "2017 Women-owned Business of the Year."

Flavor is just one of the millions of small businesses and entrepreneurs who have been touched by America's Small business development centers over the last 35 years. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the dedicated men and women of America's small business development center network and to thank them for their commitment to the small businesses that drive the American economy.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO JEREMY WEIRICH

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to express my gratitude to Jeremy Weirich, who has served as clerk for the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, or CJS, for his many years of distinguished public service.

Jeremy has dedicated much of his career to public service. He first came to the Senate in 2006 as a detailee from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, where he was serving as an NOAA Corps officer. The CJS Subcommittee needed an expert on all things NOAA, and Jeremy was brought to our attention as someone knowledgeable, capable, and ready to take on the challenge. He did not disappoint.

After his first stint at CJS, Jeremy returned to NOAA, but his knowledge and skills brought him back to the Senate in 2008. He initially worked on CJS for Senator Barbara Mikulski and then later as my subcommittee clerk. Jeremy is one of the few people on the Senate Appropriations Committee who has served as a clerk for both sides of the aisle. His honesty, integrity, and thoughtfulness have assisted in moving legislation through difficult situations. As can be witnessed by his dedicated work on behalf of both sides of the aisle, Jeremy is truly a consummate professional. His dealings with the members and staff in the Senate, both Republican and Democrat alike, are qualities that we all should strive to emulate.

Jeremy's first love is the ocean, having served as the first executive officer of the *Okeanos Explorer*, as well as at NOAA. He carried that forward on CJS as he made sure that while we modernized our Nation's weather forecast system and took the first steps to make major capital investments in the NOAA fleet, we did so in a responsible manner. Jeremy helped ensure that our Nation's fisheries are managed responsibly and was always able to thread the needle in balancing the many differing

interests. Jeremy's passion for exploration also helped guarantee that America has the vehicles and technology to further explore space with telescopes, satellites, and humans. He assisted in building the space launch system, but also kept an eye on the next generation of scientific exploration—everything from the James Webb Space Telescope to Mars rovers to Europa.

Jeremy embraced the justice portion of the CJS portfolio by promoting public safety, overseeing the current home of the FBI's Terrorist Explosive Device Analytical Center, and being instrumental in implementing the Federal Bureau of Investigation's 21st century facilities plan.

Most importantly, Jeremy approached his work with an essential appropriator's attitude: Let's get the job done. He was always ready to listen to members and their staffs, as well as experts from the agencies and outside communities. Every year, Jeremy worked tirelessly to craft a bill that garnered wide bipartisan support, and every year, he got the job done.

As Jeremy leaves the Senate after a decade of hard work and dedicated public service, he leaves the Committee on Appropriations in a better place, with a long list of accomplishments that have bettered our Nation. He also leaves many colleagues that are sad to see him go.

I want to thank Jeremy for his honorable service. I join the entire committee in wishing him continued success in his future endeavors and continued happiness in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING ROBERT JOSEPH BURKE

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the memory of the late Robert Joseph Burke of Hoboken, NJ, who passed away last month. On this day, March 21, 2018, Mr. Burke would have celebrated his 85th birthday. I had the pleasure of knowing Robert Burke personally, and I know that his legacy will continue to be celebrated through the times he shared with us.

Mr. Burke was born in Yonkers, NY in 1933. He served our Nation in the U.S. Army during the Korean war. After his military service, Robert led a successful business career as the chief executive officer of Union Dry Dock & Repair and the chairman of the Board of Hudson United Bancorp. Burke was also active within the Irish-American community through the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York City.

Robert was a beloved husband to his wife, Mariella, and a dedicated father to his five children Mary Lou Kenny,

Robert P. Burke, Laureen Flock, Susan Quinn, and Claudia Cytrynbaum. Robert had 15 grandchildren, and I have no doubt that his memory lives on through each and every one of them. •

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2040. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621 Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, as the "Amelia Earhart Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4463. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the "Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4566. An act to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11:25 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 2030. An act to deem the compliance date for amended energy conservation standards for ceiling fan light kits to be January 21, 2020, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4463. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the "Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4566. An act to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 2213. A bill to authorize Pacific Historic Parks to establish a commemorative display to honor members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Pacific Theater of World War II, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-215).

H.R. 4300. A bill to authorize Pacific Historic Parks to establish a commemorative

display to honor members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Pacific Theater of World War II, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-216).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 224. A resolution recognizing the 5th anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Paya Sardinias, and commemorating his legacy and commitment to democratic values and principles.

S. Res. 376. A resolution urging the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh to ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. ERNST:

S. 2581. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a 2-year prohibition on employment in a career civil service position for any former political appointee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2582. A bill to provide health insurance reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2583. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2584. A bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2585. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to permanently extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds from certain entities to process permits; to the

Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2586. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the ability of a State to administer a permit program under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2587. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a program to allow States to assume certain Federal responsibilities under that Act with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2588. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish a program to allow States to assume certain Federal responsibilities under that title with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 283

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 307

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 307, a bill to enhance the database of emergency response capabilities of the Department of Defense.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program.

S. 1400

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1539, a bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, *supra*.

S. 1756

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1756, a bill to improve the processes by which environmental documents are prepared and permits and applications are processed and regulated by Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2278

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2278, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve health care in rural areas.

S. 2492

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2492, a bill to provide for the reporting to State and local law enforcement authorities of cases in which the national instant criminal background check system indicates that a firearm has been sought to be acquired by a prohibited person, so that authorities may pursue criminal charges under State law, and to ensure that the Department of Justice reports to Congress on prosecutions secured against prohibited persons who attempt to acquire a firearm.

S. 2513

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to improve school safety and mental health services.

S. 2572

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2572, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to

address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2586. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the ability of a State to administer a permit program under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STATE ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN PERMITS UNDER FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT.

Section 404(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the second sentence, by striking “In addition, such State” and inserting the following:

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—In submitting a proposal to the Administrator under subparagraph (A), the State”;

(2) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through “The Governor” in the first sentence of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(g) STATE ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) STATE PERMIT PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Governor”;

(3) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) APPLICATIONS BY CERTAIN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A State department of transportation that has assumed the responsibilities of the Secretary of Transportation under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) under the surface transportation project delivery program under section 327 of title 23, United States Code, may apply to the Administrator to administer an individual and general permit program under subparagraph (A) with respect to highway projects subject to that assumption of responsibility.

“(ii) TREATMENT.—For the purpose of this subsection, a reference to a State shall be deemed to include a State department of transportation described in clause (i).”.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2587. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a program to allow States to assume certain Federal responsibilities under that Act with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2587

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ASSUMPTION BY STATES OF CERTAIN ESA RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Endangered Species Act of 1973 is amended by inserting after section 6 (16 U.S.C. 1535) the following:

“SEC. 6A. ASSUMPTION BY STATES OF CERTAIN RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO HIGHWAY PROJECTS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out an assignment program (referred to in this section as the ‘program’) to allow States to assume certain responsibilities of the Secretary with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the State.

“(2) ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the other requirements of this section, on written agreement of the Secretary and a State (which may be in the form of a memorandum of understanding), the Secretary may assign, and the State may assume, the responsibilities of the Secretary under subsections (a) and (b) of section 7 with respect to agency actions (as defined in subsection (a)(2) of that section) that are applicable to 1 or more highway projects in the State.

“(B) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a State assumes responsibility under subparagraph (A)—

“(I) the Secretary may assign to the State, and the State may assume, all or part of the responsibilities of the Secretary described in that subparagraph for environmental review, consultation, or other action required under any Federal environmental law pertaining to the review or approval of highway projects described in the agreement referred to in that subparagraph; and

“(II) subject to clause (ii), on the request of the State, the Secretary may also assign to the State, and the State may assume, the responsibilities of the Secretary described in that subparagraph for 1 or more railroad, public transportation, or multimodal projects within the State.

“(ii) EXCLUSION OF PROJECTS.—In any State that assumes a responsibility of the Secretary under clause (i)(II), a recipient of assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, may submit to the Secretary a request that the Secretary shall maintain the responsibility of the Secretary with respect to 1 or more public transportation projects carried out by the recipient in the State.

“(C) PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE REQUIREMENTS.—A State shall assume responsibility under this section subject to the same procedural and substantive requirements as would apply if the responsibility were carried out by the Secretary.

“(D) FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Any responsibility of the Secretary that is not explicitly assumed by a State by written agreement under this section shall remain the responsibility of the Secretary.

“(E) NO EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section preempts or interferes with any power, jurisdiction, responsibility, or authority of a Federal agency (other than the United States Fish and Wildlife Service), except with respect to an authority delegated by the Secretary pursuant to subparagraph (A) under applicable law regarding a project

or agency action described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(F) PRESERVATION OF FLEXIBILITY.—The Secretary may not require a State, as a condition of participation in the program, to forgo a project delivery method that is otherwise permissible for a project described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(G) LEGAL FEES.—A State that assumes a responsibility of the Secretary under this section for a project described in subparagraph (A) or (B) may use funds apportioned to the State under section 104(b)(2) of title 23, United States Code, as necessary, for attorneys’ fees directly attributable to eligible activities associated with the project.

“(b) STATE PARTICIPATION.—

“(1) PARTICIPATING STATES.—To be eligible to participate in the program, a State shall—

“(A) be participating in the surface transportation project delivery program under section 327 of title 23, United States Code; and

“(B) assume the responsibilities of the Secretary of Transportation under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) pursuant to that section.

“(2) APPLICATION.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall amend, as appropriate, regulations that establish requirements relating to information required in any application of a State to participate in the program, including, at a minimum—

“(A) the projects or classes of projects for which the State anticipates exercising the authority that may be granted under the program;

“(B) verification of the financial resources necessary to carry out the authority that may be granted under the program; and

“(C) evidence of the notice and solicitation of public comment by the State relating to participation of the State in the program, including copies of comments received from that solicitation.

“(3) PUBLIC NOTICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State that submits an application in accordance with the regulations described in paragraph (2) shall give notice of the intent of the State to participate in the program by not later than 30 days before the date of submission of the application.

“(B) METHOD OF NOTICE AND SOLICITATION.—The State shall provide notice and solicit public comment under this paragraph by publishing the complete application of the State in accordance with the appropriate public notice requirements of the State.

“(4) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary may approve the application of a State under this subsection only if—

“(A) any necessary changes to regulations pursuant to paragraph (2) have been carried out;

“(B) the Secretary determines that the State has the capability, including financial and personnel, to assume the responsibility; and

“(C) the head of the State agency with primary jurisdiction over highway matters enters into a written agreement with the Secretary, as described in subsection (c).

“(5) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCY VIEWS.—If a State applies to assume a responsibility of the Secretary that would have required the Secretary to consult with another Federal agency, the Secretary shall solicit the views of the Federal agency before approving the application of the State under this subsection.

“(c) WRITTEN AGREEMENT.—A written agreement under this section shall—

“(1) be executed by—

“(A) the Governor of the applicable State; or

“(B) the top-ranking transportation official in the State who is charged with responsibility for highway construction;

“(2) be in such form as the Secretary may require;

“(3) provide that the State—

“(A) agrees to assume all or part of the responsibilities of the Secretary referred to in subsection (a);

“(B) expressly consents, on behalf of the State, to accept the jurisdiction of the Federal courts for the compliance, discharge, and enforcement of any responsibility of the Secretary assumed by the State;

“(C) certifies that State laws (including regulations) are in effect that—

“(i) authorize the State to take the actions necessary to carry out the responsibilities being assumed; and

“(ii) are comparable to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, including providing that any decision regarding the public availability of a document under those State laws is reviewable by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

“(D) agrees to maintain the financial resources necessary to carry out the responsibilities being assumed;

“(4) require the State to provide to the Secretary any information the Secretary reasonably considers necessary to ensure that the State is adequately carrying out the responsibilities assigned to the State;

“(5) have a term of not more than 5 years; and

“(6) be renewable.

“(d) JURISDICTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States district courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action against a State for failure to carry out any responsibility assumed by the State pursuant to this section.

“(2) LEGAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.—A civil action under paragraph (1) shall be governed by the legal standards and requirements that would apply in such a civil action against the Secretary had the Secretary taken the actions in question.

“(3) INTERVENTION.—The Secretary shall have the right to intervene in any action described in paragraph (1).

“(e) EFFECT OF ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY.—A State that assumes responsibility under subsection (a)(2) shall be solely responsible and solely liable for carrying out, in lieu of, and without further approval of, the Secretary, those responsibilities, until the date on which the program is terminated in accordance with subsection (j).

“(f) LIMITATIONS ON AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section permits a State to assume any rulemaking authority of the Secretary under any Federal law.

“(g) AUDITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To ensure compliance by a State with an agreement of the State under subsection (c) (including compliance by the State with all Federal laws for which responsibility is assumed under subsection (a)(2)), for each State participating in the program, the Secretary shall—

“(A) not later than 180 days after the date of execution of the applicable agreement, meet with the State—

“(i) to review the implementation of the agreement; and

“(ii) to discuss plans for the first annual audit;

“(B) conduct annual audits during each of the first 4 years of State participation in the program; and

“(C) ensure that the time period for completing an annual audit, from initiation to completion (including public comment and responses to those comments), does not exceed 180 days.

“(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND COMMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An audit conducted under paragraph (1) shall be provided to the public for comment.

“(B) RESPONSE.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the period for public comment ends, the Secretary shall respond to public comments received under subparagraph (A).

“(3) AUDIT TEAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An audit conducted under paragraph (1) shall be carried out by an audit team determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the State, in accordance with subparagraph (B).

“(B) CONSULTATION.—Consultation with the State under subparagraph (A) shall include a reasonable opportunity for the State to review, and provide comments regarding, the proposed members of the audit team.

“(h) MONITORING.—After the end of the fourth year of the participation by a State in the program, the Secretary shall monitor compliance by the State with the written agreement under subsection (c), including the provision by the State of financial resources to carry out the written agreement.

“(i) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report that describes the administration of the program during the preceding calendar year.

“(j) TERMINATION.—

“(1) TERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary may terminate the participation of a State in the program if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that the State is not adequately carrying out the responsibilities assigned to the State pursuant to this section;

“(B) the Secretary provides to the State—

“(i) a notification of the determination of noncompliance;

“(ii) a period of not less than 120 days to take such corrective action as the Secretary determines to be necessary to comply with the applicable agreement; and

“(iii) on request of the Governor of the State, a detailed description of each responsibility in need of corrective action regarding an inadequacy identified under subparagraph (A); and

“(C) the State, after the notification and period for corrective action provided under subparagraph (B), fails to take satisfactory corrective action, as determined by the Secretary.

“(2) TERMINATION BY STATE.—The State may terminate the participation of the State in the program at any time by providing to the Secretary a notice, by not later than the date that is 90 days before the date of termination, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may provide.

“(k) CAPACITY BUILDING.—The Secretary, in cooperation with representatives of State officials, may carry out education, training, peer-exchange, and other initiatives as appropriate—

“(1) to assist States in developing the capacity to participate in the program; and

“(2) to promote information sharing and collaboration among States that are participating in the program.

“(l) RELATIONSHIP TO LOCALLY ADMINISTERED PROJECTS.—A State granted authority under this section may, as appropriate and on the request of a local government—

“(1) exercise that authority on behalf of the local government for a locally administered project; or

“(2) provide guidance and training regarding consolidating and minimizing the documentation and environmental analyses necessary for sponsors of a locally administered project to comply with—

“(A) section 7; and

“(B) any comparable requirements under State law.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) FEDERAL AGENCY ACTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(i) review other programs administered by the Secretary; and

“(ii) use those programs in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

“(B) OTHER AGENCIES.—The head of each other Federal department or agency, in consultation with, and with the assistance of, the Secretary or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable, shall use the authorities of the department or agency in furtherance of the purposes of this Act by carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species listed under section 4.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the second sentence, by striking “In fulfilling” and inserting the following:

“(B) USE OF DATA.—In fulfilling”; and

(ii) by striking the paragraph designation and all that follows through “not likely” in the first sentence and inserting the following:

“(2) AGENCY ACTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal department or agency, in consultation with, and with the assistance of, the Secretary or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable, shall ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by the department or agency (referred to in this section as an ‘agency action’) is not likely”; and

(C) in paragraphs (3) and (4), by inserting “or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable,” after “with the Secretary” each place it appears;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “within the 90-day” and all that follows through the period at the end of the subparagraph and inserting the following: “within—

“(i) the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the consultation is initiated; or

“(ii) subject to subparagraph (B), such other time period as is mutually agreeable to—

“(I) the Secretary or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable; and

“(II) the head of the affected Federal department or agency.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “the Federal” and inserting “or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable, and the head of the affected Federal department or”; and

(II) in the undesignated matter following clause (ii), by striking “The Secretary” and all that follows through “before” and inserting the following:

“(C) APPLICANT CONSENT.—The Secretary or a State that has assumed a responsibility

of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable, and the head of the affected Federal department or agency may mutually agree to extend a consultation period established under subparagraph (B) if the Secretary or the State that has assumed responsibility from the Secretary, as applicable, before”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “agreeable to” and all that follows through the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: “agreeable to—

“(A) the Secretary or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable;

“(B) the head of the affected Federal department or agency; and

“(C) the applicant concerned.”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable,” after “the Secretary” each place it appears;

(II) in the first sentence, by striking “the Secretary’s opinion” and inserting “the opinion of the Secretary or the State, respectively.”; and

(III) in the second sentence, by striking “he believes” and inserting “the Secretary or the State, respectively, believes”; and

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “an opinion based by the Secretary incident to” and inserting “an opinion of the Secretary or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable, based on”; and

(II) by striking “the Secretary reviews” and inserting “the Secretary or the State, respectively, reviews”;

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (C), by striking “the Secretary shall provide the Federal agency and the applicant concerned, if any, with” and inserting the following:

“(5) DESCRIPTION OF WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A written statement referred to in paragraph (4) is”;

(ii) by striking the paragraph designation and all that follows through “the Secretary” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(4) REQUIREMENT ON CERTAIN CONCLUSION.—The Secretary or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable, shall provide to the head of the affected Federal department or agency and the applicant concerned, if any, a written statement described in paragraph (5) if, after consultation under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary or the State, respectively,”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “which the Secretary believes” and inserting “that the Secretary or the State, respectively, believes”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “(16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(5)).”; and

(E) in paragraph (5) (as designated by subparagraph (D)(i))—

(i) in each of clauses (i) and (ii)—

(I) by striking “such” each place it appears and inserting “the applicable”; and

(II) by striking the comma at the end of the clause and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “with regard to such taking, and” and inserting “(16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(5)) with respect to the applicable taking; and”;

(iii) in clause (iv), by striking “clauses (ii) and (iii)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C)”; and

(iv) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iv) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(D), by striking “Agency. Agency.” and inserting “Agency.”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B), by adding a period at the end; and

(4) in subsection (f)(1), by inserting “or a State that has assumed a responsibility of the Secretary pursuant to section 6A, as applicable” after “the Secretary”.

(c) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The table of contents of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 6 the following:

“Sec. 6A. Assumption by States of certain responsibilities relating to highways.”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“Sec. 18. Annual cost analysis by the Fish and Wildlife Service.”.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2588. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish a program to allow States to assume certain Federal responsibilities under that title with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2588

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ASSUMPTION BY STATES OF CERTAIN HISTORIC PRESERVATION RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter I of chapter 3061 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 306115. Assumption by States of certain responsibilities relating to highway projects

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of each agency (referred to in this section as the ‘agency head’) shall carry out an assignment program (referred to in this section as the ‘program’) to allow States that are eligible under subsection (b)(1) to assume certain responsibilities of the agency under section 306108 with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the State.

“(2) **ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the other requirements of this section, on written agreement of the agency head and a State (which may be in the form of a memorandum of understanding), the agency head may assign, and the State may assume, the responsibilities of the agency head under section 306108 with respect to the undertakings of the agency described in that section that are applicable to 1 or more highway projects in the State.

“(B) **ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If a State assumes responsibility under subparagraph (A), subject to clause (ii), on the request of the State, the

agency head may also assign to the State, and the State may assume, the responsibilities of the agency head described in that subparagraph for 1 or more railroad, public transportation, or multimodal projects within the State.

“(ii) **EXCLUSION OF PROJECTS.**—In any State that assumes a responsibility of the agency head under clause (i), a recipient of assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, may submit to the agency head a request that the agency head shall maintain the responsibility of the agency head with respect to 1 or more public transportation projects carried out by the recipient in the State.

“(C) **PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE REQUIREMENTS.**—A State shall assume responsibility under this section subject to the same procedural and substantive requirements as would apply if the responsibility were carried out by the agency head.

“(D) **FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.**—Any responsibility of an agency head that is not explicitly assumed by a State by written agreement under this section shall remain the responsibility of the agency head.

“(E) **NO EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this section preempts or interferes with any power, jurisdiction, responsibility, or authority of the Secretary, the Council, or the applicable agency, except with respect to an authority delegated by the agency head pursuant to subparagraph (A) under applicable law regarding a project or agency action described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(F) **PRESERVATION OF FLEXIBILITY.**—The agency head may not require a State, as a condition of participation in the program, to forgo a project delivery method that is otherwise permissible for a project described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(G) **LEGAL FEES.**—A State that assumes a responsibility of an agency head under this section for a project described in subparagraph (A) or (B) may use funds apportioned to the State under section 104(b)(2) of title 23, as necessary, for attorneys’ fees directly attributable to eligible activities associated with the project.

“(b) **STATE PARTICIPATION.**—

“(1) **PARTICIPATING STATES.**—To be eligible to participate in the program, a State shall—

“(A) be participating in the surface transportation project delivery program under section 327 of title 23; and

“(B) assume the responsibilities of the Secretary of Transportation under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) pursuant to that section.

“(2) **APPLICATION.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall amend, as appropriate, regulations that establish requirements relating to information required in any application of a State to participate in the program, including, at a minimum—

“(A) the projects or classes of projects for which the State anticipates exercising the authority that may be granted under the program;

“(B) verification of the financial resources necessary to carry out the authority that may be granted under the program; and

“(C) evidence of the notice and solicitation of public comment by the State relating to participation of the State in the program, including copies of comments received from that solicitation.

“(3) **PUBLIC NOTICE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each State that submits an application in accordance with the regulations described in paragraph (2) shall provide to the relevant agency head and publish notice of the intent of the State to partici-

pate in the program by not later than 30 days before the date of submission of the application.

“(B) **METHOD OF NOTICE AND SOLICITATION.**—The State shall provide notice and solicit public comment under this paragraph by publishing the complete application of the State in accordance with the appropriate public notice requirements of the State.

“(4) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—The agency head may approve the application of a State under this subsection only if—

“(A) any necessary changes to regulations pursuant to paragraph (2) have been carried out;

“(B) the agency head determines that the State has the capability, including financial and personnel, to assume the responsibility; and

“(C) the head of the State agency with primary jurisdiction over highway matters enters into a written agreement with the agency head, as described in subsection (c).

“(5) **OTHER AGENCY VIEWS.**—If a State applies to assume a responsibility of the agency head that would have required the agency head to consult with another agency, the agency head shall solicit the views of the other agency before approving the application of the State under this subsection.

“(c) **WRITTEN AGREEMENT.**—A written agreement under this section shall—

“(1) be executed by—

“(A) the Governor of the applicable State; or

“(B) the top-ranking transportation official in the State who is charged with responsibility for highway construction;

“(2) be in such form as the agency head may require;

“(3) provide that the State—

“(A) agrees to assume all or part of the responsibilities of the agency head referred to in subsection (a);

“(B) expressly consents, on behalf of the State, to accept the jurisdiction of the Federal courts for the compliance, discharge, and enforcement of any responsibility of the agency head assumed by the State;

“(C) certifies that State laws (including regulations) are in effect that—

“(i) authorize the State to take the actions necessary to carry out the responsibilities being assumed; and

“(ii) are comparable to section 552 of title 5, including providing that any decision regarding the public availability of a document under those State laws is reviewable by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

“(D) agrees to maintain the financial resources necessary to carry out the responsibilities being assumed;

“(4) require the State to provide to the agency head any information the agency head reasonably considers necessary to ensure that the State is adequately carrying out the responsibilities assigned to the State;

“(5) have a term of not more than 5 years; and

“(6) be renewable.

“(d) **JURISDICTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The United States district courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action against a State for failure to carry out any responsibility assumed by the State pursuant to this section.

“(2) **LEGAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.**—A civil action under paragraph (1) shall be governed by the legal standards and requirements that would apply in such a civil action against the applicable agency head had the agency head taken the actions in question.

“(3) INTERVENTION.—The applicable agency head shall have the right to intervene in any action described in paragraph (1).

“(e) EFFECT OF ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY.—A State that assumes responsibility under subsection (a)(2) shall be solely responsible and solely liable for carrying out, in lieu of, and without further approval of, the applicable agency head, those responsibilities, until the date on which the program is terminated in accordance with subsection (j).

“(f) LIMITATIONS ON AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section permits a State to assume any rulemaking authority of the Secretary or the applicable agency head under any Federal law.

“(g) AUDITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To ensure compliance by a State with an agreement of the State under subsection (c) (including compliance by the State with all Federal laws for which responsibility is assumed under subsection (a)(2)), for each State participating in the program, the applicable agency head shall—

“(A) not later than 180 days after the date of execution of the applicable agreement, meet with the State—

“(i) to review the implementation of the agreement; and

“(ii) to discuss plans for the first annual audit;

“(B) conduct annual audits during each of the first 4 years of State participation in the program; and

“(C) ensure that the time period for completing an annual audit, from initiation to completion (including public comment and responses to those comments), does not exceed 180 days.

“(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND COMMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An audit conducted under paragraph (1) shall be provided to the public for comment.

“(B) RESPONSE.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the period for public comment ends, the applicable agency head shall respond to public comments received under subparagraph (A).

“(3) AUDIT TEAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An audit conducted under paragraph (1) shall be carried out by an audit team determined by the applicable agency head, in consultation with the State, in accordance with subparagraph (B).

“(B) CONSULTATION.—Consultation with the State under subparagraph (A) shall include a reasonable opportunity for the State to review, and provide comments regarding, the proposed members of the audit team.

“(h) MONITORING.—After the end of the fourth year of the participation by a State in the program, the applicable agency head shall monitor compliance by the State with the written agreement under subsection (c), including the provision by the State of financial resources to carry out the written agreement.

“(i) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary or the Council shall submit to Congress an annual report that describes the administration of the program during the preceding calendar year.

“(j) TERMINATION.—

“(1) TERMINATION BY AGENCY.—The applicable agency head may terminate the participation of a State in the program if—

“(A) the agency head determines that the State is not adequately carrying out the responsibilities assigned to the State pursuant to this section;

“(B) the agency head provides to the State—

“(i) a notification of the determination of noncompliance;

“(ii) a period of not less than 120 days to take such corrective action as the agency head determines to be necessary to comply with the applicable agreement; and

“(iii) on request of the Governor of the State, a detailed description of each responsibility in need of corrective action regarding an inadequacy identified under subparagraph (A); and

“(C) the State, after the notification and period for corrective action provided under subparagraph (B), fails to take satisfactory corrective action, as determined by the agency head.

“(2) TERMINATION BY STATE.—The State may terminate the participation of the State in the program at any time by providing to the applicable agency head a notice, by not later than the date that is 90 days before the date of termination, subject to such terms and conditions as the agency head may provide.

“(k) CAPACITY BUILDING.—The Council, in cooperation with representatives of State officials, may carry out education, training, peer-exchange, and other initiatives as appropriate—

“(1) to assist States in developing the capacity to participate in the program; and

“(2) to promote information sharing and collaboration among States that are participating in the program.

“(1) RELATIONSHIP TO LOCALLY ADMINISTERED PROJECTS.—A State granted authority under this section may, as appropriate and on the request of a local government—

“(1) exercise that authority on behalf of the local government for a locally administered project; or

“(2) provide guidance and training regarding consolidating and minimizing the documentation and environmental analyses necessary for sponsors of a locally administered project to comply with—

“(A) section 306108; and

“(B) any comparable requirements under State law.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 3061 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 306114 the following:

“306115. Assumption by States of certain responsibilities relating to highway projects.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET

The Committee on Budget is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Kirsten: Dawn Madison, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs), and Thomas J. Hushek, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, both of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on S. 1250 and S. 2515.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “The President's FY2019 Budget Request for Indian Programs.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael Y. Scudder, of Illinois, and Amy J. St. Eve, of Illinois, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, and Charles J. Williams, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOW

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EAST, SOUTH ASIA, CENTRAL ASIA, AND COUNTERTERRORISM

The Subcommittee on Near East, South Asia, Central Asia, and Counterterrorism of the Committee on Foreign

Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "What's Next for Lebanon? Stability and Security Challenges".

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 438 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 438) commemorating the 150th anniversary of the University of California.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 438) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 19, 2018, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Thursday, March 22; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators GRASSLEY, DURBIN, LEE, and SASSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nebraska.

SIMPLE TRUTHS

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, yesterday at the White House, two terrible things happened, and it shouldn't be difficult to condemn both of these things at once.

First, at the podium in the White House press room, it was suggested that the U.S. Government is unsure if Putin's reelection was perhaps legitimate, free, and fair or that perhaps the United States is morally indifferent to the question of whether Putin's reelection was fair, free, and legitimate.

It was not fair or free or legitimate, and it matters.

The second horrible thing that happened yesterday is that the President's confidential briefing materials for his call with Vladimir Putin were anonymously leaked to the public. That should not happen. The President's congratulatory call was terribly ill-advised, but that doesn't change the fact that the leaking of the confidential briefing materials for his call was also wrong.

It shouldn't be difficult to say both of these things. They are both true. So we should be able to say both of them at once.

Our people are very divided right now. They are unclear about who we are and how we conceive of ourselves on the global stage. Our tribalism has run amok. If you listen to some of our cable news today—I haven't—I suspect that what you would find is that on certain networks there is only discussion of the leaking and no discussion of what a terrible abandonment of American foreign policy yesterday's failure to condemn Putin's phony sham reelection was. And on the other networks, I imagine you are going to get exactly the opposite story, where the only thing that matters is how stupid this call was to Vladimir Putin, and nothing about the leaks. That isn't helpful for building a nation of 320 million people who know what we stand for together.

Here is what is true. A President's staff shouldn't leak. In cases of principle, you may need to resign. So resign. Do the right and honorable thing if you believe your conscience is compelled to do so, and resign your position and go out and publicly make a case for why a certain policy is failing. But that is a different thing than anonymously leaking the information that a President has—not just this President, but that any President has—to make his or her decisions, to deliberate with their staff, to plot their actions.

Leaks like this weaken us both at home, in terms of public trust in our institutions and our public servants, and they weaken us abroad, in terms of whether or not we have any coherence to who we are as a people and how we make our decisions.

Now, as to this decision to fail to condemn Putin's sham reelection, it is very foolhardy. Vladimir Putin is not a friend. Vladimir Putin is a despot. The President of the United States was wrong to congratulate him, and the White House Press Secretary was wrong to duck a simple question about whether or not Putin's reelection was free and fair.

It was not. The American people know that, the Russian people know that, and the world knows that. Yesterday, when the White House refused to speak directly and clearly about this matter, we were weakened as a nation, and a tyrant was strengthened.

Around the world, there are two great symbols of America from this city. The first is the dome of the Capitol, in which we stand. This building testifies to the strength of our self-government and to our belief in inherent human dignity, but the other symbol that comes from this city that is known around the world is the podium in the White House press room. Tucked into a small room and surrounded by members of a free press, it is simply the free world's biggest megaphone. It symbolizes Americans' commitment to the universal dignity not just of 320 million people—the citizens of this country—but to 7.6 billion men, women, and children across the globe.

Speaking clearly about tyrants is one of the things that we do. It is not seeking monsters to destroy. For more than 200 years, the American people have clearly understood this. For more than 200 years, administrations of both parties have clearly understood this.

At times in the past, previous administrations have made mistakes. They have split hairs. They have smoothed edges. They have dodged. They have hedged. But what happened yesterday at the podium at the White House—the dodge on Putin—broke with the basic American moral tradition. It broke faith with our core values, and it broke trust with freedom seekers across the globe.

This very day there are dissidents all over the globe struggling against totalitarian regimes in darkness. To them, America has always said and America still says: We see you. We stand with you. We may make long and deliberate decisions about how we engage in the world and about what particular commitments are prudent to exercise at different times with different allies, but we have always spoken unequivocally about the universal dignity of 7.6 billion people. To those who struggle, we have always said: We see you, and we stand with you.

These simple truths matter. The moral responsibilities of the Office of the Presidency matter. When we don't affirm these basic truths, it is a failure to who we are, and it is a failure to do what we do. It is a betrayal not just to the millions of people who were denied

free and fair elections in Russia this week, but it is a failure to people all across the globe who are struggling in darkness against tyrants.

Each and every Member of this Senate—all 100 of us—was elected in the kind of free and fair election that Vladimir Putin fears—the kind of election that he would not win. Vladimir Putin is a coward. Vladimir Putin is a despot.

Just this month, Vladimir Putin tried to assassinate a political dissident and his daughter on NATO soil in the UK. Given that we have taken an oath in this body, after our free and fair elections, to uphold and defend the Constitution—given that—we ought not, in this body, find it difficult to say basic true things, like that we condemn leaks by the President's staff against him. We also condemn Vladimir Putin's sham election. We condemn a Russian despot who aims to make Soviet tyranny great again.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO THAD COCHRAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, back in 1985, I was a second-term Member of the House of Representatives and a member, I was proud to say, of the House Appropriations Committee. The Committee chairman was a man by the name of Jamie Whitten. He was from the State of Mississippi. He was a Mississippi Democrat. Yes, there used to be Mississippi Democrats.

Jamie Whitten had been a witness to a great deal of American history. He was on the floor of the House as a newly minted Congressman from Mississippi on December 8, 1941, when Franklin Roosevelt delivered his "Day of Infamy" speech.

There I was speaking to this same man 44 years later, and I was a junior member of his Appropriations Committee. I knew that Appropriations, under the House rules, had several members who were also represented on the Budget Committee. So one day I went to Chairman Whitten from Mississippi and suggested to him that I wanted to be on the Budget Committee in the slot reserved for Appropriations members. Chairman Whitten looked down at me and he asked: Why do you want to be on the Budget Committee?

I said: I think it is good because the Budget Committee makes the spending decisions and blueprints that Appropriations and other committees follow.

He kind of sat back in his chair and Chairman Whitten said to me: Well, if you want to be on that committee, you can be on that committee, but I want you to remember one thing, the Budget

Committee deals in hallucinations and the Appropriations Committee deals in facts.

I will never forget that exchange. I served on the Budget Committee and again in the Senate on the same Budget Committee, and I have come to believe that Chairman Whitten was not that wrong in his conclusion. I call that "Whitten's Law." It remains one of the most important lessons I have learned about the Federal budget.

I have learned other lessons from Mississippi politicians, and one of them is a man by the name of THAD COCHRAN, my colleague from the State of Mississippi and one of my friends who cochaired the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee with me. I shouldn't say cochaired; I am the ranking member on that committee and he, of course, is the chairman. THAD COCHRAN taught me and others many important lessons about the Federal budget and about public service in general.

THAD COCHRAN is a man of humility and integrity, and he is a man of his word. He is a conservative Republican who values principle and cooperation over pointless confrontation. He prefers common ground to scorched Earth because he knows it is better to build on.

Senator COCHRAN and I have served together in the Senate for more than two decades. For much of that time, we have both been on the Senate Appropriations Committee. He has been the committee's ranking member and chairman twice. In all of those years, I can only think of a time or two when he and I disagreed so completely on an issue that we found ourselves unable to find that principled compromise. Some may call that "old school." I call it leadership in a representative democracy.

As a member and two-time chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator COCHRAN's skill as a negotiator has served Mississippi and the United States exceedingly well. He has helped keep his State and our Nation strong and safe and economically sound.

In a time that increasingly prizes the quick profits and short-term vision, THAD COCHRAN has helped to protect and increase America's investments in scientific, technological, and medical research. That is a proud part of the legacy he leaves.

His voice is common and quiet, but don't be fooled. When it comes to protecting the interests of his State or this Nation, he is tenacious.

That was never more apparent than in the weeks and months after Hurricane Katrina pummeled the Mississippi gulf coast and other States in 2005. Senator COCHRAN helped secure appropriations that enabled thousands of homeowners in Mississippi to rebuild after their insurance companies turned them down.

As the former chairman and now ranking member of the Appropriations Committee Defense Subcommittee, I worked closely with Chairman COCHRAN to protect critical national security priorities in my State of Illinois, and he has worked hard for his State.

Behind every Senator, of course, there are hard-working staff members without whom we could not do our jobs. Senator COCHRAN's personal staff and his committee staff are first-rate public servants. I want to thank them too. They have been part of a winning team with Senator COCHRAN. Their hard work and loyalty on his behalf and on behalf of the Senate has served this Nation well.

I wasn't surprised the other day when I learned that Senator COCHRAN had been an Eagle Scout. I was surprised to learn, however, that he once failed in pursuit of a Boy Scout merit badge as a young man. He learned a lesson from that experience that he said has stayed with him all his life: Always be prepared.

THAD COCHRAN's adherence to that lesson, his remarkable skill as a negotiator, and his deep integrity and honesty are qualities we could all do well to emulate.

I thank Senator THAD COCHRAN and wish him all the best as he departs the Senate, and I thank him for his great service to Mississippi and to America.

REMEMBERING LOUISE SLAUGHTER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York passed away after representing the Rochester area of that State for more than three decades. She was tough, unfailingly gracious, and wonderfully effective in helping people throughout her life.

LOUISE carried titles you don't see often around here. She was the Congress's only microbiologist. She was also a blues and jazz singer as well. She was a fighter, first and foremost, earning the respect of her colleagues and even those who disagreed with her. I have counted her as a friend and an ally in many causes.

She hailed from Harlan, KY, the daughter of a blacksmith in a coal mine. LOUISE can trace her lineage to the legendary Daniel Boone, and you can hear it in her voice.

She went to college and graduate school at the University of Kentucky to study microbiology and public health to honor her sister who passed away due to pneumonia at a young age.

She went on to serve in both the Monroe County legislature and the New York State Assembly before joining Congress in 1986 to represent the Rochester New York area, which includes the area around the historic Seneca Falls Convention.

She was one of only 29 women in Congress when she first arrived and quickly became a champion and a trailblazer

for the American worker and the American women.

LOUISE coauthored the landmark Violence Against Women's Act in 1994, curbing domestic violence and aiding its victims.

She also helped shepherd the Affordable Care Act through Congress as the very first woman to chair the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

LOUISE's storied career has included defending her constituents against Big Business and bringing national attention to pressing medical issues. She introduced the first legislation barring genetic discrimination in 1995. It finally became law in 2008.

She introduced a bill every Congress to fight drug-resistant bacteria.

In 2015, President Obama incorporated parts of LOUISE SLAUGHTER's plan to identify superbugs and increased funding for new antibiotics and vaccines into the administration's initiative to encourage the responsible use of antibiotics in livestock.

LOUISE also introduced the first bill to ban insider training by Members of Congress.

She did all of this, and some of it controversial, and still won the respect of her colleagues.

I worked with her on many projects, from the Bicameral High-Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail Caucus, to demanding the Supreme Court adopt an ethics code.

It was not a coincidence that on the day when news of her passing broke, the words "nicest" and "Rochester" were trending on Twitter in Washington, DC.

Through all of her hard work, she was smart and kind and always funny. She will be missed by her colleagues and friends and family, including her three daughters, Megan, Amy, and Emily Robin; seven grandchildren, Lauren, Daniel, Emma, Jackson, Mason, Linus, and Ione; and one great-grandchild, Henry.

LOUISE was a great Congresswoman. I am going to miss her as a colleague and a friend.

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this crisis we face in this country involving DACA is a crisis that was created when President Trump announced the end of the program on September 5 of last year and gave us a deadline of March 5 of this year to come up with an alternative. Many of us, including the Presiding Officer, battled mightily to do that—a bipartisan effort with compromise on both sides—but we never could come up with a proposal the President accepted. As a consequence, the destiny of the DACA recipients is uncertain.

They are now temporarily protected by an injunction from two different Federal lawsuits—an injunction which

could end in a matter of weeks or months. In the meantime, their status is so uncertain that it is difficult for them to make plans for their lives. That is where we are today.

DACA has been a huge success. It is a program designed to give those who were brought here as children, toddlers, and infants an opportunity to become part of America—a legal part of America—and an opportunity to one day become citizens.

DACA was an Executive order of President Obama's which President Trump has now abolished. There is no protection, other than the court injunction for those who are facing the end of DACA.

Yesterday, I convened a meeting with some of my Senate colleagues with the Secretary of Homeland Security, Kirstjen Nielsen. Here is what we learned: As of yesterday, more than 35,000 DACA renewal applications are pending because of these court orders. Of these pending renewal applications, 10,000 were from recipients whose DACA protection had already expired. Tens of thousands more Dreamers have DACA protection due to expire soon. Around 13,000 DACA permits could expire in March, another 5,300 in April, and nearly 14,000 more in May.

Understand what happens: When a person is protected by DACA and loses that protection, technically, they can be deported. In addition, they cannot legally continue to work in the United States.

There is some good news, though. Secretary Nielsen promised me that the Department of Homeland Security will not deport any DACA recipient with a pending DACA application, even if their DACA status has expired. I thank her for that commitment, and I intend to hold her to that commitment. Many lives are at stake.

However, for DACA recipients whose status has expired, that same Department will not authorize them to work unless and until DACA is renewed, so there can be a gap in their employment. Understand that the people we are talking about are not folks, by and large, with part-time jobs. They are teachers. They are medical professionals. Some of them are serving in our military.

What we now know about the expiration of this work permit is that tens of thousands of DACA-eligible individuals could be forced to leave their jobs while their applications for renewal are pending and before those applications are approved.

Then consider the fate of Dreamers who are eligible for DACA but never reached the necessary age to attain that status. They can no longer apply for DACA because President Trump's decision prohibits them after September 5. If a child turns 15, the youngest age at which they can apply for DACA, they are now blocked from ap-

plying because of the President's decision.

The nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute estimates that in addition to 800,000 DACA recipients, there are an additional 1 million Dreamers eligible for DACA. Because of President Trump's decision to end DACA, 1.8 million Dreamers are at risk of deportation and cannot work to support themselves and contribute to the only country they know and the country they love.

President Trump called on Congress to legalize DACA, but he has, unfortunately, refused to accept six different bipartisan offers to achieve that. One of those offers also included \$25 billion for his wall. Yet he wouldn't accept it.

Let me tell my colleagues the story of one of these young people, as I have done before. I have come to the floor of the Senate more than 110 times to tell these stories. I just think when you hear the stories of an individual, it helps us understand what the real issue is.

This is a photo of Irving Calderon. He is the 112th Dreamer I have talked about on the Senate floor. When he was 7 months old, Irving was brought to the United States from Mexico by his parents. He lived in California for 10 years and then moved to Texas where he currently lives. His childhood memories include Disneyland, going to the beach, and celebrating Christmas and the Fourth of July with his family.

Irving found out he was undocumented when he was 12 years old. At first he didn't believe it because he said there is nothing about him that wasn't American. Then, as he got older, he realized he couldn't get a driver's license, he couldn't work, he couldn't save money for college, but he didn't give up.

In high school, Irving maintained a 4.0 grade point average. He was a member of the Honor Society and the student council. He served as president of the school's chapter of the Future Business Leaders of America, played varsity basketball and tennis.

Because of his accomplishments, Irving was accepted into the University of Texas at Austin. In college, he served as director of the Hispanic Business Students Association, and under his leadership, the group adopted a street to clean. Irving organized events for underrepresented high school students and middle school students and volunteered at an orphanage every Thanksgiving.

He graduated from the University of Texas with a bachelor's degree in business administration. Thanks to DACA—created by President Obama and then eliminated by President Trump later—Irving was able to put his degree to work. For the last 3 years, he has worked as an information technology business analyst at General Motors. He creates software systems for

one of the largest automakers in the United States.

He wrote me a letter, and here is what he said:

I've always felt completely American. I've been here since I was 7 months old. It's the only place I know and the only place I've ever considered home. Being an American is not something that is just given to you; it's about the work you put in. . . . I feel that I have contributed to America.

I do too. It would be an American tragedy to deport someone like Irving, who has overcome so many obstacles and has so much to contribute to our country. People like Irving Calderon are the reason more than 400 business leaders signed a letter to Congress urging us to pass a bipartisan Dream Act. The letter and these business leaders say:

Dreamers are vital to the future of our companies and our economy. With them, we grow and create jobs. They are part of why we will continue to have a global competitive advantage.

President Trump created this crisis, but instead of working toward a solution, he has sabotaged every effort we have tried to make on behalf of Dreamers. Now it is up to Republican leaders in Congress to take yes for an answer and accept any one of the six bipartisan solutions we put on the table to save these young people.

Congress should do our job and make the Dream Act the law of the land, or we will be responsible for forcing hundreds of thousands of talented young immigrants out of the workforce and putting them at risk of immediate deportation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE).
The Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:01 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 22, 2018, at 10:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DAVID J. RYDER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL

THOMAS E. WORKMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 21, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 21, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 10:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

THE SANCTUARY MOVEMENT AND THE DOCTRINE OF NULLIFICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, California's Legislature has forbidden local governments from cooperating with Federal immigration authorities, and has even gone so far as to forbid private citizens from volunteering information to Federal law enforcement under threat of criminal prosecution. Government officials have alerted criminal illegal aliens of impending ICE raids and placed an illegal immigrant on a governing body.

Mr. Speaker, these actions invoke the doctrine of nullification, the discredited principle that any State or local government that doesn't like a Federal law is free to violate it. It formed the central legal argument that the Southern Confederacy used in its attempt to tear our Federal Union apart. It ignores the supremacy clause of the Constitution, the enumerated powers of Congress, and the exclusive jurisdiction given the courts to adjudicate disputes involving the States.

When South Carolina used this doctrine in 1832 to ignore a Federal tariff, President Andrew Jackson sent warships to Charleston harbor, threatened to hang the instigators, and declared that nullification was "incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed."

Jackson and, later, Lincoln understood how toxic this doctrine is to the rule of law and to the fundamental principles of federalism. If allowed to stand, the Constitution becomes impotent, our laws become mere suggestions, and the Federal Union itself disintegrates.

Like their Confederate predecessors, the California secessionists assert the 10th Amendment with no apparent understanding of it. The 10th Amendment reserves to the States powers not delegated to the Congress. Jurisdiction over immigration law is explicitly reserved to Congress and is thus denied the States. The supremacy clause is equally clear that the laws made within the constitutional authority of the Federal Government are the supreme laws of the land.

There is good reason for immigration law to be in Federal hands. As Attorney General Sessions explained in Sacramento a few weeks ago, if our immigration laws are not to be enforced, then our national borders mean precisely nothing. Nations that either cannot or will not defend their borders simply aren't around very long. The open borders advocated by California officials are suicidal for any nation.

Our Nation of immigrants depends on the enforcement of our immigration laws. A nation that is founded of immigration must be able to regulate the flow and set the conditions of immigration. That is what promotes and protects the process of assimilation, the glue that holds together a nation drawn from every continent.

Assimilation assures that uniquely American traditions and values—a common language, a common culture, and a common devotion to American constitutional principles—are preserved. Our immigration laws welcome those from around the world, but they also unite us as a people. Illegal immigration undermines the process of assimilation and makes a mockery of the millions of legal immigrants who have obeyed our laws and done everything our country has asked.

California officials claim that they are not defying Federal law, but only refusing to use State resources to enforce it. Well, Federal law is crystal clear: "A Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit or in any way restrict any government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual."

Yet that is precisely what California's nullification acts do.

They also claim they are trying to preserve the trust of the illegal immigrant community to report crimes.

Well, does this mean that anyone who reports a crime or talks to a police officer should be immune from arrest for the crimes that they may have committed?

And what about protecting the rest of our community from criminal illegal aliens in our midst?

The Constitution commands the executive to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." That means all laws, including our immigration laws.

For all its sanctimony, the sanctuary movement's principal legal argument springs from the same poisoned fountainhead that almost destroyed our Nation in the Civil War. Jackson and Lincoln understood that it must be confronted and defeated. President Trump and Attorney General Sessions have made it clear that this administration does, too.

GOP ATTACKS ON HEALTHCARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as you recall, 8 years ago this week, the Affordable Care Act became law. Since then, we have seen a historic increase in health coverage, with millions of people gaining access to better quality healthcare.

Under the ACA, we saw the non-elderly uninsured rate cut almost in half, from 18 percent to 9.4 percent. Individuals previously denied coverage due to preexisting conditions saw life-changing improvements in benefits and coverage. Seniors, who are finally able to spend less on Medicare coverage and prescription drugs, had a chance at a secure and peaceful retirement.

In my State alone, Wisconsin, 224,000 people became covered by ACA exchanges. From 2013 to 2016, the number

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of uninsured individuals declined by a whopping 42 percent.

But we all know, Mr. Speaker, that hardworking Americans were taking advantage of this less expensive, superior healthcare coverage while, at the same time, the GOP embarked on their all-out war against the ACA. I mean, they took no prisoners, hell-bent on sabotaging, butchering, and repealing this law at the expense of our Nation's most vulnerable.

I mean, let's get down into the nitty-gritty depths of this depravity.

Mr. Speaker, how do you think, for example, that the GOP, this Congress, is going to pay for the \$1.18 trillion deficit hole created by these tax cuts for the richest Americans and for corporations?

Mr. Speaker, you well know the answer. What we are going to do is plunder Medicare and Medicaid. We are going to build public sentiment for these actions by demonizing the poor and targeting people who already have limited access to jobs and healthcare.

Oh, come on now. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that you have been dreaming about slashing Medicaid ever since you were drinking at college keg parties. You said so yourself, Mr. Speaker.

Well, now, with the help of our President, you are acting on your dream. Your dream is coming true. And we have already seen an influx of States, including my own State of Wisconsin, submit work requirement waivers. This administration has already approved three of them, and there are sure to be more.

These attacks are unprecedented. Never has any administration gone this far to kick needy Americans off the only healthcare they have.

My own State's Governor, Scott Walker, is spearheading one of the most restrictive welfare reform proposals in the Nation. He wants harsh work requirements, drug testing restrictions, and other barriers to our State's most at-risk families to access Social Services.

These folks who are being targeted are already struggling to find work, and they are marginally connected to the workforce.

How does throwing them off healthcare help?

I say we need to uphold the ACA.

RECOGNIZING WORLD DOWN SYNDROME DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on World Down Syndrome Day, to celebrate the many individuals living with Down syndrome who are changing the world.

People with Down syndrome can and do make meaningful contributions

throughout their lives, in schools, in workplaces, their communities, public and political life, culture, media, and more.

Take Gerber's adorable spokesbaby, Lucas Warren, a 1-year-old from Dalton, Georgia, whose infectious smile set him apart from the 140,000 entries that Gerber received for the competition. After Lucas made his big debut in February on the TODAY show, the world fell in love with him, too.

Lucas is the first child with Down syndrome to win the title since Gerber began the competition. His parents, Courtney and Jason Warren, said they hope that Lucas' story will shed light on the special needs community and help more individuals with special needs be accepted, and I certainly agree.

Another incredible person living and thriving with Down syndrome is Kayla McKeon. Kayla is the manager of grassroots advocacy for the National Down Syndrome Society. She is the first registered lobbyist with Down syndrome.

I met Kayla not too long ago when she interviewed me for her podcast, Kayla's Corner. She is upbeat and outgoing, and that is just part of what makes Kayla so special.

A native of Syracuse, New York, Kayla is also a motivational speaker who draws on her experiences as an individual with a disability whose positive attitude inspires others to reach their highest potential.

Kayla is also a Special Olympian who competes in floor hockey and bowling tournaments. But in many ways, Kayla is living a life like any other young person. She lives in Washington, D.C., and rides the Metro. She has a busy social life. She likes sporting events and motorcycle rides, but she is extraordinary and she is a role model for others.

Kayla told the Auburn Citizen newspaper that she is committed to showing how much people with Down syndrome can achieve. She said: "We are most definitely ready, willing, and able to do anything we set our minds to, getting a job, driving a car, going to college. We want to showcase our abilities, not our disabilities."

Well, I couldn't agree more with Kayla. After meeting this enthusiastic young woman, I am certain that she is able to do anything that she puts her mind to, and she is an outstanding ambassador for the Down syndrome community.

Mr. Speaker, all people with Down syndrome must have opportunities to contribute to the community and live valued lives on a full and equal basis with others in all aspects of society.

People with Down syndrome can and do bring so much to the community wherever they live, around the world, when given the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating World Down

Syndrome Day, where we not only celebrate all the achievements of those living with Down syndrome, but we double down in our commitment to ensure that no one with Down syndrome is prevented from making meaningful contributions to society. They have so much to give and make this world a brighter place.

OUTSOURCING U.S. JOBS AND WAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring much-needed attention to a critical issue: the outsourcing of U.S. jobs and wages.

I have been fighting on behalf of working people to stop outsourcing, to stop sending our jobs overseas; and fighting against low-income wages that outsourcing has caused since the day I came to the Congress.

Right now, we have an opportunity to make real progress, pushing back against outsourcing. But in order to make that opportunity reality, we cannot accept the status quo on the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Any renegotiated NAFTA must eliminate the incentives for outsourcing jobs, raise wages, and level the playing field for North American workers. It is our job to ensure that the Trump administration keeps its promises to the middle class, and put an end to the outsourcing of jobs by fighting for strong, enforceable labor and environmental standards.

□ 1015

The U.S. labor proposal in NAFTA must dramatically improve to stop the outsourcing of good-paying jobs and the suppression of wages for working people. Unless we rewrite NAFTA with the workers at the center of our goals, we will repeat the same mistakes that we have made in the past.

The North American Free Trade Agreement has already facilitated the outsourcing of a million American jobs to Mexico where corporations can pay workers poverty wages and dump toxins into the environment before bringing products back into the U.S. for sale.

American workers and the environment lose. In fact, in 2004, in my district in Connecticut, we lost 300 good jobs at the BIC plant in Milford, Connecticut, because the company moved their razor operation to Mexico.

Beyond BIC, NAFTA had a tremendously negative impact on my home State in Connecticut. In fact, we lost more than 100,000 manufacturing jobs since it was enacted and since China was allowed to join the WTO—the period between 1994 and 2016, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That

amounts to nearly 40 percent of the manufacturing jobs in Connecticut, taking into account both jobs created by exports and jobs displaced by imports.

As these jobs moved overseas, the percentage of all private sector jobs that are manufacturing jobs in Connecticut declined from 20 percent to 11 percent during the NAFTA–WTO period. I watched and I fought against the slow death of the Ansonia Copper and Brass Company as they suffered under these policies.

In Connecticut, more than 25,000 workers are certified as having lost their job due to imports or outsourcing under the Trade Adjustment Assistance program—companies such as Carrier, Exxon Mobil, General Electric, Honeywell, Northrop Grumman, Dow Chemical, The Hershey Company, 3M, and others.

So manufacturing jobs, good-paying jobs that you can support a family with, took a big hit in Connecticut because of NAFTA—workers who made electrical products, medical products, machined parts, printing products, clothing, automotive parts, aircraft parts, and the list goes on.

When negotiated with the workers in mind, trade agreements can create jobs in America, and I will hold the Trump administration to that standard, just as I have done with every administration, no matter which party occupies the White House.

Turning to investor-state dispute settlement, or ISDS, in trade agreements, ISDS makes it easier to outsource jobs from the United States by making it less risky. It makes it less risky for companies to move their manufacturing to places that have a weaker rule of law and an underdeveloped court system. The assumption is that, instead of relying upon rule of law and the courts, corporations can just sue the taxpayers of the host country.

ISDS undermines the home advantage of a relatively well-developed court system and the rule of law like what we have here in the United States. Furthermore, ISDS can be wielded as a weapon to threaten and discourage efforts to raise wages, which encourages outsourcing. For example, the Egyptian Government was recently challenged by a multinational corporation because of a raise in the minimum wage.

President Trump ran on a platform that called for an end to the outsourcing of good-paying jobs, yet his tax law, arguably his proudest achievement thus far, incentivizes outsourcing, encourages companies to export jobs by creating a lower rate for multinational corporations to invest abroad. This is nowhere near the corporate tax rate for domestic investments. This is a job killer.

Right now, a company that makes their wares outside of the United

States pays up to 13 percent in U.S. taxes. The same company making their wares in the United States pays 21 percent in taxes on their operations. I have recently introduced a bill striking the sections of the law that create this incentive to outsource.

In closing, the biggest economic issue of our time is that too many people who play by the rules are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. They are struggling with rising costs of healthcare, with childcare, and some can't even put food on the table. We need to fight for these workers. We should not be sending their jobs and their wages overseas, and I will continue to fight outsourcing for hard-working middle class Americans. The stakes could not be higher.

HONORING LIEUTENANT CALEB KING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lieutenant Caleb King, a naval aviator and Port Orange, Florida, native who died when his F/A–18 Super Hornet crashed while training onboard Naval Air Station Boca Chica in Key West, Florida.

Caleb King was a standout football player at Warner Christian Academy in South Daytona. He was recruited to play football at a number of colleges but chose to combine college football with service to our country by attending the U.S. Naval Academy, and as a linebacker, he was a key component of successful Navy teams that played in two bowl games and, most importantly, went 4–0 against Army.

After graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy, Caleb completed extensive training to become a naval aviator and was eventually assigned to Strike Fighter Attack Squadron 213 based in Virginia Beach. Our fighter jets represent the tip of the sphere of America's offensive air capabilities, and the aviators assigned to these units are some of the best sailors in the fleet, so it is not surprising that someone like Caleb would find himself at VFA–213.

While we don't know yet the reason for the crash, suffice it to say that officers like Caleb put their lives on the line every day. The training they do is inherently dangerous, and it is not for the faint of heart.

Caleb King was a big, strong, American patriot. He was an inspiration to those who knew him. He served our country with distinction and lived up to the Navy's ethos of honor, courage, and commitment.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to the King family, particularly his wife, Victoria, and daughter, Rain.

America lost a promising naval flight officer last week in Key West. Lieutenant King dedicated his life to some-

thing bigger than himself: serving our Nation in uniform and risking his own life to do so. That is what we call a hero.

SUPPORTING MAKING PORTUGUESE CITIZENS ELIGIBLE FOR E1 AND E2 VISAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in fostering further investment in our United States economy by one of our oldest allies, Portugal.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Portuguese Caucus, I am proud to join Congressmen CICILLINE and VALADAO in leading the AMIGOS Act, which will make Portuguese citizens eligible for E1 and E2 visas. These visas allow individuals to enter the United States to conduct substantial trade or invest a substantial amount of capital, which spurs investment in our economy and helps create jobs. That is, after all, what we do with our friends, with our allies.

In 2015 alone, between Portugal and the United States, there was \$4.2 billion in trade. That created jobs here in the United States. It creates jobs in Portugal. It is good for both countries, and that is the way friends ought to work together.

There is precedent here. Congress granted eligibility for Israel in 2012 with the E1 and E2 visas, which allow for easier access for businesspeople who are engaged in these kinds of economic activities. What is more, Portugal was one of the first countries to recognize the United States after we declared our independence and won the Revolutionary War.

For many of us, if we remember our history, after World War II, to defend Western democracies, Portugal, along with the United States, helped organize Western Europe to create NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, that has been the bulwark of defense of Western ideals that are the foundation of our democracies.

For these reasons and more, I call upon my colleagues to join me in supporting a commonsense, bipartisan piece of legislation, the AMIGOS Act, which will further opportunities for business in America by creating more jobs and continue to enhance the relationship that has existed for over 200 years between the United States and Portugal.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the irreplaceable contributions that women

have made to our Nation. As pioneers of industry and champions of human rights, women have played a critical role in the advancement of our society.

March is Women's History Month, so I want to take a moment to talk about just three of the many women from my community who have made the world a better place.

One of those women is Lydia Hamilton Smith from Lancaster County, an African-American woman, who became the partner and confidant of Pennsylvania Congressman Thaddeus Stevens during the Civil War and during the ensuing debate and passage of the 13th Amendment.

During the Battle of Gettysburg, Ms. Hamilton Smith hired a horse and wagon and went out to collect food and supplies from York, Adams, and Lancaster Counties. Once her wagon was full, she traveled to the makeshift hospitals tending to wounded soldiers from the battle.

The recent excavation of Lydia Hamilton Smith's and Thaddeus Stevens' houses in Lancaster uncovered a passageway that led to a tavern that is believed to have been used to shelter escaped slaves. The work Lydia contributed to the Underground Railroad and the abolition movement at large is reflective of the difficult, perilous, and humble work by women during that time period to end slavery.

The next woman I would like to recognize today is Rebecca Lukens of Chester County. I would like to read an excerpt from a May 2012 piece published in the Daily Local News:

"Imagine the year is 1825. You are a 31-year-old mother, pregnant with your sixth child. You've already lost two children in infancy. Your husband has struggled for a dozen years to build an iron-making business in the rolling backcountry of Chester County on the banks of Brandywine Creek. Suddenly he dies, leaving you alone. The iron-works employees are ready to leave, and your overbearing mother implores you to abandon the business."

This is what Rebecca Lukens had to confront, but she didn't give up. Rebecca ran the household and the business, building it over the next few decades into a successful company that we know today as ArcelorMittal, the world's leading steel and mining company.

Women like Rebecca teach our sons and daughters that, if you work hard and dream big enough, you can break molds and you can achieve your goals.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Barbara Franklin. Born in Lancaster County and a graduate of Hempfield High School, she is perhaps best known for serving in President George H.W. Bush's Cabinet as the 29th Secretary of Commerce.

Following the student protests and massacre in Tiananmen Square in China, the United States imposed sanc-

tions and a ban on governmental contacts. When President Bush sought to normalize relations with China, Barbara led that effort. She reconvened the U.S.-China Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade, opening new markets for American products. She says this is the most important thing that she did as Commerce Secretary.

Barbara was also one of the very first women to graduate from Harvard Business School. As the current president and CEO of Barbara Franklin Enterprises, she has a reputation for breaking down barriers and being a leading voice for women's equality and empowerment in the workplace.

Each of the three women I have highlighted today are successful in their own right. They have paved the way for current and future generations of young people who have the same entrepreneurial drive. Their leadership has inspired men and women, alike, and has set an example of what hard work, determination, and standing for what you believe in looks like.

I have to say I am quite proud to have such impressive role models come from my congressional district. It is women like Lydia, Rebecca, Barbara, and many others who are shining examples of the progress our country has made over the last two centuries, who give hope for the future and remind us of the important contributions of women.

□ 1030

A CALL FOR ACTION AGAINST GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened and angered that the high school in my district, Great Mills High School, in St. Mary's County, was the site of the most recent school shooting, of which there have been 17 just since the beginning of this year.

Two students were injured, and the gunman, also a student, was killed. And an entire community of parents, students, teachers, and faculty has been shaken by this violence.

If it had not been for the courage and quick action of the school resource officer, Blaine Gaskill, and local law enforcement, the casualties might have been far, far greater.

Blaine Gaskill is a hero, as are the teachers, students, and other school personnel.

Tim Cameron, the sheriff of St. Mary's County, and the sheriff's office, of which Blaine Gaskill was a member, responded exactly as they had practiced: efficient, effective, and caring.

Kathy O'Brien, who heads up a place called Walden in our county and in southern Maryland, was on site within an hour, dealing with the crisis and the mental health challenges it caused.

Principal Jake Heibel made sure the school responded effectively. The superintendent of schools, Dr. James Smith, had made sure that the school would act in a way that was appropriate.

We thank all of them.

But, Mr. Speaker, our Nation is suffering from a crisis of gun violence. It has affected schools, places of worship, entertainment venues, city streets, and other places where a lot of people congregate.

No other industrialized society or nation faces such a crisis, and that is because, in America, our laws allow almost anybody to access dangerous firearms, almost no questions asked.

Furthermore, we allow the sale of assault rifles of the kind used by soldiers in the battlefield, designed to kill a lot of people quickly.

In this instance, it was a handgun, a Glock. I do not know the capacity of the magazine that was used, but it was not an assault rifle.

This Republican-led Congress, Mr. Speaker, has chosen to follow the lead of the NRA and do nothing of substance.

We did pass a bill the other day that gave schools some help, some grant money, to ensure the safety of their schools. That was appropriate to do. But they could do that now on their own. We will help, that is good, but it does not address the real problem. Perhaps that was the point.

And America's students, however, Mr. Speaker, won't have it. I had the opportunity last Wednesday to stand with thousands of students who walked out of their schools, walked into democracy, and marched to the Capitol to call for action against gun violence.

These young people, Mr. Speaker, displayed the best of America, using their voices and their actions, to promote a just cause and a worthy effort to make our Union more perfect.

The other Members and I who joined these young Americans could see that they do not take this and other national challenges lightly. Indeed, they had much to say about the future they want for our country and for the role they want to play to shape it.

One of the students, Mr. Speaker, from Maryland, Matt Post, spoke extraordinarily eloquently.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD his remarks.

My name is Matt Post. I'm a twelfth-grader, the Student Member of the Board for Montgomery County, and, I think, as students we need to make a few things clear.

To start, we will not sit in classrooms with armed teachers. We refuse to learn in fear. We reject turning our schools into prisons.

We will accept nothing less than stricter gun control. If it's what it takes, we are going to shame our national policymakers into protecting us, not just in schools but in churches, movie theaters, on the streets, and for the communities of color who are disproportionately devastated by the sickness of gun violence.

The lawmakers who fail to support us, those who look for every answer to our nation's gun problem but the guns themselves, are complicit in every single death that comes after. To every politician sitting in the Capitol behind us, you get to decide who lives.

And so, this is not a partisan issue for us. There's nothing cosmetic about life or death. This is about our basic morality as a country.

When the commander-in-chief's solution to this gun epidemic is more guns, you know we have a moral problem in the White House.

When national policymakers value the blood money of the NRA over the lives of children, you know we have a moral problem in the Halls in Congress.

And when this is doomed to happen again—when, in the coming weeks and months, more of my peers will be slaughtered in their own classrooms, when their deaths will be dismissed as collateral—you know we have a moral problem in this country.

So let's make one last thing clear: their right to own an assault rifle does not outweigh our right to live.

The adults have failed us. This is in our hands now. And if any elected official gets in our way, we will vote them out and replace them ourselves.

'Enough is Enough!'

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read the remarks in their entirety, but I do want to highlight one thing Matt had to say, which I thought was so profound.

He concluded his remarks by saying: "... their right to own an assault rifle does not outweigh our right to live."

His right to live is guaranteed by the Constitution as well.

There were many others like Matt, Mr. Speaker, other student leaders from our area, who stood up and spoke out and roused their peers to be engaged.

Along with Matt, I want to recognize Brenna Levitan; Eri Shay; Emily Dohler Rodas; Michael Solomon; Nate Tinbite; Christian Crawford; and a student from American University, who helped them organize, Aaron Thorp.

These student leaders, and their many peers who marched with them last week, deserve to be heard in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fail them.

Like the young leaders of generations ago, of centuries ago, a millennia ago, these young leaders are calling to our conscience to take action, and we must not fail them.

We must not fail the students and teachers and parents of Great Mills High School in St. Mary's County; or Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida; or Marshall County High School in Kentucky; or Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, Oregon; or Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut; or Virginia Tech; or Columbine; or any other school that has witnessed the carnage of a school shooting.

Mr. Speaker, we must take real action—action to make our schools and

our communities safer from gun violence.

I am proud to stand with the young Americans who walked out—and I thank them for their passion and their advocacy—and who say they do not want to go to school and be afraid.

One young woman said the first thing she does when she goes to school now is to look for a place to hide.

Mr. Speaker, we must do better than that. I will continue to work closely with the community in Great Mills in the days and weeks ahead, as we try to heal and move forward.

But, Mr. Speaker, in order to do that, this body, the people's body, who raise our hand and swear an oath to the Constitution and the laws of our country, designed to create a more perfect Union, a Union in which the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is protected by the people's House, Mr. Speaker, let us act.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 11 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

Minister Jeremiah Tatum, Willow Avenue Church of Christ, Cookeville, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, we bow to You and praise You upon this, the beginning of spring. We are reminded that You are in control of all things, and it is by Your hand that they exist and were created.

Look down in mercy, we beseech Thee, on these our American States. Be Thou present, O God of wisdom, and direct the councils of this honorable assembly; enable them to settle things on the best and surest foundation. Direct them according to the instructions of Your holy word.

We humbly ask for Your care and patience. We request the revival of the spirit by which we were founded and have endured. We pray for Your guidance upon our President, his Cabinet, the Members of our Congress, and each and every person within our government. We pray for Your truth and love and peace to reign in our country and in our world.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TROTT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING MINISTER JEREMIAH TATUM

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to welcome Minister Jeremiah Tatum from Cookeville, Tennessee, to our Nation's Capital.

In Congress, we begin each day thanking the Lord for His provision and asking for continued guidance, protection, and wisdom. It is a great privilege to have a fellow Tennessean lead us in this sacred tradition today.

Minister Tatum was born in Los Angeles County, California, and comes from seven consecutive generations of preachers. His call to ministry began 27 years ago, and he is currently serving his eighth year as the pulpit minister of Willow Avenue Church of Christ in Cookeville.

In addition to local work, Minister Tatum preaches abroad and serves overseas with foreign missions. He encourages young men to become preachers and believes he has the best job in the world. Our community is so grateful for his service.

He is married to Amber, and they have three children: Luke, Daniel, and LyssaBeth. I know his family and the

Willow Avenue congregation are very proud to have him with us today, and I thank him for opening our day in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING THE 24TH ANNUAL VERA HOUSE WHITE RIBBON CAMPAIGN

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against domestic violence and sexual abuse.

Domestic violence affects people from all backgrounds. Regardless of race, religion, and socioeconomic background, domestic abuse touches all aspects of our community.

According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, nearly 20 people per minute are assaulted by an intimate partner. We must work together to stop this.

Central New York is home to Vera House, a wonderful organization that works to prevent and respond to domestic and sexual violence. This month, it kicked off its 24th annual White Ribbon Campaign in central New York. This campaign raises awareness for the need to put an end to domestic violence and sexual abuse.

Throughout the duration of the White Ribbon Campaign, thousands of central New Yorkers, such as myself, will be wearing a white ribbon or a white wristband to stand in solidarity against abuse.

I urge my House colleagues to join me in wearing a white ribbon to demonstrate a personal pledge to work towards preventing violence against men, women, and children.

PROTECT THE MUELLER INVESTIGATION

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it: through their words and actions, President Trump and his allies are doing everything they can to destroy the independent investigation of Special Counsel Robert Mueller through provocative tweets: a witch hunt;

Through reckless actions: firing Director Comey and Assistant Director McCabe; and

Through provocative statements: his personal attorney calling for an end to the investigation.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is not what the President wants to do or may do. The question is: Will Congress do what it must do, which is protect the Mueller investigation?

A number of us have a bill that would do just that. Our bill would require a three-judge panel to approve any dismissal of Mr. Mueller.

Mr. Speaker, no American is above the law, no Member of Congress is above the law, and no member of the executive branch is above the law, including President Trump.

Mr. Speaker, let the House vote on our bill. Make each one of us be accountable to our constituents on the rule of law.

Will we vote to protect the Mueller investigation or will we acquiesce to the President's threats and temper tantrums?

Mr. Speaker, let us vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM PULTE, SR.

(Mr. TROTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of William Pulte, Sr. He passed away earlier this month at the age of 85.

In 1950, at the age of 18, Bill Pulte started building and selling homes in southeast Michigan. In 1956, he founded Pulte Homes, known today as the Pulte Group. Over the next 50 years, he grew the company into the largest homebuilder in the United States.

Bill Pulte was a legend in the business world, but his legacy is one of great devotion to his family and community. He was involved with the Angel Fund, a group which anonymously provides families in Detroit with shelter. His philanthropy helped Cornerstone Schools provide thousands of young people in Detroit with a great education, and his passion for homebuilding took him all the way to Central America to help its poorest communities.

So it is most appropriate that we pause today from our Nation's business to remember and celebrate the life of Bill Pulte. His hard work, devotion, and vision changed the world for the better, and for that, we thank him.

UCR VETERANS PROJECT

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, the Riverside National Cemetery is the final resting place for nearly 300,000 former military personnel and their family

members. Each of them have a story that deserves to be told.

I rise today to applaud the University of California, Riverside, on a new grant that will be used to research and tell these stories.

With support from the Department of Veterans Affairs, UC Riverside faculty and students will document the lives of those who served and partner with K-12 schools to help teach young people about the value of service and sacrifice. Our duty to honor those who sacrificed for this Nation is not limited to Memorial Day or Veterans Day.

This project will help our community understand and appreciate the individuals whose service has kept this Nation safe and free. I am proud that UC Riverside has been selected for this important initiative and look forward to seeing the meaningful work it will produce.

AMELIA EARHART CONTINUES TO INSPIRE

(Ms. JENKINS of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Amelia Earhart, one of the most iconic aviators in history, became the first woman to fly across the Atlantic Ocean, which launched her to national notoriety and inspired millions to follow. Highlighting her contributions to aviation, yesterday, the House passed the Amelia Earhart U.S. Post Office Act, which names her hometown post office in Atchison, Kansas, after her.

While she was lost at sea, that wasn't the end of the Amelia Earhart story. A woman's aviation group, the Ninety-Nines, which she founded, still exists today and advocates for female pilots in the industry. Amelia's legacy soars as high as ever as she continues to inspire new generations of women to reach for greater heights.

Please join me in celebrating the life of Amelia Earhart.

CHILD CARE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a typical Rhode Island family with an infant and a 4-year-old pays \$23,000 a year in child care. That is nearly double the cost of tuition at the University of Rhode Island.

Nationwide, the cost of child care has increased 25 percent in the past decade. That is a terrible deal. It is a raw deal for working families. Democrats have proposed the Child Care for Working Families Act, a better deal.

This bill ensures that no middle class family will pay more than 7 percent of their income on child care. It ensures universal access to high-quality preschool programs. It also raises wages

for childcare workers. It focuses on the needs of middle class families and the high cost of child care.

A few months ago, my Republican colleagues passed a huge tax cut for powerful corporate special interests and the wealthiest Americans. Democrats, on the other hand, are offering A Better Deal—a deal that focuses on raising family incomes, reducing costs in people's lives, and making sure people are prepared for jobs in the 21st century.

We propose A Better Deal.

ONE FAMILY ONE RESTAURANT

(Mr. KNIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the work of One Family One Restaurant, a nonprofit organization in my district that tackles significant homelessness and hunger problems in southern California.

I am proud to recognize its work in giving families who struggle with food insecurity the opportunity to eat at a restaurant. One Family One Restaurant provides a unique and invaluable dining experience to families who otherwise rely on food stamps and too often wait in long lines at food banks to access food. The experience also helps heal hearts and restore a family's dignity and hope.

One Family One Restaurant does not act alone. It relies on restaurants and community members to sponsor meals and local pantries and food banks to help coordinate families in need. It takes the repeated generosity of the entire community to alleviate family hunger in their region.

This year, they will be launching their nationwide America Break Bread campaign. I encourage all of those who seek to help the hungry to join in this effort and follow the footsteps of this stellar organization. It is an honor to bring their work to the attention of the House and the Nation today.

INSULT TO OUR PRINCIPLES

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of being involved in a number of international organizations representing the United States. We are defined by our love, appreciation for democracy, and for selling that around the world.

The call that was made by the Commander in Chief yesterday to Vladimir Putin, whose election was a failure, at best, was an insult to our principles and our values. This is the leader of a country alleged to have used poison gas on ally soil in London, trying to kill two individuals; had the interaction in

Ukraine with the bringing down of the plane; and incarcerating many people in Russia because of their views.

I think this is a poor statement for a country that promotes democracy. The world looks to us and seeks to be, in many instances, like America. They value our concern for human rights and our value of democracy. They wait for us to stand up against despots like Vladimir Putin, yet the President of the United States gives him a jolly congratulations for an election that was not an election.

□ 1115

CONGRATULATING PENN STATE WRESTLING

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Penn State wrestling team on winning this year's NCAA Division I National Championship.

The Penn State Nittany Lions are a force to be reckoned with and they proved it again last weekend in Cleveland, Ohio, when they brought home their seventh team title in 8 years. The team went 4-and-1 in the finals, coming back from a 6-point deficit heading into the final round to clinch the title on a pin by junior Bo Nickal in Penn State's final match of the night.

Penn State won the team title with 141.5 points, while Ohio State was in second with 134.5. Iowa took third with 97.

Head coach Cael Sanderson now has 22 national champions as a head coach, 20 at Penn State, and 7 NCAA titles.

I could not be more proud of my alma mater or this team that gave us yet another season to remember. Many college athletes dream about participating at the NCAA championships.

This team truly is the pride of Happy Valley, and I congratulate Coach Sanderson and every wrestler on the team.

We are.

CUT FRIVOLOUS SPENDING

(Mr. BIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 2017, I released a statement to mark and recognize that the national debt had just exceeded \$20 trillion.

I asked my colleagues to follow through with our commitment to reduce expenditures and create economic stability for our future. Since that date, Congress has not taken any action to reduce our deficit or to balance our budget. Instead, we have increased

our budget caps to augment Federal spending by more than 10 percent above current levels.

We suspended our debt ceiling, and this week we are preparing to pass our seventh short-term spending bill of the fiscal year. Our grossly negligent spending habits continue with no end in sight. At this rate, I am certain that we will see a \$22 trillion national debt sometime around the first of next year.

Mr. Speaker, this fiscal irresponsibility is not what we promised our constituents. We are directly contributing to the bankruptcy of this Nation that we will leave to our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues to honor the pledge to cut our spending and reduce our debt before it is too late. We must act now before we cross another trillion-dollar threshold.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 20, 2018, at 4:49 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a Report to the Congress on the Extension of Trade Promotion Authority.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

EXTENSION OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-104)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Today, I am requesting that the Congress extend trade authorities procedures for 3 years. As required under section 103(c)(2) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (Trade Priorities Act), I have attached to this message the report describing the progress that has been made in trade negotiations by my Administration and the reasons why the extension is necessary.

As noted in the 2018 Trade Policy Agenda, my Administration has

launched a new era in American trade policy, driven by a determination to use the leverage available to us as the world's largest economy to open foreign markets, and to obtain more efficient global markets and fairer treatment for American workers. One of the major pillars supporting my trade policy is the pursuit of better trade deals.

As you know, my Administration is pursuing the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement—something many have promised but have failed to deliver. In addition, my Administration is exploring potential trade agreement partners, including in Africa and Southeast Asia.

I hope my Administration can continue to work with the Congress to pursue new and better trade deals for America's workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses. Extension of trade authorities procedures is essential to fulfill that task and to demonstrate to our trading partners that my Administration and the Congress share a common goal when it comes to trade.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2018.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 21, 2018, at 8:52 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 899.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROTECT SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I addressed this House on the issue of Mr. Mueller and his important investigation in the Special Counsel's Office.

I am concerned, as we leave on Thursday or Friday, that the President could fire Mr. Rosenstein—who has authority over Mr. Mueller—or fire Mr. Sessions and put somebody in who will jeopardize Mr. Mueller's investigation.

Accordingly, a bill I have, H.R. 4669, was filed in December to protect Mr. Mueller. It gives him due process rights—if he is fired—to go to court before a three-judge Federal panel to

show that he was fired for purposes which were political and not relating to his job performance.

I am filing a discharge petition today. I will be filing it in 10 minutes, asking all Members of the House to sign it; to bring this bill to the floor immediately for a vote so that we can protect the special counsel, protect Mr. Mueller, and protect America.

God Bless America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 1 p.m.

TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK MONGIELLO, JORDAN MCINN, AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT TO TRY ACT OF 2018

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 787, I call up the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 787, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5247

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. USE OF UNAPPROVED INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS BY PATIENTS DIAGNOSED WITH A TERMINAL ILLNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter E of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 561A (21 U.S.C. 360bbb-0) the following:

"SEC. 561B. INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS FOR USE BY ELIGIBLE PATIENTS.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'eligible patient' means a patient—

"(A) who has been diagnosed with an eligible illness;

"(B) who has exhausted approved treatment options and is not eligible to participate in (for a reason such as the patient not meeting inclusion criteria) a clinical trial designed to evaluate an investigational drug for the treatment of such eligible illness with which the patient has been diagnosed, including one involving the eligible investigational drug, or for whom participation in such a clinical trial is not feasible (for a reason such as a lack of geographic proximity to the clinical trial), as certified by a physician, who—

"(i) is in good standing with the physician's licensing organization or board; and

"(ii) will not be compensated for so certifying; and

"(C) who has provided to the treating physician written informed consent, as described in part 50 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), regarding the eligible investigational drug, or, as applicable, on whose behalf a legally authorized representative of the patient has provided such consent.

"(2) The term 'eligible investigational drug' means an investigational drug (as such term is used in section 561)—

"(A) for which a phase 1 clinical trial has been completed;

"(B) that has not been approved or licensed for any use under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act;

"(C)(i) for which an application has been filed under section 505(b) of this Act or section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act, as applicable, that is active; or

"(ii) that is under investigation in a clinical trial that—

"(I) is intended to form the primary basis of a claim of effectiveness in support of approval or licensure under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act; and

"(II) is the subject of an active investigational new drug application under section 505(i) of this Act or section 351(a)(3) of the Public Health Service Act, as applicable; and

"(D) the active development or production of which—

"(i) is ongoing;

"(ii) has not been discontinued by the manufacturer; and

"(iii) is not the subject of a clinical hold under the regulations implementing section 505(i) or section 351(a)(3) of the Public Health Service Act, as applicable.

"(3) The term 'phase 1 trial' means a phase 1 clinical investigation of a drug as described in section 312.21 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

"(4) The term 'eligible illness' means—

"(A) a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months; or

"(B) a disease or condition that would result in significant irreversible morbidity that is likely to lead to severely premature death.

"(b) ALTERNATIVE PATHWAY FOR ELIGIBLE PATIENTS WITH A TERMINAL ILLNESS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Eligible investigational drugs provided to eligible patients in compliance with this section are exempt from sections 502(f), 503(b)(4), and subsections (a) and (i) of section 505 of this Act, and section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act so long as the conditions specified in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) are met with respect to the provision of such investigational drugs.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN REGULATIONS.—The conditions specified in this paragraph, with respect to an eligible investigational drug referred to in paragraph (1), are that—

“(A) the eligible investigational drug is labeled in accordance with section 312.6 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations); and

“(B) the provision of such eligible investigational drug occurs in compliance with the applicable requirements set forth in sections 312.7 and 312.8(d)(1) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) that apply to investigational drugs, subject to paragraph (5).

“(3) NOTIFICATION.—The condition specified in this paragraph, with respect to an eligible investigational drug referred to in paragraph (1), is that the sponsor of such eligible investigational drug notifies the Secretary of the provision of such eligible investigational drug for use by an eligible patient pursuant to this section. Such notification shall be submitted within 7 business days of the provision of such eligible investigational drug as correspondence to the investigational new drug application described in subsection (a)(2).

“(4) ADVERSE EVENT REPORTING.—The condition specified in this paragraph, with respect to an eligible investigational drug referred to in paragraph (1), is that the sponsor or manufacturer of such eligible investigational drug has required, as a condition of providing the drug to a physician for use by an eligible patient pursuant to this section, that such physician will immediately report to such sponsor or manufacturer any serious adverse events, as such term is defined in section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), associated with the use of the eligible investigational drug by the eligible patient.

“(5) APPLICATION.—For purposes of this section, the requirements set forth in sections 312.7 and 312.8(d)(1) of title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) are deemed to apply to any person who manufactures, distributes, prescribes, dispenses, introduces or delivers for introduction into interstate commerce, or provides to an eligible patient an eligible investigational drug pursuant to this section.

“(c) USE OF CLINICAL OUTCOMES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Public Health Service Act, or any other provision of Federal law, the Secretary may not use a clinical outcome associated with the use of an eligible investigational drug pursuant to this section to delay or adversely affect the review or approval of such drug under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act unless—

“(A) the Secretary makes a determination, in accordance with paragraph (2), that use of such clinical outcome is critical to determining the safety of the eligible investigational drug; or

“(B) the sponsor requests use of such outcomes.

“(2) LIMITATION.—If the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall provide written notice of such determination to the sponsor, including a public health justification for such determination, and such notice shall be made part of the administrative record. Such determination shall not be delegated below the director of the agency center that is charged with the premarket review of the eligible investigational drug.

“(d) REPORTING.—The manufacturer or sponsor of an eligible investigational drug that provides an eligible investigational drug pursuant to this section shall post on the same publicly available internet website used by the manufacturer for purposes of section 561A(b) an annual summary of any provision by the manufacturer or sponsor of an eligible investigational drug under this section. The summary shall include the number of requests received, the number of requests granted, the number of patients treated, the therapeutic area of the drug made available, and any known or suspected serious adverse events, as such term is defined in section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), associated with the use of the eligible investigational drug.

“(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Secretary to require manufacturers or sponsors of investigational drugs to review and report information relevant to the safety of such investigational drug obtained or otherwise received by the sponsor pursuant to part 312 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).”

(b) NO LIABILITY.—Section 561B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LIABILITY.—

“(1) ALLEGED ACTS OR OMISSIONS.—

“(A) MANUFACTURER OR SPONSOR.—No manufacturer or sponsor (or their agent or representative) of an investigational drug shall be liable for any alleged act or omission related to the provision of such drug to a single patient or small group of patients for treatment use in accordance with subsection (b) or (c) of section 561 or the provision of an eligible investigational drug to an eligible patient in accordance with this section, including, with respect to the provision of an investigational drug under section 561 or an eligible investigational drug under this section, the reporting of safety information, from clinical trials or any other source, as required by section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(B) PHYSICIAN, CLINICAL INVESTIGATOR, OR HOSPITAL.—

“(i) No licensed physician, clinical investigator, or hospital shall be liable for any alleged act or omission related to the provision of an investigational drug to a single patient or small group of patients for treatment use in accordance with subsection (b) or (c) of section 561, as described in clause (ii), or the provision of an eligible investigational drug to an eligible patient in accordance with this section, unless such act or omission constitutes on the part of such physician, clinical investigator, or hospital with respect to such investigational drug or eligible investigational drug—

“(I) willful or criminal misconduct;

“(II) reckless misconduct;

“(III) gross negligence relative to the applicable standard of care and practice with respect to the administration or dispensing of such investigational drug; or

“(IV) an intentional tort under applicable State law.

“(ii) The requirements described in this clause are the requirements under subsection (b) or (c) of section 561, including—

“(I) the reporting of safety information, from clinical trials or any other source, as required by section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

“(II) ensuring that the informed consent requirements of part 50 of title 21, Code of the Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) are met; and

“(III) ensuring that review by an institutional review board is obtained in a manner consistent with the requirements of part 56 of title 21, Code of the Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(2) DETERMINATION NOT TO PROVIDE DRUG.—No manufacturer, sponsor, licensed physician, clinical investigator, or hospital shall be liable for determining not to provide access to an investigational drug under this section or for discontinuing any such access that it initially determined to provide.

“(3) LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2), nothing in this section shall be construed to modify or otherwise affect the right of any person to bring a private action against a manufacturer or sponsor (or their agent or representative), physician, clinical investigator, hospital, prescriber, dispenser, or other entity under any State or Federal product liability, tort, consumer protection, or warranty law.

“(B) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify or otherwise affect the authority of the Federal Government to bring suit under any Federal law.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 5247.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Members of Congress heard the President during his State of the Union Address make a specific promise to the American people that the passage of right-to-try legislation would occur. This afternoon, I am proud to stand with the President and the thousands of Americans with terminal illnesses, their families, and their friends, in passing this important bill in the House.

Since 2014, nearly three out of four States, including my home State of Texas, have passed a version of right-to-try laws. I am pleased that the House is again considering H.R. 5247, the Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2018, so that terminally ill patients have a chance, or maybe a second chance, at life. These patients are our constituents. They could be someone we know. Let us take this opportunity to improve access to experimental treatments for them.

Over the course of the past decade, our Nation has achieved an unprecedented number of innovations and scientific breakthroughs. Through the contributions of researchers in academia and the private sector, Americans have more innovative treatments at their fingertips.

Despite these achievements, I still hear from patients with serious, life-threatening conditions, including my own constituents in north Texas, who are frustrated with what they see as regulatory barriers from trying new therapies when everything else has failed.

Mr. Speaker, as a physician, I understand that access to investigational drugs and therapies is a deeply personal priority for those seeking treatment for their loved ones with serious, life-threatening conditions.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, I have a simple question: Why do you not want to allow these patients to exercise their right to fight for their future?

It is worth mentioning that the bill before us today is a revised, more narrowly crafted version of the one that passed the Senate last August. Since that time, the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health held a hearing in early October to consider the Senate bill, where Members heard from the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Scott Gottlieb, about the agency's concerns. We also heard testimony from patients and groups that support and oppose right to try.

From then to just recently, our committee engaged in multistakeholder efforts to improve the original right-to-try bill, as passed by the Senate. It entailed numerous conversations with patients, advocates, the Administration, authors of the bill, and stakeholders on all sides of this complex topic.

The Food and Drug Administration was never left out of the discussion. In fact, the agency provided valuable input throughout the process and up until the introduction of H.R. 5247. The aim was to open the door to innovative, experimental drugs for terminally ill patients without necessarily compromising the vital work and the mission of the Food and Drug Administration.

The current compassionate use program at the Food and Drug Administration does make a good faith effort to help patients who do not qualify for clinical trials. But right to try would actually offer patients an alternative pathway to access eligible investigational drugs, so long as they are certified by a physician who is in good standing and abides by the rules laid out in the bill.

Again, we have worked closely with the Food and Drug Administration to ensure that this new, alternative pathway does not hinder or conflict with

the critically important oversight that the agency conducts.

Additionally, this bill protects patients from manufacturers mislabeling or misbranding drugs, requires sponsors and manufacturers to report adverse events to the Food and Drug Administration, and provides certain liability protections for parties participating in the new pathway.

Mr. Speaker, this alternative pathway would also be limited to individuals who are suffering from a disease or a condition where there is a reasonable likelihood of death within a matter of months or significant, reversible morbidity, and who have exhausted all FDA-approved treatment options.

Lastly, it is essential that we do not create additional hurdles in this process so that manufacturers in the drug approval process have the certainty that they need.

The revised right-to-try bill clearly states that the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services "may not use a clinical outcome associated with the use of an eligible investigational drug . . . to delay or adversely affect the review or approval of such drug. . . ."

After months of work and thoughtful discussions, this legislation is a positive step forward in our shared goal of improving care for America's patients. It strikes the proper balance between ensuring patient safety and granting access to new treatments.

The President outlined in his State of the Union Address that this was an important priority for the administration. In the words of our Vice President and former colleague, MIKE PENCE: "It's about restoring hope and giving patients with life-threatening diseases a fighting chance."

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote in support of H.R. 5247, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 5247, the Right to Try Act of 2018.

This legislation, introduced only last week, is an egregious attempt, in my opinion, by the Goldwater Institute to undermine the gold standard drug approval process at the Food and Drug Administration.

The supporters of this bill claim to be helping desperate patients who are looking for hope.

If this is such a patient-centered bill, then why does every major patient organization overwhelmingly oppose it?

More than 100 patient organizations, including the National Organization for Rare Disorders, the Friends of Cancer Research, and the American Cancer Society have all written in opposition to this legislation.

In a letter to congressional leadership, these 103 patient organizations

noted "that the alternative pathway in the latest version of this legislation is still less safe for our patients than the current expanded access process under the FDA."

It is not only the patient organizations that are voicing concerns. Four former FDA Commissioners—Drs. Hamburg and Califf, who served under the Obama administration; and Drs. McClellan and Andrew von Eschenbach, who served under the Bush administration—also oppose this legislation. That is two former Republican Commissioners and two former Democratic Commissioners who are opposed to both the House bill and the Senate bill on this same issue.

These four Commissioners explained their opposition by saying: "There is no evidence that either bill would meaningfully improve access for patients, but both would remove the FDA from the process and create a dangerous precedent that would erode protections for vulnerable patients."

Mr. Speaker, I think most importantly, I would stress that this legislation is simply not needed. There is already a successful program in place today at the FDA in which seriously ill patients and their doctors can request access to an experimental treatment from a manufacturer. This application process, which takes as little as 45 minutes for a physician to complete, has been overwhelmingly successful.

Last summer, a review by the Government Accountability Office found that the FDA approves 99 percent of the requests submitted to the agency. In fact, of the nearly 1,700 requests the FDA received last year, only 9 were not approved.

Physicians and patients also receive approval quickly. Emergency requests are often granted immediately over the phone and, on average, receive a response within 4 days.

While the FDA approves 99 percent of the treatments it reviews through this expanded access process, as it is called, it also adjusts applications for 11 percent of the patients to improve patient safety protections.

In order to protect patients, this review, in my opinion, should continue. We must protect patients from bad actors or from dangerous treatments that might make their lives worse. Just imagine the health consequences to patients if these 11 percent of applicants had not been adjusted.

This is the very reason that the FDA must be involved in the process. If you eliminate FDA review, as this bill does, you are putting patients at risk.

I want to talk a little bit about the fact that many States now have right-to-try statutes. I fear that some Members—and I heard this last week when the bill was on the suspension list—might support this legislation under the false belief that the State right-to-try laws in their States have provided

help to patients. But nothing could be further from the truth.

One example supporters of this legislation like to bring up is Dr. Delpassand from Texas, who claims to have treated patients under the State right to try.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Andrew McFadyen of The Isaac Foundation, who dispels this myth.

THE ISAAC FOUNDATION,
March 20, 2018.

Rep. GREG WALDEN, *Chair*,
Rep. FRANK PALLONE, *Ranking Member*,
Energy & Commerce Committee.

DEAR MR. PALLONE AND MR. WALDEN: I am writing to you regarding your upcoming debate on HR 5247, the Right to Try initiative fronted by the Goldwater Institute. I am the Executive Director of The Isaac Foundation, an organization that is dedicated to providing advocacy and support to patients dealing with a wide range of disorders and needing access to rare disease treatments. Our work pushes international boundaries, with the bulk of our efforts taking place in Canada and the United States. I am also a member of the NYU Working Group on Compassionate Use and Pre-Approval Access where we are making a concerted effort to improve and address the issues around access to experimental medications, and I'm involved with a non-profit called GE2P2.

I'm proud to say at The Isaac Foundation that we've never been unsuccessful gaining access to life-saving medications and treatments for patients in Canada, and our work directly with pharmaceutical companies is helping countless patients see similar results in the United States. We have had success by being collaborative partners with industry, regulatory authorities, and patients in need.

I watched the discussion last week with growing consternation that many of our elected officials have not taken the opportunity to fact-check claims being made by RTT proponents. Most notably, continued mention of Right to Try being used by Dr. Delpassand out of Texas is both egregiously wrong and, indeed, is the perfect example of why RTT should not be passed by lawmakers.

In October 2016, I testified during Senator Ron Johnson's hearing on Right to Try, at which Johnson introduced and played a video created by the Goldwater Institute of Dr. Delpassand. During that 3-minute video, Dr. Delpassand explained that he was using the state RTT law to treat his patients because the FDA would not allow him to do it through an Expanded Access Program. Senator Johnson asked me what I thought about this video—which included few facts, no context, and was edited by the people fronting the RTT push themselves. I explained that there must be a reason why Dr. Delpassand was in the 1% of cases not allowed by the FDA and vowed I would investigate.

In March of 2017, I received a set of documents from the FDA under a FOIA request. They show that Dr. Delpassand's clinic failed inspections during the clinical trial of Lutathera (lutetium Lu 177 dotatate). Specifically, he failed inspection due to 3 key and very important reasons:

1. Enrolling subjects into the study during a partial clinical hold, issued by the Agency.
2. Underreporting of Adverse Events.
3. 1572-protocol noncompliance.

The failed inspections were discovered after complaint from the CDER Good Clinical Practice Compliance Oversight Branch,

Division of Good Clinical Practice Compliance Evaluation, Office of Scientific Investigations (OSI). A "Clinical Hold" was placed on the lab and Dr. Delpassand. During a clinical hold, subjects may not be given an investigational drug. Dr. Delpassand and his clinic disregarded this clinical hold and enrolled 6 patients.

Additionally, and just as concerning in terms of patient safety, Dr. Delpassand's clinic failed to promptly report significant new adverse events or risks to the FDA. This failure to report was noted numerous times during the inspection. The inspection also found numerous other areas of concern. I have attached the full report for your consideration.

After these inspections, the FDA would not allow Dr. Delpassand to open an EAP at his clinic for patients in need, and rightly so. They FDA did, however, allow 42 different locations the ability to provide this drug for patients requiring access, including two sites in Texas. A quick search on ClinicalTrials.gov shows this information, further proving that the FDA has been able to provide patients the required access they need, ensuring the environment that they are receiving the drug they need is safe.

My understanding of the situation is that the company running the clinical trial distanced themselves from Dr. Delpassand after these failed inspections. Without company support, and without the FDA's permission to open an EAP, Dr. Delpassand had to use the state legislation to provide drug to his patients. Questions remain, however, such as how Dr. Delpassand paid for the product he was giving his patients, did patients themselves have to pay for that drug supply (which isn't allowed under the Texas RTT law) and who, if anyone, was overseeing the program to ensure safety of the patients, especially after multiple infractions were seen during the failed FDA inspection.

Most important, it should be noted that the FDA process here worked exactly how it is supposed to. A lab was inspected for safety to ensure patients are looked after in the appropriate fashion. That inspection placed a hold on further treating of patients due to numerous infractions. The FDA worked with the company to ensure access for patients across the USA in 42 different sites, helping to monitor adverse events while also allowing the product to advance to approval. That product was approved by the FDA in January 2018.

Also importantly, RTT was used because it was the only way for Dr. Delpassand to treat patients in his clinic after it failed inspection. RTT is a loophole designed to allow people who cannot otherwise follow safety rules set forth by the FDA that are meant to protect vulnerable patients. It's not being used—anywhere—to provide patients with hope or access to life-saving drugs.

One final note, and one that I've not see mentioned anywhere. HR 5247 includes the name of a young child—a brave child battling Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy—named Jordan McLinn. Jordan has been photographed numerous times with Vice President Pence, and is often used as an example of why Right to Try is needed. The problem with these optics is that Jordan has never received any treatment under Right to Try, even though Right to Try has been available in his state of Indiana for 3 years. He already has access to the life-saving treatment he needs—through an FDA approved clinical trial. He's doing well on that trial drug, as I understand it, and receives all the benefits of FDA oversight to ensure his safety on that

trial. In essence, the child used to promote RTT is the perfect example of why the FDA process works and is needed.

The true reality is that the landscape for access to medications for dying patients does not change tomorrow if a Federal Right to Try law is passed today. Very clearly, those patients in dire need of help today will wake up tomorrow needing access to the same life-saving treatments, and feel the same despair because they will not be getting the access they need through Right to Try.

The barrier to that access here isn't the FDA, and no Right to Try law enacted by lawmakers in this country is going to remove the true barrier—pharmaceutical companies. The gatekeepers to these medications are the pharmaceutical companies themselves, and we need to be working collaboratively as a team—Industry, Government, physicians, and Patients—to craft solutions that will work for everyone, keeping in mind that we are all on the same side, that we all want the same thing—broad and expeditious access to life-saving medications for patients in need.

I understand how difficult this is for patients—I see it every day, and I feel it every night as I check in on my son (who is battling his own devastating and very rare disease) to make sure he is still breathing, to make sure he is still with us. But I also understand that the change we all need will not come with Right to Try. It will come through collaboration with all stakeholders and by providing companies the safety and assurances they need to make their medications available to our dying patients.

Lawmakers should be spending their time helping make that collaboration happen because that is how we are going to save our dying patients. They should not spin their wheels passing legislation like Right to Try that looks good, and feels good, but will do nothing for those in need. If they do, they are doing a disservice to a large and very vulnerable group of patients now and in the future, my own son, my own hero Isaac, included.

Thank you for your time on this matter.

Sincerely,

ANDREW MCFADYEN,
Executive Director, The Isaac Foundation.

Mr. PALLONE. Andrew McFadyen said:

Dr. Delpassand claims to have used right to try because FDA would not allow him to do expanded access. And this was for a very good reason. FDA placed a clinical hold on a study, due to the fact that his clinic was not reporting serious, adverse events, as required; and he continued to enroll patients, despite the clinic hold.

The work of Dr. Delpassand's study was associated with 40 deaths and 2 hospitalizations. FDA's clinical hold on Dr. Delpassand's work is a sign to me that FDA's expanded access pathway was working to prevent bad actors from continuing to expose vulnerable patients to experimental treatments.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5247 is dangerous for our patients. It is an unprecedented attempt to roll back the FDA's oversight of investigational treatments. I urge my colleagues to stand with more than 100 organizations that have come forward to oppose this misguided and, I believe, harmful legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), one of the authors of the bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WALDEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GRIFFITH, and my friends ANDY BIGGS and Senator JOHNSON for their unflinching commitment to see right to try debated, passed, and signed into law.

Moreover, I thank the overwhelming bipartisan majority of the House, who, just last week, supported the Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act, and proved emphatically that right to try is about more than politics. It is about hope.

Each year, thousands of Americans receive a life-altering diagnosis of a terminal illness. Even with the amazing work done in American medical research and development, for too many families, access to these potentially lifesaving treatments will come too late or not at all.

□ 1315

As their Representatives, we should each endeavor to support these individuals in their time of need, as well as support new pathways to potentially lifesaving treatment. That is what right to try is all about.

For those patients caught between traditional drug approval delays, a clinical trial process for which they do not qualify and limited time, right to try simply establishes the freedom for patients and their doctors to try therapies where the benefits far outweigh the risks. It gives them the option of trying to save their life.

Although the FDA has a program that allows terminal patients to apply for early access to a promising treatment, right to try is needed because the FDA compassionate use process doesn't help enough people. Moreover, the application process is complicated, time consuming, and expensive. Only about 1,200 people each year can make it through the application process.

In 2014, more than 12,000 people in France were using investigational treatments through that government's equivalent program. If a country with one-fifth the population of the United States can help 900 percent more people than the FDA's plan, clearly, is not working.

In Australia, doctors are allowed to work directly with drug and device manufacturers to provide investigational treatments to terminal patients without the government's approval. They simply must report to the government at some point that the patient received the drug. No permission slip is required.

This bill requires robust informed consent between the patient, doctor, and manufacturer, while requiring notification be given to the FDA after an

unapproved drug becomes available to an eligible patient and requires doctors and manufacturers to report adverse events to the FDA.

Mr. Speaker, when a life hangs in the balance, the Federal Government should not stand in the way of access to these potential treatments. I have traveled our district in all corners and have met so many different people—L.J. Kidon and Claire Concilio, most recently. Mr. Speaker, these people are an inspiration for this bill. They want to see this bill passed. Let's get this done for them.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who is the ranking member for the Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his generosity and time.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in opposition to H.R. 5247 because it creates a dangerous back door for modern-day snake oil salesmen, a back door around the FDA approval process for people who may or may not be preying on desperate people, and it ignores that there actually is a safe pathway for terminally ill patients to get treatment.

This bill failed to pass last week and it should fail again. It is a harmful policy that both Republican and Democratic-appointed former FDA Commissioners concluded there is "no evidence" that this bill "would meaningfully improve access for patients, but would just remove the FDA from the approval process and create a dangerous precedent that would erode protections for vulnerable patients," the most vulnerable patients. People whose lives are in danger feel that they will try anything, and there are people out there who will prey on that.

This bill denies patients what they really need, which is safe and effective treatments. This bill strips away important safeguards in the name of helping patients, but it does not, and that is why 78 patient groups and doctors, groups like the American Cancer Society, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, and the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, oppose this bill. In total, there are now 110 groups opposing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a multipage list of opponents to this bill.

GROUPS OPPOSED TO RIGHT TO TRY LEGISLATION

ADNP Kids Research Foundation; AIDS Action Baltimore; Alliance for Aging Research; Alliance for Regenerative Medicine; American Academy of Neurology; American Association of Justice; American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network; American Lung Association; American Society of Clinical Oncology; American Syringomyelia and Chiari Alliance Project; Amyloidosis Support Groups; Association for Creatine Deficiencies; Benign Essential Blepharospasm

Research Foundation; Biomarin; Bonnie J. Addario Lung Cancer Foundation; Breast Cancer Action; Bridge the Gap—SYNGAP Education and Research Foundation CancerCare; Cancer Prevention and Treatment Fund; Charlotte and Gwendyth Gray Foundation to Cure Batten Disease.

Children's Cause for Cancer Advocacy; Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation; Congenital Hyperinsulinism International; CurePSP; Cutaneous Lymphoma Foundation; Cystic Fibrosis Foundation; Defeat MSA; The Desmoid Tumor Research Foundation; The Disability Rights Legal Center; Dup15q Alliance; Dysautonomia Foundation; Equal Access for Rare Disorders; Fight Colorectal Cancer; FORCE: Facing Our Risk of Cancer Empowered; Former FDA Commissioner Margaret Hamburg; Former FDA Commissioner Robert Califf; Friedreich's Ataxia Research Alliance (FARA); Friends of Cancer Research; Georgia State University College of Law; The Global Foundation for Peroxisomal Disorders.

Glut1 Deficiency Foundation; The Guthy-Jackson Charitable Foundation; Hemophilia Federation of America; Hematology/Oncology Pharmacy Association; HLRC Family Alliance; Hope for Hypothalamic Hamartomas; Hyper IgM Foundation, Inc.; International Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva (FOP) Association; International Myeloma Foundation; International Pemphigus and Pemphigoid Foundation; International Society for Stem Cell Research; International Waldenström's Macroglobulinemia Foundation (IWMMF); The Isaac Foundation; Jack McGovern Coats' Disease Foundation; The LAM Foundation; The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society; Lymphoma Research Foundation; Li-Fraumeni Syndrome Association (LFS Association/LFSA); LUNGevity Foundation; Max Cure Foundation.

M-CM Network; Mattie Miracle Cancer Foundation; MitoAction; MLD Foundation; Moebius Syndrome Foundation; The MSA Awareness Shoe; Mucopolidosis Type IV Foundation; The Myelin Project; Myotonic Dystrophy Foundation; National Brain Tumor Society; National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship; National Comprehensive Cancer Network; National Consumers League; National Health Council; National MPS Society; National Niemann-Pick Disease Foundation; National Organization for Rare Disorders (NORD); National Patient Advocate Foundation; National Physicians Alliance; National PKU Alliance.

National PKU News; National Women's Health Network; Neurofibromatosis Northeast; NYU Langone Health; Operation ASHA; Our Bodies Ourselves; PRP Alliance, Inc.; Prevent Cancer Foundation; Public Citizen; Rare and Undiagnosed Network (RUN); Sarcoma Foundation of America; Scleroderma Foundation; The Snyder-Robinson Foundation; Sofia Sees Hope; SSADH Association.

Susan G. Komen; TargetCancer Foundation; Treatment Action Group; The Turner Syndrome Society; TMJA (Temporomandibular Joint Disorders patient organization); United Leukodystrophy Foundation; United Mitochondrial Disease Foundation (UMDF); University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine; Veterans Health Council; Vietnam Veterans of America; VHL Alliance; Washington Advocates for Patient Safety; Woody Matters; Worldwide Syringomyelia & Chiari Task Force; Yale School of Public Health.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it opens the door for bad actors to take advantage of terminally ill patients. It

is the FDA's job to ensure that drugs are safe and effective, and we can't trust manufacturers to act as this gatekeeper.

There is already a safe process for terminally ill patients to access experimental treatments. Under what is called the expanded access program, 99 percent of applications are approved. The expanded access program plays a vital safety role.

I am very troubled by what can happen to patients in some States who undergo treatment from right-to-try companies. In 19 States, patients using an investigational drug could actually lose their hospice coverage; in 6 States, they could be denied home care coverage. These are the very people who are dependent on hospice and home healthcare, and this bill would cause them to lose that coverage.

This is not a humane, patient-centered bill for people who are facing death; it is just a dangerous pathway for bad actors to exploit those very people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5247, and, again, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak against this piece of legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the patients, the patients who face terminal diagnoses but have exhausted all available known treatment options.

Before us today we have legislation that received 260 bipartisan votes last week; that was nearly 260 votes to increase patient access to investigational drugs through a new pathway.

I want to thank Dr. BURGESS for his incredible work on our Energy and Commerce Committee to do our due diligence, to take an issue that is important to our citizens and our colleagues and make sure that it has been properly vetted, reviewed, and improved upon from what we got from the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, 38 States have right-to-try laws, including my own State of Oregon. This is something that people want and deserve. Wisconsin will make it number 39 once the bill they have passed gets across Governor Scott Walker's desk.

While the State policies vary, they have a common goal, and that is helping vulnerable patients. President Trump praised the movement during the State of the Union, saying: "People who are terminally ill should not have to go from country to country to seek a cure—I want them to have a chance right here at home."

I have spoken to the President directly about what we are doing here, and he gave me a shout-out when he was up in New Hampshire the other day

about moving this bill forward. We worked closely with the Vice President and his team and with Scott Gottlieb, who is the doctor who heads the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, to get a really good, thoughtful product before this House, and they support what we are doing here. President Trump also highlighted this bill, as I said, when he was in New Hampshire.

It is important to note that this isn't the first time we have considered this bill. As you may know, last week, we tried to move this on the suspension calendar, never imagining that the Democrats would actually whip against giving dying patients the right to try one of these drugs. We had 32 Democrats support this legislation, and that is why we brought it back under regular order in a rule today.

Now, today, there is an existing process, and you have heard about it—and we looked at this in the committee—for patients to access unapproved drugs. The FDA oversees expanded access, commonly known as compassionate use. This program has been critical in helping patients access experimental drugs. It does work.

Commissioner Gottlieb and the agency should be commended for their continued work to improve the expanded access program for patients. As you have heard from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, this program works, and works effectively, but it doesn't do it all, and that is why this legislation is before us.

To improve upon this successful program, the bill before us today provides liability protections for manufacturers, sponsors, physicians, clinical investigators, and hospitals that participate in the existing expanded access program and the new alternative pathway that we create under this legislation.

This was a very big issue for those who needed to be brought into participation who otherwise might have sat on the sidelines and never made these drugs available. This provision removes one of the biggest hurdles that patients face and that was identified by the Government Accountability Office; it is the biggest hurdle they face in getting access to experimental therapies: manufacturers' hesitancy to participate. That is the hurdle we are trying to overcome today in a safe way.

The bill also creates a new alternative pathway for patients who do not qualify for a clinical trial. This legislation strengthens patient protections with clearer informed consent and adverse event reporting. The bill also ensures the FDA is notified when a patient receives an unapproved drug through the new alternative pathway to ensure proper oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues in the House, and especially Dr. BURGESS on the Health Subcommittee, but also Representative

BRIAN FITZPATRICK; ANDY BIGGS, who is behind me; MORGAN GRIFFITH; and our Vice President, MIKE PENCE. I am grateful for their work and for their understanding that our job here in the House is to do our work: to hear from people who are affected or might be affected, to improve upon products, to go through regular order, and to bring this bill to you today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5247, the so-called right-to-try legislation. This bill does not give patients the right to try; rather, it gives patients the right to request, which fails to address real barriers to accessing experimental drugs such as drug costs or company restrictions.

I will reiterate that patients already have the right to try through an expedited process that approves 99 percent of requests it receives. This legislation, however, fails to recognize that, if a patient is denied access, it is usually because a drug manufacturer says no due to manufacturer concerns about safety or side effects, not because the FDA denied a request.

I know, like everyone else, I have heard from many constituents suffering from terminal illnesses such as ALS who are desperate for cures; and I believe that every single one of us in this Chamber has confronted, in some way, a family member—mother, father, spouse—who had, heartbreakingly, an illness that had no cure. We have gone through the process many times, and I think we all have felt desperate from time to time.

However, having said that, just because a person at the end has no hope, to try something that might make things worse so you cannot go on to a more peaceful resolution would be hurtful not only to the patient, but to the family.

Opening up unregulated pathways to drugs after only a phase 1 clinical trial may expose patients to severe and unpredictable side effects. This bill would prevent FDA from documenting these side effects and, worse, would prevent FDA from protecting other patients from a similar fate.

When a loved one is in pain, the last thing a family wants is to cause further suffering. We need clinical trials to ensure drugs are safe and effective and to find real cures for patients, and we need the FDA to be a part of the process as a matter of patient protection for all.

Rescinding any FDA oversight on unproven therapies that have not undergone multiple clinical trials is a

slippery slope. The expedited process we have now is working, and I cannot support a bill that offers a “right to ask” alongside proposals that could be dangerous for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the vice chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I have heard people say that they don’t want to support a bill that makes things worse. We have people who are terminal, whose life expectancy is measured in months, not in decades, and how do you make things worse?

I said last week, and I repeat it today, that if I—if, and I am not, thank God—but if I were faced with one of these heart-rendering situations, I would take any risk, including injecting monkey urine, if that meant I could spend a few more days, months, or years with my children.

□ 1330

I think many people are in that same boat, and the American people deserve a right to try. When we were doing our hearings on this, we had an Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health hearing where Lieutenant Commander Matthew Bellina, who graduated from Virginia Tech in my district and served in the United States Navy, testified before us. He said, in the conclusion of his comments: “I know that it is probably too late for me, and I have made my peace with that. I need to know before I die that, if my children find themselves in this unenviable position, this Nation that I proudly served will respect their liberties and their right to make their own decisions about their medical treatments.”

He suffered from ALS, as I said. I have had three friends during my lifetime die of that: Ray Robrecht, my predecessor a couple terms back in the Virginia House of Delegates; Julie Mullins, whose family I have known for decades; and Mike Ahern, who was connected with the United States Senate through his sister. All of these folks were people who lived in Salem County or Roanoke County, and they all died from ALS. They were all brave people. They should have had the right to try to see if they could make an improvement for others.

Even more poignant are my family friends who lost both a grandparent and their mother to Huntington’s chorea. I was their family lawyer. I did their will. I would like to believe, and I know they would have liked the option, that their mother would have chosen the right to try, knowing that, even if it failed, it might help another generation because, as you know, Hun-

tington’s chorea is a genetically transmitted disease.

So I do not understand why people are afraid of letting people try who have no other hope, whose life is going to be cut short, without taking that Hail Mary pass. And so I hope that everyone will support this reasonable, measured effort to let people have a choice and a right to try.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explain some other reasons why I am very opposed to this bill. I am concerned that H.R. 5247 essentially does nothing to address what may be the true barrier to expanded access, and that is the determination by the manufacturer as to whether or not they will provide access to their product that is under development. And I want to stress, there is nothing in this legislation before us today that would compel a manufacturer to grant access upon request.

Further, I believe that trusted manufacturers like J&J, or Johnson & Johnson, which is headquartered in my district, have already said that any compassionate use request must be subject to FDA review. Now, I have heard my colleagues refer to this as a Hail Mary pass for the terminally ill. I think, in reality, it is offering false hope of a cure to patients and their families when there is no guarantee that any patient will receive access to treatment from a manufacturer.

In fact, H.R. 5247 sets an extremely low threshold for the types of experimental treatments that may be available through this alternative pathway by allowing patients access to investigational treatments that have only completed a phase 1 clinical trial. Patients will be exposed to treatments with no or relatively little data that they are actually effective. These extremely small trials only examine the safety and toxicity of a drug and do not determine the effectiveness or potential side effects. Access at this phase 1 stage in the development could expose patients to untested products and further harm and result in delaying access to a treatment that may be more appropriate and more beneficial for their underlying disease or condition.

Only 1 in 10 products move on from phase 1 clinical trials to FDA approval. Mr. Speaker, the bill does not make any adverse-event reporting to the FDA immediate. It also limits FDA’s ability to use clinical outcomes associated with the use of an investigational product when reviewing a product for approval if it could adversely impact its review. It also prevents any entity from being held liable for use of the treatment.

Again, these are some of the many reasons that more than 100 organizations oppose this dangerous bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), another valuable member of the Committee On Energy and Commerce and the Subcommittee on Health.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the right-to-try legislation will be considered on the House floor today. This is about giving people hope to try. It is about hope to try investigational drugs which have passed the first of three phases of the FDA clinical trial process, the safety testing phase. And these investigational drugs could possibly prolong or save the lives of terminally ill patients.

I like to remind my colleagues that a little boy was in Washington, D.C., on the House floor just last week when we first voted on this legislation. Prior to that vote, I had met Jordan during an Energy and Commerce Committee hearing focusing on the implementation of the 21st Century Cures Act.

Jordan McLinn is a second grader from Indianapolis who may look like any other healthy child, but he has Duchenne muscular dystrophy, or DMD, a fatal, degenerative condition which causes muscle weakness. DMD is caused by an absence of dystrophin, a protein that helps keep muscle cells intact. Oftentimes, kids born with DMD are wheelchair-bound by age 12, and they have a life expectancy of just 25 years old.

DMD is a genetic disease that is typically passed on to boys through their mother’s X chromosome. But sometimes the mother is not a carrier, there is no family history of the disease, but a child is born with the disease anyway. This is what happened to Jordan McLinn. His mother, Laura, is not a carrier. This disease does not run in their family.

Jordan was born with DMD, but it was not diagnosed until he was 4 years old. So can you imagine what this family has been through? After Jordan was diagnosed, his family hit the ground running, trying to find the best possible treatment options and therapies for people with DMD. His mother, Laura, was quoted in *The Indianapolis Star* today in an article focused on the right-to-try bill saying: “The reason we have remained on this journey and fighting so hard for it is not necessarily for Jordan immediately. It’s for all the patients that we’ve met along the way.”

Jordan and his family have been on this journey advocating this fair and compassionate bill in Indiana and beyond for Jordan but also for so many others. In 2015, then-Governor MIKE PENCE signed Indiana’s right-to-try law with Jordan McLinn by his side. Now a total of 38 States have already passed laws that take a variety of approaches to helping vulnerable patients. By passing this legislation in the House today, we will increase access—nationwide—to unapproved, investigational

drugs for patients with a terminal illness.

In that same IndyStar article I mentioned earlier, Laura shared that Jordan has always wanted to be a firefighter, but now, after coming to the Nation's Capital many times, he has aspirations to be something else. He now wants to be President of the United States. This bill allows Jordan to have those big dreams, and it will be providing patients across this country with hope.

Yes, it is hope, hope for patients that they may find the cure someday that they have been searching and fighting for, hope for patients and their families that there will be more time to make more memories that can last a lifetime.

In closing, I would just like to emphasize how critically important it is that Congress join together to support the bill for the millions of Americans who fight for their lives because of a terminal illness. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member for yielding to me. I rise in opposition to the right-to-try legislation that would bypass the Food and Drug Administration's longstanding review and oversight of drug treatments and endanger patients with life-threatening diseases.

Many States have passed this right-to-try piece of legislation, including my home State of Texas, but the States don't have the FDA. The Federal Government has the right to be able to make sure we can protect both constituents and consumers. My heart goes out to the loved ones who are terminally ill and desperate for a breakthrough treatment. I cannot support legislation that offers false hope to the terminally ill and their families.

The FDA has a pathway whereby those in need of investigational medications may seek to obtain them. This program is known as the expanded access pathway, or compassionate use, and has been in the law since 1987. Over the last decade, the FDA has a clinical hold on only two commercial drug development programs due to adverse events associated with compassionate use.

There are many patient advocacy groups that are opposing this legislation. Groups such as the Alliance for Aging Research, the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Amer-

ican Lung Association, the American Society of Clinical Oncology, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Defeat MSA, the Disability Rights Legal Center, and dozens more that are committed to seeking effective treatment cures to many diseases which are terminal, are against this bill. These patients' rights groups seek to ensure that the medication that is offered to individuals is safe, has been tested, and has gone through the proper approval process before it is given to a patient.

The most vulnerable and terminally ill individuals deserve to have access to safe therapies that have undergone the necessary approval process before being given to those who can least afford to receive unproven treatment that may do them more harm than good. In addition to the physical harm which unproven treatments may cause, there is also the risk of financial exploitation of terminally ill patients given that such treatments are not covered by insurance. Manufacturers are not required to cover the cost of investigational treatment.

The majority's decision to go around our committee's consideration and effort to pass the bill on suspension last week exemplifies what this legislation is trying to do, circumvent existing rules and processes that have been created to protect Americans from hasty decisions.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for Americans facing serious and life-threatening diseases by opposing this unnecessary and potentially dangerous legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), one of the primary drivers on this legislation.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. I also pay my respects and give honor to RON JOHNSON, the Senator from Wisconsin who championed the bill in the Senate and gave us a superb bill; also, Chairman WALDEN and his committee, who have worked hard to give us this bill today; and my original cosponsor on the bill that I introduced, Mr. FITZPATRICK from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address just a couple of things that I think are really intriguing to me because it certainly seems a bit condescending to me when I hear people say: I am not going to support this because it gives false hope that people might be taken advantage of by bad actors. They cannot identify the bad actors, but they might be taking advantage of them. That is a fallacious and specious argument to make when you are denying people who have a terminal illness, who have been diagnosed with a terminal illness, who have gone through the already approved FDA processes in order to get and petition a pharmaceutical company for an experimental drug that might prolong their life and might heal them.

False hope, that argument, is the argument that I am hearing. But the reality is these people are individuals. They have a higher sense of reality than virtually anybody else I know because their mortality is there. They want the opportunity. It is not false hope. It is hope. Support of this bill is compassionate. Support of this bill is fair.

I have also heard that there may be some liability issues on the part of pharmaceutical companies which might impede them from providing drugs. Yet, in order to satisfy them, the bill itself says that they are excused unless their conduct is willful or criminal. That means that they have protection.

What I am asking here today, and what everyone with whom I have met over the years who want a right to try is asking, is simply a chance to have some determination and control over their own lives.

□ 1345

One of the intriguing arguments I hear today and I heard last week is, well, you know what, the pharmaceutical companies aren't compelled to provide these drugs. So my immediate question is: Oh, so you would be more comfortable, then, if we would have included a compulsory means in the bill? Did you want the pharmaceutical companies to be compelled to provide these?

The answer would be no. It is simply they don't like this bill. They don't want the bill.

When you have 38, soon to be 39, States that want to give their citizens, Americans all, the right to try to preserve their lives and to be healed and have a chance, they need to get that; they need that opportunity. We need to give it to them today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of misinformation spread by supporters of this legislation that FDA is a barrier to patients receiving access to these investigational treatments, and I want to be very clear that that is simply not the case.

FDA's expanded access program approves nearly all requests for investigational drugs or biologics it receives. For the past 5 years, FDA's approval rate for expanded access requests has been over 99 percent. In fiscal year 2017, as I previously mentioned, only nine individual requests were denied.

FDA also conducts its review quickly. FDA physicians are available 24 hours a day to approve any emergency expanded access requests the agency receives, typically granting emergency requests immediately, over the phone, and nonemergency requests in a median time of 4 days and, generally, no longer than 30 days.

FDA has also taken actions to streamline the expanded access request process for physicians to make it less burdensome. I think that was mentioned by Mr. WALDEN, the chairman.

Pharmaceutical companies can choose to deny a patient access to an experimental treatment because, for example, there is not enough of the drug available or they are concerned about dangerous side effects. The fact is, when a patient is denied access to an experimental treatment, it is because the company has said no, not the FDA.

So let's be clear as to what this legislation is. It is an attempt to undermine the authority of the expert public health agency charged with reviewing drugs to ensure their safety and efficacy.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this grab at FDA's authority. That is really what this legislation is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5247, the Right to Try Act, and I thank Dr. BURGESS and the Energy and Commerce Committee for bringing this important legislation to the floor of this House.

In certain States across our Nation, patients who are diagnosed as terminally ill are being told by doctors that all of the treatment options have been exhausted because they do not have access to experimental drugs. This type of overregulation by the Federal Government is creating hopeless situations for thousands of Americans whom we hold dearest to our hearts.

This right-to-try legislation allows terminal patients to have a choice on whether or not an experimental approach is the path for them, as sometimes, and many times, this is their only option.

Should this bill become Federal law, our terminally ill patients will have increased access, nationwide, to unapproved drugs, leading to more scientific breakthroughs that will benefit all Americans and, in lots of cases, will save a life.

Now is the time for Congress to take action and give terminally ill patients a fighting chance for their God-given right to life. How in God's name can this Congress deny an American the right to life?

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me today in supporting this bill on this floor.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I said before that I have found that some Members were looking to vote for this bill because they said: Well, we have the right to try in our

State by State statute, so what is the difference if we do it on the Federal level?

I just want to stress again that the State right-to-try laws do not give patients a right to try effectively and have done little to expand access to investigational treatments.

There are 37 States and the District of Columbia that have enacted right-to-try laws, and there is no evidence that anyone has obtained an investigational treatment via these laws that couldn't have been obtained through FDA's expanded access program.

Right-to-try laws do not compel companies to provide patients access to investigational treatments; therefore, under these State laws, patients still do not have a right to try, only the right to request the treatment from the company.

State right-to-try laws do not address the fundamental barriers of cost and company restrictions. Neither the FDA nor States require insurers or pharmaceutical companies to cover the cost or reduce the costs of these often expensive treatments. Instead, these laws put patients at higher risk by prohibiting or weakening FDA's oversight of investigational treatments.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5247, the Right to Try Act.

I am a physician and scientist with over 40 years experience treating patients, some of whom had the dreaded diagnosis of cancer.

Six months ago, I was operated on for cancer, and I, to this day, am a cancer survivor. If needed, I would like to have the right to try.

A little over 3 years ago, my beloved wife, Pam Roe, a nurse and friend, died of stage IV colon cancer. She would have liked to have had the right to try.

Less than 2 months after that, one of the best friends I will ever have in my life, Phil Street, a Vietnam veteran, Air Force veteran, died of a cancer related to Agent Orange. Phil would have liked to have had the right to try.

My senior partner in medical practice, a year later, good friend, was diagnosed with brain cancer. Dr. Cone would have liked the right to try.

Shortly after that, Linda Baines, a scrub nurse that I have operated with hundreds of times in my medical practice, was diagnosed with cancer. Linda would have liked the right to try.

I have two dear friends at this moment who are both being treated for stage IV cancer. If those treatments don't work—and I have had to look patients in the eye and say, Mr. Speaker: "Your life is not in my hands anymore. It is in God's hands"—they would like to have the right to try.

I tell you this: all these patients want and deserve is a right to try. Please, I am asking you to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains and whether the gentleman has additional speakers on his side.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I will be closing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to stress that, as I said before, we have the four previous FDA Commissioners, two Democrats and two Republicans appointed by President Bush, who have raised serious concerns about this legislation because it excludes FDA review and they think could pose serious risks to vulnerable patients.

I just wanted to read, once again, a statement that they made jointly to The Washington Post, where they said: "There is no evidence that either bill would meaningfully improve access for patients, but both would remove the FDA from the process and create a dangerous precedent that would erode protections for vulnerable patients."

Mr. Speaker, I just want to stress to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that my concern is that no one is actually going to be able to get an experimental drug by this bill. In other words, if you are a manufacturer that actually has done something and come up with an experimental drug that you believe will make a difference to someone who is terminally ill, you are likely going to want to go through the FDA expanded access process because then there is a seal of approval that the FDA has actually looked at this and said that it is relatively safe to use.

So my real fear is that the only thing this is going to do is open up to the possibility of some charlatan, fly-by-night snake oil drug company or manufacturer who is going to make all kinds of claims that have not been reviewed by the FDA for any kind of safety, and that then people may say: Okay. Well, I will take that because I am terminally ill and I might as well try something.

But that isn't really what we should be doing here. We should be providing a process, as the FDA does right now, where, if someone is terminally ill and they want to try something, they at least have some certification of approval by the FDA that this is something that may help them, that may make a difference, and that, in the case of about 11 percent of the cases where the application is made to the FDA, some changes are made to make sure that even though there is a certain level of risk, that that level of risk is

reduced by the FDA putting on additional safety precautions.

So my real concern here is I don't want people to vote for this legislation thinking that somehow it is going to make a difference. I really don't believe that is true. Otherwise, I wouldn't urge the opposition that I am. But for all these reasons, I do urge strong opposition to this bill and ask that my colleagues vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during the rule debate on this bill, I outlined a case where the previous Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, provided the right to try for a patient, a Democratic donor, back in my home State of Texas. So, really, all we are asking today is that we give regular Americans, the forgotten men and women of this country, the same rights that the Speaker of the House provided to a Democratic donor back in October of 2008.

Yesterday I quoted from an article from the Dallas Morning News. I have a different but similar article today talking about the same case, talking about the individual who had a diagnosis of multiple myeloma.

There was a drug that perhaps would provide some hope. The individual was clearly terminal. This monoclonal antibody that was primarily used to treat multiple sclerosis might show some efficacy in treating the advanced form of multiple myeloma that this patient had. The drug had been through phase 1 clinical trials. The patient did not have time for the drug to go through phase 2 and phase 3 clinical trials.

The article says:

Enter Nancy Pelosi. Through means to which we have never been privy, Ms. Pelosi got the FDA to give the manufacturer the all-clear to give the drug to the patient. The patient got the drug, the patient took the drug, but, unfortunately, the patient died anyway, but his family remains grateful to the Speaker for interceding on his behalf.

I don't doubt that they are.

Yesterday, I quoted the Dallas Morning News article where the patient's spouse said, somehow, NANCY PELOSI got it done.

Well, do you know what, Mr. Speaker? You shouldn't have to depend on the Speaker of the House to intercede on your behalf to get the FDA to get the manufacturer to make a drug available. If you are really up against a bad situation, wouldn't it be better if we provided everyone that same pathway?

That is what this bill does today. That is why the right-to-try legislation was advocated by the President of the United States. In fact, I think it was the only legislative priority that the President laid out during his State of the Union Address where he wanted to see Congress act.

So today, we are going to do that. Today, we are going to act. It is an important bill. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 787, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1400

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PALLONE. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pallone moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5247 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. USE OF UNAPPROVED INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS BY PATIENTS DIAGNOSED WITH A TERMINAL ILLNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by inserting after section 561A (21 U.S.C. 360bbb-0) the following:

"SEC. 561B. INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS FOR USE BY ELIGIBLE PATIENTS.

"(a) USE OF CLINICAL OUTCOMES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue guidance describing the Secretary's consideration and evaluation, for purposes of the review of, and decision on whether to approve, a marketing application under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act for an investigational drug, of clinical outcomes associated with the provision by a sponsor or manufacturer of such drug under subsection (b) or (c) of section 561. Such guidance shall address—

"(A) specific instances in which the Secretary will determine that the public health requires such consideration and evaluation;

"(B) specific instances in which a sponsor may request such consideration and evaluation; and

"(C) the context in which such consideration and evaluation will occur, particularly with regard to information and data relevant to the evaluation of a marketing application under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act for the investigational drug.

"(2) GUIDANCE.—

"(A) DRAFT GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue draft guidance with a public comment period regarding the use of clinical outcomes associated with the use of an investigational drug that a sponsor or manufacturer has provided under subsection (b) or (c) of section 561, as described in paragraph (1).

"(B) FINAL GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the public comment period on

such draft guidance ends, the Secretary shall issue final guidance.

"(b) POSTING OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall post on the internet website of the Food and Drug Administration and update annually, categorized by therapeutic area—

"(1) the number of requests that were received by the Food and Drug Administration for the provision by a sponsor or manufacturer of an investigational drug under subsection (b) or (c) of section 561; and

"(2) the number of such requests that were granted."

(b) REPORTING.—Section 561A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb-0) is amended adding at the end the following:

"(g) REPORTING.—The manufacturer or sponsor of an eligible investigational drug shall post on the same publicly available internet website used by the manufacturer for purposes of subsection (b) of this section an annual summary of any provision by the manufacturer or sponsor of an investigational drug under subsection (b) or (c) of section 561. The summary shall include the number of requests received, the number of requests granted, the number of patients treated, the therapeutic area of the drug made available, and any known or suspected serious adverse events. Such annual summary shall be provided to the Secretary upon request."

(c) LIABILITY.—Section 561 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

"(e) LIABILITY.—

"(1) ALLEGED ACTS OR OMISSIONS.—

"(A) MANUFACTURER OR SPONSOR.—No manufacturer or sponsor (or their agent or representative) of an investigational drug provided to a single patient or small group of patients for treatment use shall be liable for any alleged act or omission related to the provision of such drug, so long as such drug was provided in accordance with subsection (b) or (c), including the reporting of safety information, from clinical trials or any other source, as required pursuant to section 312.32 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

"(B) PHYSICIAN, CLINICAL INVESTIGATOR, OR HOSPITAL.—

"(i) No licensed physician, clinical investigator, or hospital shall be liable for any alleged act or omission related to the provision to a single patient or small group of patients for treatment use of an investigational drug in accordance with the requirements described in clause (ii), unless such act or omission constitutes on the part of such physician, clinical investigator, or hospital with respect to such investigational drug—

"(I) willful or criminal misconduct;

"(II) reckless misconduct;

"(III) gross negligence relative to the applicable standard of care and practice with respect to the administration or dispensing of such investigational drug; or

"(IV) an intentional tort under applicable State law.

"(ii) The requirements described in this clause are the requirements under subsection (b) or (c), including—

"(I) the reporting of safety information, from clinical trials or any other source, as required pursuant to under section 312.32 of

title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

“(II) ensuring that the informed consent requirements of part 50 of title 21, Code of the Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) are met; and

“(III) ensuring that review by an institutional review board is obtained in a manner consistent with the requirements of part 56 of title 21, Code of the Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(2) DETERMINATION NOT TO PROVIDE DRUG.—No manufacturer, sponsor, licensed physician, clinical investigator, or hospital, nor the Secretary, shall be liable for determining not to provide access to an investigational drug under this section or for discontinuing any such access that it initially determined to provide.

“(3) LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2), nothing in this section or section 561B shall be construed to modify or otherwise affect the right of any person to bring a private action against a manufacturer or sponsor (or their agent or representative), physician, clinical investigator, hospital, prescriber, dispenser, or other entity under any State or Federal product liability, tort, consumer protection, or warranty law.

“(B) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Nothing in this section or section 561B shall be construed to modify or otherwise affect the authority of the Federal Government to bring suit under any Federal law.”.

Mr. PALLONE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the bill, or the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended. And this amendment would offer a more targeted approach to improving the FDA's current expanded access program.

In October, the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on the widely opposed Senate right-to-try legislation. At that hearing, we heard concerns from FDA Commissioner Gottlieb and also from manufacturers, academic experts, and patient groups that S. 204 was legislation that would expose broad numbers of patients to harm, and sought to hamstring the FDA's ability to oversee or engage in any meaningful way on the use of investigational treatments.

Since that time, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have drafted new legislation that maintains, in my opinion, the same harmful approach prohibiting FDA review of experimental treatments. The FDA is part of the process for a reason. It protects patients from potentially bad actors or from experimental treatments that might do more harm than good.

So my motion to recommit, Mr. Speaker, abandons this harmful attempt to undermine the FDA's expanded access pathway and, instead, seeks to make two improvements that have been identified as meaningful by both manufacturers and patient groups.

This proposal will also not be any surprise to Chairman WALDEN or Chairman BURGESS because it was the bipartisan proposal our staffs were negotiating prior to the introduction of the current Republican bill.

So I want to stress that, unlike the current bill, H.R. 5247, this proposal is not based on the false premise that FDA approval is a barrier to accessing investigational treatments. Rather, it addresses the two key problems identified by expert witnesses at our hearing: how the FDA will utilize clinical outcomes of investigational treatments and liability protection.

To that end, under this motion to recommit, the FDA is directed to issue guidance to manufacturers specifically on how and when the FDA will consider clinical outcomes, and when a sponsor may request the consideration of such outcomes when it comes time to submit an application for approval for the investigational treatment.

This will provide manufacturers with the clarity they are seeking regarding how allowing patients access to drugs that are still under development may impact their ability to gain full FDA approval. It will also ensure that there is a public process for such guidance, ensuring that stakeholders will have the opportunity to offer their views on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit also provides liability protection to manufacturers, physicians, clinical investigators, and hospitals, if they are in compliance with the current law and regulations for expanded access. If you are a manufacturer, a physician, or a hospital that is in compliance with current rules and requirements related to expanded access, you will receive protection for allowing access to the investigational treatment.

Finally, it also provides transparency around the number of expanded access requests the FDA receives and grants, how many requests a manufacturer receives and grants, and if there are any serious adverse events. This transparency, I believe, will provide clear data as to how many patients are making expanded access requests and how often these requests are granted or denied by the FDA and manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these legislative fixes will go a long way to bolstering the existing successful expanded access pathway, while maintaining the critical review and oversight of the agency charged with protecting our public health, that being the FDA.

I just want to say that, last fall, FDA Commissioner Gottlieb testified on

right-to-try efforts and told our committee: “There is a perception that certain products that aren't being offered under FDA expanded access will be offered under right-to-try, and I don't see that.”

That is our current Commissioner Gottlieb, who I respect a great deal.

Rather than creating an unnecessary alternative pathway that threatens our drug approval process and our clinical trial program, I would urge my colleagues to join with Democrats and 103 patient organizations in supporting the current expanded access program.

These targeted improvements under the motion to recommit to the existing program are, I think, a way to achieve a better goal. So I urge my colleagues to support my motion to recommit and oppose this, what I consider, dangerous Republican proposal in the bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, while well-intentioned, this motion to recommit falls short of providing vulnerable patients full access to experimental treatments.

Providing clarity on how negative side effects will be accounted for during drug approvals is helpful. Giving manufacturers, sponsors, physicians, hospitals, and clinical investigators certainty on liability protections is meaningful. Taken together, these improvements to the existing expanded access program could lead to enhanced manufacturer and sponsor participation and increased patient access.

But this would not provide an alternative pathway for patients who cannot get into a clinical trial and have been rejected from participation in the existing compassionate use program.

This bill before us today does provide an alternative pathway, one that strengthens patient protections with clearer informed consent and real-time adverse event reporting. This bill—the underlying bill—also makes certain that the FDA is notified when a patient receives an unapproved drug through the new alternative pathway to ensure proper oversight. These are significant patient protections.

With this motion to recommit, we have a choice. The underlying bill is the only choice that gives those patients in the greatest need of help access to investigational drugs, with their consent, even after they were rejected from participating in a clinical trial or expanded access.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear. We need to vote to expand patient access. We need to vote down the motion to recommit. We need to vote for the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2115

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 21, 2018, at 5:15 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1865.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 5247;

Passage of H.R. 5247, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining

electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK MONGIELLO, JORDAN MCINN, AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT TO TRY ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 233, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—182

Adams	Engel	Lowey
Agullar	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham,
Barragan	Espallat	M.
Bass	Esty (CT)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Beatty	Evans	Lynch
Bera	Foster	Maloney,
Beyer	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn B.
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Blumenauer	Gabbard	Matsui
Blunt Rochester	Gallego	McCollum
Bonamici	Garamendi	McEachin
Boyle, Brendan	Gomez	McGovern
F.	Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney
Brady (PA)	Gottheimer	Meeks
Brown (MD)	Green, Al	Meng
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	Moore
Bustos	Grijalva	Moulton
Butterfield	Gutierrez	Murphy (FL)
Capuano	Hanabusa	Nadler
Carbajal	Hastings	Napolitano
Cardenas	Heck	Neal
Carson (IN)	Higgins (NY)	Nolan
Cartwright	Himes	Norcross
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	O'Halleran
Castro (TX)	Huffman	O'Rourke
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Cicilline	Jayapal	Panetta
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Pascarell
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Clyburn	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Cohen	Keating	Peters
Connolly	Kennedy	Pocan
Cooper	Khanna	Polis
Correa	Kihuen	Price (NC)
Costa	Kildee	Quigley
Courtney	Kilmer	Raskin
Crist	Kind	Rice (NY)
Crowley	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond
Cuellar	Kuster (NH)	Rosen
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Lawson (FL)	Sanchez
Demings	Lee	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Levin	Schiff
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Schneider
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Doggett	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Scott, David
F.	Lofgren	Serrano
Ellison	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)

Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela

Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—233

Abraham	Goodlatte	Nunes
Aderholt	Gosar	Olson
Allen	Gowdy	Palazzo
Amash	Granger	Palmer
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pearce
Babin	Graves (MO)	Perry
Bacon	Griffith	Peterson
Banks (IN)	Grothman	Pittenger
Barletta	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barr	Handel	Poliquin
Barton	Harper	Posey
Bergman	Harris	Ratcliffe
Biggs	Hartzler	Reed
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Reichert
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Black	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Blackburn	Hill	Roe (TN)
Blum	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Brat	Huizenga	Rokita
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rooney, Thomas
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	J.
Brooks (IN)	Hurd	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Issa	Roskam
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Calvert	Jordan	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Katko	Scalise
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	King (NY)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Knight	Kustoff (TN)
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Labrador
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Lance	Smucker
Crawford	Latta	Stefanik
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Stivers
Curtis	Long	Taylor
Davidson	Loudermilk	Tenney
Davis, Rodney	Love	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Lucas	Thornberry
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
DeSantis	MacArthur	Trott
DesJarlais	Marchant	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Upton
Donovan	Marshall	Valadao
Duffy	Massie	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	Mast	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Walden
Dunn	McCaul	Walker
Emmer	McClintock	Walorski
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Farenthold	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Faso	McMorris	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	Rodgers	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Westerman
Fleischmann	Meadows	Williams
Flores	Meehan	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Messer	Wittman
Fox	Mitchell	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Yoder
Gallagher	Mullin	Yoho
Garrett	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Gianforte	Noem	Young (IA)
Gibbs	Norman	Zeldin
Gohmert		

NOT VOTING—14

Clay	Cummings	DeFazio
Cramer	Davis, Danny	Jones

Kelly (IL)
Pingree
Rooney, Francis

Rush
Sarbanes
Shuster

Walz
Waters, Maxine

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.

Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson

Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suoizzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Clay
Cramer
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Jones
Kelly (IL)
Pingree
Rooney, Francis
Rush
Sarbanes
Walz
Waters, Maxine

□ 2143

Messrs. CONAWAY, COLLINS of Georgia, McHENRY, BISHOP of Michigan, GRAVES of Louisiana, MITCHELL, SCHWEIKERT, ROSS, LOUDERMILK, YOHO, and TURNER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BEYER and Miss RICE of New York changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 149, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

AYES—267

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gotthaimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

NOES—149

Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan, Ben Ray
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 2153

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COHEN. Would it be appropriate to announce to the House that there is a discharge petition at the desk for H.R. 4669 to give Mr. Mueller due process rights in case he is fired for other than good cause?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING LIEUTENANT COMMANDER JAMES BRICE JOHNSON AND LIEUTENANT CALEB NATHANIEL KING

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the lives of Lieutenant Commander James Brice Johnson and Lieutenant Caleb Nathaniel King, who gave the ultimate sacrifice during a training exercise last week as their Virginia Beach-based squadron was training off the coast of Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman CURBELO for organizing this moment and all the help from the great people of the 26th District of Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I am not naive to the fact that my words today don't hold a candle to the pain, the grieving, the questioning, and perhaps some anger from the families, friends, and teammates, how they may be feeling.

But today we are here with you, we pray with you, Victoria and Rain, Darrell and Robin, Mary, Charles and Kathryn, and we feel your pain. However, we must honor them. We must speak out as a grateful nation for the sacrifice these valiant men and their loved ones made for us, for freedom.

They died in the full strength and vigor of their youth, and they represent the profound power of our country and its unbroken line of patriots who understand the risks, but time and time again step forward to serve a cause greater than themselves. They are part of the very fabric of our land, and they inspire not only us, but our descendants for generations to come.

Indeed, there is nothing small about the big task it takes to defend freedom, peace, and our way of life. And this may be equally dangerous during training, peace, or war.

But in this heartache, there is hope. We are better because they have lived.

On behalf of a grateful Congress, community, and country, we give thanks and our sincerest condolences to the men and women of the fighting Blacklions from Squadron 213, to the friends and to the families of Lieutenant Commander Johnson and Lieutenant King.

Rest easy now, boys.

Mr. Speaker, I now request the House observe a moment of silence in honor of Lieutenant Commander Johnson and Lieutenant King.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members and guests in the gallery, please rise for a moment of silence.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 192, answered “present” 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

AYES—216

Abraham	Bustos	DeGette
Adams	Butterfield	DeLauro
Aderholt	Byrne	DelBene
Aguilar	Calvert	Demings
Amodei	Carson (IN)	Dent
Arrington	Carter (GA)	DeSaulnier
Bacon	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais
Banks (IN)	Cartwright	Deutch
Barletta	Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Chabot	Dingell
Beatty	Cheney	Doggett
Billirakis	Chu, Judy	Donovan
Bishop (UT)	Cicilline	Duffy
Black	Clark (MA)	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Cohen	Dunn
Blum	Cole	Ellison
Blumenauer	Collins (GA)	Engel
Blunt Rochester	Collins (NY)	Eshoo
Bonamici	Comer	Estes (KS)
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Ferguson
Brat	Cook	Fleischmann
Bridenstine	Cooper	Fortenberry
Brooks (IN)	Cuellar	Foster
Brown (MD)	Culberson	Frankel (FL)
Buchanan	Curtis	Frelinghuysen
Bucshon	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Budd	Davis, Rodney	Garamendi

Gianforte	Loudermilk
Gibbs	Lucas
Gonzalez (TX)	Luetkemeyer
Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham,
Gowdy	M.
Granger	Lujan, Ben Ray
Griffith	Marino
Grothman	Massie
Guthrie	Matsui
Handel	McCarthy
Harper	McCaul
Harris	McClintock
Hartzler	McCollum
Heck	McHenry
Hensarling	McMorris
Higgins (LA)	Rodgers
Higgins (NY)	McNerney
Hill	Meng
Himes	Mitchell
Hollingsworth	Moorenaar
Hoyer	Mooney (WV)
Huffman	Moulton
Hultgren	Mullin
Hunter	Murphy (FL)
Issa	Nadler
Johnson (LA)	Napolitano
Johnson, Sam	Newhouse
Kaptur	Norman
Kelly (MS)	Nunes
Kelly (PA)	O'Rourke
Kennedy	Olson
Khanna	Palmer
Kildee	Pascarella
King (IA)	Pelosi
King (NY)	Perlmutter
Krishnamoorthi	Peters
Kustoff (TN)	Pocan
Labrador	Polis
LaMalfa	Rice (SC)
Lamborn	Roby
Larsen (WA)	Roe (TN)
Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
Lawrence	Rohrabacher
Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Thomas
Lipinski	J.
Lofgren	Ross
Long	Rothfus

NOES—192

Allen	Evans	LaHood
Amash	Farenthold	Lance
Babin	Faso	Langevin
Barragán	Fitzpatrick	Latta
Barton	Flores	Lawson (FL)
Bass	Fox	Lee
Bera	Fudge	Levin
Bergman	Gaetz	Lewis (GA)
Beyer	Gallagher	Lieu, Ted
Biggs	Gallego	LoBiondo
Bishop (GA)	Garrett	Loeb
Bishop (MI)	Gohmert	Love
Bost	Gomez	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan	Gosar	Lowey
F.	Gottheimer	Lynch
Brady (PA)	Graves (GA)	MacArthur
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Graves (MO)	Carolyn B.
Buck	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Burgess	Green, Gene	Marchant
Capuano	Gutiérrez	Marshall
Carbajal	Hanabusa	Mast
Cárdenas	Hastings	McEachin
Castor (FL)	Herrera Beutler	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	McKinley
Coffman	Holding	McSally
Conaway	Hudson	Meehan
Connolly	Huizenga	Meeks
Correa	Hurd	Messer
Costa	Jackson Lee	Moore
Costello (PA)	Jayapal	Neal
Courtney	Jeffries	Noem
Crawford	Jenkins (KS)	Nolan
Crist	Jenkins (WV)	Norcross
Crowley	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo
Davidson	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Delaney	Jordan	Panetta
Denham	Joyce (OH)	Paulsen
DeSantis	Katko	Payne
Doyle, Michael	Keating	Pearce
F.	Kihuen	Perry
Duncan (SC)	Kilmer	Peterson
Emmer	Kind	Pittenger
Español	Kinzie	Poe (TX)
Esty (CT)	Knight	Poliquin

Posey	Schakowsky	Torres
Price (NC)	Schrader	Turner
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Upton
Raskin	Serrano	Valadao
Ratcliffe	Sewell (AL)	Vargas
Reed	Shimkus	Veasey
Renacci	Sinema	Vela
Richmond	Sires	Velázquez
Rogers (AL)	Soto	Visclosky
Rokita	Stivers	Walberg
Ros-Lehtinen	Suozzi	Watson Coleman
Rosen	Swalwell (CA)	Weber (TX)
Roskam	Takano	Wilson (FL)
Rouzer	Taylor	Wittman
Roybal-Allard	Tenney	Woodall
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Yoder
Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)	Yoho
Sánchez	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Sanford	Tipton	Zeldin

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Cleaver Tonko

NOT VOTING—19

Clay	Jones	Rooney, Francis
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Cramer	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Cummings	Meadows	Walz
Davis, Danny	Pingree	Waters, Maxine
DeFazio	Reichert	
Grijalva	Rice (NY)	

□ 2206

Ms. CLARKE of New York changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on this legislative day, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, March 22, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES THROUGH LEGISLATIVE DAY OF THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2018

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on the questions of agreeing to motions to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 4227, H.R. 4467, H.R. 5089, and H.R. 5131, may continue to be postponed through the legislative day of Thursday, March 22, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SECRET SERVICE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3731) to provide overtime pay for employees of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Secret Service Recruitment and Retention Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF OVERTIME PAY EXCEPTION THROUGH 2018 FOR PROTECTIVE SERVICES.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of the Overtime Pay for Protective Services Act of 2016 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note) is amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “IN 2016” and inserting “DURING 2016 THROUGH 2018”;

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “2016” and inserting “2016, 2017, or 2018”; and

(C) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 5547(a) of title 5, United States Code, and only to the extent that an appropriation is provided specifically in an appropriations Act for premium pay in excess of the annual equivalent of the limitation on the rate of pay contained in section 5547(a), any covered employee may receive premium pay during 2016, 2017, and 2018, to the extent provided under section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note).”

(2) CLARIFYING PROVISION.—Section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note) is amended, in the first sentence, by inserting “or 3056A” after “section 3056(a)”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on December 31, 2016.

(c) REPORT ON EXTENSIONS.—Not later than January 30, 2018, and January 30, 2019, the Director of the Secret Service shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the effects of the amendment made by subsection (a)(2). The report shall include, with respect to the previous calendar year—

(1) the total number of United States Secret Service personnel receiving premium pay above the premium pay limitation in subsection (a) of section 5547 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the total amount of premium pay for that calendar year paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection;

(3) the mean and median amount of premium pay paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection;

(4) the greatest amount paid to United States Secret Service personnel above the premium pay limitation in such subsection and the number of employees who received that amount;

(5) notwithstanding the amendments made by subsection (a), the total number of United States Secret Service personnel who were not fully compensated for service because of the premium pay earnings limitation in section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (5 U.S.C. 5547 note);

(6) the total amount of premium pay United States Secret Service personnel would have been paid but for the premium pay earnings limitation in such section; and

(7) a list of United States Secret Service personnel who, within the calendar year, received premium pay above the premium pay limitation in subsection (a) of section 5547 of title 5, United States Code, and separated from the agency, including the type of separation in each case.

SEC. 3. REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 1 year after the effective date of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the extent of the progress made by the United States Secret Service in implementing the recommendations of the United States Secret Service Protective Mission Panel, including in particular those items pertaining to training and personnel enumerated in the Executive Summary to Report from the United States Secret Service Protective Mission Panel to the Secretary of Homeland Security dated December 15, 2014.

Mr. GOWDY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE VICTORY CENTER

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to congratulate The Victory Center for Autism and Related Disabilities on the upcoming completion of its state-of-the-art education facility in south Florida.

Since its founding in 2000, The Victory Center has excelled at providing children with autism and related disabilities comprehensive individualized treatment and education. For 18 years, the teachers at The Victory Center have achieved amazing success working out of only a handful of rooms on the campus of the Michael-Ann Russell Jewish Community Center in North Miami Beach.

This outstanding institution is proud to offer five programs covering a range of services, and it is recognized as one of the top schools for children with autism in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, by opening this brand-new facility, The Victory Center will continue to grow and offer a positive and nurturing educational environment.

Once again, I would like to congratulate everyone at The Victory Center for all that they have accomplished. I thank their staff for helping so many

children in our south Florida community achieve their full potential and leave their own beautiful mark on our world.

CALLING ATTENTION TO THE SUFFERING IN PUERTO RICO

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed that our national government seems to have abandoned American citizens of Puerto Rico. Yesterday marked 6 months since Hurricane Maria furiously blew ashore. In those 6 months, more than 1,000 Americans have died because of the storm. In fact, people are still dying in Puerto Rico from causes that are directly related to Hurricane Maria's impact, and more than 100,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico are still without electricity.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we tend to forget how much we rely on electricity until it goes out. Without electricity, people who rely on respirators must choose between their homes and their health. The elderly, sick people, and newborn babies have to suffer through the heat and cold.

Mr. Speaker, if this was happening anywhere else in our country, we would have riots. But instead of action, all Puerto Rico gets are excuses from the national government.

CONGRATULATING GRANDVIEW HIGH SCHOOL BOYS AND GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAMS

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize both the Grandview High School boys and girls basketball teams. These two teams from Grandview are now the State of Colorado's 5A high school basketball champions.

The Grandview boys basketball team had a spectacular season, finishing the season with an impressive 24-4 record, and the culmination of the season was its first-ever boys basketball State Championship title.

The Grandview girls basketball team also had a tremendous season, finishing with an equally impressive 25-3 record, and the culmination of its season was its second consecutive girls basketball State Championship title.

The teams were led to their respective championship titles by their coaches: Josh Ulitzky for the girls team, and Michael Rogers for the boys team.

I also commend these two coaches, their coaching staffs, and all their supporters at Grandview High School for all they have contributed to the success of the school's boys and girls basketball programs.

I am incredibly proud to represent Grandview High School in the United States House of Representatives. Again, congratulations to the Grandview High School girls and boys basketball team on this impressive victory in Colorado's 5A State Championship.

□ 2215

IN MEMORY OF OFFICER GREGGORY CASILLAS

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and remember Pomona Police Officer Gregory Casillas, a constituent of mine who was struck down in the line of duty.

It was Gregory's dream to be a police officer. He studied police reports after hours, and he always carried flashcards and books to prepare for the police officer exam.

His hard work paid off. Friday, March 9 was the final day of Officer Casillas' ghost phase, the last day before he went out on his own. As one colleague said: "I've never met someone so eager to become a police officer."

Tragically, that was also the day Officer Casillas was shot, trying to make contact with a suspect who had fled the police. Officer Casillas put himself at risk so that we could be safer, and we can never thank him enough.

I am so grateful for heroes like Officer Casillas, and I join the hundreds of others who have attended vigils in his honor when I say that he will never be forgotten for his sacrifice.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ANDREW PATTERSON

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Commander Andrew Patterson, a native of Chittenango, New York, who currently serves as the Chief of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Plans/Operations for the military in Afghanistan. He is the son of Marlene A. Patterson and the late commander, Kenneth F. Patterson, U.S. Navy.

Lieutenant Commander Patterson has served in the U.S. Navy Reserves for 12 years, as well as serving with the U.S. Customs and Border Protection agency for 13 years. Stationed in Afghanistan, Lieutenant Commander Andrew Patterson is leading the charge on the intelligence collection operations against the Taliban, working closely with joint regional U.S. military personnel.

In today's era of combat, the role of intelligence plays an especially important role in the success of our military. Lieutenant Commander Andrew Patterson is a true hometown hero. He is an inspiration to all of us and is an exceptional community leader.

I would like to extend my gratitude to him for his answer to the call to serve, his bravery, and his dedication to our Nation. I wish him the best of luck as he continues to serve our country.

Go Navy.

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL AG DAY

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the salad bowl of the world, the 20th Congressional District in California, I commemorate and celebrate National Ag Day.

In my district, the number one industry is agriculture, yes, because of the fertile land, but also because of the fearless attitude of farmers and farmworkers, growers, and families and friends of those in agriculture.

Having grown up on the central coast, we understand that the key to their success is based on that willingness to take risk. We know that risk-taking attitude is the foundation of our country, but since then, the seed of risk taking has been sown in our culture and spread across our agricultural community.

People in agriculture are constantly using that trait to deal with Mother Nature, to overcome government mandates, to transform for the changing market conditions, and to contend with the lack of immigration reform right here in Congress.

Nevertheless, with that risk-taking attitude, people in agriculture don't shrink from those challenges; they stand up to them. That is why they not only survive, they succeed. That is why we in Congress shouldn't just recognize people in agriculture today; we should learn from them every day.

REFORMING THE POLICY FOR OUR FORESTS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, as it is known, enacted in 1970—I am sure, well intentioned—but time and time and time again, issues that need to be resolved for the people and their assets in this country are thwarted by needless red tape, a lot of times coming from NEPA.

Our forests in the West suffer badly—and the people who live near them,

from the smoke, from the danger, from the loss of homes, the loss of wildlife—because to do the slightest thing to improve our forest conditions requires NEPA delay.

In talking to forestry people just today, you can see illustrated in photographs private land that has been recovered right after a forest fire and, indeed, Federal land, because we have to do yet another NEPA on something we should already know and understand—delayed 1, 2, 3 years. And then you don't have the value left anymore of those trees that were left behind after a fire; therefore, there is never enough money to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, we must reform NEPA so it works for the people.

HONORING BERTEL VAN EEK

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, something rather extraordinary will happen: Bertel Van Eek will turn 108 years old. She has been the embodiment of the American Dream and, in some respects, of the importance of the things that happen here.

In the midst of debates here about immigration, she reminds us that we are a nation of immigrants. She came to this country as an immigrant after World War II. She was welcomed by the Statue of Liberty and by a country where she built an amazing life.

In the midst of debates about retirement security, she reminds us that it is important to have the backs of our seniors. Her husband died in 1981, and her ability to live with dignity for the last 37 years has been closely tied to two of the most successful public policies in the history of this country: Medicare and Social Security.

She was born on March 31, 1910–1910. America has had 19 Presidents over that timeframe. As someone who lived in Holland during World War II, she saw the capability and bravery of our military and its members.

Imagine all that she has seen over the years. She is going to watch this speech over the internet on a mobile phone. Imagine that. She was born 17 years before movies had sound.

But beyond that, her life has been filled with people who love her: a loving daughter who married a guy who calls her "Mom," four great-grandchildren who adore her and who are adorable, and three grandkids who consider her a hero.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be one of those grandsons, and I am proud to stand here on the floor of the U.S. House and wish my Oma a happy 108th birthday.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of

rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0120

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1625, TARGETED REWARDS FOR THE GLOBAL ERADICATION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 23, 2018, THROUGH APRIL 9, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-614) on the resolution (H. Res. 796) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1625) to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from March 23, 2018, through April 9, 2018, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 899. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2030. An act to deem the compliance date for amended energy conservation standards for ceiling fan light kits to be January 21, 2020, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, March 22, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4323. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Modification of Revenue Procedure 2018-4 (Rev. Proc. 2018-19) received March 20, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4324. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Issuance of Opinion and Advisory Letters for Pre-approved Defined Benefit Plans for the Second Six-Year Cycle, Deadline for Employer Adoption of the Pre-approved Plans, and Opening of Determination Letter Program for the Pre-approved Plan Adopters [Announcement 2018-05] received March 20, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[March 22 (legislative day, March 21), 2018]

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 796. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1625) to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from March 23, 2018, through April 9, 2018 (Rept. 115-614). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 5357. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require congressional approval of agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation with foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. JONES, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 5358. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating

to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SOTO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5359. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to provide advance notice to Congress before changing any questions on the decennial census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5360. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for qualified special law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5361. A bill to require that the Secretary of the Treasury establish a program for the issuance of identity protection personal identification numbers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 5362. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the management of Internal Revenue Service information technology; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5363. A bill to safeguard the Crime Victims Fund; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 5364. A bill to improve security at State and local courthouses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 5365. A bill to amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to reauthorize and modernize the Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 5366. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for certain authorized actions regarding interdiction of unmanned aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 5367. A bill to amend Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to protect the "gig economy" and small businesses that operate in large part through contractor services from the threat of costly class action litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 5368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that certain tax refunds be made by electronic funds transfer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BUDD, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 5369. A bill to prohibit the consideration in the House of Representatives of any legislation containing an earmark; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5370. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the IRS Oversight Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5371. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide student loan eligibility for mid-career, part-time students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 5372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain provisions of Public Law 115-97, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BIGGS):

H.R. 5373. A bill to provide support for the production of algae, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. EVANS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BASS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VELA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PARNETTA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms.

SÁNCHEZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COSTA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COOPER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BERA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 5374. A bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan):

H.R. 5375. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit to Congress a comprehensive customer service strategy for the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 5376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that contractors to whom return information is disclosed comply with confidentiality safeguards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan):

H.R. 5377. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to make available an internet platform to prepare and file Forms 1099, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 5378. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a proceeding to determine whether certain activities by licensees of the Commission are undertakings under division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, or major Federal actions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FASO:

H. Res. 793. A resolution recognizing the importance of the Upper Delaware River in New York State; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H. Res. 794. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the national parks, national forests, and public lands and waters of the United States contribute greatly to the economic and physical well-being of Americans and can be further improved by public-private partnerships; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H. Res. 795. A resolution recognizing the United States role in the evolving energy

landscape of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 5357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 5358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

Congress shall have the power . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause I states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 5362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the

Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to the Necessary and Proper Clause found in Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes."

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 5366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution," and "clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution."

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 5367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:

H.R. 5368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 stating "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 stating "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes" and Clause 18 stating that it has the power to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 5369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 5372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 5373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 5374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 5376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 5377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 5378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 754: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1057: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1150: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1212: Mr. MESSER and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1276: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1444: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1475: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1478: Mr. CORREA and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1542: Mr. MESSER and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1612: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1676: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1802: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1825: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1928: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2135: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2147: Mr. McEACHIN.

H.R. 2215: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2273: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2321: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2345: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2452: Mr. McEACHIN and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 2652: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2683: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 2902: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2913: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 3030: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3220: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 3330: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3378: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3871: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 4137: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 4143: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 4229: Mr. HOLDING and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 4311: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4491: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4525: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4659: Mr. HILL and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 4763: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4903: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 4953: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4970: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 5012: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 5058: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 5104: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 5105: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 5107: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 5155: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. McEACHIN, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 5199: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 5233: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 5244: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 5275: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 5281: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 5313: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 5336: Ms. STEFANIK and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 5345: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H. Res. 756: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 763: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. KIND.

H. Res. 781: Ms. KAPTUR.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OBSERVING EDUCATION AND
SHARING DAY U.S.A. 2018

HON. TOM MCCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on March 27th, the United States will celebrate "Education and Sharing Day U.S.A." to recognize the importance of excellence in education.

Established in 1978 by a joint Congressional resolution, Education Day U.S.A. focuses on the very foundation of meaningful education: instructing our youth in the ways of morality and ethics, and teaching them an appreciation for divine inviolable values. These educational principles are vital to the success of our nation as they prepare our students for the responsibilities and opportunities of the future.

Education and Sharing Day U.S.A. is celebrated on the birthday of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, who dedicated his life to the betterment of mankind. The Rebbe was a tireless advocate for youth around the world, emphasizing the importance of education and good character, and instilling hope for a brighter future into countless people in America and across the globe.

The Rebbe taught that education should not be limited to the acquisition of knowledge and preparation for a career; but should incorporate the building of character, with emphasis on moral and ethical values that have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization, when they were known as the Seven Noahide Laws.

Education and Sharing Day U.S.A. is a recognition of the importance of well-rounded education, and the contributions of the Rebbe. I am proud to observe Education and Sharing Day U.S.A. 2018.

HONORING DR. THOMAS
CORNWELL

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Thomas Cornwell, Founder of HomeCare Physicians in Wheaton, Illinois and President of the American Academy of Home Care Medicine. For over 20 years, Dr. Cornwell has been a champion of homecare medicine by bringing primary care to seniors in the comfort of their own homes.

Since founding his homecare practice, HomeCare Physicians, in 1997, Dr. Cornwell has personally made over 32,000 house calls to more than 4,000 patients. His services ensure that his patients have convenient access

to the care they need and save taxpayer dollars at the same time.

Due to the leadership of Dr. Cornwell and others like him the number of house-call visits by physicians is increasing. In 1996, the New England Journal of Medicine reported that physicians provided 984,000 house calls to Medicare beneficiaries annually. By 2005, the number more than doubled to 2 million house calls annually.

Roughly 20 years after Dr. Cornwell made his first house call, he received \$15 million in private funding to, as he puts it, "spread this model of care." Cornwell is tasked with using the bulk of that money to teach others how to do what he does so well. He notes that educational programs about house call medicine are sprouting up at institutions such as Johns Hopkins School of Medicine in Baltimore and the University of Illinois College of Medicine in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, and distinguished colleagues, please join me in recognizing and thanking Dr. Thomas Cornwell for his selfless service to the residents of DuPage County, Illinois and his contributions to seniors across the country.

IN RECOGNITION OF CITY MAN-
AGER W. BRIAN HIATT AND HIS
SERVICE TO THE CITY OF CON-
CORD

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Concord City Manager W. Brian Hiatt on nearly two decades of service to the City of Concord, North Carolina.

I've known Brian for many years, and throughout this time I have considered him a good friend. A lifelong North Carolina resident, Brian attended Appalachian State University for his Bachelor of Science in History and Government Service and went on to attend the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to receive his Master of Public Administration. After his education, Brian spent almost 20 years working for both Guilford County and the City of Hickory where he gained valuable experience that enabled him as City Manager to help shape the City of Concord into the wonderful place it is today.

Over the years, Brian has been very active in our community serving on the boards of Cabarrus Economic Development Corporation and the Water and Sewer Authority of Cabarrus County, NC League of Municipalities, Hospice of Cabarrus County and Cabarrus County United Way. He is a Past-President of the Concord Rotary Club, where he was named Rotarian of the Year in 2012, Lake Hickory Rotary Club and the North Carolina City, County Management Association and Academic Learning Center.

Residing in Concord, Brian is married to Julie, and they have two grown children, Andrew and Erin. I am extremely grateful for Brian's service to our community and I wish him continued success.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring my friend City Manager W. Brian Hiatt for his unwavering commitment to public service.

HONORING WASHINGTON ELEMEN-
TARY SCHOOL IN ELGIN, ILLI-
NOIS

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 125th anniversary of Washington Elementary School in Elgin, Illinois.

Since its founding in 1892, Washington Elementary School has overcome many challenges. When the school first opened its doors, they did not have access to running water or modern heating. Today, the school provides its students with a state-of-the-art computer lab, a lunchroom, and a modern gymnasium.

While the technological revolution has transformed the way Washington Elementary School educates its students, there is no more significant impact than a changing demographic. Today, the school celebrates a robust and diverse student body. According to Principal Lori Brandes, the school now offers more dual-language classes than general education classes. Washington Elementary School's ability to meet the needs of students makes it a staple of the Elgin community.

Mr. Speaker, and distinguished colleagues, please join me in celebrating the 125th anniversary of Washington Elementary School.

XUEDAN FILLMORE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Xuedan Fillmore for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Xuedan Fillmore is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Xuedan Fillmore is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Xuedan Fillmore for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING JIM FRAM

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of Jim Fram, who recently retired from his role as president and CEO of the Greater Hot Springs Chamber of Commerce and the Hot Springs Metro Partnership.

A dedicated professional, Jim brought more than 30 years of economic development experience with him to Hot Springs, having previously served in communities large and small from Lincoln, Nebraska, to Tulsa, Oklahoma. His expertise was vital as Hot Springs and Garland County looked to revitalize its downtown and expand its economic base.

Jim's support of businesses large and small has paid off. The Garland County economy has grown under his stewardship of the Chamber. I thank him for his dedication to my hometown and I wish him well in his next endeavor.

SHILAH FORSYTHE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Shilah Forsythe for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Shilah Forsythe is a student at Two Roads Charter School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Shilah Forsythe is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Shilah Forsythe for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. KRISTINA
EMELIA NOELLE DUNKLIN

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Kristina Emelia Noelle Dunklin for her

service to my office and the 21st Congressional District of California over the past five years.

Ms. Dunklin was born in Fresno, California to parents Marianne and Jerome R. Dunklin, M.D. Growing up in the Central Valley with her brothers, Joseph and Jacob, Ms. Dunklin enjoyed being active and challenging herself academically as she played varsity soccer while attending San Joaquin Memorial High School in Fresno. Following her graduation in 2008, Kristina attended Santa Clara University where she was able to pursue her love for helping others and giving back to the community by joining Kappa Kappa Gamma Sorority and serving as the Philanthropy Chair of the Eta Nu Chapter. During her time at Santa Clara University, Kristina developed a strong interest in politics and gained firsthand experience of grassroots politics by volunteering on local campaigns. In March 2012, Ms. Dunklin graduated from Santa Clara with her Bachelor of Science Degree in Political Science.

Shortly after graduation, Kristina left California's Central Valley and moved to Washington, D.C. to follow her passion of politics. Ms. Dunklin began her political career by quickly securing an internship with her hometown Congressman, DEVIN G. NUNES. Kristina has been a member of my Congressional team since 2012, first serving as Legislative Correspondent and most recently, as Legislative Director. Her thoughtful approach to crafting public policy combined with her expansive legislative knowledge made Ms. Dunklin an invaluable member of my team and a true public servant to the people of California's Central Valley.

Outside of work, Kristina enjoys spending time with her family, cooking recipes she learned from her grandmother, and skiing.

This February, Ms. Dunklin's time in my office came to an end as she moved on to a new role focused on one of her many passions, healthcare policy, with Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS of Indiana. While I am excited for Kristina to begin this new chapter, she will be greatly missed as a member of my team. Knowing Ms. Dunklin, her character and work ethic, I have no doubt she will achieve many great things in her future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Kristina Dunklin for her public service to the people of the Central Valley and wishing her the very best in this next chapter of her life.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF
THOMAS A. SPIESS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Tom Spiess, of Fayette, Ohio. Tom passed from this life on Friday, March 16, 2018 and today his family, friends and community gather to celebrate his homegoing.

Tom Spiess was an outstanding community leader. His life's work was as an art teacher

at Gorham Fayette Schools, where he founded the art club and the golf team. After thirty years as teacher and mentor, Tom retired from teaching in 2000. He then began a new career in "retirement" as the Village of Fayette Administrator, a position he held for six years. A local history buff, Tom also found time to host Civil War reenactments in his backyard.

All the while, Tom was involved in many civic activities. He served on the Ohio Arts Council; was a founding member and executive director of the Fayette Community Fine Arts Council; was integrally involved in the acquisition and restoration of the Fayette Opera House; served as chairman of Fulton County United Way; was president of the Gorham Fayette Teachers Association; president of the Fulton County Improvement Corporation; and was a member of the Fayette Chamber of Commerce. A true servant leader, Tom was an elder and board president at his Disciples of Christ Church, where he also taught Sunday school. Turning his grief into community help, Tom founded the Jon P. Spiess Memorial Golf Tournament in memory of his son.

Tom was feted by his community as Fayette Citizen of the Year. He also received a Defiance College Alumni Achievement Award. These recognitions by his community were most deserved and well earned.

Born to George and Marjorie Spiess in Wauseon, Ohio, Tom was a graduate of Delta High School. He went on to earn his undergraduate degree from Defiance College and his Master's degree from Sienna Heights College. Tom and his wife Cherrie were married on December 28, 1968 and together raised four children. In addition to their son, Jon, their children include Matthew, Mark and Elizabeth.

We offer our sincere condolences to his wife and children, grandchildren, brother, in-laws and friends. May they find some small comfort in their memories of this remarkable man and the gift of his life. Surely he will be greeted as in Matthew 25:23 "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Tom's generous, life giving spirit embraced his family, his community, and our nation. He was always building others. He cherished learning as fundamental to liberty and devoted himself to building an educated, engaged citizenry. His creativity and genius will continue to flower in all his good works. Truly, he has endowed a legacy to his family, community and country.

TIANA GALLATIN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Tiana Gallatin for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Tiana Gallatin is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Tiana Gallatin is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels

strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Tiana Gallatin for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF THE TOWN OF RUSH,
NEW YORK BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Town of Rush, New York for their Bicentennial Anniversary, which took place on March 13, 2018.

The Town of Rush is located in Monroe County near Rochester, New York, the third largest city in New York. Home to nearly 3,500 people, Rush, New York prides itself on its rich history, and suburban community feel.

As an Eagle Scout, I believe it is important to enjoy the outdoors, and preserve it for future generations to come. Rush, New York offers many opportunities to do just that, whether it be hiking on the Lehigh Valley Trail, or viewing native wildlife in Rush Oak Openings.

Rush is also home to the New York Museum of Transportation and Rochester and Genesee Valley Railroad Museum. Families and train enthusiasts from across the country can see everything from the largest collection of historic trains in New York State, to antique trolley cars.

I thank the Town of Rush for their commitment to preserving 200 years of history, and I congratulate them on their Bicentennial Anniversary.

KEEGAN GONSOIR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Keegan Gonsoir for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Keegan Gonsoir is a student at Two Roads Charter School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Keegan Gonsoir is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Keegan Gonsoir for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING PAMELA MAY LUND

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Pam Lund, Chief Executive Officer of the Girl Scouts of Eastern Washington and Northern Idaho Council. Pam is retiring at the end of April after 11 years of service to the Girl Scouts.

Pam's career has taken her in numerous directions including teaching, consulting and working for the Washington State Governor's office coordinating their work-force training programs. She used her experiences in these previous positions to grow the Girl Scouts Program in Eastern Washington and North Idaho. Today, the programs in this region have over 3,200 girls participating in these programs, aimed at building girls of courage, confidence, and character who make the world a better place.

During her tenure, she successfully merged two councils into the current council structure. She also nurtured the council through financial crisis to a position of financial health and strength. She was also responsible for garnering vital donor support to revitalize Camp Four Echoes, creating a hallmark property for the girls, the council, and the community to enjoy. She has attracted and developed a talented staff that is ready, willing, and able to elevate the Girl Scout mission and programs to the next level.

Pam describes her role with the Girl Scouts to be one of an encourager, a leader and a change agent. I appreciate her dedication and years of service to this organization and I know that her impact will be long felt among young women and troop leaders involved in Girl Scouts.

RHINA GUZMAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rhina Guzman for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Rhina Guzman is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rhina Guzman is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rhina Guzman for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TANIA HOLGUIN HERNANDEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Tania Holguin Hernandez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Tania Holguin Hernandez is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Tania Holguin Hernandez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Tania Holguin Hernandez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING JOSIE FERNANDEZ

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Hot Springs National Park Superintendent Josie Fernandez on a well-earned retirement.

A fixture in the Hot Springs community for more than a decade, Josie poured her heart and soul into her work as superintendent of one of America's oldest national parks. She led efforts to restore historic bathhouses along Central Avenue, bringing life to the core of Hot Springs National Park while raising needed revenue. Her work was both innovative and welcome by the community.

In addition to restoration efforts, Josie has joined with community leaders and groups to make Hot Springs National Park a true partner in the greater Hot Springs community.

When she retires, Josie will end more than a decade of service to the Hot Springs community and a quarter century of service to the Parks Service. Her service to our country extends beyond the Parks Service, having retired as a colonel in the Air Force Reserve.

I thank Josie for her dedication and wish her well as she begins her next journey.

YAMILE HERNANDEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Yamile Hernandez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Yamile Hernandez is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Yamile Hernandez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Yamile Hernandez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FRANK J. PIASECKI, SR.

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Frank J. Piasecki, of Toledo, Ohio. Mr. Piasecki passed from this life at the age of 91 years on March 5, 2018. He was a lifelong neighbor and constructive force across our community.

Born to parents Casper and Emily, Frank graduated from Woodward High School. Following his graduation he was a proud member of the United States Marine Corps and served as a gunner during World War II. After the war, on September 14, 1946, Frank and his wife Donna were married and together raised four children. Frank and Donna shared their lives together for a remarkable 71 years.

Frank Piasecki loved to repair cars, and he opened Piasecki's Service Inc, which has become a fixture in the Reynolds Corners neighborhood. A compassionate businessman dedicated to his community, Frank also served on the Reynolds Corners Adams Township Fire Department for many years. The business remains an anchor in the neighborhood, even as the next generation continues to grow it. The family's honesty and integrity are well-known.

Even while operating a business and raising a family, Frank Piasecki was a motorcycle enthusiast and enjoyed shooting, leading to his lifelong membership in the NRA and the American Motorcycle Association. In fact, during his racing days he was the 1952 winner of the Jack Pine Enduro. Frank also was involved in the Adams Conservation Club, where he coached the Junior Program. A proud veteran, Frank was long a member of American Legion Post 553. An avid bowler, Frank finally bowled a perfect game at the age of 71.

Frank Piasecki leaves a legacy through his honorable service to our nation in the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II, his respected records in the highly competitive world of racing, his lifetime of community minded business practices in building forward the Reynolds Corners community, and his exemplary life as a husband, father, grandfather and great-grandfather. Truly, his lasting legacy is that of his family. He leaves to cherish his

memory his wife and children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and many friends. We offer our sincere condolences, and hope they find comfort in the gift of Frank's life.

LAUREN LAWLESS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Lauren Lawless for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Lauren Lawless is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Lauren Lawless is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lauren Lawless for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

COST ESTIMATE ON H.R. 5081, THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY AND TECHNOLOGY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2018

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following cost estimate for H.R. 5081, the Surface Transportation Security and Technology Accountability Act of 2018, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, which was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 5081, the Surface Transportation Security and Technology Accountability Act of 2018.

If you wish further detail on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Megan Carroll.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director*

Enclosure.

H.R. 5081—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY AND TECHNOLOGY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2018

As reported by the House Committee on Homeland Security on March 19, 2018

H.R. 5081 would direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration

(TSA) to establish a Surface Transportation Security Advisory Committee. The bill would specify details related to the composition and responsibilities of that committee, and it would require TSA to consult the committee when developing the agency's plan for making investments in security-related technology.

Using information from the agency about the costs of similar activities, CBO expects that any increased costs to establish and support the proposed advisory committee would not exceed \$500,000 annually. Such spending would be subject to appropriation.

Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 5081 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficit in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 5081 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Megan Carroll. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

SKYLAH MARROGUIN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Skylah Marroguin for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Skylah Marroguin is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Skylah Marroguin is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Skylah Marroguin for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING SERGEANT JACK COLEMAN COOK OF HOT SPRINGS, ARKANSAS

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Jack Coleman Cook of Hot Springs, Arkansas, for his heroic actions in World War II when he selflessly sacrificed his own life to save his fellow airmen.

Sergeant Cook was a ball turret gunner on a B-17 Flying Fortress, the "Challenger," with the 384th Bomb Group. On February 3, 1945, the 384th Bomb Group participated in a mission to bomb the Tempelhof Railroad Marshaling Yards in Berlin. During the mission, the

Challenger was hit by flak, damaging multiple engines, gas tanks, and the fuselage, but left the crew unharmed.

As they made their way back to base in England, their plane began losing altitude and crash landed in the frigid North Sea. As soon as the plane hit the water, the crew members proceeded to abandon the aircraft and pull out the two life rafts, but only one fully inflated. The pilot and radio operator swam for the partially inflated raft, but the pilot succumbed to the cold and passed away, and the radio operator was dragged into the sea where he was lost.

The rest of the crew swam for the closer, fully inflated raft. Sergeant Cook, the first to make it, helped four other crewmembers into the overcrowded raft, while two men stayed in the water. Edward Field, the navigator who stayed in the water, began to push their raft towards the second raft. After thirty minutes in the water, Edward Field became numb, and said that he could no longer hold on.

Jack Coleman Cook got into the water so Edward Field could take his spot in the raft, where he continuously swam for forty-five minutes until they reached the second raft. Shortly after, Air-Sea rescue reached their position, but Sergeant Cook had little life left in him, and he passed away on the boat.

Sergeant Cook selflessly sacrificed his own life so Edward Field and his fellow crewmembers could live. Those men returned to duty only four weeks after the crash, where they bravely fought through the rest of the war.

Jack Coleman Cook is a true American hero who showed bravery and courage in a time of great circumstance. He gave his life for his fellow man, and for this, we remember him over seventy years later. It is with great pride that I honor Jack Coleman Cook.

SYDNEY MORRIS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sydney Morris for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sydney Morris is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sydney Morris is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sydney Morris for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MALLIEVE LENORA WICKER BREEDING

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of the late Mallieve Lenora Wicker Breeding. Breeding was a beloved member of the Selma community, investing hours in the city's school system and the development of her community.

Breeding was born to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Albert Wicker, on August 29, 1921, as one of three children. Breeding grew up understanding the importance of a good education. Her parents often stressed that a quality education was the key to improving one's lot in life.

As a proud graduate of Tremont High School in Selma, Breeding took her parents' advice to heart, and matriculated at Huntingdon College, in Montgomery, AL. It was during this time when Breeding met and married the love of her life, USAF Lieutenant Colonel Charles Norton Breeding. Lt. Col. Breeding was an instructor at the Maxwell Air Force Base and the two met while Breeding was serving as a hostess on behalf of Huntingdon College.

Breeding said it was commitment, trust, communication and lots of love that kept their bond alive. The Breeding's marriage produced three beautiful children and lasted 54 years, until the death of Lt. Col. Breeding. Breeding loved being a mother, and she considered her children Charles, Beverly and Nancy to be her life's greatest achievement.

Outside of her duties as wife and mother, Breeding loved to volunteer in the community. Lovingly known as Selma's "Madam Butterfly," Breeding received state and national awards for her volunteer service efforts in the public school system. She was involved in the development of butterfly gardens and was responsible for Selma being declared the Butterfly Capital of Alabama.

In 1968, she was the winner of Auburn University's W. Mosely Kelly Environmental Award for achievements in forestry, wildlife and related resources. She was a charter member of the "Tale Telling," was a member of the Benjamin Sterling Turner Memorial Committee and organized the Bicentennial Tree Program, which became the Selma Beautification Council.

Breeding was a member of Cornerstone Presbyterian Church. She used her faith as a driving force for her volunteer work. Breeding believed the Lord had given everyone specific gifts in order to help their communities.

In her passing, Breeding leaves behind her daughters, Beverly (George) Perkins of Sylacauga and Nancy (Hartley) Smith of Selma; grandchildren, Tom (Terri) Perkins of Nolensville, Tennessee, Dena Perkins (Brett), Adair of Mountain Brook, Alabama, David Perkins of Birmingham, Alabama, Rachel Smith (Brent) Evans of Middletown, Delaware, Christopher A. Smith of Springs Grove, Illinois and Cindy Breeding (Lee) Holmes of Dothan, Alabama, and 12 great-grandchildren.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama, and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Mallieve Lenora Wicker Breeding. We pay tribute to her distinguished contributions for the betterment of the State of Alabama, and extend deep appreciation for her exemplary service to the community of Selma, Alabama.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST BAPTIST CHRISTIAN ACADEMY

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize First Baptist Christian Academy (FBCA) of Pasadena, Texas on its 25th anniversary.

Through the vision of Dr. Charles Redmond and the members of First Baptist Church, FBCA opened its doors to 45 Pre-K through second grade students and five teachers in August of 1993. FBCA's first graduating class received its diplomas in May of 2003. Currently, FBCA hosts 600 students and offers a variety of award-winning extracurricular activities including academics, athletics, and fine arts. FBCA's dedication to its students is exemplified by a 99 percent graduation rate for all senior classes with approximately 97 percent of all graduates attending a college or university upon graduation.

I commend the students, families, faculty, staff, and First Baptist Church for keeping God at the center of FBCA's beliefs, values, and teachings. An "unapologetically Christian" and "academically excellent" education creates a foundation that is crucial, as FBCA students go out to make a difference in the world. FBCA is educating our future doctors, lawyers, legislators, factory workers, and educators, among other professions. If there is one thing the world could use more of, it is young Christian men and women who are engaged in serving and leading their communities.

25 years is quite an accomplishment and as someone who helped establish a Christian school in my hometown, I know it takes dedication from those behind the scenes. I commend the parents of FBCA students for the sacrifices they make to ensure their children receive a quality Christian education. To the faculty and staff, I commend you for imparting Christian wisdom and serving as a role model to your students.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize First Baptist Christian Academy on this important anniversary. May God continue to bless and grow FBCA and the community it serves.

RECOGNIZING THE VITAL IMPACT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the vital impact of outdoor recreation

on our economy and livelihood. Outdoor recreation and camping in the United States contribute significantly to our gross domestic product and Americans' physical and mental health. The great outdoors connect Americans to their natural heritage and bring families closer together. Significantly, outdoor recreation is the number one driver of economic activity on federal lands and contributes \$673,000,000,000 to the U.S. economy, and supports 4,300,000 American jobs. Every dollar Congress invests in the National Park Service effectively returns \$10 to the United States economy.

Our national parks, national forests, and public lands and waters conserve natural resources, inspire young people, offer unique moments for all to enjoy, and encourage conservation of our shared environment. Unfortunately, many public campgrounds on our public lands and waters today face backlogged maintenance, deteriorating infrastructure, and struggle to meet the needs of modern day visitors. The American-made recreation vehicle (RV) industry is a domestic job-creating and thriving industry that contributes over \$50,000,000,000 to the United States economy and supports over 300,000 American jobs. We must improve and modernize our national parks, national forests, and public lands and waters to adequately facilitate outdoor enthusiast and RV visitors.

As a Co-Chair of the RV Caucus and an outdoor enthusiast, today I proudly introduced a House Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the national parks, national forests, and public lands and waters of the United States contribute greatly to the economic and physical well-being of Americans and can be further improved by public-private partnerships. I am committed to working on innovative solutions and partnerships to modernize and expand campgrounds, address infrastructure needs, eliminate backlogged maintenance, and provide safe camping opportunities and enjoyable recreational experiences for all visitors on federal lands for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHIEF OF
POLICE WILLIAM "TOM" TACKETT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exemplary work of William "Tom" Tackett as he retires as Chief of Police for the Town of Argyle, TX on March 22, 2018. He has over 25 years of service at the Argyle Police Department and previously served his country in the U.S. Army as a Military Police Officer.

After his military service, Chief Tackett graduated from the Tarrant County College Police Academy and joined the Argyle Police Depart-

ment in April 1992 as a part-time reserve police officer. He transitioned to a full-time police officer in March 1995 and rose through the ranks to become Chief of Police in April 2000. Not only is Chief Tackett the most tenured Chief to lead the Argyle Police Department, he is the longest tenured employee to serve the Town in its 55 year history. He is a licensed Master Peace Officer and holds Texas Commission on Law enforcement certifications for Instructor, Forensic Hypnosis and Special Investigator.

Chief Tackett also serves as the Town's Emergency Management Coordinator and is an amateur radio operator and active in the Denton County Amateur Radio Club. In addition to his professional work, he is a Master Mason, serving as past Master of Roanoke Lodge 668, and he is a life member of the Moslah Shrine Circus and Legion Corps.

For more than two and a half decades, Chief Tackett has faithfully served and protected the citizens and businesses of Argyle, while holding himself and his staff to high ethical and professional standards as he has capably led the Police Department. I am deeply grateful for his service to the City of Argyle and North Texas and extend best wishes to Chief Tackett and his family upon his retirement.

HONORING CHIEF CARL
SFERRAZZA FOR 38 YEARS OF
SERVICE TO THE ENFIELD COM-
MUNITY

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a good friend and great public servant from North Central Connecticut, Police Chief Carl Sferrazza, who is retiring after a distinguished 38-year career with the Enfield Police Department.

An Enfield resident all his life, Carl's journey with the Enfield police department began in 1976 as an auxiliary police officer. Four years later, he was hired by the department to be a full-time member of the force. Carl started as a patrolman who experienced the nitty-gritty of police work, responding to emergency calls, enforcing motor vehicle laws, and acting as a mediator in the neighborhoods, keeping the peace. Sometimes he had to go above and beyond normal duty, earning himself three citations for heroism, one of which came after rescuing a father and his children from a house fire.

Over the years, Carl's talented work was recognized and he rose through the ranks, and eventually was promoted to Police Chief in 2005. Under his guidance and strong leadership, the police department received national accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies and joined regional public safety teams like Capitol Region Emergency Services Team and the Metro

Traffic Services. These improvements are a direct reflection of Chief Sferrazza's leadership style. He sees Enfield as not just a place to go to work, but as his house, and its residents as his family. He has also implemented multiple programs such as the Citizens Police Academy and the annual awards night, strengthening the relationship between law enforcement and residents.

Chief Sferrazza's leadership does not end with the Enfield Police Department. He is the president of the Mt. Carmel Society and teaches criminal justice at his alma mater, Asnuntuck Community College. He is a devoted husband to Donnalee and father to Alex and Audra.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Carl Sferrazza has left a legacy of "people-first" leadership in his time at the Enfield Police Department. His footprint is large and wide on the town and will live on forever. I ask my colleagues to please rise to thank him for his decades of dedication to the people of Enfield. He has been a great example of civic responsibility to his neighbors and I know he will continue this example, even in his retirement. I wish him all the best in this next chapter.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 22, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 23

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kirsten Dawn Madison, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs), and Thomas J. Hushek, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, both of the Department of State.

SD-419